

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

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

Various pagings.

Pages 1871 & 2528 are incorrectly numbered pages 871 & 252.

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

FOURTH SESSION — SIXTH PARLIAMENT.

53° VICTORIÆ, 1890.

VOL. XXIX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE
TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF MARCH, INCLUSIVE, 1890.



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

—
1890.

0 900265

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FOURTH SESSION OF THE SIXTH PARLIAMENT,

1890.

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

Clerk of the Privy Council JOHN JOSEPH MCGEE, Esq.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS:

Hon. JOSEPH ALDRIC OUMET	<i>Speaker.</i>
JOHN FISHER WOOD, M.P., Brockville	<i>Deputy Speaker.</i>
JOHN G. BOURINOT, Esq.	Clerk of the House.
DONALD W. MACDONELL, Esq.	Sergeant-at-Arms.
FRANÇOIS FORTUNAT ROULEAU, Esq.	Clerk Assistant.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS:

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

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

1890.

- ADDINGTON—John W. Bell.
ALBERT—Richard Chapman Weldon.
ALBERTA—Donald Watson Davis.
ALGOMA—Simon J. Dawson.
ANNAPOLIS—John B. Mills.
ANTIGONISH—Hon. Sir John S. D. Thompson,
K.C.M.G.
ARGENTEUIL—James C. Wilson.
ASSINIBOIA, East—Hon. Edgar Dewdney.
ASSINIBOIA, West—Nicholas Flood Davin.
BAGOT—Flavien Dupont.
BEAUCE—Joseph Godbout.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.
BELLECHASSE—Guillaume Amyot.
BERTHIER—Cléophas Beausoleil.
BONAVENTURE—Louis Joseph Riopel.
BOTHWELL—Hon. David Mills.
BRANT, N. Riding—James Somerville.
BRANT, S. Riding—William Paterson.
BROCKVILLE—John Fisher Wood.
BROME—Sydney Arthur Fisher.
BRUCE, E. Riding—Henry Cargill.
BRUCE, N. Riding—Alexander McNeill.
BRUCE, W. Riding—James Rowand.
CAPE BRETON—{ Hector F. McDougall.
 { David McKeen.
CARDWELL—Robert Smeaton White.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frederick Harding Hale.
CARLETON (O.)—George Lemuel Dickinson.
CARIBOO—Frank S. Barnard.
CHAMBLY—Raymond Préfontaine.
CHAMPLAIN—Hippolyte Montplaisir.
CHARLEVOIX—Simon Cimon.
CHARLOTTE—Arthur Hill Gillmor.
CHATEAUGUAY—Edward Holton.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Paul Couture.
COLCHESTER—Hon. Sir Adams G. Archibald,
K.C.M.G.
COMPTON—Rufus Henry Pope.
CORNWALL AND STORMONT—Darby Bergin.
CUMBERLAND—Arthur R. Dickey.
DIGBY—Herbert Ladd Jones.
DORCHESTER—Honoré J. J. B. Chouinard.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Joseph Lavergne.
DUNDAS—Charles Erastus Hickey.
DURHAM, E. Riding—Henry Alfred Ward.
DURHAM, W. Riding—Hon. Edward Blake.
ELGIN, E. Riding—John H. Wilson.
ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.
ESSEX, N. Riding—James Colebrooke Patterson.
ESSEX, S. Riding—James Brien.
FRONTENAC—Hon. George Airey Kirkpatrick.
GASPÉ—Louis Z. Joncas.
GLENGARRY—P. Purcel.
GLOUCESTER—Kennedy F. Burns.
GRENVILLE, S. Riding—Walter Shanly.
GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. Riding—James Masson.
GREY, S. Riding—George Landerkin.
GUYSBOROUGH—John A. Kirk.
HALDIMAND — { Charles Wesley Colter.*
 { Walter Humphries Montague.
HALIFAX—{ Hon. Alfred G. Jones.
 { Thomas E. Kenny.
HALTON—John Waldie.
HAMILTON—{ Adam Brown.
 { Alexander McKay.
HANTS—Alfred Putnam.
HASTINGS, E. Riding—Samuel Barton Burdett.
HASTINGS, N. Riding—Hon. Mackenzie Bowell.
HASTINGS, W. Riding—Henry Corby.
HOCHELAGA—Alphonse Desjardins.
HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.
HURON, E. Riding—Peter Macdonald.
HURON, S. Riding—John McMillan.
HURON, W. Riding—Robert Porter.
IBERVILLE—François Béchard.
INVERNESS—Hugh Cameron.

* Unseated on judgment of Supreme Court. Mr. Montague returned and took seat March 4th, 1890, and sat for remainder of Session.

- JACQUES CARTIER—Désiré Girouard.
 JOLIETTE—Hilaire Neveu.
- KAMOURASKA—Alexis Dessaint.
 KENT (N. B.)—Pierre Amand Landry.*
 KENT (Ont.)—Archibald Campbell.
 KING'S (N. B.)—Hon. George E. Foster.
 KING'S (N. S.)—Frederick W. Borden.
 KING'S (P. E. I.)—{ Peter Adolphus McIntyre.
 { James Edwin Robertson.
 KINGSTON—Rt. Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald, G. C. B.
- LAMBTON, E. Riding—George Moncrieff.
 LAMBTON, W. Riding—James Frederick Lister.
 LANARK, N. Riding—Joseph Jamieson.
 LANARK, S. Riding—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
 LAPRAIRIE—Cyrille Doyon.
 L'ASSOMPTION—Joseph Gauthier.
 LAVAL—Hon. Joseph Aldric Ouimet.
 LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, N. Riding—Charles Frederick Ferguson.
 LEEDS, S. Riding—George Taylor.
 LENNOX—Uriah Wilson.
 LÉVIS—Pierre Malcolm Guay.
 LINCOLN AND NIAGARA—John Charles Rykert.†
 LISGAR—Arthur Wellington Ross.
 L'ISLET—Philippe Baby Casgrain.
 LONDON—Hon. John Carling.
 LOTBINIÈRE—Côme Isaïe Rinfret.
 LUNENBURG—James Daniel Eisenhauer.
- MARQUETTE—Robert Watson.
 MASKINGNONGÉ—Charles Jérémie Coulombe.
 MÉGANTIC—George Turcot.
 MIDDLESEX, E. Riding—Joseph Henry Marshall.
 MIDDLESEX, N. Riding—Timothy Coughlin.
 MIDDLESEX, S. Riding—James Armstrong.
 MIDDLESEX, W. Riding—Wm. Frederick Roome.
 MISSISQUOI—David Bishop Meigs.
 MONCK—Arthur Boyle.
 MONTCALM—Olaüs Thérien.
 MONTMAGNY—Philippe Aug. Choquette.
 MONTMORENCY—Charles Langelier.
 MONTREAL, Centre—John Joseph Curran.
 MONTREAL, East—Alphonse Téléphore Lépine.
 MONTREAL, West—Sir Donald A. Smith, K. C. M. G.
 MUSKOKA—William Edward O'Brien.
- NAPIERVILLE—Louis Ste. Marie.
 NEW WESTMINSTER—Donald Chisholm.‡
 NICOLET—Fabien Boisvert.
 NORFOLK, N. Riding—John Charlton.
 NORFOLK, S. Riding—David Tisdale.
 NORTHUMBERLAND (N. B.)—Hon. Peter Mitchell.
 NORTHUMBERLAND (Ont.) E. Riding—Edward Cochrane.
- NORTHUMBERLAND (Ont.) W. Riding—George Guillet.
- ONTARIO, N. Riding—Frank Madill.
 ONTARIO, S. Riding—William Smith.
 ONTARIO, W. Riding—James David Edgar.
- OTTAWA (City)—{ William Goodhue Perley.*
 { Honoré Robillard.
 { Charles H. Mackintosh.†
 OTTAWA (County)—Alonzo Wright.
 OXFORD, N. Riding—James Sutherland.
 OXFORD, S. Riding—Hon. Sir Richard J. Cartwright, K. C. M. G.
- PEEL—William A. McCulla.
 PERTH, N. Riding—Samuel Rollin Hesson.
 PERTH, S. Riding—James Trow.
 PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding—John Lang.
 PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding—James Stevenson.
- PICTOU—{ Hon. Charles Hibbert Tupper.
 { John McDougald.
 PONTIAC—John Bryson.
 PORTNEUF—Joseph E. A. De St. Georges.
 PRESCOTT—Simon Labrosse.
- PRINCE (P. E. I.)—{ Stanislaus F. Perry.
 { James Yeo.
 PRINCE EDWARD—John Milton Platt.
 PROVENCHER—Alphonse A. C. LaRivière.
- QUEBEC, Centre—François Langelier.
 QUEBEC, East—Hon. Wilfred Laurier.
 QUEBEC, West—Hon. Thos. McGreevy.
 QUEBEC, County—Hon. Sir Adolphe P. Caron, K. C. M. G.
- QUEEN'S (N. B.)—George F. Baird.
 QUEEN'S (N. S.)—Joshua Newton Freeman.
 QUEEN'S (P. E. I.)—{ Louis Henry Davies.
 { William Welsh.
- RENFREW, N. Riding—Peter White.
 RENFREW, S. Riding—John Ferguson.
 RESTIGOUCHE—George Moffat.
 RICHELIEU—Joseph Aimé Massue.
 RICHMOND (N. S.)—Edmund Power Flynn.
 RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—William Bullock Ives.
 RIMOUSKI—J. B. Romuald Fiset.
 ROUVILLE—George Auguste Gigault.
 RUSSELL—William Cameron Edwards.
- ST. HYACINTHE—Michel E. Bernier.
 ST. JOHN (N. B.) City—John V. Ellis.
 ST. JOHN (N. B.) City and County—{ Charles N. Skinner.
 { Charles Wesley Weldon.
 ST. JOHN'S (Q.)—François Bourassa.
 ST. MAURICE—François Sévère L. Desaulniers.
 SASKATCHEWAN—D. H. Macdowall.
 SELKIRK—Thomas Mayne Daly.
 SHEFFORD—Antoine Audet.

* Resigned on or about 14th April, 1890, having accepted an office of emolument under the Crown.

† Resigned 2nd May, 1890.

‡ Died on or about 8th April, 1890.

* Died on or about 30th April, 1890.

† Returned and took seat 6th May, and sat for remainder of Session.

SHELburnE—Lieut.-General J. Wimburn Laurie.
 SHERBROOKE—Robert Newton Hall.
 SIMCOE, E. Riding—Herman Henry Cook.
 SIMCOE, N. Riding—Dalton McCarthy.
 SIMCOE, S. Riding—Richard Tyrwhitt.
 SOULANGES—James William Bain.
 STANSTEAD—Hon. Charles C. Colby.
 SUNBURY—Robert Duncan Wilmot, jun.
 TÉMISCOUATA—Paul Étienne Grandbois.
 TERREBONNE—Hon. J. A. Chapleau.
 THREE RIVERS—Hon. Sir H. L. Langevin, K. C. M. G.
 TORONTO, Centre—George Ralph R. Cockburn.
 TORONTO, East—John Small.
 TORONTO, West—Frederick Chas. Denison, C. M. G.
 TWO MOUNTAINS—Jean Baptiste Daoust.
 VANCOUVER ISLAND—David William Gordon.
 VAUDREUIL—Hugh McMillan.
 VERCHÈRES—Hon. Félix Geoffrin.
 VICTORIA (B. C.)— $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Edward Gawler Prior.} \\ \text{Thomas Earle.} \end{array} \right.$
 VICTORIA (N. B.)—Hon. John Costigan.
 VICTORIA (N. S.)—John Archibald McDonald.

VICTORIA (O.) N. Riding—John Augustus Barron.
 VICTORIA (O.) S. Riding—Adam Hudspeth.*
 WATERLOO, N. Riding—Isaac Erb Bowman.
 WATERLOO, S. Riding—James Livingston.
 WELLAND—John Ferguson.
 WELLINGTON, C. Riding—Andrew Semple.
 WELLINGTON, N. Riding—James McMullen.
 WELLINGTON, S. Riding—James Innes.
 WENTWORTH, N. Riding—Thomas Bain.
 WENTWORTH, S. Riding—Franklin M. Carpenter.
 WESTMORELAND—Josiah Wood.
 WINNIPEG—William Bain Scarth.
 YALE—John Andrew Mara.
 YAMASKA—Fabien Vanasse.
 YARMOUTH—John Lovitt.
 YORK (N. B.)—Thomas Temple.
 YORK (O.) E. Riding—Hon. Alexander Mackenzie.
 YORK (O.) N. Riding—William Mulock.
 YORK (O.) W. Riding—N. Clark Wallace.

* Died 12th May, 1890.

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

BÉCHARD, Mr. François (*Iberville*).
 CHARLTON, Mr. John (*North Norfolk*).
 DAVIN, Mr. N. F. (*West Assiniboia*).
 DESJARDINS, Mr. Alphonse (*Hochelaga*).
 ELLIS, Mr. John V. (*St. John, N. B., City*).
 INNES, Mr. James (*South Wellington*).
 PRIOR, Mr. Edward Gawler (*Victoria, B. C.*)

SCRIVER, Mr. Jules (*Huntingdon*).
 SOMERVILLE, Mr. James (*West Bruce*).
 TAYLOR, Mr. George (*South Leeds*).
 TUPPER, Hon. Charles H. (*Pictou*).
 VANASSE, Mr. Fabien (*Yamaska*).
 WELDON, Mr. R. Chapman (*Albert*).
 WHITE, Mr. Robert Smeaton (*Cardwell*).

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

LIST OF PAIRS DURING THE SESSION.

On Mr. LANDERKIN's proposed resolution (Rebate of Duty on Corn) 3rd February :—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)
Mr. TISDALE.	Hon. Mr. JONES.
Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN.	Mr. GUAY.
Mr. WOOD.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. TAYLOR.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. FERGUSON (Welland)	Mr. RINFRET.
Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. ROOME.	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'cy)
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).
Mr. WARD.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. PRIOR.	Mr. PLATT.
Mr. TEMPLE.	Mr. HALE.
Mr. BROWN.	Mr. COOK.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. McMULLEN.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. GODBOUT.
Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).	Mr. INNES.
Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. RIOPEL.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

On Mr. CHARLTON's motion for Select Committee (Exodus of Canadians to United States) 10th February :—

Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. WILMOT.	Mr. HALE.
Hon. Mr. COLBY.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. BRYSON.	Mr. CAMPBELL.
Mr. FERGUSON (Welland)	Mr. HOLTON.
Hon. Mr. CARLING.	Mr. MULOCK.
General LAURIE.	Mr. EDGAR.

On Mr. LAURIER's proposed resolution (Rebate on Imported Corn for Spirits) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 11th February :—

Mr. WILMOT.	Mr. HALE.
Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. MACDOWELL.	Mr. FISHER.
Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou)	Mr. FLYNN.
Mr. DALY.	Mr. HOLTON.
Mr. DESJARDINS.	Mr. SCRIVER.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. PURCELL.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. BLAKE.
General LAURIE.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. WARD.	Mr. BARRON.

On Mr. McMILLAN's (Huron) proposed resolution (Removal of Duty on Grains and Seeds) 24th February :—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. BRYSON.	Mr. LANDERKIN.
Mr. POPE.	Mr. GUAY.
Mr. MOFFAT.	Mr. AMYOT.
Mr. COLBY.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. CIMON.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).
General LAURIE.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. WILSON (Lennox).	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'cy)
Mr. DAWSON.	Sir R. CARTWRIGHT.
Mr. SPROULE.	Mr. WELSH.
Sir J. A. MACDONALD.	Mr. GILLMOR.
Sir ADOLPHE CARON.	Mr. RINFRET.
Mr. GIROUARD.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. COOK.
Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. COCKBURN.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. MASSON.	Mr. BERNIER.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.

On Mr. MARA's motion (to adjourn debate) to Mr. Platt's proposed resolution (Removal of Duty on Mining Machinery) 26th February :—

Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. DESJARDINS.	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'cy)
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. LANDERKIN.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. McMULLEN.
Mr. GIROUARD.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.

On Mr. WILSON's (Elgin) proposed resolution (Repeal of the Franchise Act) 26th February :—

Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. WELDON (Albert).	Mr. BORDEN.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Hon. Mr. MITCHELL.
Hon. Mr. COLBY.	Hon. Mr. BLAKE.
Mr. DESJARDINS.	Sir R. CARTWRIGHT.
Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. HALL.	Mr. PURCELL.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'cy)

On Mr. LAURIER's proposed resolution (Short Line Railway—Harvey and Salisbury) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 6th March :—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. MOFFATT.	Mr. HALE.
Mr. DESAULNIERS.	Mr. GUAY.
Mr. MASSUE.	Mr. CHOUINARD.
Mr. FERGUSON(Renfrew)	Mr. MEIGS.
Mr. WARD.	Mr. BARRON.
Mr. FERGUSON(Welland)	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. LANG.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. DESSAINT.
Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).	Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. COOK.
Mr. CORBY.	Mr. BURDETT.
Mr. SCARTH.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. GIROUARD.	Mr. RINFRET.
Mr. HUDSPETH.	Mr. FRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. DAoust.	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'ey)
Mr. PERLEY.	Mr. WELSH.
Hon. Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Mr. BOURASSA.
Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. PURCELL.
Mr. LANDRY.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. GORDON.	Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).
Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN.	Hon. Mr. BLAKE.
Mr. LABROSSE.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

On Sir JOHN THOMPSON's motion (to adjourn debate) to Sir Richard Cartwright's proposed resolution (*re* the Member for Lincoln) 11th March :—

Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. MOFFAT.	Mr. HALE.
Mr. MASSON.	Mr. EDGAR.
Hon. Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Hon. Mr. LAURIER.
Mr. McGREEVY.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. HUDSPETH.	Mr. PURCELL.
Mr. BRYSON.	Hon. Mr. BLAKE.
Mr. WARD.	Mr. BARRON.
Mr. BROWN.	Mr. MULOCK.
Mr. MONTPLAISIR.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Mr. DAoust.	Mr. WELSH.

On Mr. LAURIER's proposed resolution (Censuring Government for delay in bringing down Budget, &c.) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 14th March :—

Mr. SMITH (Ontario).	Mr. BOWMAN.
Mr. BELL.	Mr. TURCOT.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. COOK.
Mr. BERGERON.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

B

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Mr. MONTAGUE.	Mr. BURDETT.
Mr. COCHRANE.	Mr. GODBOUT.
Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. ROWAND.
Hon. Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Mr. HALE.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. PURCELL.
Mr. WHITE.	Mr. FISHER.
Mr. DESJARDINS.	Mr. CASGRAIN.
Mr. DESAULNIERS.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. RIOPEL.	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'ey)
Hon. Mr. McGREEVY.	Hon. Mr. MITCHELL.
Mr. WILSON (Lennox).	Mr. LANG.

On Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD's amendment (six months' hoist) to Mr. Charlton's motion for second reading of Bill 38 (Dominion Elections Act Amendment) 19th March :—

Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. MASSUE.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. McDougall (C.B.)	Mr. WALDIE.
Mr. SPROULE.	Mr. COOK.
Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. GIROUARD.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. ARMSTRONG.
Sir JOHN THOMPSON.	Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).
Hon. Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Hon. Mr. BLAKE.
Mr. MONTAGUE.	Mr. LANDERKIN.
Mr. SKINNER.	Mr. COUTURE.
Mr. PERLEY.	Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. THERIEN.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Mr. IVES.	Mr. HOLTON.
Mr. WRIGHT.	Mr. PATERSON (Brant).
Mr. DAoust.	Mr. DESSAINT.

On Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT's amendment (Increased Expenditure, Taxation, &c.) to Budget, 8th April :—

Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. MASSUE.	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'ey)
Mr. PUTNAM.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. AUDET.	Mr. CHOUINARD.
Mr. WELDON (Albert).	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. BURDETT.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. GODBOUT.
Mr. McDougald (Pictou)	Mr. COOK.
General LAURIE.	Mr. KIRK.
Mr. COCKBURN.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. PATERSON (Brant).
Mr. MARSHALL.	Mr. CASEY.
Hon. Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Hon. Mr. BLAKE.
Mr. DENISON.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Mr. LIVINGSTON.

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>	<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Mr. McDONALD (Victoria)	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.	On Mr. McMULLEN's amendment (Binding Twines)	to motion of Mr. Foster (second reading of resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means) 22nd April :—
Mr. GIROUARD.	Mr. AMYOT.	Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. FERGUSON (Renfrew)	Mr. ARMSTRONG.	Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).	Mr. EISENHAEUER.
Mr. BOYLE.	Mr. PURCELL.	Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. SKINNER.	Mr. MULOCK.	Mr. MARSHALL.	Mr. LIVINGSTON.
		Mr. POPE.	Mr. GILLMOR.
On Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD's amendment (six months' hoist) to Mr. Shanly's motion for Committee of Whole on Bill 104 (Railway Act Amendment) 14th April :—		Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. PURCELL.
Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.	Mr. JONCAS.	Hon. Mr. MITCHELL.
Mr. WRIGHT.	Mr. WELDON (St. John).	Mr. ROSS.	Mr. CASGRAIN.
Mr. GIROUARD.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).	Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).	Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).
Mr. McGREEVY.	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'cy)	Sir DONALD SMITH.	Mr. FISHER.
Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. COOK.	Hon. Mr. HAGGART.	Mr. PATERSON (Brant).
Mr. MASSUE.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.	Mr. GORDON.	Mr. WELSH.
		Mr. DAVIS.	Mr. SUTHERLAND.
		Mr. McMILLAN.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
On Mr. WATSON's amendment (Committee of Enquiry <i>re</i> Conduct of L. W. Herchmer) to Mr. Davin's motion (Management of North-West Mounted Police and Conduct of Commissioner) 14th April :—		On Mr. BRIEN's amendment (to recom. B.) to Mr. Chapeau's motion for third reading of Bill 136 (Franchise Act) 25th April :—	
Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.	Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).	Mr. EISENHAEUER.
Mr. PUTNAM.	Mr. LISTER.	Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. WRIGHT.	Mr. WELDON (St. John).	Mr. AUDET.	Mr. TURCOTTE.
Mr. GIROUARD.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).	Mr. GIROUARD.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Mr. McGREEVY.	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'cy)	Mr. DICKEY.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. COOK.	Mr. FERGUSON (Welland)	Mr. WILSON (Elgin).
Mr. MASSUE.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.	Mr. MONCREIFF.	Mr. COOK.
Mr. SPROULE.	Mr. WALDIE.	Sir DONALD SMITH.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. BROWN.	Mr. HOLTON.	Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. PURCELL.
Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. LANDERKIN.	Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. SCRIVER.
		Mr. BERGERON.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).
On Mr. BERGIN's amendment (to recom. B.) to Sir John Thompson's motion for third reading of Bill 65 (Criminal Law Amendment) 16th April :—		Mr. BAIN.	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'cy)
Mr. WOOD (Brockville).	Mr. WELDON (St. John).	Mr. POPE.	Mr. BOWMAN.
Mr. SPROULE.	Mr. AMYOT.	Mr. DESJARDINS.	Mr. GEOFFRION.
Mr. LÉPINE.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.	Mr. McGREEVY.	Mr. HOLTON.
Mr. McGREEVY.	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'cy)	Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. BÉCHARD.
		Mr. BOISVERT.	Mr. YEO.
On Mr. TISDALE's amendment to amendment (to recom. B.) :—		Hon. Mr. HAGGART.	Hon. Mr. BLAKE.
Mr. McGREEVY.	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'cy)	On Mr. MILLS' (Bothwell) amendment (to recom. B.)	(Same as last.)
Mr. SPROULE.	Mr. AMYOT.		
Mr. CURRAN.	Mr. HALE.	On Mr. FOSTER's proposed resolution (Bounty on Pig Iron) 5th May :—	
Mr. BROWN.	Mr. WELDON (St. John).	Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. EDWARDS.
		Mr. DICKEY.	Mr. WELSH.
On Mr. MITCHELL's amendment (to recom. B.)		Mr. PRIOR.	Mr. YEO.
(Same as last.)		Mr. MARA.	Mr. ROBERTSON.
		Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. HALE.

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Mr. MCKAY.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. CIMON.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. WALDIE.
Mr. DESAULNIERS.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. VANASSE.	Mr. GUAY.
Mr. BAIN (Soulanges).	Mr. CHOUINARD.
Mr. WILSON (Lennox).	Mr. LANGELIER (Mont'cy)
Mr. ROOME.	Mr. FLYNN.
Mr. MONTPLAISIR.	Mr. RINFRET.
Mr. TAYLOR.	Mr. TROW.
Mr. MCGREEVY.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. CAMERON.	Mr. KIRK.

On Sir JOHN THOMPSON'S motion to concur in Senate amendments to Bill 6 (Bills of Exchange, &c.) 5th May :—

(Same as last) with the addition of

Mr. THÉRIEN.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Mr. McMILLAN.	Mr. BERNIER.
Mr. DAoust.	Mr. DESSAINT.
Mr. BERGERON.	Mr. TURCOT.
Mr. COULOMBE.	Mr. FISET.
Mr. DESJARDINS.	Mr. DE ST. GEORGES.

On Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT'S amendment (Increased Taxation) to Mr. Foster's motion for third reading of Bill 143 (Customs Duties) 7th May :—

Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. DICKEY.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. PRIOR.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. MARA.	Mr. ROBERTSON.
Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. HALE.
Mr. CAMERON.	Mr. KIRK.
Mr. FREEMAN.	Mr. PERRY.
Mr. McDOUGALL (C.B.)	Mr. McINTYRE.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. SKINNER.	Mr. FLYNN.
Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).	Mr. EISENHAEUER.
General LAURIE.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. MCGREEVY.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. DAoust.	Mr. GODBOUT.
Mr. RIOPEL.	Mr. CHOUINARD.
Mr. IVES.	Mr. COUTURE.
Mr. POPE.	Mr. CASGRAIN.
Hon. Mr. KIRKPATRICK.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).	Mr. SOMERVILLE.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Mr. MULOCK.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. PURCELL.

On Mr. WATSON'S amendment (to recom.) to Mr. Dewdney's motion for second reading of resolutions (Land Grants to Railways) 13th April :—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. DICKEY.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. PRIOR.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. MARA.	Mr. ROBERTSON.
Mr. BARNARD.	Mr. HALE.
Mr. CAMERON.	Mr. KIRK.
Mr. FREEMAN.	Mr. PERRY.
Mr. McDOUGALL (C.B.)	Mr. McINTYRE.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. SKINNER.	Mr. FLYNN.
Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).	Mr. EISENHAEUER.
Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).	Mr. DAVIES.
Mr. PUTNAM.	Mr. PURCELL.
General LAURIE.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. FERGUSON (Welland)	Mr. WELDON (St. John).
Mr. MARSHALL.	Hon. Mr. JONES.
Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. BOWMAN.

On Mr. WALLACE'S motion for second reading of Bill 32 (Orange Incorporation) 10th February :—

<i>For.</i>	<i>Against.</i>
Mr. DESJARDINS.	Mr. SCRIVER.
Mr. WILMOT.	Mr. FREEMAN.
Mr. CAMERON.	Mr. SCARTH.
Mr. WOOD (Westm'land)	Mr. STEVENSON.
Hon. Mr. KIRKPATRICK	Sir JOHN THOMPSON.
Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil)	Mr. RIOPEL.
Mr. DICKEY.	Hon. Mr. BLAKE.
Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. McMILLAN (Vandreuil)

On Mr. BEAUSOLEIL'S amendment to Mr. Davin's amendment to Mr. McCarthy's motion for second reading of B. 10 (French Language in the North-West) 18th February :—

<i>For.</i>	<i>Against.</i>
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Mr. RYKERT.
Mr. CAMERON.	Mr. FREEMAN.
Mr. PATTERSON (Essex).	Mr. TISDALE.
Sir ADOLPHE P. CARON	Mr. BAIN.
Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.	Hon. Mr. BLAKE.
Mr. LAVERGNE.	Mr. WALDIE.
Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec)	Mr. STEVENSON.
Mr. POPE.	Mr. PORTER.
Mr. CHOQUETTE.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. CHOUINARD.	Sir ADAMS ARCHIBALD.

On Mr. WALLACE'S motion for third reading of
Bill 32 (Orange Incorporation) and amend-
ments, 3rd March :—

<i>For.</i>	<i>Against.</i>
Mr. ARMSTRONG.	Mr. CIMON.
Mr. CARPENTER.	Mr. CAMERON.
Mr. DALY.	Mr. DESSAINT.
Mr. PLATT.	Mr. GIROUARD.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. VANASSE.
Mr. WALDIE.	Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

<i>For.</i>	<i>Against.</i>
Hon. Mr. TUPPER.	Mr. LANDRY.
Mr. LIVINGSTON.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. SEMPLE.	Mr. LARIVIÈRE.
Mr. CHISHOLM.	Mr. IVES.
Sir DONALD SMITH.	Mr. RIOPEL.
Mr. BAIRD.	Mr. JONCAS.
Mr. ROOME.	Mr. AUDET.
Mr. BRYSON.	Mr. EDWARDS.

House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION—SIXTH PARLIAMENT—53 VIC.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 16th January, 1890.

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

PRAYERS.

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

MR. SPEAKER,

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned,

VACANCIES.

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

Of the HON. JOHN HENRY POPE, Member for the Electoral District of Compton, by decease.

Of JEAN BAPTISTE LABELLE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Richelieu, by decease.

Of EDGAR CROWE BAKER, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Victoria, B.C., by resignation.

Of CHARLES CARROLL COLBY, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Stanstead, by acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

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

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of RUFUS HENRY POPE, Esq., for the Electoral District of Compton.

Of JOSEPH AIMÉ MASSUÉ, Esq., for the Electoral District of Richelieu.

Of THOMAS EARLE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Victoria, B.C.

Of the HON. CHARLES CARROLL COLBY, Member for the Electoral District of Stanstead.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

HON. CHARLES CARROLL COLBY, Member for the Electoral District of Stanstead, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Hector Langevin.

THOMAS EARLE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Victoria, B.C., introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Prior.

R. H. POPE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Compton, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and the Hon. C. C. Colby.

FIRST READING.

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

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. SPEAKER laid on the Table a copy of the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament in the Senate Chamber this day, which is as follows :—

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

In calling you together again for the consideration of Public Affairs, I may fairly congratulate you on a continuance of the progress and prosperity of the country.

During the recess I visited Manitoba and the North-West Territories and British Columbia, and everywhere I found myself received with the loyalty and good-will which I have learned to be characteristic of Canada. A comparison of my own observations with those of my predecessors shows clearly the great progress which has marked this part of the Dominion, in the settlement of the country and in the development of its great agricultural capabilities, of its mineral wealth and of its other natural resources.

In consequence of the repeated seizures by cruisers of the United States Navy of Canadian Vessels, while employed in the capture of seals in that part of the Northern Pacific Ocean, known as Behring Sea, my Government has strongly represented to Her Majesty's Ministers, the necessity of protecting our shipping, while engaged in their lawful calling, as well as of guarding against the assumption by any nation of exclusive proprietary rights in those waters. I feel confident that those representations have had due weight, and I hope to be enabled during the present Session to assure you that all differences on this question are in the course of satisfactory adjustment.

Having observed the close attention which has recently been given by the Imperial Authorities and on the Continent of Europe to the improvement in the methods of catching, curing and packing fish, I deemed it expedient to cause a Commission to be sent to Scotland and Holland to examine and report upon this subject during the fishing season. The report of the delegates will be laid before you ; it will, I am sure, give our Fishermen most valuable information and instruction as to the best means of improving and developing this important industry.

My Ministers have carefully considered the difficulties which surround the administration of the rights of the Dominion in its foreshores, harbors, lakes and rivers, and a measure will be submitted to you for removing uncer-

tainty as to the respective rights of the Dominion and of the Provinces, and for preventing confusion in the titles thereto.

The Report of the Royal Commission on Labor, which was laid before you during the last Session, has been distributed throughout the country. I have reason to believe that the information which it contains will be found eminently useful in suggesting improvements in the administration of the laws which affect the working classes. Measures for the amendment of these laws, so far as they come within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, will be submitted for your consideration.

The early termination of the Acts of Incorporation of the principal banking institutions of the Dominion necessitates a review of our present system of Banking and an adjustment of the terms under which the Charters of these corporations should be renewed. Your attention will be drawn to this important subject.

Certain amendments to the Acts relating to the North-West Territories, calculated to facilitate the administration of affairs in that region, as also a Bill further to promote the efficiency of the North-West Mounted Police, will be submitted for your consideration.

Measures will be laid before you relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, to improve the laws respecting patents of invention and discovery, to amend the Adulteration Act, and the law respecting the Inland Revenue, to amend also the Act respecting the Geological and Natural History Survey of Canada, and to provide for the better organisation of the National Printing Establishment.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The Accounts for the past year will be laid before you. It will be found that the Estimates of Revenue have been realised, and that after having fully provided for the various public services of the country, a substantial surplus will remain. The Estimates for next year have been framed with a due regard to the requirements of the Public Service.

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I commit these weighty matters, and all others which may come before you, to your earnest consideration, and I rely upon your wisdom and prudence to deal with them in the manner which, under Divine Providence, may prove most conducive to the happiness and prosperity of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. BOWELL. With the consent of the House I ask the privilege of moving for the appointment of the Standing Committee on the "Hansard." I propose the same names as constituted the Committee last year, with the exception of Mr. Colby, whose place will be taken by Mr. White (Cardwell). The Committee will then stand :

Messrs. Béchard, Charlton, Davin, Desjardins, Ellis, Innes, Prior, Scriver, Somerville, Taylor, Tupper, Vanasse, Weldon (Albert) and White (Cardwell).

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to ; and at 3.45 p.m. the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 17th January, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. POPE. Out of compliment to the constituency that I have the honor to represent, the right hon. the First Minister has asked me to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I presume it is not out of order for me to apologise for my unfitness to perform the task entrusted to me on this occasion. My early training as a practical farmer has not been of any assistance to me as a public speaker, more especially upon the floor of the House of Commons. The eloquence that we are accustomed to use in the management of our animals upon the farm, although occasionally strong and forcible, would, perhaps, not be appropriate upon an occasion of this kind, and, consequently, I will have to depend on the generosity and good nature of this honorable House in asking them to extend to me the courtesy and sympathy which a new and young member may be entitled to claim. We are all pleased to note by the first paragraph that His Excellency, following the example set him by many of his illustrious predecessors, was pleased during the vacation to take the opportunity of visiting the far western portion of our Dominion, as far as the shores of British Columbia. We all rejoice in the fact that during the entire extent of that journey he was received loyally by our citizens at every hand and upon every side. Whatever may be said of the people of Canada, whatever their shortcomings may be, there is one thing that can never be imputed to them, and that is disloyalty to our noble Queen. This feeling of loyalty and devotion has been and is still being strengthened by the high personal and noble character of the illustrious statesmen whom Her Gracious Majesty has chosen from time to time to represent Her as Governors-General of Canada. There are practical results which flow from these visits of royalty. First, they give our people in the far

West the opportunity of seeing in person the men of whom they have heard so much. It is but right and just that they should have the opportunity of seeing and becoming personally acquainted with the men in whom they expect to find true friends, and to whom they look to protect their interests. These visits also help to create what is most necessary, and what I am very sorry to see is greatly wanting in Canada, and that is a national sentiment. Canadians are too apt to belittle their own country in comparison with the nations of the world; they are too apt to forget its magnitude and its great natural resources, and to lose sight of what they are going to be and are bound to be. In this they work an injustice to themselves, and create an unfavorable impression with regard to our country abroad. We should feel proud of being part and parcel of the greatest Empire that the world has ever known; and what still further should be a great source of pride and gratification to the people of Canada is the fact that they are no longer a sick child in the arms of England, but have strength within themselves—that they are quite capable of maintaining themselves, and are, in fact, a source of strength to the mother country. I sincerely believe that our future will be a glorious one, but while we have these great gifts of nature in these natural resources, which are being developed by the courage and pluck of our Canadian people, under the fostering care of the wise fiscal policy of the Government of the day—while all these things are instrumental in making us more and more independent, at the same time I believe that the desire for British connection has never deeper root in the hearts and minds of the Canadian people than it is at this very moment. Like dutiful children we feel that we have a right to be thankful to those powers who protected us in our infancy; and now that we have become strong and are rapidly becoming powerful, we bow with humble feelings of patriotism and loyalty at the Throne of Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, the woman whom we all love, honor and respect. His Excellency notices, besides, the great strides of progress our West has made in agricultural and mineral development. As a practical farmer, I may say that we have a right to be thankful to the Great Giver of all good gifts for the past season. It is quite true that, in a great country such as Canada, with such a vast extent of territory, it would be impossible for every part, portion or section to produce just the character of crops desired; but take Canada as a whole, I believe that last year's crop was a good one, free from frosts, free from any extraordinary blight, and in every instance the production was of first class quality. In the far East our crops were very bountiful, and we had a very good harvest time to secure them. The hay crop, which is very essential in the eastern section of Canada, where we are forced by our long winters to stable our animals for many months, was an immense one, exceeding any for the last few years. The ranchers of the North-West had a beautiful winter. Their cattle came out in splendid condition. They had a magnificent summer for their grasses—a very essential element in the production of beef—and, consequently, the enterprise of the ranchmen has been rewarded with success. The farmers of Canada have been able to realise for their agricultural

productions as great, if not greater, prices than those of any other section on the continent of America. I maintain that the markets open to Canada are as good, if not better, especially in the East, where, I say it without hesitation, the markets are the best that possibly could be found on this side of the Atlantic. The life of a farmer is a hard one. We are no sooner out of one work than we are into another. When we have harvested our crops, and marketed them, we must begin to prepare for the next year, and that preparation is a matter of great importance. The favorable weather we have had has admitted of ploughing in the North-West to an extent unknown before in the history of this country. Early fall ploughing insures early crops, and early crops insure, as a rule, early harvests. With a prospective, I believe a certain, rise in the price of beef, I think the farmers of Canada have the right to look forward with confidence to the year 1890. Being a new and undeveloped country, especially that section lying to the west, it is of the greatest importance that His Excellency should have personal knowledge of its wonderful capabilities. We are to-day reaping the benefits of the visits paid to that country by the illustrious predecessors of His Excellency. We now find them on the other side of the water saying good and kind things in reference to Canada, and endeavoring, by means of their position, to foster our interests. I beg, Sir, to say that I believe, when the present occupant of the position of Governor-General of this Dominion returns to his native country, we shall ever find him a true friend to our interests—in the same way as we have found the noble lords who have preceded him. I am sure both sides of the House will feel much gratified at that portion of His Excellency's speech which states that the long disputed point in reference to our fishery rights will probably be settled very shortly. The people of Canada have every reason to congratulate the Government of the day on the courteous, and, at the same time, firm stand they have taken upon this matter. They have evinced from the beginning every desire to treat our American neighbors with respect, and to make every allowance for their very peculiar way of mixing up international questions with ordinary corner politics, as though they were one and the same thing. We have given them every chance to cool down after the excitement of an election campaign, but at the same time we have not been negligent, nor are we going to be willing that they should infringe or trample upon our rights. The result of this firmness on the part of the Government of the day, accompanied by the willingness of the Government to treat the question fairly and without prejudice, has been that the world at large respect us for the courage we have displayed and recognise that we have rights peculiar to Canada the value of which cannot be over-estimated. In another paragraph of the Speech we find it stated that:

“Having observed the close attention which has recently been given by the Imperial authorities and on the continent of Europe to the improvement in the methods of catching, curing and packing fish, I deemed it expedient to cause a Commission to be sent to Scotland and Holland to examine and report upon this subject during the fishing season.”

In consequence of the great value of our fisheries, the Government of the day appointed a Commis-

sion to visit Europe and to investigate the most approved means of catching, curing and packing fish. The report of this Commission will soon be laid before the House, and I am sure we will all agree that any reasonable expenditure which the Government may have made in the direction of gaining information on the subject of this great industry will be justifiable, especially when we take into consideration the fact that for the last five years the total aggregate of the fish catch has averaged \$18,000,000 per annum. It is stated that in British Columbia, as well as in the Maritime Provinces, there are still undeveloped fisheries of great value. It must not be forgotten that, besides the money which we obtain from the sale of the fish, this industry gives employment to a very large body of men at remunerative wages, who form practically an army of sturdy men who make their homes with us and cast in their lot with us under the flag that waves over Canada. They form a navy of industrious men who, if the time ever arrives—which God forbid should ever come—when this country may be engaged in warfare, will ever show their zeal for the honor and credit of this country and of its people, and who will defend their families and their homes. The next paragraph refers to legislation affecting the rights of the Dominion in its foreshores, harbors, lakes and rivers. While the autonomy of our provincial rights should be maintained, the rights of the Dominion should not be infringed upon, and it is well that, as far as possible, all vexed questions of this character should be settled so that there may be as little friction as possible between the different legislative bodies by which we are governed. Based upon the Report of the Royal Commission on Labor, we shall be called upon to consider legislation affecting the working classes, a class to which I am proud to belong. They are not only a very important body, but they are equally deserving of kind consideration at our hands the same as any other class or section of men. To a very large extent they are Canadian born; they are moved by the same sentiments of loyalty as their employers; they remain here not alone for the wages they get, but from the fact that Canada is their native country and the home of their friends and relatives. By some ordination of nature they are not rich, but they are of our kindred, and they are entitled to the kindest consideration from the members of this House. We have had timely warnings from other nations of the world, and we know that the workman deserves protection at our hands. We have all read the account of the great strike in England, and we are continually reading in every American newspaper of the war between capital and labor in the United States. It is a vexed question in that country to-day, and may be an unsolved problem in the future. Let us, in fair Canada, endeavor, by the character of the legislation that we place upon the Statute-book during the present Session, to prove to the workmen that their best friends are within these legislative halls, and that we are prepared to protect the laborer, the honest, industrious worker, and to appreciate his citizenship as much as the citizenship of any other class which exists in Canada. Another paragraph in the Speech is as follows:—

“The early termination of the Acts of incorporation of the principal banking institutions of the country necessitates a review of our present system of banking and an
Mr. POPE.

adjustment of the terms under which the charters of these corporations should be renewed.”

I am not going to say much upon this subject, because I think I may be trespassing upon dangerous ground; but there are one or two matters which have come under my personal attention and to which I would call the attention of the First Minister. For instance: I have been asked by my banker to sign a document purporting to be a bill of exchange at three or four or six months, and I have found him, at the termination at that time, presenting that document to me and demanding that I should pay it. I think that, in future, matters of that kind should be attended to by the Government. Another paragraph in the Address reads as follows:—

“Certain amendments to the Acts relating to the North-West Territories, calculated to facilitate the administration of affairs in that region.”

In a rapidly increasing and developing country such as the North-West, with a population which is increasing very fast, and with resources which have been hitherto unknown, it behooves the Government to give every assistance in the way of legislation that lies in their power. Then, it is also stated that a Bill further to promote the efficiency of the North-West Mounted Police will be submitted. I did not suppose, from what I had heard of the North-West Mounted Police, that it could be made more efficient, but, if it is possible to make it more efficient than it is, I am glad that the Government is going to take steps in that direction. There is then reference to a Bill relating to bills of exchange and promissory notes. I have already referred to that subject. A Bill is promised to amend the Act respecting the Geological and Natural History Survey. I am glad to see that our Natural History Survey is not to be forgotten, and I trust the amendment will be in the direction of developing our economic minerals; for I would not support any assistance to the natural history section, if it simply means to dig out of the bowels of the earth any more fossils than we already have on top of us here.

“The Accounts for the past year will be laid before you.”

It will be found a source of congratulation to this House—to the supporters of the Government I am sure, and also to hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House—that, notwithstanding the great sums we have expended in assisting our railways and canals, we have been able to find, at the end of the year, a surplus.

“The Estimates for next year have been framed with a due regard to the requirements of the public service.”

I trust, Sir, that while they have been framed with due regard to the public service, they have also been framed in the direction of a further extension of those public works which will aid us to become a great and powerful nation. I am not a howler of taxation, and I do not believe that the Government of the day or the people of this country are howlers of taxation. I believe we are prepared to stand a reasonable amount of taxation provided the expenditure is reasonably made. In conclusion, I may say that I am very sorry that the gentleman who was to have seconded this Address is not present here to-day, owing to sickness. I looked upon him yesterday, and when I looked upon his broad shoulders I felt a grateful

relief that I was the proposer of this motion. I felt that I would be able to cast upon his shoulders a great deal of the responsibility that, under some circumstances, I might be called upon to assume. Sir, on behalf of my constituency, I again thank the hon. Premier for the honor he has conferred upon them, through me, and I beg to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. PRIOR. In rising to second the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I wish first to state that it was never intended that I should occupy this position to-day. Unfortunately my colleague was suddenly taken ill this morning, and I was called upon, at a moment's notice, to take his place; under those circumstances I hope that this honorable House will grant me the indulgence that they would have shown to my colleague if he had been in my place now. We are pleased to see that His Excellency the Governor-General, during the tour he has just taken through the Western Provinces, has been received everywhere with expressions of loyalty and good-will such as Canadians ever entertain towards any representative of Her Majesty the Queen who travels amongst them. In the far-off Province of British Columbia—where, I think I may state, without fear of contradiction, that the population is more cosmopolitan than in any other portion of the Dominion, where you can find every creed, race and nationality—I think His Excellency will acknowledge that the reception given him there was no less loyal than it was in the Eastern Provinces. Canadian sentiment, I am glad to say, is largely on the increase on the west side of the Rocky Mountains. Before the great national highway, that we are all so proud of, was completed, the people in British Columbia were, to all intents and purposes, cut off from relations with their Eastern brothers. The trade and commerce that we used to carry on was nearly all done with the mother country and with the United States of America. Our friendships were made with the people across the line, more than with the people of Eastern Canada. But now, Sir, I am glad to say that things are altering very rapidly, owing to the fact that it is much easier for us to have intercourse with the inhabitants of Eastern Canada, and we are now beginning to feel that we are Canadians indeed. I think one thing that tends to strengthen this feeling is the fact that every now and again we have visits from some of our public men from the Eastern Provinces. We are also glad to see that His Excellency, during that trip, noticed the great progress that has been made in the development of the natural resources of this country. No man of ordinary intelligence can travel backwards and forwards, as we members in that distant Province do, without seeing the rapid strides that every industry is making from year to year. Every man of course, knows, or ought to know, more about his own Province than he does of the rest of the Dominion; and I can say, Sir, that British Columbia, since the first day that a white man set his foot there, has never seen such an era of prosperity as she is enjoying to-day. Her fisheries are largely on the increase; her coal mines are turning out thousands and thousands of tons; her lumber mills are working full time day and night; and you cannot travel along the Canadian Pacific Railway twenty-four

hours without meeting large car loads of machinery going to the coast to be used in cutting up the giants of the forest in that Province. Take, for instance, the fisheries on the Pacific Coast. Fifteen years ago the whole coast catch was 3,000 cases; to-day, Sir, it is 400,000 cases. Take the output of coal on Vancouver Island: fifteen years ago it was less than 34,000 tons, this year it is 450,000. Nobody can help seeing that the country is going ahead when he reads these figures. Where there was one lumber mill in those days there are ten now. Many new manufactories have been started—capital coming in from Eastern Canada and the United States. I think I can safely say that every hon. member who lives in that Province, and knows it as I do, looks forward to the time, not very far distant, when the people of the Eastern Provinces will have to admit that the wealthiest Province in the whole Dominion is British Columbia. Now, Sir, there is another paragraph here that is of particular interest to myself, and that is the one in which His Excellency draws attention to the Behring Sea, and in which he mentions the fact that strong hopes are held that a speedy settlement will soon be arrived at. This subject has been before the House for the last three years, and I think it is needless for me to go into any details in regard to the why and the wherefore of this claim. I would, however, like to call the attention of the House to some of the utterances and opinions of a notable man in the United States, one who, we would suppose, would back up the United States in their claim, but who, as I will show, maintains that they have no claim whatever—I refer to Mr. J. B. Angell. This gentleman is one of the most noted authorities on international law in the United States, and he was, also, I believe, the American representative on the Washington Treaty Commission that was held a little while ago. In an article in the "Forum" Mr. Angell states, in the first place—

"That Great Britain is proceeding with much deliberation and freedom from excitement."

And he hopes that, in a short time, both England and other foreign countries will come to an understanding with the United States with regard to the protection of the seals. Now, Sir, we are all very glad to hear that England is proceeding with "deliberation and freedom from excitement," but I think the sealers themselves believe there has been too much deliberation. It is pretty hard for them to have to wait three years or more to get reparation for the losses and insults to which they have been subjected. The next thing to which Mr. Angell draws attention is the fact that it is England's interest, as well as that of the United States, to look after the seals and save them from extermination, because all seal-skins caught in the Behring Sea are sent to England to be dressed. Then the next thing he draws attention to is this:

"The question is whether, for this laudable purpose of preserving the fur-bearing seals from extinction and maintaining our undisputed right to control the taking of these animals on the Friblyoff Islands, we may rightfully board, search and seize foreign vessels in Behring Sea more than three miles away from land."

In 1821, when Russia issued an edict claiming sovereignty over the sea for 100 miles from the land, Mr. James Quincy Adams, who was Secretary of State for the United States, protested most vehemently against such a claim being set up by

Russia; and England also protested. The consequence was that the Treaties of 1824-25 were drawn up, when the Russians surrendered their claim. It will be worthy of notice that when Russia did claim that 100 mile limit, it did not advance it on the basis that it was a closed sea; but, at the same time, Mr. James Quincy Adams saw fit to draw Russia's attention to the fact that it had no valid claim on that basis. I, therefore, think that these facts will refute any argument which the Americans can bring forward on that point. Mr. Angell then asks: What is the definition of a closed sea? He cites a great many authorities, giving different distances between the headlands, but the conclusion arrived at by most of them he thinks is, that any sea where the entrance is sufficiently narrow to be easily defended by a naval power, is a closed sea. Now, the least distance between the points at the entrance to Behring Sea is 139 miles. The Straits of Gibraltar are a little under 9 miles wide, so I do not see that the Americans can lay claim to the Behring Sea being a closed sea; and Mr. Angell has come to that conclusion too. The other claim they bring forward is that, as all the seal-breeding grounds are on islands belonging to the United States, when the seals leave their breeding grounds and go to the high seas they are the property of the United States. Mr. Angell sets forward the fact that many ducks breed in the North-West Territories of Canada, and this being the case Canada has a right to declare that they should not be slaughtered elsewhere. Many opinions of other eminent men in the United States are given in some of their leading newspapers, showing that opinion is very much divided in that country as to whether the United States has any just claim or not. I must say that I firmly hope the Government will not let the matter rest, and that the sealers who have suffered so much may find that they can look to England for that protection which has always been given to her subjects. I observe, Sir, that it is the intention of the Government to send a Commission to Holland and Scotland to obtain information in respect to the catching and packing of fish. This undoubtedly will be of the greatest benefit to the country at large. I believe it will more particularly apply to the Atlantic coast, but it will also be productive of the greatest benefit to the Pacific coast, as at this time nothing but salmon are caught in very large quantities, while there are myriads of all kinds of fish that undoubtedly, if the proper men were engaged in the industry and if proper information were obtained, would be caught and packed, as is done in the case of salmon, and a large and profitable industry would thereby be established. Some time ago a salmon-canning deputation waited on the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in regard to many matters which required attention in the Province of British Columbia, and I am glad to say that they were so fortunate as to obtain nearly every request they made, not because they intimidated the Minister in any way, but because they submitted only just demands. One request, however, they failed to obtain and that was a promise from the Minister that he would proceed to the coast and observe for himself our grand rivers and fisheries. If the hon. gentleman will give that promise and keep it, I will assure him a right hearty welcome, such as that obtained

Mr. PRIOR.

by his predecessor, and I feel satisfied that he will be abundantly rewarded for all the trouble and hardship of the trip by the information he will obtain as to the present condition of the fisheries of our Province. The next paragraph in the Address refers to the question of the rights of the Dominion in its foreshores, harbors, lakes and rivers. I am glad to observe that this question is receiving the attention of the Government. It has always been my opinion that these matters can be dealt with most effectually by the Local Government of the Province in which these foreshores and harbors are situated, and I think, in the long run, it will be found more satisfactory and economical, as the Local Government can obtain plans and witnesses on these subjects more easily than can the Dominion Government. I am glad to learn that the Report of the Royal Commission of Labor has been distributed to the country. That report shows without doubt that great abuses had existed, and that the relations between the employer and employé had in many cases not been such as should have prevailed. I think that every well-wisher of the working classes, and every one who has their welfare at heart, must feel that the Government has adopted a course that merits the sanction and approval of the country. We are also glad to learn that it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the Geological Survey. I feel certain that the revenue spent in this way will produce an adequate return from the East and the West in the fresh mineral resources that will be developed. In regard to the Province of British Columbia this is more especially true, for, while many shafts have been sunk in the more accessible regions, a large portion of the country remains undeveloped for lack of the services of intelligent men who understand geology. Before taking my seat I would ask hon. members, one and all, to travel over the national highway and visit the Province of British Columbia. Start at Halifax, where you will see the British flag floating over the forts; travel through the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and see the busy workshops filled with your own countrymen. Go over the plains and see the millions of acres that are awaiting settlement and are ready to grow grain for the whole world; go through the Province of British Columbia, whose mountains are covered with magnificent timber and are filled with precious metals of all kinds; pass down the Pacific coast to Esquimalt and see the British bulldogs lying there with the same old British flag floating at the peak as was seen at Halifax—and then tell me can any man possessing any national feeling be so craven or be so deficient in manhood as to hold up his hands in the cause of annexation? Sir, there is no more glorious Province in the world than British Columbia, as hon. gentlemen will say if they will visit it. No reading of books or hearing accounts from people who have visited it can give any adequate idea of its resources. Let hon. gentlemen go and see it for themselves. Sir, I have the honor to represent a city of the Pacific coast; my duty is to watch over the interests of that city while I am here, but my first duty I consider is to assist to maintain the Dominion as a whole. Let us all drop our sectionalism, and let us all strive together to maintain Canada as a great and grand country whose interests must be guarded by us and whose people are able to defend them-

selves. I have great pleasure in seconding the motion.

Mr. LAURIER. I offer my very hearty congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address on the eloquent manner in which they have discharged the always difficult task they have just performed. They have gallantly struggled to put flesh and blood, nerve and sinew, into the dry bones which the advisers of His Excellency put in his hands yesterday as the programme of the Session, but if the Speech from the Throne remains a skeleton it is no fault of my hon. friends. The hon. mover of the Address has the honor to bear a name popular in this House, and though I differ from him politically very widely, though in my estimation the electors of Compton would have better served their country by electing my friend Mr. Monroe, still I say to the hon. gentleman, and I say it with perfect sincerity, that it is a great pleasure to friends and foes to welcome to this House a young member, the son of an illustrious father, and to find that he is true to the parent stock. But in listening a moment ago to the eloquent strain of the hon. gentleman, and a moment afterwards to the no less eloquent language of the hon. member for Victoria, who both depicted in glowing terms a country famed for its present prosperity, I asked myself whether the hon. gentlemen could have meant Canada; but, as they proceeded, I could not but be certain that the country they had in their minds was indeed Canada, and then I concluded they must have been, both of them, mesmerised by the great mesmerist on the other side, for they spoke not of things real but of things fanciful. They spoke of things not seen by the stern eye of reality, but seen by the fantastic vision put before their gaze by the great wizard. To speak of the prosperity of Canada at present, and especially of the farmers of Canada—well, if all the farmers of Canada were in the position of my hon. friend from Compton, if they had all cash accounts at the bank as he has, I could well understand these hon. gentlemen speaking of the prosperity of Canada in the glowing terms they used. But where is that prosperity to be found? Certainly not in the East; certainly not in Quebec; certainly not in the Maritime Provinces; certainly not in the great Province of Ontario itself. For it cannot be denied, whatever may be said to the contrary on the other side, that the farmers of Canada never were so pinched as they are at present. It cannot be denied that there is at this moment a deep agricultural depression all over the country, and when the agriculturists of any country are not prosperous, that country cannot be considered thriving. The hon. gentlemen referred to the trip taken by His Excellency across the continent, and to the greetings of loyalty which His Excellency met everywhere. No doubt in the West there must be a deeply seated feeling of loyalty, for those people have been treated in a manner which, if they had not been loyal, would have produced the very direst consequences. The North-West settler has not been treated in a manner creditable to Canada. On the contrary, everything has been done by the Government to hamper him. He has been forced for many years to buy in a distant and dear market when he could have bought in a near and cheap market. He has

been saddled for years with a crushing monopoly forced upon him by a wanton abuse of the power of disallowance in the Government, and it was only when the feeling of loyalty was at last giving way, and when rebellion was becoming a possibility, that the Government were induced to yield and remove the monopoly—but only after that monopoly had crushed its enemies. But even after its removal, the condition of the people seems to be no better; for the great company to which the hon. gentleman alluded, the Canadian Pacific Railway, is at this moment discriminating in an unwarranted manner, according to my judgment, against the North-West settler in favor of the American settler. The Canadian Pacific Railway, at this moment, is charging the North-West settler for carrying a bushel of wheat from Winnipeg to Toronto, 27 cents, whereas it is only charging the American settler for the same carriage between Minneapolis and Toronto the sum of 15 cents, so that at this moment the Canadian Pacific Railway is taking from the hard earnings of the Canadian settler 12 cents per bushel more than from the American settler. Under such circumstances it cannot be said that the Canadian settler is a prosperous individual. Here is a grievance, and I call the attention of the Government to it. I claim that it is the duty of the Government to enquire into this matter and to see that this railway company, which has cost so much money to the people of Canada, is made to serve the people of Canada at least as efficiently as it is made to serve the people of the neighboring country. Though I call the attention of the Government to this subject, it is, perhaps, perfectly useless on my part to do so. I do not expect that the Government will answer my demand; I do not expect that they will make any enquiry into this subject, or give any relief to the people of the North-West. I do not expect it, because it is altogether vain at this moment to expect of the Government anything like activity. They are in office, they enjoy the sweets of office, but they seem to have lost all power, all nerve for action. Why, they do not even perform the ordinary duties of administration! Yes, I charge deliberately against the Government that they have not at this moment sufficient nerve to discharge the ordinary duties which pertain to an Administration. For instance, we derive our revenue chiefly from Customs duties, and in one of the chief ports of the Dominion, the port of Toronto, the Collectorship of Customs has been vacant for over two years. Is it the duty, or not, of the Administration to fill up that vacancy? Is not that a simple matter of administration? Yet one year, two years have elapsed, and still the vacancy exists. What can the reason be? Is there no one among the hon. gentlemen who sit on your right, Sir, who would be ready to serve his country as collector for a good round sum every year? Or, is the right hon. gentleman afraid to open a constituency in a Province which for the last ten years has given him its chief support? Or, has my hon. friend the Minister of Customs become so fastidious in his tastes that he cannot find anybody suited to fill the office? Or, is it simply because the Ministers, reclining in their chairs, cannot raise the energy necessary to make this appointment?

An hon. MEMBER. Economy.

Mr. LAURIER. It cannot be economy, because if it could be economy to dispense with a collector at Toronto, the Government would remove all the other collectors in all the other ports. They would be bound to remove, not only the collector at Toronto, but at Montreal, Halifax, and all the other ports. There is more. We have a nominative Senate in this country. The Senate are appointed by the Crown. In my judgment this is a most inefficient system, one which cannot last very much longer. But the other side have always maintained that a nominative Senate—that at least has been their pretension in my Province—is the very bulwark of Conservative institutions. Well, if that is the case, I should deem it of some importance that appointments should be made when vacancies occur. I find that, in the month of November last, there were no less than six vacancies in the Senate. As you know, Mr. Speaker, death has been of late very cruel with us, but out of the six vacancies the Government summoned up the necessary energy to make two appointments, and, after having done that much, their energy was exhausted and they fell back in their cushioned seats and left the other four vacancies unfilled. Why were only two appointments made when six should have been made? I do not know the reason why all the other seats were not filled; but in regard to one I have reason to know that the cause why it was not filled was that there were two rival claimants, who had rendered services—not to the country but to the right hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentlemen were balanced between the two and found it impossible to make a selection. This is hardly a good public reason for the neglect, and we ought to have a better reason than that as a justification of the omission to fill those offices. Take, for instance, the seat of Mr. Plumb, which has been vacant for two years; take the seat of Mr. Ferrier, who has been dead for eighteen months. Certainly I was justified in saying that the Government are now in such a position that they cannot perform ordinary administrative acts. Perhaps, however, I am doing an injustice to the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. Perhaps he is inactive because he is intimidated, because he fears to make a false move, because of late he has not been as lucky as he was formerly. Of late it seems that, every time he has made a step,—if I may be allowed the expression—he has put his foot in it; because, if he took a step in advance, he has had to retrace it. Examples are not wanting. It was only in 1888 that he compelled his followers to vote to forbid the free entrance of fruits and other articles from the United States, and four weeks had not elapsed before he retraced his steps in regard to that. Then again, about ten weeks ago, the Government passed an Order in Council prohibiting the carrying by American vessels of bonded freight to Victoria, B.C.; and not only that was totally reversed, but we have another example and a more famous one. In 1888 the Government were induced to put an additional duty of \$1 upon pine logs, but it was not long after before the Government were convinced that they had made a false step. It would not be convenient, in view of the time at my disposal, to give all the examples of the manner in which the Government have been moving forward and backward, and, though the Government were pressed again and again to retrace their steps, they

Mr. LAURIER.

refused to do it in this House, because they felt it would be to their detriment, though they did it afterwards. My hon. friend from North Norfolk brought the question of the duty on saw logs before the House, and asked the House to compel the Government to carry out the policy which he proposed; but they would not do it, and the Government policy was defended by their followers, by the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), and by the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and by my hon. friend from Toronto. Yet the prorogation had scarcely taken place before the Government abandoned the policy which they had forced their followers to accept a few weeks before. At the same time the Government did something further, for which I am bound to give them credit. While they abandoned the duty on saw logs, they invited reciprocity in lumber with the United States. It is not often that I can congratulate the hon. gentleman upon his policy, but in this case I do so, although he has not altogether met my views in regard to it. He offered certain reciprocity to the United States, but his offer was too niggardly. Why did he not offer reciprocity over the whole line and the whole list? I do not know why he did not. Perhaps he was conscious that he was stealing the clothes of his opponents, and felt some remorse in consequence. I give him credit for having that feeling, but he need not have been afraid. We are generous on this side of the House. It is our policy to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked; and when the hon. gentleman feels inclined to put his hand into our wardrobe the next time, I invite him to take the whole suit. The National Policy is such a threadbare policy that we are moved to compassion when we see that there is nothing more than that on the shoulders of the hon. gentleman and his party. I must give full credit to the hon. gentleman and his policy. I would not take an unfair advantage of anyone. Though they have only appointed two senators, still they appointed a Commission to go to Scotland and to Holland to find out the best methods of catching and curing and packing fish. Why, Mr. Speaker, to send Canadians abroad to learn from the Scotchmen and the Dutchmen how to catch and cure and pack fish is something extraordinary. I should have thought that it would have been the Scotchmen and the Dutchmen who would have come here to learn from Canadians the best methods. I suppose that we shall have a report of that Commission presented to us, and I do not want to speak about it now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then why do you?

Mr. LAURIER. I do it because I strongly suspect that this Commission is merely a herring drawn across the track to hide an otherwise indefensible transaction. In the Speech presented to us to-day, it is manifest that the Government have not anything of great consequence to present or anything which requires any lengthened remarks; but it is also manifest that they have not taken into consideration the condition of the country at this moment, and especially the condition of the agricultural population. The Government seem to have reached a state of perfect felicity in the contemplation of their own perfection. They have invented a National Policy which they seem to consider the *ultima thule* of all possible progress.

While, as a Canadian, I cannot but regret such an attitude in those who are entrusted with the future of this country, I must say, as a party man, it does not break my heart to see the Government and their friends the victims of such infatuation; for the truth is that, at the present moment, with the exception of the monopolists who have been made wealthier by the restrictions of the tariff, there is no class in the country who does not desire some reform in that tariff. It may be, and it is probably true, that with the greater number, the exact form the relief, which will be welcomed, ought to take, has not yet been formulated, but it is equally true that the great majority of those who, ten years ago, put their faith in the National Policy, are now reluctantly forced to the inevitable conclusion that the National Policy has been a failure. And how could it be otherwise? By the fruits we shall know the tree; and what are the fruits of the National Policy? Let us look around the country. The National Policy has favored a few. There is no doubt of that; but it has injured the many, and there is no doubt of that either. It has imprudently been stated that the price of land has increased near some of the railway centres; but it is equally true that the National Policy has reduced the price of farming land all over the country. It has reduced the price of farming land in the great Province of Ontario by \$22,000,000, as is shown by statistics. It has turned out millionaires, but it has made the lot of the toiling masses harder than it was before. It has created sugar barons, and cotton lords and railway kings, but it has put nails upon the doors and windows of thousands of homes and sent their inhabitants to a foreign land. Sir, I arraign the Government upon that issue. When the hon. gentleman was in Opposition, 12 years ago, he boasted to the people of this country that if he were restored to power he would introduce a policy which would put a check to emigration. The people of the Dominion took him at his word; they entrusted him with power, and the result is that at this moment emigration is a greater curse than it has ever been before. Now, I know very well what the answer will be to this statement. The answer will be—tergiversation. It is always easy to deny the past.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And to assert.

Mr. LAURIER. Especially to assert a fact which is within the knowledge of everybody. I appeal here to the intelligence and to the experience of every man upon these benches. I do not appeal to those who made the promises, but I appeal to those who believed the promises that were made, and I defy anybody to stand up here to-day and say that the anticipations which were raised in 1878 by the National Policy have been fulfilled; I defy anyone to say that the price of land has been improved in the rural parts, that in the rural parts of the country every family is contented at its own fireside. But if any man can deny these things, then by all means let him stand up for the National Policy. But if that man is bound in his conscience to admit that his anticipations have not been realised, that the price of farming land has been decreased everywhere over the country, that there is not, perhaps, in the rural parts one single family which is complete at its fireside, then I would ex-

pect that man, whatever would be his party preferences, to stand up for the cause of reform. Hon. gentlemen may deny, but the fact is plain. Whatever may be the language spoken here by the Government followers, I believe their conscience tells a different tale. They are like the man going through the woods who whistles to keep his courage up. They may speak bravely, but their actions once more show they have not escaped the general feeling of uneasiness which is at this time permeating the whole community. Since the hon. gentleman seems to be obdurate upon this question, I propose to show that in the ranks of those who follow him, even amongst his own colleagues, the impression is deeply seated at this moment that the country wants reform, that the National Policy has not accomplished what was expected, and that the farmers of this country, especially, must in some way be relieved. Not later than the Session of 1888 my hon. friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Marshall) proposed a motion which reads in this manner:

“That the establishment of mutually favorable trade relations between Great Britain and her colonies would benefit the agricultural, mining, lumbering and other industries of the latter, and would strengthen the Empire by building up its dependencies, and that the Government should ask the other Colonial Governments to join in approaching the Imperial Government with a view of obtaining such an agreement.”

The debate was participated in by several prominent members; amongst others was the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), a very strong supporter of the Administration. The hon. gentleman upon that occasion spoke not so much to the motion of the hon. member for East Middlesex, but he spoke to a motion of which he had given notice, which he moved, and which ran in the following language:—

“That it would be in the best interests of the Dominion that such changes should be sought for in the trade relations between the United Kingdom and Canada as would give to Canada advantages in the markets of the mother country not allowed to foreign states, Canada being willing for such privileges to discriminate in her markets in favor of Great Britain and Ireland, due regard being had to the policy adopted in 1879 for the purpose of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion, and to the financial necessities of the Dominion.”

The hon. member from Simcoe, in speaking to that question, stated that he and those with whom he was acting—all followers of the right hon. gentleman—were endeavoring to create a trade with Great Britain and to obtain a market in Great Britain for our surplus farming productions. The debate was participated in by several members; amongst others were the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), now Minister of Marine and Fisheries, also by the hon. and gallant member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), and by the no less hon. and gallant member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), all to the effect that in their opinion the present condition of the country was not satisfactory, and that something ought to be done to relieve it. What was the meaning of that motion? If the National Policy had realised everything that we had in view, if it had developed the country in the manner which had been predicted by hon. gentlemen here, why should there have been such a motion? Why was such a question opened up? Simply because, in the opinion of those gentlemen, the condition of the country was not satisfactory, the condition of agriculture was not satisfactory, and something

needed to be done to improve that condition. It is to be remarked that upon that occasion not a word was said to the contrary by the hon. gentleman or by anybody supporting him. Then, what conclusion should be drawn? This conclusion: that the Government themselves shared in that view. Then you would expect that, sharing in that view, they would have brought forward some measure of reform, since they admitted that there was an evil to be cured. But, Sir, we could not expect them to go that length. They knew the evil, but they presented no remedy and they let the evil remain. Now, Mr. Speaker, while I agree with those hon. gentlemen in their opinions respecting the evil, I say there is a remedy to be sought for in our condition. Though this is their conviction, they do not act upon it. That conviction is the basis of the policy which we support on this side of the House. The policy we support asks that some reform should be made in the condition of our country. I wish, for my part, that I could agree with hon. gentlemen opposite in the remedy they have suggested; I wish, for my part, I could believe that we could find for our surplus agricultural products a market in Great Britain; but, certainly, I cannot agree in the policy which has been suggested to us, for that policy, to say the least of it, is a singularly foolish one. Hon. gentlemen opposite propose to establish a trade with Great Britain. They propose to induce the people of Great Britain to take our surplus products—and how? By opening our doors to the trade of Great Britain, which doors are now closed to that trade? Not at all. By inducing Great Britain to open her doors to us? No; they are already open to us and to the world. But it is to induce the people of Great Britain, if possible, to shut their doors to the rest of the world and keep them open to ourselves. Hitherto the policy has been Canada for the Canadians, but hereafter the policy will be England for the Canadians. The object the hon. gentlemen have in view is to induce British workmen to remove all competition from the products of the American farmer and thereby to enhance the price of bread and foodstuffs for themselves. Will the British working classes adopt such a policy? It is preposterous to assume it. What have hon. gentlemen opposite to offer to the British workmen for the sacrifice they will be called upon to make? Do they offer to admit here British products free of duty? No; on the contrary, it is proposed to lower, by a few inches only, the barriers which the hon. gentlemen opposite have set up against the productions of British workmen. And that is what they call fair trade. Some of the hon. gentlemen opposite have the candor to believe that the British public at large can be induced to adopt such a policy. It is impossible to conceive that the British people would adopt a policy so absolutely delusive. Where are the public men in England who would countenance such a policy? You could not find them in the ranks of the Liberal party, or in the Radical party, or in the Conservative party, although the Conservative party in England are entitled to the reproach that they have opposed every reform that has made England what she is to-day. Yet as soon as some reform has been adopted it becomes the common inheritance of every Englishman, and the last reform carried in England was the adoption of the great principle of free trade. England has

Mr. LAURIE.

been the pioneer in trade, as she has been the pioneer in the science of government. She obtained a full measure of fair trade 100 years at least before any other continental nation. It was so also with respect to free trade. They adopted a system of freedom in trade, as in politics and everything else, and so paved the way for the other nations to follow. It is true, as has been often stated, that their policy has not been answered, that other nations have not responded, and that the idea, the dream and the hope of those who advocated the gospel of free trade has not been realised. I do not believe so. Only fifty years have elapsed since the principle of free trade was proclaimed in England, and fifty years, it must be admitted, form a dot on the ever revolving panorama in the life of a nation. Fifty years is but a dot in the life of the world, and it cannot be expected that that great principle should germinate, blossom and fructify within half a century. But if it cannot be said that the expectations of those who have proclaimed the principle has been fulfilled, it is manifest that it will be fulfilled yet, and the first nations to adopt it will be those nations of British blood and tradition, the offshoots of England. It is true that Canada and the United States are to-day far from this position, but the time may come, and it may not be distant, when Canada and the United States will adopt a policy—which we on this side of the House have advocated—a policy not to seek a market on the other side of the ocean, but to seek a market on the other side of the line; and it would seem to me that this consideration should commend itself to our friends on the other side of the House, that if we were to effect a commercial alliance between these two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon family, it would be a great step towards effecting what they have in view, and that is, our obtaining a market at some ultimate day in Great Britain and Ireland. In this respect I do not consider the Government will ever change their policy; but it must be apparent to the right hon. gentleman opposite, from the feeling manifested among his own supporters, a feeling not in favor of reciprocity but yet a feeling in favor of a change, that the change we propose is the more logical one and is bound to be carried out at no distant date. In the Speech which was delivered yesterday there is an important paragraph, and an important paragraph only, it is the paragraph in reference to the difficulty we have in respect to the Behring Sea. It is now more than three years since Canadian vessels fishing for seals in Behring Sea were ousted from those waters by the American authorities. Three years had elapsed, and after three years this is the reference to the subject by His Excellency. His Excellency informs us, practically, that Canadian fishermen have laid their claims before the Canadian Government, that the Government have referred those claims to the English Government, and His Excellency goes on to say:

“I feel confident that those representations have had due weight, and I hope to be enabled during the present Session to assure you that all differences on this question are in the course of satisfactory adjustment.”

Well, certainly caution could not go any further than it goes there. His Excellency informs us that he believes—what? That the difficulty will be settled during the course of the present Session? No; but that they were in the course of satisfactory adjustment. That is all he can assure

us. The statement is not that the difficulty was adjusted, but that during the present Session it would be in course of adjustment. It appears, therefore, that, so far, it has not been in the course of adjustment at all, and that it is only from this moment it will be in course of adjustment; and even this statement is made with caution. His Excellency does not say that he can even "assure" us, but he "hopes" to be enabled during the present Session to assure us that all differences are in course of adjustment. To the Canadian fishermen who were ousted from Behring Sea three years ago this is not a very satisfactory prospect. What can the cause be? Here is what we conceive to be an unwarrantable assumption of authority by the American people over Canadian fishermen, and yet, after three years, all the satisfaction we obtain is that, perhaps, during the present Session His Excellency will be able to assure us that the difficulty is in course of settlement. In regard to what has taken place during these three years there is a blank, the Government has not informed us; but, although the Government has not informed us, I think I know pretty well what has taken place, if we may judge the past by the present, and what has taken place on this question by what occurred on former occasions. It was simply this: His Excellency, on receiving the complaint of the Canadian fishermen, sent his statement of complaint to the Colonial Office in England. The Colonial Office sent the statement to the Foreign Office; the Foreign Office wrote a letter to the American Minister; the Minister probably called upon the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The Minister of Foreign Affairs wrote to the British Minister at Washington, and probably wrote also to the Secretary of State at Washington. Probably the British Minister and the Secretary of State at Washington had a conference, and more despatches were sent from Washington to London, and from London to Ottawa, and then the matter was probably laid before the hon. the Minister of Justice here, who no doubt wrote a very able paper upon it, which some day will see the light of day, and then the matter was again referred to London, and from London to Washington. This was what took place some two or three years ago, and no doubt is what is taking place again upon this occasion. Now, British diplomacy can be very active or very slow, just as it suits the purpose of British diplomacy. In 1861, when Slidell and Mason were taken on board a British ship, the British Government at once sent to Washington a note temperate in language, respectful and courteous in tone, and the result was within a month the difficulty was settled to the satisfaction of both parties. If the same diligence had been used on this occasion, probably we would have had an answer before this; for the issue is a simple one between two contending parties. The Americans claim jurisdiction over the disputed waters. This is not the place to discuss whether or not this contention is well or ill-founded, but I have no hesitation to say that, in my judgment, the American contention is not well founded. However, this subject will come up for discussion at the proper time and on the proper occasion. We do not admit that contention, we reject it. Well, was it not possible within three years to have reached some solution of the difficulty. What is the reason we have not? Sir, if I am to credit

a paragraph published some time ago in the American newspapers, the cause of the delay lies with the Canadian Government themselves, because the American papers some time ago represented that the American and British Authorities had come to some arrangement which was about to be completed when the Canadian Government asked to be consulted and to be allowed to give its views, and though several months have elapsed no representation had been received from the Canadian Government. If that be true, then all the blame falls upon the Canadian Government, and for their want of action they will have to render, some time or other, a very severe account. This is no trifling question, but one of great importance; and although it has to be approached in a friendly spirit, still it has to be approached in a firm and temperate manner consistent with our own dignity and rights. I cannot conceive, however, that if the Government had been as diligent as they should have been in this matter, our fishermen would not have received redress long ago. But we shall hear more upon this question during the Session. I do not intend on this occasion to exercise any more criticism than can be avoided. I have in former years followed the practice of not indulging in more criticism than is fairly invited by the Speech from the Throne, and propose to follow the same practice to-day, and, therefore, shall conclude my remarks by expressing my intention to do my best in furthering the business of the Session, and I call on the Government to lose no time in bringing down business.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very glad indeed to find from my hon. friend's speech that we may have some prospect of getting at once to work. He is not going to move an amendment, and his speech shows that he means business. I am very glad that such is his intention, and we shall be delighted to have his assistance in entering on the work of the Session. In his speech, delivered in the hon. gentleman's usual agreeable and pleasant style, which always gives pleasure to those who listen to it, he entered into a little prologue before the play, a little preliminary chaff. He must blow off the froth before he gets down to the porter, and though his speech was nearly all froth it was very pleasant froth, indeed. My hon. friend commenced by submitting that he and his friends are the only persons who know what the situation of the country is. He said that on this side we labor under an agreeable delusion. We fancy that the country is prosperous, we fancy that Canada is in a state of prosperity, but it is a fatal delusion, and he says that it must be the enchantment of the wizard which induced my hon. friends the mover and seconder to make the glowing statements they did. Well, my hon. friend is the leader of a party and also a distinguished member of the legal profession. My hon. friend who moved this Address, and who did it so ably, and who was so well and properly congratulated by my hon. friend, is a practical farmer. He should know whether the farmers are prosperous or not in his part of the country, rather better than my hon. friend, though he comes from the same Province. Now, he tells us, as a practical farmer, and not only a practical but a wealthy farmer, that the Province of

Quebec never was more prosperous, that the farming interests in Quebec never were more prosperous than they were in the past year of 1889. My hon. friend also supposes that the same fatal hallucination has blinded the eyes of my hon. friend from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior). He is a man of business, a shrewd man of business, he knows what he is talking about, and he says that the people in the Province of British Columbia, and especially his own constituency, were never so prosperous before as they were this past year. Yet my hon. friend ventures to say that they are mistaken, and that we are mistaken, and that the majority of the people of this country are mistaken, and that we are a miserable, desponding, ruined, depressed and retrograding country. That is the style of the speech of my hon. friend. As long as my hon. friend entertains those opinions, and those whom he leads entertains them, he will, I regret to say, remain at your left, Mr. Speaker, and will not come to the position to which his great abilities entitle him, of leading the majority of the people of Canada and their representatives on the right of your chair. There is a difference of opinion between my hon. friend and the majority of the people of Canada. We know that when in a lunatic asylum somebody asked an inmate how he came to be there? "Oh, said he, "I am here as a consequence of a difference of opinion: all the world think I am mad, and I think all the world mad, and the majority carried it." So it is with my hon. friend. The majority of the people of Canada will declare that the hallucinations, the delusions, are on that side of the House and not on this; but it is a misfortune to my hon. friend's party; it is a sort of blindness which has come upon them for their sins, by which they have become prophets of evil, in their press, on the stump, on the platform, everywhere, and now in Parliament. We find that their *raison d'être*, the basis and foundation for their party, is that Canada is ruined, and will remain ruined, and will be more ruined every day, until there is a change of parties and my hon. friend comes on this side. I am afraid the people of Canada will prefer to be ruined under us, than to be prosperous after the fashion of my hon. friends on the other side. You know the story of Lord Palmerston, when a wine merchant sent him some special Greek wine, which, he said, was admirably adapted for gouty patients, to cure gout. Lord Palmerston tasted the wine and said "I would rather have the gout." So the people of Canada would rather have Canada, with all her misfortunes, real or imaginary, governed by the Liberal Conservative party, even when led by your humble servant, than have it directed by all the abilities, all the force and all the patriotism of my hon. friend opposite. My hon. friend seemed rather disappointed at the statement of the mover and the seconder of the Address, that the people in the West were loyal. He seemed to be rather surprised at that statement, as they have been so badly used—look at the way, said he, in which the people in the North-West have been used and the people in British Columbia, and yet they are loyal. My hon. friend was quite surprised at that, and I remarked that there was not one single response or cheer to the statement of the hon. member from Victoria in reference to the loyalty of the North-West—from the other side of the House. The hon. gentleman

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

objects to the want of matter, apparently, in the Speech from the Throne. I think it is a very practical speech, and I think it would puzzle the hon. gentleman to have suggested new subjects for discussion during the present Session, excepting the one with which he wound up his speech. Although he commenced with a criticism of the Speech and the Address in answer to it, he found it was rather hard work; it was up-hill work, and so he fluttered off into a discussion of free trade, unrestricted reciprocity and Imperial federation. He says, among other things, that the Government have become so indolent and apathetic that they are not able to carry on the ordinary administration of affairs; and what is the reason he gives to prove his statement? That there has not been a collector of customs appointed for Toronto. If he had been able to state that, in consequence of the non-appointment of a collector of customs in Toronto, the business of the country had been neglected, there might have been something in the charge; but, in the meantime, as an economist, and hon. members in Opposition are always economists, I think he might have congratulated the country upon the saving of the salary of a collector of customs in Toronto for two years. Then he says we had not the energy to fill the vacancies in the Senate. The hon. gentleman, as a public man, as the leader of a party, ought not to attribute bad motives when only good motives exist. Could he not imagine that a good motive was the reason why those positions were not filled? The hon. gentleman might have thought that we were of opinion that there were too many Tories in the upper House, that we were looking to the possibility that the great ability and energy of the hon. gentleman might put him at the head of affairs, and he might have supposed that we were keeping a certain number of vacancies in that House to enable him, after he succeeded in attaining power, to fill the four vacancies in the Senate, so that the complaint which has been made that the Senate has too much of one complexion would be removed. I shall not now enter into a discussion or reply to the hon. gentleman's remarks as to the vacillation of which he accuses us in regard to the duties on fruits and sawlogs and the regulations in regard to coasting. Those questions will come up during the present Session in a more legitimate form, and it would be a waste of time to discuss them now; but I assure my hon. friend that, in our opinion, we have a good answer and we have good reasons to give for every one of those actions which the hon. gentleman is pleased to call vacillations. The hon. gentleman says he gives us credit for one thing. We made some steps towards reciprocity with the United States, but he ventures to say that we have been stealing the clothes of his party. Mr. Speaker, we would make a great mistake if we took the clothes of hon. gentlemen opposite. We are well clad now, and we do not want to wear any Opposition rags. I am an older public man than the hon. gentleman, and can look back a little further, and I think he will find that all the successful exertions towards reciprocity, after those which were made by Sir Francis Hincks and his party, have been made by the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman says that the National Policy has been a failure. The country does not think so. There is no evidence that the country thinks so. Every

evidence that we have points in the other direction. The hon. gentleman said that the reason why we did not fill up the Senate was that we feared to open constituencies. It does not appear that that is our reason. Since last Session there have been three vacancies and three elections, and I had yesterday the honor and pleasure of introducing three supporters of the Government after those elections. The hon. gentleman says he could not help grieving over our position in consequence of the failure of the National Policy. We deny that it has been a failure, and, if it had been a failure, the hon. gentleman, instead of wasting his time in simple grieving, should have had something like active sympathy with us, because I remember when the hon. gentleman was a National Policy man himself. I remember when the agreeable eloquence of the hon. gentleman was used in pointing out that Canada must be for the Canadians, and that a protective system was the proper one to adopt. But, other times, other manners, other opinions, and the hon. gentleman is quite right, if he thinks he is right, to change the opinions he once professed; but he is not able, and will not be able, to carry the country with him. I am, however, exceedingly glad, as a party man, that the hon. gentleman has induced his party, after a great deal of vacillation and a great deal of chopping and changing, to come down and nail their colors to the mast of free trade. That is the issue now before the country; but the hon. gentleman will find that Canada will remain, as most of the civilised nations of the world have remained, advocates of a national policy—every one with the exception of England. For the sake of my party I am glad that the hon. gentleman has taken that course. The hon. gentleman has seen in the papers, if he has not otherwise been aware, that I have attained the ripe age of three-quarters of a century. I cannot hope to be much longer, here or in this world, but I have this satisfaction, as a Canadian, as one interested in the future development and prosperity of Canada, of knowing that, after I go hence, the party which I believe is the true patriotic party of Canada—the Liberal Conservative party—will remain in power as long as the hon. gentlemen opposite adhere to the unwise, the unpatriotic policy which has been indicated by the hon. gentleman.

Paragraphs one to eleven agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

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

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS.

The Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1889.—(Mr. Foster.)

The Trade and Navigation Returns for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1889.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Annual Report of the Department of Inland Revenue.—(Mr. Costigan.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 20th January, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 2) to permit reciprocity in wrecking and the towing of vessels and rafts.—(Mr. Trow for Mr. Charlton.)

Bill (No. 3) to admit vessels registered in the United States to wrecking, towing and coasting privileges in Canadian waters.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland, for Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Bill (No. 4) to permit foreign vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 5) to make further provision as to the prevention of cruelty to animals, and to amend chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. White, Cardwell, for Mr. Brown.)

BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes. He said: This is the Bill which received some consideration at the hands of the House last Session, and I introduce it now in accordance with the understanding then arrived at.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. JONCAS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Explain.

Mr. JONCAS. It is the same Bill I presented last year, and is purely of local interest. It asks to put Gaspé on the same footing as Algoma in the Province of Ontario, and Cariboo in the Province of British Columbia; since the delays now provided for are not sufficient to allow the returning officer to post up his proclamations in time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MAPLE HILL POST OFFICE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether the Maple Hill Post Office, in the County of Bruce, has been closed? If so, why? Is it the intention of the Government to re-open it?

Mr. HAGGART. The post office of Maple Hill has been closed. It was closed on account of the resignation of the postmaster. It is the intention of the Government to re-open that office.

TRIAL OF ROBERT VOLLET.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Do the Government propose defraying the expenses of the trial of Robert Vollet, of Durham, who was tried at the assizes in Walkerton last autumn?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have had no application on that subject.

ELECTORAL DIVISION OF SHAWINEGAN.

Mr. DESAULNIERS asked, Whether the Government have been informed of the death of the Hon. James Ferrier, Senator, appointed for the electoral division of Shawinegan, in the Province of Quebec? If they have been so informed, why has this vacancy in the Senate not been filled, when the Counties of St. Maurice and Maskinongé have made known to the proper persons, through their representatives, the views of the electorate?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has been informed of the death of the Hon. James Ferrier; the appointment of his successor is still under the consideration of the Government.

PAYMENT TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has the Government of Prince Edward Island drawn any money from capital at Ottawa since the 14th January, 1889? If so, what amount, and when drawn?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government of Prince Edward Island has not drawn any money from capital at Ottawa since the 14th January, 1889.

THREE PER CENT. LOAN OF 1888.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) asked, Whether any portion of the 3 per cent. loan of 1888 has been purchased for the sinking fund since June 30, 1889? If so, what amount, at what date and at what price?

Mr. FOSTER. The following amounts have been purchased out of the 3 per cent. loan of 1888 on sinking fund account:

Date.	Amt. purchased.	Rate.	Accrued Int.	Net rate.
July.....	\$56,456.86	95½	nil	£95 10 0
Oct.....	92,591.34	95½	3 mos ½ p.c.	94 0 0
		95½	3 " ½ p.c.	94 10 0
Nov.....	247,589.50	95½	4 " 1 p.c.	94 17 6
		96	4 " 1 p.c.	95 0 0
Dec.....	97,315.44	96½	5 " 1½ p.c.	95 5 0
		96½	5 " 1½ p.c.	95 2 6
	\$493,953.14		Average cost.	95 16 6
			Net cost.	94 18 4

CONTRACTORS' CHEQUES.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether it is customary to transfer amounts put up by contractors from Chartered Banks to the Government Savings Banks? Has such been done in any case during the last year?

Mr. JONCAS.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not customary to transfer amounts put up by contractors from Chartered Banks to the Government Savings Banks, and I know of no case in which such has been done.

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL BILLS.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for:

Statement showing the total number of Bills disallowed since Confederation, also the total number disallowed each year during the same period; giving the titles of the Bills, the Province where passed, and the reason for said disallowance.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would suggest that my hon. friend make a little change in the motion he has just made, and insert the following:—

And the reasons for such disallowance so far as to show whether each Act was not within the competence of the Provincial Legislature, or upon grounds of public policy; also, in like manner, the Bills reserved for the pleasure of His Excellency the Governor General to which his assent was not given, showing the reasons for such refusal.

The hon. gentleman's motion asks the reason for such disallowance. Well, that means, of course, the printing of a very long correspondence in each case, and down to a certain date we are already in possession of that. I suppose what the hon. gentleman desires to have is a short synopsis of the Bills disallowed, and shortly the reasons for this disallowance. If the hon. gentleman will accept this suggestion I will not move it as an amendment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may be allowed to explain that last Session there was laid on the Table of the House a second blue book on this question which showed the title of every Act reported upon, giving the full text of the report in every case; and that brought the subject down to the end of the calendar year of 1888, I think. If this motion carries it will be simply necessary to bring down the supplementary papers to those which have been laid on the Table so far. Besides that, in the blue book which contains that report as brought down last Session, the hon. gentleman will find a carefully prepared table showing the year in which every Act was passed in each Province, the chapter of the Act, the title of the Act, the observations that were made upon it, and the date of the Order in Council; so that not only is the return asked for by the hon. gentleman already down to a certain date, and a very recent date, but it is also in the form of a synopsis which is very convenient for reference, and which the hon. gentleman will find, I think, to answer all his purposes.

Mr. LAURIER. I think my hon. friend might readily accept the suggestions of the Minister of Justice; that would provide all the information which, I presume, he has in view by making this motion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I only wish to have an extension of the return that has been already brought down. The suggestion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is worthy of consideration, and I have no objection to adopt the suggestion he has made.

Mr. McCARTHY. The information is all included in the returns already made, but I thought the hon. gentleman simply desired to obtain it in some short form.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is the idea.

—Mr. MCCARTHY. If it could be shortly stated, without giving any reasons, whether the action taken was on grounds of public policy, or on the ground that it was *ultra vires*, it would be desirable; but perhaps it would not always be easy to make the distinction.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I suppose if the return will be brought down in English and French, the hon. gentleman will not object to that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will allow it, the information will cover matters since the date of the last return.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Certainly. I hope it will not be refused because it is going to be in French too.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return giving the names of all persons who were tried before a Magistrate for selling whiskey to Indians in the County of Grey or Bruce, in the year 1888-89; together with all papers, documents and letters on the subject; also the name of the party who laid the information, the name of the Magistrate before whom it was tried, the name of the constable employed and the name of the lawyer retained in each case, together with the decisions of the Magistrate, stating the fines imposed, if any; also, if any appeals were made from the decisions of the Magistrate, stating before what Judge the appeals were tried and what was the result; giving the cost of each trial before the Magistrate, and of each appeal before the Judge, together with the name, occupation and post office address of every person who received money for any service whatever, either at the trial at the Magistrate's court or at the appeal before the Judge; the total cost of all the trials, the total fines imposed and collected. If costs were refused at any trial, giving the reason for such refusal; also showing whether any of the Indians who received intoxicating liquors were electors of Bruce under the Electoral Franchise Act of Canada.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Return showing the number of Dominion Franchise Voters Lists of 1889, printed outside the Government Printing Bureau, the names of the offices in which they were printed, and the amount paid for the printing of each respectively.—(Mr. Innes.)

Copy of Government Engineer's report of survey of harbors of Pinette and Wood's Island, and also copy of report of survey of New London Harbor and Breakwater, in the Province of Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. Welsh.)

Return showing the amounts of money deposited in the several Savings Banks in the Dominion, and in the several Post Office Savings Banks, the location of each, and the gross amount of deposits in each on the 30th of June and December last.—(Mr. McMullen.)

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That a special committee of seven members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the select standing committees ordered by the House on Thursday, the 16th instant, and that Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir John Thompson, Messrs. Bowell, Laurier, Mills (Bothwell) and the mover do compose the said committee.

Motion agreed to.

CONTRACTORS' CHEQUES.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend, who asked with reference to the contractors' cheques, to information which I have had sent to me since I gave the answer to his question; and I will refer him for a complete answer to C-12 Auditor General's report of 1887-88, in which the report of the Deputy Finance Minister and the Order in Council are given in full, and

which may in some little degree modify what I stated in answer to his question.

BEHRING SEA FISHERIES.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether it is his intention to lay on the Table the papers connected with the Behring Sea question?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the present intention to lay them on the Table. We may be able to do so during the course of the Session.

Mr. LAURIER. That is very vague.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When papers of that kind are referred to in the Speech from the Throne, the practice always has been to lay them on the Table as a matter of course. I think I have heard the hon. gentleman insist on our following this practice, on a former occasion, when we were on that side, and unless my memory is entirely at fault, that is the practice always followed in England.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The subject is of importance and of course properly should be alluded to in the Speech from the Throne. My hon. friend stated that the language was very vague. The language is vague and purposely vague.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Discussions are going on at Washington, and I have every reason to believe, as His Excellency put it, that a satisfactory solution of that question will be reached. In the meanwhile it is not in the public interest that the papers should now be laid on the Table.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not in the Government's interest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have met unusually early, and I presume the Government business is in a state of forwardness. I would ask the Minister of Finance whether he expects to be able shortly to bring down the Estimates?

Mr. FOSTER. I expect to have the Estimates probably about the middle of this week.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 21st January, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN presented the report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on Thursday, 16th inst., and moved that that portion of the said report relating to the Committee on Standing Orders, and to the Printing Committee, be adopted.

The Committees are as follows :—

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs	
Bain (Wentworth),	McKeen,
Bergeron,	Marshall,
Brien,	Meigs,
Burdett,	Mills (Annapolis),
Casgrain,	Moffat,
Coughlin,	Montplaisir,
Coulombe,	O'Brien,
Denison,	Paterson (Brant),
De St. Georges,	Patterson (Essex),
Dessaint,	Perry,
Dupont,	Porter,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Rinfret,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Robertson,
Ferguson (Welland),	Smith (Sir Donald),
Gigault,	Stevenson,
Gillmor,	Sutherland,
Gordon,	Thérien,
Jones (Digby),	Turcot,
Landerkin,	Wilmut,
Langelier (Montmorency),	Wilson (Lennox), and
Lavergne,	Wood (Brockville).—43.
Macdowall,	

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

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs	
Amyot,	Hickey,
Bergin,	Innes,
Bourassa,	McMullen,
Bowell,	Putnam,
Charlton,	Somerville,
Davin,	Taylor,
Desjardins,	Tisdale,
Ellis,	Trow, and
Foster,	Vanasse.—19.
Grandbois,	

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That a Select Committee be composed of Messrs. Amyot, Blake, Curran, Chouinard, Cockburn, Colby, Davies, Davin, Desjardins, Kirkpatrick, O'Brien, Scrier, Thérien, Weldon (Albert), Weldon (St. John) and Wright, be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament in so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honors therewith, and that the Clerk of the House do carry the said message to the Senate.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting their Honors to unite with this House in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament; and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, namely, Messrs. Amyot, Bergin, Bourassa, Bowell, Charlton, Davin, Desjardins, Ellis, Foster, Grandbois, Hickey, Innes, McMullen, Putnam, Somerville, Taylor, Tisdale, Trow and Vanasse, do act as members on the part of this House on the said Joint Committee on Printing.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—
STANLEY OF PRESTON.

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

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 21st January, 1890.

FOREIGNERS AND ALIENS.

Mr. TAYLOR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract to perform labor in Canada.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Explain.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is a Bill intended to protect the laboring classes of Canada. It is similar to a Bill passed by the Congress of the United States in 1875; it is a copy of the American Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire to ask if the Minister of Justice has considered this Bill, and if he is of opinion that this House has power to interfere with contracts of this kind?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have not seen the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEPUTY SPEAKER—CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I heard last night that you, Mr. Speaker, were threatened with an attack of influenza, and although I gave notice that to-morrow I would move for the appointment of a Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House, with the consent of the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Laurier), I will move the motion now.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That John Fisher Wood, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the Town of Brockville, be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House, have never been quite satisfied that the office that the hon. gentleman now proposes to fill was either necessary or even absolutely useful. But as the House has on two or three different occasions pronounced differently from our views on this as on many other subjects, I do not propose to question the advisability of this policy; on the contrary, I look upon it as a settled matter. As to the choice which the Premier offers to this House to fill this important office, I must say that it is altogether acceptable to this side of the House. I have always considered, and I think that it is the opinion of the House at large, that the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) is a good species of wood, although I am afraid that it has been his misfortune to grow in a very unhealthy camp; but it is a misfortune so prevalent in this country that we cannot take it as a cause of reproach in this case. I bear testimony that the hon. gentleman has always bore the character of being endowed with a calm temper and judicial

mind, and, I believe, in discharging the important duties now conferred upon him, he will distribute equal justice to all, without fear or favor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On behalf of the majority of this House, I thank the hon. gentleman for the cordial manner he has spoken of our recommendation and the manner in which it has been accepted by the Left.

REPORT.

Report of the Commissioner, Dominion Police, for the year 1889, under Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter 184, Section 5.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to ; and the House adjourned at 3.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 22nd January, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the report of the special committee appointed to report the list of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House, in so far as it relates to the following committees, namely : on Privileges and Elections ; on Expiring Laws ; on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines ; on Miscellaneous Private Bills ; on Public Accounts ; on Banking and Commerce, and on Agriculture and Colonisation, be concurred in as follows :—

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Amyot,	Langelier (Montmorency),
Barron,	Langelier (Quebec),
Beausoleil,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Blake,	Laurier,
Bryson,	Lister,
Caron,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Casgrain,	Mackenzie,
Chapleau,	McCarthy,
Colby,	McDonald (Victoria),
Costigan,	McIntyre,
Curran,	Mills (Bothwell),
Davies,	Moncrieff,
Desaulniers,	Mulock,
Desjardins,	Patterson (Essex),
Dickey,	Préfontaine,
Edgar,	Prior,
Girouard,	Riopel,
Hall,	Temple,
Hudspeth,	Thompson (Sir John),
Ives,	Tupper,
Kirkpatrick,	Weldon (Albert), and
Landry,	Weldon (St. John).—44.

ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs

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

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

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs

Archibald,	Landerkin,
Amyot,	Landry,
Armstrong,	Lang,
Bain (Soulanges),	Langelier (Quebec),
Bain (Wentworth),	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Baird,	LaRivière,
Barnard,	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Barron,	Laurier,
Beausoleil,	Lavergne,
Béchar,	Lépine,
Bergeron,	Lister,
Bergin,	Livingston,
Bernier,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Blake,	Mackenzie,
Boisvert,	McCarthy,
Borden,	McCulla,
Bourassa,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bowell,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Bowman,	McGreevy,
Boyle,	McIntyre,
Brien,	McKay,
Brown,	McKeen,
Bryson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Burdett,	McMullen,
Burns,	Madill,
Cameron,	Mara,
Campbell,	Masson,
Cargill,	Massue,
Carling,	Meigs,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mills (Annapolis),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell),
Casey,	Mitchell,
Casgrain,	Mulock,
Chapleau,	Patterson (Essex),
Charlton,	Perley,
Choquette,	Perry,
Chouinard,	Platt,
Cimon,	Pope,
Cockburn,	Porter,
Colby,	Préfontaine,
Colter,	Prior,
Cook,	Purcell,
Corby,	Rinfret,
Costigan,	Riopel,
Coulombe,	Robillard,
Couture,	Roome,
Curran,	Ross,
Daly,	Rykert,
Davies,	Scarth,
Davin,	Scriver,
Davis,	Shanly,
Dawson,	Skinner,
De St. Georges,	Small,
Desjardins,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Dessaint,	Smith (Ontario),

Dewdney,
Dickinson,
Edgar,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Welland),
Fisher,
Foster,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Girouard,
Godbout,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guay,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hale,
Hall,
Hesson,
Hickey,
Holton,
Hudspeth,
Innes,
Ives,
Joncas,
Jones (Halifax),
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,

Sproule,
Stevenson,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thérien,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Trow,
Turcot,
Tyrwhitt,
Vanasse,
Waldie,
Wallace,
Ward,
Watson,
Weldon (Albert),
Weldon (St. John),
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wilson (Elgin),
Wilson (Lennox),
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland),
Wright, and
Yeo.—166.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Amvot,
Armstrong,
Audet,
Barnard,
Barron,
Bell,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Brien,
Burdett,
Campbell,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Casey,
Chisholm,
Choquette,
Chouinard,
Cochrane,
Costigan,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Denison,
Dickey,
Dickinson,
Edwards,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Girouard,
Hale,
Hickey,
Holton,
Hudspeth,
Ives,
Jamieson,

Joncas,
Jones (Digby),
Kenny,
Labrosse,
Landry,
Langelier (Montmorency),
Langelier (Quebec),
Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Lavergne,
Lépine,
Lovitt,
McCulla,
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGreevy,
McIntyre,
McKay,
McMillan (Huron),
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Madill,
Marshall,
Massue,
Moffat,
Moncrieff,
Montplaisir,
Mulock,
Robillard,
Rowand,
Scriven,
Small,
Sproule,
Vanasse,
Ward,
Watson,
Weldon (Albert),
Weldon (St. John),
Wilson (Argenteuil), and
Wright.—74.

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

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Bécharde,

Macdonald (Sir John),
Macdonald (Huron),
Mackenzie,

Bergeron,
Bergin,
Blake,
Bowell,
Cameron,
Carling,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Chapleau,
Charlton,
Colby,
Costigan,
Davies,
Ellis,
Ferguson (Welland),
Foster,
Gillmor,
Grandbois,
Haggart,
Hesson,
Hickey,
Holton,
Jones (Halifax),
Landerkin,
Langelier (Quebec),
Lister,

McCarthy,
McDougald (Pictou),
McMullen,
Madill,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mitchell,
Moncrieff,
Mulock,
Perley,
Rinfret,
Riopel,
Rykert,
Scarth,
Scriven,
Smith (Ontario),
Somerville,
Taylor,
Tupper,
Wallace,
Welsh,
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westmoreland).—57.

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

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Archibald,
Baird,
Barnard,
Beausoleil,
Bécharde,
Bernier,
Blake,
Borden,
Bowell,
Bowman,
Boyle,
Brown,
Bryson,
Burns,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casgrain,
Cimon,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Colby,
Colter,
Cook,
Curran,
Davies,
Dawson,
Desjardins,
Dickey,
Dickinson,
Dupont,
Earle,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,
Fiset,
Flynn,
Foster,
Freeman,
Gigault,
Girouard,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hall,
Hesson,

Landry,
Lang,
Langelier (Quebec),
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Lister,
Lovitt,
Macdonald (Sir John),
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdowall,
Mackenzie,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McGreevy,
McNeill,
Mara,
Masson,
Massue,
Meigs,
Mills (Bothwell),
Mitchell,
Moncrieff,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Perley,
Préfontaine,
Purcell,
Putnam,
Riopel,
Robillard,
Rykert,
Scarth,
Scriven,
Semple,
Shanly,
Skinner,
Smith (Sir Donald),
Sutherland,
Temple,
Thérien,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Turcot,
Vanasse,
Waldie,
Wallace,

Holton,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Joncas,
Jones (Halifax),
Kenny,
Kirk,
Kirkpatrick,
Landerkin,

Weldon (Albert),
Weldon (St. John),
Welsh,
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wood (Westmoreland),
Wright, and
Yeo.—110.

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

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONISATION.

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Audet,
Bain (Soulanges),
Bain (Wentworth),
Béchar, d,
Bell,
Bernier,
Boisvert,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brien,
Bryson,
Burdett,
Burns,
Cameron,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Chapleau,
Chisholm,
Choquette,
Cimon,
Cochrane,
Coughlin,
Coulombe,
Couture,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Dessaint,
Dewdney,
Dickinson,
Doyon,
Earle,
Edwards,
Eisenhauer,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Ferguson (Welland),
Fiset,
Fisher,
Flynn,
Gauthier,
Gigault,
Godbout,
Gordon,
Grandbois,

Guay,
Guillet,
Hesson,
Innes,
Joncas,
Jones (Digby),
Kirk,
Labrosse,
Landry,
Lang,
Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Lépine,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
McCulla,
McMillan (Huron),
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McNeill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Mitchell,
Montplaisir,
Neveu,
Paterson (Brant),
Perley,
Perry,
Platt,
Pope,
Putnam,
Robertson,
Roome,
Ross,
Rowand,
Ste. Marie,
Semple,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Trow,
Tyrwhitt,
Watson,
White (Renfrew),
Wilson (Elgin),
Wilson (Lennox),
Wright, and
Yeo.—98.

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

Motion agreed to.

ADULTERATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) to amend the Adulteration Act, Chap. 107, Revised Statutes. He said: The first object of this Bill is to change the present law so that if food or drugs be found in the possession of any person which on analysis be found to be adulterated, the cost of such analysis shall be

charged to the owner of such adulterated article. This Bill when passed will be no tax whatever upon the honest trader and it proposes merely to make the vendor of adulterated articles pay the cost of the analysis. The other amendments are principally with the object of strengthening the hands of the department in prosecuting under this Act. On account of the wording of one section of the Act, we find a difficulty in proceeding in certain matters, and to remove that difficulty, the amendment is proposed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT—THE DUAL LANGUAGE.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 10) to amend the North-West Territories Act. He said: In introducing this Bill I think that perhaps it might be as well that I should offer some explanation, though I do not think that any defence or apology is called for on my part in bringing this matter before the House. It is, however, necessary that there should be some explanation, because it must occur to us all that it is most extraordinary that in the North-West Territories, and so long ago as 1877 an Act should have been passed in this Parliament whereby the dual language was imposed upon the Territories; of course without any consent of theirs, because at that time there was practically no people in the Territories to assent, or consent, or dissent from the proposition. I think it is also requiring of explanation, not, as I say, to move for a repeal of this clause, but to give some account of how and why it is we find this clause in the North-West Territories Act. Now, the history of the matter, as I understand it, is this: I think it was a year or two, or perhaps three or four years, before the Act was passed to which I am about to refer more in detail, that the North-West Territories were constituted, or, at all events, brought under some kind or form of government—during the time my hon. friend the Prime Minister who now leads the Government and the House was also in the position he occupies to-day. In 1877, however, when my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was Minister of the Interior in the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), he brought in a Bill to amend the North-West Territories Act, but that Bill as it was introduced into this House did not contain the clause with regard to the dual language which I now propose that the House should expunge. The Bill went in due course to the Senate, and in the Senate it was amended by the introduction of this clause; and, so far as I have been able to ascertain, there appears to have been no objection made in that body to the clause, which was introduced, as I am told, by an hon. Senator at the instance of the then leader of the Government in that House, the Hon. Mr. Scott. I do not pretend to vouch for that, but I am so credibly informed. I rather think that that cannot be true, however, because when the Bill reached this House with these amendments, and concurrence in them was called for, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) seemed to be surprised at the introduction of this particular clause, and expressed his regret at it. I have extracted from *Hansard* what he said on that subject, and I can hardly imagine that his

surprise was feigned, or that his astonishment was not expressed in perfect good faith. Speaking of the amendment, the hon. member for Bothwell is reported to have said :

"One of them, he stated, provided for the publication of the proceedings of the North-West Council in English and French, and for the use of both languages in the courts. They had thought that this was a matter which had better be left to the Council in question. He regretted that the amendment had been made, but it would be impossible to get the measure through at this late period in the Session, unless the amendments were accepted. The action taken by the Senate would add very considerably to the expense. Almost every one in that part of the country spoke Cree, though some spoke, in addition, English or French, and, if the proceedings were to be published in the most prevalent language, Cree should be chosen for the purpose."

With these observations the amendments were concurred in without any objections being made, so far as I have been able to see, by any hon. member on the floor of this House ; and I was either present or ought to have been present, and I therefore share in the blame attachable to the proceedings on that occasion. Then, I think it was in the year 1880, this North-West Territories Act was again dealt with, and again we find this clause, which I venture to call an objectionable clause ; and I believe that on that occasion also it was passed through both Houses of Parliament without objection being made by any hon. member on either side of the House. And finally, last Session, in the proposition submitted to us by the Government in the Bill then brought down, the same clause is to be found ; and although the Bill did not advance very far, so far as it did go, no objection appears to have been made to the clause. Now, Sir, all this may appear, perhaps, to form some good reason against the proposition I have now the honor to make. I venture to think, however, that that is not so. The enactment in question is as follows :—

"Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the said Council, and in the proceedings before the courts, and both those languages shall be used in the records and journals of the said Council, and the ordinances of the said Council shall be printed in both those languages."

Now, I venture to say that if a constitution were framed for a new country, it would never occur to any person to do so foolish a thing as to stipulate for two official languages. I venture to think that, with the knowledge which there is on the subject at this time, it never would occur to any person that it was a proper thing to create or perpetuate, as the case might be, two official languages ; and yet practically that was what was done in that North-West Act. What is the explanation, Mr. Speaker, of this extraordinary piece of legislation, which appears to have been assented to by the House on three or four different occasions without objection on the part of any one ? It is not to be found in the Treaty of Cession, although a very large number of persons seem to be under the impression that by the treaty negotiated at the time this country was ceded to the British Crown, the right of the language was guaranteed to the French. As I say—and the fact cannot be too widely known or too often repeated—that is not so. The mistake is one which very generally prevails ; and on looking at articles on this subject—articles by very learned men—I have been surprised that this statement has been very generally made and very generally accepted. But there is

Mr. McCARTHY.

not a word to be found in the treaty or in the Articles of Cession anywhere by which the language was guaranteed to the conquered French.

Mr. AMYOT. Not conquered—ceded.

Mr. McCARTHY. Ceded, my hon. friend says, although I venture to think the other expression is the more correct. But there is not a word to be found either at the time of the cession or conquest, or whatever it may be called, which gives any ground for the statement that the language was guaranteed to the French inhabitants of this country. Nor is it to be found in the Act known as the Quebec Act. That Act went a good deal further than the treaty, as we all know. The treaty guaranteed to the French people their religion, and that so far as the laws of Great Britain permitted ; but the Quebec Act went much further. It restored to them their laws—the civil laws to which they had been accustomed ; and it restored to their church certain rights and privileges which are enjoyed to this day ; but it dealt not with this question of language. Well, the next stage would be perhaps in 1791, when the Province of Lower Canada was constituted ; and at the time of the constitution of that Province the language was not dealt with either ; though very shortly afterwards, it is perfectly true as an historical fact, the French members of the Assembly then constituted did claim the right, and enforced the right, to use their language ; and I believe the proceedings were carried on in both languages in that Assembly—however, not by any statute law, or by anything more than a resolution of the Assembly, which had a perfect right to so resolve and so act. Well, we come down to the time of the Rebellion and the Real Union of the Provinces in 1840 by the Act of that date ; and there, so far from the language being allowed to the French, as we all know, consequent on the report of Lord Durham, who was sent out here to investigate the causes of the Rebellion—a report which was recognised on all hands as a most statesmanlike document—that in Lower Canada, at any rate, it was more a trouble of race than that of alleged misgovernment, a clause was introduced into the Union Act of 1841 by which the use of the French language was absolutely prohibited instead of being permitted. So that the first piece of legislation we have on the subject is a clause prohibiting the use of the French language. That was followed in the Parliament of the United Provinces by an Address to the Crown, passed unanimously, I think, in 1844, asking for the repeal of that clause, and accordingly, in 1848, that clause in the Union Act was repealed. Now, Sir, I come down to 1867, to the time of the British North America Act, and there we find that the dual languages are for the first time permitted by legislative enactment ; but the permission is restricted to this Parliament and to the Assembly and Legislative Council of the Province of Quebec. It is not at all intended by that Act, from anything to be gathered from it, that the use of the dual languages is to be permitted in any of the other Provinces, much less in any Province which did not even then belong to Canada, and which were acquired afterwards when the Hudson Bay Company sold us their territory of Rupert's Land, by which that great country passed under the Dominion of Canada. Therefore, there was no legislative warrant for the use

of the French language in that territory in any sense, and it is based and founded, if founded at all, simply on the will of Parliament, and it ought, therefore, to be based on some good and sufficient reason. Now, is it, or is it not, a matter of importance that the dual language or the additional French language should be permitted—I will not say permitted—should be encouraged and fostered throughout the Dominion of Canada? If it is a matter of no importance—and so, perhaps, it was considered at the time—of course the motion I am making to Parliament, the Bill I have had the honor to ask leave to introduce, is an unnecessary measure, and will no doubt be so received and dealt with by this House. But in my judgment it is by no means an unimportant matter. On the contrary, I think, and I assert here in my place in Parliament, that there is no more important matter in the formation of the character of a people than the language that they speak, and, after all said and done, I think it will be found that nations and races are distinguished and are distinctive more by reason of the language they speak than by the blood which is common to or supposed to be common to them all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Switzerland.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it would be found upon an investigation of the subject, and I will appeal to the very closest investigation upon the subject, that this is the well-known and accepted truth. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) refers to Switzerland or to the Swiss. When the proper time comes for the discussion of this Bill, that will certainly be a proper illustration to be dealt with; but I think my hon. friend would not, even if his view were correct, adopt the rule from the exception. Everyone knows that the use of several languages in Switzerland is an exception to the general rule, and should not be adopted as the general rule.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Well, well.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friends laugh, and I hope, when the proper time comes, they will justify their laughter by something more than sneers. Before I sit down I will fortify my statement by an authority whose opinions I believe will be accepted, and certainly cannot be gainsaid. If, then, as I assert, it is an important matter in the great question of national life, I would ask my hon. friends in this House what we are assembled here for if not for the purpose of promoting national unity and building up a great country in the enormous territory we have under our control? Is not that the grandest and greatest object that has been entrusted to us as the representatives of a people; and towards that great object are we dealing truly if we are sowing the seeds of dissensions and of future trouble by legislation of this kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friends perhaps will allow me to proceed quietly because there will be a full opportunity of debating this subject, and then I hope there will be a fair hearing given to all opinions in this House. I have a right to my opinion and I intend to maintain it, notwithstanding what my hon. friends may say. In my opinion

it is of the greatest importance to endeavor to make this great country united in fact as we are endeavoring to unite it in substance. We are spending our means, we have spent enormous sums of money, we have united the Atlantic to the Pacific, we have spent enormous sums, I say, on the Inter-colonial Railway to unite the Maritime Provinces with the heart of the Dominion, but what profits it if, at the same time, we are passing measures and promoting legislation which separates and divides the people into two separate races, or which is perpetuating that division; which is not only permitting it in the Province of Quebec, but in the new territories belonging to the Dominion. As a matter of dollars and cents, as a matter of mere money, the acquisition of the North-West, looked upon as a speculation, has been a loss, and, except for the purpose of building up a great nation, which we are willing to do, there can be no justification for the expenditure, not only in the acquisition of that great country, but in the building of those great railways at enormous expenditure, bringing into the market, to compete with our farmers, vast quantities of land, which must diminish the value of the land of the farmers in the older Provinces, while they are actually spending their money in the acquisition of the land which accomplishes this result. The only object we have had in all this has been to create on the northern part of this continent a great nationality, to build up a great country, one that our descendants would be proud to occupy and proud to belong to; and that is the only justification of the procedure which has been adopted from first to last since the passing of the Confederation Act. As I stated before, I will read from a document which I do not think hon. gentlemen will say does not convey a fair statement of this question of language. I will read from an article written by Professor Freeman, in which he deals with this question in the following words:—

“And now, having ruled that races and nations, though largely formed by the working of an artificial law, are still real and living things, groups in which the idea of kindred is the idea around which everything has grown, how are we to define our races and our nations? How are we to mark them off one from the other? Bearing in mind the cautions and qualifications which have been already given, bearing in mind large classes of exceptions which will presently be spoken of, I say unhesitatingly that for practical purposes there is one test, and one only, and that test is language. We may at least apply the test negatively. It might be unsafe to rule that all speakers of the same language have a common nationality, but we may safely say that, where there is no community of language, there is no common nationality in the highest sense. As in the teeth of community of language there may be what for all political purposes are separate nations, so without community of language there may be an artificial nationality, a nationality which may be good for all political purposes, and which may engender a common national feeling, still, this is not quite the same thing as that fuller national unity which is felt where there is community of language. In fact, mankind instinctively takes language as the badge of nationality. We so far take it as the badge that we instinctively assume community of language as a nation as the rule, and we set down anything that departs from that rule as an exception. The first idea suggested by the word Frenchman, or German, or any other national name, is that he is a man who speaks French or German as his mother tongue. We take for granted, in the absence of anything to make us think otherwise, that a Frenchman is a speaker of French, and that a speaker of French is a Frenchman.”

I think that will not be denied as a correct doctrine, but I will further trouble the House with a reference from a man very distinguished in this branch of science, Professor Müller, who, in his

lectures delivered before at the Oxford University Extension meeting, says :

"It is said that blood is thicker than water, but it may be said with even greater truth that language is thicker than blood. If, in the interior of Africa, surrounded by black men, whose utterances are utterly unintelligible, we suddenly met with a man who could speak English, we should care very little whether he was English, or Irish, or American. We should understand him and be able to exchange our thoughts with him. That brings us together far more closely than if we met a Welshman speaking nothing but Welsh, or a Scotchman speaking nothing but Gaelic; or for all that, an Englishman who, having been brought up in China, could speak nothing Chinese. A common language is a common bond of intellectual brotherhood, far stronger than any supposed or real community of blood. Common blood without a common language leaves us as perfect strangers. A common language, even without common blood, makes the whole world feel akin."

Again, speaking of the other question, the question of race, a subject of very great interest, a subject which has been pursued by scientific men up to a recent period, this seems to be the result. The Professor quotes in his lecture from the Director of the American Bureau of Ethnology, who says :

"There is a science of anthropology composed of subsidiary sciences. There is a science of sociology, which includes all the institutions of mankind. There is a science of philology, which includes the languages of mankind. And there is a science, philosophy, which includes the opinions of mankind. But there is no science of ethnology, for the attempt to classify mankind in groups has failed on every hand."

There is no such thing as a Celtic skull any more than a Saxon skull; no such thing as Celtic hair any more than Saxon hair. It is only by language and by the community of language, that men are formed into nations. Finally, speaking of the whole subject of the science of language, the professor says :

"These may seem but idle dreams, of little interest to the practical politician. All I can say is that I wish that it were so. But my memory reaches back far enough to make me see the real and lasting mischief for which I feel the science of language has been responsible for the last fifty years. The ideas of race and nationality founded on language have taken such complete possession of the fancy, both of the young and the old, that all other arguments seem of no avail. Why was Italy united? Because the Italian language embodied Italian nationality. Why was Germany united? Because of Arndt's song, 'What is the German's Fatherland?' and the answer given, 'As far as sounds the German tongue.' Why is Russia so powerful a centre of attraction for the Slavonic inhabitants of Turkey and Germany? Because the Russian language, even though it is hardly understood by Servians, Croatsians and the Bulgarians, is known to be most closely allied. Even from the mere cinders of ancient dialects, such as Welsh, Gaelic and Erse, eloquent agitators know how to fan a new, sometimes a dangerous, fire."

I would just add to that an extract from the report of Lord Durham who dealt with the matter, not solely from a scientific, but from a practical point of view. When he was sent here, as we all know, he was a Liberal of the Liberals, and he was sent here by Lord Melbourne's Government for the purpose of investigating the difficulties and ascertaining what caused the rebellion in both Upper and Lower Canada. I have nothing to do at the moment with his report with regard to the Upper Province, but in his report on the Lower Province, he found the rebellion to be caused mainly, if not altogether, by race difficulties. Whatever else there was, whatever other prejudices there were, whatever other causes there might be, the trouble, when probed to the bottom, was found to be caused by race difficulties. Now, it may be said that has nothing to do with language,

Mr. McCARTHY.

but when hon. gentlemen take the trouble to pursue the subject further they will find that when speaking of race, they mean a community speaking the same language. When you talk of a race you will find, when you investigate the subject, that the race is made up, not of men of one blood, but of men who have been adopted into the race, and there are instances of that in the Province of Quebec. I would like to know whether the Highland soldiers who were disbanded after the cession have not been received and adopted by the French Canadians, and are not now considered as much French Canadians as those who came from France a hundred years before that time? That process is going on constantly. Can you distinguish an Englishman who came over at the time of the Conquest from an Englishman of three or four centuries earlier? Or, to come back to more recent times, is the Frenchman who came over to England during the time of the troubles, and owing to the troubles in France, and after a generation or two changed his name to an English name; is he to be distinguished from those who have descended from a long line of English ancestry? It is plain, that what makes the nation is language; and, therefore, when one speaks of race, as these distinguished writers have done, they meant a community speaking the same language. But at the moment I am not dealing so much with that question, which I will come to by-and-bye, as with the particular matter of the difficulties in the Lower Province, and I will quote again from Lord Durham's report about this difference of language :

"The difference of language in this respect produces effects quite apart from those which it has on the mere intercourse of the two races. Those who have reflected on the powerful influence of language on thought, will perceive in how different a manner people who speak in different languages are apt to think; and those who are familiar with the literature of France, know that the same opinion will be expressed by an English and French writer of the present day, not merely in different words, but in style so different as to make utterly different habits of thought. This difference is very striking in Lower Canada; it exists, not merely in the books of most influence and repute, which are, of course, those of the great writers of France and England, and by which the minds of the respective races are formed, but it is observable in the writings which now issue from the Colonial press. The articles in the newspapers of each race are written in style as widely different as those of France and England at present, and the arguments which convince the one are calculated to appear utterly unintelligible to the other. The difference of language produces misconceptions yet more fatal even than those which it occasions with respect to opinions; it aggravates the national animosities, by representing all the events of the day in utterly different light."

Now, I venture to think, I have, at all events to some extent, made good the proposition which I am dealing with, that is, that language is of great importance, that it is of vital consequence to a nation that the language spoken by its people should be common to them all, that they should not, at all events, be encouraged and trained in speaking different languages.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Alsace and Lorraine seem to be exceptions to the rule.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to see that my hon. friend, at one time Minister of the Interior, has changed his views. He regretted the introduction of the French language in the North-West Territories at the time he consented to that amendment, and I give him credit for good faith in that regret. Certainly circumstances since have not altered in favor of the policy which my hon. friend seems now

to have adopted. But I am glad to see that he stands firmly by the Bill which he fathered. At all events, on his part there can be no going back, and he is not accustomed to change any opinion he has once entertained. Now, I say, what has been the result in this country? Let hon. gentlemen remember that when this country was ceded to the British Crown there was not more than 60,000 or 65,000 French Canadians—I think that number includes, though I am not quite certain, those who dwelt on the banks of the Illinois, and who did not form a part of what is now the Dominion of Canada. However that may be, instead of encouraging them in the use of their language, had a policy been pursued of inducing them—not by any harsh means at all, not by any aggravating measures—to speak the English tongue, I want to know whether to-day, instead of the difference, the cleavage of race, which we see going on, and which is becoming more and more pronounced, and which is calculated to rend this Dominion in twain, if some stop is not put to it—I would like to know whether we would see the spectacle that we see to-day? I think it is perfectly plain that we would not see it. I think no injustice would have been done, and that in one generation, or in two at most, my hon. friends that now represent the Province of Quebec, or their ancestors, would have been speaking English, and would have been English in fact, English in sentiment, just as much as those who have gone to the other side of the line, no matter what country they come from, whether from Austria, from Italy, from Germany, or any other country in Europe, have now become assimilated and form part of the American people, not merely in name but in truth and in fact. Well, it is said that this is a matter of no consequence. Now, I venture to state that Lord Durham did find it to be a matter of consequence, and as I am desirous of convincing my hon. friends, if I possibly can, I want to give authority for what I say. I see there is a good deal of feeling on the subject, more than I should have expected, but I assume that my hon. friends are open to reason, and willing to listen to argument. Now, Lord Durham says in his report again:

“I expected to find a contest between a government and a people; I found two nations warring in the bosom of a single state; I found a struggle, not of principle, but of race; and I perceived that it would be idle to attempt any amelioration of laws or institutions, until we could first succeed in terminating the deadly animosity that now separates the inhabitants of Lower Canada into the hostile divisions of French and English.”

Further down:

“We are ready to believe that the real motive of the quarrel is something else, and that the difference of race has slightly and occasionally aggravated dissensions, which we attribute to some more usual cause. Experience of a state of society, so unhappily divided as that of Lower Canada, leads to an exactly contrary opinion. The national feud forces itself on the very sense, irresistibly and palpably, as the origin or the essence of every dispute which divides the community; we discover that dissensions, which appear to have another origin, are but forms of this constant and all-pervading quarrel, and every contest is one of French and English in the outset, or becomes so ere it has run its course.”

Now, I think that, as regards that time, at all events, Lord Durham's statement may be taken as good evidence—and no one would question his perfect impartiality—of what he saw on the spot here and reported to his Government. I hear the First Minister remark that Lord Durham did not write the report himself. That may be perfectly

true; but a man as competent as Lord Durham was here—Mr. Buller—who is credited with having written the report, and so, whether it is called Lord Durham's or Mr. Buller's report, does not alter the fact, if fact it was, that such was the result of their investigation on the spot. But is it true or not that these things have changed, is all this matter of language a matter of no moment, a matter which does not call for investigation in this House or inquiry by the representatives of the people? Why, we have had statements made by the Premier of the Province of Quebec, who leads a great majority of his fellow countrymen in that Province, and there is no use denying, and I say it in the presence of the right hon. gentleman and the Government that I have hitherto followed, that there can be no question whatever that Mr. Mercier is to-day the true representative of the French Canadians of the Province of Quebec. Has he given any uncertain sound upon this question of Nationalism? What means it when he forms a party and calls it the National party? We have our National Policy. That was not a policy confined to one Province or one part of the Dominion, but a policy intended to apply and embrace the whole Dominion. We know, however, that the Nationalist party in the Province of Quebec is intended to embrace and consolidate one of the races, divided by the language—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McCARTHY—and that it has successfully done so.

Mr. AMYOT. No such thing.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot accept the hon. gentleman's disclaimer.

Mr. LANGELETT (Quebec). We cannot accept your assertion.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may be asked what evidence I produce. I ask what is the meaning of the word “Nationalist?”

Mr. AMYOT. I will tell you later on.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to have an explanation, but I must accept the definition of the word as I find it. Nationalism means French nationality in that sense. What did Mr. Mercier say, speaking in the presence of the hon. gentleman leading the Opposition in this House, if I am not misformed—at all events, the hon. gentleman spoke very shortly after him.

Mr. LAURIER. I spoke for myself.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said Mr. Mercier spoke in your presence. I am only stating what Mr. Mercier said.

Mr. LAURIER. You do not expect me to accept your statement.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am going to do justice to the hon. gentleman, and say that he disclaimed it. Now, what did Mr. Mercier say?

“To-day the rouge and the blue should give place to the tri-color. They must be united if they wish to make their nationality powerful.”

Mark the words—“their nationality.” Perhaps these words do not mean what they appear to say:

“It was a triumph for the National cause.”

It does not need an explanation from the hon. gentleman, who, I believe, is a warm supporter of Mr. Mercier in provincial affairs.

"For the sake of their nationality, for the sake of their religion, they must be united."

Who must be united ?

"The strength of the French Canadian people lay in the union of the people with the clergy. By coupling the name with Jesuit hero, Brebeuf, with the immortal Jacques Cartier they said to their insulters, it is useless to imagine that we will ever cease to be French and Catholic. This monument declares that after a century of separation from our ancient mother we are still French; more than that, we will remain French and Catholic."

Is there any doubt about these words? What is meant by "National?" These words were said in the presence of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition in this House, as he does not deny, and he allowed them to pass without rebuke. I quite admit that when the hon. gentleman spoke he made no such declaration of policy in his own behalf, and when he delivered himself afterwards in Toronto—perhaps it would have been better if he had said it in Quebec—he stated that he for one was not in favor of French nationality. There is no doubt, at all events, as to what was meant by the hon. gentleman who leads the 'Local Government' in the statement which called forth in Toronto a disclaimer from the leader of the Opposition in this House. But the hon. gentleman will remember that when he went back to his Province he was not warmly greeted for this frank and rather liberal declaration which he made in the Pavilion at Toronto.

Mr. LAURIER. Do not pander to party prejudice.

Mr. McCARTHY. When the hon. gentleman returned he threw himself into an election then pending, and the result (I should like the hon. gentleman to explain, if the result was due to any other cause,) was that the majority of the candidate for the seat of the late Capt. Labelle was very much increased, the position not being appreciably changed except by this declaration, which was not received with favor by the press of Quebec, or a portion of the press of that Province. Is it not perfectly true also, that a large section of that press, more or less influential, having, I believe, an influence quite as great perhaps as any newspapers are supposed to possess, spoke out on this subject with no uncertain sound. Let me read to the House, what is perfectly well known to the members of the Province of Quebec, what *La Vérité* said on more than one occasion. We gather the signs of the times from newspaper articles and from the declarations of public men. I may perhaps be belittling Mr. Mercier by reading newspaper extracts in attempting to bolster up that hon. gentleman, but that newspaper makes such a declaration that I cannot pass it without remark. That journal says :

"But such was not, is not, never will be, the desire of French Canadians. For us, Confederation was and is the means to an end. It is a means of enabling us to dwell in peace with our English neighbors, whilst safe guarding our rights, developing our resources, strengthening us, and making us ready for our national future. Let us say it boldly—the ideal of the French Canadian people is not the ideal of the other races which to-day inhabit the land our fathers subdued for Christian civilisation. Our ideal is the formation here, in this corner of the earth, watered by the blood of our heroes, of a nation which shall perform on this continent the part France has played so long in Europe. Our aspiration is to found a nation which, socially, shall profess the Catholic faith and speak the French language. That is not, and cannot be, the aspiration of the other races. To say, then, that all the groups which constitute the Confederation are

Mr. McCARTHY.

animated by one and the same aspiration, is to utter a sounding phrase without political or historical meaning. For us the present form of government is not, and cannot be, the last word of our national existence. It is merely a road towards the goal which we have in view, that is all. Let us never lose sight of our own national destiny. Rather let us constantly prepare ourselves to fulfil it worthily at the hour decreed by Providence, which circumstances shall reveal to us. Our whole history proves that it is not to be a vain dream, a mere Utopia, but the end which the God of nations has marked out for us. We have not been snatched from death a score of times; we have not multiplied with a rapidity truly prodigious; we have not wrought harvests of resistance and of peaceful conquest in the eastern townships and in the border counties of Ontario; we have not absorbed many of the English and Scotch settlements planted among us in order to break up our homogeneity; we have not put forth all these efforts, and seen them crowned with success, to go and perish miserably in any all-Canadian arrangement."

I could multiply quotations of this kind; but perhaps *La Presse* is a paper which may be said to speak with more authority, and I may give a quotation from it. I find, however, that I have not a quotation from that paper here. My hon. friend will perhaps remember it sneeringly alluded to the fact that the people were astonished at his observation, they could not accept it, they could not credit it, and instead of cheering it they merely said "hear, hear," being induced to do so by astonishment, but such was not the views or the policy of the French Canadian people. Now I have endeavored to show to the House so far, that this is not merely a sentimental matter but that it is a matter of practical politics and a matter which must be dealt with. I have endeavored to show that as early as the years 1837-38 it was then recognised as being the great cause of trouble in the Province of Quebec. I think I have also successfully shown (I do not think, in fact, I needed to have shown it, because it is familiar to us all) that these difficulties exist at present, and that now that the French race, or those who speak the French language, to be more accurate, have attained to a considerable numerical strength, their ambition is rising in proportion, and the difficulties which ought to have been foreseen long ago are now upon us and must be dealt with, at all events, as far as our new Territories are concerned, and that we must not allow the same difficulties to arise in that part of the Dominion. But if I have given the views of those within the Dominion, let me draw attention also to the views which are also entertained on this question outside of the Dominion by impartial spectators. I am not going to read from any journals that are hostile to the French Canadians, because I know that my quoting them as authority would produce no effect upon those whom I am very anxious indeed should very seriously consider this question. There ought to be no such differences between the English and French Canadian members of this House. There ought to be no differences on the subject between those who come from the Province of Quebec and speak in the French language, their mother tongue, and those who come from the other Provinces of the Dominion, and who speak the English language. If, in truth and fact it is in the interests of this Dominion, that there should be one race, one nationality and one national life, it is the duty of all of us to strive to bring about that result. I am now about to quote from a paper, from a Catholic journal, which was introduced to this House last Session by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. I confess I did not hear of it before, but no doubt it has now become

historical. It is called *The Month*. Dealing with this difficulty with the French language in Canada in the year 1885, the writer speaks as follows:—

“While freely admitting that the French Canadian is behind his English-speaking neighbor not only in farming, but in commerce, trade and all kindred branches, we must not take for granted everything that this same English-speaking neighbor says of him. One of the most striking and curious things in the social life of Lower Canada is the latent hate which the French and English-speaking races have for each other. It is a sad thing to say, but truth requires that it should be said, that English-speaking people, no matter whether they are English, Irish or Scotch, have rarely a good word for their French neighbors; and it is still sadder and more unaccountable that of all those English-speaking people, the Irish are those between whom and the French there seems to be the least rapport and the greatest enmity.

An hon. MEMBER. Do you believe that?

Mr. McCARTHY. This journal was accepted as a good authority last Session. I am reading from the same authority as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice quoted last Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was twelve months ago.

Mr. McCARTHY. The article goes on to say:

“If the French Canadians were not Catholics, if they were not the people of all others whom the Irish are supposed to love, one might not be so puzzled over this social enigma.”

It goes on to give reasons or to account in some way for this cause of the hatred being greater between the Irish and the French, than between the French and any other nationality, and says:

“The preservation of the French language in Canada seems to be the most absorbing subject at present, not only in that country, but in France, and public opinion in both countries seems somewhat divided about it. All Frenchmen, and most Canadians of French extraction, are as one as to the absolute necessity of preserving their language in America; but how is it to be done? The best way would, of course, be to annex Canada to France; but that is not to be thought of. One thing is certain, and that is that in spite of the wonderful tenacity with which the French have stuck to their language in Canada, there are signs that it is losing ground.”

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Neither do I; but that is the opinion of this writer. Finally, the writer in *The Month* says:

“It would appear as if the French Government has become fully aware that the French language in Canada is in danger, and that steps have been taken to bring about a more cordial and general intercourse between the French-speaking people on both sides of the Atlantic. This can be done in many ways, but in no way more effectually than by close commercial relations.”

In another article it gives my hon. friend the Secretary of State credit for the endeavor he has made to bring about that good feeling between France and the people of the Province of Quebec, which good feeling up to that time was not to be discovered. I have read these extracts from *The Month*, which I thought would be accepted as undoubted authority, having been quoted before in this House by the Minister of Justice, and I now propose to read from the *Catholic World*, published in New York, and from its publication in the year 1885 I make the following extracts:—

“The growing power and importance of the French in Canada is the cause of the annexation feeling now taking root in Ontario and Nova Scotia. It is felt by all sections of Canadians that the connection with England must be severed, but the dread the French entertain towards annexation and the English towards independence prevents the sundering of the fragile tie.”

An hon. MEMBER. You don't believe that.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hear my hon. friend say that I do not believe that. Sir, I have heard that argued over and over again, and it is not very long ago since I heard a gentleman, who was a distinguished member of this House, say it was the only remedy for the existing condition of things—that gentleman said that the only remedy was to swamp my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec in the great American Confederacy.

Mr. LAURIER. Are you then an Annexationist?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not by any means. I do not at all concur in that, Mr. Speaker. I think that within the lines of the Constitution and in this Dominion of Canada this question can, will and must be settled, but I think that if that question is not settled considerable difficulties, as I have said, must arise.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is settled.

Mr. McCARTHY. The article in the *Catholic World*, to which I refer, commences by this:

“We are Englishmen speaking the French language,” said the late Sir George Cartier, the colleague and close personal friend of Sir John A. Macdonald.”

And the article goes on to explain that the result of that statement made by that distinguished Canadian statesman was:

“Before this he was the undisputed leader of the French Canadian element in Canada; three years later he was unmercifully beaten at the polls for Montreal East by an obscure young lawyer by the name of Jetté. The crushing defeat was the French Canadian way of punishing Sir George for his ultra-loyal speech and the misrepresentation it embodied. Not that French Canadians are not well affected to the Empire as things go; only it must be understood they are well affected as French Canadians.”

I would just ask the House to allow me to trouble them with another extract.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it another religious book?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will not further trouble the House with quotations. I have endeavored at all events to make good my statements, that both from within and from without the general opinion prevails that this question has come to the point where it is likely to cause further differences, as it has already caused differences in the Dominion. I come back now, Sir, to the North-West Territories. I am not attempting here, and hon. gentlemen know that, at all events in this form of motion, I could not attempt in any way to interfere with any rights under the British North America Act which are guaranteed to the French Canadians of the Province of Quebec, and to the French Canadians in this Parliament. I am treating, Sir, of what this Parliament is competent to deal with. I am treating of the question of the dual language of the North-West Territories. I hold in my hand, though it has not been yet presented to the House, a petition from the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories. Where that petition is I cannot say: whether it is in the hands of the Government, whether it is to be brought before the House, whether it has been sent to Mr. Speaker, or where the petition is I cannot say; but, that the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories did, at their last session discuss this question and pass the following resolution on the subject, by what was practically

an unanimous vote, there can be no doubt. That petition of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West is as follows:—

"Address to the Honorable the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament Assembled, adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories, on Monday, 28th October, 1889.

"The petition of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories in Session assembled, humbly sheweth:—

"That, whereas by Section one hundred and ten of 'The North-West Territories Act' it is enacted that 'Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Legislative Assembly of the Territories and in the proceedings before the Courts; and both these languages shall be used in the records and journals of the Assembly, and all Ordinances made under this Act shall be printed in both these languages.'

"And, whereas this Assembly is of the opinion that the sentiment of the people of the North-West Territories is against the continuance of the section recited, on the grounds that the needs of the Territories do not demand the official recognition of a dual language in the North-West or the expenditure necessitated by the same.

"And, whereas this Assembly is also of the opinion that sound public policy demands the discontinuance of two official languages in the North-West:

"Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray:

"That your Honorable House may be pleased to pass an Act repealing said section one hundred and ten of said Act.

"And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray."

Not only, Sir, was this petition thus with almost practical unanimity resolved upon, but I am informed, and I believe the fact to be, although I have not examined it, that every newspaper published in the North-West has declared in favor of the abolition of the dual languages—every paper which has referred to the subject, I mean. One distinguished paper, the *Regina Leader*, I believe, has not yet thought it a subject worthy of notice; but almost every other paper has pronounced in favor of abolition. So that we have practically the unanimous opinion of the people of that territory. Now, are we going to perpetuate this system of things? Are we going to permit it to grow into what might be called a vested right, so that by-and-by a French Canadian can urge, and with some degree of truth, "I have left my own home in the Province of Quebec and have gone and settled in the North-West Territories, relying on the faith of an Act of Parliament by which it was said I should be allowed to have my language." Is it, or is it not, a matter which we ought to deal with, and deal with promptly? Sir, I have nothing further to add on the general question. I will only say, in conclusion, that while I have thought it right at this early stage to make a statement of the reasons which have actuated the course I am taking, I desire here, as I have done elsewhere, to disclaim any feeling of hostility of any kind against the French Canadian race or their representatives in this House. I desire to say that I have no such feeling.

Mr. BERGERON. Thank you.

Mr. McCARTHY. My only desire is to promote the welfare of us all, and I think our truest interest will be found in trying to create and build up in this country one race with one national life, and with a language common to us all.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. (Translation.) I have listened to, with more curiosity than interest, Mr. Speaker, the speech which has just been made by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I must con-

Mr. McCARTHY.

cess that I have been astonished, and that in no slight degree, at seeing an Ontario member arrogate to himself the right of coming here, into this House, and asking for amendments to the Act erecting the North-West Territories. It is thought good to make an attack upon a right which is very dear to us, to all of us French Canadians—a right which we possess under the British made constitution which governs us. And what astonishes us still more, connected with the means employed to-day, is that they begin by attacking a handful of Métis scattered throughout the North-West Territories, with the object of crushing them out. I think this is a cowardly act, an act of cowardice which we must oppose with all our powers. To what end is all this exertion made? Why,—if sincerity exists,—if this French language ought no longer to be spoken in Canada,—why do they not attack its use throughout the whole Dominion of Canada; why do they not endeavor to prohibit its use universally, instead of proceeding to attack, as I have just said, a handful of French Canadians, away off yonder, who cannot defend themselves; but who count upon us to be their defenders? I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to follow the hon. member throughout the speech which he has just delivered; I shall only allude to certain passages. He stated, among other things, that the language of a people is the foundation of its nationality. I ask myself, if this idea is correct, how does it happen that in the Islands of Jersey and Guernsey, which have been English possessions for more than two hundred years, they have preserved the French language,—that the French language only is spoken,—and that that language is the only one recognised officially? How comes it that in the Island of Saint Lucie and the other islands in the Antilles which happen to be British possessions, the French language is spoken? Is this merely a privilege which the peoples of these places have arrogated to themselves; or is it not rather a privilege granted by the British Crown, by the laws, and by the constitution of these countries that the mother tongue of the inhabitant is allowed them. So that the power which we possess, we French Canadians, of using our mother tongue is no unprecedented concession; it is not a right possessed exclusively by the French Canadian subject, but it is a right which belongs to subjects in other colonies of the Empire. The hon. member has observed that it is only in Switzerland where the use of two languages is permitted. I think that if he had studied history he would have found that in other countries likewise the use of two distinct and different languages is sanctioned. In Belgium, among others, two languages are allowed; French is the official language, even though the public documents and papers are printed and published in Flemish. So that Canada forms no peculiar exception. The strongest position of the hon. member for Simcoe rests upon the celebrated report of Lord Durham, or supposed to be that of Lord Durham. All my fellow countrymen know what this report is worth. It was not prepared with the object of favoring the population of this country; it was not drafted in the interests of those who then dwelt in Lower Canada; but it was projected with the aim of Anglicising and of being able to persecute the population which then dwelt in the land, to the benefit of the immigration which had come out to possess it. Under such circum-

stances is it allowable to make use of this report in order to support the attempt which they are at this moment making adversely to our interests? Those who take advantage to-day of this report are worthy successors of him who prepared it. I must here remark, Mr. Speaker, that there exists a false impression about the history of this country. They wish to treat us as if we were a conquered people, whereas Canada was not conquered but was ceded to England under the terms of a treaty. In this treaty it is provided that our religion, our laws, and our customs as they existed at the time, should be protected, and I ask myself whether it cannot be affirmed to-day, that within these conditions and terms is included the conservation of our mother tongue, which we spoke at that time and which we still speak. From such reasoning it results that when the hon. member for Simcoe states that there was no such guarantee in the treaty,—that is to say the guarantee of the use of our language,—I can tell him his statement is false. The gravest insult that can be offered to us in the course of this discussion, which has hardly yet opened in this House; is that men should wish to have our enemies believe that because we do not use the English language habitually we are not loyal subjects of Her Majesty. They attack us on this line when taxing us with disloyalty. Well, when we see what our ancestors did when the time had come to defend the frontier, can it not be fairly said that they showed themselves quite as loyal if not more loyal than our fellow subjects of British origin? Can it be that people have forgotten the celebrated battles which we fought against our powerful neighbors the Americans? And if Canada still remains a British possession, to whom does England owe its retention if not to the French—but still loyal—population of the Province of Quebec. No, Mr. Speaker, in the present state of affairs they have thought it expedient to endeavor to excite prejudices in order perhaps to avenge the defeat which they suffered last year in another matter; but on this question, as on every other where our laws and our religion are attacked, I believe that we shall remain unmoved; and more particularly, that we shall defend in this House, as is but our duty, against the attacks this day attempted to be made against them, the few men of our own race who are scattered throughout the North-West country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill introduced is in terms of very great importance, and of course we can weigh it with reference to its effect on the North-West. But the line of argument my hon. friend has taken raises questions of such a nature, his whole line of argument is of such a kind, as to involve most serious and grave questions—so grave that I think we must take full time to consider what his arguments are, what they tend to, in what direction they lead, and what consequences may follow if the measure is persisted in. I, therefore, Sir, would hope that the discussion would end here—that the Bill should be allowed to be read the first time, and that after we have an opportunity of reading the carefully prepared speech of my hon. friend, we may, on the second reading, have an opportunity of discussing this important, this very grave question in all its bearings.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. May I be allowed, not to enter into a discussion of this question, but—as

my hon. friend from Simcoe has quoted the authority of a great name, a great statesman and writer—only to cite one authority which I suppose will be accepted by himself and the whole House, as it has already been accepted by the whole country. A great statesman, at the time of the Union, wrote these words which have never been forgotten in this country :

“I must, moreover, confess that I for one am deeply convinced of the impolicy of all such attempts to denationalise the French. Generally speaking they produce the opposite effect from that intended, causing the flame of national prejudice and animosity to burn more fiercely. But suppose them to be successful, what would be the result? You may perhaps Americanise, but, depend upon it, by methods of this description you will never Anglaise the French inhabitants of the Province. Let them feel, on the other hand, that their religion, their habits, their prepossessions, their prejudices if you will, are more considered and respected here than in other portions of this vast continent, who will venture to say that the last hand which waves the British flag on American ground may not be that of a French Canadian.”

These words were those of the noble Lord Elgin, and I ask my hon. friend to read them and to meditate upon them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have read them.

Mr. LAURIER. I did not understand my hon. friend from Simcoe, in his opening remarks, to say that he expected that this question would be debated at this stage of his Bill. I understood, on the contrary, that he expected that it would be debated, as is usual in this House, only on the second reading. This is our customary practice, and, therefore, perhaps, the hon. gentleman will permit me to tell him that it would have been preferable if he had not introduced in his remarks a good deal of controversial matter, which is quite debatable, no matter what stand is taken on the Bill. The hon. gentleman must allow that a man may be in favor of his Bill, and not agree with a good deal that he has said. For my own part, Sir, I do not propose at this stage to express an opinion on the Bill which he has presented. I reserve that for the second reading. I propose to follow in this instance the very safe practice which has always been followed in this House, of not expressing an opinion on a Bill, even if the tenor of it be well known in advance, until it has been placed in the hands of all members, and until they have read it and can form a mature judgment upon it. There is a good deal that I would personally take exception to in the hon. gentleman's remarks. I will not do so to-day; but the hon. gentleman will permit me to give him a piece of information as to which he appears to be in obscurity. He wants to know what was the cause that the Liberal candidate was defeated in the County of Richelieu. So far as my information goes, I have always understood that the cause was the bank notes of the defunct Mechanics Bank.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to say that I am sorry if I have introduced what my hon. friend calls controversial matter. I deliberately adopted the course I have taken in making my statement, which I endeavored to make as impartial and fair as possible, on the introduction of the Bill. I understood it to be the English practice, and I think it is the fair practice. I have made my statement now and hon. gentlemen have an opportunity of considering it before the second reading, and then I shall have an oppor-

tunity of defending my position in answer to the objections that may then be made.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CUSTOMS DUTY ON MEAT.

Mr. MARSHALL asked, Is it the intention of the Government at the present time to increase the duty on mess pork or meat of any kind coming into Canada?

Mr. FOSTER. This is a question which it would be inadvisable to answer at the present time, as it is in regard to tariff matters.

INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES FOR PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked, Have the Government appointed an Inspector of Fisheries for Prince Edward Island in the stead of Col. John H. Duvar? If yes, who is he? What is the date of the appointment? and at what salary?

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Edward Hackett was appointed, on the 1st July last, Inspector of Fisheries for Prince Edward Island, at a salary of \$800 per annum.

IMPORTED FLOUR AND WHEAT.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, How many barrels of flour have been entered for consumption in Canada during the six months ending on 31st December last, with amount of duty paid on the same? Also, how many bushels of wheat were entered during the same time for consumption, and amount of duty paid on same? Also, number of barrels of cornmeal entered for consumption during the same period, and amount of duty collected on same?

Mr. BOWELL. The number of barrels of flour entered for consumption in Canada during the six months ending on the 31st December last, was 108,408 barrels, and the duty collected on the same was \$54,204. Those figures, however, do not include the return from British Columbia for the three months ending the 31st December last, for the reason that they have not yet been received. The returns showing the different descriptions of grain are only received quarterly, and, as a number of the ports have not yet forwarded their reports for the last two quarters, answers to the last two questions cannot be accurately given now.

BAR AT THE MOUTH OF THE THAMES.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to complete the work of removing the bar at the mouth of the River Thames, in the County of Kent, Ontario, as soon as the weather will permit in the spring?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government have not as yet considered this question.

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or between the Government and the Board of Trade of Quebec, or other public bodies or persons, as well as all other documents, respecting the debentures of the North Shore Railway Company.

He said: Every hon. member of this House knows that in the year 1875, the Government of the Pro-

Mr. MCCARTHY.

vince of Quebec undertook the construction of a railway from Quebec to Ottawa, which was then called the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway. That railway was completed in 1879. In 1880, the Government of the Province took possession of the road, and undertook the management of the same. In 1882, when the Hon. the Secretary of State was Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec, the railway in question was sold—one portion, that between Ottawa and Montreal, to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the other section, that between St. Martin's Junction, in the County of Laval, and the city of Quebec, to a company which was constituted by the same Act, which authorised the sale of the railway. By that Act, the company, which was known as the North Shore Railway Company, was empowered to issue debentures at the rate of \$25,000 per mile over the whole length of the railway. Acting on the powers contained in that Act, the North Shore Railway Company issued debentures to the amount of about one and three quarter millions, in round numbers. I do not pretend to give the exact figures, but that was about the amount. I understand that a portion of these debentures was handed over to the Government of Quebec as collateral security for the obligation entered into by the company with the said Government of Quebec for the payment of the price of the railway. As I understand, half a million was paid cash, but the rest, three millions and a-half, is still due to the Government of Quebec. Of the total amount of debentures issued some \$1,108,000 was given as collateral security by the company to the Bank of Montreal. At the time of the sale of the railway to the North Shore Railway Company, a great deal of opposition was shown to the scheme of the Government, not only by the members of the then Opposition, but also by a great many supporters of the Government of which my hon. friend the Secretary of State was then the head. That opposition from his own friends was stopped, in a large measure, by the representations which were made—that that was the only way to prevent the railway from going into the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. That sale took place in 1882, and not later, I think, than February, 1883, the same railway was sold to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I do not mean to say that the line of the railway was sold, but an agreement was entered into by the North Shore Railway Company, which was then represented by the late Senator Senecal, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, by which the stock of the former company was transferred to certain parties representing the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The Grand Trunk Railway Company then took possession of the railway, and what was the result? The city of Quebec had subscribed a large sum, a much larger sum than it could relatively afford, if we consider the needs of the city of Quebec. That subscription amounted to \$1,000,000. In order to help the construction of the North Shore Railway the city of Quebec made this immense sacrifice, so as to secure a rival line between that city and Montreal. After the line was sold to the Grand Trunk Railway, that rivalry for which the city of Quebec had paid so much ceased altogether to exist. Not only that rivalry ceased to exist, but an arrangement was entered into by the Grand Trunk Railway and the

Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, which was then controlled by the same syndicate, by which Quebec was put under the control of a monopoly ruinous to its trade. There was no more competition at all between the different lines of steamboats and railroads, but the whole was conducted as under one management.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. And the rates were lower than ever before.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I do not say what the rates were, but I mention, as a fact which cannot be denied, that Quebec was worse off than she has ever been before. There is another fact. A good many members of this House were also members of the House in 1885 when the present Government brought down their resolutions for the construction of the so-called Short Line. I may say, in passing, that it has now been proved that not only was it not the shortest and best line, as it was represented to be by the Minister of Public Works who expounded the policy of the Government, but it is now established that there is a much better and a shorter line through our own country than the line which was then adopted. It was pretended, at that time, that it was necessary to cross American territory and to expend millions of our own money to build a railway in the United States, because we had to build the shortest line. It is now proved that it was not the most advantageous for the country, but it was the most advantageous line for the then Minister of Railways. It was a bitter pill for the friends of the Government from the district of Quebec to swallow, and in order to sweeten the pill the Minister of Public Works, by the same series of resolutions, proposed to give a subsidy of a million and a half to secure to the Canadian Pacific Railway access to the Harbor of Quebec. I admit at once that a large portion was voted previously, but a million and a half was voted as compensation to Quebec and to give satisfaction to the city of Quebec. It was stated that that million and a half was to be expended in order to give Quebec the advantage of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to enable that road to reach the city of Quebec. The hon. gentleman in charge of the Government resolutions explained clearly what he intended to do. He stated that if the Grand Trunk Railway would not consent to transfer the North Shore Railway to the Government, in order that the Government might transfer it to the Canadian Pacific Railway, another line would be built parallel with the North Shore Railway. But a million and a half was voted on that representation; and then it was stated further by the Minister of Public Works that a million and a half would be expended not only for securing control of the North Shore Railway, but in order to put it in a working condition, to repair some of the bridges, and, in a word, to give us, not an imaginary communication with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but a real communication. But this is the fact that I wish to make clear: The Government entered into an agreement under that law, first, with the Grand Trunk Railway on the 19th September, 1885. Acting under the legislation of the previous Session the Government made an agreement with that road by which the whole stock of the company was transferred to the Government with the understanding that it was to be trans-

ferred immediately by the Government to the Canadian Pacific Railway; and this was done. On the very same day another agreement was entered into between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway by which the railway and its franchises were transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I wish to call the attention of the House to clause 3 in that agreement, and which is number 35 of the Sessional Papers of 1886. Clause 3 of the agreement reads as follows:—

“In consideration of the premises, the Government agree to apply and use part of the said sum of one million five hundred thousand dollars, to wit, the sum of nine hundred and seventy thousand dollars, in aid of the said company in acquisition of the said railway, in the following manner, that is to say:—In the event of the net receipts of the operation of the said railway, after paying the operating expenses thereof, proving insufficient to meet the interest on the first mortgage bonds of the said North Shore Railway Company, including those held by the Government of Quebec as collateral security for the balance of the price of the said railway, the Government will apply the interest on the said sum of nine hundred and seventy thousand dollars, at the rate of four per cent. per annum, in whole or in part, as may be required, towards the payment of the deficiency. But if, or when after payment of all such deficiencies, the net receipts of the said railway, as aforesaid, shall be sufficient to pay the interest on the said bonds, the said company shall cease to have any further claim or demand upon the Government in respect of the said sum of money; provided that, as regards operating expenses, the cost of no new works or renewals of a more expensive character than existing works were when new, shall be accounted as forming part of such operating expenses, unless the previous consent of the Minister of Railways and Canals has been obtained to their construction.”

The object of the clause I just read was this: that, first, the running expenses of the railway were to be paid out of the gross receipts and the interest on the amount due to the Government of Quebec, the balance of three millions and a half, was to be paid to that Government. And if any of these receipts remained after the payments of these two items, then interest was to be paid on these debentures which I have mentioned, and which debentures amounted to the sum of \$1,108,000, and which cost the Government, as I believe, from information I got last year from the Minister, \$970,000. The result has been this: it has become the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway not to develop the trade and the traffic of that railway, but to prevent it from being developed. It is quite evident that it would be against the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway to take proper steps to increase the traffic, because if the traffic is increased it would be simply in the interest of the Government, it would be simply to enhance the value of the debentures now held by the Government. The result has been most ruinous to the trade of Quebec. I may mention another fact. No expenditure for renewals can be made without the consent of the Minister of Railways. Some of the bridges on the North Shore Railway are, and have been, in a dangerous condition for several years. One of them, called St. Jeanne, or Pont Rouge, became so dangerous that some three years ago the bridge inspector of the Canadian Pacific Railway reported that it was no longer in a safe condition for traffic. The Canadian Pacific Railway, I understand, applied to the Government for permission, under clause 3, to make a better bridge. As usual the matter was postponed until to-morrow. These men are not men of to-morrow but men of to-day. They said: We shall stop running trains between Montreal and Quebec unless the bridge is

rebuilt, because if an accident occurs we shall have to pay damages. Eventually the Minister of Railways consented to the reconstruction of the bridge, and it was reconstructed. More than a year was occupied in securing the repayment of the money expended, which was \$70,000. What has been the result? Now the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who are operating the road, do not want to build any more bridges. Another bridge is equally as dangerous, namely: the Portneuf bridge. I am always afraid when I pass over it. It is 65 feet high over the level of the river, and if the bridge were to fall there would be a terrible catastrophe. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have carried out insignificant repairs, but the bridge will have to be rebuilt. The consequence of the present state of things is that the company cannot run heavy locomotives between Quebec and Montreal, and not one of those heavy locomotives now used for freight trains can be run on the lines between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec. The Board of Trade of Quebec, in fact all the merchants of that city, have made representations to the Government asking them to terminate the existing state of affairs. The only way to do so is to cancel the debentures which they now hold on the railway. When in 1885 the hon. members of this House, especially the hon. members for Quebec, were induced to vote \$1,500,000 for Quebec, it was represented that the money would be expended to promote trade that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were supposed to be able to bring to that point. The money has not been expended as it was understood would be the case. It is true that the money has been expended, that the money has been paid over. It is true that \$525,000 have been paid to the Grand Trunk Railway in order to get back a railroad that had been sold in 1882 by the Government of the present Secretary of State. It is true that \$970,000 have been paid to the Bank of Montreal to redeem debentures that had been given by the North Shore Railway as security for loans obtained from the bank, but the Government now retain these debentures. So, as a matter of fact, they have not expended the money in the interest of the City of Quebec. They keep these debentures as security, and we want some steps taken to secure the fulfilment of the promises made in 1885. At that time it was promised that Quebec should have a grain elevator, that many bridges—I am repeating the statement made by the Minister of Railways—would be repaired, that better rolling stock would be placed on the line. I hope the Government will take steps to give us the facilities promised in 1885.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Carried.

Mr. LAURIER. I should have expected to have received some answer from the Government to the very serious representation made by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier). I do not think the Government is treating the House properly in simply answering "carried," to such a motion as that before it. My hon. friend has made a most serious charge, which, in substance, I will state. Before I do so, I may remind the House that in 1884 Sir Charles Tupper, speaking as a member of the Government and Minister of Railways, distinctly stated that the policy of the Government was to make the harbor of Quebec the summer ter-

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

minus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was the policy stated by the hon. gentleman, upon which a series of resolutions were introduced and adopted. What has been done with regard to this question? No less than \$1,500,000 was voted by the House to carry on that object, namely, to acquire certain interests which were then controlling the railway, and placing the road in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The charge of my hon. friend is this: That the policy proposed by the Government and adopted by the House has not been carried out, because the Government have actually expended no money whatever, because they have acquired the debentures of the road and such appear as Dominion assets in the Public accounts. I do not understand how the Government can resist the conclusion suggested, rather than formulated, by my hon. friend, that it is the duty of the Government to wipe out those liabilities on the road and place the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in a position to carry out the improvements which are necessary in order to make the road a first-class road and make Quebec the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. My hon. friend has explained in a lucid manner that it is actually the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company not to make any improvements on that road, because immediately they did so and developed traffic over the line, they would become liable to the Government for \$960,000. I call the attention of the Government to this subject, and ask that it be dealt with in the manner indicated, when the appropriation was made by Parliament, and unless they do so we must call attention to it on another occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can assure the hon. gentleman who made the motion that no disrespect whatever was intended, but quite the reverse. The hon. gentleman's statement was calm and clear in every respect. The motion itself does not disclose the object that my hon. friend has in moving for these papers, but we know now what they are and we have the statement of my hon. friend in making his motion.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC POST OFFICE—SUPERANNUATION OF OFFICIALS.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec) moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence and documents respecting the superannuation of certain employés in the Post Office at Quebec, and in the Post Office Inspector's office at Quebec; and the filling up of the vacancies caused by their superannuation.

He said: I would like the Government to bring down the papers in this matter as soon as possible as some most extraordinary things have taken place with regard to those changes in the post office. I may state that Mr. Bolduc, one of the gentlemen superannuated, as well as the deputy inspector of the post office, Mr. Fréchette, were perfectly capable to fulfil their duties for some ten years to come, at least. It cannot be on account of ill-health that they were superannuated, for I do not think that either of those gentlemen have ever failed one day to go to their office. They are both in as good health as I am in, and in as good health as the Postmaster General himself. If they were entitled to be superannuated, he is entitled to be superannuated also, for those gentle-

men are physically as strong and not any older than he. Not only are those two superannuated officials in good health, but I have never heard any complaint against them. On the contrary, I have heard Mr. Bolduc, the deputy postmaster, praised as being one of the most efficient men not only in the Quebec post office but in any post office in the Dominion. I heard a very high official of the Post Office Department state that he did not know of one man in the whole post office service more capable of discharging his duties than Mr. Bolduc. It has been publicly stated in Quebec that the deputy postmaster received notice of his superannuation in the most accidental and most extraordinary manner. About a month or five weeks ago, he arrived at his office one morning and he found another young man occupying his chair : Mr. Simard, and a very nice young man, I am informed, about 22 years of age. I have nothing to say against Mr. Simard, because he has been represented to me as being a very respectable, intelligent and active young man. However, the deputy postmaster found this young man seated in his chair, and Mr. Bolduc, who is a courteous gentleman, waited some time for him to rise, and after waiting some time, he said : "If you please I have something to write and I would like to have my chair." The young man said : "Mr. Bolduc, before you sit down, here is a very important letter for you from the Post Office Department and please read it." Mr. Bolduc read the letter and nearly fainted as he found from it, for the first time, that he was superannuated. I did not hear the manner of the notification to Mr. Fréchette, the other gentleman who was superannuated. I am quite impartial in speaking on this question, because the post office officials interested have all been good supporters of the Government and their friends are also strong supporters of the present Administration. Another gentleman in the Quebec post office, named Mr. Vohl, was, without any reason given him, taken from the Post Office Inspector's office, and made mail clerk. He is now acting as mail clerk on some railway, and he does not know himself why he was removed from the Inspector's office and made a mail clerk. Those gentlemen I have referred to are well known and most respected citizens of Quebec, and are remarkable for their courtesy and attention to the people doing business with the post office. There never has been any complaint against them ; the public are anxious to know why they have been superannuated in such a despotic manner. For my part, I have never heard of such a removal of a respectable and efficient officer except, perhaps, in Russia or Turkey.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no correspondence other than the report to Council in reference to the matter enquired into by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier). Mr. Bolduc was a very old officer and was for a long time in the service.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). He was only 62 years of age.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, he was 62 years of age. There has been no appointment as yet to his place, and the report and Order in Council will be brought down at the request of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I may say that the City of Quebec was taken by surprise in this matter. I happen to know the two gentlemen referred to, and they are men in active life and of very good health, neither of whom deserve the treatment they have been subjected to by the Government. Unless there should be some reasons which are known to the Government and as yet unknown to the public, those two officials should certainly not have been disturbed in their positions. For my part, I believe that the Government has been misled by some wrong information as to the exact position of those two officials, and I believe that if the Government should take the opportunity of examining into the question once more, they would find sufficient reason to recall the order that has been made. I have met those gentlemen every day as I went to the post office, and I know that they are in as good health as the hon. the Postmaster General is in at the present moment, and as well fit to perform their duty as ever they were. I suppose I am about the same age as the hon. gentleman, and I do not think that he will deny that there may be several years of useful career before us yet, nor will he admit the principle that we should be shelved on account of our age just now. Unless the American system should prevail in this country, I think the superannuation of those officials has been a *faux pas*.

Mr. LAURIER. I think my hon. friend was altogether too mild in characterising the conduct of the Department in the matter as a *faux pas*. If I understand aright the answer just given by the hon. Postmaster General, a man 62 years of age, while engaged in the regular discharge of his duty, was superannuated without a word of communication being sent to him previously.

Mr. HAGGART. The statement has been made, but I am not aware of it. It has been told to me for the first time now.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood from the hon. gentleman a moment ago that there was no correspondence, except the order. Therefore, it follows that there was no communication whatever made to this man before he was superannuated.

Mr. HAGGART. There might have been.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, I ask again if the House is to tolerate such a system, that an officer in the vigor of 62 years, engaged in the discharge of his duties, who states that he is in good health, should be superannuated without any previous communication to him. It is not only a piece of tyranny against this man, but it is an utterly indefensible act on the part of the Government. On what ground was this man superannuated? Certainly not on account of age or ill-health. It must then have been on some ground which cannot see the light of day.

Mr. AMYOT. We must not assume that Mr. Fréchette is 62 years of age. I do not think he is 55. He is quite a young man. If we were all to be put out of public life when we are 55 years of age, most of us, and some of the most important members of the House, would be away.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no intention on the part of the Department to superannuate any officer without notice. If this man has not received notice, it is through some misunderstanding or

fault of the inspector. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that in cases of superannuation there should be some communication or conversation with the officer beforehand. No doubt the report of the superannuation when brought down, will give the reasons, and we shall then be able to discuss it intelligently.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I am not here simply speaking in the interest of this man, although he belongs to my division. But speaking in the public interest, I think it is a waste of public money to superannuate men in perfect health. I can state without fear of contradiction that neither of these men has ever failed to go to his office, and there never has been a complaint against them in the discharge of their duties, and to all appearances they may live for many years yet.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC LAND SLIDE.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec) moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence and documents respecting the falling down of a portion of the rock on which the Citadel of Quebec is built, which fall took place on the 19th of September last.

He said : Not only every member of this House, but every man in this country, is aware of the terrible accident which took place at Quebec, on the 19th of September last, when a large portion of the rock upon which the Citadel is built came down, crushing eight tenement houses, in which a large number of families were living. About 50 people were killed or mortally wounded, and a good many others were very seriously injured. Serious losses were suffered—I do not speak so much of the owners as of the tenants. The owners of those houses are well-to-do people ; and while they are of course entitled to justice, they are not in such immediate want of justice as the tenants. All the tenants of those houses belong to the laboring classes. Most of them are the families of ship laborers, and they are very badly in need of clothing and furniture, which they lost by the accident. Many representations, in the shape of petitions and letters, have been addressed to the Government asking for redress. I must say that the whole population of Quebec was under the impression that the Government would not dispute for one moment their liability to the sufferers. Several years ago a report was made to the Government by the city engineer of Quebec, Mr. Charles Baillargé, calling their attention to the dangerous condition of that rock, in which a crack was already visible, and it was easy to see that sooner or later the whole rock would crumble with just such serious consequences as have occurred. Very little attention seems to have been paid to that report. I have seen some of the ministerial papers, after the accident took place, attempting to base the defence of the Government on the ground that the plans suggested by the city engineer of Quebec had been carried out by the Government. I do not admit that that is true ; but supposing it were, it would be no defence of the Government, because it was not the business of the City of Quebec to point out what precautions should be taken to prevent the accident ; it was for the Government and their engineers to see to that. But no serious steps were taken, with the result that I have stated. At the time the accident

Mr. HAGGART.

happened a committee of citizens was formed. It was proposed to organise a general subscription from the public to come to the help of the sufferers. A good many even of the supporters of the Government said they did not want to organise a public subscription because the Federal Government, with a budget of about thirty-six millions a year, was able to pay its debts, and it would be preposterous for the citizens of Quebec to put their hands in their pockets in order to pay the debt of this Government. The result was that a comparatively small amount—I think only about \$5,000—was subscribed by the people of Quebec, and it was distinctly understood that that amount was only for the relief of the sufferers according to their immediate requirements, but was not intended to buy new furniture or new clothing for those sufferers. Since that time repeated demands have been made upon the Government. Letters and petitions have been sent, and correspondence of all kinds has taken place, requesting the Government to come to the redress of the sufferers. I must say that, on the spur of the moment, the Minister of Public Works undertook the responsibility for the Government of doing this. I state at once that the hon. gentleman cancelled the telegram he had sent, but, in cancelling that telegram, I did not understand that he intended to cancel the responsibility he had accepted for the Government. When he visited Quebec and went to the place where the accident had occurred, I understood that his view was that the Minister of Militia had taken the matter in hand, and he did not want two Ministers to take charge of one subject. That was a good explanation, as far as I understood it, but I did not understand him to retract the responsibility of the Government for the telegram which he sent to the chairman of the road company, in which he said the corporation might go on to repair the consequences of the catastrophe, and the Government would recoup them. There is more than this. The sufferers have not only lost their furniture and clothing, but the street is completely blocked. Between 40,000 and 50,000 tons of rock have fallen into Champlain Street, and everyone who has been in Quebec knows that Champlain Street is a very narrow street, lying between the cliff and the wharves, and it is by means of the wharves that it is connected with the St. Lawrence River. When we wanted to clear the street, to clear away the *débris*, and to open the roadway, we were asked by the engineers of the Government not to touch the rock which had fallen, because that would result in bringing down a much larger quantity of rock, as that which is now there acts as a buttress to prevent the fall of the rest of the rock. But nothing has been done since. All we have is letters acknowledging receipts of petitions and complaints which have been sent from time to time, and in the meantime the corporation of Quebec has had to go to a great deal of expense to open a temporary roadway. It is only a temporary roadway, and it is a very dangerous roadway, because we are threatened with another very serious accident of the same kind. I cannot understand the negligence of the Government in regard to this matter. At present a very much larger piece of rock is threatening to fall, and if it comes down, as it threatens to do, I do not know how many lives will be lost. The Government cannot

ignore this matter. The report of their own engineers, which was communicated to me by Gen. Middleton, states that sooner or later a portion of the rock—and not a small portion, but a portion weighing about 150,000 tons, will come down if no means are adopted to prevent its falling, and yet nothing has been done. All that has been done is that the Minister of Public Works came down and looked at it, and the Minister of Militia came down and sent two gentlemen from the Military School at Kingston, and they examined it and made the report I have been speaking of. The Minister of Militia, who is well posted in military matters and in military engineering, knows that reports will of themselves be no buttress against those rocks; and, if no step is taken, if no action is authorised to prevent the disaster, I think the Government would be criminally liable for any lives which might be lost as the result of another slide. They have been twice warned without effect. Now, they have had another warning, and a more serious one than before, in the shape of the loss of the lives of fifty people. They did not take any step to prevent that, and, if another accident should happen, everyone would be justified in holding them criminally responsible for the lives that would be lost. Now that the House is sitting, I hope the Government will not be so remiss in discharging their duties in this matter.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman has made use of rather strong expressions, and has spoken about the possible criminal responsibility of the Government in regard to the great accident to which he has referred, and which we all so much regret. I believe the time to discuss that is not just at the present moment upon the motion which has been made by the hon. gentleman to produce the papers, but that it is when the papers are laid upon the Table. Those papers will show the course which the Government have seen fit to adopt after taking all the advice which it was proper for them to take on a matter of that importance. When those papers come down, I shall be prepared to show that the action taken by the Department, upon the report of Mr. Baillairgé, to which the hon. gentleman has referred, has been the proper course to follow.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I belong to the city of Quebec, and I know something of this matter. I saw with my own eyes what will come, and what may come possibly in a few days or even in a few hours. There is a great fissure in the rock and no one can tell what the result may be. The corporation of Quebec has informed the Government in reference to this matter, but that accident must come and will come, but at present the hands of the city of Quebec are tied. There is a statute of the Province of Quebec by which no one is allowed to touch or to undermine the cape, so that the matter rested entirely in the hands of the Government. It is a military property and, therefore, under the direct control of the Minister of Militia, and I do not see that anybody else but the Department of Militia is responsible for preventing future accidents. I am sorry to say that there is no denying the fact that at the present moment that part of the city is as much in danger of a slide as it was before the accident occurred. The danger is so evident that the firing of the gun on the citadel was stopped, as it was feared that the shock would de-

tach another large portion of the rock. Under these circumstances I think the Government ought to take, and ought long ago to have taken, immediate steps either to take that part of the cape down or to adopt such other means as the Government engineers may suggest in order to prevent a recurrence of accidents of life and property.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I must say that I am greatly disappointed by the course taken by the Minister of Militia on this subject. Of course I did not expect him to admit his guilt; that would have required more philosophy than I gave him credit for possessing. But I thought he would explain to the House what the Government intended to do in the matter. Whether the Government have been guilty or not in the past, is one question, but what should be done in the future is a very different question. I think the people of the city of Quebec have a right to know at once if any measures are to be taken to protect them in the future from similar accidents. They have a right to know, because, as I said a few minutes ago, they are obliged to pass through a temporary and difficult passage that they have made, because Champlain Street has been blocked up, and we have been asked by the engineers of the Government, who came down to inspect the scene of the accident, not to touch the rock which is there—

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Been advised, not asked.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec),—in order to prevent the rest from falling down. The street cannot remain in that condition for all time to come. At present, people who have business in that quarter are obliged to climb over that mass of *débris*. The proprietors on the other side of the street cannot rebuild their houses; in fact nothing at all can be done until we know what the Government proposes to do. I do not ask whether the Government are going to pay an indemnity, but I ask what they are going to do to prevent further accidents, and to put an end to the state of things from which the people in that locality are suffering very much, and have been suffering for so many months?

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence and documents respecting the establishment of the Marine Hospital at Quebec, and respecting the closing of the same.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec.)

Copies of all correspondence and documents respecting the appointment of Mr. Joseph Gareau as Superintendent of Government Works at Quebec; and respecting his removal and the substitution of a person named L. P. Lepine.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence and documents respecting the superannuation of certain employees in the Culler's Office at Quebec.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec.)

Copies of all correspondence between the officers of the Temperance Colonisation Company and the Department of the Interior, or any member of the Government, and the Saskatchewan Land and Homestead Company with the Department of the Interior; and all correspondence between Rev. Alexander Sutherland and John T. Moore and the Department of the Interior, or any member of the Government, in relation to the location of lands and claims for placing immigrants on lands, and compensation for assisting immigration to the said lands, together with all Orders in Council relating to such claims.—(Mr. Somerville.)

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With the permission of the House I would ask that the House now adjourn. There are only two or three matters left, and they can stand until to-morrow. The reason that I ask the House to adjourn is this: There is a very large and important deputation present from Montreal, which the Government promised to see, and which we expected to have been able to see before now, if the House had adjourned earlier. We want to meet them now, and if my hon. friend opposite will agree, I now move that the House adjourn.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 23rd January, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 11) further to amend the Act, chapter five of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled "An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise."—(Mr. Choquette.)

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) for further securing the Independence of Parliament. He said: The object of this Bill is to cause to be administered to members of Parliament the essentials of the oath which is required to be taken by any person holding an office under the Crown. Although the office of member of Parliament is not held under the Crown, still it is an office of great trust and great responsibility, and I believe that the safeguard of such an oath as I propose would add a great deal to the successful performance of the duties devolving on members of Parliament. That is the object of the Bill. If a member comes to take a seat in this House it should be required that he should declare himself free from any objection which might impede his conduct in Parliament, or which might affect his seat. So far as I have been able to draw the Bill, it follows the very expression of the law to secure the independence of Parliament as it stands now. I believe that the Bill, when read by the members of this House, will receive due consideration, and I believe also that every elector in the Dominion will be glad to find a Bill of this description introduced, which will be an additional security for the performance by members of Parliament of the high trust committed to them. I have included in the Bill one of the Rules of the House concerning the duties of members of Parliament, namely, that the offer of any money bribe for a promise to promote or impede a measure before Parliament is a misdemeanor. That is embraced also in the oath. The Act also provides that the oath required to be taken by members shall be taken before the Clerk of the House, and that a record of the oath, in writing, shall be kept by the Clerk of

the House. That oath is taken in addition to the usual oath of allegiance, which is also mentioned in the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend if there is to be any provision in the Bill imposing penalties in case of a breach of the oath to be taken by members of Parliament?

Mr. CASGRAIN. There is no other penalty than this: that if the oath, being on record, is violated, the usual course of the law will follow; there is no special penalty attached. I thought of providing that if a member returned as elected should refuse to take the oath, he should not be allowed to sit, and the matter should be reported to the Speaker of the House, and then the House should say whether, by the refusal of the member to take the oath, the seat would be vacated or not. I have not inserted that provision; but I intend, if the Bill comes in due course before the House, to suggest something of the kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend also, if there is to be any clause providing that any cases of bribery or corruption shall affect a member's seat?

Mr. CASGRAIN. If a member is entitled to his seat according to the law, he is all right.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. GORDON asked, Have any application, either verbal or written, been made to the Government, or to any member thereof, by any person, persons or corporation, for a repeal of the Act restricting and regulating Chinese immigration into Canada, or of any of the provisions of the said Act? If so, when and by whom?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No applications that we are aware of have been made to the Government, or to any member of the Government, on these subjects.

I. C. R.—RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What are the receipts and expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for the half year ending the 1st January, 1890, and for the half year ending 1st January, 1889?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For the half year ending the 1st of January, 1890, the earnings were \$1,562,897.48; the working expenses \$1,834,046.29. For the half year ending the 1st of January, 1889, the earnings were \$1,543,341.70; the working expenses \$1,808,481.72.

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO ROAD.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) asked, 1st. At what date were the papers respecting the Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road handed to the Department of Justice for a report as to the ownership of the said road? 2nd. Has the Minister of Justice reported thereon? If so, how soon will his report be presented to the House? 3rd. If not, how soon may we hope to have his report?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first communications with the Department of Justice were in September, 1885. The Department of Justice and my own Department have been in communica-

tion several times since, and the Department of Justice have put a number of questions to my Department to which my Department are now preparing answers, in order that the Department of Justice may be in a position to give an opinion on the question as to whether that road should be under the control of the Federal authorities or not.

REPORT.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ended 30th June, 1889.—(Mr. Haggart.)

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

—Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return showing the amount of money expended by the Dominion in each Province since Confederation to the 30th of June, 1889, under the following heads: 1st. Subsidies to railways in each Province, excepting the Canada Pacific main line and Sault branch; 2nd. The several railways built by the Dominion in each Province, including the Intercolonial branches and extensions, but not the main line as originally constructed; 3rd. The buildings erected or purchased in each Province, their location and cost.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The first part of the hon. gentleman's motion can be readily granted, that is as to subsidies to railways in each Province, except the Canadian Pacific Railway main line and the Sault branch. As to the second branch of the hon. gentleman's motion, which reads as follows:—

“The several railways built by the Dominion in each Province, including the Intercolonial branches, sidings and extensions, but not the main line as originally constructed.”

I have this note sent to me by the Department:—

“Is it understood that the main line as originally constructed is intended to cover the Intercolonial Railway from Chaudière Junction to St. John, Halifax, Point du Chêne and Picton, or is the line purchased from the Grand Trunk (Chaudière to Rivière du Loup) to be included? The main line should be defined. That done, the returns can be readily made, provided the word ‘sidings’ is omitted, but if the sidings are to be included, the returns could scarcely be brought down this Session.”

Perhaps, if I sent this memorandum over to the hon. gentleman, he might look at it and we will allow the motion to stand over until to-morrow.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have erased the word “sidings” in the motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was not aware of that, but then, as to the definition of the main line. If the hon. gentleman means what the words in his motion would imply, if he means all the branches which I have referred to in the memorandum I have read, it would be difficult to bring down the returns within any reasonable time, and I would like to know whether he means to include or exclude those branches to which I have referred.

Mr. McMULLEN. My object was to get a return in regard to the branches which have been added to the Intercolonial Railway since the construction of the main line. At the time of Confederation the understanding was that the Intercolonial Railway was to be built for the purpose of uniting the Provinces, but since that, branches have been constructed in order to serve the trade of various places in different Provinces and not as a national concern.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I understand what the hon. gentleman wants; but in the third part of his motion he asks for the expenditure on buildings erected or purchased in each Province,

their location and cost. Does he mean all buildings, but not railway buildings?

Mr. McMULLEN. No; not unless they are connected with the main line or the branches.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman means simply railway buildings and not post office buildings, for example.

Mr. McMULLEN. The last portion of my motion has reference to post office and custom house buildings.

Motion agreed to.

PAYMENT AND EXPENSES OF MINISTERS, &c.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return giving the names of each Minister of the Crown, High Commissioner or other Foreign Plenipotentiary, from Confederation to the 30th June, 1889. 2nd. The amount of money drawn by each under the following heads:—Salary, sessional allowance, travelling expenses, cab-hire and all other sums drawn under any other head during their term of office. 3rd. The total amount paid to each for all purposes during their term of office up to the 30th June, 1889.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to be a little more explicit. He asks for an order of the House giving the names of each Minister of the Crown, High Commissioner or other foreign plenipotentiary. This is the first time that I have received the information that I or any other Minister was a foreign plenipotentiary. In fact I was not aware that we had any foreign plenipotentiaries. It has been contended that we should have foreign plenipotentiaries.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am willing to alter that: from foreign plenipotentiary, to foreign agent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But we have no foreign agents. Canada cannot have any foreign agents. The only foreign agents we have are the Consuls General and Consuls who come to this country from abroad.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend means Commissioners who have been sent to foreign countries, as we know they have been sent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not what he says.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is what I intend. I am willing to make all the alterations necessary in order to secure the information for which I ask.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have no doubt that the returns asked for by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), will prove to be a valuable addition to the ancient literature of Canada. Of course they will cost a large amount of money, as the return dates back to Confederation, which is more than twenty years, and no doubt it will cost about \$100 a year to bring down that return. I am of the opinion that when that return comes down, it will not be a volume which we would care to have sent down to posterity at such a cost, unless it embraced something more than the hon. gentleman proposes, and I therefore move that the following words be added:—

4th. A detailed statement showing the purposes to which the amount received by each Minister of the Crown, High Commissioner or other Foreign Plenipotentiary was applied or disposed of, together with a statement in detail showing:—

1st. The names of all members of the House of Commons since Confederation.

2nd. The total amount received by each member as sessional indemnity, travelling expenses or for any other purpose.

3rd. The amount expended by each member while living in Ottawa and attending to his parliamentary duties; the names of the parties to whom any sum or sums were paid and the purposes for which paid.

4th. The amount expended by each member of the House of Commons in travelling to and from the Capital to attend to his parliamentary duties.

5th. The names of those who travelled on passes, and the name of the railway company issuing the same.

6th. The number of returns moved for by each member, the cost incurred in preparing each return, including the printing of the same and what was subsequently done in relation to each return.

7th. The number of times each member addressed the House, the length of time occupied in speaking, the cost to the country of each speech so made and the value thereof, computing the same on the basis of the length and cost of each Session.

8th. The number of motions and the name of the member making the same, other than for returns, and the disposition of such motion after being made.

9th. The number of votes given by each member and the number of times each member refrained from voting and the reasons therefor, showing the character and nature of each motion, the purposes for which made, and whether in each case that a member refrained from voting he had the consent of the House for so absenting himself.

10th. How the sum of \$500 extra sessional indemnity granted in 1885 was expended by each member of the House for that year, and what proportion of it was paid to agricultural societies, subscription to church funds or other charitable purposes, as promised by certain members when accepting the same.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before you put the amendment I beg to say that my object in moving the resolution I have placed in your hands is simply to be in a position to show the people of this country what the Government has cost from the time of Confederation down to the present time. I have no desire to eliminate any Reform or Conservative Government, and I have asked for an entire return down to the present moment. I have not attempted to leave out the names of those of our friends who might possibly figure in that return as well as those on the opposite side of the House. Now, I think there is a feeling throughout the country generally that the Government of this Dominion is costing the people more than they can afford to pay. I am not myself in a position to give the information to my constituents with regard to the exact figures of expenses for the officers of the Crown from Confederation down to the present time, and I wish to be in a position to tell them the exact cost of the public service down to this time.

Mr. TAYLOR. You have got it all in the Public Accounts.

Mr. McMULLEN. If it is in the Public Accounts it will take a very long time to gather all the items out of the Public Accounts in order to find the information asked for in my resolution. It is evident that the hon. member who has moved this amendment wants to burke the information I am asking for, he wants to attach a tail to it that will make it utterly impossible for all the clerks now in the service of the House to furnish all that information at this Session, or next Session, or before a general election can take place. That is evidently his intention, but mine was an honest intention to give the people of this country information that they do not now possess, information that they have a right to have, and we have a right to see that they get. Now, we know perfectly well that there is a feeling throughout the country that the governmental machinery of this Dominion is

Mr. TAYLOR.

altogether too cumbrous for the people to bear, and we believe that it is the duty of the members of this House, as well as the duty of the people outside this House, to secure a full statement of all the cost entailed upon the people by the Government of this Dominion; and if we can alter or change in any shape that machinery so as to reduce the cost, I think it is clearly our duty to do so.

Mr. GUILLET. There is every facility for obtaining this information in the Public Accounts, and the hon. member himself can, by looking up the proper page, find, under the proper headings, statements of expenses for the items he has mentioned, and the total cost of the civil government. There is no difficulty about it. He has the public records to show the people, and he can save all this expense to the country which his motion, if carried, would involve. He has full detailed statements in the Auditor General's Report, and in the Public Accounts, which were published yearly before the office of Auditor General was established. Therefore, I see no necessity for the expense this motion will entail.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see that the amendment made by my hon. friend has attracted general attention, and the apparent approbation of the House. I think the amendment was meant to signify that there was no necessity for the resolution. As my hon. friend who has just spoken says, the hon. gentleman can get all this information for himself. To prepare the return he asks for will cause a great deal of expense without any necessity whatever. The hon. gentleman says there is a general feeling in the country that the expenses of government are too great. Well, one of the great portions of the cost of government is caused by the legislation of the country, and we must get the whole cost if we are to inform the people what the cost of federal government is, including legislation. A great portion of this amendment, as moved by my hon. friend, is a necessary sequence of the motion of the hon. gentleman. Perhaps the hon. member had better allow his motion to stand over, and I think the best way to dispose of it will be to move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. LAURIER. I must say that I regret to see the course the Prime Minister has just taken in regard to this amendment. I must tell him that he is giving assistance to what I cannot regard otherwise than a frivolous lowering of the dignity of this House. This amendment is nothing else but a lowering of the dignity of this House. We can all take issue for or against the motion of my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen). It can be granted or it can be refused. Everybody may have his own view upon that, but why not treat it in a manly way? Why not consider it upon its merits, instead of attempting to throw ridicule upon the motion, which, after all, is properly put.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The motion in itself is ridiculous.

Mr. LAURIER. The First Minister did not say so in the first instance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought so.

Mr. LAURIER. He only objected to the wording of it. I understood that the hon. gentleman's objection to the motion was confined

to the wording of it. Certainly the hon gentleman is aware, and everybody is aware, that we have had commission after commission sent to foreign countries on one pretence or the other and have never obtained any result from such commissions. Under these circumstances, it would be fairer to the House and fairer to the hon gentleman, and more in keeping with the dignity of the House, if the First Minister had stated that he could not allow the motion to pass, for reasons given; but for the First Minister to permit such a frivolous amendment as that offered by the hon member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), to be submitted, and for the right hon gentleman to then move the adjournment of the debate, is to adopt a course against which I must protest, as one not in the best interests of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not so very easy for hon. members of this House to obtain from the Public Accounts of fifteen or twenty years the detailed information which the hon gentleman asks. It is a matter of some moment to the people of this country to know what sums of money have been expended on the various commissions for promoting foreign trade, what sums have been spent by the several members of the Government in their trips abroad, what sums have been spent by our High Commissioners and by other persons who have been entrusted by the Government with the task of carrying on more or less successfully, I am sorry to say less rather than more successfully, negotiations with foreign powers. If the First Minister thought any portion of the motion of my hon friend which was likely to entail a disproportionate expense, then it was quite within his right to oppose it, and ask my hon friend to modify it, so that the information could be got at a reasonable cost. But I must say I entirely agree with my hon friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) that the introduction of the amendment, many of the details of which it would be impossible to carry out, is not the way to treat this motion, and lowers the dignity of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon gentleman's motion had been confined to the subject mentioned by the hon gentleman who has just spoken, to ascertain the number of commissions, and the expense of those commissions, there would be no objection to it. But this motion covers every possible expense of almost every possible employé of twenty odd years, and was so absurd I could not help seeing that hon gentlemen on the other side of the House were laughing at the motion when it was moved by the hon member. The reason why I moved the adjournment of the debate was because I thought that before another day perhaps both motion and amendment might be dropped. It was with that object I moved the motion. No doubt the amendment is a sarcastic and ironical motion, but I think it was fully called for by the very absurd motion of the hon member.

Mr. LAURIER. If the right hon gentleman will advise the hon member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to withdraw his amendment, I will suggest to my hon friend to let his motion stand; but, with the amendment now before the House, we cannot allow the debate to be adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that will be fair. I will ask the mover of the amendment to withdraw it if the hon member

for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) will withdraw his motion and give notice of another similar to that suggested by the hon member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Mr. LAURIER. I will appeal to the right hon gentleman's better nature. The hon gentleman is aware that very often motions are amended across the floor, and I understood the right hon gentleman was adopting that course when he drew attention to the expression "foreign ministers." This course was being followed a few moments ago. If the right hon gentleman had suggested that certain words be admitted, I should have asked my hon friend to agree to the suggestion; but the hon gentleman must admit that when such an amendment as that proposed by the hon member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is offered, the debate cannot be adjourned on it, but it must be disposed of.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is perfectly clear that we cannot allow such a motion to stand over as an adjourned debate. The First Minister has himself stated that it is a sarcastic motion, one intended to cast ridicule on the original motion. The hon gentleman who moved the amendment has asked for information which it is absolutely impossible for the House to supply, information with regard to the motives which actuated members in receiving indemnity, how much money they expended in coming to Parliament and residing here. He will have to go to some of the graveyards to get the information which he seeks, and I do not think he will be successful in getting it even there. The House itself would be doing what my hon friend the leader of the Opposition, affirmed, it would be lowering its dignity by consenting to adjourn the debate upon a motion of that kind. The proper course for the First Minister to take would be to ask the hon member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to withdraw his amendment, and then suggest to my hon friend what he considers objectionable portions of his motion; and I am sure that this side of the House would be disposed to advise my hon friend to accept any reasonable suggestion which might be offered. Surely, if my hon friend wishes information of this kind and seeks to obtain it in a form which will be authoritative, and which may be used by him in addressing his constituents, it is not unreasonable, although it might be obtained by searching through the Public Accounts for twenty years, to get the information in a formal way, at least every part that can be consistently given. The First Minister says there are some absurd things in the motion. Let the hon gentleman point out what is highly objectionable, and then let my hon friend amend his motion in accordance with the First Minister's suggestion, and there will be no difficulty. It would be a most improper course to take, and surely the First Minister cannot have considered the effect of the motion that he made, to adjourn the debate upon such an amendment as that proposed by the hon member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have explained the reason why I made the motion to adjourn the debate: Because I considered the motion as presented by the hon member as altogether unreasonable, and I still think the motion of my hon friend in amendment was quite justified by the fact of the original motion being altogether inadmissible. My object in making the motion was

that the whole matter might be dropped, and the hon. gentleman have the opportunity to move another motion which would be acceptable to the House. The hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) suggested a matter which is worthy of inquiry. It is now asked that the hon. member for Leeds should withdraw his amendment, and that we should help to amend the original resolution. It is not part of our business to amend the hon. gentleman's motion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You do it every day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is no part of our business to do it. I shall object to the motion and to any amendment of it, because it was moved for no good purpose, and it would involve a great expense. Under the circumstances I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Motion to adjourn debate withdrawn.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). As the leader of the Government requests me to withdraw the amendment, I ask leave of the House to withdraw it.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. LAURIER. Might I ask my hon. friend, under the circumstances, to withdraw his motion?

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no objection to comply with the request of my hon. leader. I may be permitted to add that I simply moved the resolution in order to get the information, and that is all I want.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend can bring it on again.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) can put it in another shape.

Mr. McMULLEN. All right.

Motion withdrawn.

MARINE AND EMIGRANT HOSPITAL, QUEBEC.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec) moved for :

Statement, in detail, showing the expenditure made in connection with the Marine and Emigrant Hospital at Quebec, since the 30th June, 1886, the said statement giving: 1. The sum voted each year by the Dominion Parliament. 2. The amount expended. 3. The number of sailors and emigrants taken in each year, and the total number of days that each one of these passed in the hospital. 4. The number of persons not being sailors or emigrants, taken into the said hospital, and the number of days that each one of this class passed there. 5. The total cost day by day of each patient. 6. The amount received by the Government for the patients who are neither emigrants nor sailors. 7. The amount received from the Sick Mariners' Fund under the Act 49 Vic., chap. 76, section 16.

Mr. TUPPER. I beg to ask the hon. gentleman whether he desires any special return other than what is contained in the annual report of the Department that has been laid on the Table of the House for the year. For instance, the information given in the precise form that the hon. gentleman asks now is contained in the annual report, which brings it down to the end of the fiscal year 1888. The same information up to July, 1889, is contained in the report now in print for this year and which will be shortly laid on the Table of the House. What I desire to know is whether the hon. gentleman wants the information to be taken from the reports themselves, or is the information con-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

tained in the reports in a form suitable to the hon. gentleman?

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). The object of my motion is to put those matters in detail before the House. The return I ask for is the very same which was made to this House a long time ago, and my object is to complete that information down to the latest date possible. A similar motion was made and in exactly the same words in 1887. I do not know what hon. gentleman moved the motion, but I have in my desk the return which was then made, and my object is to have that return completed down to the present date.

Mr. TUPPER. There can be no objection to the motion passing. The information was brought down in the annual report.

Motion agreed to.

CHARTERED BANKS AND LIQUIDATION.

Mr. HESSON moved for :

Return giving the names of all the Chartered Banks in Canada that have suspended payment, gone into liquidation, or become insolvent since Confederation, showing the amount of capital stock authorised, the amount of stock subscribed, the amount of stock paid up, the assets and liabilities of said Banks at the time of such suspension or failure, the nature of such assets and liabilities, the dates of said charters and the dates of forfeiture or relinquishment of such charters.

He said: I desire to ask the indulgence of the House while I make a few remarks on this subject, which, hon. gentlemen will observe, is a matter of very considerable importance. The House was advised at the opening of Parliament in His Excellency's speech that the subject would be brought under consideration this Session. I do not rise to make any remarks which would throw any reflection whatever upon the financial institutions that have been so admirably conducted by the directors and managers of the banks of the Dominion. I wish to state, in the presence of every gentleman in this House who may occupy a position of authority with reference to the great financial institutions of our country, that I have the highest admiration for the success they have achieved in the past. That there have been financial failures in Canada is well known to us all, and that some of these failures have brought serious consequences to many of our people is without doubt, but a crisis of that kind must necessarily arise in the trade and commerce of any country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Thanks to the National Policy.

Mr. HESSON. My hon. friend suggests the National Policy. I would say to my hon. friend that if there is great evidence of prosperity and growth in Canada, it is due to the National Policy, and that such prosperity has been developed to a greater extent since the National Policy was introduced than during any period of our country's history. If I am compelled to draw attention to that matter, my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin) must be responsible for it. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is of some importance to the people of this country to know that the standing of our banks in Canada is worthy of the admiration and confidence of the people of this continent, and I believe that it is possible that the position of the banks to-day may be improved.

by the careful consideration and attention of the Government in the matter of renewal of their charters. I have no hesitation in making the statement that it is in the interests of all the people of Canada that the privilege hitherto granted to the banks of circulating their own promises to pay should not be renewed or continued for any great length of time. I am aware, Sir, that it is necessary to gradually introduce the system of national issue of notes which will be a legal tender everywhere in the Dominion. It will be a great convenience to the public if the difficulties which now arise from the interchange of provincial notes from hand to hand in different parts of the Dominion should be removed. We pride ourselves on being a great nation, but I conceive that we are not following the wisest policy in connection with our banking institutions if we do not remove the system by which a note good at par value in the Province in which it was issued is subject to a discount of perhaps 5 per cent. in another Province of the Dominion. This is not creditable to us. It brings the blush of shame to us when we cross to the American side to see that the notes of our banks having a high standing in Canada should be discounted in the United States. It is a fact known to every gentleman who has travelled in the United States that there is not a single issue of bank notes, excepting the Government legal tender notes, which are not subject to a discount of 5 per cent. in the United States, while we accept the greenbacks issued by their national government at par value. That is an indignity not only on our banks but on the country itself. A Government circulation in Canada would be equally acceptable to the Americans in our commercial intercourse with them, and it would prevent the difficulties arising in the case of people coming to this Province from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island or British Columbia, and endeavoring to pass the bills of banks of their own locality, which they find refused, save at a discount, though the banks issuing them are on a perfectly solid basis. Now, the Government have issued something like \$16,000,000 of legal tender notes. The banks have to-day locked up in their vaults about \$9,000,000 of this issue, held as specie. How did they get this specie? In the regular course of trade; and when we add the reserve of specie which they now hold, amounting to \$6,620,000, we find that they have altogether over \$16,000,000 locked away in their vaults not earning a single penny for the directors or the shareholders of those institutions. I appeal to the judgment of any hon. gentleman in this House whether such a state of things is necessary. The circulation of the banks is often shortened by the conservative policy pursued by the directors in forecasting the future, which may bring some severe pressure upon those institutions, and make it impossible for them to leave their circulation at such a point as to meet the demands of trade, notwithstanding that their own vaults are full of gold and Dominion notes. They do that on a principle which we can all understand as perfectly right, but it does not serve the full wants of the country. If, instead of their own promises to pay, they had a circulation provided by the Government, there would be no danger of this circulation coming back upon them, and their being compelled to redeem it

at an unfavorable moment in the condition of the trade of the country. I am satisfied that the banks themselves would be benefitted by this change. I cannot conceive why over \$16,000,000 of specie and Dominion legal tender should be locked up in the vaults of the banks and withheld from the trade and business of the country. In addition, the banks hold other securities to very large amounts. They hold Dominion Government securities, debentures or Government stock, to the amount of \$2,600,000; British provincial or foreign and colonial securities, not Canadian, to the amount of \$5,546,000; loans, discounts or advances for which stock, bonds or debentures are held, not Canadian, to the amount of \$13,250,000; and they hold loans of corporations, which are usually recognised in Canada as good securities, to the amount of \$23,879,000. Here we have a total of \$63,550,000 under the heads I have given of good securities locked up in the vaults of the banks of the country. Now, I cannot see that the banks would be placed at any disadvantage if required to gradually withdraw their circulation and gradually replace it with a Government issue in the shape of legal tender notes. It would be much more advantageous to the stockholders and directors of these banks to have their securities in the shape of Government stock, or other debentures bearing interest, earning something for them, than to have them lying in their vaults without earning a single penny. Therefore I contend that the banks are in a position, without the slightest inconvenience to their customers, without requiring to refuse a discount to any man worthy of receiving it, to replace the entire circulation of this country on a basis of legal tender notes issued by the Government, and to put in the hands of the Government the most satisfactory securities that could be desired by the people. It is all very well for the *Journal of Commerce* and other papers which usually view this question through the spectacles of bank directors and stockholders, to say that they want a flexible currency. Well, I say that we have in the legal tender notes the most flexible currency that we can desire. What are the facts? To provide for the trade and commerce of Canada, the banks have to-day in circulation about \$35,000,000 of their promises to pay. The Government would have the benefit of that circulation, and would gain considerable from wear and tear. In the creation of a single plate for the whole currency of the country, the Government would also effect a great saving to the thirty-eight other institutions which now require to have their separate plates. We have no means of ascertaining what the wear and tear amounts to, but it is very considerable to-day, and yet it will scarcely pay the cost of the circulation to the banks. When we speak of a flexible currency, and the undesirability of renewing to the banks their charters with the privilege of circulating their own promises to pay, I would remark that they have been able to give discounts to the business men of Canada to the amount of \$150,000,000 on a circulation of \$35,000,000 of those promises—let us remember that for the privilege of enjoying that circulation they tie up gold securities to the amount of over \$16,000,000. Now, it is of no use saying that the bank is the only means by which the country can obtain its gold. The bank has no means of creating gold.

They cannot manufacture gold; and I am satisfied that, if, instead of exporting, as we do now, the enormous amount of money required to settle our foreign interest and foreign balances—the debt was one to the people of Canada, with the trust which they have in the securities of the Dominion—we might keep in the country the amount of interest which we are now exporting every year in that way. For the past few years the Government have been receiving very large amounts from the depositors in the savings banks. We have now in the savings banks about \$42,000,000. The Government has chosen to reduce the rate of interest to the depositors to 3½ per cent. Still that amounts to a very considerable sum, and that is paid out to the people of this country instead of to foreigners, and I think there is not an hon. gentleman but will say that a foreign indebtedness being turned to a home indebtedness would encourage the people of the country, while the Government would obtain the money at the lowest possible rate of interest, and at the same time encourage the people who have small savings to make. The deposits in the savings banks have grown within the past ten years from \$9,000,000 to \$42,000,000, and those are the savings of the people of Canada. If it were possible for the Government to realise what they desire for the amount required for expenditure on public works, and the public expenditure generally from the people of this country, would that not be better than to obtain it from abroad? Even since Confederation, without referring to the time before, if the Government had been in a position to obtain loans from the people of this country, instead of borrowing abroad, we would have saved for interest \$120,000,000 which has been exported out of this country, would we not be in a better position than we are to-day? Think what that means. This may be in the form of the issue of bonds or the issue of stocks, but it is well known to every member of this House that we have to continue drawing upon the resources of this country to settle these foreign balances and foreign interest, thus impoverishing the country. The sooner Canada recognises the fact, that it will be better for our people to keep that money in our own country, the better. Our people have shown that they have faith in our institutions, and there is no doubt that the banks will not be injured by the adoption of such a system as this, because we know that now the weaker banks can be driven to the wall and crushed by the stronger banks. I am not saying anything against the banks of this country, and I do not think it is possible for anyone to cast any slur against the management of our banks. It is not for that purpose that I arise, but, speaking for my own constituency, which is a rural constituency, I say that ninety-nine out of one hundred—leaving out the proprietors and stockholders in the chartered banks—would say, Give us a national currency. The Government can very easily arrange the conditions with the banks on which this could be carried out. This has been done already to a certain extent, first in prohibiting the banks from issuing the bills as low as \$1 and \$2, and then in prohibiting them from issuing notes as low as \$4. That was done without any injustice to the banks. Why should not the Government go further? That measure has been accepted by the people of this country, and they know that it is

Mr. HESSON.

the best security they can have except the gold in their vaults, and I doubt if even that is as good. When this return comes down, perhaps I may have a chance to again address the House on the subject, but in the meantime I move this resolution.

Mr. CASEY. The motion just made by the hon. gentleman, coupled with his remarks, which were rather discursive, leads me to believe that the object of his motion and of his speech is to point out the necessity for a greater measure of security in our national currency. I think that is the general drift of his remarks. As I said, his speech was so discursive and dealt with so many points that I am not quite positive as to the exact means by which he proposed to give greater security to our currency. But I think that I did gather that, in his opinion, the Government should issue all the currency issued in the country. If I am mistaken in that interpretation of his opinion, I hope he will correct me. If that be his view, it is a matter deserving of very serious consideration, whether we should endorse his view or not, for it is possible to raise a very grave objection against the Government as the source of issue for the whole currency of the country. If the Government are allowed without limit, or even within very wide limits, to issue legal tender as a means of carrying on the business of the country, as a means of paying the obligations of the country, complications are very apt to arise. Governments have not the means of gauging the necessities of the country as well as the bankers have, they do not know, in fact, as well as the bankers, how much currency the country needs to carry on its business. They do not know to what extent the commerce of the country can be carried on, or is being carried on, by checks and other methods instead of currency as well as the bankers know it. So that if the issue of currency were left entirely in the hands of the Government, it is very easy to foresee that this sort of complication might arrive: The Government, having to make large payments, instead of having recourse to borrowing or other methods of making those payments, might simply put on the market a large issue of legal tender notes, which, of course, would be redeemable in gold, because I did not understand the hon. gentleman to propose an irredeemable currency. Well, the country being constantly flooded with a large issue of redeemable legal tender notes, if that issue happened to be in excess of the actual wants of the country for circulation, for purposes of currency, the result would be that very soon a large quantity of these notes would come back to the treasury for redemption, and it would be found that the Government, instead of obtaining any material advantage by the issue of this large amount of currency, would simply postpone for a comparatively short time the necessity of paying in gold, or the equivalent of gold, for the services they require. But, on the other hand, if my hon. friend only means that it is the duty of the Government to see that all public currency, which is issued as money in this country, is absolutely safe and is redeemable at any moment in gold, I am prepared to agree with him most heartily. I think it is the duty of every Government to see that no public currency

is issued as money which is not redeemable in real money, that is to say, gold, at any moment. Of course, we know that at present, under the law giving note holders a first lien on the assets of banks, there it probably in every case, I may say certainly in every case, a sufficient ultimate security for the note holder in the assets of our Canadian banks; that is to say, that when banks fail and are finally wound up, it will be found that there are sufficient assets to cover all their notes. But in the meantime there will be necessarily a discount of the notes of that bank, and even if the time occupied in winding-up be very short, the man who has some of its currency in hand when the bank fails, will lose the discount if he has to use the notes immediately and is not able to hold them until the bank is wound up. I think it is, therefore, the duty of the Government to devise some scheme by which, no matter what may happen to the bank itself, the currency issued by a bank should remain of a definite value, an absolute par value. I am not, at present, going into a discussion of the various means by which this might be brought about; it is certain that we shall have another opportunity of doing so during the Session. But I wish to urge the general principle thus early in the Session, even before the Government's Bill on the subject is brought down, that it is the duty of the Government to take upon themselves any risk that there may be in connection with the currency. The notes of chartered banks pass from hand to hand without inspection. The poor man takes them on his wages, the average citizen, whether poor or rich, takes them for the most part without looking to see what bank has issued them. Now, I say that it is the duty of the Government of any country to see that any currency which is passed in this way, from hand to hand, without inspection, is absolutely safe, that if there be any risk in the matter, the country at large, and not the individual note holder, should take that risk. As I say, I hope to have another opportunity of presenting one or two proposals as to how this might be managed, and I shall not, therefore, do so now. But I am prepared to sustain my hon. friend or anybody else who takes it up, in the contention that nothing should issue as money in this country which is not absolutely as good as gold, which the Government does not guarantee to be as good as gold. My hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Hesson), in discussing the business of the banks, said that the banks could not produce any gold, that it was the exports which produced gold, and that—I took down his words—"there is where the wealth comes from." I understood him to mean that when we exported a surplus of products and got the balance in gold, that constituted the wealth of the country. That is the good old-fashioned argument, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the balance of trade. I certainly would have thought that my hon. friend, sitting, as he does, behind the Government of the day, and supporting that Government, would not have brought up that argument just now; for if it be true that the excess of exports over imports is the measure of the wealth of the country, if it be true that the amount of gold we import is the measure of our actual profits, then, Sir, the Government of the day have landed this country in a very sad financial condition, because

for a long series of years, with one exception, our exports have been less than our imports, and we have imported less gold than we have exported, so that during the whole term of office of the present Government, with the exception of one year, we have been going to the dogs, according to the doctrines of the hon. member for Perth, and according to the doctrines of the school to which he belongs. In view of these facts, I am astonished that he should have brought up this argument. I do not believe, myself, that the test which he proposes to the people is the true one, but I am astonished that he should bring it up, and that he should cast upon his leaders the responsibility of the fact that we are apparently running behind from year to year in our account current with foreign countries. I do not think it is necessary to say anything more at the present time with regard to this matter, and I reserve a great deal of what I shall have to say for a later opportunity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to enter into the somewhat abstruse questions which have been raised by my two hon. friends at this moment, at any rate; but it is a convenient opportunity of asking the hon. Minister of Finance whether he will not, at a very early date, lay before the House the proposals which the Government intend to make with respect to any modifications they may see fit to propose in the bank charters. I would suggest to him that these ought to be placed before the House, and before the country for a period of some weeks, before we are called upon to go on with the formal discussion, as no doubt the Government have maturely considered the subject and have made up their minds in regard to it. It has been referred to in the Speech from the Throne, and, therefore, we have reason to believe that the Government have made up their mind as to what they ought to do.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in his suggestion that the Government have been giving a great deal of consideration to the matter, and in due course of time—and I hope it will not be at a very distant period—the Government will be in a position to lay before the House the outlines of their measure. In the meantime there is no objection to the present motion passing. The two hon. gentlemen who have spoken have, no doubt, aided in this direction at least, in directing the minds of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to what, no doubt, will form the subject of a very important and intelligent discussion. I think that I can promise the hon. gentleman opposite that it will not be a very long period before the Government measure on this subject will be before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I trust the Minister will be able to do so soon, because this is a question on which the country ought to have the fullest information for a period of some weeks before it is discussed in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I might add that, before the measure is brought down, the opinion of the bankers will be obtained with regard to it, and they will have an opportunity to lay their views before the Government. They have held their meeting, and I have an appointment to meet a deputation from them on Saturday to discuss the proposed measure.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved for :

Return of all the expenses generally incurred to this day for the making of the Electoral Lists for the Dominion of Canada.

He said : This return can be prepared within a short time, as it will not involve a great amount of labor. The people of the country wish to know the cost of printing the Electoral List, and a fair estimate of the cost can now be made.

Motion agreed to.

REGISTERED LETTERS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for :

Return showing the number of registered letters sent to the Dead Letter Office during the years 1887, 1888 and 1889, up to the 31st December last.

Mr. BOWELL. In the absence of the Postmaster General I may say that if the hon. gentleman will refer to the return laid on the Table by the Postmaster General he will find all the information asked in his motion. That return was laid on the Table to-day. The annual returns for each year contain all the information asked. We have no objection to bring down such a return if the hon. gentleman thinks he will obtain further information from it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am willing to take the information contained in the blue books up to the 30th June last, but I wish a return to cover the period from 30th June to 30th December last. There are clerks employed to do this kind of work, and if the members have to ferret out all the information from the blue books, they may spend all their time in doing so, and do nothing else.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to the motion as amended, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that when I occupied a seat opposite I did precisely what he objects to do now. I have spent hours, and sometime half the night, in trying to find out what my opponents were doing.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do a great deal of that kind of work.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing, by years, the cost of printing the Ordinances and other official papers and publications in the French language, from the time of the passage of the North-West Territories Act of 1877. The number of copies of the Ordinances from time to time printed in said language. The number distributed, and the number remaining in stock.—(Mr. Denison, for Mr. McCarthy.)

Return giving a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures to 1st January, 1890, together with statement of the same for the half year ending 1st January, 1889.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

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

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 4.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 24th January, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar Mr. FOSTER,

of the Supreme Court of Canada a certified copy of the judgment of the said court in the election appeal for the Electoral District of the County of Haldimand, by which the appeal was dismissed and the election declared void. In conformity with chapter 9, section 46, of the Revised Statutes, I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 13) to amend the Act to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. McMullen.)

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DOYON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a fact which is personal to myself. The *Empire* published yesterday a paragraph couched in the following terms :—

“ ABSENT MEMBERS.—There are still a number of members of Parliament who have not yet reported at the House. Amongst them are the following—”

Among several names cited, I find my own and that of Mr. Ste. Marie, the member for Napierville. I do not desire to cast blame on this journal, which I suppose was badly informed ; but, nevertheless, I must indeed state, in justice to my colleague of Napierville as well as to myself, that we were here both of us since the opening of the Session. I would not have this false piece of news hawked about by all the press, seeing that it is of a nature to injure us in the eyes of our electors ; and if I might be so bold I would beg this newspaper to correct the statement.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. BERGERON moved, That the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended to Tuesday, the 11th February next, and the time for presenting Private Bills to Tuesday, the 18th February next, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

GREEN COVE BREAKWATER.

Mr. LOVITT asked, Whether the Government have received any tenders for repairing Green Cove Breakwater, County of Yarmouth? If so, have they accepted any tender? If not, is it the intention of the Government to make arrangements for repairing this breakwater as early as possible?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Tenders were received for repairing the Green Cove Breakwater in the County of Yarmouth. Those tenders are receiving the attention of the Government, and I hope in a short time that the proper one will be accepted. When I say the proper one, I mean the lowest, which is always accepted unless there are reasons to the contrary.

COPYRIGHT.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether the Copyright Amendment Act of 1889 has yet been brought into

force by proclamation of the Governor General? Has any correspondence taken place between the Canadian and the Imperial Governments respecting the Copyright Amendment Act of 1889? Is the Government prepared to state to the House the substance or the result of such correspondence, or to lay it before the House at present?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Act has not yet been proclaimed. There has been some correspondence on the subject, and there is no objection to lay it upon the Table in a few days.

POSTAL SERVICE IN LOTBINIÈRE COUNTY.

Mr. RINFRET asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to supply an every day mail service to the Parish of St. Édouard (Rivière Boisclair Post Office), in the County of Lotbinière?

Mr. COLBY. In the absence of the Postmaster General, I beg to inform the hon. member that this matter is under the consideration of the Government.

TOBACCO SALES.

Mr. SMALL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government during the present Session to amend the Inland Revenue Act, in so far as it relates to the sale of tobacco?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The subject is being considered, with a view to meet the wishes of the trade, if it can be done without prejudice to the revenue.

FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENTS.

Mr. JONCAS asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to continue, according to the plan now followed, the creation of fish-breeding establishments? Or whether it is the intention of the Government either to increase or lessen their number?

Mr. TUPPER. It is the intention of the Government to continue, according to the plan now followed, the creation of fish-breeding establishments. The question of increasing their number is under consideration.

CATTLE DISEASE IN THE WESTERN STATES.

Mr. INNES asked, Has the Minister of Agriculture made himself acquainted with the cattle disease now prevalent in some of the Western States, and has he taken steps to prevent its introduction or spread in Canada?

Mr. CARLING. No report of any special cattle disease prevalent in the Western States has reached the Department of Agriculture, but the quarantine of ninety days to which cattle from the Western States are subject on crossing the Canadian frontier, is sufficient protection to prevent the introduction of any cattle disease into Canada.

CAUGHNAWAGA RESERVE QUARRIES.

Mr. DOYON asked, How much does the Government pay per square yard for the measuring of the stone in the quarries of the Caughnawaga Reserve? What is the name of the person employed in measuring this stone? Is this person

engaged in any other public employment whatever in the said reserve?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Government pays 2½ cents per square yard for measuring the stone in the quarries of the Caughnawaga Reserve. The name of the measurer is Moïse Lefort. He is also employed as a constable on the reserve.

Mr. DOYON asked, What is the price per toise charged by the Government during the years 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, and 1889 against those persons who have worked the quarries on the Caughnawaga Reserve, in the County of Laprairie?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Government charged per toise during the years 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, and 1889, \$1.50 for stone of large dimensions and \$1 per toise for rubble.

Mr. DOYON asked, Whether the Government are prepared to lay on the Table of the House the report of the operations carried on by McLea Walbank in the Caughnawaga Reserve, in the County of Laprairie? If they are so prepared, when do they intend so to do? If they are not, what reason have they to offer?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is no objection to these papers being brought down.

RELIEF OF SAMUEL MAY.

Mr. DENISON moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 16) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Samuel May. He said: It appears that some time ago the gentleman asking for this legislation bought a patent, which, in the usual course, should have run for fifteen years. It had only been extended for five years of the fifteen, and I believe it is customary to extend a patent for successive terms of five years. At the end of five years he should have paid a small fee and had the patent renewed for a further term of five years, but through some oversight, or negligence, or forgetfulness, or want of knowledge of the law, he omitted to do this, and the Bill is to put him in the position he would have occupied if he had made his usual payment at the time. It is customary to give a patent fifteen years, and through this oversight he has been deprived of a valuable right.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

STEAMSHIP LINE BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND JAPAN.

Mr. PRIOR moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Dominion Government and the Imperial Government, and between the Dominion Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in regard to the granting of a subsidy to the latter company for lines of steamships to run between Vancouver, B.C., and Japan and Australia.

He said: My object in moving this Address is to find out, if possible, when the correspondence I am asking for is brought down, who is responsible for the state of affairs now existing on the Pacific coast in regard to the calling of the China and Japan steamers at the port of Victoria. It seems to me an extraordinary thing, as it must seem to any other hon. member who knows the geography of that part of the country, that a large subsidy has been granted by this Government to a company to run steamers from the port of Vancouver to China and Japan, and that nothing was inserted in

the charter in regard to their calling at the port of Victoria, the capital of British Columbia. It seems to me that, as that port pays a very large amount into the public treasury—over a million dollars was paid for the last twelve months in duties and internal revenue—at the very least a clause ought to have been put into the charter making it imperative on the company who run these steamers to call on the outward and inward passage at the port of Victoria, especially as they go within a very short distance of that port already and will do so as long as they run. At the present time they go direct to Vancouver city on the mainland, and according to the best nautical authorities it would not require more than two hours or two hours and a half for them to call at Victoria. I may say that when the Imperial agent—Sir Arthur Blackwood, I think—was out in Victoria, he told several residents that he saw no objection to the vessels calling there. I was also informed by the right hon. leader of the Government that he had requested Sir Charles Tupper to interview the Imperial Government in regard to this matter, and that Sir Charles had done his best; and I wish to find out on behalf of my constituents why that has not been done, whether it is the fault of the Imperial Government or of the Dominion Government; and what is the cause that a clause was not inserted making it imperative on the company to call at Victoria.

Motion agreed to.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. GORDON moved for :

Return showing: 1st. The total number of Chinese immigrants who have arrived in the Dominion of Canada from the 31st March, 1887, to the 31st December, 1889, specifying the ports at which such immigrants have arrived. 2nd. The amount of fees or duties collected from Chinese immigrants during the same period. 3rd. The number of certificates of residence that have been issued to Chinese, as provided for under section 13 of the Act to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into Canada, since the passage of the Act. 4th. The number of Chinese who have been detected in attempting to land in Canada upon fraudulent certificates and who were prevented by the courts from doing so. 5th. Copies of all correspondence having reference to the removal from office of Mr. Vroman *alias* Mr. Gardner, and also all correspondence having reference to the appointment of a Chinaman to the position of interpreter at the port of Vancouver, in the place of the said Mr. Gardner. 6th. The number of Chinese who have passed through Canada in bond for passage from Vancouver by steamer to China, and the regulations that have been prescribed for placing them securely on board said steamers to prevent their disembarkation into Canada. 7th. The total number of Chinese other than those in bond who left Canada during the first mentioned period, and the number of return certificates that have been issued.

He said: It is not my intention at the present time to detain the House by discussing the Chinese question, my object being chiefly to get certain returns which, so far, I have been unable to find in the Trade and Navigation Returns. Perhaps my inability may have arisen from an attack of "La Grippe," but I have not the time to search for that information. My desire is to have the whole returns in a consolidated form, because, as this House is well aware, the question of Chinese immigration is a very important one to British Columbia.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to bring down the return asked by the hon. member. I

Mr. PRIOR.

should like, however, to call his attention to the fact that, as regards the fifth question, Mr. Vroman *alias* Mr. Gardner never was an interpreter for the port of Vancouver, and, consequently, no such successor has ever been appointed. It would be impossible to answer the seventh question, because we have no record of those who smuggled themselves into the country and left it in the same way; but the total number of certificates granted can be brought down. We will bring down all the information on the subject in the possession of the Department.

Motion agreed to.

THE ROYAL PREROGATIVE.

Order of the House for :

"Copies of all correspondence between the Canadian and the Imperial Governments relating to the provisions of the Dominion statute 51 Victoria, chapter 43, whereby it was provided that, notwithstanding any Royal prerogative, no appeal shall be brought in criminal cases from Canadian courts to the Imperial Privy Council," being read,

Mr. EDGAR. The question involved in the papers which are traversed in this motion is one of very considerable importance. It involves the question of the right of this Parliament to regulate, restrict, and indeed to abrogate the Royal Prerogative in cases where this Parliament had legislative powers to deal with the matters in question. It appears that, in the closing days of last Session, a return was laid on the Table of the House which contained an Order in Council, with a very full and able report from the Minister of Justice upon the subject of the legality of this Act, or at least on the subject raised by the Home Government as to the propriety of this Parliament passing such an Act. I had not seen that return when I placed this motion on the Notice paper. I am very glad to be able to concur in the position taken by the Minister of Justice in that very able paper. In it he sustains very skillfully and firmly the right of Canada to legislate even questions involving the Prerogative of the Crown. He succeeded, as the papers show, in his contention, just as I think all Canadian statesmen have succeeded, and will always succeed, when they respectfully and firmly insist before the Imperial Government that Canada shall have the fullest right to self-government in all respects. I hope the papers which the Minister of Justice has to-day promised to lay before the House very soon, on the question which has arisen between Canada and the Imperial Government as to the right of Canada to legislate on the subject of copyright, will also show that the Minister has sustained the same sturdy Canadian ground, and has been equally successful. I beg to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

FRESH BEEF IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) moved for :

Return showing the quantity of fresh beef imported into Canada from the United States during the fiscal year ending 30th June last, and also for six months ending 31st December last, distinguishing by Provinces.

He said: The reason I moved this motion is that during last year fresh beef was brought into the Maritime Provinces from the United States in such very large quantities as to affect the interests of our farmers in that respect. I have turned to the Trade and Navigation Returns, but I cannot find

any information as to the extent of the fresh beef imports. Under the general head of beef appears to be included all beef imported, whether in barrels salted or in quarters or carcasses fresh. An examination of the returns of some years past show that the imports of beef have very largely increased. I find that in 1880 we imported into New Brunswick and Nova Scotia only 364,148 lbs. of beef for home consumption. There was a small increase in that quantity in each year until 1886, when it reached 1,173,325 lbs. Since that time it has increased very rapidly indeed. In 1887 the imports reached 1,520,337 lbs.; 1888, 2,507,335 lbs.; 1889, 3,210,351 lbs., showing an increase during last year of 1,200,000 lbs. I believe this very large increase during last year is due to the fact of the large import of fresh meat from the United States. It will, no doubt, seem strange to many members of the House that in a country like the Dominion of Canada, from which we export to Great Britain beef cattle to the amount of nearly six millions of dollars, that there should be any import of meat from the United States; and an examination of the facts connected with this trade would, I think, interest the members of this House, and show to them that the importation of meat is largely due to the mode in which this business is carried on. The large exporters in Chicago and other points of the west ship the meat in large quantities in refrigerator cars. They have large buildings specially prepared for storing this meat, from which they distribute it to those local markets as from time to time they require it, and during the last few years they have been pushing this business in the Maritime Provinces to a greater extent than before. Now, every one acquainted with the matter knows that the cost of shipping live stock a distance of 100 or 150 miles is fully equal to one-half cent per pound on the dressed weight. I venture the assertion, although I have not the figures here, that these large exporters are able to ship their dead meat to the Maritime Provinces at a cost which is not in excess of what farmers 150 miles away from our markets would have to pay. So far as the cost of transportation is concerned, I believe that at the present time the farmers of Illinois and Wisconsin have practically as cheap access to our markets as our own farmers who are only 100 or 150 miles away. I notice a motion on the paper asking for an increase of duty on fresh meat and also pork and bacon, and I suppose this will come up some other day for discussion. The result of our experience for the past year in the Maritime Provinces has certainly been in favor of an increase of duty upon fresh meat; and whatever may be the action of the Government in respect to other meats, I trust, so far as this is concerned, that they will increase the duty to at least double what it is at present.

Mr. BOWELL. I may inform the hon. gentleman, as he is aware, no doubt, that he cannot find anything in the Trade and Navigation Returns which would indicate the quantity of fresh meat brought into the country. The returns, which are made from the different ports, include all classes of meats under a general heading, whether they be salted or fresh, and hence it would be impossible for the Department to give the information that he seeks. Under the circumstances, I presume that the hon. gentleman will withdraw the motion.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). If the information cannot be obtained I will withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return of all papers and correspondence between the Ontario Manufacturers' Association and the Dominion Government, during the years 1883, 1884 and 1885, on the subject of proposed legislation relating to factories.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Return showing the total amount of expenditure to date on the Government Printing Bureau building, the total expenditure to date on type, presses, and all other printing and binding machinery and material placed in the Bureau; also the total amount paid in salaries and wages to officers and employes in the Bureau, from the 1st July, 1889, to 1st January, 1890.—(Mr. Innes.)

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 27th January, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CARLING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 17) to amend the Patent Act. He said: The primary object of the amendments with respect to the first two of these Bills, the Patent Amendment and the Trade Marks Amendment, is to remove the jurisdiction for the trial of cases arising under them as they at present stand, from the Minister of Agriculture or his deputy, to the courts. The jurisdiction in the three Bills is made uniform. It is placed in the Exchequer Court concurrently with the ordinary courts having jurisdiction in such cases.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 18) to amend the Act respecting Trade Marks and Industrial Designs.—(Mr. Carling.)

Bill (No. 19) to amend the Copyright Act.—(Mr. Carling.)

REPORT.

Report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts, for the year ended 30th June, 1889.—(Mr. Foster.)

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DOYON. (Translation.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I again wish to draw the attention of the House to a matter personal to myself. On Friday last, I drew the attention of the House to an article which appeared in the *Empire*, stating that I had not yet taken my seat. With a strict regard to truth, I must say that I was here since the opening of the Session. This is what, according to the *Hansard*, I then said:—

“Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a fact which is personal to myself. The *Empire* of yesterday—”

That is to say, the *Empire* of the 23rd instant—“has published a paragraph couched in the following terms:

“**ABSENT MEMBERS.**—There are still a number of members of Parliament who have not yet reported at the House. Amongst them are the following:

“And among several names given, are to be found my own, and that of Mr. Ste. Marie, the member for Napierville. I do not wish to cast blame upon the journal which has published this piece of intelligence, because I think it has been misinformed; but I must indeed state in justice to my colleague of Napierville as well as to myself, that we were here both of us since the beginning of the session. I have no wish that this false intelligence should be bandied about by the press, inasmuch as it is of a nature to injure us in the minds of the electors; and if I so far could presume, I would ask this newspaper to make this correction.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the correction made by the *Empire* after having published this false intelligence:

“**MR. DOYON'S EXPLANATION.**—Mr. Doyon, M.P., rose to a question of privilege to-day. The *Empire* had stated yesterday that he had not arrived at Ottawa. This was a mistake, as he has been here from the beginning of the Session. He made this explanation, as otherwise his constituents would think he had been on a ‘bum.’ This explanation was made in French and evoked much laughter from the French members.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the House whether if there are newspaper representatives who conduct themselves like “bummers” in the streets of Ottawa, they should not be compelled to act as gentlemen in this House. I owe it to myself and to my constituents to make myself respected here. If those young persons do not know how to behave in the streets of Ottawa, and are accustomed to haunt the lowest drinking dives, and if they have not the decency to conduct themselves like gentlemen when they are in the deliberative assembly of the Dominion, I insist that the orders be put in force and that they be expelled. There is no need for corrections made in such spirit. There are many among those people, whom I might call “bummers,” did I but know their names.

BANKING AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. LAURIER. I wish to call the attention of the Government to the fact that the name of Mr. Edwards does not appear on the Committee on Banking and Commerce. I think it should go on.

Mr. BOWELL. I remember distinctly seeing the name written upon the list. I suppose it was left out by some inadvertence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I move that the name of Mr. Edwards be placed on the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 13) to amend the Act to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

POST OFFICE AT ST. EDMOND.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL asked, Whether the Government have received a petition from the inhabitants of St. Edmond, in the County of Berthier, Mr. DOYON.

asking for the erection of a post office in the said parish of St. Edmond? If they have received it, do the Government intend to grant the prayer of the petition, and when? If not, why not?

Mr. HAGGART. There is no trace of any such application in the department.

MONTREAL HARBOR POLICE.

Mr. CURRAN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to ask Parliament for a gratuity to the sergeants and members of the Government Harbor Police Force, lately disbanded at Montreal?

Mr. TUPPER. This question is now receiving the consideration of the Government.

WHARF AT STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE.

Mr. DESSAINT (Translation.) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to repair and bring to completion the wharf at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, in the County of Kamouraska, as prayed for in a petition from the Hon. Mr. Elisée Dionne and others, which petition was handed over to the Department of Public Works, more than a year ago, through the intervention of the member for Kamouraska?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This question has not yet been decided.

POST OFFICE AT PALMER ROAD CHAPEL.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether a post office has been established at or near the Palmer Road Chapel, Prince County, Prince Edward Island, as promised by the Postmaster General? If so, when; and who is postmaster?

Mr. HAGGART. There has been no post office opened at Palmer Road Chapel.

MR. RUFUS STEPHENSON.

Mr. BRIEN asked, Whether Rufus Stephenson, late Inspector of Colonisation Companies, has been in the employ of the Government since June 30th, 1889? If so, what were his duties, what his salary, and amount of money paid either as salary or expenses, since that time?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Rufus Stephenson has not been employed by the Government since June 30th, 1889.

CATTLE QUARANTINE STATIONS.

Mr. POPE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to establish a cattle quarantine station on the frontier at some inland port in the Province of Ontario or Quebec? If not, why not?

Mr. CARLING. It is not the intention to establish a cattle quarantine station on the frontier at any inland port, either in the Province of Ontario or Quebec. The reason “why not” is: that the Government find it impossible to do so, without imperiling the present advantageous position between the Dominion and United Kingdom, in virtue of which Canadian farmers can send their store and fat cattle to Great Britain without restriction. It may become necessary, in consequence of a recent intimation received from the Imperial Government, to suspend for a time all importations of cattle into Canada from countries in which the

disease of pleuro-pneumonia is known to exist, as a condition of continuing to enjoy exemption from being placed on the schedule list, which would imply immediate slaughter on the Foreign Animals' Wharf immediately on arrival.

POST OFFICE AT OYSTER PONDS.

Mr. KIRK moved for :

Copies of all petitions and correspondence with the Postmaster General or other officer of the Government relative to re-opening a post office at Oyster Ponds, in the County of Guysborough; and also, copy of a report or reports of the Post Office Inspector at Halifax thereon or in relation thereto.

He said : Oyster Ponds is the centre of a district ten miles in extent. A post office had been in existence for a number of years at that place, but five or six years ago, or perhaps longer, the office was closed and has remained closed ever since. More than a year ago I applied to the Postmaster General to have a postmaster appointed there and the office re-opened. I make the present motion to ascertain whether the hon. gentleman is going to carry out the request I made at that time.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman desires to know simply whether the post office has been re-opened or not. It was re-opened on the 23rd of last month, and Geo. G. Kerr was appointed postmaster.

Mr. KIRK. That will be news to the people in that district. Before leaving on the 14th inst. I saw a municipal councillor of the district, who lives near Mr. Kerr, of whom the hon. gentleman spoke, and he did not know there was a post office there. I am glad to know from the Postmaster General that a post office is to be open there and Mr. Kerr appointed.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. I said that the post office was ordered to be opened there on the 23rd inst. and that Mr. Kerr had been appointed postmaster.

Mr. KIRK. I withdraw the motion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. By reason of action taken last Session, postmasters in rural districts have had their salaries reduced. I have heard a good many complaints in regard to this matter. Hon. members are well aware that the salaries of country postmasters are not very great, and I understand that, under the operation of the Bill passed last Session, the salaries of postmasters in many small places have been reduced. At some places, I understand, the postmasters have refused to keep the offices on the terms proposed by the Department, and consequently some offices have been closed. If there is any class of officials that is not fairly used by the Government, it is that of country postmasters. Last year I complained in regard to the salaries they were receiving, and I stated that I had found the average salaries of postmasters in rural parts of my riding was \$11.50 a year. It is absurd to expect that a post office will be kept open every day when such a salary is paid, especially when, under the operation of the same Bill, the Government took power to give larger salaries to some postmasters in cities who already have large salaries, and at the same time took away from the country postmasters the salaries they formerly enjoyed. This is a considerable hardship. I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the

matter, so that in future he will deal fairly, at all events, with country postmasters, many of whom keep post offices more in the interest of the district than in their own interests.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. There was no Act passed last Session with respect to this matter. The mode of calculating the pay has remained the same for a number of years, and it is upon that principle country postmasters are still paid.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The fact which I have spoken of is borne out by matters which are within my own knowledge, and which have come under my own observation. Some officers have had their very small salaries reduced, and, I am told, that if they operated under the Act as formerly existing, this would not have occurred. This may be, however, in keeping with the general policy of the Government, which is reducing the business of the country all over the Dominion.

Motion withdrawn.

POST OFFICE AT LITTLE DOVER.

Mr. KIRK moved for :

Copy of all petitions and correspondence with the Postmaster General, or other officer of the Government, relative to establishing a post office at Little Dover, in the County of Guysborough, and mail communication to connect it with Cape Canso, and also a copy of the report of the Inspector at Halifax thereon.

He said : Little Dover is a fishing village situated about five miles, or, perhaps, a little more, from the town of Cape Canso, and, up to the present time, the inhabitants of that village have had no post office nor any postal communication whatever. About twelve months ago I applied to the Postmaster General to establish a post office in connection with the office at Cape Canso, but no post office has as yet been established there. There are about thirty-seven families at this village, and they have to journey to Cape Canso to get their mail matter. A post office established there would not only serve the thirty-seven families who are resident there, but it would also be a great convenience to those who come from other sections of the country to fish in Little Dover during the summer season. I, therefore, wish to enquire from the Postmaster General, through this motion, whether he intends to establish this post office for the convenience of the residents of this place as well as for the convenience of the summer visitors?

Mr. HAGGART. I ordered an enquiry to be made into the establishment of a post office at Little Dover or Dover Bay, and I found that the revenue from a post office established there would be likely \$15 and the cost of service \$20. As the receipts so nearly balanced the expenditure, I ordered the post office to be established there.

Mr. KIRK. After the satisfactory answer given by the Postmaster General, there is no necessity for passing the motion, and I beg to withdraw it.

Motion withdrawn.

POST OFFICE AT CORINTH.

Mr. LANDERKIN. While on this subject, I might bring another matter to the attention of the Postmaster General. Some two or three years ago, when the present Minister of Agriculture was

Postmaster General, he wrote a letter informing the people of the Township of Bentinck, at a place called Corinth, that a post office would be opened there. Up to this time the pledge of the hon. Minister has not been redeemed, and the office has not been opened, although the people are still anxious to have the office established. I brought the matter to the attention of the present Postmaster General last Session, not only in the House, but I also spoke to him outside the House, and I was informed by him that he would give this matter his attention, and I supposed he would carry out the pledge of the former Postmaster General. I draw his attention again to the fact that the office has not yet been opened, as I wish the responsibility of failing to carry out the pledge given the people should rest upon the shoulders of the Government, for I do not wish to be blamed if the ministerial pledges are not kept.

THE JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

Mr. O'BRIEN moved :

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to lay before the House, copies of the reports or opinions of the Law Officers of the Crown relating to the Act passed by the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, intitled: "An Act for the settlement of the Jesuits' Estates," and also copies of the case or cases or other documents or reports submitted to the said Law Officers, or to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, in relation to the said Act, and upon which the said opinions were obtained, and also all the despatches and correspondence in reference thereto.

He said : This motion, Mr. Speaker, is intended to obtain from the Government some information with reference to the terms, or the conditions and circumstances, under which the opinions of the law officers of the Crown, with reference to the constitutionality of the Jesuits' Estates Bill, were obtained. It is obvious that the value of that opinion must largely depend upon the conditions on which the case was presented; upon any correspondence which accompanied the Bill, and upon all the attendant circumstances. This is especially necessary, because the opinions themselves are so worded that they may be confined within the most technical and narrow sense, or else they may embrace the widest and most general sense. That can only be decided when we know the conditions under which these opinions were obtained. I want to know whether any case was presented by the hon. Minister of Justice or by anyone on behalf of the Government, and whether the Bill itself was sent or what documents accompanied it. I think it is but justice to the Government, who presented this as so conclusive and so authoritative an opinion that no appeal could possibly prevail with regard to it, and I think it is also in justice to those who were called on to accept that opinion, that we should have this information. I have only further to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think it rather unfortunate that when the Government found it necessary to fortify themselves with this opinion, after their very positive declaration of their own confidence in the course they had taken, that they did not do what a great many of their supporters wished them to do, and submit the case to some legal tribunal where it could fairly and manfully be fought out, and where both sides of the case could be presented. Had that been done, a great deal of ill-feeling and irritation would possibly have

Mr. LANDERKIN.

been prevented, and public opinion, instead of being intensified and aggravated, would be satisfied and calmed. However, the Government did not choose to take this course, and I think we have therefore the right to ask for the information which is called for in the resolution which I have read.

Motion agreed to.

LOYALTY TO HER MAJESTY.

On the Order :

Address to Her Majesty, declaring the desire of the Commons of Canada, in their own name and in behalf of the people whom they represent, to renew the expression of their unswerving loyalty and devotion to Her Majesty's person and Government; &c.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend to let that stand over until I have an opportunity of conversation with him.

Motion allowed to stand.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER.

Mr. PERRY moved for :

Statement, in detail, showing the expenditure made in connection with repairs to Tignish breakwater, Prince Edward Island, during 1889; the date of commencement of work, and when completed; the name of party in charge of work.

He said : I desire to say a few words in explanation of the reason why I make this motion. It will be remembered that, last year, I informed the Minister of Public Works that a great deal of money spent on the Tignish and other breakwaters in Prince County found its way into the pockets of private individuals instead of being expended on the works themselves. I informed him that a gentleman was acting there on behalf of the Government, buying material and trying to go on with the work at the wrong season of the year. The Minister's answer to me was that he knew nothing at all about it; yet it was impossible for me to believe that that gentleman could be going on with the work without having direct instructions from the head of the department. On returning home I found that he was still in charge. The expenditure there may have been in the vicinity of \$1,000; I believe this gentleman kept the work going for over three months, so that, at the rate of \$3 a day, he would have drawn about one-third of all the money expended; and all this was done in order that the boys of two or three friends about the place should receive employment, to the exclusion of other men who were able to earn their wages. The whole of that work should have been done in a month or six weeks, but it was delayed in order that this partisan friend should get \$300 or \$400 of the money, whereas less than \$100 would have been quite sufficient for the superintendence of the work. I wish also to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that at least half-a-dozen gentlemen who carried on the work there turned the tower of the Tignish lighthouse into a cooking house. I say it is wrong that the public lighthouses of this country, which are for the protection of the lives of mariners and fishermen, should be used in this way. I trust that the Minister of Public Works knows a great deal more of what has been done during the season of 1889 in connection with the breakwater at Tignish than he did last year. Last year he said he knew nothing at all about it. He did not know that Mr. Thomas Bernard was

appointed inspector of the work. He said that in due time a clerk of the Government would be appointed to take charge of the work, while at the same time Mr. Bernard was in charge. I asked my question on the 10th of April, and on the 12th the Minister made these remarks; and I am aware that the work had commenced late in March or early in April. I trust that these papers will be brought down in good time, in order that the House may be put in possession of all the facts.

Motion agreed to.

KAMOURASKA WHARF.

Mr. DESSAINT (Translation) moved for :

Copies of the accounts connected with the building of a wharf at Kamouraska, in the Province of Quebec, made up during the course of the year 1889.

He said : Before placing this motion in your hands, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make some remarks in its support. It is not a declaration of war which I am going to make on the Government, and I am sure that they will take in good part the few words I am going to utter. In 1886, I think, the Dominion Government, at the request of Mr. Blondeau, gave orders for the building of a wharf at Kamouraska. In ordering the construction of this wharf the Government naturally thought that it was necessary, indispensable in fact; and I must state that when my predecessor made this request, he did it not only in the interests of his county, but in the interests of the country in general. Therefore, so far from blaming the Government for having taken action in this matter, I think that they rather deserve to be congratulated thereon. In the autumn of 1886, the Government caused certain works to be constructed, but unfortunately at a too advanced time of the season, for the works were not able to be finished and the ice demolished them in part during the course of the winter. The consequence was that from 1886 to 1889 we remained without any wharf. They were obliged to break up the new wharf and pile the wood on the old one. In this way for three years we were in a worse position than before. The old wharf was encumbered by pieces of timber belonging to the remains of the wharf begun by the Government; and the stone which was used to fill up this wharf remained on the site, so that at the end of the Taché wharf was found an immense mole of stone from eight to ten feet in height and more than one hundred feet in length. This obstacle made the mooring to the wharf almost impossible; and placed the harbor in a most dangerous condition for navigation. In fact several vessels in the autumn storms chanced to be thrown upon this mole of rock and suffered damage to a greater or less extent. In the month of November, 1888, I think, three sailors were shipwrecked there and nearly lost their lives. Captain Belanger, his brother and a sailor almost lost their lives on that spot. In going ashore from their schooner with their boat alongside—it was during a dark night—their boat capsized on this reef and they were barely able to gain the shore by swimming, driven onwards by the surf which pushed them to the strand. Unfortunately for the Government, they were three of their political friends who thus narrowly escaped with their lives, owing to the negligence and want of foresight of the Government, but happily for them Providence saved

them. I thought it my duty as member for Kamouraska to bring these facts to the knowledge of the Minister of Public Works. I must say to his credit that after the facts had been made clear to him, the hon. Minister took them into consideration, and did what was right, as it was his duty to do. I am not addressing myself to him in order to curry favor. I have no right to it, because I am not a supporter of the Government; but I speak in the interests of the public. Last year, the hon. Minister ordered the building of the works anew; a portion of the works as planned was carried out; and I must say that this time they have been constructed in a practical manner, and the work done is in accordance with the requirements of the situation. But this is not all,—only a beginning of the wharf has been made. The wharf as determined upon was to be two hundred feet in length, and to end in the form of a "T". Well, the portion now completed may be about one hundred feet in length; and the wharf as planned was to have at least two hundred feet. I have no doubt that, having regard to circumstances and the needs of navigation in this quarter, the hon. the Minister of Public Works will take again this question into his serious consideration, and will complete the works as contemplated according to the plans furnished by the department. I have the greater excuse for making the request I have done, inasmuch as the design of the Government was to build the works in the manner I have just indicated. When the Government thought it good to order the construction of these works, it was because there was need of them, for there is truly a considerable trade carried on at Kamouraska. Navigation opens early with us; and several days before it is open at Quebec, we have twelve or fifteen schooners in our port. The county of Kamouraska is essentially an agricultural one, which produces in abundance hay, oats and other grain which are exchanged with the people of the county of Charlevoix for cord wood, the principal article of commerce of the latter. At all times there has been quite a trade carried on between the north shore and the south shore, and I would venture to say that the harbor of Kamouraska is not only a harbor of refuge for the inland navigation, but that it is perhaps the most important harbor as regard local traffic on the lower part of the river, with the exception of that of Fraserville. Such being the facts, I say that the Government are right in continuing the work begun; and I will add that they should carry on these constructions by contract and not by day work, as has been done in the past. I am persuaded, and I think the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who has had more experience than I have in such matters, will admit that if these works were done by contract the Government would save nearly 50 per cent. I think, seeing how the case stands, the Government would encourage inland navigation by the completion of these works. We should not only protect ocean trade; we ought also to encourage inland navigation, and protect the poor sailors who are engaged in so laborious an occupation, and earn their livelihood at the price of so much wretchedness and sacrifice. I am persuaded that if the Government would give themselves the trouble to send to these parts an engineer who would ascertain the needs of the locality, instead of relying on a person who makes

out the plans in his office, I am persuaded, I repeat, that the hon. Minister would order not only the lengthening of the wharf he has commenced, but that he would also cause to be made a pier at Ile Brulée, which lies opposite to Kamouraska; which would allow the Saguenay Company's steamboats to run a regular line between Kamouraska, Malbaie and Quebec. I am persuaded that all the facts which I have brought out will be substantiated by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Cimon), who is conversant with the considerable trade carried on between the county of Charlevoix, which he represents, and the county of Kamouraska. I venture to hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government will take this matter into its serious consideration, and that they will complete the works of which I have just spoken.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In reply to the hon. member, I must say, in the first place, that there is no objection to the granting of his motion. No one can find fault with either the shape or the manner in which the hon. member has made his motion in this House. As to the contracts, of which he spoke, as a general rule it is better to ask for tenders and to allot the contracts according to the tenders; but there are circumstances where it is not preferable, or, I might say, where it is not possible to ask for tenders. For example, when the case in point is a portion of work which is badly built, or is old; or, again, when the matter is the raising of work which has fallen, it is always difficult to furnish specifications sufficiently accurate for a contractor to make a tender and not lose money by it; or, again, he will ask for too large a sum of money. In cases such as these the Department of Public Works prefers to give out its work by day-work. As to an extension, of which the hon. member speaks, if the Government decide to carry out this piece of work, I am persuaded that it will be better to have it done by contract than by day-work.

Motion agreed to.

AMERICAN FREIGHT IN BOND.

Mr. LAURIER moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council or Departmental Orders prohibiting American vessels from carrying bonded freight from American ports to Victoria, B. C., or any other Canadian port, and copies of all Orders in Council or departmental orders revoking the same.

Mr. BOWELL. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, if he desires to obtain all the information—as I have no doubt he does—that he should add: “and the correspondence connected therewith.” I think the correspondence should accompany the departmental orders issued, though I may say that it would be impossible for me at present to bring down all that correspondence. I have received important letters in connection with the matter this morning, but I will bring down all the correspondence we have, and, subsequently, we will be glad to lay the balance of the correspondence before the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand my hon. friend to move an amendment?

Mr. BOWELL. I ask the hon. gentleman to add those words, and at the same time I inform him that I will not be able to bring down all the correspondence at present.

Mr. DESSAINT.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the matter under consideration?

Mr. BOWELL. No; but the correspondence is still going on.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

HALF-BREED CLAIMS.

Mr. LAURIER moved for :

Copies of all Resolutions of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories respecting the settlement of the Half-breed claims.

He said: I understand that the North-West Assembly have made some important representations to the Government as to the claims of the Half-breeds. I have only seen the statement in the newspapers, and am not in a position to speak in regard to those claims, but I would like to have the information as soon as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They shall be brought down at once.

Motion agreed to.

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LAURIER moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada, or any of the Departments, and the Messrs. Anderson, or any other parties, respecting the Atlantic mail service.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must ask my hon. friend to allow this motion to stand over for the present. The correspondence is very full, and the contract provides for a certain time within which the company may ask that the contract should be cancelled. The contract was cancelled at the request of the company, and the Government are now proceeding in their endeavors to obtain another fast line on the Atlantic. It would not do to bring down correspondence with the Andersons at present, because it would be giving other parties information which it is not in the interest of the Government to do.

Motion allowed to stand.

BANK OF UPPER CANADA.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for :

Return showing the lands sold and prices realised for the same, as well as all sums of money realised from other sources by Clark Gamble, acting for the Crown, in the case of the Bank of Upper Canada; also all payments made by him in connection with said bank, and to whom made.

He said: I desire to state that I do not reflect upon the standing and honor of the parties who were connected with the winding-up of the Bank of Upper Canada, but I have been requested by a party who is, I believe, in some way interested in the matter, to ask for this return. I do not wish to be understood as making any insinuations against anyone.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN COMMISSIONERS ABROAD.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for :

Return giving the names of each Commissioner or other Agent appointed by the Canadian Government since Confederation to the 30th June, 1889, on missions to foreign countries; the salary paid per month or year; the total amount paid for salary, travelling expenses, living allowance, and all other expenses of any kind, during their term of office up to the 30th June, 1889.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Although the hon. gentleman could, if he exercised his usual zeal and energy, and diligence, get this information for himself, yet, as these officers are exceptional officers, I have no objection to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF MINISTERS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for :

Return showing the names of each Minister of the Crown from Confederation to 30th June, 1889. The amount of money drawn by each during each year of their term of office, under the following heads: Salary, sessional allowance, travelling expenses, and all other sums drawn or paid under any other head, during their term of office until 30th June, 1889. The total amount paid to each up to the same date.

He said : In moving this resolution again, which is virtually a copy of the one I brought before the House a few days ago, and which was withdrawn at the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, I do so in order to be in a position to lay before my constituents and before the country a statement of the expenses which have been incurred under the head of Government and by members of the Government. When this resolution was brought before the House on a previous occasion, the First Minister took objection to it on the ground that it would cost a great deal to comply with its terms. I would willingly cut down the time to the last ten years, from the 30th June, 1879, to the 30th June, 1889, but my reason for including the whole of this time is that hon. gentlemen opposite might object to a return which would simply include the period during which they themselves were in power, leaving out the time when hon. gentlemen on this side were in power. I repeat to-day what I said then : That the people of this country are of opinion that the expenses connected with the several departments and the heads of those departments, and the expenses incurred in connection with the discharge of the official duties of Ministers of the Crown, are far in excess of the power and ability of the people of this country to support. If we are going to cut down the public expenses—and I am sure there never was a time more opportune than the present, as everyone who knows the condition of this country will agree with me in saying—it is our duty to begin at home and to begin with the heads of those departments. After adjusting the expenses which are excessive in that regard, we may go on and deal with other matters, and see if we cannot bring the annual expenses within such an amount as the people who have to pay the taxes can bear. That is my object in making this motion. When I brought this matter before the House on a previous day, the Minister of Customs threw out the hint that I could gather the information out of the blue books. I do not believe that members of Parliament are supposed to make book-worms of themselves. The Minister himself, when he sits in his easy chair in his office, does not supply himself with the information he needs from the documents in his Department, but he simply touches a bell which is very close to his chair, and calls on his subordinates, who come dancing around him and give him all the information that he requires. I would like to know if a man who receives a salary of \$7,000 a year, and a sessional allowance, and a considerable number of perqui-

sites in addition to that, is not better entitled to perform the duties of searching through all the documents and Public Accounts than an humble member of this House who only gets a sessional allowance. Now, I say that it is unfair for the hon. gentleman to cast up that insinuation. In the first place there are a number of Orders that passed this House for returns that could be very easily picked up if the people were only willing to search the blue books. If there is one duty at all devolving more especially upon the Opposition than another, it is that they should closely and carefully criticise the public expenditure in connection with the several departments here, and in conjunction with the general service of this country. That is one of the important duties devolving upon the Opposition ; and I want it understood that, so far as I am concerned, I shall ever endeavor to perform that duty. Now, there has been a considerable amount of criticism with regard to my bringing this motion before the House, and I notice that some journals have taken a great deal of notice of it, and challenged the propriety of my doing so. I wish it to be distinctly understood, Mr. Speaker, that I care not what criticisms are made, I care not what sarcastic or scurrilous remarks may be made ; when a duty of this kind devolves upon me I shall do it, regardless of all those criticisms and insinuations, whether made by a subsidised journal of the Government or any other journal. I want that to be distinctly understood, in the start. If they fancy that they can close my mouth by these sarcastic criticisms, they are very much mistaken. Now, Sir, I have given the reasons why I moved this resolution. As I said before, if the First Minister, or any Minister, thinks it is going to be a costly return to prepare, that it is going to take a long time to get it, and if he is prepared to cut the time to ten years in place of twenty-one, I shall accept the amendment to my resolution and be content with ten years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say that I greatly sympathise with my hon. friend for these very improper attacks made upon him in the newspapers. It is the penalty, however, that all men in public life pay for greatness—for being active in assisting to carry on the Government. I am rather surprised, however, to see that these unworthy attacks on my hon. friend have not been confined to the Conservative press. There are some papers called Reform papers, so utterly devoid of a proper sense of their duty as to sneer in the most sarcastic way—if they were directed against myself, I would say, in the most offensive style—at the action of my hon. friend. For my part, I fully understand the course taken by the hon. gentleman, and I quite appreciate the patriotic motives that induced him to make this motion. He wants to understand exactly what the cost of the Government is, what it has cost to conduct the administration of affairs ; but he has not taken advantage of what has been suggested to him when this matter was before the House the first time, and he has not included, in his very patriotic and proper enquiries, the cost of the whole administration of public affairs : the cost of legislation—the cost of running the whole machine. He has confined himself to the salaries and perquisites, as he calls them, of the members of the Government, and, while that is a very small portion of

the expense, he has not obtained what he wants to obtain—that is to say, what the whole cost of administration is, with a view of cutting expenses down. Now, I think he ought to have gone on a little further. In the first place, he ought to have told us whether these salaries of Ministers are too large; I think he ought to have gone on still further, and told us if he thinks the allowance made to the members of the two Houses of Parliament is excessive. He says the whole cost is excessive, but he does not descend to particulars, and he does not in any way show how a reform can be obtained. One thing rises in my mind, in considering the speech of my hon. friend, and it is this: The hon. gentleman has abandoned the idea of being a member of a Reform Government, because if he had the most remote expectation of coming over to this side—a position which his abilities entitle him to claim—if he had the most remote idea of that ever coming to pass, I do not think he would have stated that the salaries of the Ministers were too large. I might almost think that he intends to abandon public life, otherwise he would not be so stern an economist, and he would not have attacked the amount of salaries received by the members of the Government—not a farthing too large, in my opinion:—but then we are an extravagant Government, you know, Mr. Speaker. We support the salaries and the allowances made to members of this House. We have no intention in the world of diminishing our own salaries, or of proposing to diminish the salaries of our successors. But for all that, Mr. Speaker, supposing the hon. gentleman is right in his ideas that great reform is required, that is not the motion. He does not move for any reform. He does not make any economical proposition, but he merely wants to get a return, at considerable expense, which he can, with very little trouble, procure for himself. Now, that was proposed the last time the hon. gentleman moved it, and there seemed to be a general consent to that proposition on both sides of the Chair. I shall oppose his motion as one which is not called for. It is throwing away money for nothing, and it is opposed to the general economical principles of my hon. friend himself.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend behind me is certainly discharging an unpleasant duty when he is attempting to look into questions of the expenditure of members of the Government. My hon. friend opposite makes the admission that this is an extravagant Government. That is well known throughout the country, but I am afraid the hon. gentleman does not want the whole of their extravagance to be put in such a shape that every elector can see it. It is objected by my hon. friend behind me that we should not have to go over the twenty-one or twenty-two Public Accounts published since Confederation, and he wishes for a statement showing the whole extravagance, by way of contrast, of the members of this Government as compared with the extravagance of their predecessors. This is the object which my hon. friend has in view. Of course, any hon. gentleman can go over the votes of the House for the last twenty years and pick out for his own information that which might be brought down in the form now desired. I do not see why the motion should not be granted; it is a legitimate motion, and nothing could be more plain than that the people should have the fullest information as to the cost of Government. The right hon. gentleman says he has no intention to reduce the salaries of Ministers. That is not the question. The country knows exactly what Ministers receive every year in the way of salary, but the country does not know what they receive every year by way of perquisites. This is what my hon. friend has in view. I understand the perquisites are almost as large as the salaries, and this of itself should be a good reason why the motion should be granted.

Motion negatived on a division.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all Resolutions of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories respecting the application of moneys voted by this House for the use of the said Territories.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Copies of Orders in Council, despatches, correspondence and documents relating to the resignation of the Advisory Council of the North-West Territories and the appointment of their successors.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 28th January, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 20) respecting the Goderich Pacific Junction Railway Company, and to change the name to the Goderich and Wingham Railway Company.—(Mr. Porter.)

Bill (No. 21) to incorporate the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Hudspeth.)

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Corby.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Belding-Paul Company (Limited).—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 24) respecting the St. Stephen's Bank.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 25) respecting the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company (Limited).—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 26) relating to the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

BILLS OF EXCHANGE, CHEQUES AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 6) relating to bills of exchange, cheques and promissory notes. He said: The House will remember that this Bill was introduced early last

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Session, and that considerable progress was made with it. Before its introduction, even then, it had been fully distributed throughout the country, among institutions immediately connected with commerce; not only to the banks, but to chambers of commerce and boards of trade, and to any person who manifested interest in the subject. That distribution resulted in a number of suggestions, more or less valuable, emanating from banking institutions and persons connected with trade and commerce. Those amendments and suggestions were eventually incorporated in the Bill brought before the House when the House was in committee; but, at a subsequent stage, it was considered desirable, in view of the great importance of the subject, and the necessity of having a fuller consideration of it by members of the House, to withdraw the Bill for that Session and introduce it early in the present Session. That has been done. In order to furnish further information the Bill was distributed once more to upwards of 100 organisations and persons throughout the country. The result of the second distribution was not to elicit further suggestions of any importance; and I have, therefore, to invite the attention of the House again to the Bill and to ask that it be now read the second time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Minister of Justice state briefly the particular changes made in the Bill now under the consideration of the House, from the Bill of last year, especially changes in regard to notarial action?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bill is now in precisely the state in which it was, with a few verbal exceptions, at the time it was withdrawn last Session. The hon. gentleman may recollect that, after the second reading of the Bill and before progress was made in Committee, the amendments which I intended to make were embodied, in galley form, in a Bill then distributed, not universally throughout the House, but pretty generally. This is the Bill as then printed. I omitted to state that the Bill has been distributed in advance of this Session to members of both Houses.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may say by way of explanation that the second clause of the Bill contains the definitions embodied in the English statute on the subject of bills of exchange, with the exception, of course, of letter "c." The English Act defines that a banker is a person or body carrying on banking, whether incorporated or not. Inasmuch as our banking institutions in this country are corporations, the definition has been made to correspond with our system in Canada; otherwise the section is the same as the English law.

On section 8, sub-section 4,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The words "or order" would not be necessary to make it transferable. This is the effect of this section, is it not?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not know whether the rule is uniform in all the Provinces or not, but where there has been an endorsement by a party in whose hands the bill has not been, as where the

endorsement is intended as additional security, would that endorsement be accepted? There are some advantages to endorsements of that sort by a person in whose hands the bill never has been as a holder. There have been some American decisions that an endorsement by a party in whose hands a note has never been as holder is only a guarantee of the note, and the party cannot be proceeded against until an attempt has been made to collect the amount from those who would otherwise be liable. Of course, the English rule is different. I do not know whether it is uniform in all the Provinces or not, or whether it is the intention to make it so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think there have been conflicting decisions in some Provinces on that subject.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. Minister intend by this Bill to establish any rule?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not by this section. That is done hereafter.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). What is the meaning of sub-section 5?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is to make a bill negotiable, unless it is declared that it shall not be negotiable. Some bills, instead of being made payable to A. B. or his order, are made payable simply to the order of A. B., and this is to declare that such a bill is, nevertheless, payable to him or his order, at his option.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). Is it necessary to declare that? Is that not already the law?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the law now, but it is a point that has had to be settled. We are embodying a good deal of the common law in the Bill.

On section 9,

Mr. LANDERKIN. What rate of interest is meant in sub-section 3?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Any rate which the bill may bear; and if it bears no interest, the rate is provided for by the interest law of the country. The object is to meet this difficulty in the common law: that, in order to be valid, a bill or note must be for a certain sum; this section provides that it shall be considered to be for a certain sum, even if it specifies a certain sum of money with interest or by instalment.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the rate of interest?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The legal rate is at present 6 per cent., but may be varied from time to time by Parliament.

On section 10,

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). This is a clause which I think elicited some discussion last Session. The present custom is that a bill payable at sight has three days' grace, but it is proposed by this section, as I understand, to make such a bill payable on demand, the same as a demand draft or bill. I would ask the hon. Minister of Justice to consider the advisability of continuing the practice which at present prevails in regard to sight bills.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the discussion which took place, of which I have some recollection, referred to bills payable at sight, and it was

not intended by the Bill as introduced last Session that days of grace should be allowed on sight drafts; but if the hon. gentleman looks at section 14, he will find that it provides that days of grace will be allowed on a bill unless it is payable on demand.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think that would not affect this clause, which provides that a bill which is expressed to be payable on demand or at sight is payable on demand. What I wish is that there should be a distinction between the expressions "on demand" and "at sight."

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not agree with the hon. member for Renfrew. There has always been a difficulty with drafts payable at sight, and it seems to me it would be better to make such drafts the same as demand drafts, without any days of grace.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). In the discussion which took place last Session, I think this distinction was made. Bank drafts are usually made payable on demand, when it is intended that they are to be collected on presentation; but, as was stated here during last Session frequently, when a draft is drawn payable at sight, the person on whom it is drawn really owes the money, but is not able to meet it at the moment, he has the three days' grace after his acceptance. That is the present custom, and it seems to me that is a considerable convenience to the mercantile community. If it has not at present the effect of law, it has the effect of custom, and I think it would not be well to make a change in that respect. I hope the Minister of Justice will give his attention to this matter, so that he may provide that, instead of a bill payable on sight being payable on demand, it should be payable only after three days' delay.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This provision is simply following the English law, by which a bill payable on sight is payable on presentation. As far as circumstances will allow, it would be well to follow the same rule as the mother country.

Mr. BARRON. The custom has been to allow three days' grace on a sight draft, and I think it would be dangerous to interfere with that established custom.

Mr. CHARLTON. The commercial practice in this country has been to allow three days' grace on a sight draft, and I think it would be generally acceptable to the creditor as well as to the debtor if that were continued, because, if those three days are allowed, a far less number of bills would be dishonored than if the sight draft meant payment on presentation.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I feel the same in regard to this matter, and I think the Minister should yield. If the bill is to be paid on demand it should be so drawn, but I think it would be very unfortunate to make a sight draft a demand draft.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The draft in that case should be made one day or three days after sight. I think, in the majority of instances, sight bills are paid on presentation.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not agree with the last speaker. We have a system which is well understood by the farmers and the business men, and, in fact, by all the people of this country, which is

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

that a sight draft has three days' grace. Why should we change that system and introduce a new one? I am sure the Minister of Justice, who is always so anxious to meet the views of commercial men in this country, will see the advisability of making this change in his Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understood that to be the wish of the House last Session, and I meant the Bill to be so drawn. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) has called my attention to the fact that a slight amendment will be necessary in section 10, and I will, therefore, allow that to stand for the present.

On section 12,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is that the present law?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The present law is very obscure, and this is intended to remove the doubt in the same way as it has been done in the English law.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Do I understand that the parties would have to show the true date?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That may lead to a difficulty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is simply a choice of the lesser difficulty. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has not given full consideration to the latter part of the proviso in this section.

On section 14,

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do you propose to recognize civic holidays in cities and towns?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; only those prescribed by this Parliament and by the Legislature of the Province.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Because on civic holidays banks and such institutions are closed up.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Is the provision respecting the date on which a bill will fall due the same as the law as it now stands? For example: Would a bill dated 31st January, payable one month after date, fall due on 28th February, under the law?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, under our present Canadian enactment.

Mr. WHITE. Is it proposed to make any alteration in the law in that respect?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

On section 15,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Under the law of the Province of Quebec, and also under the law of the Continent of Europe, it is obligatory, not optional, with the holder of a bill to send to the referee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is so. In making a uniform enactment on this subject, the question is simply whether we shall adopt the law of the Province of Quebec or that which prevails in all the other Provinces. The hon. gentleman is quite right in stating that, on the Continent of Europe, the reference in case of need makes presentation obligatory. It was an unsettled point in England down to the passing of the English statute, but it has been definitely settled by enactment that it should not be obligatory.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I simply wished to enquire whether this was the English law. I agree that it is desirable to have an uniform practice with the English law, because our business relations are much more extensive with England and the United States than with the Continent of Europe.

Mr. BARRON. The English law provides for the insertion of the names of one or more persons in case of need. Does the Minister intend to confine it to one person?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The provision is the same as the English statute.

On section 16,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Under our Code it is provided that on a bill of exchange drawn in the Province of Quebec it can be stated that there shall be no protest, or, if a protest, that the costs shall not be borne by the drawer of the bill. Not only may the drawer do so, but also any endorser. This has been found a very useful provision, because it saves very large costs. Especially was this the case when the system was in force some years ago in Quebec of charging 10 per cent. damages on a bill of exchange drawn on England, and 6 per cent. on any bill of exchange drawn on the United States, if returned under protest for non-payment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The practice to which the hon. gentleman refers has been acted on in other Provinces as well. We have a provision of that kind in the bill, and the only modification is one that has grown up by usage: the adoption of the short form of the words "without protest."

On section 17,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I desire to enquire as to how this provision will affect letters of credit?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that this Bill will not affect that subject. A letter of credit can hardly be considered an acceptance of bills. It is simply a contract, as I understand it, on the part of the writer of the letter, that the bills will be accepted. It seems to me that the remedies will stand in precisely the same position under this Bill as they would at common law. I may call the attention of the Committee to the fact that subsection "c" has been inserted, as recommended by the representatives of the banking section of the Toronto Board of Trade.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I understand that a letter agreeing to accept a bill which is not yet drawn has been held good as an acceptance.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand such letter as an agreement to accept simply, and it is hardly an acceptance of the bill.

Mr. BARRON. I believe the practice is that banks frequently accept those letters of credit in the form of an acceptance.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think that would be in any way effected by the bill.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the present mercantile law amendment the party who draws the bill would have a right of action under the bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will give that matter careful consideration, and, in the meantime, we need not allow the clause to stand.

On section 19,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That section would not bind the holder to take a qualified acceptance?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. I may call the attention of the Committee to one alteration that was made in this section, in accordance with the view that was generally expressed by the House last Session. The House may remember, when the Bill was under discussion last year, it contained a provision that an acceptance to pay at a particular place is a general acceptance, unless it expresses that the bill is to be paid there only and not elsewhere. That is, in fact, the provision of our present statute as regards the Province of Ontario. I think the feelings of the members from the Province of Ontario was, that it was undesirable to continue that principle, and that it should not be extended to the other Provinces. For that reason the clause was changed; and, for the present, I have omitted that provision.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). The bill must be held to mean what it says. What is the use of saying that a bill is payable at a particular place if it is to be paid at some other place? I do not think it is common sense; and if it is the law of Ontario, I do not think it is desirable to give bad law to the other Provinces.

On section 22,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would suggest whether corporations should not be given power to draw or accept bills of exchange and promissory notes. The law of England is indefinite as to whether they have that power or not. I remember that, a short time ago, an action was brought against an educational society, which was erecting a building, and which gave a promissory note in the course of business; and I felt very great doubt as to whether that note was valid or not. It would be a great benefit to these corporations if they had that power, which, it seems to me, could not be easily abused.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subject is provided for, as regards companies incorporated by letters patent, under the Joint Stock Companies' Act, and it seems to me that the effect of this provision will be to enable a corporation to make a promissory note if the capacity to do so has been conferred upon it by its charter. At present the practice pursued by the Provincial Legislatures in granting charters, is to make provision that the companies shall have power to make promissory notes and bills of exchange. We have heretofore objected to Provincial Legislatures undertaking to confer that power, as being a power within our jurisdiction. This provision will have the effect of removing that doubt from provincial charters which purport to confer that power, so that if the charter of any corporation, no matter by what Legislature granted, confers upon it that power, it will have the right to exercise it under this Act. Whether we should go further and declare that any company should have the power, whether its charter gives it the power or not, seems to me rather doubtful.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The language of the section, as it stands, is too indefinite to accomplish what the hon. Minister states to be his object. It refers simply to a general Act relating to incorporated companies, but would not refer to the powers given by a special Act of incorporation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to meet the difficulty by inserting the word "such" before the word "corporation."

On section 24,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). What would be the effect of this clause, supposing the name of the drawer of a promissory note was forged, and the note after endorsement passed into the hands of other parties? Would the fact of the forgery of the drawer's name make the note a complete nullity, or would not the endorser be liable?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This does not alter the present law. It simply carries out the provision of the common law in the case of the signature being forged.

On section 26,

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me there is some inconsistency in this clause. The first part provides that, where a person adds words to his signature indicating that he signs for or on behalf of a principal, or in a representative character, he is not personally liable thereon. But then it says that the mere addition to his signature of words describing him as an agent, or as filling a representative character, does not exempt him from personal liability. It seems to me there is some inconsistency in that.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That is the present law.

Mr. MITCHELL. It may be the present law, but I understand this measure is intended to improve the present law and to remove its incongruities. I would suggest to the Minister that he should reserve that section, with a view to consider and amend this provision.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As the member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has stated, this is simply the present law; but perhaps the hon. member (Mr. Mitchell) has misunderstood the clause, the purport of which is to provide that, where John Smith signs a note in the name of, say, the Ottawa Manufacturing Co., he is not personally liable, but if he signs the note "John Smith" and adds, "Agent of the Ottawa Manufacturing Company," as in that case he is simply adding his own description, he is personally liable.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then, I understand that if in the one case he signs the name of the principal, with himself as agent, he is not personally responsible; and if, in the other case, he signs his own name as the agent, he is responsible. I think that is rather inconsistent, and it would be well for the Minister to reserve that clause.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The English law provides just the same thing. It would be well to have this clearly defined in order to prevent any doubt arising, and I think the adoption of the English rule will remove any doubt.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have often objected to one thing in this House, and that is, the endeavor on all occasions to follow English practice and English precedent, and to adopt the wording of English laws. My hon. friend states that this is the practice in England, and that where a man signs as agent there is a very great deal of doubt existing as to his liability. I say this section continues and retains that doubt. In my opinion it

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

ought to be immaterial whether a man signs his name in a representative capacity, as agent for a principal, or whether he signs the principal's name and signs his own as agent of that principal. My hon. friend says people in the country know this distinction, because it is the law. How many people who are doing business with manufacturers' agents, and the agents of various merchants and others, know about that clause of the law? They may think, when they sign as agents of a manufacturing company, they are simply creating a liability on the part of the company. My hon. friend and the Minister both admit, and the Act itself states, that if the agent signs as the agent of a manufacturing company, he is personally liable, in addition to the liability of the company. Now, I think that ought to be removed, and wherever a man puts upon the back of a bill any explanation of his attitude with a view of protecting himself from liability, that should have the effect of relieving him from personal liability, and only bind him in his representative capacity.

Mr. BARRON. I would suggest to the Minister that he had better add the words "for the purpose of identity" after the word "character"; because I think it is wise to retain, as far as possible, the wording of the English Act, as there are decisions under the English Act which would help us.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am afraid that would only continue the obscurity. Let the hon. gentleman reflect that some of the illustrations given in the Bill are these: Where executors sign, stating that they sign as executors, they are nevertheless bound personally. Under this Act it is intended that they should be bound. I think, with respect to the remark of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), we have, first of all, to keep in view the great necessity for providing, in the case of contracts of this kind, plainness as to who is to be bound by these contracts. In the second place, this principle must be borne in mind: that if there is any ambiguity in the instrument itself the person who has the opportunity of removing that ambiguity is to blame for it, and should bear the burden. We provide a distinct rule, and in doing that we accomplish a great deal by removing the obscurity that now exists upon that subject. We provide that if a man desires not to be bound himself, he must sign the name of his principal to the instrument and declare that he is merely an agent; but that if he signs his own name first he shall be personally bound. When we have laid down a clear rule upon the subject, the fault will be clearly that of the person who wants to limit his liability, if he does not follow that rule. If we had the subject to reconsider *de novo*, there might be some weight in the contention that where it appears in any way on the face of the instrument that a person acts in a representative capacity he should not be personally bound. The difficulty of changing the law upon that subject is not merely that we are not following an English precedent—that would be, as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) says, comparatively of little consequence—but we would be changing the course of the law which we have followed ever since the settlement of the country, or, at any rate, ever since the settlement of this question at common law, and we would be establishing a new rule, and, I am afraid, introducing a great deal of

inconvenience, because it would conflict with the English law and with the common law which has prevailed in this country for so long a time.

Mr. MITCHELL. I admit it is difficult to follow the hon. gentleman, with his great ability and his great powers of speaking, and putting forward his views in such a gentlemanly and clear manner. The hon. gentleman says that it would be altering the principles of the law well understood for many years past. Now, I think it has been a great and fertile source of litigation, and a great source of revenue for the lawyers of the country, to define what the liability of an agent is, when he is personally liable and when he is not. The hon. gentleman says it would be wrong to depart from the principles of the common law which have been so well understood. If I understand the object of this Bill, it is to define and make clear those parts of the law where doubts have existed in reference to the usages and decisions that have been obtained in past years under the common law. Now, here is a very strong illustration which could be given: that if this legislation, now under consideration, is to be worth anything, it is desirable that whenever a point arises in the consideration of this measure, affecting, as it does, the commercial law of the country and extensive business transactions, the single object is to describe when and where an agent shall be liable personally and when he shall not. What would be the natural conclusion if we were to frame laws *de novo* upon that subject? It would be this: that in any commercial document in which a principal was represented by an agent, whenever the agent, in the execution of that document, placed in words upon the face of it that he acted as an agent only, he should not be personally liable. That is clear. Why, then, should the ambiguity be continued in this section of the Bill? My hon. friend says that he has defined when an agent is liable and when he is not, by the words of the Bill. How many people throughout this country will ever read that section of the law? How many of the hundreds of thousands of people who are carrying on business and signing documents, acting for principals, will ever know the fine distinction contained in that section of the Bill? If that is the case, why should we allow these men unnecessarily to get into trouble and create a personal liability for themselves which was never intended by the persons with whom they are acting, nor by the principals for whom they are acting? I think the main object of this measure is to make clear the law where it is doubtful now, and this is one doubt that now exists, and I hope the hon. gentleman will reserve for consideration this section, with the view of amending it.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I think the best course to adopt is to leave the law of agency completely out of this Bill. This section conflicts with the question of agency. The liability of an agent does not relate to notes and bills of exchange. I also remark that this section will introduce a change in the law relating to agency, which law is very satisfactory as it now stands. Under the law of the Province of Quebec an agent is responsible if he is a commission merchant; he is personally responsible, even when he acts in his capacity of agent, if his principal is in any foreign

country. That has been found very satisfactory; but if this section passes, that provision of the law would be removed so far as bills of exchange are concerned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the law all over Canada.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). That section also would apply to all bills of exchange drawn from foreign countries. It is most desirable that the law as to agency should not be changed.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Justice is no doubt well aware that a knowledge of the law is the exception, not the rule, among business men. I take it that if a man signs his name as agent, he does so under the belief that it exempts him from personal liability. To insert a clause in this Bill to hold him personally liable, when he thought he was not liable, would hardly be just. The fact that a man signs as agent is *prima facie* evidence that he disclaims all personal liability. It is for the party who drew the bill to obtain information in relation to the party in question. But to provide by this clause that unless the party complies with certain phraseology and a certain form, although, in point of fact, he does explain what his position is, or supposes he does so, is to work an injustice. The fact that he has signed as agent indicates that he is not the principal, that he has not signed for himself, but as the agent of another party, and that circumstance should exempt him from personal liability. The clause now proposed would work disadvantageously and unjustly in a great many cases.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not think the difficulty is so much as regards principal and agent as parties representing estates, such as executors or persons holding official positions. They sign in their official capacity, and understand, when they sign as executors or agents, that they are not holding themselves personally responsible. Clauses might be inserted to cover this point. In some cases a party signs a note or bill of exchange as executor, not supposing that he makes himself liable; but, after a lapse of time, in consequence of the failure of other parties, he is held to be liable. Of course there are difficulties surrounding the question, but the English rule might be followed, that a party must expressly exempt himself from liability.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) disapproves of the provision on the ground that very few persons are acquainted with the law. He must remember that if this clause were cut out the common law would remain; and if few persons are acquainted with the statutes, still fewer have studied the common law. In regard to the law of the Province of Quebec, I understand the principle of the law on this subject is the same. I have no objection to allow the clause to stand, but I do so with the understanding that I have in no way modified my views in consequence of allowing further consideration.

Mr. MITCHELL. The point I make in regard to the hon. Minister's last remark is this: I do not care whether the common law or the statute law contains this provision or not, but I hold it is due to the country that, where a man represents that he is the representative or agent of another, he

should not be personally liable. That is the point I desire to make. It is the duty of the Government, in codifying the laws, to frame a section to provide that when a man signs a document, purely in his representative capacity, believing that he is not making himself liable, at the same time the receiver not expecting him to be liable, he should not be liable. I think the hon. gentleman has such great ingenuity and ability as to be able to frame a clause to accomplish this object. As the hon. gentleman has allowed the section to stand, we will have an opportunity to discuss it again.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. On the other hand, we should take care that innocent persons shall not be given pieces of paper which are worthless. Farmers receive many promissory notes; and if the suggestion of the hon. gentleman opposite be adopted, a man may sign himself as the agent of some person, or as acting in some representative capacity, and give notes which will prove to be worthless, and thus escape liability. There must be a distinction drawn. I do not see how this can be done except in the words of the section. If the person signs in a certain way he should be personally liable; if he chooses to put after his name the statement that he is agent of some company, that fact should not allow him to escape liability; it might be that he was a lightning-rod pedlar or something of that kind. If a man signs ostensibly for a company, then let the company be responsible, and no one else; but if he signs his own name he should be held to be liable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will allow the section to stand, in the hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will become convinced. When the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is almost convinced, he always accuses me of special pleading.

Mr. MITCHELL. I regret that the tone of the hon. gentleman's voice was so low that I did not catch the force of his, no doubt, very forcible remark. When the question comes up again, I hope to meet the hon. gentleman with a view to endeavor to come to some common understanding whereby innocent persons will be protected.

On section 30,

Mr. MITCHELL. I think, Mr. Chairman, there might be some doubt in regard to this section. It uses the words "for value or not." I would quite agree that the holder "for value" of such a bill should make the maker personally liable, but I doubt the propriety of allowing the holder "without value," or where a bill was fraudulently obtained, to have recourse against the maker. Suppose a man forces a bill out of another and gives it to another party, that other party can prosecute the maker.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). He cannot, because he does not get it from the holder in due course.

Mr. MITCHELL. The wording seems to indicate that here, but it may be that it is intended that only lawyers can understand this bill.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he has incorporated in this Bill a provision that where notes are given for the purchase of patent rights, they must have stamped upon them "given for patent rights?"

Mr. MITCHELL.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That provision is not in the Bill, but it is in the present law.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think we should have a clause of this kind in the Bill. It is an important provision, as a great many notes given for patent rights are largely given fraudulently.

Mr. BURDETT. That provision is an Act of Parliament by itself, and is not repealed by this law. I intend to introduce a Bill directed against this kind of rascality, and also against another species of rascality adopted in our part of the country, in relation to notes given for seed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must say that I agree with the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). If we are mentioning exceptions in the case of notes, all those exceptions ought to be incorporated in the body of the Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be wise to follow the suggestion of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick).

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. If we are consolidating the law in this respect, the matter I have referred to should be incorporated in this Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that law is better separate than it would be embodied in this Bill, because that law aims at what may be regarded as a criminal offence. It is to protect parties against certain fraudulent proceedings.

Mr. LAURIER. Would the hon. Minister explain what he means by the third sub-section of section 30, referring to usurious consideration?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is now the Canadian statute law.

On section 31,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that when a person endorses a bill in a representative capacity, the mere statement of that fact should be *prima facie* evidence that he does so without making himself personally liable. This section puts upon him the necessity of using words to relieve himself of personal liability.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A man may, for instance, be bound by his duty as an executor to endorse a bill, and this provision permits him to add that he does so in his representative capacity only.

Mr. MITCHELL. This sub-section is inconsistent with section 26, which states that the mere addition to a signature of words describing the signer as an agent or as filling a representative character does not exempt him from personal liability.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On the contrary, the sections exactly fit each other. This section is to provide that, notwithstanding the previous section and that principle of law, a man may validly endorse a bill as executor, and at the same time add words stating that it is not binding on him personally.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I fancy that the difficulty would be that if a note or bill went into the hands of an innocent holder, how would he know in what capacity it had been endorsed unless it were so stated on the bill?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This provision is to mitigate the force of the principle laid down in

section 26, in cases where persons are under obligation to endorse bills or notes in their representative capacity.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think there is a good deal of force in what the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) says in regard to the comparative ignorance of business men of acts of this kind. Take, for instance, the case of the secretary of a company. A note is payable, say, to the National Manufacturing Co. The secretary is bound to endorse that note, and he does so as secretary of the National Manufacturing Co. It seems to me that that ought to be sufficient notice to the subsequent holders of the bill that he has endorsed it in his capacity of secretary of the company, and that it ought not to be necessary for him to add any additional words declaring that he is not personally liable.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Might I direct the attention of the Minister of Justice again to section 12 of chapter 123 of the Revised Statutes, which provides that every bill of exchange or promissory note given in consideration of the purchase of or interest in a patent right shall have written across the face thereof the words, "given for a patent right." That is the law now, but you are proposing to repeal that law, and I do not think it would be wise to do so. I hope the Minister will introduce that clause into this Bill, because, by the schedule, you are proposing to repeal it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have already made a note of that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think any gentleman in this House will suppose that my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Charlton) is not a very intelligent member of Parliament or that he does not know what the laws of this country are. I do not think I am a fool myself, but neither my hon. friend nor myself knew until now of the existence of that provision referred to by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). Therefore it shows the necessity of that provision going into this Bill.

On section 33,

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think this section brings up again that question of patent rights. I think that, from the rascality which has been practiced by the persons who take these notes around the country, this House ought to take some action in the matter. If it were made the law of the land that these transactions should be cash transactions, that would be all right, and if it were understood that no note for a patent right should be negotiable, it would prevent these rascals from going through the country and victimising the people they meet. Certainly some drastic measure is necessary, and in that case some of the men who are now imposed upon by the artful, wily schemers who go through the country, would be no longer imposed upon. This thing ought to be stopped, and I believe this is the way to do it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If these were to be made payable in cash, that would hardly be within the provisions of a Bill in regard to bills of exchange.

On section 34,

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Is that the law at present?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 42,

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Is it stated what is the customary time for acceptance?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Is it to differ in the various Provinces? Ought we not to state the number of hours that a bill may be left for acceptance?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It is usually twenty-five.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It might be so stated, as the rule may not be the same in all the Provinces.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Does the hon. gentleman propose that a rule shall be established on this subject?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Then let this section stand.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 29th January, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Secretary of State, for the year ending 31st December, 1889.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 29) to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Cook.)

Bill (No. 30) to amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Cook.)

Bill (No. 31) to provide for the examination and licensing of persons having charge of stationary steam engines or other devices worked under pressure.—(Mr. Cook.)

PEAKE'S STATION, P. E. I.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked, Whether the Government have received a petition from the inhabitants of Peake's Station, Prince Edward Island, asking that Peake's Railway Station be made a booking station? If so, is it the intention of the Government to grant the prayer of their petition?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That subject is now under the consideration of the Department.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSION.

Mr. BARRON asked, When were the Trent Valley Canal Commissioners appointed? What has been the entire cost to the country up to the present time of the Trent Valley Canal Commission? Is it expected that the Report of the Commission will be received this Session of Parliament; if not, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Judge Clark, Frank Turner and J. Kennedy were appointed on the 10th October, 1887, Trent Valley Commissioners. Judge Clark having to resign, Judge Charles A. Weller was appointed in his place on the 1st December, 1887. The entire cost of the Commission to date is \$2,271.39. The Report of the Commission is expected during the present Session.

LETTER OF MGR. GRANDIN.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether the Government are aware that the following letter has been addressed by His Grace Monseigneur Grandin to persons occupying a high position in the Province of Quebec :—

DIOCESE OF ST. ALBERT,
ALBERTA, N.W.T., CANADA, 20th Nov., 1889.

To His Eminence, Monseigneur Taschereau, Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec, and to Monseigneurs the Archbishops and Bishops of the late Ecclesiastical Province of Quebec.

Your Eminence and Most Reverend and Venerable Sirs :— Permit one of your humble brothers in the Episcopate, overcome by the troubles and anxieties which are crushing him, to have recourse again to your affectionate sympathies, hoping that you will be able to aid him at least with your prayers and your advice, and that our Saviour himself will inspire you to devise some plan to succor him.

Since the annexation of our Territory to Canada, in the portion fit for settlement of my diocese, the physical hardships of former times have much diminished, they have even ceased to exist in certain localities, but I am compelled to admit that the moral afflictions which have succeeded them, especially those which we anticipated, cause us to regret the past years. At the time of the annexation the French Canadians and Métis were, we may say, the only settlers in the country which their fathers had discovered. They lived at peace with the traders of the Honorable the Hudson Bay Company, and with the few English settlers who had but recently taken up land.

After the annexation the immigrants came in great numbers, and I can tell you that out of every hundred there were but ten Catholics; the English and Protestant population thereupon increased rapidly, and in a few years we must be content to find ourselves in the minority. God forbid that I should wish to accuse in a sweeping manner this new majority of wishing to ill-treat us; there are among the new comers respectable and honest families who regret the war that is being made upon us. This war, my Lords, they will not admit, but I for one will certify to your Eminence and your Graces that it is the Dominion Government which, by means of the staff of the Indian Department, has first declared war upon us, taking the initiative and with so much the less fairness, seeing that on their part there has been no declaration of war; and as for us, not being able to imagine all, we did not in the beginning make any resistance. Since the time that the Indians concluded the treaty with the Government the entire control of the Indian Department was, in my diocese at least, generally and exclusively under that of Protestants using the English language. For reasons which they will not admit at any time these gentlemen compel our Christian Indians to withdraw from our establishments, in consequence of which we were compelled to close them. This conduct was as equally opposed to the treaty conditions as to the physical and moral interests of the Indians. When, after that, we desired to establish ourselves among the Indians at their own request, you could not conceive the difficulties which they stirred up against us. Without regard to the religious faith and the wish of the Indians, Protestant schools were the only ones granted to them; and the poor Indians were pressed, even threatened, to compel them to send their children to schools where their faith was not respected. Apart from an industrial school, there is not in my diocese a single Catholic school which we were not obliged to establish ourselves, often against a lively opposition, and to support in a measure in the beginning. In November, 1887, I was assured most positively from Ottawa that such a course of action was going to cease. I must certify that the persecution—I can make use of no other word—is more keen than ever. In spite of all this, you will be surprised to hear it we are the guilty ones; like

Mr. BARRON.

good sheep we should allow ourselves to be torn and swallowed without even a bleat.

This fanaticism is an epidemic and has spread from the reserves to certain centres of civilisation. Our schools are hunted down. It is a crime for us to take advantage of the education laws to procure assistance from the Government. Our reports are studied; they are found fault with, in order more especially to be able to accuse us and deprive us of that assistance which is ours by right. Although in the minority, we might be able, nevertheless, to send two representatives to the House, but they have succeeded in making this a thing impossible for us. I again charge the Dominion Government, who in marking out the electoral districts have divided up the two French Catholic centres in such a manner that it is impossible for us to secure representation. You are also acquainted with what is going on this very day at Regina. In spite of the efforts of the Honorable J. Royal, Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West, and the Honorable Judge Rouleau, all our representatives, not one of whom is a Catholic, demand, with two exceptions, the abolition of our language and the amendment of our school laws in order to impose upon us the so-called secular schools which are nothing else but anti-Catholic schools, even admitting that they are not Godless schools. Imagine what will be the consequence of all this, in a new country, in a savage country. These petitions were addressed to His Excellency the Governor General in the name of the people of the North-West. They are certainly not ignorant how we are opposed to these doings, but we count for nothing in the eyes of these gentlemen.

This studied contempt of the French Catholic population has already had very sad consequences. Although the Half-breeds gained nothing by their uprising, they are not on that account more insensible to contempt. Nothing would at this moment be easier than to fire the powder. Let one of those so-called loyalists, so ready to question our loyalty and patriotism, presume that another rebellion would advantage him, and he will find all the less difficulty in inciting our population to it because our Catholics have no longer the same reliance in their clergy. They have been told so often that we are paid by the Dominion Government to work for it against them, that they now believe this. Certainly, we have supported it, as we always sustain constituted authority; but we are bound to acknowledge that we have been very badly required, and those who have found fault with us on this account are partly justified. Nevertheless, the French Catholic party, which is now in the background, has rights of which it cannot be deprived without injustice, it even has a right to the gratitude of the powerful party which is inclined to oppress it. Are not these French Canadians and Half-breeds the men who made possible the settlement of the North-West, who rendered more easy the intercourse between the white man and the Indian, and who are to this day the connecting link between them? But it seems that gratitude, even the remembrance of an obligation, is not a quality to be met with in the powerful; and that we, the minority, must submit to being of no consequence socially, and should only be too glad if we are allowed to live as conquered outcasts. Although possessing a certain amount of humility, which I have tried to practice, I can hardly resign myself to existence on such terms. I am often told that a French Catholic immigration into the North-West should be organised. This is very true; but what can I do towards this immigration? One can do nothing without money, and I have none—our population is poor. If, with this object in view, I appeal to your charity, you will doubtless repeat what several persons in your dioceses have very properly said to me: The Province of Quebec must not be depopulated in order to people the boundless North-West. Very true, my Lords, but without impoverishing yourselves, bestow upon us at least the crumbs which fall from your tables. How many thousands of your flock leave each year for the United States, where they too often lose both spiritual and bodily health, and are moreover lost, not only to your Province, but to the Dominion, unless we are to imagine that they prepare the way for a union between Canada and the United States. Both you and I, my Lords, have other views and other hopes.

If even one-fourth of those who emigrated from your Province during the past ten years had come to us, we would still constitute the majority, or would at all events be a powerful minority which would have to be taken into account and against which none would think of enacting extraordinary laws. To people this territory, to people *our land*, as the aborigines call it—and the Half-breeds and French Canadians have some right to use that expression; for French Canadians discovered this vast country; French Canadians and Half-breeds opened it up to religion and colonisation—to settle *our lands* there

are sent men from every nation, men without faith and without religion; Mennonites are brought from a great distance, even Mormons are admitted and are seemingly held up as examples to the Blackfeet; yet each year a multitude of Canadians are allowed to depart—honest and hard working, but too poor to come this far to settle. Do you not think, my lords, that this is a great evil? Can no remedy be found? Since our Government appears to take no heed, I think that, with the assistance of your patriotic and devoted clergy, of your pious, intelligent and influential laymen, of generous charity of every one, you could enable those brave Canadians to settle comfortably in the North-West. You would obtain from the Dominion Government, and from the various railway companies the means of preserving to Canada these good and upright citizens; and the Province of Quebec would be none the poorer, but would, on the contrary, acquire strength by extending its influence, and would at the same time protect the poor Canadians who are threatened with the fate of outcasts on their own lands.

I therefore beseech you, my Lords, as well in my own name as in that of my missionaries, in the name of the French Catholic party, in the name above all of the interests of the Church in the North-West, to see what you can do, and I appeal to you, in the name of God, to take action.

Pardon my pressing entreaty, and believe me, my Lords, your most devoted and grateful servant and brother.

2nd. Have the Government any reason to doubt Bishop Grandin's word, who signed the said letter?
3rd. Is it the intention of the Government to take any steps to remedy grievances complained of by the Bishop, what steps and when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have not received the letter set out in the question, or any copy of it. I have been informed that it appeared, without signature, in the *Montreal Witness*. I would simply say that the letter has never come before the Government except in the manner I have mentioned. The Government will attend to the complaints of Monseigneur Grandin, and those of any other clergyman or person in Canada who has any complaints to make.

CRANE ISLAND MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause for the future the mail service of Crane Island, in the County of Montmagny, to be performed by way of Montmagny or by way of Giles' Bay?

Mr. HAGGART. The question is now engaging the attention of the Department. No decision has yet been arrived at.

SUMMERSIDE HARBOR, P. E. I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether a further examination for a breakwater at the entrance of Summerside harbor, Prince Edward Island, has been made during the year 1889, as promised by the Minister of Public Works during last Session? If so, has the engineer made a report thereon?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, an examination was made of Summerside harbor last season, and a report has been submitted. The work proposed for the improvement of the entrance to the harbor consists of a breakwater extending southwardly from Willing's Point a distance of 3,800 feet, and a second from the lighthouse 1,000 feet in a southerly direction towards Indian Head, the cost of these two structures being placed at \$75,000.

MIMINGASH BREAKWATER, P. E. I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether it is the intention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to repair the damages done to the Mimingash breakwater, Prince Edward Island, as promised last Session by the Minister?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. gentleman puts in his question the words, "As promised last Session by the Minister," I may say that on referring to *Hansard*, I find that on April 22nd the hon. gentleman asked this question:

"Is the Department of Public Works aware of the amount of damages done to the breakwater at Mimingash, P. E. I., last fall? If so, is it the intention of the department to repair said breakwater immediately?"

The answer given by me was:

"The attention of the Department was called to the damage done to this breakwater, and the matter is now receiving the attention of my department."

Mr. LAURIER. What do you do this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is not asked.

THE TRADE IN OLEOMARGARINE.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) asked, Is the Dominion of Canada the British North America referred to in the official Trade Returns of the United States for the eleven months ending November 30th last, which show, among exports to British North America, "Oleomargarine, 534,146 lbs."? If so, has the hon. Minister of Customs any reason to believe that oleomargarine enters into consumption in Canada under a fraudulent or assumed name? Has any recent investigation been made by the officers of the Department to ascertain whether it is being brought into the Dominion, in evasion of the statute forbidding its importation?

Mr. BOWELL. There is reason to believe that the part of "British North America" to which the oleomargarine referred to is exported, is the colony of Newfoundland. There is no evidence that any of it was imported to Canada, and entered into consumption in the Dominion. The officers of Customs are instructed to exercise constant vigilance everywhere for the prevention of such violation of law. A few pounds of the article was sent to a party in St. Thomas, Ont., from Chicago as a sample without orders. It was seized by the Collector of Customs and confiscated by the Department. A consignment of oleomargarine from the United States to a party in Halifax was entered for consumption, and was seized by the Customs officials, but upon evidence being produced that the entry was made in mistake, it was allowed to be amended and the article exported to Newfoundland. Similar entries were made in Cornwall, Ont., in December last, which are under seizure, the parties who imported claiming that they purchased it as butter, and they are holding it for exportation to Great Britain. There is reason to believe that a great quantity of oleomargarine passes through Canada *in transitu* to other countries, and that in this as in other articles exported from the United States, which are forwarded through the Dominion, are entered in the Export Returns of the United States as being exported to British North America, that being the first foreign country which the

article reaches, which may account for the entry in the Trade Returns referred to by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain).

THE MAIL STEAMER *OTTER*.

Mr. AMYOT asked, 1. Is there a contract now in force between the Government and the Messrs. Holiday & Fraser for the carriage of the mails by the steamboat *Otter*, along the north shore of the Lower St. Lawrence? 2. What is the sum for which the Government have bound themselves to pay these contractors for this transport service? 3. How many trips are they bound to make under the said contract?

Mr. HAGGART. There is a contract for a service between Eskimo Point and Rimouski. It is held by Alexander Fraser & Co. The rate of payment is \$200 per trip, and the service is fortnightly during the season of navigation.

DUTY ON MEATS.

Order of the House being read :

That, in consequence of the large importation into Canada annually of fresh beef, mutton and salt pork or bacon, it is expedient, in the interests of the farmers of this country, that the duty on such should be increased.—(Mr. Marshall.)

Mr. FOSTER. I think I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should withdraw that resolution for the present. It has reference to tariff matters which are under the consideration of the Government, and it is not probable that he would get as full and free discussion on the subject now as he would wish.

Mr. MARSHALL. Under those circumstances I will withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

LOYALTY TO HER MAJESTY.

Mr. MULOCK. On Monday last when I was about to move the resolution which I now desire to move, the First Minister requested that the motion should be allowed to stand, in order that he might have a conversation with me on the subject. The motion accordingly stood, and I had the advantage of a conversation with the First Minister. I may say that the whole tenor of the conversation was simply that I might make certain verbal changes in the resolution without, in the slightest degree, impairing the effect of it. I mention this circumstance particularly, because I have been told that very inaccurate reports have gone abroad as to the proposed object of the First Minister in speaking to me. The whole tenor of the right hon. gentleman's conversation with me was that he highly approved of the spirit of the motion, but thought it might be possible to improve the style of it. I entirely concurred with him, and, as a result of the conversation, the motion has been slightly varied, and a reprint of the altered motion placed in the hands of hon. members. I may say further that I omitted to consult an important element in the House at the time, and, therefore, the draft of the corrected motion went to the printer without having been submitted to the representatives of all the various parties in the House. After it was printed the leader of the Third party suggested to me that there should be a little further change, and that suggestion I thought reasonable.

Mr. BOWELL.

I mentioned it to the First Minister and he thought it reasonable, and, consequently, I presume that everyone will think it reasonable. Therefore, with the consent of the House, I will now read the motion proposed to be submitted, and ask the permission of the House that it be substituted for the one of which notice has been given, as follows :—

That an humble Address be presented to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty in the following words :—

MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY :

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, desire most earnestly in our own name, and on behalf of the people whom we represent, to renew the expression of our unswerving loyalty and devotion to Your Majesty's person and Government.

We have learned with feelings of entire disapproval that various public statements have been made, calling in question the loyalty of the people of Canada to the political union now happily existing between this Dominion and the British Empire, and representing it as the desire of the people of Canada to sever such connection.

We desire, therefore, to assure Your Majesty that such statements are wholly incorrect representations of the sentiments and aspirations of the people of Canada, who are among Your Majesty's most loyal subjects, devotedly attached to the political union existing between Canada and the mother country, and earnestly desire its continuance.

We feel assured that Your Majesty will not allow any such statements, emanating from any source whatever, to lessen Your Majesty's confidence in the loyalty of your Canadian subjects to Your Majesty's person and Government, and will accept our assurances of the contentment of Your Majesty's Canadian subjects with the political connection between Canada and the rest of the British Empire, and of their fixed resolve to aid in maintaining the same.

We pray that the blessings of Your Majesty's reign may, for your people's sake, be long continued.

My object in submitting this motion is not for the information of the hon. members of this House, or for the information of the country. I think for anyone to suggest that such a course as this was necessary for such a purpose would be to offend the intelligence alike of the House and the country. We may have our party differences in regard to what we deem to be the best methods of promoting the public welfare, but we also have, I trust and believe, a common bond of union—the great principle of British connection; a principle which, I submit, controls all political thought in Canada; a principle before which all other questions dwarf almost into insignificance; a principle which is, and I trust will continue to be, the touchstone of political thought in Canada. That principle has developed for us the position here which we enjoy as citizens of the greatest Empire known to civilisation, an Empire which, I think, to-day commands in a greater degree than in any other period in the history of our country the admiration and the love of the whole people of this country, and which has, I believe, developed amongst us a common standing-ground and common cause which makes the hearts of the whole people beat as one. I repeat, therefore, that I do not make this motion for our information or for the information of the country, believing it to be but a feeble echo of the sentiments which are entertained by the whole country; nor do I make it out of any individual or party considerations, nor because of any circumstance which has occurred, or which is occurring, within the borders of Canada; but I make it for the purpose of removing, if possible, misapprehensions, and contradicting statements that have been made and, which, perhaps, have al-

ready been of great injury to Canada, and which, if allowed to remain any longer unchallenged, are calculated to be injurious to our best interests. I am sure that, in an assemblage such as this, it will be unnecessary for me to observe any particularity in regard to what I refer to. We are all observers of current events, we are all readers of the literature of the day, and we have had the opportunity of observing the trend of the American press during the last few months. In that press, you find a doctrine set forth as if it were the expression of one mind, but appearing in the whole of the press of the United States and being in that way spread far and wide. You find it asserted there that the political institutions in Canada are broken down: that we are a people divided against ourselves or amongst ourselves; that we are torn apart by internal dissensions; that race is set against race, creed against creed, Province against Province, and the Dominion against the Empire; and that this has created a feeling in favor of independence or annexation which is now only awaiting the opportunity to take practical form and shape. These statements have, no doubt, already done injury to our country. A surplus population does not seek countries which are supposed to be bordering on revolution. Capital does not seek investment in countries which are supposed not to be blessed with stable Government. Therefore, for the information of the outside world, for the information of those who have not had the advantage of being born or becoming Canadian citizens, for their advantage and for our own advantage ultimately, I have asked the House to adopt this resolution. To give further color to these statements, we find that the United States Congress appointed a Committee of the Senate, ostensibly to enquire into the relations of Canada with the United States; but if anyone investigated the proceedings of that Committee, he would find that apparently the principal anxiety of the Commission is to discover satisfactory evidence that this country is in a frame of mind to be annexed to the United States. I know of no better way of meeting their curiosity on that subject, and at the same time of settling this question, than for the people of Canada, through their representatives here assembled, to make an authoritative deliverance upon the subject. Such a deliverance will go far, I believe, to settle the question in the minds of the people of the United States, and in the minds of the people of the old land, those of England and of continental Europe, and then I hope it will result in setting once more flowing towards our shores the surplus capital and the surplus population of those old lands which are so much wanted for the development of the resources of this vast Dominion. I make this statement in no feeling of unfriendliness to the United States. We cannot blame them for casting longing eyes towards this favored land, but we can only attribute that to Canada's worth, and, therefore, to that extent we can appreciate their advances. But that the American people seriously believe that Canada, a land so full of promise, is now prepared, in her very infancy, to commit political suicide, I cannot for a moment believe. Do the American people believe that this young country, with her illimitable resources, with a population representing the finest strains of human blood, with political institutions based upon a model that has stood the strain for ages, and has ever become

stronger—do they believe that this country, possessing within her own limits all the essentials for enduring national greatness, is now prepared to abandon the work of the Confederation fathers, and pull out from the Confederation edifice the cement of British connection which holds the various parts of the edifice together? Do they, I say, believe that the people of Canada are prepared in that way to disappear from the nations of the earth, amidst the universal contempt of the world? No, Mr. Speaker, the American people are too intelligent to believe any such a thing. They have been trying to make themselves believe it, but they cannot do it. But whether they believe it or not—no matter who believes it outside of Canada—I venture to say the Canadian people do not believe it; and whatever be the destiny of Canada, I trust that such as I have indicated is not to be her destiny—Canada, full of a people who rejoice, as I said before, more, perhaps, than they ever did yet, by reason of their connection with an Empire that has girdled the whole earth with a confederacy of provinces for the promotion of a higher civilisation, not for the sake of conquest. Sir, that connection, I believe, has, if possible, intensified the feeling of love which is entertained by the people of Canada towards the Union, and nothing, perhaps, has more aided it than the glories of the Victorian era in which we now live. It is not my intention to refer to anything that can possibly suggest a controversy upon this question. In order that this motion may have the fullest effect it should have, I think the heartiest endorsement, the unanimous endorsement of this House, I shall, therefore, avoid any further discussion of this question, believing, as I do, that there is nothing in respect to British political connection that ought to interfere with the material prosperity of our country. Believing this, and believing that the present is an opportune time for us to make a candid declaration of what we deem to be the sentiments of the country, and believing also that such a declaration will not be an unwelcome communication to Her Majesty, I beg to move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. AMYOT. As a British subject of French descent, I have great pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. friend. I endorse every one of his words, and I am happy to choose this occasion to speak in the name of the county which I have the honor to represent in this House. I think the motion is opportune, and I will take this occasion to tell the new members of this House who, perhaps, have not studied our history fully, the exact position that we have occupied in the past, so far as loyalty is concerned, and the reasons why we French Canadians are loyal to the Crown. After the Treaty of Paris, a great many struggles occurred between the old and new colonists, as might have been expected, and as is always the case when a sudden change takes place in a country. After many petitions and representations the Act of Quebec, in 1774, passed, and it was accepted by our forefathers as a good step in the right direction. That Act was granted in spite of the opposition of some fanatics and of some speculators, and the very next year our forefathers had occasion to prove their gratitude to England and their loyalty to the new flag. The Americans invaded the coun-

try, and it was owing to the efforts, to the chivalry, to the valor of the French Canadian people, powerfully aided, of course, by the few English troops that were here, that Canada was retained as a possession of the Crown of England, in 1775. As my words alone may not be of sufficient authority, I will quote from Biggar, in his work: "Canada—a Memorial Volume," at page 27, where he says:

While there was, as a matter of course, a good deal of friction between the new subjects, as the French were called, and the British settlers, or 'old subjects,' under the temperate and judicial guidance of General Murray and Sir Guy Carleton, matters proceeded hopefully and the country entered upon a career of prosperity, rapidly increasing in population and wealth."

At page 28 he says:

"The colonists were now called upon to pass through another war period—bloody but brief—and this time with their own countrymen across the border. In the year following the passing of the Quebec Act, the long smouldering fires of secession in the American colonies burst into flame. On April 19th, 1775, the 'Minute men' of Concord, Lexington, 'fired the first shot heard around the world,' and the War of Independence began, which ended in the loss to England of her 'American' colonies. One of the first steps taken by the secessionists was to capture Ticonderoga and Crown Point on Lake Champlain, and thus possess the gateway to Canada. Forts St. John and Chambly soon followed, and on the 12th November, Montreal succumbed; but the tide turned when, flushed with their first success, the Americans essayed the capture of Quebec, two daring attempts resulting in disastrous failure."

In 1808, although we did not possess then a full measure of liberty, though our old laws and customs were not entirely recognised, yet our forefathers were always loyal; and we find that Sir James Craig, the Governor, expressed himself as follows in opening Parliament:—

"He added, however, that means for meeting adverse eventualities were not to be neglected; and he had the firmest confidence that the co-operation of the people in that respect would not be wanting; while the loyalty and zeal of the militia met his own warmest approbation. All appearances gave promise that, if the colony were attacked, it would be defended in such a manner as was to be expected of a brave race, who fight for all that is dear to it. The reply of the Assembly was of a character which ought to have persuaded Britons that they might reckon on the fidelity of the Canadians, despite the prejudices and fears which late repeated appeals to it betrayed."

In the years 1812, 1813 and 1814 a new war occurred between England and the United States. Again our forefathers had the opportunity to show their fidelity to the British Crown. Those who have read our history cannot but admire the struggles that took place then, and the extraordinary victories won by a few hundred men over thousands of soldiers. I again quote Biggar, from page 30:

"In the year 1812-14 the young auxiliary nation was called upon to undergo a severe ordeal through the United States declaring war against Great Britain, partly because of sympathy with France and partly through misunderstandings between the two Governments. The United States naturally selected Canada as the first object of attack. The position of the two countries was very unequal. Canada was totally unprepared for the conflict. She had less than 6,000 troops to defend 1,500 miles of frontier. Her entire population was under 300,000, while that of the United States was 8,000,000. Despite this startling disparity the Canadians, rallying as one man to the loyal support of their Government, bore themselves so nobly throughout the two years' struggles which ensued, that when it ended the advantage lay clearly upon their side, and the victories of Queenston Heights and Chateaugay are to-day pointed to with the same patriotic pride as the Englishman takes in Waterloo or the Frenchman in Austerlitz."

Mr. AMYOT.

Our celebrated historian Garneau, at page 188 of the English translation, says:

"The result of the campaign of 1812, in which the zeal and spirit of the Gallo-Canadian population rivalled British courage and loyalty, was a practical justification of the sage and conciliatory policy of Sir George Prevost. This worthy Governor assembled the Chambers on the 29th December. He informed them that, in virtue of the power entrusted to him, he called out the whole colonial militia, and expressed his liveliest satisfaction at the public spirit, orderliness, firmness, love of country, and respect for religion and the laws which had been manifested by all ranks of the people. Such a conduct as theirs, he observed, would make their country respected at home and redoubtable abroad."

It might be objected that in 1837 there was a revolution; but that revolution occurred in Upper Canada as well as in Lower Canada, and only a few men took part in it. I shall not enter into the details, but everyone knows that the great majority of the people remained perfectly loyal to the Crown. When Canada was attacked by the Fenians, our French Canadian battalions were called upon to march to the front. None of them hesitated one moment, and everywhere along the frontier, at the points of danger, we saw French Canadian troops ready to give their lives in defence of the British flag. Lately, when there was a rebellion or trouble in the North-West, two French Canadian battalions were called out; and no one hesitated a moment. They went to the front, they executed all orders given them, and not for one moment was their loyalty suspected, and when they returned they received praise from the authorities of the country. The Governors, which England so carefully selects, have recognised our loyalty on many different occasions. Lord Dufferin and Lord Lorne, who have represented the Queen in this country, and the actual noble man who presides over our destiny, have all expressed themselves most emphatically on this matter. Lord Dufferin, whose name has remained dear to all hearts in this country, used the following words in 1878, and I like to repeat them, because these sentiments are calculated to promote harmony, peace and contentment in this country:—

"Year by year I have had better opportunities of appreciating the devotion of the inhabitants of the Province of Quebec to the Throne and Government of the Queen, and to the interests of the Empire, and nothing has given me greater pride than to observe, when a cloud of war recently threatened Great Britain, that Her Majesty's French Canadian subjects were not a whit behind their English, Scotch and Irish fellow citizens in testifying their willingness to rally to the defence of Her dominions."

"It is quite true that the distinctions of race which exist within the borders of Canada, complicate to a certain degree those problems of government with which the statesmen of the country are periodically called upon to deal with, but the inconveniences which may sometimes arise from this source are more than counterbalanced by many advantages which ensue from it. I do not think that ethnological homogeneity is an unmixed benefit to a country. Certainly, the least attractive characteristic of a great portion of this continent is the monotony of many of its outward aspects, while I consider it fortunate for Canada that her prosperity shall be founded on the co-operation of different races. The inter-action of national idiosyncrasies introduces into our existence a freshness, a variety, a color, an eclectic impulse, which otherwise would be wanting, and it would be most faulty statesmanship to seek their obliteration. My warmest aspiration for this Province has always been to see its French inhabitants executing for Canada the functions which France herself has so admirably performed for Europe. Strike from European history the achievements of France, subtract from European civilisation the contributions of France, and what a blank would be occasioned."

Lord Lorne, in answer to an address presented to him by the St. Jean Baptiste Society, said :

"I have obeyed a pleasant call in being amongst you today, to testify my respect for our French Canadian fellow citizens and my appreciation of the value of the element furnished by its noble and gallant race in influencing for good our young and Canadian nationality. I am here to show how much I prize the loyalty evinced by you on all occasions towards Her Majesty the Queen, whose representative I am."

I need not adduce more proofs of our loyalty. But it is not without reason that we are loyal. It is a sentiment, but it is based upon principle; it is based upon our faith and upon our interest. At all times our clergy have taught the people of the Province of Quebec, or of any part of this continent, to be loyal. I may quote as far back as 1791. The following words were spoken by Mgr. Plessis, in the Cathedral of Quebec, in the course of his funeral discourse over the remains of Mgr. Briand. I quote this because it will convince everyone that if we are loyal we are essentially so, and we know why we are loyal—

"Our conquerors," said Mgr. Plessis, "regarded (at first) with a jealous eye and lowering brow, inspired in us feelings only of detestation or aversion. We cannot be persuaded (for the time), that a race of men, strangers to our soil, to our language, to our laws, to our worship, could ever be willing to render to Canada an equivalent for what it lost by changing its masters. Generous nation! which has made us aware, by so many evidences, how ill-founded were our prepossessions; industrious nation! which has developed the earth's fecundity, and explored its hidden riches; exemplary nation! that, in critical times, taught the attentive world wherein consists that liberty which all men aspire to obtain, but so few know how to keep within proper bounds; pitying nation! which has just welcomed, with so much humanity, the most faithful yet worst-used subjects of that realm to which ourselves once belonged; beneficent nation! which daily gives us men of Canada fresh proofs of its liberality:—no, no! your people are not enemies of our people, nor are ye despoilers of our property, which rather do your laws protect; nor are ye foes of our religion, to which ye pay all due respect. Pardon us, then, for that, our first (and now past) distrustfulness of a foreign race, whose virtues, being as yet unexperienced by us, we had not the happiness to know; and if, after being apprised of the overthrow of the monarchy and the abolition of the only right worship (*le vrai culte*) in France, and after experiencing, for 35 years, the gentleness of your domination, there remains still among us some natures purblind enough, or to awaken in the popular mind disloyal wishes (*désirs criminels*) to revert to French supremacy—let Britons be assured that such beings are rare among us; and we beg that what may be true of the malcontent few, will not be imputed to the well-disposed many."

Mgr. Briand's maxim ever was, that true Christians and sincere Catholics are (and must be) all obedient subjects of their legitimate sovereign. He had learned, from Jesus Christ, that we must render to Cæsar what belongs (of right) to Cæsar; Saint Paul has taught him, that every soul should be (voluntarily) submissive to established authority; that he who resists it is in opposition to God himself, and thereby merits damnation; he had learnt from the chiefest of the apostles, that the magistrate (*rex*) bears not the sword in vain; inculcating, that we are to accredit him by our obedience, as God's representative (*propter Deum*); and to honor him, not only in his own person, but in the person of his lawful deputies, (*sive ductibus tanquam ab eo missis*). Such are, my fellow Christians, the principles of our holy religion in that regard; principles which we cannot too often impress upon your minds, or over frequently bring under your view; for they form an integral part of evangelical morality, upon which our eternal salvation depends."

Those words were spoken in 1791. After Confederation, the Bishops of the Province of Quebec, Mgr. Baillargeon, Mgr. Langevin and nearly all the others sent pastoral letters to their flocks with regard to the change of the system of government. I will quote especially from the pastoral of Mgr. Baillargeon, dated 12th June, 1867, and you will

see from those remarks that the same sentiments which animated Mgr. Plessis in 1791, animated the Bishops of the Province in 1867. Mgr. Baillargeon says :

"CHARLES FRANÇOIS BAILLARGEON, Bishop of Tloa, &c., &c. To the Clergy, Secular and Regular, and to all the faithful in the Archdiocese, Greeting and blessing in our Lord.

"Her Majesty, our Gracious Sovereign, has just issued a Proclamation, by which it is ordered, by virtue of an Act of the Imperial Parliament, that, dating from the 1st of July next, the Provinces of Canada, of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall form a federal union under the name of the 'Dominion of Canada.' The State thus formed shall possess a common legislature which shall concern itself with the greater interests of the whole confederated territory; but this State shall be divided into four Provinces distinct, each possessing a local legislature occupied with the particular interests of the Province. In this way Lower Canada, henceforth separated from Upper Canada, shall form under the new regime a separate Province which shall be styled 'The Province of Quebec.'

"This order of things having been established by competent authority, at the request also of our representatives in the Canadian Legislature, there remains nothing for us, my very dear brethren, but to submit to it with a good grace; to do so is for us all a duty imposed by conscience. If, during the century and more since our country was ceded to Great Britain, the form of our government has changed several times, let us remember that the essence of authority does not vary, but remains ever the same. Authority is requisite for the maintenance of all human society, and experience has shown us into what misfortunes those peoples fall who venture to throw it aside.

"Do not let us forget, my very dear brethren, the wholly Divine origin of this authority, which fact has been so often disregarded in our so-called era of enlightenment. It is to God that we must ascend in order to discover its source; it is He Himself who has delegated it to men for the preservation of the community fresh from His hands.

"To God alone," says the Apostle Jude, 'belongeth dominion and power' (verse 25). 'By me kings reign and princes decree justice,' saith the Lord in the Book of Proverbs (ch. 8, v. 15). Jesus Christ teaches us our duties towards those in authority when he says:—'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's.' (St. Matthew, ch. 22, v. 21.) St. Paul saith:—'Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power withstandeth the ordinance of God.' (Romans, ch. 13, v. 1-2.) And in order further to convince us, he adds:—'Wherefore ye must needs be in subjection, not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience sake.' (Romans, ch. 5, v. 5.)

"Therefore, my very dear brethren, inasmuch as the federal union which is going into operation, proceeds from lawful authority, you will regard it as a law for yourselves, and you will obey the command of God by obeying it in all sincerity. It is besides to your interest to do so, as it is a matter of conscience, in order that it may result in the common good, and in this way secure the benefits to individuals. Soon you will be called upon to choose those who either in the Federal Parliament or in the Local Legislature will work to put into practice the new Constitution. You will then guard against giving your votes in favor of those who are disposed to fight against it or prevent its working, but you will give them to citizens proved and acknowledged as having at heart the wish to make it useful in promoting the greatest good of the country."

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may go amongst our parish priests in Lower Canada, and you will find that every one of them—men of talent and science as they are—you will find that they teach to the bottom of their hearts pay obedience to the laws, and be faithful and loyal to the Crown. That is one of the reasons why we are loyal. It is also our interest to be loyal. In this country we enjoy the fullest freedom that citizens of any country may expect. We practice freely our reli-

gion, we talk our language, we enjoy our own customs, and we live in peace and harmony with all the different races and creeds of the Dominion. We enjoy a constitution which we admire, and we are proud of being British subjects, because we belong to a country which has mastered nearly the whole world, and because the constitution of that country is based on an experience of centuries, and assures the liberty of the people. We are loyal because we find freedom, justice and peace under that constitution. We do not believe—for my part I do not believe—and I know that I express the views of my constituents, when I say that they do not believe in the republican form of government, under which a president or an executive becomes an autocrat for four years after an election. We believe in the British constitution, under which the majority of the people are always and at every moment commanding. We believe that, with the civilisation and enlightenment of the present century, the people are fully able to govern themselves by themselves; and this is the essence of the form of government we have received from England. Of course, we would feel some pride in being our own masters, in having no colonial tie; but, Mr. Speaker, the advantages we derive from that tie—the protection of the British flag all over the seas, and our more intimate relations with the English people—fully compensate for the want of that sentiment of pride in being our own masters. Besides, if in years past England has been perhaps unfair to Canada, of late years, I must say, she has become more and more just, she has been extending greater liberties to Canada, she has come to look upon us as one of her most important possessions, one of her possessions most able to govern itself; and we have the pleasure of seeing every day that English statesmen are learning more about Canada, and are coming more to respect her and to give her full protection. I find in an English author a *résumé* of the benefits which we derive from British connection. Dr. Withrow, in his "History of Canada," says:

"The conquest of Canada by the British was the most fortunate event in its history. It supplanted the institutions of the middle ages by those of modern civilisation. It gave local self-government for abject submission to a foreign power and a corrupt court. It gave the protection of the *Habeas Corpus* and trial by jury, instead of the oppressive tribunals of feudalism. For ignorance and repression, it gave cheap schools and a free press. It removed the arbitrary shackles from trade and abolished its unjust monopolies. It enfranchised the serfs of the soil and restricted the excessive power of the *seigneurs*. It gave an immeasurably ampler liberty to the people and a loftier impulse to progress than was before known. It banished the greedy cormorants who grew rich by the official plunder of the poor. The waste and ruin of a prolonged and cruel war were succeeded by the reign of peace and prosperity; and the pinchings of famine, by the rejoicings of abundance. The *habitants* could now cultivate their long-neglected acres free from the molestation of Indian massacres or the fear of British invasion. Even the conquered colonists themselves soon recognised their improved condition under their generous conquerors."

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have kept our civil laws, but we have also with thanks and gratitude received from England her criminal laws, and I believe that the criminal laws of England are as perfect as human genius and experience can make them. Our civil laws, based on the Roman laws, are also admirable and are quoted in all the tribunals of the world. Under this system of laws we feel happy and contented. So, Mr. Speaker, you see some of the
Mr. AMYOT.

reasons why we are loyal. The more we know of our English-speaking friends in this country, the more we learn to appreciate them; and I may say that if among those who do not know us there may be sentiments against us, those sentiments soon disappear when we have opportunities of mutual intercourse and are enabled to know each other more perfectly. We admire the qualities of the English-speaking subjects of Britain, and they seem to regard the qualities of our race with pleasure also. I think, on this part of the continent, by mutual agreement, by mutual forbearance, we may live in harmony under the protection of the British flag, and approach the consummation dreamed by many of our people—that there may be a great Canadian nation composed of different races, but all animated with the desire of fostering the general welfare of all. In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I will with pleasure repeat the words of one of our most popular and celebrated public men, Sir Etienne Pascal Taché: That the last gun that would be fired in defence of the British flag on this continent will be fired by a French Canadian.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When I first saw the motion of my hon. friend on the paper, the only doubt in my mind was whether there was any special occasion for the Commons of Canada to renew the assurance of their loyalty towards Her Majesty. If I had any doubt whatever, it has been more than removed by the clear and lucid statement of my hon. friend in moving the resolution. I cordially agree with every word of his eloquent remarks, and I hope and believe that the House will respond to the resolution and to the sentiments which my hon. friend has expressed. As my hon. friend has just stated, the conversation which I sought with him was simply for the purpose of suggesting for his consideration some verbal alterations, because I thought it well that if possible the resolution should be received and carried without any amendment or suggestion of amendment; and my hon. friend was kind enough to view with favor some of the suggestions I made. I hope that the desire expressed by my hon. friend, that this resolution should be adopted by the House without any controversial remarks or any statement which in any way might impair the effect which my hon. friend's address ought to have in this House and in the country, and out of the country, will be realised. I shall say no more, Mr. Speaker, except that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has suggested an amendment which did not occur to me, but which is perfectly correct: that is, that the Address should, according to the ordinary form of Addresses to Her Majesty, begin, "Most Gracious Sovereign." However, I cordially agree with everything my hon. friend has said. I believe the resolution truly expresses the sentiments of the representatives of the people and of the whole people of Canada; and after hearing him, I am of the same opinion as he is, that this is a very opportune occasion, under all the circumstances, for expressing the sentiments contained in the resolution.

Mr. LAURIER. I am also of the opinion that perhaps there was no occasion for my hon. friend moving such an Address as this. We all appreciate the motives which have induced him to do so; but the resolution itself, unless it were coupled with some such remarks as those which have just fallen from

the First Minister, would almost imply that there was some necessity for renewing our expressions of loyalty to the British Crown. Now it is useless to say that there is no such necessity whatever coming from any quarter, because from all quarters of Canada there is nothing but the most unswerving loyalty to the British Crown at this moment, and devotion and attachment to the person of Her Majesty. The great qualities that Her Majesty has exhibited as Queen and as woman during her long career, have made the question of loyalty not only a feeling of duty, but a personal feeling in the heart of every one of her subjects. What I am afraid of, however, is that there is a mistake made sometimes, that what is mistaken for disloyalty is nothing more or less than the natural anxiety which all Canadians naturally have as to their future. I thank my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) who has spoken for the race to which he and I belong, for the way in which he has alluded to the French Canadians. He has alluded to the fact that in the first year of Her Majesty's reign our compatriots rose in rebellion against the Crown; but I repeat what he stated, that the fair and generous treatment which we have ever since received, and which I hope we will ever receive in the future, has converted that sentiment of bitterness into a sentiment of devotion to the British Crown. My hon. friend, however, said that our aim was to create a great nation on this side of the ocean. Well, if this is our aim, as it is, to create a great nation on this side of the ocean, based, as I hope, on British institutions, this brings us to the fact that our connection with Great Britain cannot remain forever what it is at the present day. As long as the powers of self-government, which we now enjoy, are adequate to our national requirements, for my part I endorse and will endorse every word which is contained in this Address, but—I speak with all candor—I do not expect that Canada will remain forever a colony. There is no necessity to enter into this question at present. Now our citizenship is adequate to our requirements, but I think our condition might be improved, and this might be the subject of further discussion. I cannot lose sight of the fact that at present there is a movement in favor of Imperial federation. That movement implies that our present relations with Great Britain might be improved. It does not follow that our relations with Great Britain are deemed unsatisfactory, but simply that they might be improved. I agree with the sentiment that our relations with Great Britain may be improved, whether in the way indicated by that movement or in any other way, but, whatever may be the future relations of this country to Great Britain, as long as we remain as we are to-day, with the great measure of liberty which we have received from Great Britain, we are quite happy to express our feeling of attachment to the Crown of England and to the person of Her Majesty.

Mr. MITCHELL. It may not be inopportune for me to make a few remarks on such a proposition as this. I endorse every sentiment which has been uttered by the mover of the resolution (Mr. Mulock), and I listened with pleasure to the repetition of the history of the loyalty of our French fellow-subjects to the Throne of England. I may say that I looked upon it with a little

suspicion when it was first introduced, because I thought it might imply some antagonism to our neighbors and kinsmen on the south of the line, but I think that the present resolution will not be looked upon as in any way antagonistic to them. I believe it is the interest of this country to maintain the most friendly relations with the people of the United States, and, as I understand the statement of the mover of the resolution, he was induced to take this step mainly in order to correct the impressions which our friends on the south of the line might have obtained from statements made to them, or from the press, as to the sentiments or the loyalty of the people of Canada. I have been pleased to hear the expressions from both sides of the House in reference to our loyalty to the Throne and Constitution of England. I am as loyal as any man in this country. I am no annexationist. I am no advocate for independence. But, as my hon. friend, the leader of the second-rate party in this House—because I recognise three parties, and, perhaps, for all I can tell, there may be four parties—has stated, I recognise that Canada cannot and will not always remain a colony; but I am willing to abide the tide of events. We have made a success as a colony. We have had prosperity; perhaps not always as great as many might desire. We have had just laws; perhaps not always executed as justly as some of us might expect. But we have had peace and prosperity in this land; we have, under the aegis and protection of the greatest nation in the world, attained to a position which, notwithstanding what certain statesmen in England some fifteen or twenty years ago may have said as to the weakness of Canada, prevents anyone now from denying that we are a source of strength to the home country, and must be so as long as we remain in connection with her. Long may it be before that connection is severed; but, I may say, that it cannot remain in harmony and with satisfaction to the people of Canada if the interests of Canada are neglected or overlooked. I make this one observation not to raise any discussion on a motion of this kind—for I would deprecate that—but simply to tell the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, that it is his duty and that of his Government, when they are sending this Address to Her Majesty, to inform her Ministers that there are some people, at all events, in this Parliament of Canada who think that the interests of Canada have for some time past not been receiving that attention and protection to which they are entitled. I will not particularise now this question to which I allude. Every one here understands to what I refer. I only hope that the Government, in sending this Address to the home Government, will represent that, if Canada shows a fealty to the English Crown and a desire to aid in the protection of the Empire, she has a right to expect a corresponding protection from the Empire in regard to the rights which really belong to it, and in connection with which that fealty is given. In conclusion, I may say that there are some political doctors who, of late, have promulgated vague changes and ideas under the name of Imperial Federation, as to the advantage which the Empire and Canada might gain from the creation of a central authority in London with colonial representation. We are progressing satisfactorily now, and I want these political doctors to leave us alone. We are

satisfied with the relations which Canada has with the Empire at present, and they had better leave well alone. If they imagine that we will submit to any sort of taxation dictated by a body assembled in London, they will find that no one possessing any sense in Canada will consent to anything of the kind. There is no man of sense in Canada who would consent to it. I merely throw this suggestion out now in order that, when we are sending this devoted and loyal Address to Her Majesty, as representing the sentiments of the people of Canada, we should also let Her Majesty's Ministers know that if they countenance, as some have countenanced, this agitation for a change in our relations, based upon giving up a certain portion of our liberties, the people of Canada are not unanimous, at all events, and I believe there is only a small fragment of them that feel inclined in that way. I felt it a duty to myself, as a representative man, when we are sending this Address, that we should also let them know that there are some things in which our relations to the Empire, and to the Executive of the Empire, might be very much improved in the interests of Canada.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). Representing a remote part of Canada on our most southerly frontier, and which is to some extent cut off from the rest of the Dominion, I may be permitted to say that I cordially join in the sentiments of the mover of this resolution. I would not have trespassed upon the time of the House were it not that I have seen in newspapers lately some reference to my constituency, and to the town in which I live. Well, Mr. Speaker, although I do not think it necessary to contradict every newspaper report, I take this opportunity to say there is no truth in the newspaper statements derogatory to the loyalty of my constituency, or of the town of Windsor in which I live. I believe it as loyal a town as is to be found in Canada, and I would like no easier task than to contest that constituency with an annexationist. I may say that the town gave me a very large majority at the last general election, and I am very certain that the question of annexation if put forward, would increase rather than lessen that majority, as there are many patriotic old Reformers who would support me upon such an issue. Some statements have been made in the press affecting a fellow townsman of mine, Mr. Solomon White, lately a member of the Provincial Legislature. I have Mr. White's personal assurance that what he did say was, that if our relations were to be changed, if there was to be any constitutional change in the direction of independence, while he is perfectly satisfied with our relations with the mother country now existing, rather than support independence he would go in for political union with the United States. While I do not echo his sentiments in that regard, I think there are men in this House, and a good many men in the country, who would agree with him. I think Mr. White has a perfect right, as we all have, to exercise our own judgment as to the future, because we all must look forward to some future for this country. For my part, I hope the time is far distant when there may be any severance of the tie binding us to the mother country. I believe there is no possibility of annexation to the United States under their present constitutional system. Our own constitution rests
Mr. MITCHELL.

on a far broader basis of liberty; we are more in touch with popular sentiment, and the people have a more direct control over those who serve them in a public capacity. During the greater part of my lifetime I have lived upon our south-western frontier and have had exceptional opportunities of studying the two forms of government, and I have no hesitation in saying that all my sympathies are with our own system, as infinitely superior in the spirit of true liberty, and all my energies will be devoted to supporting and perpetuating the system of government which we possess. I heartily endorse the sentiments of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) in the Address which he has moved in this House this afternoon.

House divided on motion of Mr. Mulock.

YEAS :
Messieurs

Amyot,	Landry,
Archibald (Sir Adams),	Lang,
Armstrong,	Langelier (Quebec),
Audet,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bain (Soulanges),	La Rivière,
Bain (Wentworth),	Laurier,
Baird,	Livingston,
Barnard,	Lovitt,
Barron,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Béchar, d,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bell,	Mackenzie,
Boisvert,	McCarthy,
Borden,	McCulla,
Bowell,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bowman,	McIntyre,
Boyle,	McKay,
Bryson,	McKeen,
Burdett,	McMillan (Huron),
Cameron,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Campbell,	McMullen,
Cargill,	McNeill,
Carling,	Madill,
Carpenter,	Mara,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Marshall,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Masson,
Casey,	Meigs,
Casgrain,	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	Mitchell,
Choquette,	Moffat,
Cinon,	Moncrieff,
Cochrane,	Montplaisir,
Colby,	Mulock,
Cook,	Neven,
Corby,	O'Brien,
Costigan,	Paterson (Brant),
Coughlin,	Paterson (Essex),
Coulombe,	Perley,
Couture,	Perry,
Curran,	Pope,
Daoust,	Porter,
Davis,	Porter,
Dawson,	Putnam,
Denison,	Putnam,
Desaulniers,	Rinfret,
Dessaint,	Riopel,
Dewdney,	Robertson,
Dickinson,	Robillard,
Doyon,	Roome,
Dupont,	Ross,
Earle,	Rowand,
Ellis,	Rykert,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Ste. Marie,
Ferguson (Welland),	Scriver,
Fisher,	Semple,
Flynn,	Small,
Foster,	Somerville,
Freeman,	Sproule,
Gauthier,	Sutherland,
Geoffrion,	Taylor,
Gigault,	Temple,
Gillmor,	Thérien,
Godbout,	Thompson (Sir John),
Gordon,	Tisdale,
Grandbois,	Trow,
Guay,	Tupper,
Guillet,	Turcott,
Haggart,	Tyrwhitt,
Hale,	Vanaase,
	Waldie,

Hesson,	Wallace,
Hickey,	Wa.d,
Holton,	Watson,
Hudspeth,	Weldon (St. John),
Innes,	Welsh,
Ives,	White (Cardwell),
Jamieson,	White (Renfrew),
Joncas,	Wilmot,
Jones (Digby),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Kirk,	Wood (Brockville),
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Labrosse,	Wright—161.
Landerkin,	

NAYS :

None.

Mr. MULOCK moved that the said Address be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MULOCK moved than an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to lay the Address at the foot of the Throne.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MULOCK moved that the Address be presented to His Excellency by such members of the House as are members of the Queen's Privy Council.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are they loyal? You had better present it yourself.

Motion agreed to.

SETTLERS ON THE RAILWAY RESERVE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. LAURIER moved for :

1. Copies of all petitions addressed to His Excellency the Governor General by settlers in the districts of Cranberry, Cedar, Wellington, Nanoose, and Nanaimo, British Columbia, asking the privilege of obtaining the lands on which they had squatted on the Island Railway Reserve on ordinary terms allowed to settlers, viz., that their grant should include surface and minerals. 2. For copies of all Orders in Council passed to authorise a Commission to enquire into the claims of the said settlers.

He said : It has been represented to me that certain settlers who are interested in this motion are squatters upon land which subsequently became part of the railway belt in the island. It has been represented to me also that they were desirous of obtaining pieces of land, and should have obtained them before the lands became part of the railway belt. I have been also informed that upon several different occasions they have made complaints and representations to the Government in that regard. It is a matter of public notoriety that upon one or two occasions they made their complaints to His Excellency the Governor General when he visited British Columbia. I understand a rumor has gone abroad, founded or not founded in fact, I do not know—and this is a point on which I desire to be informed—that in answer to petitions which were placed in the hands of His Excellency, an Order in Council had been passed authorising the issuing of a Commission to investigate the claims of those settlers. Whether such an order has been passed or not, the impression has certainly prevailed for some years past in that district that such an order had been issued ; and what I desire to ascertain is whether such an order has been issued or not ; if the order has been issued why is it not complied with, or, if the order has not been issued, whether it is the intention of the Government to enquire into the claims of those squatters in order to ascertain whether they can be granted or not ?

Mr. GORDON. This motion has taken me somewhat by surprise to-day, and also at some disadvantage, as I am not very well. If I remember rightly I called for a similar return, in fact for all correspondence relating to these railway lands, in 1887, and from the return brought down, I was unable to find either the petition referred to in the motion of the hon. gentleman or the Order in Council referred to in the motion. I took every opportunity, and made every effort possible, to ascertain if anything had emanated from the Government, or any department thereof, giving the settlers any reason to believe that they were to be entitled to the mineral rights under the lands within the railway belt. When the Bill granting those lands to the Esquimault and Nanaimo Railway Company was before this House, I think, on referring to *Hansard*, it will be found that in pleading for those settlers, I mentioned the fact that there were 122 settlers on those lands. I also mentioned the fact that they had been led to believe by different persons that they had a claim, not only on the Local Government, but also on the hon. gentleman who led the Government in 1875. It was a vague claim, however, and when it came to be examined it really did not amount to a claim. Other difficulties have arisen with respect to the mineral rights. Some of the parties who claim to be squatters, and justly so, and who have been squatters within my own knowledge since 1870, have so far failed to obtain the right to their pre-emption records. As will be remembered, the Local Government were constituted by that Act the agents of the Government of Canada. There was no alternative given to the Canadian Government to dismiss them and appoint other agents, but their agency was complete ; and any settler who happened to incur the displeasure of the railway company met with opposition to their records from the then Commissioner of Lands and Works in British Columbia. Some of the settlers have, to my own knowledge, suffered very great hardship and are now threatened with eviction. But it is not my fault ; and I fancy this appeal to the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has been due to a feeling entertained by those settlers that their interests have been neglected by the Government, and perhaps by myself, although they do not convey that view in their communications to me. They simply inform me of the fact that they have placed their case in the hands of the leader of the Opposition, and referred him to me for information on the subject. I have had no communication with the hon. gentleman beyond asking him, the other day, to allow the motion to stand for one day in order that I might read over my letter from the party again, and to which the hon. gentleman kindly consented. Referring to the complaints of those squatters, the very foundation of them lies in the passing of the Bill under which the land was handed over to the railway company. I find the hon. gentleman's name among the names of those who voted for that Bill, which gave that company all the rights they possess and all the powers they are exercising over the people who now complain. My name is not to be found in that list. In answering the people who applied to me I stated my surprise that they had asked the leader of the Opposition to investigate the matter when he himself was among those who—I do not say wilfully, but in ignorance of the

condition of affairs in British Columbia—voted for a Bill which, no doubt, he believed to be right but which at the same time caused all the injury of which these people complain. I do not know that I can add anything further than to say that I relieve the hon. gentleman of any desire to interfere in matters within the electoral district of Vancouver. It is his right, if appealed to, to take this action, and if he can devise any means by which the wrongs of those people can be righted he shall have my support; if he can devise any means to repeal that Act, that is acting more harshly than was even dreamed of when I appealed to the House on the subject, he shall have my support to the fullest possible extent. In any condemnation of that scheme he himself must stand as having assisted its adoption. I hope, however, some relief may be obtained, by which the courts may be placed in a position that they may not find the power vested in the Bill to transfer to that company the rights which they now claim to exercise, and that the people will yet be enabled to obtain their rights. If the motion of the hon. gentleman will tend in that direction, I will, on their behalf, feel very much obliged to him and to hon. members who will support it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In reply to the appeal made by the leader of the Opposition, I may state, as the hon. member for Vancouver says, that all correspondence in relation to this matter was brought down in 1887, on June 22nd, in accordance with the motion passed. The Department over which I preside has no record of any Order in Council having been passed directing that a Commissioner be appointed to enquire into that matter. There is no Order in Council that I can place, and I believe none has been passed. Since the date those papers were brought down to the House, we have no communications whatever in our Department with reference to this matter.

Mr. LAURIER. I did not bring up this subject with a view to raise any question as to the suggestion of any policy to be followed in regard to these matters. The only desire I had in view, in bringing up this matter, was to know whether or not there had been such an Order in Council passed, as I am informed had been represented in the district to have been passed. The return which was brought down in 1887, as far as I understand, contained no petition whatever from the inhabitants of these districts. This was surprising to the people, and that is the reason why I brought up this motion, because they allege for a certainty that upon one or two different occasions they laid their grievances by petition before His Excellency the Governor General, on his visit to British Columbia. Now, it is extraordinary to them that having presented those petitions and submitted their grievances, that when they ask to have these petitions brought before the House, the answer should be there is no petition at all. They believe somehow that those petitions have been pigeon-holed away and forgotten, and that if a full enquiry were to be instituted, those petitions would be found. At all events, one thing is certain: that they will know by the debate which took place to-day the position in which they stand. The only object I had in view in bringing forward the question was to know exactly how the matter stands. The settlers in these districts will now
Mr. GORDON.

know that their petitions are not in the Department; they will know no Order in Council has been passed to investigate their claims, and they will take their remedy afterwards. As to what course ought to be followed by them afterwards, or as to whether their claims are well founded or not, the instructions which I had do not go so far as to say. The instructions were to have something tangible on which they could act one way or the other, and now they have this, which is nothing at all.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have given the hon. gentleman the information I obtained from my Department after I saw his notice on the paper. I will make further enquiries, and if I find that there are other papers anywhere of course they will be brought down.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand this motion is to stand.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If you please.
Motion agreed to.

SULTANA ISLAND.

Mr. BARRON moved for:

Return showing whether or not the island known as Sultana Island, in the Lake of the Woods, has been sold, and if sold, showing by what right or title the Government of Canada claimed to have the power to sell the same; showing, also, all correspondence had between the Government of Canada and the purchaser or purchasers of said island, or the solicitors or other persons acting on behalf of such purchaser or purchasers (if any); showing, also, the area of land contained in said island, and the value and extent of the pine timber thereupon, and the price or amount for which the said island was sold, and the names and addresses of the purchaser or purchasers thereof.

He said: I would like to have that motion amended so as to include the bringing down of any map there may be showing the location of the islands themselves.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior whether the Government of Ontario have not claimed these islands as a portion of the Crown domain of that Province; and if so, whether any correspondence has taken place between the Department and the Government on the subject? If that be the case, I think it will be very desirable that this motion should be amended so as to embrace that correspondence also.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In correspondence with the Deputy Minister of my Department, I found out that the Crown Lands Department of Toronto had laid claim to Sultana Island, after it was found that there were mineral deposits upon it, and probably there may be correspondence upon the subject. If so, I will be glad to bring that down, as well as the maps which the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) asked for.

Mr. BARRON. Since putting that motion on the Order paper, I have been advised that at one time the island was leased prior to the sale. I would like to have the motion so amended as to include any lease there may be.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not aware of any lease, but I will bring everything down.

Motion agreed to.

C. P. R. BRIDGES IN BAGOT COUNTY.

Mr. DUPONT (Translation) moved for :

Copies of all petitions, letters or other documents addressed to the Government, complaining of the condition of the bridges on the branch lines of the railways in the county of Bagot and the neighboring counties, worked by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

He said : I am not inspired by any hostile design, Mr. Speaker, against the Canadian Pacific Railway in making this motion. Quite on the contrary, for I have always been, as much as lay in my power, by my votes in this House, favorable to this company, which was destined to develop the portions of our country, which ought to have been and which were not up to that time accessible to colonisation. For some years past, certain lines of railway in the county of Bagot and the neighboring counties, running under charters obtained from the Local Government, fell under the control of the Canadian Pacific. On these railway lines, originally called the "South Eastern," "The Montreal, Portland and Boston" and "The St. Lawrence and Lake Champlain Junction Railway," there were temporary structures; portions of the railway and the bridges were built of wood of a very inferior character. During the ten years since these lines have been built, these bridges have not been renewed, and the working of these lines has been carried on as in the past by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Several citizens of the county of Bagot and the neighboring counties state that certain portions of these roads are dangerous to the travelling public, and that there will result sooner or later, to the company as well as to the public, considerable injury and loss, owing to the bad condition of these lines. My intention, Mr. Speaker, is to draw the attention of the Government to these facts before a catastrophe takes place. I trust that the Government, through its engineers, will prevent in this portion of the Province of Quebec, a catastrophe as disastrous as that which overtook the "Vermont Central" through the imperfections of that line—I allude now to the accident at the White River Junction. The Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Speaker, is not always readily disposed to renew certain works which ought to be so renewed, when they are not owners of the lines but merely lessees of certain branches of these roads. For this reason I will venture to ask the Government to see that this company places the travelling public and the citizens of this portion of the country in a position to be able to travel with the same safety and comfort that is to be found on all other lines of railway. I have no intention to injure in any way the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but I make these observations, I repeat, in the interests of the public, of the Government itself, as well as of the company; for if any disaster should happen on these lines, it would throw a heavy responsibility on the Government and on the company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to this motion passing. If there are any petitions or correspondence they will be brought down. From the memorandum sent me, I do not find that there are any such petitions or correspondence; but I am sure we are all obliged to my hon. friend for calling the attention of the Government to the state of these railways. Of course, it is of the greatest importance that there

should not be any doubt as to the safety of any railway, and since the hon. gentleman has called my attention to the matter, I will, as Minister of Railways, make it my duty to cause an immediate enquiry to be made as to the state of the railways to which he refers.

Motion agreed to.

THE GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. RINFRET (Translation) moved for :

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and documents of every character respecting the Great Eastern Railway, or any line of railway which it is proposed to lay between Lévis and Montreal, following the course of the river St. Lawrence.

He said : Last Session, Mr. Speaker, I drew the attention of the House and of the Government to the great importance, looking towards the general interests of the country, that was to be attached to the granting facilities for the building of a railway connecting the last railway station at Lévis with the city of Montreal. The Hon. Minister of Public Works answered that the Government would interest themselves in the construction of this line : which statement he has verified by granting subsidies to it on many occasions. At the last Session I had the pleasure of seeing that grants were made for the encouragement of the Great Eastern Railway; but unfortunately the grants of the last Session have not been drawn upon, for reasons which I cannot understand; but I suppose that the contractors had not the necessary means to carry out the works of construction. These delays in the building of this road have caused grievous disappointment in the county which I represent, as well as in the neighboring counties. And I might say that not only in these counties but also among business men and merchants in general of the cities of Lévis, Quebec and Montreal, there are misgivings as to the final success in securing the building of this line; so keen did these become that last summer, the French Board of Trade of Montreal considered it right to interfere. It called a meeting at Nicolet, composed of delegates from Montreal and the other parts of the Province interested in the building of the Great Eastern Railway. At this meeting, certain resolutions were adopted, and, although they may be somewhat lengthy, I do not think that I can do better than to bring them before the House, in order that it may see their importance. This is how they read :

The convention having been organised as aforesaid and debate thereon having taken place according to the usual forms, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the delegates present:—

1. Whereas the parishes ranged in sequence on the south shore of the river St. Lawrence, from the parish of La Prairie to the city of Lévis, and the parishes adjoining the said parishes, but more particularly those included in the territory between Lévis and Sorel, are deprived of the advantages to be derived from a railway which would give them direct communication with Montreal and its great network of railways to the west, and with the Maritime Provinces on the east by way of the Intercolonial Railway;
2. Whereas the assured success of the railway from Montreal, as regards a number of the said parishes, and that of the other lines projected or partially built admits of grave doubts;
3. Whereas the Intercolonial Railway does not pay expenses because at a point in the neighborhood of Lévis its traffic is absorbed by a line which controls the rates for freight or passengers from Halifax to Montreal, to wit the line of the Grand Trunk Railway;

4. Whereas a railway starting from the present terminus of the Intercolonial Railway at Lévis, would reach Montreal by passing through the said parishes of the south shore, and would absorb the Montreal and Sorel Railway, and the other lines projected or partially built,—would be able to pay expenses by means of its local traffic, seeing that the parishes in question include a population of more than 60,000 souls, producing an annual value of exports of about \$3,700,000;

5. Whereas such a railway would aid, by forming one unbroken means of communication or trunk line between Montreal and the Maritime Provinces, to further develop the rich country through which it would run, while at the same time releasing the Intercolonial from a duty which is a heavy charge upon the Dominion exchequer;

6. Whereas the Intercolonial Railway was projected and built in its inception with the object of binding together all the Provinces of the Dominion; and with its present terminus it does not fully accomplish the object of its construction, which would be attained if it was pushed as far as Montreal;

7. Whereas the extension of the Intercolonial Railway as far as Montreal, along the St. Lawrence River, on the south shore, would not be injurious to the railways constructed in the interests of the Province of Quebec, but would be, on the contrary, a new reason for their material development;

8. Whereas the aforesaid parishes, which only possess communication with the important centres of the country during the summer season, are unanimous in demanding the said extension of the Intercolonial from Montreal to Lévis in order to remedy these inconveniences which are injurious to their development;

It is hereby resolved to pray the Dominion Government to undertake at their own cost the construction of a railway, from the present terminus of the Intercolonial, as far as the city of Montreal, proceeding by way of the south shore of the river St. Lawrence.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, was adopted by all the delegates present, who numbered from two to three hundred. I consider that these resolutions are of great importance,—and that it was my duty to bring them before this House. I do not expect that the Dominion Government can pronounce this day upon the question. However, I shall take advantage of the opportunity to remark that there are only 160 miles of railway yet to be built in order to connect the Intercolonial with the other railways of the west. We have spent more than \$100,000,000 on the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific. There only remain about \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 to spend in order to link together these lines which are the most important in the country. I think, further, that it would be easy to prove to the House that this addition to the public debt, so far from being a burden upon the country, would be of great service to it, inasmuch as the projected line would pay its expenses. It is a well known fact that the Pacific line from Montreal to Quebec, on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, is one of the best paying portions of the Pacific Railway. The parishes on the south shore are as rich or richer, perhaps, than those on the north shore of the St. Lawrence; and I have no doubt but that in a few years from this time the local traffic will be sufficient to pay, not only the interest on the money expended, but even handsome dividends. The building of this line would have, besides, the advantage of increasing the traffic on the Intercolonial: the carriage of freight between Montreal and Lévis often meets with difficulties and delays, because the Grand Trunk is not equal to the traffic between these two points. Another disadvantage, which I may mention in passing, is that up to the present time the carriage of freight is absolutely controlled by the Grand Trunk. It follows from this that the Intercolonial does not reap the benefits which it would were there a

Mr. RINFRET.

direct line between Lévis and Montreal. So I say that if the Government would consent to build a line between Lévis and Montreal, the Intercolonial would derive considerable advantage; which would enable it to lessen considerably the annual deficits. At the meeting held at Nicolet, of which I spoke a moment ago, there were other proposals made, not put in writing but merely enunciated by the speakers present. It was proposed that if the Government did not wish itself to undertake the building of this line between Lévis and Montreal, they could assist in another way, namely, in helping to construct the bridges of the road. I know that it is not customary for the Government to make grants for such a purpose, although such a course may not be without precedent. But I regret to say that a request to this end was made by the Great Eastern Company and they were refused. I hope however that the Government will reconsider its decision, and that if they do not decide upon building the road from Lévis to Montreal, they will at least aid in the building of the bridges on this line,—one of the most important in the country.

Mr. GUAY. It is with the greatest pleasure that I rise to support the motion which has just been made by my hon. friend from Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret). I do not hesitate in saying that I but echo the sentiments of the people of the south shore of the St. Lawrence from Lévis to Montreal, when I state that they would be most happy if the Government would undertake to build the Great Eastern Railway, in order to make a direct connection between the Intercolonial present terminus and Montreal. Last summer a meeting was called at Nicolet by the members of the French Board of Trade of Montreal, and the leading citizens who were interested in the scheme. The object of this meeting was to pass the resolutions which have just been read to the House by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret). I had been invited to be present and I had promised to be there, but unfortunately vexatious circumstances—sickness in my family—prevented me from going there. However I seize the present opportunity to declare before the House, that I wholly concur in the resolutions which were adopted by the Board of Trade of Montreal in meeting assembled at Nicolet. And I venture to hope that the Government will find the means to place in the estimates of this Session a sum of money sufficient to assure the building of this road, or at least to grant a sum sufficient to aid in the construction of the bridges. In fact, if I am well informed, I believe that this is almost the only thing which hinders at the present moment the construction of this great iron road. I am informed that there are bridges which will cost very great sums of money—something like three-quarters of a million of dollars. In conclusion, I venture to hope that the hon. Minister of Public Works, who has so far shown himself to be favorable to this enterprise, will continue to give it his patronage, and that he will assure, by his influence, during the present Session, the construction of this great iron highway.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED

Copies of all petitions, reports of engineers, and all correspondence in reference to the dredging of the bar at

the mouth of the River Thames, in the County of Kent, Ontario.—(Mr. Campbell.)

Return showing the date of the creation of the Trent Valley Canal Commission, the time and place of the first sitting, the actual number of days it has actually been occupied in the work appertaining to the said commission, and the number of days and of sittings held in taking and receiving evidence, and the places whereat thus far sittings of the commission have been held.—(Mr. Barron.)

Copy of the quarantine regulations of Grosse Isle, together with all Orders in Council and instructions given to the medical officers at said station.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 30th January, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Grand Orange Lodge of British America.—(Mr. Wallace.)

REUTER'S TELEGRAPH AGENCY.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Have the Government expended any money upon the account of any telegrams sent from Canada in the year 1889 through Reuter's Agency? If so, how much, and under what head does it appear in the Auditor General's Report?

Mr. COLBY. The sum of \$135.60 was paid in the year 1889 for telegrams. Nothing has been paid since March last. The amount was paid out of the contingencies of the Privy Council. I am not aware under what head it appears in the Auditor General's Report.

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. DUPONT (for Mr. CROMB) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish an experimental dairy department in connection with the Central Experimental Farm? If so, when?

Mr. CARLING. The subject is now receiving the consideration of the Government.

MANITOBA SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. WATSON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to offer for sale any of the school lands in the Province of Manitoba at an early date? If so, in what districts are the lands situated that will be offered for sale?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No date for holding the next general sale of school lands in Manitoba has yet been determined on, nor has it been decided what particular parcels of land will be offered. An inspection of the school lands in the Province, with a view to determining their probable value and eligibility for sale, has been in progress for the past season. The public will be duly notified, as in the past, when it is decided to hold such sale. One or two small parcels may be offered in the interval, as, for instance, a quarter of section 11, Township 5, Range 14, west of the 1st Meridian,

which the Government of Manitoba ask to have put up because the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company want to acquire it for town site and station ground purposes.

RECIPROCITY IN WRECKING, &c.

On the Order for second reading of Bill (No. 2) to permit reciprocity in wrecking and the towing of vessels and rafts, being called;

Mr. CHARLTON. It is arranged between the promoters of the three wrecking Bills now before the House, that this Bill shall stand over until Thursday, if the Government will consent to have the three Bills made the first Orders upon Thursday.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As it will be, no doubt, more convenient to have a day fixed for these three Bills, I see no objection to the request of the hon. gentleman.

Order allowed to stand.

I. C. R.—PASSENGER AND MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence and documents respecting the passenger and mail train service on the Intercolonial Railway between Lévis and Campbelltown.

He said: I wish to call the attention of the Government to the arrangements existing between Lévis and Campbelltown, especially Lévis and Rimouski, with regard to passenger and mail service, as there are general complaints on the subject. The following statement has been given me of the hours when the trains leave Lévis and arrive at Rivière du Loup. Since the beginning of October there have been three passenger trains a day. One leaves Lévis at 8 o'clock a.m., arriving at Rivière du Loup at 3 p.m.; another leaves Lévis at 3.30 p.m., arriving at Rivière du Loup at 6 o'clock in the afternoon; and the last one, which is called the market train, leaves Lévis at 5 p.m., arriving at Rivière du Loup at 1 a.m. From Rivière du Loup to Lévis the trains leave as follows: One at 7.45 a.m., one at 9, and a third at 9.20 a.m., and there is no train whatever for Lévis after that until 10 p.m. The first arrives at Lévis at 3 p.m., the second at 6 p.m., the express train from Halifax at 1.10 p.m., and there is no other train until 10 o'clock at night.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Is the train that arrives at Rivière du Loup from below the fast through train?

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). The fast train is the one leaving Rivière du Loup at 9.20 a.m., and arriving at Lévis at 1.10 p.m., so that there is no train at all from 9.20 a.m. until 10 at night. Another objection to the train arrangements is that the mail train does not stop at several important stations where there is a large quantity of mail matter. The mail bags are thrown from the train as it passes, and caught at the station; and the mail bags to be received on board are thrown on board in the same way, and the result has been that on several occasions mail bags both ways have been lost, and could only be found after several days' search. This system causes a great deal of confusion and inconvenience to the trade of that portion of our province. What the people along the line ask, is, that the same arrangements which are made in summer should be continued in winter. There is no complaint whatever about the train arrangements in

summer, and to make this change would not involve any additional expense, as it would not entail any additional train service. It seems as if that portion of the line from Rivière du Loup to Quebec was not to be considered at all. The train arrangements seem to have been made to suit some other portions of the line, without paying any attention whatever to the requirements of the public on that most important section. There is not a portion of the Intercolonial Railway which passes through a richer and more thickly-populated country, and that part of the country certainly deserves more consideration. The trade of the city of Quebec has suffered a great deal, the train arrangements being such that they give an interest to the people of that district to go straight through to Montreal, instead of stopping at Quebec. I postponed making this motion for a few days at the demand of the hon. member for Rimouski. I regret he is still too unwell to be in his seat, and do not care to risk postponement any longer, as I am afraid the motion would go too far down on the Order paper. I may add that it is at his special request I draw the attention of the House to this matter, and I am quite sure the Government will take steps to have the train arrangements made to suit the people of those localities.

Mr. DESSAINT. (Translation.) Seeing that the Intercolonial Railway passes through the county which I have the honor to represent, Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a few words to the remarks which have just been made by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier). Since the last changes in the departure of the trains have been made, I have been informed that several petitions have been addressed either to the Government or to Mr. Pottinger, the General Superintendent of the road, asking for the restoration of the hours as they existed last year, because the present arrangements are not most certainly in accordance with the desire of the population or the needs of commerce. As has been said by the hon. the last speaker, nothing would be more advantageous for the public than the changes asked for. In answer to the petitions which have been presented, Mr. Pottinger, or the railway authorities, have replied that as the time-tables have been made for some time, it would be almost impossible to make the desired changes. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is in my opinion, a poor reason for refusing a request which would be to the general interest of all this section of the Province which the Intercolonial traverses. It would have been easy, methinks, to change the hours; and the reason given for not doing so at the time is so far from being correct, that on that portion of the railway between Moncton and Halifax, changes in the hours have been made since the time referred to, and no fear was expressed that they would result in any inconvenience. But in the portion of the Province of Quebec of which I am one of the representatives, it has not been considered proper to take into consideration the reasonable complaints which have been made for a long time. We ask for nothing out of the common. We ask, simply, that the hours of the arrival and departure of the trains be fixed the same as last year, before the winter arrangement; by doing this everybody will be content. I have nothing to say against the local superintendent who received our representations with much good nature, but he was unable to make the desired changes. I trust, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

that the Government will take into consideration the reasonable demands which are made upon them. There is so much inconvenience under the existing system, that the Government would find, if they took the trouble to look into the question, that it is their duty to remedy the state of things. For example, let us take the station of St. Paschal, in the County of Kamouraska; the trains come in, the one at 1.45 p.m. and the other at 5.25 p.m. I must remark that fresh changes have been made in the carriage of the mails. Formerly the mail cart driver was compelled to make a journey to meet each train. To-day all this is changed and the driver of the mail cart is allowed to make but one trip in the afternoon, so that the mails reach us in Kamouraska very late in the evening, and often it is impossible to receive them in time to answer them by the next morning, because the trains leave at half-past seven, and the mail-driver makes but one trip in the morning. All this is very inconvenient for business and professional men. If we had the same hours for the arrival and the departure of the trains as we had last year the public would be fully satisfied. This is all we ask for. Another source of inconvenience we suffer from, is that in the County of Kamouraska the express train does not stop at all the stations. It should stop at least at the more important stations. For example, the express does not stop at Rivière Ouelle, which is an important parish, and where it did stop last year. This station serves also for St. Pacôme. The trains do not stop also at Ste. Hélène or at St. Alexandre, the centres of great business interests. Now, in the County of Temiscouata, represented by my hon. friend Mr. Grandbois, who, I trust, will concur in the statements I have made, the express does not stop at Cacouna, St. Arsène, St. Simon, or at St. Luce. Besides this, in the whole length of the valley of the Metapediac from St. Flavie to Campbellton, there are, if I am not mistaken, fifteen stations, and out of these fifteen stations the express stops at only two; whereas in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia the express stops at nearly all the stations, and stations of far less importance than those I have mentioned. I hope therefore, Mr. Speaker, on account of the reasons which I have given, the grievances of which we complain with so much cause will be removed, and that the hours of the departure and the arrival of the trains will be restored to what they were last year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fear I was unable to follow my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Dessaint) in all the remarks that he made in French, but there is no objection to bringing down all the papers, so that the House may be fully charged with the subject which my hon. friend has brought up. I had expected my hon. friend to make this motion every day for a week or ten days, and I had a memorandum from the Department on the subject, but I have not got it here to-day. The papers will be brought down at once. I know there is a very considerable feeling, from what my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Dessaint) has told me, in favor of a re-arrangement in regard to some of the trains. The Government may attempt to place some accommodation trains on that line, though of course my hon. friend cannot expect that the express trains will stop at every station.

We desire, however, to accommodate every part of the country through which that railway passes, from Lévis to Halifax, as far as possible.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—THE ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows :—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1891, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 30th January, 1890.

Mr. FOSTER moved that His Excellency's Message, with the Estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

LOSS OF THE STEAMER QUINTÉ.

Mr. PLATT moved for :

Copy of report made and evidence taken by the Court of Inquiry ordered by the Department of Marine to investigate the loss of the steamer *Quinté*, which was burned on Bay of Quinté in the autumn of 1889.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no objection to the motion passing, but I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that it will take some time before the Department will be ready to bring down the return. The evidence has been taken, and it is very voluminous, and the final decision has not been reached. If it meets the wishes of the hon. gentleman, this motion can pass, and as soon as the matter is decided, the papers will be brought down.

Mr. PLATT. How long a time is expected to elapse before the decision will be reached ?

Mr. TUPPER. Not an unreasonable time. Simply sufficient time to allow me to look into the papers, which have only just reached the Department.

Motion agreed to.

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO ROAD.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) moved for :

Return of copies of all correspondence, petitions, reports or other papers respecting the sale, ownership or condition of the Dundas and Waterloo Macadamised Road, since the close of the Session of 1889.

He said : This is not a matter of very great moment to anyone but the inhabitants of my own county, but it is a matter which has been held in consideration since 1884. The road is only twenty miles long, seventeen miles of which lie in my county, and three miles in the adjoining County of Waterloo. The road is decorated with four tollgates, and, of course, the first duty of the proprietor is to see that no man gets through those tollgates without being tolled. Some six months after the sale, when the conveyance to a new proprietor should have been executed, there was a hitch discovered, and it was found impossible to complete the conveyance, more particularly as the purchaser declined to form a company under the Joint Stock Companies' Act of Ontario.

He kept out of the operation of that Act, and special legislation had to be introduced in this House to enable the Government to convey the road to the purchaser. About that time the Ontario Government set up a claim to the ownership of the road, and the Bill which was introduced here was withdrawn. In 1885, correspondence began between the Department of Public Works and the Department of Justice, with a view to ascertain who were the proprietors of this road. The hon. Minister of Public Works, at the close of the Session of 1885, intimated to the House that at the earliest possible moment the papers would be looked up and the question of ownership would be settled. We find that correspondence began in September, 1885, and we find that in the Session of 1890 that correspondence is still in progress. In the meantime the gentleman that purchased this road, like every other business man, not feeling that he had a very sure tenure of the property, although he was in possession, did not particularly exert himself to put it in a very high state of repair. But he was particularly careful to attend to the tollgate question. He proceeded to load up that road with a series of check gates and devices for the purpose of extracting money out of the community, until at last the community got tired and some of these gates disappeared mysteriously in the night. Since then, not finding that he had sufficient encouragement from the Minister of Public Works to maintain his aggressive policy, the people have been allowed to go by paying the old series of tolls ; and a year ago the County Council of Wentworth felt that it was becoming a nuisance, and they passed a resolution urging the Government to take some steps to settle the ownership of this road. The Reeves of the municipalities of Beverly and West Flamboro', through which the seventeen miles in my county run exclusively, and where they have the honor of paying toll at three distinct gates, also petitioned the Minister of Public Works to have the road inspected, believing that a competent engineer would indicate that the road was not in such a condition as would entitle the proprietor to collect tolls. The Minister kindly sent an engineer, and he went over the road. His report as presented contains sufficient internal evidence that he did not consider the road was in a very high order. I do not know what his instructions were, but there was no indication from the tenor of that report that he was required to inspect the road with a view of ascertaining whether improvements were required, or whether they should be effected. He stated that he saw certain quantities of material lying on the road, and some men at work, and the appearances were that the proprietor was improving that road. The residents on that road tell me that that material is a part of the stock-in-trade, that it has been on that road, not quite ever since they can remember, but that it has been lying on the roadside until the thistles and the weeds have grown up through it ; and if the engineer would go along there again he would see it just waiting to go on the road, as it was years ago, and as it had been there for years previous. Now, when I tell you that the engineer simply appeared on one end of that road and went through to the other in less than one day, you can understand the nature of the inspection. I feel satisfied that no engineer who is expected to report on the condition of a road can make an effective survey of

the road in such a limited period: and the result is, that things are dragging on just as they were five years ago, after the road was sold and transferred into the hands of this party. We are told this Session that the correspondence is still going on between the two departments, and that a series of questions that had been sent over to the Department of Public Works for answer, respecting this road, are in process of being replied to. This process has been going on for three or four years. I know that last summer, about every two months, I felt it my duty to write down to the Minister of Public Works and ask him if these papers had found their way to the Department of Justice, with a view of having this question settled; and, invariably, in the course of a week or ten days, I received a reply, saying that they had received my letter, and that they were commanded to acknowledge the receipt thereof; and that as far as I could get. I got as many answers, from time to time, from that Department as would fill a cart—if I had only preserved them. In addition to that, to be just to the Minister, I must say that every time I have interviewed him about this question, he has always been exceedingly kind and exceedingly civil, and promised that the thing should be attended to; and I sometimes felt, after leaving him and saying hard things to him, that I ought to go out into a back yard and hire some individual to kick me for being so uncivil to so gentlemanly a Minister. But, all the same, while this state of things is going on, the people that travel this highway are the parties that are suffering. And there is this difficulty: Since this road was sold the community in the County of Wentworth became tired, thoroughly tired, of the way in which the public highways, upon which tolls were levied in that county, were being maintained; and there has been a systematic warfare upon the proprietors of those roads, simply to require that if the community pay toll on these highways they should, at least, give them a passable highway upon which to travel, with the result that, in some cases, the proprietors of the roads in that county have been obliged to give up their tolls until such time as they made effective repairs. I know one company that for over a year were unable to get tolls replaced upon their highway until these repairs were completed to the satisfaction of the local engineer, who was appointed to inspect these roads; and to-day one of the roads that belongs to the county is in the same position. The engineer inspected that road, and he intimated to the county that unless repairs were completed within a certain time the tolls should go off, and when the time appointed came the tolls went off, and to-day the people are travelling free on that road because the county did not comply with the instructions of that engineer. I have no hesitation in saying that if this road had been in the same category the tolls would have been off that road long ago, and then the community could have waited, with some degree of patience, until this question of ownership was settled. But they are in this position: that while the road is nominally under the control of the Dominion Government, no engineer can interfere with that highway unless he is sent out by the Dominion authorities at Ottawa. The people have petitioned the county judge, and they have moved the

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

county council, and they have worried me, and I have worried the Minister, and still the thing goes on, and still the people are paying toll. I say it is discreditable to the Administration that they should be placed in that position. I know it is a two-penny-half-penny matter interest to this whole Dominion, but I leave it to any member in this House if, under these circumstances, it is not a serious thing to be thus, from year to year, kept in the position of being forced to pay tolls for a road that I have no hesitation in saying, if it was under the same circumstances that other roads in that county are under, and in other portions of Ontario, there would not be a toll on it for a single week after a competent engineer had inspected the road. I only want to move the Minister, if possible, to require that the officers in his Department shall just hurry up a little bit faster than five years the hunting up of those papers concerning the construction of this highway. The road was built as an old Government highway some forty or fifty years ago, but in face of the fact that the people are suffering from the present condition of things—and I do not blame the present proprietor of the road—I do ask the Minister that, in the midst of a multiplicity of other cares pressing upon his attention, he would devote a little bit of attention to this matter and try and urge the question on, and let us have the question of the proprietorship of that road settled, and give the community a chance for fair play. It is for this reason that I have moved for the papers in this connection, because, although it is a small matter to a Legislature of this size, it is a very important matter to very many people residing in my county.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not find fault with the hon. gentleman who has brought this matter before the House on a motion for papers. They will be brought down as soon as it is possible to have them prepared, after the opinion of the Minister of Justice has been obtained. The hon. gentleman is perfectly correct in stating that it has taken a long time to bring this matter into its present position. The question was and is one between the Federal Government and the Ontario Government. The Ontario Government claim that the road might belong to them. When a Bill was brought before the House to legalise the sale made of the road, Mr. Mowat communicated with me on the subject, and I was authorised by my colleagues to withdraw the Bill in order that an examination might be made to ascertain whether the ownership rested in the Federal or Ontario Government. As the hon. gentleman has stated, this matter was a very old one, of probably more than fifty years' standing, and accordingly we had to cause search to be made, not only at Ottawa, but elsewhere, in order to ascertain where the ownership rested. We have now completed it, and the papers are being placed in order, and the latest papers will be placed in the hands of the Minister of Justice in a very short time, when the Minister will be in a position to examine the matter on the answers given to his questions, and then advise the Department on the subject. If his decision is that the road is one that belongs to the Ontario Government, of course the transfer will be made accordingly. I hope the hon. gentleman will be satisfied

with my statement, and that he will see there is every desire on the part of my Department, and on the part of the Government, to bring this matter to a close, and I think the end is very near.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). While I am perfectly satisfied with the present position of the matter, I would like to suggest this: that if the settlement is going to be delayed for some time it would be only fair to the people there to send an engineer, with instructions to ascertain the actual condition of the road, whether it was fit for travel and whether tolls should be collected. The people of the locality are suffering a wrong while a settlement is being delayed from time to time. I have no wish to press for the papers, and beg to withdraw the motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think the delay will be sufficiently long to render this necessary. If there was a prospect of a long delay I would comply with the request of the hon. gentleman, but I think we will soon come to a decision on the matter whereby the necessity will be avoided. If the road remains in the hands of the Federal Government, it will be necessary to send an engineer and obtain information in regard to it. If the road passes to the Ontario Government, of course it will be their duty to look after it.

Motion withdrawn.

KETTLE CREEK.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) moved for:

Copies of all letters to the Government asking that engineers be sent to examine Kettle Creek, between St. Thomas and Port Stanley, with a view to ascertaining the feasibility of building a canal; and all reports, maps and other documents sent in by such engineers.

He said: In moving for copies of all letters sent to the Government asking that engineers be sent to ascertain the feasibility of constructing a canal on the line of Kettle Creek, from St. Thomas to Port Stanley, I do so for the reason that it appears to me that no man who had lived in that section for any length of time, or who had had an opportunity of knowing the locality or anything as to the course of Kettle Creek or the lack of water supply there, could be so stupid and so insane as to imagine that a canal could be built between those two points. That a letter should have been sent to the amiable Minister of Public Works, asking him to send an engineer to make an examination and prepare a report on such a scheme, is to me very strange indeed. I can understand well that the kindness of heart which distinguishes the Minister of Public Works and his desire to please everybody, more especially those who are Conservatives, is such that he could easily make up his mind to send an engineer or engineers to make examination. It must, however, be borne in mind, that the Minister himself had been in that locality prior to that time; indeed, the hon. gentleman, with the rest of his colleagues, made frequent visits there. For a number of years past, whenever an election was about to take place they visited the locality, and the hon. Minister of Public Works had every opportunity of knowing the quantity of water that is in Kettle Creek and the impossibility of constructing such a canal. I am told, although of course I cannot vouch for the truthfulness of the statement, that after the survey had been made it was found that a canal to St.

Thomas would require to be 300 feet deep. The Government would not care about that; there would be lots of money to spend; they had plenty of funds, and it would prove advantageous to the district, and would thus be a means of inducing the electors to make up their minds to support the candidate of such a generous Government. I have no objection to that. I tell the Government now that, if they will build a canal from St. Thomas to Port Stanley, even if they have to go down 300 feet on account of lack of water in Kettle Creek, or if they tap the Thames, twenty miles distant, by boring through the earth, I will step aside. Let them select their Conservative candidates; for such a project would be a marvellous one and one capable of being conceived only by some people of St. Thomas, assisted by the ability of the worthy Minister of Public Works. I have been told further that, on account of the lack of water in Kettle Creek, they were going to adopt some means whereby they might use the water of the lake. Of course if they adopted such a scheme, which would benefit the good people of the locality, and more especially good Conservatives, I should be delighted to see it carried out, because, if we got a canal built from St. Thomas to Port Stanley and the lake water conveyed into the canal, it would solve a very great problem and relieve the difficulty we are now laboring under for lack of a sufficient supply of water for domestic purposes. It is admitted by everybody who knows anything about the matter, that there is not even a sufficient supply of water running there to serve a population of some ten or twelve thousand inhabitants. Yet we are told that the Minister of Public Works is going to build a canal there, and that he is going to have some of those big ships we hear talked about, sailing in that canal. It may be that the Minister intends to send some of those ships which protect our fisheries up there to look after a few Americans who live in St. Thomas, and who go down in the spring-time to catch a few suckers. Perhaps the Government are going to protect the fish there—and that, no doubt, will be a very laudable course for the Government to pursue. At all events, it would be the only apparent object in building the canal. I suppose I have no right to complain, but I was totally unaware that anything of this kind was likely to take place, until I heard that the engineers were upon the ground. I represent the views and wishes of the majority of the people in that locality, but if any communication did take place with the Government, it took place between them and some other person beside myself. Perhaps the communication was with my late opponent, for I understand that he, to a certain extent, controls the patronage of that district, and being unable to secure any other position, I suppose he is quite satisfied with that one. But, Sir, I declare that, in all common fairness, no more unjustifiable course could be pursued by the Minister of Public Works than in his trying to make the people of that locality entertain the idea of the possibility of the construction of a canal from St. Thomas down to Port Stanley. There was plenty of useful work for him to do at the port, and I have called his attention, time and again, to the state of neglect in which it was left. I have frequently called the attention of the Government to the number of wrecks that take place there on account of the neglect of the port at

Port Stanley. True, the Government says: "We have no control over the port; it was transferred to the railway company, and, therefore, we have no right to interfere." But I hold that the Government have plenty of work, if they will only do it, to put Port Stanley in a proper condition, without trying to deceive the public with the possibility of constructing this canal. Suppose there were a canal there, what would they do with it? What benefit would it be to the country? What have you to convey from Port Stanley to St. Thomas, or from St. Thomas to Port Stanley?

An hon. MEMBER. Suckers.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My friend here says "suckers." No doubt there are plenty of them at Port Stanley, as there are at other places; but let me return to the question of what object there can be of building this canal. Why, one flat car would convey all the freight that passes from Port Stanley to St. Thomas in a week, and what traffic there is, is all done by the railroad. How, then, I would ask, can anyone conceive the idea of building this canal, at enormous expense, when there is really no traffic to go in that direction? It is an absurd proposal; and I am surprised that the hon. Minister of Public Works should so far be deceived as to send his engineers to kick up their heels there for a week or ten days while they were making their surveys, taking their levels, and having a good time generally. It may be an amusement to them, it may give the worthy Minister an opportunity of spending a little money, but I do say that the people look upon the project as something most supremely ridiculous; and that the individual who recommended it is looked upon as only fit for—well, I will not say what—but he is certainly not fit to direct and advise the Government as to what they should do in the interests of the people of that locality. I therefore move for those papers in the hope that we may see that the Government are not quite so absurd as to think that they will build a ship canal from St. Thomas to Port Stanley.

Mr. CASEY. I thought perhaps the hon. Minister would say something about this matter, but if he has no explanation to make in connection with it, I cannot lose the opportunity of adding my voice to that of my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), in pointing out the absurdity of this whole proposal. The question did come up in this House before, when my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and, for the purpose of killing time, one night I started the proposal of making Kettle Creek navigable. After three hours' discussion, between midnight and three in the morning, we agreed that it would be possible, for an expenditure of half a million dollars, to make the river navigable at least for fish between these two points.

An hon. MEMBER. Suckers.

Mr. CASEY. Yes. I think the idea never entered into any reasonable mind that it could be made navigable for traffic, or that anyone believed, as my hon. friend says, that there is any traffic for it if the canal were built. Some years ago, the hon. Minister of Public Works may remember that somebody started the idea of digging a canal from the River Thames to Lake Erie through my county, and passing by a

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

village called Iona, and that surveys were actually taken for that. I remember asking my hon. friend, the Minister, for the figures regarding that scheme, and the figures in regard to it were pretty much the same as those my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) mentions in connection with this canal at St. Thomas, viz.: that it would take a cutting of somewhere about 300 feet in depth to carry the waters of the Thames down to Lake Erie by that route. The one project is just as absurd as the other, and whoever recommended it to the hon. Minister must have known it was absurd. Whoever had this survey made had it made for the purpose of making a little political capital out of it; but I am confident that that idea will work the wrong way. Instead of making political capital out of it, the parties who recommended it have succeeded in obtaining for themselves a very fair amount of public ridicule instead.

Motion agreed to.

LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) moved for:

A statement of all tolls and other receipts collected by the London and Port Stanley Railway and by the Great Western and Grand Trunk Railways at the port of Port Stanley, and of the disposition of all such revenues; and copies of all reports of engineers as to the state of such harbor not already laid before this House.

He said: In moving for this, I may state that it is a repetition to some extent of a motion which I had previously made. I have time and again called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the condition of the port at Port Stanley. I have frequently requested, when the Estimates were under discussion, that there might be an item placed in the Estimates to put the harbor in a decent state of repair. I have been told as frequently to exercise patience, and that perhaps the Supplementary Estimates might contain an item in them that would gladden my heart and please the people in that locality. I did keep patience until I knew the hon. the Minister as well as I know him now, and I had some hope, when he held out these promises, that perhaps I might realise something from them. But it has occurred so often that I have no hope that any redress will be given to the people of that locality at the present time. I could quite understand their being neglected during the time I have represented the locality; but, prior to me, a Conservative represented it, and during his time the people and the port were as much neglected as they have been during the time I have had the honor of occupying that position. I might say, in passing, that in a sense the people have been rightly served. The majority of them are Conservatives, true and staunch supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, ever faithful and true in recording their votes for them, while the number of Reformers among them is very small. But I suppose the Minister of Public Works knows full well that he can rely on the Conservatives in most parts of the country to support him whether he does right or wrong—that, according to the saying of the First Minister, he does not thank persons who support him only when he is right, it is when he is wrong that he wants their support; and I suppose he expects the people of that locality to come to his assistance in times of need, whether he deals fairly or unfairly with

them. I say he is dealing unfairly with them; and Port Stanley, from having been a thrifty and prosperous village, has so dwindled down that very little traffic or business is now done there; the traffic has been almost wholly forced from the lake, and is carried over the railways running east and west. It may be said on behalf of the Government that they have no control over that port, because it was transferred years ago to the London and Port Stanley Railway Company. No doubt my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture knows something about that matter; but he knows very well that his own city is now appealing against the wrong inflicted on the people by the London and Port Stanley Railway Company, and it is time he woke up to see that something was done to overcome the difficulty, lest the people of London complain of his indifference. He ought to bring pressure to bear on the Minister of Public Works to induce him to do something towards putting the port in a reasonably good condition, so that vessels may be enabled to land and ship cargoes there. What is the use of a canal from St. Thomas to Port Stanley if the port is left in its present condition? It would have to be put in a better condition before the vessels could be got through, and the hon. Minister of Public Works ought to see that the railway company does its duty in accordance with the agreement it entered into with the Government, that tolls and other revenues derivable from the port should be expended upon it. I therefore hope that when the papers are brought down the Minister will see the necessity of forcing the railway company to do its duty, and of having the harbor put into a proper and efficient condition.

Mr. CASEY. This is a matter which I have a good deal of knowledge of, for the reason that Port Stanley was formerly in my riding, though it is now in the riding of my hon. friend who has just spoken, and I think he is highly justified in calling the attention of the Government to the condition of that port. The terms of the lease under which the London and Port Stanley Railway Company were allowed to have control of the harbor, were, that they should spend all receipts from the harbor in keeping it in proper repair. I had a Committee on the condition of that harbor as far back as 1875, and it came out in evidence, even so long ago, that a great proportion of the receipts of the harbor had been diverted by the railway company to other uses. At a subsequent period we got a small Government grant, which went a long way towards putting the harbor in repair for the time being; but what we have complained of continuously ever since the harbor came into the hands of the railway company, is not so much that the Government did not make grants for it, but that they did not, neither the previous Government nor the present, insist on the railway company carrying out the terms of the lease under which it held the harbor. At the present time I do not know that there is much use in insisting on that provision of the lease that all receipts shall be spent on the harbor, because the company have effectually managed to kill off receipts by levying extremely high tolls, and the Government have supplemented their efforts in that respect by high duties, which have almost entirely put an end to the import trade which used to be done at Port Stanley. At one time

nearly all the coal imported for the supply of London and several adjacent districts was imported at Port Stanley, and the tolls were very considerable; but now, between the National Policy and the high tolls levied by the railway company, which prefers to bring the coal around by Buffalo on its own line, hardly any coal is imported at that port, and so with other things. Now, to put the port into decent repair, it will be necessary, not only to enforce the expenditure of all tolls on the harbor itself, but to make a considerable additional expenditure there. The Government are not unaware of the condition of this port. It has been examined and reported upon by their engineers several times during the last fifteen years. A great deal of money was spent on it about forty years ago, and we are now losing the benefit of that expenditure, because the port is being allowed to fall into disrepair, and is now useless except as a port of call. And the basin at the head of the piers, where vessels should have room to load, is filling up every year, and it is now almost entirely unfit to receive vessels. The Government are not unaware of the importance of the harbor and of its condition, which has been reported to them; but I would urge upon them and the House consideration of the fact that this harbor, situated about midway on the north shore of Lake Erie, directly in the way of vessels trying to escape from the prevailing winds on the western part of Lake Erie, should be put, at all events, in a decent condition of repair. I am speaking from personal knowledge of the fact that the piers, which were put up at great expense by this country, are absolutely rotting away, and unsafe even for foot passengers. My hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, has frequently expressed himself as having kindly feelings to that part of the country, and there is no reason why he should be unwilling to encourage trade and commerce there as elsewhere. If he will put his mind to it, he will be able to find somewhere the necessary few thousands to do what is absolutely required for this very important work.

Motion agreed to.

PEMBROKE POST OFFICE ROBBERY.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved for:

Copies of all communications sent to the Post Office Department in relation to the robbery of the post office at Pembroke, on the night of 19th or morning of 20th April last, together with copies of all claims for reimbursement by the Department of moneys abstracted from registered letters lying in the said post office at the time of said robbery.

He said: I make this motion for the purpose of drawing the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General to a case of extreme hardship, and to endeavor to enlist his sympathy on behalf of those whose money was stolen. The post office was broken into the 19th or 20th April last, the safe forced open, and all the registered letters that remained over from that day's delivery were rifled, and their contents abstracted from them, or the letters themselves taken. The amount of money thus stolen was in the vicinity of \$2,000, as far as can be traced. Many of the persons whose money was taken were very ill able to afford the loss, and in many cases these letters were posted in localities where there was no other means of transmitting money except through the Post Office Depart-

ment. They were posted in small towns where there were neither express offices nor money order offices, or banks, or any other mode of transmitting money, except by registered letter; and if the hon. the Postmaster General can see his way clear, under the law, to reimburse the sufferers, I am extremely desirous that he should carry out the suggestion I now make, and allow his sympathies to be extended towards those poor people.

Mr. HAGGART. The facts of the case are, as Mr. White has stated, that a robbery was committed at the post office and a lot of money taken from several registered letters lying in the safe. These parties who have lost the money are entitled to every sympathy; but it is a rule of the Department, which cannot be departed from in any case, that losses of that kind are never made good. This is the rule laid down in England and the United States, and in other countries which have similar regulations, and a departure from that rule would entail a very great responsibility on the Government which they would not be justified in assuming.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Statement showing the amount of dredging done during the season of 1889, in Prince Edward Island, by the dredge *Prince Edward*, the names of harbors and other places dredged during said season, and the amount of work done in each harbor.—(Mr. Perry.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 31st January, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the People's Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 34) to amend the Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 36) to confirm the agreement between the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Steamship and Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 37) to amend the Act to incorporate the Imperial Trust Company of Canada.—(Mr. Huds-peth.)

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 38) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: The object of this amendment Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

is to provide against promises on the part of candidates, of Government expenditure in their ridings. Another object is to provide that the Government shall not expend money for the purpose of influencing elections, that being one of the most fruitful and dangerous sources of corruption existing.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read the first time.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. McCARTHY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the leader of the House whether it would not be convenient that a day should be fixed for the second reading of the Bill that stands in my name with reference to the North-West Territories Act. I have suggested to him Wednesday week, if that would be convenient to the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a subject that will interest the House a good deal, and it would be well that a day should be fixed. The day suggested, Wednesday, the 12th February, would be a very convenient day, provided it meets the convenience of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. LAURIER. As far as this side is concerned, we are quite prepared to take it up on that day.

Mr. COOK. I may not be here then, owing to other business; but I will forestall the course I intend to take by stating that, if here, I shall certainly vote against the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is certainly an appeal to my hon. friend's magnanimity, and I think he should consult the hon. member for East Simcoe, and ascertain what day will suit him.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would be quite willing to do that, but as the hon. gentleman has indicated his intention, before hearing any discussion on the subject, of voting against the Bill, perhaps that is unnecessary.

Mr. COOK. I have read the speech of my hon. friend on the subject, and the Bill speaks for itself.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that the Order for second reading of Bill (No. 10) further to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 50, respecting the North-West Territories, be the first Order of the day on Wednesday, the 12th of February.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What rule does the hon. gentleman propose to adopt? I would suggest that we should proceed regularly through these items, and if for any reason the Government wish to alter that course, they should give us notice the night before, so that we shall know from day to day what items are likely to be taken up.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the suggestion of the hon. gentleman is one that will meet the approbation of both sides of the House, and I will see that this order is carried out. I might also suggest, before we go into Committee, whether or not we could agree, as far as possible, in going over the items of Civil Government, to keep our discussion to the items which are before the Committee. Last year, as will be remembered, we were led, while taking up the items of Civil

Government, into a discussion of all the expenditure in regard to the Departments. Of course, it is difficult to keep absolutely to the item under discussion, but I would suggest that, as far as possible, members should keep at least to the general line of discussion suggested by the item.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that we have endeavored to do that. Of course, sometimes the item might lead to a digression into other matters, but I think the hon. gentleman cannot complain of the tone which we adopted last year, and of the manner in which we endeavored to do everything to facilitate the business of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, it would be premature to ask the hon. gentleman when he will be likely to bring down his Budget. However, I suppose I am safe in supposing that it will not be brought down next week?

Mr. FOSTER. Not next week, or the week after.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Charges of Management..... \$179,902 36

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that there is a reduction of \$3,000 for the office of the Dominion Auditor and Assistant Receiver General, Victoria. I should be glad to hear under what circumstances this reduction has been effected, and, in particular, whether it is a permanent reduction, or simply means a transfer of one of the officers to some other department or branch.

Mr. FOSTER. The reduction is due to a rearrangement in the office of the Receiver General at Victoria, by which Mr. Graham, who was the Deputy Receiver General, has been superannuated, and the officer next in charge has been appointed at a far lower salary. Then some of the extra help has been dispensed with, making a reduction in the annual amount of \$3,000, which, I hope, will be permanent. Taking in the superannuation allowance with these salaries, the total amount is just about the same, and all around I think it is a very good arrangement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I understand that, practically, there is no reduction, that we have to pay out in a superannuation allowance what equals the amount of the nominal reduction.

Mr. FOSTER. We have the advantage of avoiding the payment of a very large salary to the head officer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that Mr. Graham had a salary of \$3,000 before. I should like to know who takes his place and at what salary?

Mr. FOSTER. The officer who takes his place is J. H. McLaughlin, who was receiving \$1,200, and who now gets in his new place a salary of \$1,800.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose another officer is put in Mr. McLaughlin's place?

Mr. FOSTER. There were previously five officers. One of them, Mr. Chambers, died during the year, and his place has not been filled. Mr. McLaughlin, who was next to Mr. Graham,

takes charge of the office at a salary of \$1,800, and a third class clerk has been appointed at a salary of, I think, \$500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is Mr. Graham's retiring allowance?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not that item here, but I will give the hon. gentleman the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When did the retirement take place? I suppose the amount will not appear in the Superannuation Accounts of this year?

Mr. FOSTER. It took place this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman state whether Mr. Graham has retired on the proportion of his year's salary, or whether anything has been added?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing has been added. He has the usual superannuation allowance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He lives in Victoria?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Country savings banks in the Maritime Provinces—I would like to know if it is not possible for the Government to do away with these Dominion savings banks. When we have a good system of Post Office savings banks now all over the Dominion, I cannot understand the necessity of keeping in existence a number of banks in the Maritime Provinces, and paying away \$13,000 or \$14,000 a year for salaries, when they can just as well be dispensed with, and all the work done by the Post Office savings banks. I presume the reduction of \$1,000 this year means that one of these institutions has been closed up. Now, I would like to know, if that has been done, why we could not eventually wipe out all these institutions in the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. FOSTER. Following out the end suggested by my hon. friend, we have adopted this policy: Whenever an officer in charge of one of these savings banks—at least outside the large cities—dies or resigns, the amount of the deposit is then transferred to the Post Office Department, and thereafter managed the same as the Post Office savings bank. Last year, for instance, I transferred over a million dollars from Dominion savings banks, that were closed in that way, to the Post Office savings banks; and gradually, by following out this system, we shall, with the exception, it may be, of some of the large cities, in which there are other circumstances, have them all amalgamated with the Post Office savings banks system, and go on more economically, as I admit.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is virtually an acknowledgment that these institutions are simply kept alive for the purpose of finding a salary for those men employed in them for past years. The Minister admits that as soon as these men die the offices will be closed up. That is a confession that the necessity of their existence is gone. I don't think the country should be asked to continue institutions of that kind simply because some men have got to be provided for. The fact of the matter is, we are providing for too many men now. If there can be no better excuse given for the continuation of this system than the Minister has

offered to the House, then the sooner he wipes the whole thing out, the better.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Commission on sum for payment of interest on public debt, \$36,094.05. I observe, in connection with this, that there has been a correspondence between the Auditor General and the Finance Department with reference to a supply of vouchers for brokerage charged on the last loan. There is no doubt a good deal of force in the contention of Baring & Glyn, that vouchers cannot be supplied under the usual terms of doing business. On that point I am not disposed to object; and it was only proper and right that the demand of the Auditor should be complied with as regards persons who receive brokerage when the amounts are paid separately. Apparently nothing further has been done than to call their attention to it, but there has been time enough now to receive some information on the point. I see that this letter of the Auditor General was dated on 5th December, 1888, being considerably over a year ago; and in the period that has since elapsed it seems to me there can be no possible reason why that information has not been given. I see that the subject was brought to the notice of Baring & Bros. in January, 1889. I find this in the Auditor General's Report, C 25 and 26.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to that I may say that the correspondence there, as my hon. friend will see, rests on the arrangement that when Sir Charles Tupper came to this side he would see the Auditor General and make full explanations to him. That, I believe, has been done, and so much to the satisfaction of the Auditor General that he has passed the accounts. With reference to the vouchers mentioned by my hon. friend, I will ask whether these have been received or not? The correspondence does not show that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to insist upon this item, which is correct enough, being held over on that score. But it is quite clear, I think, that what the Auditor General asks for is reasonable enough. He waives his claim for the vouchers; all he wants is to know the name of the brokers employed and the sums paid; and you will observe that Baring Bros. do not dispute that they can furnish them, although they refer the Auditor General, or the deputy Minister, to Sir Charles Tupper for explanations. Now, I presume that the details have been given, and I shall ask the hon. gentleman, if this matter is not to be discussed further now, that he will agree to cause to be laid on the Table a statement of the brokers to whom these sums are paid, and the amounts.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make enquiry into it, anyway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will you agree to lay that statement on the Table, supposing it has been furnished, if you have not got it?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not got it, but I will enquire about it. There is no objection to lay on the Table everything that can properly be brought down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no difficulty in this. We ought to know what sums are paid to the various brokers. Then the hon. gentleman can tell me, I suppose, when the House goes into Committee of Supply again, what he can

Mr. McMULLEN.

say on this matter, to save the necessity of making a formal motion for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. The House will remember that when we were discussing the question of appointing Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner in London, the First Minister stated to us that a great saving to the country would be effected by having a High Commissioner in London. He stated that we would more than save all his salary and expenses by having him there to look after loans, and commission, and so forth. But, in looking over the Public Accounts, I cannot see that there has been any change in the charges this year, as compared with past years. It appears to me that all the items for expenses in connection with meeting the interest, paying loans, and generally handling the accounts of the Dominion in London, are about as high as they were before a High Commissioner was appointed at all. I should like to know what particular duties in connection with the public debt the High Commissioner performed, whereby this country is saved large sums of money, as was promised by the First Minister. Hon. gentlemen will remember that when the appointment was under consideration, the right hon. the Premier distinctly stated that a very large sum would be saved in connection with the duties which the High Commissioner would be able to perform in London with respect to the national debt. Can the Finance Minister state any sums that have been saved by Sir Charles Tupper in connection with handling the public debt?

Mr. FOSTER. With regard to the item at present before the House, payments for commission and brokerage, my hon. friend will understand that this payment is in pursuance of the arrangement which has been running with our financial agents for a number of years. I think the last arrangement was a modified one, made by Sir Leonard Tilley during the time he was in office as Finance Minister, by which arrangement charges which had hitherto prevailed were very largely reduced. This reduction took place, and an arrangement was made, based upon the condition that it should continue for a number of years. This period will not expire till 1892; and I am sure the hon. gentleman would not wish any breach of faith between the Government, on the one hand, and the financial agents, on the other, with regard to the payment of commissions. As to the benefits derived to the country from the presence and action of the High Commissioner on the other side, that is a subject which we are not afraid to discuss when any item in regard to it comes before the Committee, if the hon. gentleman wishes to discuss the advantages to the country of having a High Commissioner resident in London.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not challenge the statement of the Finance Minister with respect to the duties performed by the High Commissioner outside the public debt. It may be that he has discharged the duties very well. It must be remembered, however, that when the question of the appointment of the High Commissioner was before the House, the First Minister stated that a large saving would be effected in connection with the public debt by having a High Commissioner there. The House was, however, virtually misled, for, according to what the Finance Minister has said,

the First Minister must have known that this arrangement with the financial agents was then in force. The Finance Minister now states that the arrangement will not expire until 1892, that Sir Charles Tupper's presence in London is of no consequence or advantage to the country, notwithstanding the fact that the First Minister had previously stated that his presence would be of very great advantage. This is a very striking confession on the part of the Finance Minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid there was too much truth in the remark of my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that the benefit expected to be derived from the appointment of a High Commissioner, in the direction of saving brokerage and commission, has certainly not been realised. However, I desire to enquire from the Finance Minister with respect to another matter. The Minister is aware that there are two ways in which our bonds are held. Some are used as ordinary securities and held by the parties, and others are put on register. Does the hon. gentleman know in what way we are holding those sums which are invested for sinking fund purposes? Are they held under register, or do our trustees receive and keep the bonds *per se* just as they buy them on the market?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot answer that question, but I will make enquiries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am inclined to think, if there is a register, it would be better to avail ourselves of it, to prevent any possible loss or accident.

Mr. FOSTER. In regard to the item of \$50,000 for printing Dominion notes, I may say this is an increase of \$7,000. By reference to the Public Accounts it will be seen that the amount voted has been for several years too small, and this was the case last year. I propose to take a vote which, in the opinion of the Department, will be sufficient to cover the expenditure, namely, \$50,000.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Has the Government any contract for the work? Was it let to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose so. The contract was for five years, from the 22nd October, 1886.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who holds the contract?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Burland.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was about to call the attention of the House to the fact that, whereas a vote was taken under this heading for \$184,000, no less than \$20,000 more was spent last year. It is useless to bring down Estimates when the expenditure cannot be brought within them. The estimated sum last year was \$179,000, but the Government actually spent, of course in part without authority, \$202,276. Has the Minister reason to believe he will be able to keep any better within the present estimate than he was able to do last year?

Mr. FOSTER. I think there will be no difficulty in keeping within the present estimate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The excess was over \$20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It was largely for printing Dominion notes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. My question has not been answered. Was the contract let to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract is with Mr. Burland, who had had the contract for a number of years; and in the renewal of the contract in 1886, no doubt regard was had to the fact that Mr. Burland had had this contract before, and had been put to all the expense that was necessary in the procuring of the plant and other requirements to carry on the very responsible work of printing bills. At the time of the renewal a very significant reduction was made from the old price, and I have no hesitation in saying now, after having made full enquiry into the prices paid for similar work, not only in this country, but in the United States, that we are getting as good work and as cheap work in this line as we can hope to get, consistent with the necessity for having the work done near to us and having it under our supervision.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You did not answer the question. Did some one ever offer to do it cheaper?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are we to understand that no tenders were asked for this work, the last time that this contract was let? Is it not a fact that parties offered to do this work at a much lower price than Mr. Burland?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a fact that parties sent in offers to do the work, but I do not think it is a fact that the offers were at lower prices.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Finance Minister ought to be able to give us some definite information in reference to this matter. It is quite a large expenditure, and I think we ought to be put into possession of the facts. If the hon. gentleman does not know what the facts are, the item should stand over until he gives us the information.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there is any necessity for that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Unless my recollection deceives me greatly, Mr. Desbarats, of Montreal, tendered for this work, and I think Mr. Desbarats was not allowed to be a tenderer. He has asserted, if I am not entirely misinformed, that he was prepared and able to do this work (which is an important work and one which costs us, in the course of five years, some three or four hundred thousand dollars) for decidedly less than Mr. Burland was in the habit of receiving. At all events, we ought to have one rule and one measure in those matters. If the hon. gentleman is going to abandon the system of tendering for such purposes, well and good. We can dispute it from this side, but we would understand it. We ought to know, and the public ought to know in advance, what the responsibility of the Government is in respect to contracts running for several years and involving expenditures of several hundreds of thousands of dollars. My own impression is, that, undoubtedly, we ought to invite tenders for this work, seeing that a large sum of public money is concerned, and seeing that Mr. Desbarats, and others in his position, are as well entitled to have the chance to do the work as Mr. Burland himself.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister will see that he is wasting a good deal of the time of the House

in not giving a direct answer to a direct question. It has taken us now a considerable time to elicit the fact that no tenders were asked for this work; but the fact has come out all the same. If the hon. the Minister of Finance had given the information directly, he would have saved a good deal of the time of the House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think we ought to be in possession of the information we ask for, before this item is passed. We are entitled to know the price paid to this firm over the prices asked for by the other firm in Montreal. I contend that the Minister of Finance was not in a position to judge whether the firm that tendered to do this work at a much less figure than the present contractors, would not perform the service as well and as faithfully as the firm who are favored with the contract without any tender. We should have this information from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. This matter has been discussed every year. We have considered this item for the past three or four years, and I think the House is seized of all the facts in connection with it. I think my hon. friend will agree that it is not quite possible to follow exactly the same course in a matter of this kind as it is with an ordinary tender for new work. There are various considerations which come into this which would not come into an ordinary tender. Mr. Burland received this work at first, and he performed it to the satisfaction of the Government. He had incurred a very large outlay for plant and for the necessities to carry on the establishment, and as the Government felt that this work should be done in Ottawa, under supervision as close and efficient as possible, Mr. Burland agreed to come to Ottawa, and to put up buildings in every way suitable for the work, where we might have a thorough supervision of the printing and engraving of these bills. In addition to this, Mr. Burland also made a very considerable reduction on his rates for engraving and printing. As I said before, the work has been done very satisfactorily, and it is done now as well and as cheaply as that style of work is done anywhere.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to enquire whether the Government are the owners of the engraved plates which are used in the production of the notes, or is the contractor the owner of these plates?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government, of course, are the owners of the plates.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If the Government are the owners of the plates, it is a good guarantee that the work will be done as well by any other contractor as by Mr. Burland, for they would use the same plates.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Certainly; they do not make a different plate each time.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman knows that there is a great difference in the inks used in that class of engraving and others.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It appears to me that the information given by the hon. Minister is very far from being satisfactory.

Mr. FOSTER. It is reasonable.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It is either necessary to call for tenders, or it is unnecessary. We have no Mr. CASEY.

right to consider the original tender in a renewal, for the contractor tendered to do a work for which he was amply and fully paid. Are we to allow these contractors to continue this work year in and year out because they have done the work well? I hold that if the Government pretends to let contracts by tender they should allow this work to be tendered for as well as others. If the Government think it is unnecessary to call for tenders for work; if they think they can manage it better without tenders, why do not they announce to the country that they do not intend to have work performed by tender, and that they intend to let contracts to their favorites without any protection to the public at all. I really think it is unfair that the hon. Minister of Finance should hedge himself in the manner in which he does in reference to this matter. He should have said at once that the Government did not call for tenders, or that they did not intend to call for tenders, and that in the opinion of the Government the work would be much better done if left to the option of Ministers. If the hon. gentleman had stated that manfully at the commencement, we would not object to it. Is it because Mr. Burland has agreed to come to Ottawa, and that he has done the work satisfactorily, that we should consider he is entitled to a prior claim to everybody else? That is an unreasonable proposition for the Government to make. Carry that principle throughout the various departments of the Government and you will see how disastrously it will end. The question arises: Is it necessary to have any tenders for work at all? If it is not, let them announce to the country at once that they do not intend to have any more tenders, but that they intend to give the work to their favorites, to run the machine entirely in the interest of their friends and supporters, and then we will understand it quite well.

Gov.-General's Secretary's Office..... \$10,150

Mr. FOSTER. The only increases are statutory increases.

Office of the Queen's Privy Council for
Canada..... \$27,405

Mr. FOSTER. The increases are the usual statutory increases and one messenger.

Department of Justice..... \$21,235

Mr. FOSTER. Statutory increases are the only increases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many are there?

Mr. FOSTER. Eight at \$50, one at \$25, one at \$30, and one at \$22.50.

Department of Justice,—Penitentiaries
branch..... \$6,250

Mr. FOSTER. There is one statutory increase at \$50.

Department of Militia and Defence... \$43,300

Mr. FOSTER. There are sixteen statutory increases of \$50 each.

Department of the Secretary of
State..... \$35,972 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Four officials appear to be required for this Department, in addition to the twenty-eight it had before. I shall be

glad to hear from the hon. Secretary of State on what grounds he requires so large an augmentation of his staff?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Since the Act was passed allowing employes to receive commissions, the number of commissions issued, for which fees are paid, has been very much increased, so much so that, since the passage of the Act, four employes have been constantly occupied in engrossing the commissions. They were paid from \$2 to \$2.50, and I think one at \$3 per day. It is special skilled work, as was shown by specimens which were laid before the House, and I must say it is a work which is creditable to the Government and creditable to those who are receiving those commissions. Instead of leaving those employes to be paid at so much a day, we have put them on the permanent staff, where they should be, I think, because it is not likely that their work will decrease.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. Minister tell us how many gentlemen are required to receive commissions under the regulation to which he refers? Whatever may be necessary, it appears to me that he should hardly require to keep four men employed permanently, from year to year, to engross commissions.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They are also required to engross proclamations and other documents, and the work done by them is very voluminous. I shall be glad to give the number of commissions in a return to the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To what grade are the commissions issued?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think down to second class clerks, as well as a great many in the outside service.

Department of Printing and Stationery, \$22,710

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like the Secretary of State to explain in some measure this expenditure. It seems to me that an extraordinary number of employes are required to administer the affairs of the printing bureau, in comparison with those who were employed by the contractors.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the hon. gentleman a general statement on that subject. There were eight statutory increases at \$50, one at \$30 and one at \$20, making a total of \$450. There was one new first class clerk at \$1,400. There was an addition to the salary of Mr. Foran, as caretaker of the printing bureau, \$100. Then there is an increase, by additional second-class clerks' salaries amounting to \$3,300, less \$2,900 paid to the same officers last year, making a total increase of \$2,350. Then there is the difference between the salaries voted last year for two third-class clerks and those of their successors, \$950, making a total increase of \$1,400.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I suppose this would not be the proper time to discuss the expenditure on the printing bureau.

Mr. FOSTER. That will come under an item, later on, I think.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think, however, the contractors got along with a less number of employes than this. I do not think they had more than one-fourth of this number employed to discharge the duties which are now costing \$22,710 a year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend, though he has been long in the House, unfortunately thinks only of the printers and the contractors, but he should remember that the Department of Printing and Stationery existed when we had contractors. That Department existed under the Administration which preceded this one, and it has, in fact, always existed. In the printing bureau itself, I do not think we have more than one or two employed in addition to those who were employed under the contractors, and we have no contractors. Certainly the contractors were worth two men.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The explanation of the Secretary of State was quite unnecessary, because, at page 12, letter G, anyone can find the explanation. I was quite aware that the expenditure for the Printing and Stationery Department is included in this item, but I say that there are a good many now employed more than were employed by the contractors.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Do you mean printers?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No; I am talking of the clerks and the managers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Then my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I find there are twenty here, altogether.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If you take Mr. McLean and Mr. Roger, our last contractors, as being worth two, you will find that there has been no increase in the number.

Mr. McMULLEN. As far as I can see, we have a bigger contract on hand in regard to this printing bureau than ever we had before. I think it is going to be a pretty costly arrangement for this Dominion. The Secretary of State, when he introduced the Bill to establish a printing bureau, assured the House in plain terms that he anticipated a considerable saving, that he thought the work would be done better and more satisfactorily, and at less cost than before; but, since we have been in Ottawa, it has appeared to us that it will prove more costly than ever. None can deny that the building is a very creditable structure, but it is a very expensive one, and, when we realise the amount it is going to cost us—though I hope it will be much less than is reported—we must see that it will be a very costly establishment. The hon. gentleman appears to be getting into deep water with the printers and others in connection with it. We all hope his prediction will be true, and that the country will save money by this work, notwithstanding what has appeared in the press.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When the proper time comes, we will see to that. I know my hon. friend generally takes a gloomy view of the expenditure of the Government, and that he is not over liberal in giving to the Government the allowances necessary for the public expenditure; but, if we had not had the accidents which have occurred, and which, I hope with him, will not occur again, the condition of affairs would have been different, and, when the printing bureau is fully and completely in operation, I believe we shall be able to realise the economies which I anticipated, even without reference to the improvement in the appearance and quality of the work. If we cannot do so, it will not be my fault.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understood, by a report which I saw in a newspaper, that the Secretary of State had admitted to a deputation of printers that waited upon him, that the printing had, so far, cost much more than it did under the contractors.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said it had cost more than I had anticipated, owing to the difficulty in which we have been placed, because we have had to carry on two establishments, in consequence of the unfinished state of the building. What I said was, that this year the economies had not been what I anticipated, and I asked the printers not to press the Government at present, as the results this year had not been what we anticipated in regard to economy.

Department of the Interior—Dom-
inion Lands.....\$87,187 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here, again, we find a very large increase asked for. Last year seventy-one officials were required for the Dominion Lands branch, and this year we find that eighty-one are required. Turning to the end of this volume, the House will see that, in addition to the \$87,187 which is asked for here, an amount is asked for Dominion Lands chargeable to income, of \$172,143, and for Dominion Lands chargeable to capital, of \$95,000, making, if you include the Minister's salary and the contingencies of his Department, a sum total of very close to \$400,000 which is required for the Department of the Interior practically for the administration of our lands in the North-West, from which the actual receipts last year were just \$237,000. That is, we are asked to expend \$400,000 in order to collect \$237,000. A bad showing, that, Mr. Chairman, for the redemption of the promises which were so solemnly made by the First Minister and Sir Charles Tupper, that within about a year from the present date we should be in the reception of \$50,300,000 net, as the result of our expenditure upon those lands. I should be glad to hear why this increased expenditure is necessary, and, in particular, why the hon. gentleman wants to have ten additional gentlemen appointed now, in order to collect \$237,000 at a cost to the country of \$400,000 per annum?

Mr. DEWDNEY. If the hon. gentleman had felt inclined to treat me with a little fairness, I think he would have drawn attention to page 98 of the Estimates, where he will find that I am proposing a saving of \$13,605 on the Dominion Lands expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say, and taking it out here.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The reason of the increase of a certain number of third class clerks to Civil Government is this: We have a very large number of temporary clerks, some of whom have been in the service from three to eight years, and it is proposed to take some of these clerks and put them into the permanent class. We are paying to the clerks that I propose to take out of the temporary class, \$6,525, and in the permanent class we shall pay them \$4,200.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is asking the same amount of contingencies as before, out of which these clerks are paid.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; these clerks were all paid out of Dominion Lands moneys, and that is where Mr. CHAPLEAU.

the saving is. I have not forgotten the debate we had upon this question last year, and I have given a great deal of attention to the remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell, and I hope to make, during the year, some re-arrangement which will, to a great extent, meet the recommendation he made last year. I have enquired, during the recess, into the working of the Dominion Lands branch in connection with our head office, and I have come to the conclusion that there is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman said last year. I find there is considerable duplication of work, which I hope to remedy during the coming year. In reference to the large expenditure which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, he has only given the figures of the cash received for land sales and timber license fees; but he has forgotten the amount of scrip which, as I mentioned last year, we should be given some credit for, and which I think will amount to five or six hundred thousand dollars. He must also recollect that we are giving away land for railway subsidies. We are receiving greater value, I think, for our lands on account of that work. Although we are not getting as much cash as we expect to get, at the same time we have the work which must be done, and we must have the force to do it.

Mr. McMULLEN. In comparing the accounts of the Department of Interior the last two years, I find that the entire receipts in 1888-89 are \$239,830, for land, timber and pasture land, everything that came into the hands of the Minister for the year. Then take Civil Government at Ottawa. The payment of salaries at Ottawa amounts to \$137,916; outside service, including land board at Winnipeg, \$152,012, making a total of \$289,928. Deduct from this sum the amount received for land, timber and pasture, and it leaves an actual loss of \$50,107. Then we have the Survey branch. I find that \$130,577.51 is charged to capital account; that makes \$180,685.44; to that we have to add contingencies, \$19,301, which makes an actual loss in the Department of the Interior to the country during last year, of \$199,986.44. It is surprising that the Minister of the Interior can present to the House the statement he has just made, in face of the promises that were made to us with regard to the receipts we were to get from lands in the North-West. We have to take into consideration the enormous sums paid to the outside service, \$152,000, including many officials at Winnipeg, the expensive land board we have got up there, the many inspectors and officials that are roaming around over the prairie, which has virtually been constituted, as my former leader pronounced it, a happy hunting ground for officials of all kinds that can be put into offices, and they are sent to the North-West and put upon the resources of the country. I think it is time that a complete cleaning out of the whole institution should be agreed to, and a stop put to all this abominable business. Here we have another High Commissioner—a tony fellow, if fancy he, must be—that lives in Winnipeg and draws \$5,000 a year, with some considerable perquisites into the bargain. I think we ought to do away with that land board, and the whole work done either here or in Winnipeg. We are paying a staff of officials \$137,000 a year, and we are paying another staff in the North-West \$152,000 for doing the same work. When a case comes before the land

board at Winnipeg and it is not settled to the satisfaction of either party, surely no judge, nor jury, nor land board here can settle it more satisfactorily. Now I say that, under these circumstances, we should abolish either the one or the other.

Geological Survey Branch..... \$47,330

Mr. FOSTER. There are nineteen statutory increases, \$950; one at \$30; one first class clerk, \$1,400; amount of Mr. Richard's salary over his predecessor, \$100; then, \$200 for the librarian, which, make \$2,680 of an increase. Then, difference between the salary of the technical officer and his successor, \$450; difference between the salaries of Tyrrell and Adams and their successors, and difference between the salaries paid to Faribault and Richard, \$650; making decreases of \$1,110, leaving a net increase of \$1,580.

Mr. CASEY. I understand the Minister to say that all the increase in the permanent salaries is caused by the transfer of clerks from the extra service to the permanent staff.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Transfers from the extra to the permanent staff.

Mr. CASEY. Have they all passed the examination?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They have not been appointed, but they will have to pass the examination.

Mr. CASEY. It seems to be very ungenerous to find fault with a department, but I cannot allow this item to pass without entering my protest, in order that I may have an opportunity at a later stage to develop more fully my views: that notwithstanding the very high character and abilities of nearly all the gentlemen on the Geological Survey, we do not derive that benefit from the Department which should be derived. Those who remember the results achieved by the very much smaller staff under Sir William Logan, and even later management, must be satisfied that this Department is not practically managed. No doubt the members of it are very able men, and are doing their best to earn their salaries, and, in fact, are doing a great deal of work; but the practical results are not what they should be. It is true that for this year there are many excellent reports, but, after all, I do not think the work of exploration is such as it should be.

Department of Indian Affairs..... \$46,890

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here, again, there is a very considerable increase both in the expenditure and the staff.

Mr. FOSTER. The increase is explained by twenty-four statutory increases at \$50 each, one at \$25, one at \$30, and one at \$12.50, one new appointment at \$900, two new appointments at \$400, and a promotion giving \$50; the total increase being \$3,018.14.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why should three additional officers be required? There is a staff of forty-four men, exclusive of the Minister. All through the list we find large increases—four in one Department, ten in another and twelve in another. These increases do not merely mean the salaries at which the appointees begin, but in a very few years their salaries are increased to \$1,200 or \$1,400

each. This increase is unnecessary, and, at all events, we should have an explanation regarding it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The statutory increase covers \$1,259, leaving \$1,600 to be accounted for. There have been appointed two-third class clerks at \$400, and one, in the technical branch, at \$800. This increase was found to be absolutely necessary, and provision was made accordingly. The item for contingencies has been reduced \$1,000, owing to two temporary clerks paid out of it having been placed on the permanent list. The Deputy Minister advises me that these appointments are absolutely necessary, and also one in the accountant's branch and an assistant type-writer. The increase is made entirely on account of the statement of the Deputy Minister that they were absolutely necessary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have had a good deal of experience of this plan of taking men from the temporary and putting them on the permanent staff. Our experience has been, that, although the Government during three, six or nine months endeavor to effect the economy intended, yet after eighteen months there were as many men employed on contingencies as before, while the increase on the permanent staff remained. Here the increase has been four and not three, because the messengers have been reduced by one. This is an increase, practically, of more than 10 per cent. Is the hon. Minister of the Interior now administering the Department of Indian Affairs? If so, is it the policy of the Government to re-unite the office to that of the Minister of the Interior, and, if so, for how long?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot say with regard to the future, but I understand it has been attached to the Department of the Interior for a number of years; at all events, it has been since I have been connected with the Department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was severed in 1879. It was then taken charge of by the First Minister, and, if it has been united, it must have been since the present Minister took office.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think Mr. White represented both Departments.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Are we to understand that the volume of the business of the Department has increased to an extent requiring the proposed additional number of clerks? We have had no representation beyond the statement that the deputy has said more employes were required, and the Minister thereupon acceded to the wishes of the deputy. We will wait till we get the contingencies, and very likely we may find that the contingencies ought to be reduced also. I want to know, is there a larger volume of work being performed in the Department than there was last year, necessitating an increased number of employes to do the work? If the Minister cannot establish that he ought not ask the House for an increased number of clerks.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If the hon. gentleman would only read the annual report he will find the business of the Department of the Interior has been increasing very largely. If there had been no increase I should be the last to have supported the recommendation made by my deputy. This Department has been extending for years, and the report shows that the business has been increasing materially for the past year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman seems to be speaking of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; the Indian Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman said the Interior Department.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That was a mistake, it was the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not exactly see that there is any increase of Indians. We have not made any new treaty, have we?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Only a small one last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where was that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. With the Indians north of Prince Albert; the surrendering of 11,000 square miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The number of Indians there is very small, is it not?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, about 800 families.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would account for some additional work. Still, it is not an important treaty; and, excepting that, there has been, I think, no increase in the Indian population.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am sorry to say there has been a decrease.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; I was about to remark that, on the contrary, the number of Indians are decreasing.

Mr. DEWDNEY. But a large number work on the reserves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Still, considering the enormous outside force we have had in connection with the Indians, I should think that would not throw any great amount of extra work on the Department here. We have got, as the hon. gentleman knows, a host of new instructors and other officers of various kinds to look after the Indians on the reserves—quite enough, I should think, to do the work without imposing on the Minister any necessity for additional clerks here. The Minister stated, generally, that there was more work, but he did not say how it came about.

Mr. DEWDNEY. When the Indians come in on their reserves more officers are employed. There is more correspondence and the returns are more numerous, which we insist in having from each agency. For a year or two previous to the last year we have divided several of the large agencies, which has necessitated the appointment of more agents, and would necessarily give us more work in the head office.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I may state to the hon. Minister that I always read the departmental reports when they are brought down. I have not had an opportunity of reading the report of his Department last year, but most certainly I cannot see that there was any extra work done in the Indian Department. As my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says, the Indian population has not increased, and I do not suppose it is likely to increase. I think the Minister must be mistaken in saying that there is more work in the Indian Department. It appears, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, that when the Deputy Minister says he wants a little more assist-

Mr. DEWDNEY.

ance, so that the balance of the clerks will not have to work so hard, the Minister always accepts his recommendation. I do not think that this is a good system. In looking over the Auditor General's Report, I find enormous expenditures for the inside and outside service of the hon. gentleman's Department. I would like that the Minister would point out to the House wherein the volume of work in the Indian Department has so increased so as to require an extra number of clerks. If he does that, I think the House will say that this is a necessary item, or otherwise I do not think we can concur in it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If a Minister is not to take the word of his deputy with regard to the work transacted in his Department, I would like to know from whom he is to get the information?

Mr. LAURIER. From himself.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am aware that the Minister took the word of his deputy last year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; and you will probably hear some more before the Session is over. I may state that I was myself satisfied that the work of the Department was increasing, before I consulted my deputy, and, if I thought it would be necessary, I could have got for the hon. gentleman a statement of the increased correspondence and work of the Department. I shall be glad to bring it down later to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman explain the item at C 39 of the Auditor General's Report: "Thomas McKay & Co., reporting on flour, 73 samples, at \$5 a sample; 60 samples, at \$4 a sample; total, \$605?"

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have nothing to do with that. That is an outside vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. How does it come under the heading of "Departmental Salaries, Ottawa?"

Mr. FOSTER. It is not under Civil Government. If you will look at the page you will see that there are two columns, and the Auditor General has this year, different from any previous year, gathered all salaries together, those that are outside and those that are at Ottawa.

Mr. LAURIER. No one will father that item.

Mr. FOSTER. The Auditor General will tell you its percentage.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the Minister of the Interior take note of that and give us some information on it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; certainly.

Department of Inland Revenue ...\$37,882 50

Mr. FOSTER. The increases are due to two new second class clerks at \$1,100, ten statutory increases of \$50 and one of \$22.50, and the difference in the salaries of messengers, \$150.

Customs Department.....\$36,730

Mr. FOSTER. There are twenty-one statutory increases of \$50 each, two promotions from third class to second class, one statutory increase of \$30, and the difference in the salaries of messengers, \$200.

Post Office Department.....\$191,210

Mr. FOSTER. There are one hundred and sixteen statutory increases of \$50 each, eight of \$30,

and four of \$20; four promotions from third class to second class, one second class clerk omitted last year, four new third class clerks, and three new packers, making a total increase of \$9,920; less the salary of the Financial Comptroller, \$3,200; the difference between the salaries of two second class clerks and those of their successors, \$350, and the difference in the salaries of packers, \$120; total decreases, \$3,670; making a net increase of \$6,250.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has become of the Financial Comptroller's office?

Mr. HAGGART. The Financial Comptroller died, and we intend to dispense with the office, giving the secretary the work formerly done by the comptroller.

Mr. ELLIS. The returns prepared with reference to the number of persons employed in the Post Office Department seem to me to be somewhat misleading. Last year the Postmaster General estimated for 199 employés, but 260 persons appear to have been paid. His estimated expenditure was \$184,960, while the actual expenditure was \$188,134; and the sum of \$12,312 was paid out of contingencies. The number of extra persons employed in that Department seems to be exceedingly large.

Mr. HAGGART. It is very large. The contingent expenditure is nearly \$12,000 a year for that purpose, and the reason for the increase of the staff this year is that I am going to transfer some of the temporary clerks to the permanent list, and I am asking \$6,500 less for contingencies this year than last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the hon. gentleman has made a mistake in that statement, or the printers have, for they have put down \$35,000 for contingencies, as against \$25,000 last year.

Mr. HAGGART. I have made no mistake. I have said that the amount I ask this year is \$6,500 less than the expenditure of last year. My expenditure last year was largely in excess of the estimate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the whole system is bad and misleading. A large number of persons are employed every year in the different departments as temporary clerks, and their salaries ought to be provided for among the estimates for the permanent expenditure of each department, and not in the contingencies. Anything that cannot be foreseen ought to be provided for out of contingencies, and everything that can be foreseen—and the experience of the members of the Government is sufficiently long to enable them to determine this matter—ought to be estimated and included in the ordinary expenditure of the Department. Therefore, in many of these cases large additions should be made to the estimated expenditure for each Department, leaving to the contingent account only those expenditures which cannot be foreseen or exactly estimated.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must be mistaken, or I do not understand the object of the contingent account, which is not to provide for unforeseen expenditure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it is not contingent.

Mr. HAGGART. My contingent account is not for any such purpose as that. It is for the purpose of paying expenditures which are foreseen and known, and which might be estimated for. It is for accounts which are regular, but which do not come into the ordinary items. The only part of my contingent account which can be called unforeseen is that for extra clerks, which only amounts to \$9,000 or \$12,000 a year, which I intend to decrease in the direction the hon. gentleman suggests as fast as possible, because I believe that each person who is employed in the Department should have his salary estimated for during the Session, and that it should be voted for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it is a misnomer to call that a contingent account.

Mr. ELLIS. It appears that more than twenty persons have been added to this Department during the year. Is that statement correct, and, if so, what is the reason for the increase?

Mr. HAGGART. The addition was caused for two reasons. There was a large increase in the post office receipts, and a large increase in the savings bank branch receipts, and in the money order receipts, and there was a larger increase in the cost of management. In the savings bank branch there is an increase of \$1,300,000 in deposits, and that requires a large increase in the staff of clerks. In the money order department the business has also increased, and that has demanded an increase in the number of clerks; but the increase of the clerks employed in each case is less in ratio to the business done than the number of clerks employed before.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How many temporary clerks are there in the Post Office Department?

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot say off-hand. The hon. gentleman will find the amount in the return, and the pay is about \$399 a year, on the average. I think the amount is about \$12,000, and, if he divides that by about \$400, he can arrive at the number of extra clerks as nearly as possible.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have you not had the time to count them?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Can the Postmaster General tell me how many permanent officers there are in the Post Office Department?

Mr. HAGGART. You can see that by looking at the list.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did I understand the Minister to say that the deposits in the savings banks were increasing at present?

Mr. HAGGART. I said that there had been transfers from the Finance Department to the Post Office Department amounting to about \$1,300,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that from the Dominion savings banks?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How did that take place? Did the Finance Minister shut up these offices and the Post Office take them over? Were they altogether in the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. FOSTER. They were all in the Lower Provinces, except, I think, one, which was in British Columbia.

Department of Agriculture.....\$55,960

Mr. FOSTER. In this there are twenty-four statutory increases at \$50, \$1,200; two statutory increases at \$25, \$30; two at \$30, \$60; and one salary of a third-class clerk, omitted last year, of \$650. Then there is an amount of \$500 to provide for the appointment of Miss Steacy, and there is an increase by promotion of one second-class clerk to first class, amounting to \$1,100, or a total of increases of \$3,560. The decreases consist in two guardians dropped, \$1,000, and the difference between the salary of Mrs. Lyster and that of her successor, \$70, leaving the net increase \$2,490.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are these guardians who have been dropped?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe they were guardians of the Patent room.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that there is an amount charged for Mr. George Johnson of \$2,400. Was that an amount left over from last year, or how does it come to be put into this year's vote?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Johnson's appointment was only permanently made during the present financial year, and before that he was paid out of the general vote. He is now a permanent officer, receiving \$2,400 a year, which is the maximum salary of a chief clerk.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where does he come in here under the head of the Department of Agriculture? You had four chief clerks last year, and I see the same number estimated now. Under which of the items does Mr. Johnson come?

Mr. CARLING. His salary was estimated for last year, but the appointment was not made until this year.

Department of Marine.....\$29,417 50

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase here, caused by the promotion of three second class clerks, amounting to \$300; nine statutory increases at \$50, \$450, and one at \$37.50, making a total increase of \$787.50.

Mr. McMULLEN. In regard to Charles F. Cox, who was employed last year at \$3.50 a day, what is his position?

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Cox has been in the service of the Department for a number of years, and is an assistant to Mr. Anderson, the engineer. He is an extremely valuable officer, and Mr. Anderson would not be able to get on without him. I think the amount paid him is very moderate for the work he does. He is entirely engaged in regard to the construction of lighthouses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long has he been in the service?

Mr. TUPPER. He has really been employed by the Department for three years. If he were made a permanent officer, it would simply mean that his salary would increase from year to year, and we are now able to secure his services for the amount which has been paid to him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the nature of his work such that after a time his services could be dispensed with?

Mr. TUPPER. In connection with officers of that kind, the idea followed is this: The salary is

Mr. FOSTER.

as fairly chargeable to the work performed as to Civil Government, but this gentleman has been specially employed in connection with our lighthouses. He is a draughtsman and engineer; and I think, as far as the Public Accounts are concerned, it is better to keep his charges in their present shape than to appoint such an officer a permanent officer of the Department. He is simply employed to perform that work in connection with lighthouses, and, if not paid in this way, would have to be paid out of the amount voted for the construction of the lighthouses.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many days' work did this gentleman perform last year?

Mr. TUPPER. Although he is called a temporary clerk, he is permanently in the employ of the Department at \$3.50 a day.

Department of Fisheries.....\$16,975

Mr. FOSTER. Here there are nine statutory increases at \$50, \$450; one at \$12.50, and there are increases in class, bringing the total up to \$637.50.

Department of Public Works.....\$46,100

Mr. FOSTER. These are simply statutory increases, seventeen at \$50 and two at \$30, making a total of \$910.

Department of Railways and Canals...\$56,150

Mr. FOSTER. In this Department there are twelve statutory increases at \$50, \$600. Then there is an addition to Mr. Page's salary of \$1,500, and an addition to Mr. Bradley's salary of \$400, and there is a provision for one new first class clerk of \$1,400, making a total of \$3,900. There is a decrease in the accountant's salary of \$1,800, a difference between Mr. Costin's salary and that of his successor of \$300, and the difference between the salaries of two third class clerks promoted and those of their successors amounting to \$1,000, or a total decrease of \$3,100, leaving a net increase of \$800.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that I have any objection to make to the increase of Mr. Page's salary. He has been a very valuable officer, and has been for a long time in our service. Whether some of the hon. gentleman's friends and supporters equally appreciate him, may be doubted. But I presume that this is really not so large an increase as it appears. I think Mr. Page received formerly some other allowances.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not in lieu of any other services. It is an absolute increase to his salary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will the Minister give us the reason for increasing Mr. Bradley's salary?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Bradley is an old officer of the Department, and has been continually in the service for about twelve years. It was considered that his services entitled him to an increase of \$400.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that this increase is hardly correctly stated as regards Mr. Schreiber. In last year's Estimates he figured in two different places. His regular salary as engineer of Government railways was \$4,000. It is true there was an allowance made him, but that was for special services.

Mr. FOSTER. That was an absolute increase to his salary of \$2,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He has received a sum, I am aware, of \$2,000 for a long time, and it was stated to be for a distinctly different service. "Mr. Schreiber, \$2,000 a year as chief engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to be paid out of the appropriation for that railway." This is really an increase of \$2,000, because I presume that work on the Canadian Pacific Railway has closed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to Mr. Schreiber's salary, although it is quite true that the work on the Canadian Pacific Railway has ceased to a very considerable extent, still, his labors on the whole have not decreased. The work is incessant, not only to look after the Intercolonial and its branches, but the whole system of railways that have been assisted by subsidies have got to be under his strict supervision. The two salaries, \$6,000, is not at all excessive, is very moderate, for an engineer of the standing of Mr. Schreiber, who has so much responsibility. I can assure the hon. gentleman that Mr. Schreiber has remained in the service from a sense of duty, because there were certain responsibilities which he had undertaken as chief engineer; and he has abandoned a much larger salary, if he would only accept it. I think it is desirable that we should retain an officer like him who, if he has any fault, has too great a regard for the public treasury. I may say that he has incurred a good deal of personal unpopularity through his desire to protect the public treasury. He is a most valuable officer and most conscientious.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disposed myself to say that an officer of such importance, and with such duties, would be overpaid at the salary, although it is a large one compared with salaries which the heads of the departments get. Would the hon. gentleman explain to us the sums paid to my old friend, Mr. Page, and to the Secretary of the Department, whose salary he has increased by \$400. Mr. Page, I see, is raised from \$4,500 to \$6,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to Mr. Page, the hon. gentleman knows the great work that is now upon his shoulders—the whole work of carrying out the canal system, the enlargement of canals, the completing of the system, the completing of the Sault Ste. Marie canal; and when his salary is compared with those of hydraulic engineers, he has been kept down at a very low rate. I do not think the hon. gentleman, however economical he may be, will object to that salary. With regard to Mr. Bradley's salary, I ask that it be allowed to stand.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). In regard to the Chief Engineer of Railways, we have the positive assertions of the First Minister, and of the Minister of Railways in previous Sessions, that, as soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed, the item of \$2,000 would be struck out of the Estimates. We bore with it, expecting to see that promise realised. Now they tell us the railroad is completed, yet the \$2,000 appears in another way. The Prime Minister assures us that this official is a very patriotic servant, that he is sacrificing himself to the interests of the country for the sum of \$6,000 a year. It is certainly very generous on his part. I should think the First Minister feels wonderfully grateful to him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So I am.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). No doubt of it. We are paying for the official's gratefulness a pretty liberal salary, and one entirely different from what we expected to pay when the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed. A few words with respect to Mr. Page. No doubt he is a very efficient officer; at least I am inclined to think so, although some of the right hon. gentleman's own supporters are evidently not of that opinion, because there is a motion on the paper to impeach that official. When threatened with impeachment it is hardly fair to increase that official's salary by \$1,500 a year, unless it is by way of consolation. Canals are to be built and enlarged under his responsibility, and at the same time there is impeachment hanging over him by one of the First Minister's leading supporters. Are we to understand that these men are to be compensated, because one is certain of impeachment and another is such a patriotic man, that he is willing to sacrifice not only himself but his relations in the service of the country? I cannot understand the item with respect to Mr. Bradley; but that is allowed to stand. It appears to me that none of these items are thoroughly understood. They have not been considered, and I hope the Government will see their way clear, after reconsidering them, to come to the conclusion that they are paying one man a little too liberally for being patriotic and another too much for being threatened with impeachment, and will strike out the increases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the hon. gentleman says, although the statement may satisfy the hon. gentleman from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), it will not satisfy him. I have undertaken many great works, including the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I shall never undertake to satisfy the hon. gentleman. If we look through *Hansard* from the time he has had the honor and advantage of being a member of this House, I do not think it will be found that the hon. gentleman has expressed satisfaction with any one measure brought forward, or with any statement made, before Parliament, and I, therefore, decline to attempt to give satisfaction to the hon. gentleman. As regards the impeachment of Mr. Page, that will be another page in his history. In the meantime, I repeat that I believe both those gentlemen are well worthy of their present salaries. Canada can afford to pay engineers fair allowances for their services, if they are really good engineers, and I believe these two men to be good engineers and to render valuable services. The hon. gentleman has said he remembers my making a statement about Mr. Schreiber's salary being cut down when the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed. That is not my recollection. I paid very little attention to these matters; my predecessor, Mr. Pope, looked after them for himself. I do not mean to say that some discussion did not take place in which I may have spoken, but I have no recollection of making such a statement, and the matter was not within my Department. I am sure the Committee will accept these two increases, although they may not be quite to the satisfaction of the hon. member for Elgin.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I regret exceedingly that I cannot place that amount of confidence in the First Minister which I should like to do. I ac-

quired a history of the right hon. gentleman before I came into the House. I had full opportunities of knowing that it could hardly be expected that the right hon. gentleman would satisfy one of the Opposition if he merely depended on statements made by him. Could I for a moment expect to be fully satisfied, unless I had some evidence, proof and substantial guarantee, given by the hon. gentleman that certain things would be carried out? I can well remember when the hon. gentleman held up his hands and declared these hands were clean, when they were not clean. I can well remember when the hon. gentleman was conducting certain elections, that he asked for another \$10,000. I well remember, also, when he held up his hands and said: Would to God he could catch a certain individual, when, at the same time, he was giving Bishop Taché \$1,000 to get him out of the country. Could it be expected that on the right hon. gentleman's simple assertion I should be ready to believe him? The hon. gentleman might be able to build the Canadian Pacific Railway; in fact, it was an easy matter for him to do so. He could put his hands into the public treasury up to the elbow, and proceed with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the Dominion at its back. I would advise the hon. gentleman, in making comparisons and statements as to his ability to convince, not to use the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway as an illustration. He should hold his head in shame for many things connected with that road.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I retract any remarks if I am out of order. I wish to say this: that if the hon. gentleman would give some reasonable proof why I should be convinced by him, I would be prepared to accept any proposition and legislation in the interests of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would simply say that I do not object to the hon. gentleman's speech, although I think a good deal of it has been heard before on the stump, and will, no doubt, be heard on the stump hereafter. I said I did not undertake the task of satisfying the hon. gentleman. There are no means of satisfying him. Why, the hon. gentleman's own side cannot satisfy him. He was not satisfied with the resolutions of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), and how can I expect him to be satisfied with anything coming from a rabid Tory like myself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Anyhow, the item stands.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When was Mr. Page's salary increased?

Mr. FOSTER. It is proposed to increase it now.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Did I understand that Mr. Bradley's salary was to stand at \$2,400, or that the item was to stand?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, it was the item that was to stand.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.40 p.m.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 3rd February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

JOSEPH AIMÉ MASSUE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Richelieu, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. J. A. Chapleau.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the York County Bank.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the National Construction Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Canada Cable Company.—(Mr. Hesson.)

Bill (No. 42) to amend the Indian Advancement Act.—(Mr. Doyon.)

Bill (No. 44) to further amend chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Mr. Barron.)

FRAUD IN THE SALE OF CEREALS.

Mr. BURDETT moved for leave to introduce a Bill to prevent fraud in the sale of cereals and seed grain.

Mr. SPEAKER. There has been no notice of that Bill. Being a public Bill, notice has to be given.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. HESSON moved:

That the Public Accounts of the Dominion of Canada for the fiscal year ended the 30th June, 1889, and the Report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts for the same year, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 43) to amend chapter 4 of 52 Victoria, intituled "An Act to authorise the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies." He said: At our last Session, when the Dominion Lands and Railways Subsidy Bill was before the House, the land asked for by the Alberta Company was given to the North-West Coal and Navigation Company, through a clerical error. It is only to correct that mistake.

Mr. MITCHELL. I suppose the gentleman responsible for that mistake will pay all the expenses of this legislation. He ought to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That will be the railway company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVILEGE—LOYALTY TO HER MAJESTY.

Mr. COCKBURN. Before the next Order is called, I wish to make a personal explanation. I shall read to the House an article which appeared in the Montreal *Herald* of Saturday last, and which runs as follows:—

"DID HE SHIRK?"

"Mr. Cockburn, one of the members for Toronto, and, we believe, some other Conservative members, at being called to account by the press for having, it is alleged, shirked the vote on Mr. Mulock's Loyalty motion, an impression has been created that during recess some remarks were made elsewhere, tending to show Mr. Cockburn's annexation tendencies, and attributing to him a closer connection with the direction of Canadian affairs than he quite possesses. Mr. Cockburn, it appears, was not in the lobbies at the time the vote was taken, but had already started from the Capital. It is held by some that there is very little difference between the two things, because it was known that the vote was about to be taken."

In reference to this matter I have to state that there is a certain modicum of truth in it, because it is true that I was not in the lobbies at the time the vote was taken, but I had already started from the Capital; indeed I had started four days before, having been called to Toronto by urgent business. I regret that I was not able to be present at the time the vote was taken, and I need only say that had I been present it would have given me the greatest pleasure to vote for the loyal resolution proposed by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), and so ably seconded by the gallant member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). Indeed I would not have thought it necessary to take any notice of this article at all, but I could not regard it as an ordinary article. It appeared in a paper of which the merits have been held forth to our admiration so often, and so loudly vaunted by a member who occupies no ordinary position in this House, that I thought it required my attention. Moreover, I am not dealing with an ordinary member, but I am dealing with the sentiments of a great party, a party which is one and indivisible, and which, in the interests of the country, I hope will ever remain so.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very glad to find that the hon. gentleman recognises that, in referring to the columns of the Montreal *Herald*, he is dealing with no ordinary paper. Indeed he is not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is an extraordinary paper.

Mr. MITCHELL. No doubt the right hon. gentleman feels that sometimes. I am glad to find that a compliment is paid to myself by the hon. gentleman when he says, speaking of the gentleman connected with that paper, that he is dealing with no ordinary man. Sir, he is not.

Mr. SPEAKER. According to the Rules of the House, I would remind the hon. gentleman that he is out of order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have been attacked, and I am giving a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. These personal explanations must be very short.

Mr. MITCHELL. If you will tolerate the few remarks I have got to make, we will get through it much quicker. He is dealing with an independent man, and that is what I am scarcely inclined to believe the hon. gentleman will state in reference to himself. After having heard his explanations, and the feelings of loyalty he has expressed, I will say that I accept the apology he has made.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 20) respecting the Goderich and Canadian Junction Railway, and to change the name

of the company to the Goderich and Wingham Railway Company.—(Mr. Madill, for Mr. Rorter.)

Bill (No. 21) to incorporate the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Corby, for Mr. Hudspeth.)

Bill (No. 22) to amend the Act to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Corby.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate "Belding-Paul and Company (Limited)."—(Mr. White, Cardwell, for Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 24) respecting the St. Stephen's Bank.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 25) respecting the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company (Limited).—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

Bill (No. 33) respecting the People's Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 34) to amend the Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Wallace.)

PASSAGE RATES TO WINNIPEG.

Mr. DOYON asked, How does it happen that, whereas immigrants coming from Europe pay only \$13.50 as passage money from Portland, in Maine, to Winnipeg: Canadian-born immigrants from the United States, wishing to return to their native country, are obliged to pay \$28 to \$30 as passage money for the same journey?

Mr. CARLING. The passage rates between Europe and Winnipeg, and between Portland and Winnipeg, are fixed by the transportation companies, and are not under the control of the Department. However, I shall take an early opportunity of communicating with the railway companies on the subject.

SURVEYS IN MONTCALM.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to have published, shortly, the report of the exploratory surveys made of late years in the County of Montcalm by F. D. Adams?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The work of Mr. Adams, referred to by the hon. gentleman, will appear in the summary report of the Department of the Interior for this year, which report is now in the hands of the printer. It will be enlarged on when the geological map, which is now under preparation, is completed.

CAPTAIN TAIT ROBERTSON.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether the attention of the Government has been called to an outrage that was committed on the steamer *Baltic* last season while on a voyage in the Georgian Bay, through which a young man named Hambly lost his life? If so, is it the intention of the Government to cancel Captain Tait Robertson's license, he being the captain who was in command of the *Baltic* at the time the outrage was committed? If not, why not?

Mr. TUPPER. My attention was called to this so-called outrage by the press, and, having observed the reports in the papers regarding it, I, some time ago, gave directions to obtain full information, with a view to ordering a strict enquiry into the conduct of the captain.

RAILWAY ACCOMMODATION AT BRYANTON.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to carry out the promise made by the Department of Railways and Canals, of putting in a switch at Bryanton in connection with the Derby Branch of the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The memorandum I have from the Department is that a platform was promised at Bryanton, and that there is no record of a promise to build a switch. However, my hon. friend has told me there was a verbal promise made, and I will take occasion to make an early enquiry into it.

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

Mr. CASEY asked, Whether the Government has received a petition from the railway mail clerks, asking for increase of pay; the establishment of a mutual benefit fund, &c.? If so, what are their intentions in regard thereto?

Mr. HAGGART. Such a petition has been received, and will be given due attention.

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RAILWAY.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. McMULLEN) asked, What is the entire sum expended in connection with the production and equipment of the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, up to the 31st December last; the entire length of the new line; the entire length from Oxford to New Glasgow *via* the new line; the length from Oxford to New Glasgow by the old line of the Intercolonial?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The entire sum expended up to 31st December, 1889, was \$1,543,831.27. The entire length of the new road is: Main line, 67'60 miles; Pugwash, 4'75 miles; total, 72'35 miles. The distance from Oxford to New Glasgow by new line is 82'40 miles. Distance, Oxford to New Glasgow by old line, 89 miles.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to enlarge and deepen the Beauharnois Canal this year; or when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole subject of the enlargement and deepening of the St. Lawrence canals is now engaging the attention of the Government.

THE CASE OF LÉBOURDAIS BROTHERS.

Mr. BERNIER (for Mr. CASGRAIN) asked, Whether the Government has any official information as to remittance, in whole or in part, of the sentence against the two brothers Lebourdais, tried in Scotland last year? If so, what is such information, and when will their detention be ended?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On 3rd June a communication was received by the High Commissioner

Mr. LANDERKIN.

from the Colonial Office, covering one from the office of the Secretary of State for Scotland, dated 14th May, 1889, stating that the Secretary of State, having given most careful consideration to the case, found there was no ground for the statement in the petition that there had been a miscarriage of justice, but that, in view of the whole circumstances, he felt justified in stating that he would be prepared to recommend the release of the parties at the expiration of one year from 10th May last.

ALASKA AND CANADA BOUNDARY LINE.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. CHARLTON) asked, What progress has been made in settling the boundary line between Alaska and the Dominion of Canada? Are difficulties likely to arise in the settlement of the boundary?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No difficulty is likely to arise in regard to the boundary between Alaska and the Dominion of Canada. That boundary is defined in the Treaty of 1825, known as the Treaty of St. Petersburg. It will doubtless be necessary that a delimitation of the boundary shall be made, at least at several points, by actual survey; but although the Government of Canada have expressed readiness to join with the United States in making such a survey, the United States Government have not, so far as this Government are aware, taken any steps to that end up to the present time.

AMOUNT OF CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) asked, 1. What was the estimated population of the Dominion on which the amount of Customs duties paid per head of population (as per Table No. 7 of Trade and Navigation Returns of 1889) was calculated for each of the years from 1880 to 1887? 2. On what date was based the estimated population for the years 1887, 1888 and 1889, as given in said table? 3. Was the same rule adopted in estimating the population for the years 1880 to 1887 as for the years 1887 to 1889?

Mr. BOWELL. The figures used from 1871 until 1880 for the calculations in column 3 of No. 7 of Trade and Navigation Tables were the numbers ascertained by the census of 1871, plus 113,508, the estimated population of British Columbia, Manitoba and North-West Territories. From 1881 to 1886 the figures were given annually to the Customs Department by the Department of Agriculture, and were based, I am informed, on the census of 1881, with the percentage of increase between 1871 and 1881 added thereto. Since the publication of the Statistical Abstract in 1886, a table has appeared in it, giving the population estimated for such year, and this differs in 1887 and 1888 from the numbers published in the Trade and Navigation Tables, the latter, as I am informed, being estimated only up to 4th April (date of census of 1881), while the former was for the fiscal year ending 30th June.

BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES.

Mr. DICKINSON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce this Session legislation to regulate Benevolent Societies?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the present intention of the Government to introduce this Session legislation to regulate Benevolent Societies.

THE JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before we pass over the questions, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, whether, among the papers moved for by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is included the correspondence with Mr. Graham of the *Star*, and if not, whether the Government is prepared to bring down the memorandum or letter of the Minister of Justice to Mr. Graham, along with the other correspondence?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the papers are not covered by the present motion, but there can be no objection to bring them down?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be very desirable to have them all before us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will be brought down.

THE PUBLIC CURRENCY.

Mr. CASEY moved:

That the Government should issue, or guarantee the absolute soundness of all paper currency issued or circulated as money, taking adequate security in the latter case, and to make such guaranteed currency a legal tender, whether issued by the Government or by banks.

He said: I trust the House will permit me to make the few verbal amendments in the motion I have just read, and which is slightly different from that on the Order paper. My object in bringing this motion before the House is not to ask any expression of opinion, by way of a division, which it would be unreasonable to ask, in view of the fact that we are shortly to have a Bill on the subject of banking; but to attempt to elicit from the House by discussion a sort of general opinion with regard to the great principle of the matter which I propose to have introduced. I may say, in the first place, that I have no idea of proposing anything in the line of "greenbacks" or trying to nourish that ill-fated "rag baby." On the other hand, I do not wish to propose anything in exact accordance with the National Bank system of the United States, nor yet with the system in force in England, as concerns the issue of paper money by the Bank of England. I propose to attain the same thing that is attained in these nations by somewhat different means, which I will explain as I go on. But the leading principles which I wish to urge are, that the Government is responsible for the absolute soundness of all currency which it allows to be circulated and used as money in currency, and that all such currency, whose soundness is guaranteed by the Government, should be made legal tender in the same manner as Dominion notes are at present. I will take this matter up somewhat in the manner of the good old-fashioned preachers who used to divide a sermon into three heads; and I will ask, first, why should the Government be responsible for, or guarantee the soundness of the currency? In the second place, why is it preferable for the Government to guarantee the soundness of the currency, issued by banks rather than issue it directly themselves? And, in the third place, I will ask why the Government should make it a legal tender? As to the responsibility of the Government for the soundness of the public currency I maintain that, *prima facie*, are just as responsible for the sound-

ness of the paper currency which they allow to circulate as for the absolute purity of the coinage which they circulate as money. In the latter case the responsibility of the Government is universally admitted all over the civilised world. Governments, and they alone, issue coinage and insure through their mint, and by the stamp on each coin, the purity of that coinage. This is looked upon as a public duty of the Government—and it is a duty, because Government should protect from all losses, in buying and selling, the holders and takers of currency who have not the means of protecting themselves. If that is true in regard to coinage, it is, I think, still more true in regard to paper currency, because, in regard to coins, the holder has some means of protecting himself. It is possible to test the genuineness of a coin by means of a little acid and a pair of scales, but there is no means of testing the goodness of a bank note unless one is an expert in banking matters and knows all possible counterfeits, and unless one is perfectly well informed as to the financial standing of the bank whose notes are offered to him. Therefore, I hold that the duty of the Government, to secure the absolute soundness of the paper currency, is greater than their duty to secure the absolute purity of the coinage. The duty of the Government in issuing coins is universally admitted, and the duty of securing the soundness of paper currency is almost as universally admitted by all the nations of the civilised world. It is admitted by all the great nations, at all events; these Governments hold themselves responsible for the soundness of that currency. Now, admitting the duty of the Government so to secure the currency, the next question that arises is, how should they secure it? It might be secured by the regulation of the bank issues, to a great extent; it might be secured by a Government guarantee stamped on the issues of the banks; or, it might be secured by issuing all the currency directly from the public treasury, making it a direct promise to pay from the Government to the holder of each note. As to the regulation of the bank issues, we have done a great deal already. We have provided that a bank may issue only to the extent of its paid-up capital, that it shall hold certain reserves in gold and Dominion notes, and that beyond that, in case the bank suspends payment, the holder of its notes shall have a first lien on all the assets of the bank before any other creditor shall be satisfied. These provisions would seem to afford a very high degree of security. It has been found, in practice, that they do afford a very high ultimate degree of security; but still they are not quite sufficient to accomplish the purposes the Government should aim at in connection with the currency. In the first place, after a bank suspends, a considerable time is required to liquidate its assets, and during that time the holder of its notes is in such a position that, if he must realise on them immediately, he has to dispose of them at a discount, large or small, according to the public estimate of what the assets of the suspended bank will be when liquidated. I would like to refer here to the rumored proposal of the bankers to the Government, that they should make a mutual agreement to redeem each other's notes in case of suspension. If such an arrangement were carried out, it would still further increase the

security, and make it, to my mind, nearly absolute; because, on looking at the combined assets of all the banks, and comparing them with their combined issues of currency, it is clear that there are plenty of assets to cover all the issues, leaving a large surplus. According to the last statement published in the *Gazette*, the paid-up capital of all the banks was \$60,289,000, their assets, \$252,166,000, and the note circulation, \$33,577,000; so that, even allowing a very large margin for over-estimation of assets, it is perfectly clear that the banks, taken altogether, could redeem the bank circulation, or could relieve any individual bank. But still, although that arrangement would afford a security known to be good by experienced business men who understand the system and the standing of the banks, there is one thing it would not secure—the general and absolute recognition of that security; and I contend that the Government's policy in regard to the currency of the country should be such as would not only secure its absolute soundness, but also the universal knowledge and recognition of that soundness; just in the same manner as the Government is not content with seeing that each gold piece has the right number of carats of gold, but also stamps it in such a way that everybody shall see that it is pure and genuine. I think the currency should be equally secured, so that everyone to whom a note is presented would take it not only with safety, but without any fear of loss. Now, the present currency certainly does not meet that requirement, and even the arrangement proposed to be entered into by the banks, as reported in the papers, would not secure it. It might secure the goodness of the notes, but there would be nothing on their face to show to anybody that they were so secured, or that he might take them without loss. The inconvenience of such a state of things is very obvious. In the first place, as anybody who has travelled in the United States well knows, our bank notes are either non-current at all, or they are received with great suspicion on the other side of the line, while their greenbacks pass without question here, for the reason that they are Government notes, and everybody knows that the Government is responsible for their payment. The people of the United States do not know the standing of our different banks, and know very little indeed of the credit of our Government, and therefore regard all our notes with some suspicion. If they saw that all our notes were guaranteed by the Dominion Government, they would look into the matter, and our notes would pass there at as small a discount as their currency does here. But even in the Dominion of Canada, if the Finance Minister should visit British Columbia, taking with him some of these bank notes which pass current here, and should offer them to some one who did not know he was the Finance Minister, he might have some difficulty in passing them. The people of one end of Canada do not know the standing of the banks at the other end; the Dominion is a large country, and such knowledge is not as widely diffused as a knowledge of politics. We also often find that notes of newly-established banks, or those about which there are rumors, are received with some distrust or refused altogether. Then again, in litigation between parties, the question sometimes arises as to whether payment has been duly offered, and whether it was done with

Mr. CASEY.

bank notes or with legal tender; and even though bank notes are sound, they do not satisfy the requirements of the law because they are not legal tender. There are great inconveniences arising from the existence of a currency so diverse in its character, so little known beyond the neighborhood of the bank which issues it, and so liable to cause disputes between parties dealing with each other. In respect to counterfeiting, also, we find difficulties. The very diversity of the issue facilitates counterfeiting. When counterfeit money is put in circulation, it is nobody's business in particular to detect and punish the counterfeiters. The banks do not care much about them, for their tellers are experts and sure to detect counterfeit money. The only person who suffers is the innocent holder who presents the counterfeit notes to the bank, and then discovers that he has no recourse, and is unable to find the man who passed it upon him. Now, a case arose illustrating this a few years ago, when a number of counterfeited notes of different Canadian banks were issued in Detroit, and nothing was done towards having the counterfeiters arrested, until they began to counterfeit some Dominion notes, when Dominion detectives were sent to ferret out the guilty parties, who were discovered and arrested. If these parties had not tried their hands on Dominion notes, they might have gone on uninterruptedly swindling the people out of a large amount of money, and no means taken to check them. Having established, as far as I am able to do at present, that it is the duty of the Government to secure the soundness of our currency, and to make that soundness known, the question arises: How shall the Government make it known? You, Sir, no doubt have read Burns' famous lines:

“The rank is but the guinea stamp,
The man's the gowd for a' that.”

Which means that the rank conferred upon a man by the Government, or conferred on money by the Government, would not of itself give the man or the currency any value; but it yet remains true that the rank, though not the cause of value in gold, is the proof to all the world that the value as represented exists. The King's stamp is the proof of the purity of the gold, and the Government stamp upon a bill is the only absolute proof of its soundness, the only absolute security for its redemption in gold at any time. I believe this guinea stamp, this tower mark, this proof of absolute soundness, should be given by way of a guarantee of all notes issued by the banks, rather than by their direct issue by the Government. Bankers have the best opportunities of knowing what the needs of the country are in the way of circulation, and it is most convenient that our currency should be issued only through the medium of the banks, and that the Government should not pay out any notes directly, but leave their issue to the banks; and my motion is to the effect that, in that case, the Government should take security from the banks. What would be an adequate security for the Government to take? We know that in the United States the demand for Government bonds is rather more than dollar for dollar; we know that in England a sovereign is required for every pound's worth of currency issued. I think both those systems would be too inelastic for this country. We all know that at times greater expansion than usual is required, and the banks are the best judges of the necessity

for any sudden expansion. The figures I have given of the assets of the banks show that the Government would have absolute security if they had the first lien on those assets which are now held by note holders. As the case stands at present, the note holders are forced to accept this as their only security, and have to take the risk of its being sufficient. They have no means of knowing whether it is adequate or not, and they have no control over the banks, and, therefore, I think the public, rather than the individual, should assume this risk, as the Government have both the knowledge of the standing of the banks and control over them. It is, therefore, eminently fair and just—in fact, it is the only just way—that the Government should take the risk the note holders take and accept the security which the note holders now have. In other words, the Government should take the first lien on all assets of the banks, and guarantee the note circulation of those banks within the prescribed limits; and, if these were not found sufficient, I fancy very small additional guarantees and securities would make up the deficiency. I cannot expect the Government to take action on this motion, as they contemplate bringing down a Bill of their own on this subject, and I do not hope to be able to teach the Government; but I make this motion in the expectation that it may bring up a discussion on this subject, which may be instructive to the House and the Government. I now come to my last point. Why not make the guarantee currency legal tender? If the Government has absolute security and guarantees, why not compel everybody to accept this currency in payment of debts? Nearly all Governments who have a guaranteed currency make it a legal tender, and it only seems logical that they should do so. Such a course would cause this currency to be taken with greater confidence, not only at home but abroad, and our people would be put in possession of a national currency second to none possessed by any country in the world.

Mr. FOSTER. I have listened with great attention to my hon. friend who has spoken to his motion, as he himself intimated, rather with the idea of starting a discussion in the House which might elicit opinions for the mutual information of members and the Government as well, than with any idea that the Government would, at this stage, indicate its policy with reference to the Banking Bill which it is its intention shortly to bring down. The hon. gentleman's views, which he has enunciated with much ability, will be printed in the Debates, where I will have the pleasure of reading them at leisure, and of considering the various principles he has laid down; and, having stated his views, I am convinced my hon. friend is prepared to withdraw his motion, and not press it to a vote.

Motion withdrawn.

MAIL SERVICE IN GASPÉ COUNTY.

Mr. JONCAS moved for:

Copies of all letters, reports and other correspondence now in the possession of the Postmaster General respecting the carriage of the mails between Campbellton, in the Province of New Brunswick, and Gaspé Basin, in the Province of Quebec.

He said: I desire particularly to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that, from the 15th October last to the 15th January, almost every day our mails have been behind time

from twenty-four to seventy-seven hours. I have received lately a number of letters complaining of the state of affairs in our county. On the 17th January, the head of one of the most important commercial firms wrote as follows:—

"Our mail service is as bad as possible. It makes no difference whether roads are good or bad. Even with the slow time allowed, mails are always behind. I do not believe that, in the last three months, we have had a mail on time, and frequently they are twenty-nine hours late, and sometimes fifty-three hours, and even seventy-eight hours."

On the 22nd January, another gentleman well known in the county wrote:

"Three mails again due this morning. The mail that left Campbellton on Friday last, the 17th, is not yet in—130 hours to travel 180 miles."

This is a very bad state of affairs. Who is responsible for it? I do not wish to blame anyone principally, but I think the evil lies in the fact that, if I am well informed, the Postmaster General is obliged to accept the lowest tender whenever tenders are invited for the carrying of the mails, and also in the manner in which the contracts are worded. If the law is so framed that the Postmaster General is bound to accept the lowest tender whenever tenders are invited for the carrying of the mails, I think the law should be changed, because the consequence of it is that every Tom, Dick or Harry can tender, every irresponsible party can tender for the carrying of the mail, and consequently irresponsible parties who have not the means of doing the work tender too low, get the contract, and then cannot do the work properly. I think also that the manner in which the contracts are worded has something to do with this. One of the clauses of the contract contains these words:

"That the contractor will be obliged to be at such a place at such an hour, weather permitting."

These two words, "weather permitting," are made very elastic, and the couriers are sure to find an obliging postmaster to write on the way-bill a statement that the roads are bad. What is the remedy for this state of things, which is, as everybody in this House will understand, prejudicial to the trade and business of the County of Gaspé? I have had the pleasure of having a conversation on the subject with the Postmaster General, when I respectfully submitted that something should be done in the way of improving the service; and I think that a good way of improving the service would be to strike out of the contracts the words "weather permitting," and oblige, under a penalty, the contractor or courier to be at such a post office at such a time. We have no railway in the County of Gaspé. We are almost out of the world for six months in the year, and I think the Government should at least give us a good mail service. It is within my personal knowledge that important commercial firms have spent as much as \$300 and \$400 in telegrams, just on account of delays in the mail service. I hope my hon. friend the Postmaster General, will see his way clear to put a few hundred dollars more in the Estimates this year to give the County of Gaspé a better mail service. We must remember that there is in that county a population of 60,000, that the trade of that part of the country is very important, and that such a state of affairs is disastrous.

Mr. HAGGART. No letters or correspondence on the subject are in the Department in reference

to irregularity in the delivery of mails in the district which my hon. friend mentions. I suppose the reason of it is, as he says, that the contract for the whole distance between Campbellton and Gaspé is divided into two or three contracts. The reports of the postmasters will show that when the mails arrived late there was some reason; the weather was unfavorable, or there was some other reason. The contract for the delivery of the mail from Campbellton to Gaspé used to be one single contract, and the delivery was better than it is at present. The first information I had of the irregularity of the delivery was a conversation with my hon. friend the member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) the other day. The suggestions which he made to me I have embodied in a letter that I sent down to the inspector to report upon, and as they have no railway communication there, and it is an important section of the country, the Department will pay every attention to the suggestions of my hon. friend, and I hope to make the service between Campbellton and Gaspé, in the future, everything that the hon. gentleman desires.

Motion agreed to.

REBATE ON CORN.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved :

That whereas distillers are allowed a rebate of duty upon malt imported for use in the manufacture of spirits for export, it is, in the opinion of this House, but just and right that farmers and stock raisers who import corn to feed cattle or other stock for export should also receive a similar rebate.

He said: Last Session I brought this matter before the House, and we had a considerable discussion of the subject. My views have not changed since that time. I believe in the correctness of the resolution; I believe in the soundness of the resolution; I believe in the justice of the resolution, and hence I have felt it my duty to bring it again before the House for further deliberation and further consideration, so as, if possible, to remove from the tariff of this country what appears to me to be a great blot upon it. We have a very high tariff, and we find many anomalies in connection with it. We find many distinctions of an invidious character in connection with it. We find many matters in it prejudicial to the interests of the great masses of the people, and in favor of the interests of classes of people in this country. It is in order to remove this anomaly that I have brought this resolution before the House. I have thought that in a British Parliament where fair play should be the predominant feature of the deliberations of the House, measures should not be passed, nor assented to by the Government, that deal out uneven-handed justice to the people of this country, as is done in these statutes and in the Order in Council upon which this is framed. When I brought this matter before the House last Session, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs told me of the difficulties there would be in the way of enforcing such a resolution as this. He gave us to understand that it would be impracticable to carry out a resolution of this character; that while he was able and willing, and while he could recommend to the Government to pass an Order in Council that would give a rebate or a drawback to the distillers of this country, he was unable to offer any solution of such a problem on

Mr. JONCAS.

behalf of the agriculturists of this country. He appeared to indicate—or his words bore out that construction—that the farmers of this country, and the consuming masses of the people of this country, could not be relied upon in making their declarations in reference to what they might see fit to import for purposes of production. Now, Sir, I will tell the Minister of Customs, in order to relieve his mind, that one of my objects in bringing this before the House is to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that these inequalities exist, that injustice is being done, repeatedly done, against the great consuming masses of the people of this country. It is for that reason that I have drawn the attention of the House to this matter, and it is in order to secure, if possible, the support of the Minister of Customs, and to relieve him of the difficulty of solving the problem of giving any relief, or of giving any aid, or of giving consideration, to the farmers and agriculturists and the other classes of the people of this country. I purpose to say to him, I purpose to take him into my confidence, and tell him that what I propose by this resolution is to strike a blow at this drawback system in the tariff of this country. This matter is but in its infancy, and I propose to nip it in the bud now while we can. It will grow, it will become strong, and it will become impossible for the Government, if this is allowed to go on, to grapple with this great and pressing evil, an evil that is fraught with a great amount of expense to the people of this country. Young as it is, in infancy as it is, I find that last year the drawbacks amounted to something over \$20,000. The bounty that was given to the manufacturers of pig iron amounted to over \$37,000, making in all \$58,305.58 last year. That is a pretty promising infant for this country to feed, that is a pretty promising industry for the people of this country to grapple with, if, when these Orders in Council have only been in force, some of them with which I am dealing, for little over a year, they have been able to extract from the people of this country over \$58,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is something that should meet with fair play, and commend itself to the judgment of every member of this House. I believe it can be comprehended by every man in this country with the instincts of fair play, that whereas we are willing to give to this class I am dealing with here, a rebate on commodities that they import for the purpose of manufacture and re-exportation, we cannot give it to the larger classes, or that we do not give it to the larger classes, but they are discriminated against by the Government of this country. If there is one class of people in this country to whom the Government ought to give a helping hand, it is the agricultural and the laboring classes. It is upon these classes that the success and the future of this country very largely depend. It is certainly the duty of this House, and it should be the high privilege and pleasure of this House, to do everything they possibly can to lessen the burdens of these great classes, instead of adding to their already heavy burdens. Now, we find that this is a two-fold evil. While it not only adds to the taxation of the people, while it not only imposes heavier burdens upon them, it enables the distiller to bring in corn to fatten cattle and to have the duty taken off his corn, while the farmer alongside of him, if he sees fit to import corn

to fatten his cattle, is obliged to pay $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per bushel. What is the result? Both their products have the same market. The distiller has his corn at $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents a bushel less than the farmer. The farmer is obliged to compete in the markets of the world with the distiller and pay this additional $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents duty on the corn. I appeal to the sense of justice of the House if this should be allowed to continue; I appeal to the sense of fair play of hon. members to say if such a principle should be allowed to exist either on the statute book or in Order in Council. It is a blot upon the deliberations of this House, and it does not harmonise with what I would regard as a system which could carry out the feelings of hon. members. The farmer is handicapped by this resolution—as many other resolutions to which I shall call the attention of the Government. I propose to urge upon this House the impropriety of the continuance of such Orders in Council or statutes that favor special classes of the people and impose burdens on the great mass of our population. With our high tariff, with a protective system in operation, a system that is taking the life blood out of the industries of this country, a system that is producing a depression more severe in its character than has ever been felt in the history of Canada, a system that has depreciated the value of property more than ever before, a system that possesses anomalous features which are always creeping to the surface—it becomes the duty of members of this House to rise in their might and sweep from the statute book regulations so obnoxious and so oppressive upon the industries of the country. It is well known, not only by the farmers but by many manufacturers, that the taxing of the raw materials they use, as is the case under the present tariff, is obnoxious and detrimental to our best interests, and it becomes the duty of this House to consider these matters with a view to relieving the distress that prevails so widely over the Dominion. A few years ago we were told by the Government of the day that they could make peoplerich by Act of Parliament; that it was scarcely necessary to continue their energy and enterprise, for by parliamentary Acts they could add to the people's wealth and bring about prosperity. How fallacious have been the promises they made. It is known from one end of the country to the other how fallacious have proved to be the promises made in regard to that policy. It is known to hon. members of this House, and you, Mr. Speaker, know it as well as any of the hon. gentlemen, that these promises have proved fallacious; that their fallacy has been exposed, and that the country now understands that this protective tariff has been the means of inflicting great injury on the country, evil which will take many years to repair, and many years will elapse before we will be able to restore to the farmers the prosperity that previously existed. An hon. gentleman suggests that I should take a drink. He will vote for the distiller; he is not an advocate against drawbacks, but he is anxious that those anomalies should exist. He is anxious that the people should be burdened with this species of class legislation, as they have been burdened for the past few years. Another matter which occurs to me in connection with this subject, and it is an important one, is this: I notice that these Orders in Council granting drawbacks to certain classes of

the community, and I confess to a great many classes, have been passed either just before or just after an election. It appears that every man who was not promised to be a Senator at the last election has obtained a drawback on something that he manufactures. This is another way in which the liberties of the people are affected by this rotten and corrupt system of legislation. I saw in one of the returns brought down the name of a gentleman who formerly supported hon. members on this side of the House. An Order in Council was passed, just after the election, granting him a drawback on certain articles which entered into his manufactured goods, and under that order he received \$1,500 for that one year. That was something tangible for him, and it was to him a good and sufficient reason why he should change his political creed. But should the Government have the power of taking the people's money and handing it over to any individual or any class, in order to debauch them and lead them to oppose principles they believed to be correct? Certainly not. I presume if I were to go through the list I could find a great many instances of this kind. It is well known that there are many, many instances on record; but I will not occupy the time of the House in doing so. I have taken my stand on this matter. I am going to fight unto death this drawback system. In season and out of season I am going to draw the attention of the House and country to the injurious effects that are calculated to arise from a system so unsound as this and one so far removed from a fiscal system which merits the support of the people. I will oppose this system to the bitter end; and my object is not to oppose the Minister of Customs, but to come to his rescue and to the rescue of the people, and relieve them of the burdens placed on them by the drawback system, which oppresses them and discriminates unfairly against the farming class. Entertaining this feeling and being convinced of the soundness of this view, I shall, unhesitatingly, go forward, and everywhere fight to the bitter end the drawback system which is calculated to do so much injury to the people of the country.

Mr. CORBY. As the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has brought a resolution before the House, asking that the farmers of the Dominion be granted the same relief as distillers on corn imported to feed stock for export, I should like to give the House a few figures as to the quantity of corn brought in by distillers for manufacturing purposes, the quantity of spirit exported, and the rebate allowed distillers on the spirits exported for the last five years. First, I will give the corn used by distillers in manufacturing spirits.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Might I ask when the Order in Council was passed? The hon. gentleman is reading figures for the past five years. Will he state when the Order was passed?

Mr. CORBY. I am giving you figures for the past five years.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Order in Council was passed a year ago.

Mr. CORBY. I only went back five years, and I thought that would cover the whole ground.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is all nonsense bringing figures before the Order in Council was passed.

Mr. CORBY. Indian corn, used by distillers in manufacture of spirits, Dominion of Canada, was as follows:—

Year ending 30th June, 1885	48,780,428 lbs.
“ “ 1886	61,044,700 “
“ “ 1887	70,067,303 “
“ “ 1888	74,285,727 “
“ “ 1889	77,666,625 “
Total	331,844,783 lbs.

The grand total of Indian corn is 331,844,783 lbs., which, divided by 56, the number of pounds in a bushel, equals 5,925,800 bushels, the import duty on which, at 7½ cents per bushel, is \$444,435, which is paid by the distillers in the Dominion for the last five years. Against that I will give the figures of the spirits exported for the Dominion of Canada for the same time, which are as follows:—

Year ending 30th June, 1885	Proof gals.
1885	10,322'26
“ “ 1886	9,309'94
“ “ 1887	4,596'89
“ “ 1888	7,889'38
“ “ 1889	8,730'83

or a total quantity exported by the distillers of the Dominion for the last five years of 40,849'30 proof gallons, which, at 20'4 lbs. for one proof gallon, equals 833,325 lbs. of grain in spirits exported, and 80 per cent. of corn in 833,325 lbs. of grain equals 666,660 lbs. of corn at 56 lbs. to the bushel, which would be 11,905 bushels used in the manufacture of the amount of whiskey exported. The rebate on this would equal \$982'87 for the last five years, and even this large sum has not all been claimed, for we find that only \$412'60 has been claimed as rebate during all that period. Not only do the distillers of this Dominion pay an import duty on corn to the amount of \$444,435, but they also pay an excise duty of \$4 a bushel on 5,925,800 bushels, which was brought in by them for manufacturing purposes during the last five years.

An hon. MEMBER. \$4 a bushel.

Mr. CORBY. That is right. It is \$1'30 a proof gallon, and as there is a little over 3 gallons to the bushel so the excise duty is over \$4 a bushel. Now, Mr. Speaker, as a distiller, I do not ask, nor do I want this Government to grant me any rebate on spirits exported, nor do I want the Government to make any difference between me and the farmers. I am satisfied of one thing, and that is, that if corn is allowed to be brought into this Dominion as proposed by the resolution of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin), there is no doubt but that it will reduce largely the price of our coarse grain which is now used by the farmers for feeding purposes. Feeding corn to-day can be bought in Chicago and laid down in our city at about 30 cents a bushel in bond, whereas we are now paying, and have been all winter, in Belleville, 45 cents per bushel for rye, which would make a difference of 15 cents discrimination against the farmers in our part of the country, which would have been lost to the farmers had corn been allowed to come in free. With these observations I will close, trusting that in the interest of the farmers, as well as in the interest of the manufacturers of this country, that the Government will not accede to the motion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not touch this subject at all were it not for the fact that it seems

Mr. LANDERKIN.

to be the custom of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) to bring this question up, year after year, for the purpose of trying to make capital with a large class of his constituents in that part of the country. Grey is noted for its being a fine agricultural county, where all kinds of grain that the farmer usually raises are raised, and on which cattle and other animals are fed. Let me say that the cattle are not fed, as the hon. gentleman says, always for export. They are raised for the purpose of selling to the first buyer who comes along and who gives the farmer a profitable price for them. The first feature of the hon. gentleman's remarks to which I would refer, is, when in almost stentorian tones he wished to impress upon this House and upon this country the evils of the system of giving drawbacks. He said that, in the interests of the country, the system should be nipped in the bud; that it is an evil, and a growing evil, and therefore the earlier we do away with the evil the better. But, in the same resolution in which he proposes the abolition of this evil, he asks that it should be continued and extended, not to the manufacturer, but to the farmer. It is impossible for two wrongs to make a right, I think that the hon. gentleman could hardly convince intelligent people that it would be an improvement to extend what he calls an evil to a much larger class than the one to which he refers. I can only say that, from my knowledge of the pursuits of the farmers, from my knowledge of their intelligence, that they are too intelligent to be gulled by any such—I was going to say clap-trap, were it not for the fact that that might be unparliamentary—but, at all events, I believe the farmers are too intelligent to be gulled by such false logic as is advanced here for that purpose. The farmers of the country understand that this motion is brought up here for the purpose of creating among them a feeling that in some way or other the Government discriminates against them in the interest of the manufacturers. What is the usual course adopted by the farmer when he feeds cattle for the market? He feeds them on the coarse grain which he raises on his own farm, and which the soil of the country is better adapted than for other grain, and the surplus of this coarse grain he sells in the market. As my hon. friend (Mr. Corby) says, if corn were allowed to be brought in free of duty it would very largely reduce the value of the coarse grain to the farmer and put him in a worse position than he is in to-day. We know that before the duty was put upon corn and on oats we had grain imported from the Western States right into the County of Grey. I know this, because it was sold in my own village, and I have the honor to be one of the constituents of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin). I know that this imported grain was sold, to the detriment of the farmers who are raising oats in that district. They knew how this imported corn was coming into competition with their oats, and for that reason they turned around in large numbers and supported the National Policy at the general elections of 1878, and have continued to support that policy at every succeeding election. But would it benefit the farmer if the hon. gentleman was enabled to accomplish what he aims at, and if the farmer got a drawback on the corn he imports to feed cattle for exportation? Farmers do not import grain to feed cattle for exportation. They feed with the grain they

raise on their own farms, and if they were obliged to import grain to feed their cattle they could not make the business of raising cattle a profitable one. Neither do the farmers feed their cattle for exportation. They feed their cattle to sell them on the market at the highest price they can get, and whether the beef is killed in their own district, or sent to Toronto or Montreal, or out of the country altogether, they care not so long as they get their price. I hold that it would be a great calamity if the duty was taken off this corn, because then the imported article would come in direct competition with what the agriculturist of the country produces, and out of which he makes his money. Provided the Minister of Customs saw fit to make a rebate, what would the farmer think of having to go to the Customs house officer to give him the necessary papers to make out for a few cents rebate of duty. I have only spoken on this one resolution so far, but I believe there is another motion on the paper, put by the hon. gentleman from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) or one of his friends, a short time ago, in reference to the corn imported into the country for soiling purposes or for feeding cattle, such as fodder and other corn. How much would the farmer receive rebate if such a proposition were carried out? I think in the whole County of Grey the man who uses the largest amount of corn for the purpose of feeding cattle does not sow 15 acres, or probably he does not sow 12 acres. So far as my information goes, I think I use as much as any man in the county; I have some eight or ten acres sown with it. How much rebate would a farmer be entitled to on three-quarters of a bushel to the acre? Last year I sowed five bushels on seven acres, on which the rebate would amount to 52½ cents; and out of that I had nearly 100 tons of ensilage. Now, would it be to the interest of any farmer so situated to go to some Custom house officer and get papers made out, and perhaps have to get it done through a broker, in order to get a rebate of 52½ cents? He would think it a privilege not worth all that roundabout trouble. I think the hon. gentleman is availing himself of this opportunity, as he has done before, and will probably do again, for the purpose of creating the impression in the minds of the farmers that they are in some way unfairly dealt with. When you analyse his proposition, and consider the difficulty of carrying it out and the slight return which would be made to the farmer, you must come to the conclusion that it is only a buncombe resolution offered for no good purpose, and with no substantial grievance to be remedied. I find five such resolutions on this paper, and the same purpose and principle appears to run through them all; there is really nothing in them for the benefit of the farmer; and the sooner the hon. gentleman comes to the conclusion that the time of this House could be better employed than in listening to such speeches, made for the purpose of sending them out to his constituents, and that we should devote ourselves to redressing substantial grievances and doing something for the good of the country, the better for the House and for the country.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The position of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House is very different from that of the man who makes his entire living from the farm. The hon. gentleman has his profession, and a few cents of duty here

or there are of very little consequence to him; but the farmer who looks to his farm for his living is not so well off, and from his standpoint I will make a few remarks. The farmers of Canada have a perfect right to be heard from on this question. Promises which were made as to what the National Policy would do have not been fulfilled. The First Minister told them that their cattle and produce would all be consumed in the country when we got all those tall chimneys and that immense population to be produced in the country by the National Policy. Those promises have not been fulfilled. Again, last Session, when the Finance Minister made his Budget speech, he told us that there were only two hundred articles of raw material imported into Canada duty free for the benefit of the manufacturers of the country. I ask why he could not point to a number of articles brought in duty free as raw material for the farmers? They are excluded from the benefits which are granted to the manufacturers. Let me quote some of the duties which the farmers pay. We were told last Session that they pay almost no duty. Now, I find that on clothing they paid in 1887 17½ per cent., in 1888 30 per cent., and in 1889 35 per cent., so that that duty is increasing steadily. During the time of the Reform Government any agricultural society could import into Canada all the agricultural implements the farmers required free of duty, while in 1880 there was a duty of 25 per cent., and in 1889 it had gone up to 35 per cent. Now let me show how the tariff discriminates in some other articles against the farmer. On stone-ware and crockery which the farmer uses he pays 35 per cent, while the china which is used by a man in a little better position is charged only 30 per cent, and when we come to the case of the goods the rich man puts on his table, we find that only 20 per cent is charged on silver and gold plate. We also find that jewellery, about which we heard so much in the Budget speech last Session, and which is a luxury of the rich, comes in at 20 per cent., while spades and shovels, which farmers use in making a living, are charged 46 per cent. On forks and hoes the duty is 53 per cent., and on a little article called the hay-knife, which every farmer has to use, the duty is 79½ per cent., so that one of these articles, imported at a value of \$3.15, has to pay \$2.51 of duty. When we find that the farmers of the Dominion are discriminated against in this manner, we have a right to claim that they should get a rebate on some of their materials. We know that strong pressure has been brought to bear on the Government by the millers for a change of duties in their interest, and one of the statements made in their association was that while some classes of property were increasing in value, the value of the properties of the millers was remaining stationary. If the farmers could say as much they would not have the same reason to complain that they have; but our property is not remaining even stationary, it has been reduced in the last five or six years about 25 per cent. Taking all these facts into consideration, and also considering that this rebate is supposed to be given for the encouragement of a very important industry, that is, the export of cattle, it is only a fair demand. Last year we exported 102,000 head of cattle, of which, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, over 60,000 head,

valued at \$83 per head, went to the English markets, while we sent 37,000 head to the United States, and they were sent there at prices that could not pay any farmer to raise them; but I suppose, under present circumstances, the necessities of farmers compelled them to part with a very large quantity of stock which they would not otherwise part with. Would you believe me when I state that these cattle were exported at an average price of \$13.07 per head? Now, if we could obtain corn for fattening cattle, it would be one of the cheapest feeds we could obtain. I have been examining the papers to-day, and I find that the price of barley in Toronto is from 38 to 48 cents per bushel; and we were told by the hon. member for West Hastings that corn could be laid down in Canada in bond for 30 cents per bushel. Now, if we could sell our barley at 38 cents, and buy our corn at 30 cents, and get fifty-six pounds of feed for forty-eight pounds of feed, would not that be a great benefit to the farmers? But we have been told that that would reduce the price of our coarse grains, which would not be as dear as they are to-day. Well, I find that at present in Toronto, there is only a difference of 2 cents or 2½ cents in the price of oats as compared with Buffalo, which I hold to be a fair comparison, so that that would not to any extent interfere with the price of coarse grains. Now, with respect to the price of corn, I find that in 1881, the price of corn in Canada was 66 cents, while in the United States it was only 55 cents; and in 1886, the price of corn in Canada had fallen to 49 cents, a reduction of 17 cents per bushel, while in the United States it had only fallen 6 cents in the same period, showing plainly that the National Policy has not kept up the price of corn for Canadian farmers, and it is only two or three counties that raise corn here. When we come to cattle, I hold that no benefit could be conferred upon the farmers to such an extent to give them cheap food, in order that 37,366 head of cattle might be got ready for slaughter before they left our own country. It is the duty of the Government to do all they can to foster this young industry. When we go back to 1877 and 1878, we find that not over 500 head of cattle per year were sent to the English market, while this last year 60,000 head were shipped; and when we get the Trade and Navigation Returns of next year we will find the shipments amount to 85,000 or 90,000 head. Ald. Franklin of the city of Toronto gave a report, at the close of the shipping season, showing an increase of 30,000 head of cattle shipped during the past year to the old country markets, and a very large number of those cattle were shipped as stockers. If we could get corn at 30 cents in bond in Canada to-day, a great many farmers would avail themselves of this opportunity of getting corn cheap, and would keep their animals at home and feed them for the English market, instead of shipping them as stockers. Supposing these 37,000 head of cattle could be all made into beef, and sold, as no doubt they would be sold, at \$45 per head, that would mean a profit of \$30 per head, which would amount to \$1,111,000, which would go into the pockets of the farmers of the Dominion. We have been told that this motion is brought up as buncombe; but hon. gentlemen will find, when the next elections come round, and the farmers are made aware of the injustice they suffer under the tariff—when they are

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

told that they have no advantage under it compared with other classes of the community—that this is a serious matter. We were told that the distillers during the last year consumed 77,000,000 pounds of corn, or 1,386,404 bushels. But there was a total home consumption of imported corn of 2,894,838 bushels, which leaves 1,508,534 bushels of corn consumed by the farmers. I hold that, taking the price this corn came in at, a considerable amount must have been used for seed purposes, and there was a duty of \$113,135 collected on the corn consumed by the farmers. That is one of the little items that my hon. friend spoke of when he said that no farmer would pay more than 30 cents or 40 cents, but it amounts to that sum in the whole; and when we consider that the whole salvation of the farming community lies in producing upon the very cheapest possible scale—when we consider that feeding cattle to-day for the English market is one of the most important industries that Canadian farmers engage in, and one that is fairly remunerative, provided we can get food as cheap as possible—I hold the Government is not doing justice to the farmers when they do not give them a rebate on corn. If the rebate that is given to the distillers and starch manufacturers were given to the farmers, they would send to the English markets more cattle than they do; and they are certainly more entitled than the manufacturers of liquor to have a bounty or rebate. Not only are the distillers and starch manufacturers given a rebate, but the iron manufacturers enjoy a rebate of \$1.50 per ton on pig iron; besides a protective duty of \$4 per ton, while the only articles used by the farmer which are allowed in free of duty are cotton seed, meal and oilcake, and animals for breeding purposes. Small seeds are also admitted free, but I cannot congratulate the Government on granting us this boon, because it was granted under strong pressure, and had it not been for that strong pressure we would have been without that boon to-day.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to enter into a general discussion of the National Policy, or as to whether it is a burden either upon the manufacturing or farming industries of this country. The question before the House is a very simple one. It is whether the system of drawbacks should be extended to those who import corn for the purpose of fattening cattle for exportation, because the law provides for the refunding of the duty paid upon corn from which whiskey is made. No doubt the hon. gentleman who proposed this motion was actuated by the purest motives; but it is somewhat singular, that, holding the opinions he does upon so important a question as that of drawbacks paid to manufacturers or to others who establish industries in this country, he should have been so long in finding out the iniquities of a provision in the law of that kind. It has been on the statute book for a great number of years. It was found there and re-enacted by the Government whom he supported in the year 1877, when the Customs Act was consolidated. The hon. gentleman spoke of the anomaly and iniquities of the tariff. There is no provision in the tariff providing for drawbacks. The clause is contained in the general Customs Act, and that has been on the statute book ever since I have known anything of the provisions of the law.

That provision has been carried out by all Governments, by the Government which preceded this, and the Government which preceded that, as well as the present Government; is it not, therefore, very singular that the iniquitous character of that clause should only be discovered when it is being carried out, I admit, to a greater extent than it was under the former Government. It depends in a great measure, it seems to me, with hon. gentlemen like the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), whose ox is gored. When his party were in power he did not discover the wrong and the inequality which he says exists, and which he has now only discovered. If the system of drawbacks is as bad as it is represented by the hon. gentleman, why should he ask to have it extended? I leave that problem for him to solve. He says we have this year paid a large sum in drawbacks to manufacturers. I only regret, in the interest of this country, in the interest of the artisan and of the laboring population of this country, that the sum has not been quadrupled; and I hope, in future, instead of multiplying the figures by units, he may be able to say we have paid thousands in drawbacks to manufacturers in this country on the portion of articles which have gone into the manufacture of goods which have been exported. The system of drawbacks, if it has any effect at all, must be in the line of encouraging the manufacturing industries of the country; and just as we encourage the manufacturing interests, we will in proportion furnish more work for the artisan, the workman and the laborer; and just in proportion to our doing that will a market be furnished for the product of every farm and of every garden in the country. There is another reason why we should continue the system of drawbacks, and I refer to this more particularly because the hon. gentleman stated that the object he desired to attain was not so much to have this principle extended to the agricultural interest of the country, as it was to strike a blow at the promising infant, which he said was growing rapidly. I think it is the duty of all statesmen to nourish and feed promising infants, and I should like to know if the hon. gentleman desires to have these promising infants treated as puppy dogs—kill them as soon as they come into the world? It is known that the system of drawbacks prevails, to a great extent, in the country to the south of us, and that, if we desire to create an export trade in the articles we manufacture, particularly considering the disadvantages under which our manufacturers labor from the position they occupy, not being upon the seaboard, as many of the manufacturers in the United States are, we must pursue the same policy as that which is pursued by the protective country to the south of us, and that is, to grant liberal drawbacks upon the articles on which duty has been paid which enter into the manufacture of goods which are exported from the country. I lay that down as a principle. If we are to adopt the principle which I believe the hon. gentleman desires to have adopted—free trade—let us have a direct attack; but, as long as the protective tariff exists, as long as our manufacturers have to compete in the markets of the world with others who are allowed drawbacks on articles which enter into competition with them, just so long must this country pursue the same course. I do not know how many hon. gentlemen

on the other side will accept the proposition of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). I know that many of them have been urging upon the Government, and upon the Department of which I have the honor to be the head, the extension of the principle of drawbacks, and have claimed that we have not gone far enough in that direction—in fact, they have claimed that we ought to pay a drawback on all articles entering into the manufacture of goods which are exported, equal to the duty which is levied on those goods imported from a foreign country; in other words, that a bonus should be paid by us to the manufacturer of every agricultural implement which is exported.

Mr. MULOCK. And so discriminate against our own consumers in this country.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not aware that that is the argument which the gentlemen use. The argument which has been enforced in this House and upon the Department, is that a drawback should be given for every article exported, whether the materials used in its construction were manufactured in this country or not. The policy of the Government is to levy a duty upon all articles imported which are manufactured in the country, and, if that duty is to be refunded, it would strike a blow at the fundamental principle of the party now in power, which has been three or four times endorsed by the people of Canada. We hear from my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), the threat which we have often heard from him, as to what the people will do when they are next appealed to. We have heard that threat for ten or fifteen years, and, for one, I have no objection to his using all his power and all his logic on that subject in the counties which he may visit. I believe he has tried his eloquence in the county adjoining my own, but it was not sufficiently persuasive to induce the farmers to reject the hon. gentleman who is now sitting on this side of the House. When the farmers, who are an observing and an intelligent people, have the facts laid before them fairly, I have no doubt as to the result. One word more to my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). The House and the country might imagine, from that hon. gentleman's motion, that applications have been made for a drawback on corn imported by persons who have used it for feeding cattle intended for exportation. This question has been before the House for a great number of years. I remember that, seven or eight or nine years ago, it was brought under the notice of the Government by the then hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Fleming), and it has been discussed nearly every Session since with the same result. As I informed the House at that time, whenever an application is made to the Department for a drawback on corn, used in the manner suggested by my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), then will be the time to take into consideration, not only the feasibility of the proposal, but to see if the law would permit it. I am very much of the opinion, which the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me have expressed, that the quantity of corn imported by farmers for the fattening of cattle for export is very limited; and, if it were otherwise, it would have the effect which has been pointed out by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that it would take the place of the coarse grains raised in

this country which are now used for the fattening of cattle, and would be, as the hon. gentleman said he desired, a blow at the operation of that National Policy which has been a protection to the agricultural industry of this country. I know that there are many gentlemen who have strong views upon the question of trade, and free trade in particular. If the policy is to be attacked, let it be attacked fairly, in all its parts, and then we will be better able to meet it. But it appears to be the plan of the Opposition to adopt some system of guerilla warfare, to attack it wherever they think they can make a point with those whom they represent. Whether they will accomplish that end I am not prepared to say; I doubt it very much. The agriculturists and the farmers, a vast majority of them, are too intelligent to be led astray by any such fallacious arguments—I will not call them arguments, but any such fallacious statements as those which have been made upon this subject. The difficulties which my hon. friend referred to in dealing with the question of drawbacks, are not of that minor character that he pretends they are. The most minute calculations have to be made whenever an application is made from any manufacturer. It has to be dealt with cautiously, and in the most searching manner, in order to prevent larger sums being paid than that which has been paid by the manufacturer for duty, unless we are to adopt the system of bounties. I must dissent *in toto* from the inference which the hon. gentleman says he drew from my language last year in explaining very shortly the difficulties that present themselves in arranging a fair basis upon which a drawback should be made. I deny that I insinuated that the farmers of this country were not to be trusted, that their oaths were not to be accepted like those of other people. I made no such statement; no such inference could possibly be drawn from any remarks I made. Whenever an application for drawbacks or refunds is made, we have to look at it from every possible standpoint in order to protect the revenue, but that is not a reflection upon those who make the demand, and I repudiate in the strongest possible manner the insinuation which the hon. gentleman has made, in the deductions which he pretends to have drawn, from anything I may have said upon this subject. I do not know whether it is necessary to pursue the subject to a greater extent. I would ask the House to remember this fact: that no application has ever been made under that clause, which you will find in the statute book, and which gives power to the Government to grant these drawbacks—by any feeder of cattle or by any farmer in the country; it is, therefore, for the House to say whether it is necessary to affirm the principle contained in the hon. gentleman's resolution. When a wrong has been shown to exist, then it will be time enough for the House to act; but until that wrong has been shown to exist, until it has been shown that injustice has been done to any one of the classes to whom he has referred, then I am quite satisfied, speaking from a departmental standpoint, and also for the Government, that the injustice will at once be remedied. But until that is done, I do not think the Government or the House should be asked to affirm a resolution such as has been placed before us.

Mr. FISHER. From the last few words which have fallen from the Minister of Customs, one

Mr. BOWELL.

would almost suppose that to-day, if a farmer makes application for a rebate such as is asked for by the motion of my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin), the Government are in a position to grant that rebate. I think it is well that the farmers of the country should thoroughly understand this matter, and if no other good object can be obtained by the debate which has arisen from this motion, this object alone would certainly justify my hon. friend from Grey in having made his motion. I was not aware, and I confess, until the Minister and the leader of the Government put it more clearly, I cannot quite understand or believe that the farmers of this country are in a position to demand, under the law, a rebate upon any corn or other grain which they may feed cattle for export, upon which they have previously paid a duty. If that is the case, I think it would be well for those who are in charge of this particular Department to state it clearly upon the floor of Parliament, so that the people throughout the country may clearly understand it and be able to take advantage of this law in the same way in which our friends the distillers are doing, as has been pointed out this afternoon by one of them. Sir, I think this question is not to be dismissed so lightly as the Minister of Customs thinks he may do. Although he said he did not wish to take up the whole question of protection and discuss it here, he really did touch largely upon a very important point of the policy of protection. The question of rebate seems to be intimately bound up with the question of protection, and I think that in passing upon the system of protection, which is fathered by hon. gentlemen opposite, we can fairly consider this question of rebate. While the hon. gentleman seems to object very much to particular details of the system of protection being taken up and being attacked, I venture to say that this is one of the most effective ways by which the fallacies of the system of protection may be brought home to the people. I venture to say that if this system of protection cannot bear the test of being carried out to its legitimate conclusion and being dealt with by the method of *reductio ad absurdum*, then that system is a false system, and ought not to be imposed upon the people of this country. Sir, some of the other motions which are upon the paper have been alluded to—I thought a little out of order, by the hon. member for North Grey and the hon. Minister of Customs, when discussing one particular motion.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in error; I referred to no other motion on the paper.

Mr. FISHER. I accept the hon. gentleman's correction; I suppose it was the hon. member for Grey alone who did so. The question we are discussing here this afternoon is simply whether the farmers of the country shall be put upon the same basis as the distillers, and treated in the same manner. The distillers are getting a certain advantage, an advantage which the Minister of Customs has spoken of and pictured in the most roseate hues. I took down a few of the words which he uttered—and what did he say? That rebates increase the profits; that rebates enable the manufacturers to employ more labor; that rebates are having a good effect; and that they increase the manufactures of the country. Now, if

these good things are going to be done for the sake of the distillers, why should not the same things be done for the sake of the farmers, who, I venture to say, are the most important class of manufacturers in the country! It is usual, on the floor of Parliament, to speak of the farmers as if they were not manufacturers, as if they were hewers of wood and drawers of water. But I venture to say that if you examine the exports of this country you will find that the farmers are the greatest manufacturers we have among us, and that the exports of the so-called protected manufacturers of the country, whom these hon. gentlemen have taken under their ægis, are a mere fleabite in the gross exports of this country. They make no showing at all alongside the exports of the manufactures produced by the farmers. If these things are going to be of benefit to any manufacturers in this country, if the rebate is going to help the distillers, and does help the distillers, to manufacture here, things which they could not otherwise manufacture, then let the farmers get the same advantage, let them be induced to go more largely into the manufacture of beef, and butter, and cheese, to be sent out of the country; and if they are able to bring into this country certain classes of raw material which are produced in the neighboring republic at a cheaper rate than here, and if they could bring these raw materials into this country and turn them into good beef, butter and cheese, to be exported, then let them have that advantage, let them be enabled to do so, let them be encouraged to do so—for, by the manufacture of that class of products, not only are those who manufacture them benefited by obtaining their profit, but the whole country is improved by the fact that, in consequence of the importation of those articles and the feeding of them to our cattle, the fertility of the country is increased, the products of our lands are augmented, and our ability to compete in the markets of the world is increased. It is only by these advantages and the profits which our farmers are able to secure that our manufacturers have a home market, of which hon. gentlemen opposite say so much. What is our home market? It is the market which our farmers make for our manufacturers; and were the market of the farmers and agricultural class to be shut up and the products of our manufacturers not sold in that home market, where would our manufacturers go? Our manufacturers would have no market whatever, for under the hotbed system of hon. gentlemen opposite, they are not able to export their goods and compete in foreign markets with the free trade manufacturers of England. The hon. gentleman has, however, said a good deal in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin), as to the whole question of rebate. I thoroughly and heartily concur in the objections formulated by that hon. gentleman to that system. I believe it is an iniquitous offshoot of the protective policy of hon. gentlemen opposite; I believe it is an almost necessary offshoot of that policy, and one which, with that policy, should be condemned by the people. But if we are going to have rebates, let there be rebates all around; if we are to maintain a system of protection, let us have it all round. If one class is to be protected, and that protection is believed by hon. gentlemen opposite to benefit that class—that protection should be extended to every class, to the farmers as well as

to other classes, if it can be accomplished. If rebates are to be given to whiskey dealers, they should be given to farmers likewise, and they should be allowed to reap such benefit as may come from the system. What are the facts? The hon. member who spoke on behalf of the whiskey dealers said that this rebate was a very little thing that did not amount to much. Then what is the good of it; why does the hon. gentleman want to continue it, and why do occupants of the Treasury benches want to continue a system by which they make an invidious comparison between two classes of the community? It is admitted that the object of the rebate is to benefit the distillers, and it is supposed they have been benefited. The Minister of Customs has himself said he thought it benefited the distillers. It is, I believe, a little thing, and has not been availed of by the distillers to any great extent, and the Minister of Customs, who generally poses as a good temperance man, thinks it is a great pity that the distillers have not manufactured more whiskey.

Mr. BOWELL. You would rather have it drank here; but I would rather have it exported. That is all the difference.

Mr. FISHER. I would rather not have it manufactured in this country at all. I would like to make it unprofitable for distillers to manufacture it here, and not give them advantages to enable them to maintain their distilleries, and even increase them, and in fact show that their business is such a profitable one that other people will be induced to enter into it. I do not believe in this system adopted by the Government. It would be a great deal better if advantages were withheld, rather than given to distillers. By their actions the Ministers, who continue this system of favoritism to the distillers, show their support of this traffic, and that they seek to foster the interests of whiskey manufacturers rather than those of the manufacturers of beef, butter and cheese. So long as they continue to make this invidious comparison and favor such an invidious system, and draw such invidious comparisons between the two industries, the people can draw no other conclusion than I have stated. There is another point brought out by the remark of the hon. gentleman for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). The hon. member spoke about the price of coarse grains, and intimated that if the Government allowed free corn and a rebate to the farmers on corn imported for feeding purposes, fed to cattle for export, that would reduce the price obtained in our home market for our coarse grains. As a matter of fact we know, as was proved very conclusively by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. McMillan), that our farmers can, by showing a little business capacity, sell their coarse grains to good advantage and buy cheap corn and other articles from the United States. It would be well if our farmers can introduce a little business capacity into their dealings. But how is it with the whiskey distillers? If the whiskey distillers were not allowed a rebate on the corn which they import from the United States, would they not be forced to buy the corn of our own farmers, in Essex, Kent and other parts of western Ontario. If the argument holds in regard to coarse grains it must also hold in regard to corn. If the Government think our coarse grains in danger, let

them remove the rebate on corn imported, and exported in the shape of whiskey, and allow our western farmers to reap the advantage of the increased price which their corn would realise. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not wish to do so. It is by exposing such a fallacy as this that we are able to show the gross inequalities furnished by the whole protective system. Although the Minister of Customs said this is not a fair attack on the system, I tell him and his leader that this is an attack which will be effectual and one which will show them up to the people, especially to the great farming class, on whose vote they have in times past depended and whose votes they have obtained, but whose votes they will not secure in the future, because promises made to them have not been fulfilled. The farmers are awakening to the fact that promises made to them have not been fulfilled, and that they form the only class of the community who are not protected, whose interests are not covered by the protective policy, and, knowing this, they will take good care to send to the right-about hon. gentlemen opposite when again they appeal to the people.

House divided on motion of Mr. Landerkin :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Laurier,
Bain (Wentworth),	Lister,
Barron,	Livingstone,
Béchar, d,	Lovitt,
Bernier,	Macdonald (Huron),
Borden,	Mackenzie,
Bourassa,	McIntyre,
Burdett,	McMillan (Huron),
Campbell,	Meigs,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell),
Casey,	Mitchell,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Couture,	Neveu,
Doyon,	Paterson (Brant),
Edgar,	Perry,
Eisenhauer,	Robertson,
Ellis,	Rowand,
Fiset,	St. Marie,
Fisher,	Scriver,
Flynn,	Simple,
Gauthier,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
Gillmor,	Trow,
Holton,	Watson,
Kirk,	Weldon (St. John),
Landerkin,	Welsh,
Lang,	Wilson (Elgin)—54.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Audet,	Haggart,
Bain (Soulanges),	Hall,
Barnard,	Hesson,
Bell,	Jamieson,
Bergeron,	Jones (Digby),
Boisvert,	Kirkpatrick,
Bowell,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Brien,	La Rivière,
Bryson,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Cameron,	McDonald (Victoria),
Carling,	McDougald (Picton),
Carpenter,	McKay,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McNeill,
Chapleau,	Madill,
Cimon,	Mars,
Cochrane,	Marshall,
Cockburn,	Moncrieff,
Colby,	O'Brien,
Corby,	Perley,
Costigan,	Robillard,
Coughlin,	Ross,
Daly,	Skinner,
Davis,	Small,
Dawson,	Smith (Ontario),
Denison,	Sproule,

Mr. FISHER.

Dewdney,
Dickinson,
Dupont,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Foster,
Freeman,
Gigault,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guillet,

Motion negatived.

Thompson (Sir John),
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Vanasse,
Wallace,
White (Kenfrew),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox),
Wood (Westmoreland),
Wright.—70.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Public Works.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

RETURN ORDERED.

All memorials, petitions and resolutions of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories passed at its last Session, whether addressed to His Excellency the Governor General or to the Parliament of Canada.—(Mr. Daly for Mr. Davin.)

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

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 4th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 45) to incorporate the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

ST. CROIX RAILWAY BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) moved :

That the 52nd Rule of the House be suspended, as far as it relates to the petition of Russell Sage and others, asking that an Act be passed, authorising them to construct a railway bridge over the St. Croix River, in the town of St. Stephens, N.B., in accordance with the recommendation contained in the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

PROTECTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 47) to amend chapter 91 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled : " An Act respecting the protection of Navigable Waters." He said: This Bill is intended to improve the machinery for enforcing the statute as it now stands, giving jurisdiction to the superior courts. The proceedings now are confined to the Summary Convictions Act, and very often that means the impossibility of enforcing the Act as it is intended to be enforced. The second clause of the Bill is of a more important character, and I purpose to repeal the clause of the statute as it now stands, giving power to the Governor in Council to exempt any rivers or streams from the opera-

tion of the Act, and to permit those mill-owners who now enjoy an exemption under the old statute to make preparations during the next year to dispose of the sawdust and prevent its deposit in streams and waters; and after that the Act shall apply equally.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE FISH COMMISSION.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when we shall have a report of the commissioners sent to Scotland and Holland to report on the curing and packing of fish? The fish season is about to open, and perhaps fishermen would like to have the benefit of that report.

Mr. TUPPER. I am happy to be able to inform my hon. friend that the report to which he refers is already in type, and is, I hope, bound by this time. I will lay it before the House at the earliest possible moment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In sufficient numbers to be distributed among the fishermen?

Mr. TUPPER. I hope so—at any rate in the localities interested.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Amount required to provide for the contingent expenses of the High Commissioner.....	\$2,000
--	---------

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there any detail given of these expenses?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there are any detailed accounts given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is it supposed to cover? The practice of paying a lump sum by itself without any vouchers, is not a proper one, no matter to whom it is paid. Some account ought to be rendered by the High Commissioner of the sum he receives. I do not perceive anything in the Auditor General's Report bearing on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. In C 76 you will find the items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was looking at C 76, and if the hon. Minister will glance at the next item he will see that the contingencies include taxes and insurance on official residence, income tax, &c. These items appear to be in detail, even down to so minute an item as repairing the electric bells, which is charged at \$3.40; but there is a lump sum paid to Sir Charles Tupper of \$2,000. Now, some details ought to be given of that. It has not been our habit to pay a lump sum in addition to a salary and receive no voucher for it.

Mr. FOSTER. In order to explain that, I must first ask the House to allow me to make a change in item 25, which, as it reads now, is misleading. It says there: "Including taxes and insurance on official residence." I want to leave out those words after "contingencies," and put in their place: "London office, income tax, rent, fuel, light, stationery, &c., \$6,050." The item in C 76 in the Auditor General's Report has reference to the official residence, and not to the London office. So the items are not included in the vote of \$6,050.

Included in that amount are the following items: Rent of office, \$2,812, same amount as last year; gas and repairs, \$250, reduction of \$100; printing and stationery, \$650, reduction of \$100; postage expenses, \$800; miscellaneous and petty cash, \$960; travelling expenses, \$200; income taxes, \$122; newspapers and periodicals, \$225; total, \$6,050, being a decrease, compared with last year, of \$450. With regard to the sum of \$2,000, it is paid monthly, and I do not see that any items are given in the Auditor General's Report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They should be given.

Mr. FOSTER. When Sir Alexander Galt was in London we gave him a certain sum, \$4,000, out of which he was to pay contingencies and rent of house. A house is now furnished the High Commissioner, and \$2,000 seems to have been allowed for expenses covered by the \$4,000, less what was paid for house rent by Sir Alexander Galt.

Mr. McMULLEN. If this has been the system in the past, it is time it should terminate. Every item of expenditure connected with the official residence of Sir Charles Tupper in London is charged in the Auditor General's account. If Sir Charles Tupper leaves London his travelling expenses are charged. If he makes a short trip on immigration matters, his travelling expenses and living allowance appear under the heading of Immigration. We have a perfect right to obtain an account of the \$2,000 granted, especially when, in the other amounts granted, we find all items connected with his official residence covered. If the hon. Minister will turn to page C 76, he will find such amounts as ground rent of official residence, \$332.15; house duty and taxes, \$97.33; income tax, \$250.02; insurance premium on house, \$35.90; repairing electric bells, \$3.40. What accounts does this item of \$2,000 go to pay? The House has a perfect right to an explanation on this point, as every single item in connection with the official residence of Sir Charles Tupper in London is paid and set out in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. COOK. I should like some information respecting Sir Charles Tupper's visits to Spain. It has been stated that much of his time is occupied in hunting up civil servants, and sending them here to replace Canadians in the Civil Service.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Committee is entitled to some further information. If the Finance Minister states he is not in a position to give it, I suppose the item must be allowed to pass.

Mr. FOSTER. I have already given the information in my possession. With regard to the item of \$2,000, I stated that the items for this amount did not appear in the Auditor General's Report. I also stated how that payment arose: that in Sir Alexander Galt's time, \$4,000 was granted for contingencies and official residence; but as we now provide an official residence, the interest on the purchase money, which will amount to \$1,500 or \$1,700, \$2,000 is allowed for contingencies. There are a great many contingencies in connection with the London office. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has spoken in regard to charges made by Sir Charles Tupper for travelling expenses on immigration service. Those expenses are for an entirely different service, and have no direct connection

with his duties as High Commissioner, so far as regards these contingencies.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is evident that the Government cannot give explanations with regard to this item of \$2,000. If the Finance Minister can give no details, and is unable to show the necessity for the vote, the Government should drop it. The Committee should not vote money when the Government are unable to explain the manner in which it will be expended. The Government admit that they do not know how Sir Charles Tupper spends this \$2,000. He does not spend it for contingencies, as was provided when the grant was originally made to Sir Alexander Galt; and if he does not spend it in the way it was intended to be expended, and his expenses appear to be provided otherwise, the vote should be dropped, or the High Commissioner's salary should be increased from \$10,000 to \$12,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister's explanation accounts for the way in which the \$2,000 was appropriated, leaving the sum absolutely at the disposal of the High Commissioner; but the Minister will see that the amount Sir Charles Tupper receives now is very much greater than the amount appropriated to the office when Sir Alexander Galt was in charge. The sum of \$4,000 was granted, and Sir Alexander Galt had to provide himself with an official residence out of it. Now the official residence is provided, which the Minister estimates to be equal to an annual charge of \$1,500, but which represents a good deal more; and further, Sir Charles Tupper is allowed \$1,250 and \$2,000, which aggregate nearly \$5,000 appropriated, whereas in the days of Sir Alexander Galt \$4,000 was granted for the purpose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have forgotten what the total cost of house and furniture was, but I think it was about \$50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. About \$45,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That represents \$2,000 a year, at the rate we are paying for savings bank deposits. I do not see it follows that, after having provided house and furniture, which I suppose we are debited with and have to keep in order from time to time, there should be any reasonable ground for the further allowance of \$2,000, when I find \$1,250 were paid for just such contingencies as I think Sir Alexander Galt formerly met out of the \$4,000. It is quite clear there is a very considerable excess over the sum granted in Sir Alexander Galt's time, and it was for the express purpose of avoiding all that difficulty that we were induced, somewhat against our inclination on this side of the House, to become proprietors of an official residence in London, and to furnish it.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have several times been given as an excuse for items of this kind that some previous High Commissioner had been granted certain privileges, and had done certain things, and that, therefore, this item of expenditure should be continued. We have the same reply to-day, but there is no answer to the question as to how this \$2,000 was spent. It is entered as "contingencies," but there are no contingencies to be paid, because everything necessary seems to have been paid already out of the public purse. We are told that some previous High Commissioner was granted \$4,000 contingencies, but there was no official

Mr. FOSTER.

residence then, and there might be some reason for it. It would be much more satisfactory if the Government would openly and manfully make Sir Charles Tupper's salary \$12,000 a year, instead of making this gift of \$2,000 extra.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Can it be possible that this sum has been paid to the Reuter Agency for telegrams sent from this country. It would be a very likely idea that such was the case. The Government has not given us the information on this subject that we are entitled to, and I do not know but what it would be both in the interest of the Government and of the country that copies of these telegrams should be laid on the Table of the House, so that we could see the nature of them and be able to know if this sum was required for that service.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We have no information in the Auditor General's Report showing how this \$2,000 was spent, and we have a right to know what became of it. If Parliament is prepared to give Sir Charles Tupper \$2,000 a year in addition to his salary, let the House say so; but, at all events, the people of this country are entitled to know what becomes of their money. It is shown by the Auditor General's Report, that all the necessary expenses of the High Commissioner are paid outside of this grant of \$2,000. If it is a gratuity to Sir Charles Tupper, let the Government say so, and let us know the facts of the case. I do not think it is proper that the Minister of Finance should sit in his place and refuse to give us this information. If he does not know how Sir Charles spends the money, he should find out, and let the item stand until he is prepared to inform us. It is, at all events, quite apparent that the money is not necessary to pay the contingencies of the High Commissioner's expenses at London, as every item appears to be paid for outside of this grant. The Government should act fairly and manfully in this matter and let the country know that Sir Charles Tupper is not only paid \$10,000 salary, but that he gets \$2,000 from the Government in addition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Finance appears to be under the impression that the \$4,000 which he refers to was paid to Sir Alexander Galt in a lump sum. In looking at the Public Accounts for 1881, I find, under the head of contingencies for the High Commissioner, a series of sums amounting to £1,000 sterling, but they are all accounted for in detail, such as "balance on account of house furniture," "house rent," "fuel and gas," "travelling expenses," "cablegrams." That is a proper mode of rendering an account, and it appears to have been correctly rendered in former times, when Sir Alexander Galt was High Commissioner. A similar statement, it appears to me, ought, in all conscience, be submitted to the House now. I will send the Minister of Finance the book if he wishes, and he will see for himself that, to all appearances, the accounts were given in detail formerly.

Mr. MULOCK. When this item appeared in the Public Accounts a few years ago for the first time, the present High Commissioner stated that this account was to cover the various incidental expenses which are now charged in detail in the Public Accounts. If any hon. gentleman will turn up the *Hansard* of that date, he will find that this item for contingencies was never intended to

be in addition to the various items which are now paid for under their proper head, and which so appear in the Public Accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. Carried.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No. I do not think it is right that an item of this kind should be allowed to pass before the Minister gives us the necessary explanation. If the Government has a desire to make Sir Charles Tupper a present of \$2,000, let them say so. The Minister ought to give us some explanation or allow the item to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought I had sufficiently explained this matter. I have given the House all the information I have at hand, and I do not think the House will ask me to give anything more. If you look at page C 76 you will find that all the items charged there are for taxes and duties and insurance premiums, and the like of that, upon the official residence. In Sir Alexander Galt's time I find that there are items of contingencies outside of any of these that would fall under this head. It is quite plain that the official representative of this country to England must have some expenses outside those mentioned in C 76 which are necessary in order to keep up his establishment and to perform his duties, and this \$2,000 is to cover these contingencies. Sir Charles Tupper is not expected to travel as High Commissioner and pay his expenses on his official visits. Part of this sum may go for travelling expenses. As I said before, all these expenses were formerly charged to Immigration; and these now are defrayed out of this sum of \$2,000 granted for contingent expenses, personal and otherwise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Sir Alexander Galt gave a detailed report, which appears in the Public Accounts, and the same thing should be given now.

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated that I have not this this detailed account, and, therefore, cannot give it. I will see if it can be obtained.

Mr. COOK. The Finance Minister is not exactly correct in his statement that this refers to the taxation of the official residence. I see that there is an income tax of \$250 on the income of the High Commissioner. People in this country who get high salaries generally pay their own taxes, and I do not see why we should make an exception in this case.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Finance Minister explains that a part of this expenditure is for travelling expenses. It is well known that when Sir Charles Tupper comes to Canada his expenses are charged. There was a large item in the Public Accounts of last year for his expenses on the occasion when he last came out, and it is fair to presume that all his travelling expenses are provided for in other ways than out of contingencies. The Finance Minister says that, in connection with the official residence, it is necessary to have provision made for contingencies other than those enumerated on page C 76 of the Auditor General's Report. If it is necessary to have such contingencies provided for, it is equally necessary that this House should know what they are, and I protest against this system of passing a \$2,000 vote for contingencies which cannot be explained. I think the Government ought to have more

respect for themselves and for their character in the country than to allow a vote of this kind to pass through the House without any explanation, and I think the Finance Minister ought to allow this vote to stand until he can give us the information, which he should be able to do, before these Estimates are all passed.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are not quite aware, on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, as to whether that item is to be allowed to stand in the meantime.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I declared it carried.

Mr. McMULLEN. If this item is to be forced through in this way, I think we should have at least one promise from the Finance Minister, and that is, that this will be the last year that items of this kind will be passed without a detailed account, and he had better make a note that the House will insist next year, if we come back here, on a detail of this item.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make a note of that, if that will satisfy you.

Salaries of Board of Examiners, and other expenses under the Civil Service Act.....	\$4,000
--	---------

Mr. CASEY. I cannot let this vote pass, or any other vote in connection with carrying out the Civil Service Act, without protesting that the whole affair is a farce—that the examinations are inefficient, that they are not the sort of examinations recommended by the Government's own Commission, appointed nine years ago for the purpose of framing a system of Civil Service reform, and that the Government have not abided by the results of these examinations, as required by the law. I have constant information which I consider trustworthy, the sources of which I cannot reveal, in reference to the passing over of people who have a right to promotion in favor of others who have not passed the required examination, in reference to the admission of persons to the service who have not been successful at the examinations, and other statements of that kind. I must also protest against the employment of members of the Civil Service as members of the Board of Examiners. The examiners being dismissible at the pleasure of the Government, are sufficiently at their mercy, without being selected from men already in the service of the Government, whose whole time is supposed to be bought and paid for by the Government, and who are so much more at the mercy of the Government. A Civil Service Board absolutely at the mercy of the Government of the day is a farce. It cannot, in human nature, be expected to be absolutely fair and unbiassed in its transactions. The gentlemen themselves are as respectable as any who could be named, but it is not to be expected that the public will believe them to be as independent as men who are not so subject to the control of the Government. I find that Mr. DeCelles, the librarian, who already receives a large salary in that office, and whose whole time is supposed to be given to it, is paid \$558.33 as a member of the Board of Examiners; Mr. LeSueur is paid \$558.33 as a member of the board, and also \$700 for acting as secretary of the board. Mr. Thorburn, the chairman of the commission, holds a position in the Geological Survey; and as to the clerk of the board, Mr. Keays, I do not know what other positions he may fill. But

I find that all of the commissioners themselves are members of the Civil Service, and I maintain that appointing members of the Civil Service, holding subordinate positions, to act as Civil Service examiners, exposes them inevitably to the suspicion that they will act under the coercion of the Ministers whenever that coercion is exercised; and I could present to this House evidence that such coercion has been exercised, and that the examiners have departed from the spirit and letter of the law, were it not that, in order to present such evidence, I should have to reveal to the Ministers the names of my informants. My mouth is, therefore, absolutely sealed, except to state as a member of this House that I know such to be the case. The continuation of this system is, therefore, under the circumstances, to be deplored. The fact that we have nominally a Board of Civil Service Examiners, tends to give people a sort of confidence in the administration of the service which that administration does not deserve. There is nominally a board which is supposed to be a safeguard as regards entrance into and promotion in the service, but that safeguard really does not exist, and it is a farce and a fraud on the public to keep this board in existence. Another evil resulting from this system is that thousands of young men and many young women are induced to present themselves for examination, with the illusory idea that if they pass satisfactorily they will thereby obtain some claim to a position in the service. These young persons for the most part have prepared themselves to be school teachers, or to enter some profession, but when they have passed a satisfactory examination and obtain a certificate, they hesitate and delay going on with their occupations or professions, in the hope of obtaining a position here. In that way hundreds of them are kept waiting and losing their chances for making a living for themselves, in the illusory hope held out to them by the Government that the passing of that examination may obtain for them a position here. For all these reasons I protest against the continuance of the Civil Service Board of Examiners as long as the Act is in its present shape. If it were an Act really providing some check upon the administration of the Civil Service, the matter would be different; but as it stands, considering the composition of the board and the nature of the Act, I protest against the whole item.

Mr. FOSTER. Most of the remarks made by my hon. friend are reiterations of those he has made before on other occasions, and I would not have risen to reply were it not for one statement he made which it is necessary I should notice. He has stated that he is in possession of information, which is conclusive to him, that the Government has interfered with the board, and used compulsion upon the board to make them vary the results of the examinations. If the hon. gentleman has any information of that kind, he ought to come out fairly and squarely with it, and prove his charge. So far as I am concerned, I know nothing of any such interference, and I do not believe the Government has ever in any way interfered with the work of the examiners. The hon. gentleman has got out of the necessity of making proof very easily, by saying that his lips are sealed because he cannot give the names of his informants; but

Mr. CASEY.

when the hon. gentleman makes the charge he has made, I think he is bound to give us the evidence in support of it.

Mr. CASEY. I can only reiterate my statement. Certain facts have come to my knowledge, and I am justified in using that knowledge to enforce my other remarks. Perhaps I was not just to my informants in saying as much as I did, but I know I was not unjust to the Government. Certainly, I shall not take steps to inform the Government who the parties were who gave the information, as I know in that case what their fate would be. I do not retract my statement, and if I have to apologise to anybody, it is to those who casually gave me the information to which I referred.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not the way to get over a charge of that kind. The hon. gentleman makes a charge not only against the Government, but against the examiners. These gentlemen have got their characters as well as the hon. gentleman. Their character is as unexceptionable as that of the hon. gentleman himself, and when he says that the Government compelled them to give false certificates, and that they were dishonest and dishonorable enough to yield to that compulsion, he is making a charge which he is bound to substantiate or withdraw. The hon. gentleman has no right, either as a member of Parliament, or as a man and a gentleman, to make such a charge unless he is able to support it.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman in part mistakes my charge. I am not attacking the honor of the Board of Examiners, but I am attacking the use the Government have made of their influence. I say the Government have influenced the Board of Examiners—not to make false certificates—I do not charge them with that—but that they influenced the Board of Examiners, in their conduct of the examinations, to arrange matters so that certain persons might receive certificates and others would not—that they so arranged certain questions that one man could pass while another could not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. CASEY. Yes. The hon. the Postmaster General probably shows his acquaintance with the process, since he said "hear, hear," when I mentioned it.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not say a word.

Mr. CASEY. It is very easy, as anyone knows, to prevent an employé from going up for examination at all. I am informed—and my information I believe to be trustworthy—of a case where employés were refused the right to go up and pass the promotion examinations, and of a case where the Government used their influence to prevent the carrying out of the Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not the case.

Mr. CASEY. Further, the questions put in the promotion examinations are not made up by the Board of Examiners at all, but by the officials of the Department, and it is very easy for those officials, who are the subordinates of the Government, to fix those questions in such a way that favorites of the Government or their own personal favorites will pass, and others will not.

That is the charge I make, and which I could sustain, were it not for the reasons I have given.

Mr. BROWN. Does the hon. gentleman say that there is one class of questions put to one man and another to another man? Or, that, when a candidate comes up for either preliminary or qualifying examination, there are different classes of questions put so as to suit different individuals?

Mr. CASEY. I have not been able to catch exactly what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. BROWN. I will speak louder. I wish to know if the hon. gentleman states that, when the candidates go up for either the preliminary examination or the promotion examination, there are two sets of questions, or that questions are made up to suit this or that man, according to the idea of the examiner?

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman cannot suppose that I am so ignorant of the mode in which all examinations are conducted as to imagine that there are two sets of examination papers, one given to one man and another given to another; but I say that, to the officers in the Department, who know what knowledge is possessed by one candidate and what is possessed by another, it is easy to fix a set of questions which one may not be able to answer while the other may be able to answer.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am not surprised that the senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) should be excited in regard to this question. If rumor is to be credited, it is likely that he will avail himself of the Civil Service before long. At any rate, it is so reported in Hamilton, and it is well known to the House and the country, and to the Government also, that men who do not pass these examinations are often put in office in preference to those who do. It is often found that those who do not pass examinations are put over the heads of those who have passed severe tests as to their fitness; and, probably before long we may hear that the senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) may be pitchforked into a fat Government position with a salary of \$2,400 or \$3,000 a year, without having to pass any examination. I would like the Minister to state, if he can, the number of candidates who are now on the successful list, the number of men who have passed the examination who are available for the Civil Service at the present time, the number of those who have passed during the last year, and the number of those who have passed the examination who were appointed during the past year.

Mr. FOSTER. The Secretary of State is not here just now, from whom the information could be more properly asked in order to get a direct answer, but I think his report has been brought down, and, in that case, my hon. friend will see the number who have been examined and the number who have passed. I think it will be impossible to get the number of available men who have passed these examinations. We do not keep track of them. Some may be in one country and some in another.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Could you not give an approximate idea?

Mr. FOSTER. I could not give even an approximate idea.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Say 5,000 or 6,000?

Mr. FOSTER. I could not state at all. Some have gone to other countries, and some have died, and we have no trace of these.

Governor General's Secretary's Office
—Contingencies..... \$13,500

Mr. McMULLEN. There are several items here in regard to which an explanation ought to be given. For instance, I find at page C 66 of the Auditor General's Report: "Advertising New Year's reception" in Ottawa papers, \$72; and "Advertising Drawing Room, February 2nd," in Ottawa papers, \$144. I do not understand why it is necessary that the country should be asked to pay these expenses. It seems to me that it is absurd that the country should be asked to pay for these things. I should like to know if that has been the custom in past years?

Mr. FOSTER. It has been the custom.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then it is time that we should put a stop to that custom. Already to-day we have noted an expenditure of \$2,000 in connection with the High Commissioner's office, and I think we should stop that, and I think also it is time that we should put a stop to this item. The way in which the expenditures connected with the general management of affairs in this Dominion are placed before us from year to year, shows that we will never be able to put a stop to them until the people turn out the men now in power, who have started this abominable system and are carrying it on, and increasing it from year to year. This should not be tolerated. It is unfair. Fancy an amount of \$144 being expended for advertising in Ottawa papers a Drawing Room at Rideau Hall on February 2nd.

Mr. COOK. I think the people are beginning to see that the Governor General's Department is getting to be rather an expensive toy.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. COOK. I am not speaking about the Governor General, but about his Department, and you should be more careful, before you call members to order, and know what you are talking about. I say I think this Department is getting to be rather an expensive toy to this country, and the fact that a few individuals are to be notified in the city of Ottawa to attend a reception at Rideau Hall at a cost of \$144 is a most outrageous thing. The item may be a small one, but I should like to know why my constituents, or the people living in Toronto or anywhere else in the Dominion, should be called upon to pay for advertising this reception at Rideau Hall. The item may be small, but it may be increased from year to year. The Finance Minister states that it is the custom, but, if it has been the custom, the quicker it is dropped the better. I know it has been the custom with this Government to increase expenditure in every Department. We find they have their own jaunting cars. In going through this country they have their own cars at the expense of the country, even when they are going on their own private business. I think it is time that the people of this country should understand how they are placed, and I object to these expenditures, not only in the Governor General's Department, but in every Department, which are not in the interest of the people, but which are

simply in the interest of this or that hon. gentleman. The people are sick and tired of paying these expenses.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to have an explanation of these items which I find on page C 66 of the Auditor General's Report :— Postage charged to the Governor General's Office, about \$600, of which there are charged, \$472 at Ottawa, 97 cents at Montreal, \$91 at Quebec, and \$36 at New Richmond. What does this mean? Is not the Governor General at liberty to frank his letters?

Mr. FOSTER. If they are franked, they are charged as matters of account, as they are in other Departments.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is all the franking done by members of Parliament charged in that way?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find that, at this rate, it would be necessary for the Governor to send 66 letters a day.

Mr. FOSTER. I know that all the postage to foreign countries was charged. I may not have been correct in stating that the domestic postage was charged.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I thought so, because I did not discover any similar charge in the other Departments.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is an item here the Minister of Finance should examine carefully. I notice that Gunner Morrison receives 25 cents a day, but when he goes to a ball he receives \$4. I would like to have some explanation about that.

Mr. FOSTER. I will ask the gunner.

Mr. CASEY. Without going into these expenses in detail, there are certainly a number that, if they are paid by the country at all, should be charged to the domestic expenses of Rideau Hall, and not to Civil Government, under the heading of the Governor General's Department. I am not going to discuss the question whether they should be paid by the country, but if they are so paid, these items: printing, stationery for Rideau Hall, and cloak tickets, and this kind of thing, ought not to be considered part of the expenses for administering the Governor General's Department. They ought to be charged to the cost of maintenance of Rideau Hall.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There is one strange item in the account which, although it does not amount to a great deal, seems to be out of place. That item is: printing an address on satin for Mrs. Leyden. How did that come about?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the explanation. All I find is the item.

Mr. CASEY. It is a very small item, but it is a very funny one. It would give the Minister a good chance for a joke if he could explain it, and it would give us a good chance for a joke if he could not. Is Mrs. Leyden a clerk in the Governor General's Office, or is she an orderly, or a chambermaid?

Mr. FOSTER. She is not a gunner.

Mr. COOK.

Privy Council Contingencies..... \$11,100

Mr. LANDERKIN. There are some items in that expenditure last year to which we might draw the attention of the House with profit. I leave it to the honor of the Government, that they have spoken about to-day, whether these items are to be continued. I notice on page C 67 of the Auditor General's Report of last year, that in addition to the ordinary indemnity to the members of the Government, and in addition to their official salary, we defrayed their travelling expenses, their cab hire, and we also provided lunches for them at the Privy Council. We not only provided lunches for them, but we provided refreshments for them. In the former instance the lunches amounted to \$231.34, and the refreshments were very moderate—I suppose it is in deference to the temperance feeling that pervades the country—they only spent \$86.37. Now, I do not think we should take away these perquisites from the Government. We give them their salary, we give them their indemnity, we give them their cab hire, we give them their travelling allowance; and why, in the name of reason, should we not feed them? Why should we not give them their refreshments likewise? If there is anything else they want let them bring it down in a bill of fare and let us know what they want, and we will see what we can do for them. The country is very grateful to the hon. gentlemen. They give us nearly every blessing we enjoy. They give us good government, and they look after themselves. We give them the refreshments, and the lunches, and all those things. But there is a serious aspect to this. I would like to know how the Government can have the face to get up in the House and talk to us about honor, and about the principles that should actuate hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, when they come and actually ask the poor, toiling masses of the people of this country to pay the expenses of their lunches, their refreshments, and all that sort of thing! There is one thing I do not object to. I see we paid last year for some disinfecting fluid for them. If there was any one thing more than another they wanted in the Privy Council chamber it was a disinfecting fluid. We will not object to that. Next, I notice that they have a clerk; and what is the use of a clerk without a gown, and what is the use of a gown if it is not a silk gown? So they have provided their clerk with a silk gown, and the people of this country pay for the silk gown the sum of \$35. What would be the use of a silk gown without a hat, and what would a hat be good for unless it were a silk hat? And so they bought him a silk hat which only cost \$25. There are a number of other things I might mention, but I presume I have done enough for to-day.

Mr. COLBY. My hon. and facetious friend has drawn the attention of the House to an important item. Owing to the remarks, last Session, on this subject of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), I have procured a statement which I will submit to the House, and which will, perhaps, relieve the hon. gentleman's mind to some extent. The member for West Elgin, last Session, desired a comparative statement of the contingencies of the Department, showing the expenses for the year 1876, and the expenses of last year. Now, I find that in every other item except the one item that the hon. gentleman has referred to, there has been

a very large increase. I find that the expenditure for newspapers in 1876 was \$745; for the last year it was \$440, a little reduction.

Mr. LANDERKIN. People used to read in those days.

Mr. COLBY. They selected their own literature.

Mr. CASEY. What Department is the hon. Minister reading about?

Mr. BOWELL. The Privy Council.

Mr. COLBY. I am answering now the hon. gentleman's question as well. In 1876, telegrams cost \$358; in 1888, \$2,300. Postage, in 1876, \$63; in 1888, it was \$260; and so through the various items, all which I will read if necessary. The cost of luncheons in 1876, was \$1,100, and in 1888, it was \$144.38, so that in voracity, in eating at the public crib, those gentlemen have far away exceeded their successors in office. That possibly may account for the small amount of disinfectants required in that Department during the last year, which, I believe, only amounts to \$1. While upon that point, however, I may say, that while the expenses of that Department have increased, the work has enormously increased. It has increased, according to the estimation of the deputy, some tenfold. The expenses of the Department have been doubled since 1876, but the work of the Department has increased, I am certain, at least, four or five fold, and, according to the estimate of the deputy, very much more. But the eating capacity possessed by the Ministers has not reached, or even approximated, the capacity of the hon. gentlemen in the former period.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Let me remind the hon. Minister, that in those days the Ministers had to feed a hungry Opposition.

Mr. CASEY. I did not understand, from the hon. Minister, whether he had compared the figures for newspapers in all the Departments, or only in his own Department.

Mr. COLBY. I was only speaking for the one Department.

Mr. CASEY. I do not find in the Auditor General's Report for this year a statement for the total cost of subscriptions to newspapers for the various Departments; but I have been looking over the amounts, and I wish to treat the question as a whole for all the Departments. The expenditure of the Privy Council, as the hon. Minister has stated, was \$259.75 for Canadian papers, \$31.35 for American papers, and \$151.73 for European papers. I have roughly ran over the subscriptions to Canadian papers, and I find that they aggregate for the different Departments over \$6,000. I need not give the exact figures. I should think that the English and European amount to more than one-third additional; so that, roughly speaking, the newspaper subscriptions for the various Departments reached between \$8,000 and \$10,000. I have protested before, and I protest now, and I will protest another year if a reform is not made, against wholesale subscriptions being made for newspapers for the different Departments. It is utterly absurd to imagine that either the Minister or his secretary can read all the newspapers received, or that it would be worth their while to do so if it were possible. For whose use, then, are they? Only for the use of the clerks

in the Departments, who should be busy while they are on duty, or for the use of casual visitors, for whom such accommodation should not be provided. I have maintained before, and I still contend, that it is necessary to have some collection of Canadian newspapers to which the Departments can refer, in order to see what is said about public and departmental affairs in different parts of the country. It is undoubtedly necessary that the Government should be informed in regard to what is being said about them and about public business, and an assortment of Canadian papers is required for that purpose; but whether so many American or European papers as are found in the list are required, is open to doubt. There should be only one collection for all the Departments, and it should be placed in one building accessible to all the Ministers and secretaries, and there information as to the spirit of the press might be derived. In fact, a suggestion, which I think good, was made to me the other day, that there should be some Department selected, and one or two clerks of good judgment appointed to look over the papers and extract all items relating to the different Departments, and forward them to the Departments interested. I suggest to the Minister, that the Privy Council Office would be the best place to have such an arrangement carried out, and that if he would engage one or two clerks, and take only one set of Canadian newspapers instead of thirteen or fourteen sets, and arrange that all items concerning public business should be cut out and sent to the respective Departments, much money would be saved, and the Departments would be much better informed. I do not pretend that the system of subscribing for newspapers originated with this Government. It originated many years before this Government or its predecessor took office. Neither Government is blamable for the system, but a Government may be blamable for the manner in which it is carried out. The subscriptions of the various Departments for Canadian newspapers differ very considerably. The Governor General's Office subscribed to the amount of \$281, Privy Council \$259, Justice \$700, Militia \$681, Secretary of State \$681, Interior \$648. In regard to the Department of the Interior, it is undoubtedly necessary that attention should be paid to all the newspapers published in the territory over which it has control, but, notwithstanding this fact, its subscriptions are less than those of several other Departments—those of the Finance Department amounting to \$779. I hope the President of the Privy Council, who is a new broom and may be expected to sweep clean, will take this suggestion into consideration and consult the heads of the different Departments to see whether he could not have an information bureau, or press bureau, in connection with his Department. Let me now consider subscriptions paid for English and American newspapers. The Governor General's Office paid \$106 for American papers, and \$215 for European papers; Privy Council, \$31.35 for American and \$151.73 for European; Department of Justice, \$10 for American and \$12 for European; Militia Department, \$7 for American and \$234 for European. I cannot understand how the Department of Militia should require any such quantity of European papers. The Minister and his subordinates might like to look over the London and Paris illustrated

papers and the comic papers of the different capitals, but they cannot be needed for their use as a Department of Militia. The Secretary of State's Department subscribes but a small amount, and nothing appears for the Queen's Printer. The Department of Interior subscribes \$6 and \$5 respectively. For the Audit Office there appears \$38 for Canadian and \$10 for European; the officials have not much time, evidently, to read the newspapers. These are fair samples of the figures, and they show that very large sums have been spent on subscriptions to American and European as well as Canadian newspapers, and those amounts are entirely unnecessary; and I submit that the amount expended for Canadian newspapers can be greatly reduced by the adoption of the suggestion I have thrown out, which I hope the new Minister will take into his serious consideration.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has addressed himself to the interesting question of subscriptions to newspapers, and as I had occasion, a short time ago, to look into the figures and the charges to contingencies in this connection in the different Departments, I am glad to be able to inform him, and no doubt he will be glad to know it, that the result of the enquiry has been that in the last two years a great reform has been accomplished, and the expenditure considerably reduced. I hold in my hand a statement showing the expenditure in the five years when the hon. gentlemen opposite were responsible for the amounts chargeable to advertising and subscriptions.

Mr. CASEY. I am only speaking of subscriptions.

Mr. TUPPER. I am speaking of the amount of subscriptions and advertising charged to contingencies. That is the general subject to which the hon. gentleman alluded. At any rate, whether he alluded to it or not it is important. I might inform the House that for the five years from 1874 to 1878, inclusive, the total amounts charged to contingencies, and newspapers, and advertising, amounted to \$89,000 in round numbers; and for the five years from 1884 to 1888, inclusive, it amounts to \$59,000, in round numbers. I have here the number of items in reference to the different Departments, each Department being given, and if the hon. gentleman is interested in studying this subject thoroughly, I am sure he is welcome to look through these papers and these items. If the Committee will allow me, I will hand the statement to the official reporter, so that the House may be in the possession of the facts.

Mr. LAURIER. Read the statement.

Mr. CASEY. I disclaim any intention of charging the Government with the system of subscriptions to newspapers, and I instituted no comparison as to figures.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CASEY. No; I did not. I merely wished to point out, and I did point out, that a great economy could be made by the abolition of the present system and the introduction of another system. I would be pleased to see the hon. gentleman's figures, and I think they ought to be read for the information of the House, if they are not too voluminous.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. TUPPER. I will read them or hand them in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. TUPPER. Very well, I will read them. They are as follows:—

STATEMENT of Amounts paid for Subscriptions to and Advertising in Newspapers during 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878, charged to Contingencies.

Departments.	Years.					Total
	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Gov. Genl's Secy's Office.....	1,270	1,242	1,303	1,002	1,300	6,117
Privy Council.....	517	741	746	551	585	3,140
Secretary of State	866	747	800	533	460	3,406
Interior.....	1,633	2,125	435	409	444	5,046
Justice.....	523	392	*796	572	545	2,823
Militia & Defence	573	877	902	472	511	3,336
Finance.....	706	635	682	676	772	3,491
Public Works.....	734	639	729	445	419	2,966
Marine & Fisheries	1,285	2,245	1,996	1,474	1,337	8,438
Rec. Genl's Dept....	550	501	436	349	348	2,184
Customs.....	4,951	6,085	6,857	5,471	7,270	30,634
Inland Revenue....	2,433	796	622	314	468	4,633
Agriculture.....	924	570	545	425	479	2,943
Post Office.....	1,080	2,486	2,371	932	921	7,790
Treasury Board....	53	37	67	69	62	288
Depts. Generally..	792	926	44	Nil.	Nil.	1,762
Total.....	18,895	21,165	19,332	13,694	15,921	89,007

* \$205 of this amount incurred in 1874-75 and paid in 1875-76.

STATEMENT of Amounts paid for Subscriptions to and Advertising in Newspapers during 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887 and 1888, charged to Contingencies.

Departments.	Years.					Total
	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.	1888.	
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Gov. Genl's Secretary's Office...	1,135	1,013	1,021	1,213	1,203	5,585
Privy Council.....	856	756	837	713	876	4,038
Secretary of State	795	1,281	1,304	1,442	1,207	6,029
Interior & Indian Affairs.....	762	619	843	892	1,103	4,219
Justice.....	515	531	684	607	452	2,789
Militia & Defence	783	754	810	1,001	788	4,136
Finance & Treasury Board.....	841	943	893	1,005	791	4,473
Public Works.....	827	789	788	1,182	862	4,448
Marine.....	530	446	435	477	309	2,197
Fisheries.....	592	155	206	242	220	823
Customs.....	1,089	727	757	645	568	3,766
Inland Revenue....	592	854	843	1,033	806	4,183
Agriculture.....	760	785	976	1,037	971	4,529
Post Office.....	808	1,096	865	630	586	3,985
Rys. and Canals....	548	582	662	822	549	3,163
Queen's Printer.....	125	124	177	318	514	822
Audit Office.....	125	124	177	318	514	822
Total.....	10,966	11,455	12,121	13,405	11,853	59,800

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman's figures would be more satisfactory if they were not given in the form in which he has put them; but what I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention

to, is, that I do not notice any statement in regard to the Railway Department. Under the administration of my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Mackenzie) the Public Works Department embraced the Railway Department.

Mr. TUPPER. The amount for the Railway Department is stated there. I may have omitted it in reading over.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman does not say what he includes in the department of the Department of the Interior. He does not state whether the Indian branch is included. The Indian branch has not been under the Department of the Interior for many years.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will find when the statement is published that it is more ample than the hurried figures I gave to the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain what the expenditure of \$20,000 was to which he referred.

Mr. TUPPER. That will be for the hon. gentleman to explain, as it was in his time. I do not think that he will be able to without a little trouble.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. the President of the Council a moment ago referred to the contingencies of the Privy Council for 1878. I went to the Library and I got the contingencies of the Privy Council for that period, and I do not find in the contingencies one single dollar for lunches or for refreshments charged.

Mr. COLBY. That is a mystery that was covered up.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The contingencies of that office at that time were \$4,454.77, and the amount of contingencies we are asked for this year is \$11,100. I will read the whole of the item if the House wishes; and if you find one single dollar for lunches or refreshments in 1878, I will take a back seat.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will read, because it was stated in the House that lunches were procured at that time and were in the Public Accounts.

An hon. MEMBER. You cannot read them if they are not charged there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They are not charged, but I will read the item, so that the House may see. They are as follows:—Montreal Telegraph Company, \$224; Dominion Telegraph Company, \$124; directories, \$3; ditto, \$5; ditto, \$8; ditto, \$7; ditto, \$2; books, \$7; ditto, \$13; ditto, \$2; ditto, \$30; maps and stationery, \$30; ditto, \$205; stationery, \$14; ditto, \$2; maps, \$12; plans, \$12; atlas, \$20; guides, \$10; travelling expenses, \$200; ditto, \$185; ditto, \$44; ditto, \$82; ditto, \$16; extra work, \$16; contingent expenses, \$1,100; cab hire, \$10; ditto, \$34; ditto, \$146; and so on through all the items for that year there is not a single item for lunch or refreshments. I would like the President of the Council to explain how he made a statement of that character, when it is not in keeping with the record.

Mr. COLBY. Unfortunately in those days we had no Auditor General to give us every Session a minute statement of the expenditures. I made

the statement on the authority of the deputy head of my Department. If the hon. gentleman has any doubt about it, I will undertake to let him have every voucher on which it is predicated. I will bring them to-morrow, so as to relieve his anxiety on the subject, when he will find not only how all these amounts were paid, but for what objects they were paid—how much for eatables, for drinkables and for smokeables, if these are included.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would prefer to take the statement of the Public Accounts to that of the deputy head of the Department, who may be some new appointment, some new creature there.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose that, in matters of this kind, my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) is quite within his right in suggesting a plan which he thinks might be more economical than the present, whether it should prove to be so or not. Nor do I know that I object to the line taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, in comparing the expenditures of the two Governments; that is, perhaps, the best defence they can make; but when they make comparative statements of this kind, I trust that they have been careful that they are done on a fair and proper basis. When the hon. Minister of Marine read his comparison, it appeared to me, so far as I could see, to be made on a fair basis; but when the discrepancy was pointed out in the figures of the Customs Department, I think it was hardly right for the Minister to say that it was for us to find out where the discrepancy was. An hon. member who furnishes figures to the House as infallible ought to be ready to show that they are so. The figures he gave were not for the one item of subscriptions to newspapers, but for subscriptions and advertisements; and it did strike me—I do not challenge the hon. gentleman's figures—that, when some Departments showed only a difference of probably \$1,000, while in another there was a discrepancy of \$27,000, if I were preparing such a statement, I would examine it very carefully lest I should be trapped when presenting it to the House. The solution that occurred to my mind was that, perhaps, advertisements were not charged to contingencies under the previous Administration, while they are under the present one. I do not know whether I am right in that or not, but it occurred to me that there must be some explanation of that kind, and that the Minister was not entitled to credit for the whole of the diminution which he claims credit for.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not pretend to base any argument on the figures I gave to the House, and I purposely said so. I did not analyse the different items at all, and it may be, for all I know, that some items which are now charged to contingencies were not charged to contingencies then, or *vice versa*. It only shows us all how necessary it is to make a very careful examination of these items, instead of founding an argument on the mere figures which we find in the Auditor General's Report or in any other report. If hon. gentlemen will allow me to say so, it has been the custom of some of them, in criticising items, to draw conclusions too quickly from the bald figures as they find them. My intention, in giving the figures just as they stood, was to enable any hon. gentleman to examine them who chose to do so. Even if there were a

slight excess in the last five years, it would be a highly creditable state of affairs, because the years from 1884 to 1888 have been years in which great and extraordinary public works have been carried on in the country.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not seen this statement before, nor would I have referred to it but for the remark made by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), in which he left the impression on the House, whether intentionally or not I do not know, that the charges included in this statement of subscriptions to and advertising in newspapers, might have been covered up in some other account.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Not covered up, but found under a different head.

Mr. BOWELL. They are not even found under a different head. They are kept under the same head and in precisely the same manner as they were from 1874 to 1878; and although I have not verified these figures, I venture the statement that they are strictly accurate. I am speaking of the Department of Customs alone, to which the hon. member for Brant called the attention of the House.

Mr. CASEY. I think my hon. friend from Brant has, after all, struck the solution of this question. It is very possible, and the hon. Minister of Marine has admitted, that the items in the different Departments might not have been charged in the former years as they were in the latter years. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs says the statement is a correct one, and that things were much the same then as now, but, on further explaining, he said that the amounts were charged as they appeared in the headings of that paper. Now, until I have examined that paper and compared it with previous records, I will be unable to criticise the classification made by the hon. the Minister of Marine; but I would caution him, to echo his own words, against the danger of basing arguments upon mere figures without considering their relations to each other, and the changes that may have been made in the system of keeping accounts. He began by stating that he meant to found no argument upon these figures. Well, if he knew they formed the basis of no argument, I cannot understand why he should have read them to the House at all. He could only have read them with the idea that they would produce the impression upon the House that greater economy prevailed now than under the administration of my hon. friend who sits in front of me. But he has since fairly and properly admitted that they do not really form a basis for any argument, and do not really show any increased economy. I would advise him, for that reason, to be more cautious in the future in making comparisons which are not complete. My hon. friend has so mixed the figures of the two periods together that there is no telling whether more or less is spent now in subscriptions to newspapers than in the other four years to which he referred. I would ask him if he could furnish the figures separately?

Mr. TUPPER. I furnished all the figures I had myself.

Mr. CASEY. It would take a little time, but, of course, they could be collected from the Public Accounts.

Mr. TUPPER.

Mr. TUPPER. There are no more details in the Public Accounts that I could find.

Mr. CASEY. With these remarks on the statement presented by the hon. the Minister of Marine, I drop the matter for the present, merely asking that the subsequent discussion should not divert the attention of hon. Ministers from my original proposition for greater economy.

Mr. ELLIS. The extravagance of the past, if there was extravagance, does not justify extravagance at present. It seems to me quite unreasonable that the Departments should require \$10,100 worth of newspapers per year. Here is the total amount of subscriptions for newspapers paid by the Departments:

Governor General's Office.....	\$602 00
Privy Council.....	441 00
Minister of Justice.....	722 00
Militia Department.....	922 00
Secretary of State.....	743 00
Interior.....	709 00
Indian Affairs.....	226 00
Audit.....	48 00
Finance Department.....	918 00
Inland Revenue.....	809 00
Customs Department.....	616 00
Post Office.....	724 00
Agriculture Department.....	440 00
Marine Department.....	361 00
Fisheries Department.....	152 00
Public Works.....	908 00
Railways and Canals.....	740 00

I should think that the Departments would be glad of some plan by which they could get rid of what must be to them, undoubtedly, a nuisance. I cannot conceive that the Ministers, or the deputies, or even their clerks, can find time to read any great portion of these papers. Some of the English newspapers must be subscribed for, and, no doubt, the leading Canadian papers ought to be taken, but some plan should be devised by which the Ministers could get rid of the greater part of this heavy item.

Mr. BURDETT. I understand there are some ninety new members serving in this Parliament who had no seat in the House of Commons prior to 1877, and, therefore, they are in no way responsible for the extravagance of Governments prior to that date; the new members on the Opposition side are certainly not responsible for any extravagance since then. Life is too short and time too valuable to have both continually wasted in recriminations of the sort indulged in to-day. This Government is continually in the habit of declaring that the Mackenzie Government was the very worst, and that this is very best Government that ever administered the affairs of the country, and whenever they are charged with extravagance or waste of public money, they shelter themselves behind the argument that they are as good as the Mackenzie Government, or at least no worse than that Government which they continually pretend was the worst Government that ever existed in Canada. I do not think that extravagance on the part of the Reform Government in 1877 will justify extravagance on the part of the Government to-day. Governments, like individuals, ought to improve, and if the Mackenzie Government was extravagant, the present Government is not only guilty in permitting that extravagance to go on, but in continuing such practices. They cannot possibly shelter themselves behind the alleged extravagance of the Mackenzie Government, when

they cannot justify the items of expenditure which are brought under discussion. The point is, whether we are entitled to take \$10,000 of the people's money and literally waste it in subscriptions to subservient newspapers, or newspapers that are practically of no use to the public or the country. Can it be possible that the Departments require all these newspapers? No man can reasonably say that they are required in the interests of the public service. Why, then, is this money wasted in subscriptions to these papers which are not wanted? Enterprising newspapers are able to live without Government patronage or Government pap, and I submit it is our duty, instead of continually indulging in recriminations and saying, "You were as bad as we are," to set ourselves to work and lop off a great many of these useless branches of extravagance. It is perfectly manifest, no matter who is to blame, that the public expenditure is increasing year by year and day by day. It is evident that the resources of the country are becoming exhausted, and the time has come when we, as representatives of the people, ought to put our hands to the wheel and see if we cannot put an end to these absurd expenditures in some way or other. All I ask is that both parties should unite and prune down those accounts, and lop off all these limbs that ought not to exist, and we would soon find that we would have a public tree of great health and vigor. I repeat, our time is too valuable to have it continually wasted by Government supporters trying to prove, when charged with extravagance or mismanagement, that they are no worse than the Mackenzie Government was ten or twelve years ago—that Government which they are continually boasting was turned out for its extravagance. If that be true they ought, by their own admission, to step down and out, or else very largely reduce these expenditures.

Mr. COOK. I wish to call the attention of the Government to two or three items here that have not as yet appeared in any of the Public Accounts of the past. The items are small, but still it is but the thin end of the wedge, and they may grow to great proportions if not checked. I refer to the charge of a stationary trunk, two travelling bags, and repairs to travelling bags. If the hon. gentleman will remember, last Session I introduced a Bill to compel the railway companies to pay for baggage they had smashed. The Government opposed that measure. The Minister of Justice particularly took exception to it, and I do not know but that, at that time, he may have had it in contemplation that they might have the misfortune to have their baggage smashed, and to have it repaired at the public expense. I would, therefore, ask the Government to assist me this year in passing that Bill, and I will especially ask the Minister of Justice to help me so as to rid his Department of the odium and difficulties which appear to surround it by charges of this nature.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before we leave this item, I desire to say that I do not admit the charge which has been assumed—that the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was an extravagant Government. On the contrary, the total amount of the expenditure each year shows that it was a highly economical Government, and that it administered the affairs of this country

with efficiency as well as economy. I think we shall be able to show, at the proper time, that the comparative statement laid before the Committee by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is an illusory statement, and does not properly represent the comparative expenditure of the two Governments; and further, that the statement of the Minister of Customs, that the accounts of his Department are kept now in the same way as they were under the administration of the late Mr. Burpee, is not accurate, but that the Public Accounts and the Report of the Auditor will show that he is mistaken, and that many things were charged in Mr. Burpee's time, when he was Minister of Customs, to these particular accounts, which go to make up this very large sum, which are not now embraced in the accounts in the same way. I do not propose to delay the Committee at present by going into this matter, but I have my general recollection of what the expenditure was, and I have no doubt that I, or other gentlemen on this side, will be able to show that the statement which the hon. gentleman has submitted to the Committee is a misleading statement, and one which will not be warranted in reference to the comparative expenditure of the two Governments. It is only necessary to look at the aggregate expenditure of the two Governments to see that the increase has been enormous. The explanation which is given for the expenditure being much larger is that the labor is five times more than it was? Is the country more wealthy? Are the people more prosperous?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the population five times greater? An hon. gentleman says that the people are more prosperous. He has only to go to the loan societies to find out what the comparative prosperity is. He has only to go to them to find out the reduction in the valuation of real estate, from Halifax to Vancouver, and that will show him the difference in the prosperity of the country. I deny that there has been such an increase in the work of Government as to justify the large increase which has taken place in expenditure. Further, I say that, if the Government could show that a Government which died ten or twelve years ago was extravagant, it would be no answer to the demand that they should economise now. We are not to refuse to make improvements because improvements were not made at that time. Still, I deny that the statement of the hon. gentleman represents accurately the expenditure of the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), or is an accurate comparison between that and the expenditure of hon. gentlemen to-day. Let hon. gentlemen confine their examination of these accounts to the merits of their own expenditure, and not try to justify that by making an inaccurate or unfair comparison between their expenditure and that of a Government which has been dead for twelve or fourteen years. We are supposed to live in an age of improvement and of progress. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been in power for a long time, and their experience ought to enable them to administer the affairs of the country efficiently and economically. It would be no justification for extravagance on their part if they could succeed in showing that

the expenditure on the Department of Customs was larger formerly than it is to-day, but I deny entirely that the statement which the hon. gentleman has read is a fair representation of the relative cost of that Department ten years ago and to-day.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) ventures the assertion that the statement which I made was not accurate. He made a general charge, and attributed to me a statement which I never made. I referred exclusively to items which are before the House—advertising and subscriptions. I did not say a word in reference to anything beyond those two items, and I repeat what I then said. The hon. gentleman is very apt to indulge in charges of inaccuracy, and even to make stronger statements in reference to gentlemen on this side of the House. I repeat now what I then stated: that in regard to these items of advertising and subscriptions to newspapers, the amount charged in the accounts is precisely the same as those of the hon. gentleman's colleague, the late Mr. Burpee, when he occupied the position which I now hold. I repeat that statement, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to the proof of his insinuation, either on the floor of the House, in the Public Accounts Committee, or anywhere else.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think this discussion ought to lead to some good results, and I entirely approve of the suggestion of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). We have a reading room connected with the Commons and one connected with the Senate. In these rooms we are supposed to have all the newspapers published in the Dominion, and duplicate copies of them, besides a large number of the leading English and American newspapers. These reading rooms are open to all the members of the Government and to civil servants, and I understand they are also open to the reading public of Ottawa. What necessity is there, then, for each Department to obtain copies of all the newspapers which are to be found on the files of the reading rooms of the Senate and House of Commons? I contend that the large number of newspapers that are received in the different Departments must really be a nuisance to the heads of the Departments and to the men in those Departments who are there for the purpose of rendering a service to the country for the wages they receive. Of course, they may be used by those drones who are to be found in almost all the Departments, who want to put in their time, and render no services, by reading these newspapers; but, at the same time, I think it would afford them some exercise, and be of some benefit to their bodily health, if they were required to step up to the buildings here when they want to refresh their minds by reading the newspapers. I think this system of having newspapers sent to the Departments, as well as to the reading rooms in this building, should be put a stop to. We find even that justice is not done in the Departments to those who are desirous of reading the news; because I have no doubt that it will be found, upon investigation, to be a fact that the newspapers ordered by the several Departments are not the general newspapers of the country, but they are newspapers that support the Administration. The Liberal newspapers are not ordered by the Departments at all. Those

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

who read newspapers in the Departments must confine their reading to papers that support the Government, but if they want to get general information, they have got to come up here to the reading room. I believe that if an investigation were made, you would find very few Liberal newspapers subscribed for in any of the Departments. There may be a few leading newspapers, such as the *Toronto Globe* and the *Hamilton Times*, but the great bulk of the papers subscribed for are those supporting the Government. Now, I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) is a very good one, and if the Government will avail themselves of it, they will effect a saving to the country of from \$8,000 to \$10,000 every year. This may not be a very large item in the estimation of a Government that thinks nothing of voting millions of dollars for certain enterprises, but it is an item which will strike the people of this country as an important one. Here we can save from \$8,000 to \$10,000, and the service of the country will be just as effectively performed, and the men in the Departments at Ottawa, and their friends, will be just as thoroughly versed in the news of the day, by coming up to the reading room to see the newspapers, as if they had not to step out of their own offices. I urge upon the Government to accept this proposition and act upon it. I noticed some time ago in the newspapers that the Secretary of State had announced that he intended to make some marvellous reform in the matter of advertising in newspapers, and I expect to hear from him this Session in what direction this reform is to be made. I know that a vast amount of money is squandered every year in this way by giving what is known as "pap" to Government newspapers. The money is actually thrown away, because it is of no use to the public service. Advertisements are inserted in British Columbia papers of matters pertaining to the Maritime Provinces, and in the papers of the Maritime Provinces of matters pertaining to British Columbia, and in this way the money of the country is squandered. Now, I ask that the Secretary of State will accomplish what some of the newspapers have said that he intends to accomplish in the way of economy in this direction, and I trust the suggestion made by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) will be adopted, and that we will no longer find sums ranging from \$8,000 to \$9,000 expended every year for newspapers for the Departments. I entirely agree with what my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) has said: That the members of this House are not responsible for the conduct that has been pursued by members of former Parliaments. We are here to conduct the affairs of this country in the best way we know how. We are here to economise as much as we can in the interest of the public. But we are not here to be told that because so-and-so did this or that, it is right for this Government to do it. We are not responsible for the acts of a former Government. A good many men may be sitting on this side of the House who did not support the Mackenzie Government at all. They may have had their eyes opened since, and have come to the conclusion that, although the Mackenzie Government did commit errors in some respects, they see that this Government, of all Governments that have ever ruled in this country, is the most extravagant and corrupt that

ever sat on the Treasury benches. It is high time that the people of this country were aroused to a determination to compel the Government to exercise economy, not only in large matters, but in small, in administering the affairs of this country.

Mr. TUPPER. I would just like to say a word to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who seems to think the Committee should take his *ipse dixit* in reference to the statement I brought before the House. To my mind, it only shows the utter recklessness of that hon. gentleman, when he was forced by these figures to make a statement that he could not have considered before making, when he said that my statement was false and misleading. Upon what authority does he say so? He has not had an opportunity of examining one single figure. The hon. gentleman, let me tell him, if these figures are misleading, is himself responsible for them, to a large extent. They are figures published by the Government of which he was a member. The statement I made is true in every particular. The hon. gentleman may have had a guilty conscience in reference to the deductions that were made from that statement. But I went no further than this—that that statement, prepared and brought before the House in Committee, was an accurate statement of the items charged in the Public Accounts against the contingencies for advertising and subscriptions to newspapers in those different years. I leave it to hon. gentlemen to draw their own conclusion; I leave it open to any hon. gentleman to say whether, before an attack can be made on one side or the other, a careful and fair investigation is demanded. I brought those figures before the House simply for what they were worth. I made no charge; I made no insinuation. But the hon. gentleman became restive and feels uneasy because, in the comparison, he was shown at a disadvantage. The hon. gentleman did not seem to object so much to the comparison in reference to his colleagues, but he found great fault with the comparison that places him in rather an unpleasant plight.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, I did not.

Mr. TUPPER. I have only to remind the hon. gentleman that the time has not come for him to make the charge, that the statement is misleading. If he is able to find that it is misleading, the charge may be properly brought against the officer who prepared those accounts for him, in his own time, and enabled them to be entered upon public journals. I think the House will agree with me that the production of these figures has been beneficial in securing a fair discussion. Hon. gentlemen opposite who were making glib charges before these figures were produced, and though they are discussing a matter of logic as to whether it is fair to quote the proceedings under former Governments, I think the House will agree with me in believing that the comparison has had the effect of making them more reasonable, and in making them feel that, in entering upon this discussion, they had better make a careful examination into the facts and figures before they criticise them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not see how we can very well ascertain the correctness of these figures without the vouchers. I would like the Minister of Customs to be as frank as the President of the Privy Council, and say now, without any

formal motion, that he will bring down the vouchers, not for the whole five years, but, as a preliminary, the vouchers for 1878, and those for 1888, pertaining to the Customs Department alone—all the vouchers connected with contingencies.

Mr. BOWELL. From when?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). For the years 1878 and 1888.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Half of 1878 was their year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Let them take 1877, and 1887, if you like, so that we can see the difference. As the hon. Minister knows we have not the details in the Auditor's account of 1877 that we have here, and the system of making up the accounts. I did not charge that the accounts were different; the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will agree with me that I did not say his figures were wrong.

Mr. TUPPER. I alluded to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I thought there was such a discrepancy, that did not exist in any of the other Departments, that it was only natural to infer that some different method had been followed; and with all deference to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and while accepting his word that he means what he says, and that he has himself personally examined the vouchers, and knows the way in which the contingencies have been made up, still I think he may have made a mistake, and that the cost of advertising in connection with his Department may appear somewhere else, and not under this head, and the same may have been under a previous Administration. I throw it out merely as a suggestion; it may be so, but we must have the vouchers before we can ascertain whether that be the case. You see, Sir, that there is over \$600 spent this year for subscriptions to newspapers—\$590 for Canadian papers alone. Five years would bring that up to \$3,000, almost the whole thing, and that would leave the Customs Department with scarcely any advertising during five years. Now, hon. gentlemen will agree with me that, under the Mackenzie Administration, it is a most improbable thing that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Burpee) spent \$6,000 a year in subscriptions to newspapers. They will not entertain the idea, surely, when \$600 now strikes the members of the House as a large amount, that ten times that amount was expended in that year by Mr. Burpee. If that be so, the difference must be in the question of advertising. Will the Minister say that the Minister of Customs of that day spent money needlessly for advertising—\$27,000 in five years—more than he has spent under that head. I am not saying that he will not, and that he cannot say so, but it does not seem to me to be probable; and the only way is to have the vouchers for two years, to make a comparison.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not understand exactly what the hon. gentleman means by having the vouchers. If he desires to obtain them, he had better make a motion to have them brought down from the Auditor General's Department. If he will refer to the contingent account for the different years, as published in the public record, he will find that for which he is asking.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No; I beg the hon. Minister's pardon. The hon. President of the

Council, in reply to my hon. friend for South Grey, (Mr. Landerkin) who said he could find nothing for refreshments, said the amounts did not appear there, but he could bring down the vouchers and show them.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman desires to leave the impression on the House that the Customs Department has been managed lately in the same manner as the Privy Council contingencies account was managed in the year to which I have referred, he will have to call for some other vouchers than those which cover advertising, because, if I understood the statement of my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council, he is prepared to lay before this House accounts and vouchers covering those refreshments, which did not appear in the Public Accounts—that is under the head of refreshments. If that is what the hon. gentleman means, I have no objection that he should make a motion for the most rigid investigation into that question. I can inform him that there has been very little advertising done for the Customs Department since I have been at the head of it, and that may account, in a great measure, for the difference in that matter as between the five years of my predecessor and myself. If he will turn to the Public Accounts—and this is all I can give him—unless I went to the different Departments and examined all the accounts which had been rendered for the last ten or twenty years—he will find the contingencies account for Customs, 1879, which I hold in my hand and which covers the accounts of one of the years largely under my predecessor, is entered in this way: “Sundry persons, subscriptions to and advertising in newspapers, \$7,269.88.” In 1876 it is entered in the same way: “To sundry persons for subscriptions to and advertising in newspapers, \$621.97.”

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The advertising is not charged in the contingencies of the Customs now.

Mr. BOWELL. Simply because there was none. There has been an occasional advertisement, but I think only \$75 was expended during last year, and during some years scarcely anything. I can explain, I think, to a certain extent, how the large expenditure in question occurred. Every time a new port was opened under the old Administration; it was advertised in nearly every Liberal or Grit sheet throughout the Dominion, at an enormous cost. If a port is now opened, I insert a notice in the official *Gazette*, and that is all. I think those interested in the opening of the port, men who desire to send their goods there, will find out the fact without the Department expending \$300 or \$400 in advertising in different sections of the Dominion. I put a stop to that system of which the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Paterson) has complained, by which advertisements which did not interest any but a particular section of the Dominion, appear unnecessarily in many local papers.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I entirely agree with the Minister of Customs that he has administered his Department with a good deal of economy, in fact, there is no doubt as to that being the case; but the charge he has made, that his predecessor published the opening of every port in every Grit newspaper throughout the Dominion, requires a little stronger evidence than the mere assertion of the hon. gentleman to establish it. I admit that that

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

rule is not applied by the Minister of Customs now, but it is adopted largely by the Minister of Public Works and by other Ministers in regard to advertising. I understand the Secretary of State is going to establish a new practice with regard to advertising, and I hope the Minister of Public Works will be able to show a better record for his Department in the future than in the past.

Mr. CASEY. I do not understand this point: If it be true that the amount for advertising and subscriptions under the Mackenzie régime reached the figures stated, how did the result come about? The Minister of Marine has said that the total amount for advertisements and subscriptions for the last four years reached \$59,000, while I find, in the Auditor General's Reports, that advertising alone cost nearly \$77,000 last year.

Mr. TUPPER. Is that in contingencies?

Mr. CASEY. No.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman either did not listen to me, or did not understand.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman will listen to me, I will listen to him. He is a very young member, but he is a Minister. The advertising does not appear as a separate item. The explanation of the whole matter is, that that expenditure which was included under contingencies for the four years of the Mackenzie régime, now appears largely under a separate item.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has in this case, as is his practice in dealing with other subjects, made the matter as clear as mud.

Mr. CASEY. I am prepared to submit to the impertinence of greenhorns, of course; I have had to submit to it often before, and I will submit with the graciousness of a senior in age as a member of the House, and I can afford to submit to it. On the other hand, I have shown that no comparison can be made from the unfair and misleading statements submitted by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TUPPER. I take the statement back that the hon. gentleman made it as clear as mud; he did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). No doubt, so far as the Customs Department is concerned, it has been very economically administered under the present Minister—so far as regards advertising. It has been shown, however, that advertising is now a separate item, on which \$77,000 have been expended, the bulk by the Department of Public Works. It has been shown that almost every paper in the Dominion, from the Maritime Provinces to British Columbia, receives advertisements from the Public Works Department.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will excuse me. Does he find anything whatever that controverts what I said in regard to the Customs Department?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I say that in the Customs Department there is no advertising charged.

Mr. CASEY. Nothing appears under contingencies except casual advertising, the necessity for which arises during the year, but in the years between 1874 and 1878 nearly all the advertising came under the head of contingencies, and there is where the absolute misleading character of the comparison comes in.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries put words into my mouth which I did not use. I did not characterise his statement as false, but I said it would be found to be misleading. The hon. gentleman said I had no right to state that, simply because I had not before me all the Public Accounts for the years within which he instituted the comparisons; but, Sir, I was speaking generally of my impression, for I follow the expenditure of the Government with some attention from year to year, and I purposed to invite the attention of the Committee to the paper which he has submitted for the latter period. But, in the Auditor General's Report, the particular item to which my hon. friend who sits beside me has referred, shows how utterly inaccurate and with what little care the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has made up his statement. Why, Sir, within the expenditure of one of the Departments for one year there is an amount of money for printing almost equal to the expenditure of the whole five years made in the statement which the hon. gentleman has read. I refer to that one fact in order to show the accuracy of my impression. The statement which my hon. friend beside me has made has vindicated the accuracy of my impression and the misleading character of the paper which the hon. gentleman has submitted to the Committee.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There is another matter to which I wish to call attention, and, as I see the First Minister in his place, I would like to have some information with regard to it. I know it is not very popular for any one to refer to the personal expenses of the right hon. gentleman, but, at the same time, a member of Parliament has a duty to perform, and though it may be disagreeable, he should not fail to discharge it. I would like a little explanation in regard to the cab hire business, for it seems to be increasing instead of decreasing. I thought, after the assault made on that expenditure last year and the year before by my friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that probably the Government would use a little more economy in their expenditure for cab hire. I find that the right hon. the First Minister expended \$928.75 for his own personal cab hire. Why, he must have been riding in cabs nearly all the time, and when he was not riding in cabs he must have been riding in the pay car "Jamaica." I am sorry to know that that source of enjoyment which the First Minister had so much at his command formerly, has passed out of existence; for I believe that fire has destroyed the celebrated "Jamaica." The First Minister also travelled to the extent of \$566.61, besides the cab hire; and I find that in the same expenditure, not only the First Minister draws a large amount for cab hire, but that \$260 was paid to persons not named in vouchers. Now, this question has been up before the Public Accounts Committee for some years; and when we ask that these accounts be brought down for the information of the Committee, we get a lot of tickets that are passed from the Department to the cabmen, but we cannot trace who these unknown persons are. It was urged in this House that some method should be adopted by the different Departments in order that the public might know the persons who benefit by this travelling in cabs other than the Ministers and their

assistants. I hold that it is due to the public that there should be some means of ascertaining who these people are. I observe that my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs has, last year, pursued his usual frugal course and that he has travelled, as the Scotch say, on "Shank's mare" most of the time. I observe, however, that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine, who is a young and athletic man, has been rather extravagant in the matter of cab hire, and I think that a gentleman who is noted for his ability to play a good bat at cricket, ought not to set such a bad example as he does in this matter of cab hire. I think he should follow the example of the Minister of Customs and be more economical. I also see that the Postmaster General is an economical man, as far as cab hire is concerned, and for this he ought to be commended. I notice also, with regard to the cab hire at Ottawa, that the Hon. C. H. Tupper received not only \$231.35, but that there are various other persons named in the Auditor General's Report, as connected with his Department, receiving public money for cab hire.

An hon. MEMBER. Name.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I observe that one Madame Lamouche was paid \$46 on this account, and I think it is due to the House that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should show what services Madame Lamouche rendered to the country for this \$46. I would also like the First Minister to assure us that he will be more economical in the matter of cab hire for the future, and that a system will be established whereby the members of the House and Public Accounts Committee may know the names of these unknown persons who travel to the extent of \$260 at the public expense in the cabs of the city of Ottawa.

Mr. COLBY. I have not been very long in the Department which has been presided over until recently by the right hon. the Premier, but I must state to this House—and I feel it my duty to state it to the House on my own responsibility—that I have been there long enough to find out that the First Minister has not always treated the House with perfect frankness and ingenuousness. With regard to this item which the hon. gentleman speaks of as being personal to the First Minister, I made a complete investigation into this, and I find that the hon. Premier has concealed from this House and from the country, Session after Session, when he has been charged with making extravagant expenditures for his own personal advantages, the fact that he has paid his personal cab hire specially and separately from this item, and that last year he gave his cheque for \$500, and the year before that he gave his cheque for \$500 also, and that he has paid, according to his judgment, that proportion of the cab hire account which could properly be included as personal. The hon. gentleman would not expect, no hon. member of this House would expect, that the Premier of this country, every time he discharges a hack, should make a special entry in his own note-book to distinguish whether it was personal or public. His time is, perhaps, altogether too valuable for that. But the right hon. gentleman, against whose personal integrity no charge has ever yet been successfully made in Canada, has felt it his duty to pay that portion of the account for cab hire which he, in his judgment, considered he should fairly appropriate; and when I assure the

House that the sum of \$500 was paid by him last year, and the sum of \$500 the year before, I think hon. members will agree with me that that sum fairly covers the portion of cab hire that could be called personal. The right hon. gentleman has permitted himself to rest under this imputation; I suppose it is his modesty, though I should have thought he was old enough to have outgrown that. I suppose he felt that if any gentlemen were disposed to consider him unworthy enough to pilfer from the public treasury a paltry amount for his own personal advantage, he was quite ready that they should continue to entertain that opinion of him.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the hon. gentleman has not approached the subject under discussion at all. We have an item in the Auditor General's Report, page 66 C, showing that cab hire at Ottawa for Sir John A. Macdonald, amounting to \$928, was paid, and just below that on page 67 we find another item of cab hire for persons not named in vouchers, \$260. What I claim is that this House has a right to know how the public money is expended. I do not wish to be small in dealing with the Premier in this connection at all. I think he should enjoy the comforts of life now that he is so advanced in years, but I think this expenditure is extravagant, and what I complain of is that we have not been given the information asked for, as to who the persons are who took advantage of the right hon. gentleman's good nature, as the President of the Council says, and imposed on the Privy Council and on the people of this country, by having this item of \$260 charged in the Public Accounts for their cab hire. Now, we have a right to know who those persons are, and I shall not be satisfied until I do know who they are. The President of the Council says it is not right to insinuate. I am not insinuating at all. I make a public charge here, based on the Auditor General's Report, that the public money is squandered to the extent of \$260 for cab hire, and that no account can be given of that expenditure; and I think that the President of the Council, who has this particular Department in charge, will not be doing his duty, unless he ascertains for us who got the benefit of this money, and unless he establishes some practice in the Department which will prevent such items appearing in future accounts. That is the position I take, and that is a position that cannot be assailed, and that has not been assailed by the President of the Council on this occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not at all object to the hon. gentleman bringing this matter up. I do not at all object to the course he takes. He is performing his duty, and he is quite right in doing so. However, with respect to this particular item of \$260 for persons not named in vouchers, I can give him no information. I know I did not give any tickets to any person for any such purpose. Whether that work was done for the Department of the Privy Council or not, I cannot say. Of course I have no vouchers here, because there are no vouchers, I am told. All I can say is that I have not the slightest objection to the Committee on Public Accounts looking into the whole matter to any extent. As regards the cab hire, the fact of the matter is, as I have said before, as long as

Mr. COLBY.

I am Premier the overburdened taxpayers of Canada will have to pay my cab hire, and I believe they will be quite willing to do so, because the older I get the less will my powers of walking become, and the more frequently shall I be obliged to use a cab. I may tell the hon. gentleman that in winter time I drive in a cab from my house to Parliament; and during last summer, in order to economise a little, I occasionally took a ride in a buss, and I saved a little money for the country by riding in the buss instead of Buckley's cab. But they are too cold for my feet in the winter time, and I am using a cab just now, and I hope the House will pardon me.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am afraid the hon. First Minister must have been out of pocket when he rode in a buss, because there is no charge for buss expenses in the accounts here. However, as I said before, I do not complain of the expenditure particularly, if we can get at the bottom of it. I want to find out who these unknown persons are, and I think the hon. Minister should have such supervision over his Department as to enable him to give us that information. I would like the Minister of Marine to explain his cab hire items.

Mr. TUPPER. With reference to my own cab hire, the vouchers exist for every dollar which I have charged, and the hon. gentleman can get them. With reference to Madame Lamouche, she is a very worthy lady in the employ of the Government, who had the misfortune to meet with an accident and break her ankle, and during the time she was recovering, instead of sending work to her house, the Department allowed her a small amount, something like 25 cents per cab or per day, and the \$46 covers the time during which she was recovering. When she could walk, I am sorry to say we compelled her to do so.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is now six o'clock, but I am not going to permit this item of cab hire to pass, because I have a remark to make upon it.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 5th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Northern and Western Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Canada Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Hereford Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 52) for the protection of persons employed by contractors engaged in the construction of railways under Acts passed by the Parliament of Canada.—(Mr. Purcell.)

PUBLIC STORES ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 53) to amend the Public Stores Act. He said: In 1887 Parliament passed a statute to prevent the counterfeiting of marks by which public stores connected with the Imperial service, as well as the Colonial service, are recognised, and we have been requested by the Home Authorities to amend the Act to meet a slight change that has been made.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RIVER ST. LOUIS.

Mr. BERGERON (Translation) asked, Does the Government intend to push to completion, this year, the works on the River St. Louis?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I can give, Mr. Speaker, no definite answer to the hon. member to-day, but I can tell him that the Government are engaged in considering the question.

81ST BATTALION OF PORTNEUF.

Mr. FISET (Translation) asked, (for Mr. DE ST. GEORGES), Are there any complaints or reports lodged with the Militia Department respecting the 81st Battalion of Portneuf, its commanding officer or any other of its officers? If such have been lodged, what is the nature of these complaints or reports? Is the Militia Department satisfied as to the condition and working of this Battalion? If not, is it the intention of the Department to remedy matters?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In reply to the hon. member, I have the pleasure of telling him that there is no complaint or report before the Department of Militia and Defence respecting the 81st Battalion of Portneuf. No complaint has been made by any person whomsoever against the officers of this Battalion; and the last report from the Deputy Adjutant General on the manner in which this Battalion performed its duties when in camp at Lévis, is quite favorable. There exists no reason why the Department should complain of the manner in which this Battalion is managed.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. PLATT), asked, When did the Board of Visitors last visit the Royal Military College at Kingston?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The last visit of the Visitors of the Royal Military College was made on 18th October, 1881.

PAYMENTS OF PUBLIC MONEY.

Mr. RINFRET asked, 1. Whether Messrs. J. S. Hall, advocate, M.P.P. for Montreal Centre; Charles Auguste Cornellier, advocate, of Montreal; and Gabriel Des Georges, advocate, of Montreal, have been employed in any way by the Dominion Government? If so, in what capacity, and what have they received for their services? 2. Did the Government employ Mr. Elie Moreau, advocate, of Sorel, in the case of Boucher, postmaster of St.

François? 3. Have the Government anywhere in their employment a workman or foreman named Octave Leclerc?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Hall has been occasionally employed for legal purposes in the city of Montreal. The sums which have been paid to him from time to time appear in the Public Accounts. Mr. Cornellier was consulted, especially by the Customs officers, in relation to the infringement of the Customs laws, and on one occasion he was paid the sum of \$200. Mr. Gabriel Des Georges has not been employed, so far as I am aware, and I understand he is not an advocate. Mr. Moreau, of Sorel, has been employed occasionally. I cannot answer in regard to Oliver Leclerc, as his employment does not come under my Department.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So far as regards my Department, the party in question has not been employed by it.

ST. MICHEL WHARF.

Mr. AMYOT asked, 1st. Whether any resident of the parish of St. Michel, County of Bellechasse, has written, during the past year, or during the present month, to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, or to any officer of the Department, respecting the expediency or inexpediency of making repairs to the wharf at St. Michel? 2nd. What are the names of the signers of any such letter or letters?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Six communications have been received during the year 1889 in reference to repairs to the wharf at St. Michel. 1st, No. 97117, a petition of the 3rd April, 1889, through Mr. G. Amyot, M.P., from the Municipal Council of St. Michel, asking for further repairs to the wharf; 2nd, No. 101774, a letter from the Secretary-Treasurer (L. A. Mercier) of the Council of St. Michel, dated 14th September, 1889, asking on behalf of the Council why the execution of repairs is delayed; 3rd, No. 91388, a letter (25th September, 1889,) from Rev. L. A. Déziel, asking that repairs be at once proceeded with; 4th, No. 103090, a telegram (29th October, 1889,) from G. Amyot, M.P., reporting damage and asking that engineer be sent; 5th, No. 103091, a letter (29th October, 1889,) from A. Sansterre, pilot, asking that repairs be made; 6th, No. 103313, a petition received on the 8th November, 1889, and signed by 122 citizens of St. Michel (the Curé, Rev. L. A. Déziel, Mayor A. Forgues, Councillors E. Goupil, L. Mercier, G. Ray, J. Bissonnette, N. Leclerc, H. Gagnon, &c., and 114 others), asking that an additional sum be granted to repair the damage lately caused to the wharf by a gale. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not require a list of the names in the petition.

WHARF AT ST. PETER'S BAY.

Mr. MCINTYRE asked, Whether the Minister of Public Works has given instructions to his engineer to hold a survey at St. Peter's Bay, King's County, Prince Edward Island, with a view to the construction of a public wharf at that place, as asked for by a petition largely signed by the inhabitants of that locality, and sent to the Department? If so, when was the order given?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On the 17th December a petition dated 11th December was received by the Department, asking for a grant to complete a wharf at the mouth of St. Peter's Harbor. It was acknowledged by Mr. Gobeil, secretary of the Department, on the 18th, and forwarded to the chief engineer's office on the 19th. On the 10th January the following letter was written on behalf of the chief engineer to the resident engineer :—

"SIR,—I enclose file 104405, being a petition for a grant to complete a wharf at the mouth of St. Peter's Harbor. Is this wharf the one assumed by the Department and known as St. Peter's Bay?"

"Please enquire into this and furnish the usual report, and return No. 104405 therewith."

"Yours obediently,"

"(Signed) LOUIS COSTE,
"For Chief Engineer."

No examination has been ordered, but I am informed that the resident engineer proposes to make the enquiry this week. Therefore, this examination could not affect the last election.

THE CAUGHNAWAGA RESERVE.

Mr. DOYON asked, 1. What are the names of the parties who worked the quarries on the Caughnawaga Reserve since 1884? 2. Are some of the said persons indebted to the Department in connection therewith, and, if so, to what amount? 3. Did they furnish good and sufficient sureties, and to what amount? 4. Who are the said sureties? 5. When and how do the Government purpose collecting the amounts due?

Mr. DEWDNEY. 1. John D. de Lorimier and Thomas Jocks—both members of the Caughnawaga Band of Indians. 2. The former owes \$2,594.87; the latter, \$1,314.14. 3 and 4. These parties are not under security. 5. The Department is taking steps for the recovery of the amount due, but it would not be prudent to state what those measures are.

Mr. DOYON asked, What was the cost of the survey of the Caughnawaga Indian Reserve, in the County of Laprairie? Has the expenditure caused by this survey been taken out of the Indian Reserve Funds, or has it been charged against them?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Walbank, the surveyor who was employed in laying out the Caughnawaga Indian Reserve in allotments, has rendered accounts for the work up to \$22,250.32. Of this sum, \$19,000 has been allowed and paid up to date. There is a balance of \$3,250.32 as yet unpaid, and in regard to which the Department is in communication with Mr. Walbank. Payment was made out of the funds of the band.

SUMMERSIDE HARBOR BREAKWATER.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to build a breakwater in Summerside Harbor, Prince Edward Island, in accordance with the recommendation of the engineer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The works proposed for the improvement of the entrance to the harbor consist of a breakwater extending southwardly from Welling's Point a distance of 3,800 feet, and a second from the lighthouse on a length of 1,000 feet in a southerly direction towards Indian Head, the cost of these two structures being placed at \$75,000. The Government do not intend erecting these works.

Mr. McINTYRE.

DUTY ON FISH IN BOND.

Mr. EISENHAUER asked, 1. Whether any changes have been made during 1889 in the regulations regarding the bonding of foreign fish, and, if so, what changes were ordered? 2. Have the changes so made been carried out by the Collectors of Customs at the ports where foreign fish were entered in bond?

Mr. BOWELL. There have been no changes in the regulations, but instructions were sent to all Collectors of Customs by Departmental Order No. 3015, of the 26th July last, requiring them to comply with the provisions of the law as amended by chapter 14, 15 Victoria, as to treatment of foreign fish in bond. The instructions have been carried out, so far as is known to the Department of Customs. If the hon. gentleman has not a copy of that order, I will have pleasure in sending it to him.

I. C. R.—FREIGHT CHARGES.

Mr. AMYOT asked, What is the sum charged over the Intercolonial Railway for the carriage of a barrel of flour from Quebec to Métis? What is the charge made over the Intercolonial for the carriage to the Maritime Provinces of a barrel of flour coming from Montreal or from Toronto by the Grand Trunk Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Intercolonial Railway freight charges on a barrel of flour from Quebec to Métis is 32 cents. The Intercolonial Railway receive out of the rate on flour from Montreal to Amherst, N.S., 57 cents per barrel.

THE SHIP BRIDGEWATER.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1. Whether the Government has received any further representations, since the close of last Session, respecting the seizure of the ship *Bridgewater* from or on behalf of the owners, or from the Imperial Government, or from the Government of the United States? 2. Has the Government yet made any settlement of the owners' claims for damages for such seizure? 3. If any settlement has been arrived at, what amount is to be paid by Canada?

Mr. BOWELL. No further representations have been received from the Imperial Government, or from the Government of the United States, respecting the seizure of the ship *Bridgewater*, since the close of last Session; no settlement of the owners' claim has been made or recognised, and no amount has been paid or promised to be paid.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to reprint the correspondence, reports, and Orders in Council upon the subject of Provincial Legislation, from 1867 to 1884, so that members and others may obtain copies?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That subject has not yet been considered at all. I understand that the volume is out of print, but I am not aware that there has been any particular demand for it.

PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS.

Mr. McINTYRE moved for :

Copies of all petitions from fishermen and others interested in the fisheries on the coast of Prince Edward Island,

and all other correspondence with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, having reference to the prevention of taking mackerel by means of purse seines and gill nets within the territorial waters of Canada.

He said: In making this motion, I desire to say a few words in reference to it. For many years it has been recognised by those interested in our fisheries, that the purse seine is one of the most destructive agencies ever invented for taking fish. Of course, we have not to seek far to find the cause of this. An immense net is thrown around a large shoal of fish, and fish of all kinds are captured; but only those wanted are taken out of the net, and those not wanted are thrown out to become food for other fishes. This evil became so great on the coast of the United States that, some years ago, Congress was compelled to pass a law making it illegal to take mackerel on the coasts during the spring months up to 1st June. During that month and afterwards, the fish work their way to the northern waters, going along the coasts of the United States and Nova Scotia into the Gulf of St. Lawrence, or, as it is now called by fishermen, the North Bay. They are immediately followed by the American fishing fleet, and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence are joined by our own seining vessels; and from the depredations of these two fleets, which continue to operate until late in the fall, the fish are rapidly disappearing from those waters. The three last years, in the mackerel fisheries, have been exceedingly bad years, and the last year has been the worst of all; and although our own fishermen have the privilege of fishing in the three-mile limit, their catch is growing remarkably small, as well as that of the Americans. Our fishermen state that the evil of the seine is not wholly in the destruction of the fish, although that is a large factor, but they claim that the seine has the effect of frightening away the fish. Whatever the cause may be, the mackerel are fast leaving their old haunts and disappearing from our waters, so much so that last summer they could not be caught either by the seine or by the fishing line. Within the last few years the gill net has been added to the seine as a destructive agency, and all along the coasts of Prince Edward Island, within the three-mile limit, along the north shore especially, these nets are strewn in all directions. Our fishermen claim that these nets have the object and effect of frightening the fish in the same manner as the seines, and they say that they are quite as destructive. They are kept set the whole time, both day and night, and the fish caught in them are not taken out, as no boats can approach them in rough weather. The consequence is that the fish drop out of them, and are used as food by the others. Individually, I have not formed any particular notions in regard to this matter. I can readily understand that it is a rather difficult question. In the present instance, I am merely voicing the sentiments of my constituents. Large meetings have been held all over my county during the past fall, at which strong resolutions have been passed against the use of purse seines and gill nets, and the desire was expressed by them that some steps should be taken by the Minister of Marine to put an end to the destruction which has been going on during the last few years.

Mr. FLYNN. I differ from my hon. friend from King's, P.E.I., in the views he has expressed to the House in regard to the destructive

character of gill nets. Gill nets have been used for years along the coasts of Nova Scotia for the catching of herring, mackerel and alewives; in fact, we could only take alewives and herring by using them. They are fish which do not take bait, and cannot be caught in any other way than by the use of gill or floating nets. I have never heard that there are any complaints whatever as regards the destructive quality of gill nets, or that they in any way interfere with the fish. The prohibition of the use of these nets, which are largely employed on the Atlantic coast, would simply take from the fishermen their means of livelihood. But, while dissenting from the views of the hon. member for King's (Mr. McIntyre) as regards gill nets, I entirely concur in what he said concerning the destructive character of purse seines. There can be no more destructive method used in prosecuting the fisheries than these purse seines. Until recently, they were altogether used by sailing vessels, but now they are used by steamers, and by steam launches; and in the calm weather, when the mackerel can be seen sporting on the face of the water, these launches can steam over and surround them in a very few minutes, and, by means of their purse seines, catch the lot. There are two reasons why purse seines are destructive. In the first place, they gather in all kinds of fish. When the fish show on the surface of the water, the fishermen are not able to tell what kind of fish they may be, but seine them indiscriminately, and any herring or small mackerel not marketable which are caught they destroy. It is said by those who are in the business that the quantity of small fish not marketable, caught in the course of the season even by one seiner, is so large that the amount is incredible. As the hon. member for King's has said, having exhausted the fisheries on their own coasts, the American Government found it necessary to enact a law prohibiting the catching of mackerel on their coast before the 1st of June. It is well known, from the habits of the mackerel, that they come down in the summer into the North Bay where they spawn and remain during the summer, and then go back south in the winter, only to return in the spring, reaching the furthest part of Cape Sable about the middle of May, and making their way to Cape Canso the latter part of May or first of June. The Americans, prohibited from fishing on their own coasts, have come with their steamboats and sailing vessels to catch the fish off our coasts, and the noise made by their vessels coming in frighten the fish from the coast altogether, and prevent our fishermen from making any catch. While the Canadian Parliament may have the power of prohibiting the use of purse seines on our coasts, there will be little use in their doing so, so long as the Americans come in, not only to the three-mile limit, but, as they frequently do, inside the territorial waters of Canada. This would be a fit subject for international correspondence. The Americans themselves are coming to the conclusion that this practice is injurious to the fisheries; and unless something is done in the matter our mackerel fisheries and other fisheries will become completely extinguished. The statistics show that year after year the catch is falling off. There may be some other cause, but I believe in a great measure that falling off is due to the use of these destructive purse seines. This is a serious matter, and I would sug-

gest to the hon. the Minister to take such steps as will lead to action on the part of both Governments, to prevent this destructive method being continued.

Mr. TUPPER. The papers called for will, of course, be brought down. Last December I received some petitions from the district of Prince Edward Island, relating both to the subject of purse seines and gill nets. As the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) has said, there is considerable difference of opinion with reference to the use of gill nets, but there is almost no difference of opinion as to the destructive effects of the purse seines. The injury caused the mackerel has been very clearly stated, but, as the hon. gentleman who preceded me has pointed out, there arises the very grave question as to how far it would be prudent or wise, looking to the interests of this particular fishery, to interfere in connection with the three-mile limit, or to legislate upon that question and restrict our fishermen in our territorial waters, while foreign fishermen can harass these fish and destroy them at will by the use of purse seines or any other method, up to that three-mile limit, or even within it when they get the chance. The question, therefore, has to be approached very carefully, and I may say that, before the petitions were received from Prince Edward Island, my attention was directed to the subject, and I have been since endeavoring to obtain more complete information with a view of dealing particularly with the question of purse seines. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), however, was slightly inaccurate, when, in referring to the trouble experienced by us on account of the United States fishermen, he said the American law prohibited American fishermen from using purse seines for mackerel up to the 1st June, on their own coasts. I may remind the hon. gentleman that the law of the United States is not restricted to the catch on their own coasts, but prohibits the importation of any mackerel caught in any waters by purse seines up to the 1st June. It is, of course, possible that, by international arrangement, the subject should be fully dealt with, and that the waters of both countries should be freed from this very destructive engine. The difficulty in dealing with this question is, of course, enhanced by our experience in the past, because it is well known that there have been years, before the purse seine was ever seen in our waters at all, when the mackerel fishing in districts fell off entirely. In 1868, I think, there was great distress among the fishermen all over our coasts, owing to the almost complete disappearance of the mackerel, and people assigned all sorts of reasons for their disappearance. Happily the mackerel appeared again in greater numbers than ever before. I merely throw this out to show what difficulties there are in dealing with this important matter. Even in Prince Edward Island, as my hon. friend knows, while in some districts the number caught was very small where there were gill nets used, still, in other districts, miles away from any gill nets, the same experience occurred. There is no doubt our American friends, fishing in the open waters, have themselves suffered considerably from the use made in recent years of these purse seines, because the catch of mackerel by the United States fishermen in these waters along our coasts outside the three-mile limit has very materially decreased. This year, I think

Mr. FLYNN.

the proportion of our catch to that which we usually have will show that the American fishermen have suffered worse than our own fishermen. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the subject will be considered in every aspect, and I hope, before the next Session of Parliament, to be able to make some definite announcement in regard to it.

Mr. MITCHELL. The subject of this motion is one of considerable importance to this country, and its importance is not confined to the motion itself. It has been stated by an hon. member that he differs with the mover in regard to the use of gill nets. As far as my experience goes, the only question as to the use of gill nets is in places which are not protected. Where the action of the open sea cannot affect gill nets, there can be no objection to their being used. It is only when, in consequence of the open sea, it is impossible to reach them in order to clean the nets and take out the fish, that an objection arises, because in that case the fish becomes putrid and of no use, except, perhaps, as food for other fishes. The hon. gentleman who presides over the Department of Marine and Fisheries has referred to the efforts which have been made to protect the fisheries on our coasts. The fact is, that no effort has been made in the proper quarter to protect the fisheries on our coasts. The great difficulty which has arisen in connection with these immense seines is that they come into waters which, by the Treaty of 1818, belong to Canada, and that for the last twenty years Great Britain has studiously avoided taking up and discussing this matter. When I heard the eulogy paid to the efforts made by this Government, on the part of the second of the Address, as to their endeavoring to protect the interests of Canada, I thought that, if he only knew as much about the subject as I do, he would see that the British Government have not done what they ought to do in order to protect the interests of Canada. On the contrary, they have studiously avoided dealing with the great headland question, in regard to which, if it were properly enforced and duly set before the American Government, and pressed, as it ought to have been pressed, not by war, but by diplomacy; if the interests of Canada had been kept to the front, we would not have these questions arising and we would not have the Americans coming into our waters within the three-mile limit, coming into our bays within our headlands, and sweeping all the fish out of our waters. In that case we would not have had the Americans breaking up the schools of fish which come to their natural resorts. Until the Government of this country presses upon the British Government the necessity of taking up and dealing with this headland question, and not only of dealing with the Atlantic fisheries, but also of dealing with the seal fisheries on the Pacific and the fisheries on the Newfoundland coast, they will find no attention paid to these matters by the British Government; because they quietly ignore the complaints which are made on such subjects from the colonies. They allow these matters to drift, and allow us to suffer these abuses; and the Government of this country has not pressed this matter upon the Government of the mother country as it ought. I think these platitudes which we hear every year upon this

subject should cease: the statements that the Government are doing their best; that they are opening or continuing negotiations; that there is correspondence going on, and so forth. What is the result of the whole? Do we not know that our Commissioner at Washington deliberately ignored the enforcement of the headland treaty? Why, that was giving up the whole case; and it is useless to talk about protecting the interests of Canada when the British Government are not attempting to do anything in that direction.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I cannot altogether agree with the statements which have been made by two hon. gentlemen as to the gill nets. In my Province it has been found that the gill nets were almost as bad as the purse seines in regard to the catch of mackerel. In my county large meetings were held and strong resolutions were passed in regard to the use of gill nets. I have some of these resolutions here, which I will read. At a meeting at Monticello, held on the 6th December last, it was resolved:

"Whereas, it has been made apparent to this meeting that the method, so largely resorted to during the past summer, of catching mackerel in gill nets, has resulted in driving the fish from our coasts, and, as a consequence, the mackerel fishery has, in those places, proved a total failure."

Here is another resolution, adopted at another meeting at Fairfield:

"Whereas, it has been brought to the knowledge of our fishermen that the several methods now in use, namely, netting, seining, &c. (particularly the former), are a source of the greatest injury to the mackerel fishery along our coast; and whereas, in various localities where the catch of mackerel was formerly large, this year, owing to netting being carried on extensively, the catch was, comparatively speaking, very small by hook and line, while in places where hook and line were exclusively used, the catch was good."

The destruction of our fish, and particularly of the mackerel, by the use of gill nets and seines, is becoming very important; and I might refer the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the report of Lieut. Gordon, in which he says that the use of these gill nets and seines will ultimately destroy our mackerel fishery. He says that, after the mackerel pass a certain point, they are met by traps in every direction, and the result is that the mackerel fishery is being driven from our coasts. The Government is spending large amounts every year to protect our fisheries by cutters, but, if this netting and seining is to go on, there will be no use for the cutters. The Government also give bounties to encourage the fishermen to catch fish, but what will be the use of that if there are no fish to catch? This question is of the greater importance, because, a few years ago, the Government received \$5,000,000 from the Americans for the use of these fisheries. The fact is that the fish will be encouraged to come only where hook and line are used, on account of the quantities of bait thrown into the waters from boats using hook and line, thus drawing the fish towards the shore inside the three-mile limit. It affords a large employment to our men and boys, especially in Prince Edward Island, and the result is that our fisheries are worth from \$70,000 to \$100,000 a year if preserved. It is of vast importance that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should take this matter into his consideration. I am very glad to see that he considers it such an important matter, and I hope that all parties and all sections of the country will take an interest in

it and endeavor, if possible, to protect our fisheries.

Motion agreed to.

ANNAPOLIS POST OFFICE.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) moved for:

Return of a copy of the contract and specification for the erection of the Post Office and Custom House building at Annapolis, Nova Scotia; the several tenders and amounts thereof; also, any order or orders altering the quality and nature of the stone used in the construction.

He said: In moving this motion, I wish to call the attention of the House to some facts in connection with the giving of the contract. The contract was awarded to Rhodes, Curry & Co., of Amherst, Nova Scotia, at a price which was something like \$750 lower than the next higher tender. After their tender was accepted and the contract awarded to them, I am informed that an alteration was made and that brown freestone was substituted in the place of the granite, which change makes considerable difference in the amount of the contract. Now, it seems to me that this is not a fair course towards the other parties who tendered. I may say that, as far as we know in the Maritime Provinces, this firm of Rhodes, Curry & Co. seems to be rather a favored firm. Now, it seems to me, when the Government made specifications upon which parties tendered, these specifications should be adhered to. I am informed that the change in the quality of the stone mentioned in the specification and the stone actually used, would make a difference something like \$1,250. It seems to me this gives the successful firm an unfair advantage over the other parties tendering who, had they been aware that any such change was to be made, would have made their tender lower than that of the firm who obtained the contract.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no objection to granting this motion. But, I must say that the hon. gentleman is mistaken about the alteration of the quality and the nature of the stone used in the construction. The tenders were eight in number, as follows:—

Rhodes, Curry & Co., Amherst, N. S.	\$12,497, lowest tender.
C. B. Burton, Annapolis.	13,250
J. Burns, Ottawa.	14,623
McDonald, Aylmer, Que.	14,750
F. Toms, Ottawa.	14,886
J. Sykes, Yarmouth.	15,200, rec'd 2 dys. late
J. McIntosh, Stellarton.	16,300
T. Connor & R. McDonald, Moncton.	16,737

The specification required, "approved grey granite from Lawrencetown, or other approved granite of equal quality," for the whole of external work and dressings above ground line. The contractors submitted a sample of red sandstone from North Port, United States, which was found every way equal in quality and durability and more pleasing in color, better adapted for use in conjunction with red brick, and adding to the effect of the building when completed, as the greater portion of the exposed surfaces is to be quarry faced, viz.: without dressing. Mr. Fuller says: "This stone, from its pleasing color and durability, must be considered one of the finest stones on this continent." The change will not cause additional expenditure. That stone was accepted on the statement of the chief engineer that the

building would appear better with that stone than with the other.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). No reduction was made in the contract price.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, because the stone was as good as the other—probably better.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I am told that it is much more easily quarried and much more easily worked than the granite.

Motion agreed to.

BANK CHARTERS.

Mr. EDGAR moved for :

Copies of the original charters of the Bank of British North America and of the Bank of British Columbia, and of all amendments thereto.

He said : I am aware that the House will have an opportunity during the present Session to consider the whole banking system of the country, and I do not propose to introduce a discussion on that subject now. What I desire is to obtain some information, which I hope will be brought down by the Government at an early day, to assist the members of the House in considering that very important legislation when it comes down. It is necessary for me to ask for copies of the charters of the Bank of British North America and of the Bank of British Columbia, for two reasons : one is, that these charters are not accessible to members of the House at the present time, they are not contained in any Canadian Act of Parliament ; they are not contained in any Imperial Act of Parliament ; they are simply letters patent, charters issued in England to these commercial associations. Another reason is that the present Bank Act of Canada, by several of its clauses, makes very exceptional legislation in favor of these banks ; and it is important for us, therefore, to see the charters of these banks which can justify the exceptional legislation that exists to-day, in case it should be proposed to continue that exceptional legislation in the Bank Bill which the Government are going to lay before the House this Session. Section 87 of the present Banking Act which refers to the Bank of British North America, specifies a number of the antecedent sections of the Act which apply to the Bank of British North America, and says that the provisions contained in the other sections of this Act shall not apply to it. Now, when we come to look at the sections of the Bank Act which by these provisions are said not to apply to the Bank of British North America, we find that a great many of the most important clauses of that Act are among them. Now, I admit that some of the exceptions made by that section are justified by either the original or the amended charters of the Bank of British North America containing clauses which, more or less, supply the place of the clauses in our own Bank Act, which are not made to apply to the Bank of British North America. But I can point out to the House several important clauses which are not applied to the British bank, and which are not contained, or anything like them, in the charters of that bank. For instance, section 4 of our Canadian Banking Act says that all the charters of the Canadian banks enumerated in the schedule shall expire in 1891. That does not apply to the British North America Bank, and an amendment to the original Act extends the time to 1st

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

June, 1894. That is an important provision. Then the question of the circulation of our banks is one which is certain to engage the attention of the House very largely during the Session. We know that, under our own Act, there is a limit to the circulation of our Canadian banks—that by section 40 the circulation is limited to the amount of the unimpaired paid-up capital of those banks. That section also does not apply to the Bank of British North America, and there is no provision in their charter of a similar character. Probably the most important of the whole provisions from which that bank is exempted from application, is the clause relating to the double liability of shareholders. Section 70 of our Banking Act provides for all persons dealing with the bank and making deposits there, or accepting their notes—a very valuable safeguard in the shape of the double liability of the shareholders. I think it will be news for members of this House, when I tell them that the clause respecting double liability of shareholders does not apply to the Bank of British North America, which receives the money of the Canadian people in the shape of deposits and circulation to the extent of about \$9,000,000. There, is moreover, no provision in their charter, either original or amended, so far as I have been able to ascertain, providing for anything more than the ordinary liability of shareholders of a joint stock company to pay up for once the amount of stock subscribed. I do not say any harm has occurred to the country ; I do not say that the Bank of British North America is not one of very high standing and very conservative administration, but still I do not see any reason why an exception should be made in its favor. There is another important exception. We know, and we have seen the importance of it. There is a provision in our law which says that, in the case of the insolvency of a bank, any shareholder who may have transferred his shares within one month of suspension shall still be liable upon those shares for a double liability. That does not apply to the Bank of British North America, and, in case of the bank's insolvency, there is no law that would enable the creditors of the bank to reach the shareholders if they transferred their shares twenty-four hours before suspension. What reason is there for making an exception in favor of that bank ? It is not, surely, because it is a bank having its head office in London, England, and because the bulk of its shareholders are not Canadians. I know that a good many of the shares are held in Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and in the western part of Canada, but the shareholders are perfectly willing to send their proxies over to London to be used to elect a board there. I do not think that furnishes any special reason why an exception should be made in its favor. I do not say that Canada will not be glad to receive British capital to assist her banking institutions, but I think, when British capital comes in here, it should be placed on the same footing as our own Canadian capital which is used in the banking business of the country. While it is true that some British capital is sent out here to benefit us, it must be remembered that out of the \$13,000,000 of capital used in the business of the Bank of British North America, only £1,000,000 sterling is the share capital, the rest of it consisting of deposits and circulation, the money of the people of Canada. It is important there should be uniformity in our banking system,

and it will be advantageous to ascertain how far these bank charters prevent that uniformity, and how far they agree with our general law

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) moved :

That, in the opinion of this House, the Electoral Franchise Act ought to be repealed, and that it is preferable to revert to the plan of utilising for the elections of this House the Provincial franchises and voters' lists.

He said : I move this resolution with the object of ascertaining whether hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as hon. members on this side of the House, after having had the experience of that Act since 1885, have not come to the conclusion that it would be in the interests of all parties concerned that we should revert to the old system of utilising the various Provincial lists. It appears to me that if I could, by any possibility, approach the supporters of the Government, and by any means ascertain their views and feelings ; if I could induce them for the moment to withdraw their attachment and fidelity to their party, and to express their un-biassed opinion as to the utility of keeping the present voters' lists, as prepared by the Dominion, still upon the Statute-book, I would find almost an unanimous voice on that side of the House. saying that they thought it was useless to continue any longer the voters' list in its present form. I am perfectly aware that we can hardly expect hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, led by the First Minister, to easily forsake this Act. The right hon. the Prime Minister is very tenacious of his Franchise Act, and I do not blame him for it, because he had a hard struggle to build up the infant franchise to its present condition. It was a difficult and an arduous task for him, and no doubt the labor he bestowed on it has very much endeared the Franchise Act to the right hon. gentleman. But, Sir, after we have had an opportunity of proving the inutility of the measure, I think that the members of this House are to-day better prepared than they were at the time the Act was placed on the Statute-book to form an opinion as to its usefulness. I am well aware, from my own experience—and I think every hon. gentleman in the House will agree with me—that this Act is a cumbersome Act. If you examine the complicated machinery that is necessary to enable a person to be placed on the voters' list, under the Dominion Franchise Act, you will find that it is very cumbersome and almost unworkable. I maintain that where an Act of that description has been found, after experience, not to work smoothly or evenly, and not to be in the interests of the people of the country, the Act should be amended or repealed, and relief granted to those who require to go before the court to get their names placed upon the list. Not only is this Act cumbersome and inconvenient, but I think that every individual member of this House will agree with me that it is an extremely expensive Act, and that the expense connected with the carrying out of the machinery essential to the revision under that Act is so enormous that, at the present day, we ought to hesitate to longer continue the Act in force. When the Bill first came before the House for discussion we were

apprehensive lest our opponents were going to get a great advantage over us through its operation, and we naturally feared that the revising barrister system and the other machinery in connection with the Act would work much more favorably towards members supporting the Government than it would towards us. But I will guarantee that if I ask any member in this House who has taken an interest in the preparation of the voters' lists in his constituency, that he will at once admit that the Act is cumbersome, troublesome and expensive. Although the Act is to us, on this side of the House, troublesome, irksome, a great annoyance and a great expense, it is almost equally so to gentlemen on the other side. They know full well that if they are not alert in seeing that every member of their party is placed upon the voters' lists that the candidate upon the opposite side may get an advantage over them in having a larger number of his friends placed on the list, and so carry the election. Therefore, members on the Government side are called upon to exercise the same amount of vigilance, industry and activity in the preparation of the voters' lists as the opponents of the Government. I call the attention of the House to the fact that up to the present time we have had only one full revision and one partial revision. Does anyone pretend that that failure to have revision is on account of the cost? Do you suppose the hon. the First Minister or the Government of the day were influenced to hold back the revision on account of the great cost it would be to the country? When we remember the extravagant course of the Government in the past, I am not inclined to think that the question of cost would interfere with the action of the Government. No, Sir ; it was not the question of expense, but it was the power behind the Government which prevented the revision from taking place. The Government supporters have gone to them and told them distinctly that on account of the great inconvenience, the great annoyance, and the great expense connected with the revision of the voters' lists, that it was neither prudent nor desirable, in the interests of the supporters of the Government, that a revision should have been made. I do say that it is an outrage upon the electorate, and that it is unjust and unfair that the people of the country should be deprived of their votes because of neglect to revise the lists. It ought to be the pride and the boast of the Legislature that every man who is entitled to be placed on the voters' lists should have an opportunity each and every year of exercising his franchise. I say it is wrong, and I say it is unjust and unfair that a man in every way qualified to vote for a representative to the Parliament of Canada should, through no fault of his own, but only because the supporters of the Government advise that the lists should not be revised, be deprived of his right to vote. It is unjust to the people that if there should be an accidental election in any one of the constituencies, an elector would not have the opportunity of recording his vote. We have been told that the First Minister was desirous of extending the franchise and of making it more liberal than it was before. Such cannot be the case, because we find that there are thousands of electors entitled to have their names placed on the voters' lists who were deprived of the privilege of voting when an election took place in their county. Therefore, I say that this of

itself is a reason why we ought to resort to some other means whereby we can prevent this injustice being done to a large portion of the people of the country. I have referred you to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we had only one complete revision and one partial revision up to the present time. Let us consider what the revision has cost, and then let us remember what the cost would be to revise and utilise the Provincial lists in lieu of this Dominion list. Last February a return was brought down to the House, in response to a motion, and I find in that return the following amounts for the revision of 1886 :—

Amount paid for printing.....	\$174,340 68
for revising officers' salaries.....	93,767 94
Amount paid to clerks and bailiffs.....	79,494 93
Other expenses.....	67,318 21
Claims still unsettled.....	5,264 49
Making a total of.....	\$420,186 25

Which the revision cost up to that date. Now, Sir, if you were in the House in 1885, you will remember that it was estimated on this side that the preparation and revision of these voters' lists would cost from a quarter to half a million dollars; but hon. gentlemen opposite declared that no such sum, and nothing approaching it, would be required for that purpose. I have no doubt that, had the supporters of the Government imagined that the cost would swell up to half a million dollars, they would have withheld their assent to the passage of such an Act. Now, what has been the cost of the partial revision which has been made up to the present time? On looking at the returns brought down, I find that we have paid, up to February, 1889, the following amounts :

Type and material.....	\$63,849 80
Composition and presswork.....	15,511 04
Paper.....	292 11
Rent and steam power.....	1,413 00
Proof-reading.....	666 00
Ink.....	97 50
Revising copy for printers.....	885 50
Stationery.....	6 29
Erection of shed.....	601 80

Making a total of..... \$86,313 04

Then, you will remember that during last Session the Government took a vote of \$260,000 to defray the expenses of a revision of the Franchise Act. Whether they have used all that money or not, it is difficult to say, but I suppose they have, and a much larger amount. Therefore, so far as we have returns, the second revision has thus far cost \$346,513.04. If you add this to the cost of the original revision, you will find that for one complete revision and for one partial revision nearly \$800,000 has been spent, and no doubt before the second revision is completed the cost will reach a full million dollars for only two revisions since 1885. Now, you will agree with me, Sir, that it is unfair to the electors of this country, that there should be only one revision every three or four years. A revision according to the Act means an annual revision, so that every person in a constituency who has a right will have his name placed on the voters' list; if that is not done, an injustice is done to him, just as much as if he were refused the right to vote. Only those who have committed some criminal act are supposed to be deprived of their votes, and yet those whose names are not on the voters' lists are treated just as if they had committed some crime.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

Now, the general tendency of public opinion, not only in this country, but in the United States and in Great Britain, is towards a more liberal and more extended franchise; the general feeling is that a manhood franchise ought to prevail; we have heard of leading statesmen of England declaring openly in their public speeches in favor of the principle of one-man-one-vote. If we examine the franchises existing in the various Provinces of the Dominion, we shall find that manhood suffrage, or something very near to it, prevails in nearly every one of them. In Prince Edward Island, for instance, every man above the age of 21 years has a right to vote, even under our Dominion law; and the same is the case in British Columbia. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, very liberal franchises exist; and in Ontario we have manhood suffrage. There is only one Province in the Dominion in which the Provincial franchise is not, perhaps, more liberal than that of the Dominion—that is, the Province of Quebec; yet, I am told by those who ought to know, that the franchise of that Province is as liberal, or more liberal than the Dominion franchise. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite contended, when we were discussing this subject in previous Sessions, that it would not do to repeal the Franchise Act, because, if we did so, we should be depriving a number of people of votes who had votes under the Dominion franchise and not under those of the Provinces. If the local franchises have become far more liberal than that of the Dominion, that argument has been removed, and hon. gentlemen have no right to urge it any further; and I contend that their own argument can be used against them, for they must admit that, by using the local lists, we should be giving the right to vote to a large number of people than now possess that privilege under the Dominion Act. I am inclined to think that the Government themselves desire to have this Act repealed. During the discussion last Session on the amendments to the Franchise Act, the Government conveyed the impression that at some future Session, before another election took place, they would reconsider the whole matter and perhaps resort to some other franchise than the one now in force. Lest it might be contended that, in saying this, I am misrepresenting the members of the Government, I will read what the right hon. the First Minister, on that occasion, said to the House, and I have no doubt that any statement made by him will be accepted as good authority by every hon. gentleman opposite. I do not think I would go quite so far, but I must say that I understood him then to hold out to us inducements that if we would only refrain from opposing the amendments then being made, the whole subject would at a future Session be reconsidered. In reply to my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) the right hon. the First Minister said :

“The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) and the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Colter) took that line, and they both, I have no doubt, would agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Mills, to have either universal suffrage, or manhood suffrage, or the various suffrages as they exist in the different Provinces, adopted, as giving our electorate for the Dominion Parliament; that is their opinion, and it has been their opinion. But I do not think that question comes up this Session, and at this period of the Session, in connection with this measure of practical politics, I do not think there is any chance of our immediately going back to seek a renewal of confidence from our constituents.”

You will remember this was very shortly after the

debate on the Jesuit question, when the Government felt very confident, because they had obtained a large vote on this side, as well as on their own side.

"I think, especially after the strong vote of confidence given by the hon. gentlemen opposite to the present Government; that we can well consider that we are going to last for a year or two.

"Mr. MITCHELL. You get some of that vote under protest, you know.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; but we got the vote."

As a general rule, that is all he cares about.

"Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, yes; you got the vote.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We got the vote anyhow, and the protest will stand for what it is worth. In the meantime, I hope that we will not be drawn into a discussion of that great and important question, which, I think, when it is brought up on its own merits, for the purpose of altering our constitution and our parliamentary representation, shall receive full consideration. I know the strong feeling that the hon. gentlemen opposite entertain on that point, and I know that they will take care that before there is an appeal to the people that that question will be brought up. Meanwhile, this is a simple proposition to amend the law as it is, and I will invite the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite to this Bill as it stands, and as a Bill simply amending the law as it is. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that he will, this Session, and before this measure gets through the House, bring up the entire question. If he thinks it right to do so, or if any other hon. member thinks it right, we will have to discuss the general principle. I am not quite sure that the hon. gentleman will take my advice that it would just be as well to postpone that for another Session—"

What did the hon. gentleman mean if he did not mean to convey the impression that it would be better to let the matter rest then, and that this Session he would take into consideration the question whether we ought to repeal the present franchise or not.

"—and to discuss then, on its merits, the question: What ought to be the representation of the people of Canada in the Dominion Parliament of Canada? In the meanwhile, I would ask that we should not be induced to enter upon that large subject, which can produce no practical result this Session, but that we will discuss this Bill on its merits, as a Bill merely amending, and amending in no important principle, the Franchise Act as it now stands."

You thus see, Sir, that the right hon. the First Minister was in favor of our reconsidering the question of the electoral franchise, and deciding whether we should repeal the present franchise or extend it to manhood suffrage. I do not wish to delay the House upon this question. I will confine myself to stating that if our hon. friends opposite will only consider the real interests of the country, and what the country really desires, they will agree with me that the time has arrived to make the change of utilising the local lists in lieu of the Dominion lists. If you will consider, Sir, how these local lists are prepared, you cannot fail to admit that they are made up with much care and efficiency. It may be said: Oh, but you have political feeling and partisanship in the election of your county councils, in the appointment of your assessors and clerks, and in your courts of revision, and, therefore, there may be partisan lists prepared. I would reply that, if you will go from one end of the Dominion to the other, if you will take every constituency in the Province of Ontario and in the other Provinces, you will find that the municipal councillors are chosen from both parties; you will find that the assessors and the clerks are as free from partiality as any revising barrister you could

possibly appoint. I may add, that in Ontario the revision of the lists is made before the county judge, who is appointed by the Dominion Government, and who, therefore, is not at all likely to be a Reformer. If reports be true, an appointment to the position of county judge has been made very recently in my constituency. No doubt the gentleman appointed will revise the local voters' lists, and it is not to be expected that, in so doing, he will act partially in my interest. I do not say that I will not have every confidence in him, for I have every confidence in our local judges; and it is just as much in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite as it is in the interest of hon. gentlemen on this side, that there should be no Dominion lists, as their interest will be served just as well as ours by utilising the local lists. If we take all matters into consideration, if we consider the expense to which the country has been placed on account of these lists, if we consider the interests involved, we must admit it is the bounden duty of this House to pass a resolution repealing the Dominion and authorising the use of the local lists, and, by so doing, we will save to the country at least half a million dollars on every occasion when it is necessary to have a revision. Feeling strongly on this subject, and feeling satisfied that, perhaps, anything I might be able to say might not to any extent influence hon. gentlemen on the other side, I shall conclude. But, having attempted to show them that it is as much in their interest as it is in ours, and in the interest of the Dominion at large, to repeal the present Franchise Act, and to utilise the local Acts, and that no injury can be done to any individual in the Dominion by taking that course, I appeal to them strongly to adopt it, and I think they must feel that the time has come to revert to the system which prevailed for seventeen or eighteen years, from which no grievance has ever arisen, no injury has ever been complained of, no abuse has been heard, and no wrongs have been inflicted on the people. Under those circumstances, I claim that, according to the British system, when there are no wrongs to redress, no measure of redress should have been brought forward, and there was no reason for introducing that Act in the first place, but there is a great reason for repealing it at the present moment.

Mr. LAURIER. It is evident that, upon this occasion, as five years ago, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are not disposed to discuss this question, or the principle involved in the Act, any more than they were then disposed to discuss the principle involved in the Bill. Those who were present here five years ago can quite well remember that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House were always ready to vote for the Franchise Bill, but were never ready to give a reason for their vote. They could always screw up their courage to the point of giving a bad vote, but they could not screw up their courage to the point of giving a bad reason; and it is evident that this year they have not changed their minds on that subject. It is very plainly evident that the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) will not carry, and that the force of numbers will have success, but not the force of reason. Everyone who was here five years ago will remember that a long struggle took place to free the country from the iniquitous Franchise

Bill, which afterwards became the iniquitous Franchise Act. We had then every reason to believe that it was iniquitous in its conception, and would prove obnoxious in its practice, and it cannot be doubted that the experience we have since had has confirmed, and more than confirmed, these views. It is, I am certain, an almost unanimous consensus of opinion that that Act has been an unmitigated evil. It is vicious in its conception; it interferes with the federal principle of our constitution, it removes from the Provinces a power which properly belongs to them; it interferes with and takes away from the people the system which previously existed of having the lists prepared by the people themselves; it has proved expensive in its operation, and now we find that not a word can be spoken in commendation of that Act. I do not know what the experience of others may be, but I know what my own experience has been, and I believe it has been the same as that of others, and I say that I have never heard one word of commendation spoken in favor of the Franchise Act. There is not a redeeming feature in any of its numerous clauses, but the great objection to me is chiefly that it is an interference with the federative principle upon which our constitution rests. I know very well that on the other side of the House that may not be considered a very strong objection to the Act. The opinion is held by many on that side that the federal principle is the weak point of the union of the Provinces; but I entirely dissent from that view. It may be said that the federal principle was adopted at the time on account of the peculiar position of the Province of Quebec, because we had not a homogeneous race; but I say that the best and the only way to unite under a free Government, even a homogeneous race, is under the federal principle, especially if the people are scattered over a large territory. Take, for instance, the people of the United States. It is manifest, or ought to be manifest to everyone, that a variety of climatic conditions, of geographical situations, of natural productions and of industrial pursuits, must create a difference in regard to the wants, the desires, the pursuits, and the conditions of the people. Climatic conditions alone will modify the features of the same population. In the United States, the man from the North, the man from the South, the man from the West, and the man from the East, though exhibiting all the common characteristics of the same race, still exhibit marked differences of character and of manners. Is it not manifest that these different classes of people will have different wants, different tastes and different requirements, and will not be always in accord with the people of the rest of the country? Take, for instance, Texas and Maine, Louisiana and Massachusetts, Illinois and Mississippi, they must have different requirements arising from their different pursuits and their different wants. The question is, how are these wants best to be ministered to? Is it to be by a single Parliament or by local bodies? Would it be contended that these different interests can be served by a single Parliament as efficaciously as they are served by Local Legislatures? Is it not manifest that if there were in the United States only one legislative body, only one executive body, the local interests of the different sections would suffer materially, and they could

Mr. LAURIER.

not enjoy the same prosperity and the same contentment that they now enjoy? What is true of the United States is exactly true of our own country. We are similarly situated, and it must be obvious to every man that the mountainous region of British Columbia, for instance, must have special wants and requirements which will not be the wants and requirements of the prairie regions, and of the Eastern Provinces, and *vice versa*. Under such conditions, I ask, can we have a better system than the one we possess, where local wants are controlled by local bodies, the wants which are common to all being looked after by a Parliament representing all sections of the country? Sir, this principle seems to be so very obvious that at this age there can be but one opinion that the best system that has yet been devised for the government of a large country is, after all, the federal system; and it is this system which we have in view every time and on every occasion that questions come up in this House for a solution. Now, the charge I make against the Franchise Act is that it is conceived in entire antagonism to the federal system of our constitution. It is not so glaring a violation of the constitution as the disallowance of Acts of Local Legislatures, which constituted so shameful an abuse in the past; but though the invasion is not so glaring, it is just as insidious, it is just as dangerous. Now, I contend that the regulation of the franchise is, above all, a matter of local legislation, local in its provisions, in its nature, and it should be determined by the local legislative bodies. I believe my statement is proved to be correct by our own history upon this question. What has been our history upon this question? During the twenty-two years that Confederation has lasted, we have had seventeen years of local franchise and five years of a Dominion franchise. For the first seventeen years of Confederation the franchise was regulated by the Local Legislatures, and not one word of complaint was ever heard. I insist especially upon this, that not one word was ever heard against the working of the Provincial franchise. It is true that during those seventeen years the hon. the Prime Minister, who is well known to be in favor of a legislative union, at least in principle if not in practice, endeavored upon two or three or four different occasions to introduce his pet scheme of a universal franchise for the Dominion. He endeavored to carry it; he introduced such legislation two or three times in succession, but the antipathy felt for such legislation by his followers was so great, that upon each occasion he was compelled to abandon his measure after having introduced it. In 1885 he introduced it once more, and then, screwing up his courage, and that of his followers behind him, who were then no more in favor of it than before, he rammed it down their throats against their will, and we remember that they had to swallow it with many painful contortions; but swallow it they did, though the Act was no more popular on that side than it was on this side of the House. Well, we have had five years of the present Act, and what has been the result? What has been the consensus of opinion throughout the country? Sir, we have never heard one word, so far, in favor of the Act. I have often heard it attacked, but I never heard it defended heartily yet. Dissatisfaction has been the result of the Act, such as

we have it now. Then, I say again, that the Act itself proves conclusively that the franchise is a matter for local legislation. Take the very opening chapter of the Act, the regulation of the franchise. One of the bases of the franchise is real property, but the same rule concerning real property does not apply to all men. You have different rules applying to different kinds of real property; one rule for property in cities, one rule for property in towns, and another rule for property in the rural parts of the country. If a man is possessed of a piece of land worth \$300 in a city, he can be an elector; if his piece of land is worth only \$200 he cannot be an elector, but if his piece of land happens to be in a town, then he can be an elector. If a man is possessed of real property worth \$150 in a city or town he cannot be an elector; but if it be in the rural parts, he can be an elector. What is the reason of all this? The reason is, that real estate has not everywhere the same value. It varies in price in different localities. Now, if it varies in price within the limits of one Province *a fortiori* it must vary still more in different Provinces. If, therefore, it is obvious, even from the very first clause of the Act, that real estate will vary in price, this basis of the franchise must also vary in different parts of the country. In this view of the case, who is the best judge to determine what kind of real estate should command a vote? Clearly, the Provincial Legislatures. If that question is to be settled by the Dominion Parliament or by Local Legislatures, I ask, in the name of common sense, which is the most competent body to settle it? Is it not the Local Legislature of the Province where the real estate is situated? So, Mr. Speaker, we find in the very first clause of the Bill the evidence that the best method of regulating the franchise is to leave it to the Local Legislatures. Moreover, the regulation of the franchise is so much a provincial, a local matter, that in the United States—which are situated very much as our Provinces—I understand that there are scarcely any two States which have the same franchise. In one State it is manhood suffrage, pure and simple; in another State it is manhood suffrage, coupled with some restrictions; in another State the basis is the payment of taxes, in another the basis is real property. When we find such various provisions where there might be uniformity, it is manifest that the best method, after all, is to leave each state to determine what, in its opinion, should constitute the qualification of its electors. As I said, we are similarly situated, and a rule which applies in the United States ought also to apply here. But there are considerations of a higher moment—the regulation of the franchise, above all things, and the question of education. Very few civilised States have the same qualification. In France, in England, in the United States, in Germany, in Spain, and in Italy, I am sure that you cannot find the same basis of franchise. The tendency at this moment is, as has been stated by my hon. friend who introduced this resolution, in favor of extending the franchise in the direction of complete manhood suffrage. Well, in the Province to which I belong, there has always been a feeling of suspicion against universal manhood suffrage. It may be a prejudice; I think it is founded on reason. I claim now, and I have always claimed, to be a

Liberal of the Liberals, but I say here that I would not be disposed to favor manhood suffrage. It may be perhaps a prejudice of my race, but still, prejudice or not, I am prepared to defend my opinion. Though we have long been separated from France, yet we have always followed closely the history of our ancestors. Up to 1848 the franchise of France was very limited; in fact, out of a population of 30,000,000, the number of voters under the régime of Louis Phillippe was under 200,000. After the revolution, the first act of the Republic was to proclaim manhood suffrage, and to jump at once from 200,000 electors to 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 electors. The result has not shown that the example is one which should commend itself to the civilised world, because the very first act that was done by manhood suffrage was to vote away the liberties of France into the hands of an adventurer, and again and again France, being called upon to pronounce an opinion upon the question, pronounced in favor of the same adventurer. Having these examples before us, we are not disposed, in the Province to which I belong, to adopt at once manhood suffrage. It may be, if we follow the example of the rest of the Continent and the civilised world, that we may come to it; but at this moment, I am sure, the great majority of the race to which I belong are not in favor of such a measure. But, at the same time, I hasten to say this: if we do not want manhood suffrage for ourselves, we do not wish to deprive any other Province of manhood suffrage, if it favors it. If Ontario wants it, let her have it—and she has it to-day, I understand. If New Brunswick wants it, let her have it; let all the Provinces that want universal suffrage have it, but do not let us impose it upon those who do not want it. What will be the result if we keep the present Act on the Statute-book? The result must be that you must deprive Provinces of manhood suffrage when they want it, and impose it upon some which do not want it. Cannot there be a solution between these two extremes? Yes, there is a solution. And what is it? The solution is, to stand by the true principle on which Confederation rests, to stand loyally to the federative principle, and leave every Province to determine that vexed question. If you allow every Province to determine for itself the question of the franchise, there cannot be any discontent anywhere and every person will be satisfied with it. If you pass from the principle of the Act to its details, you will find it is just as bad in its disposition as in its conception. Why, it is so bad that the Government themselves are ashamed of their own progeny, they dare not exhibit it to the people in all its hideousness. They exhibit it only when they are compelled to do so by force of circumstances. One of the provisions of the Act is that there should be a revision every year. This is the law of the land, introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite, introduced by hon. members on the Treasury benches, voted by their followers, carried against the determined opposition of this side of the House. Has there been a revision every year? No; there have been only two revisions in five years. Hon. gentlemen opposite were ashamed to go before the people and submit them to such an enormous expense as is necessary. That is the reason of their action. If not, what is the reason? If it was necessary, as it was enacted, that there should

be a revision every year, why did we not have it? If it were not necessary, why should this House have enacted that a revision be made yearly? The reason is the one I have given: that the expenditure is so enormous to the country, to hon. members and to candidates, that the Government dare not impose such expense on their followers and on the country every year. These are some of the reasons why we ask that this Act, which the Government dare not put into execution, shall no longer be retained on the Statute-book. I have nothing more to say on the subject. The question of expense is one to which hon. members should give serious consideration. When, in 1885, we, on this side of the House, contended that the expenditure under the Act would reach half a million dollars, the notion was ridiculed by hon. gentlemen opposite. That was the only answer they could give at that time to our objection, but when the Government had to stand before the glaring fact that our argument and our predictions were absolutely true, they adopted the other method, of not applying the Act at all. Under such circumstances, we contend that, if the Act is vicious in conception, expensive in its operation, there is no reason why it should be retained on the Statute-book, and it should be got rid of at once.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have renewed, or tried to renew, the debate which occupied twelve or fourteen days of a previous Session.

Mr. LAURIER. Seven weeks.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was debated about twelve days consecutively. I do not know for how many days they have commenced the debate now, but they appear surprised that we do not follow suit in discussing the question. We are not disposed to continue that debate, which was closed by the vote of Parliament after due and long consideration, after which the measure was passed through this House and through the other House, and was sanctioned and became the law of the land. The Act has been put into force. We have seen the working of the statute, and hon. gentlemen opposite now wish the Act to be repealed, on account of the large expenditure incurred under its provisions. It was, however, well understood when the Bill was under consideration, that it would entail a large expenditure. It involved the introduction of a new system and required a number of officials to establish it. The Act has been put into force, the officials have done their duty, and we have had lists prepared and elections held under those lists. I do not think we on this side of the House, at all events, have cause to complain of the result of the working of the Act. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite either should complain, for they favorably compare with those opposed to us previous to the passage of the Act, and therefore, I think the hon. leader of the Opposition should not complain that the Act which, according to his statement, was one which was vicious in its conception. Those are strong words, and the hon. gentleman must allow us to differ with him in regard to the working of the statute. We think it works well. It may have been expensive in the beginning. We will try to make it less expensive, and no doubt, now that the machinery or the machine is in operation, the expense of the revision will not be so great as hon. gentlemen opposite

Mr. LAURIER.

predicted and expected. The leader of the Opposition stated that the franchise should not be in the hands of the Federal Parliament, that we should divest ourselves of that power and leave it entirely in the hands of the Local Legislatures. And why? It is the basis of our existence here as a Parliament, and it is the basis of our existence as members of Parliament. It is the Act by which we receive the right to come and to take our seats here as representatives of the people; and are we not to have anything to do with the basis of that franchise, or must it be left, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, entirely to the Local Legislatures? Well, we have discussed that long ago. We discussed it when this Act was under consideration as a Bill before Parliament, and we differed entirely from hon. gentlemen opposite on that head. I do not think that on our side of the House we have yet changed our opinion. We believe that the determination of the Dominion federal franchise should be in the hands of this Parliament, and we believe that this Parliament should determine who has the right to vote and who should not vote. We have made the franchise very wide; as wide as I think the leader of the Opposition would have wished it to be, and I was glad to hear him say just now that he was not in favor of universal suffrage. I have never believed in that either. I think that those who vote should have some interest in the country, and that the first adventurer who may come to the country should not have a vote to determine whether the hon. gentleman or myself should sit in this Parliament. Those who determine who should sit here as their representatives must be persons who have an interest in the country and who can be governed by this Parliament. Therefore we think and we believe that the regulation of that franchise should be in our own hands. The hon. leader of the Opposition speaks of the local franchises of certain Provinces, and he says that these are as liberal as they should be, and are as liberal as our own franchises. Well, when the hon. gentleman was so speaking, I thought of the exceptions which have been made in certain Provinces, by which large classes of people who have a great stake in the country—people who own large properties in this country, and are interested in the welfare of the country, have been disfranchised. In the Province of Quebec all the officers of the Federal Government have been declared to have no vote, and even a workman who might be employed by the Intercolonial Railway for one day was disfranchised by the Local Parliament. Why should he be deprived of his vote more than any local officer of that Local Government? I do not see the reason. He is not less interested in the welfare of the Province of Quebec than the messenger of one of the Ministers there, or the man employed by the local board of works for a day's work. Therefore, I do not see, Mr. Speaker, how the hon. gentleman can say that that franchise is preferable to ours, and I speak of the Province of Quebec especially, because I know personally the facts of the case in that Province. I believe an attempt was made, in the first instance, by the Quebec Government to disfranchise the members of this House, and especially the Ministers of the Crown. If that had gone into effect we would have had no resource left but to resign our portfolios, vote for our candidate, and try our

luck at getting re-elected. But the hon. the leader of the Opposition goes further than this. He makes a comparison between our constitution and the constitution of the United States of America, and says that, of course, the constitution of the United States is better than this constitution. Well, I wish him to excuse me if I do not agree with him in that. The constitution of the United States, he says, is a federal one, but ours also is a federal one. He says that in the United States they have only one Legislature; but how do they look after the wants of the different States? They have their Local Legislatures in the United States, and their local wants are attended to by those local bodies. But that is no reason to suppose that here, under our constitution, we have not also our local bodies to look after the local wants of the Provinces. We have them as well as they have them in the United States, the only difference being that their local bodies are for different States while our local bodies are for Provinces. There is a difference in name, and that is all. If the hon. gentleman had continued his comparison between the two constitutions, and had asked whether the constitution of the United States or the constitution of Canada was the more democratic and the more popular one, he would have been obliged to admit that here the federal executive is directly responsible to the representatives of the people, and that the representatives of the people may at any time by their vote change the Government of the country. It is not so in the United States, as the hon. gentleman knows. The Ministers there are not responsible to the people. They are responsible to the President of the United States, and so long as that President holds office and does not violate the constitution of the country, he is there for his four years. There is no vote of Congress which can change him and put another in his place though they may not like him, and though they may consider that he is not governing the country as it should be governed. I do not see how the hon. gentleman can, in comparing the two constitutions, find that of the United States better than ours. Of course it is a good card to play, in order to show that the Government of this country are not looking after the wants of the people. But when you go into the merits of the constitution, you must admit that the constitution of Canada is much more democratic than that of the United States of America. For all that, I do not intend to depreciate the institutions of our neighbors. They are prospering under their constitution, and we are glad to see them prosper; but, on the other hand, we wish that our neighbors should leave us alone, under our constitution, prospering, as we do, from one end of the country to the other. I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to follow the hon. gentleman who spoke on the different clauses of the Act, and on the working of the Act. I think I am expressing the opinions of hon. members on this side of the House, in saying that we are satisfied with that Act as it is. If any remedies or changes are shown to be necessary, we will not stand in the way of changes or improvements. We have shown many times that we are a progressive Government, and therefore, if hon. gentlemen can show something that is really a want in that Act, or in any other Act, we are open to conviction. Other members may wish to speak on this subject, and I will not continue the discussion further. I

have only to say, that I hope that a large majority of the House will vote down the resolution of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson).

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When this Franchise Act was before the House in 1885, it was stated that the passage of that Act would necessarily lead to motions for its repeal, and debates following them, in every subsequent Session. Of course, that idea was based on the fact that on almost any measure introduced into or passed by Parliament, there is something to be said in favor as well as something against it, upon which a debate might fairly arise. But this measure has proved an exception to the general rule. It is a measure which those who support it with their votes are apparently unable or unwilling to defend with their utterances. It is true, the hon. Minister of Public Works at this time has screwed up his courage sufficiently to say: We passed that Bill in 1885, we got a majority of members returned to this Parliament to support us under it; we therefore think it is a good Bill, and having a majority in this House, we intend to keep it on the Statute-book. Well, that is all very well as a declaration, but as an argument it does not go for much. If we expected very much by way of argument in defence of this Bill, we might have known, from the scene which was enacted when it was first introduced to Parliament, that we could hardly expect it. True, the measure as it stands is one in favor of which something, however little, might possibly be said. We know that the Bill, as originally conceived and introduced, and as attempted to be forced through this House by sheer overpowering numbers, was so iniquitous in its nature that there was no one found for days and nights together who had the hardihood to open his lips to attempt to defend it. Sir, the Bill as introduced into this House was a deliberate attempt of a Government to subvert the rights and liberties of a free people; and they endeavored to pass that Bill by wearing out the strength of the Opposition, compelling us to sit here continuously from three o'clock on Thursday afternoon until the stroke of midnight on Saturday relieved us — because these gentlemen, hardened as they were in that iniquity, would not encroach on the Lord's Day. And they found the attitude of the Opposition at that time so determined against the measure, and the country so aroused because of their persistent attempt to force it through the House, that they did not impose upon us any more continued night and day sittings, but for weeks afterwards they gave us sessions lasting from one o'clock in the afternoon instead of three to two or three o'clock in the morning, during which time the Opposition had to carry on the whole debate, for no man on the other side dared to rise to defend the measure. During all the years from Confederation the Canadian people had freely enjoyed the right of the franchise, and were exercising it; but what was the fundamental principle of the Bill as introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite? It was to appoint an irresponsible officer, and to place in his hands absolute and complete power over the voters of this country, without any appeal whatever from his decisions; no matter what proof was adduced, he could say to this man, you shall go on the list, and to another man, you shall not; then taking out of the people's

hands the control of the franchise and putting it in the hands of a nominee of the Government, who was to be absolutely secure in his position, who could only be removed by an Address from this House, having as its majority the members who attempted to perpetrate the act. Sir, that was the Bill as originally introduced; but, after days and nights of debate, when they found that the Opposition were willing to sacrifice health, if necessary, in defending the liberties of the people, and when they could not hope, even by overpowering numbers, to carry the Bill through this House, they were obliged to abandon part of their iniquity, and the Act we have on the Statute-book to-day, which is infinitely better than the one sought to be forced upon us, became the law of the land. But, even to-day, modified as it is, where is the gentleman on the other side who will rise to defend it? Last Session, as has been read to you, the First Minister said that by-and-bye, in another Session or two, we would discuss it. The Session is here; the motion is before you; and the hon. gentlemen opposite are asked to rise and defend the vote they are about to give against the proposition to wipe the Act from the Statute-book, and to revert to the Provincial list. The hon. Minister of Public Works said that this Parliament has a right to keep its franchise in its own hands, and to say who shall, and who shall not, vote for members of this House. Sir, will it not be keeping the franchise in its own hands, if it solemnly declares that the franchise for this House shall be the franchises adopted in the different Provinces? We would be doing it just as much as we do by placing a separate statute on the Statute-book, and we would secure just as much uniformity throughout the Provinces as is secured by this Act, which was the only claim made on its behalf. But hon. gentlemen have not ventured to use that argument to-day. Why? Because, when they attempted to carry out this Act in its details, they found that it was impossible to secure uniformity. You find that principle violated time and again by seeing that certain persons in one Province may vote, while like persons in another Province may not vote. This measure has been challenged by the mover of this resolution for several reasons. It has been challenged by the leader of the Opposition for that which is a mighty objection to it: that it is a subversion of the federal principle held dear on this side of the House. I need not attempt to enlarge on this objection, which I could not do in as able a manner as has already been done. Another argument which has not been met by hon. gentlemen opposite, is the enormous cost of this Act to the country. Figures have been given showing that a complete revision has cost over \$400,000. Now, five revisions should take place during the life of a Parliament, which would mean the expenditure of \$2,000,000 of the money of the people of Canada—for what? To secure lists better than the Provincial lists? No one has ventured, or will venture, to declare that they are better lists than the Provincial lists. But hon. gentlemen reply: You have only had one revision costing \$400,000 imposed on the country during the past four years, the difference of \$1,600,000 being saved. How has it been effected, this saving of the other \$1,600,000? At the expense of the franchise to men who are entitled to vote for representatives in this House. In that way only can that economy

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

be made, for it is a well understood principle of the Franchise Bill—and if it is not a principle of that Bill, it is a principle that should be held in this House—that the voters' lists should be revised every year. If not revised, it does not require much observation to ascertain what the consequences will be. Young men all over the Dominion, attaining their majority, with the opinions and aspirations of young Canadians in their breasts, believe that in this land, in which are centred all their interests, they have the right to vote; they believe that on attaining manhood the right of a Canadian subject should be theirs. But of this right they must be deprived, because this Government keeps an Act upon the Statute-book so expensive in its nature that they dare not carry out its provisions, and dare not revise the voters' lists even once every four years. I hold the Government to it. To revise the lists means an expenditure of \$2,000,000 to the country; not to revise them, means the sacrifice of the votes of those who have the right to vote. And this expenditure of \$2,000,000, will anyone pretend to say it is of any use? It is absolutely useless. The Provincial lists cost us not one cent, and they are more carefully and accurately prepared than the Dominion lists. What could be done with this \$2,000,000? If you could do no better, you could strike that amount off the burden of taxation which is weighing down the people of this country. Or, if for other purposes you wish to keep up your taxation, what useful public works could not be constructed in the country that we are told time and again cannot be done, if you were to save this money. I hold further, that in reverting to the Provincial lists we would not only save the entire cost of this expensive and inadequate franchise system, but the people of each Province would secure a franchise suited to their wants and their desires. The hon. the leader of the Opposition told us frankly that his Province had not yet reached the point he desired it should reach, of manhood suffrage; but, with the principles of a true Liberal, he said that although he did not believe manhood suffrage would be in the best interests of his own Province, he did not wish to withhold that privilege from the other Provinces to which it was best suited. In the Province of which I have the honor to be a representative, we believe in that principle. We have adopted it in the Local Legislature, which is elected on that basis, and I believe that is the principle which should prevail in our Province in the elections for the Dominion Parliament; but while our young men, growing up with all their interests in this country, with all the aspirations of Canadians, anxious to have a voice in the affairs of the country, have a voice in our local affairs, they are not entitled, many of them, to cast their votes under the lists prepared by the Dominion officers. There is another right which we have established under our Provincial lists, and that is the right of one man to cast one vote. We have done away with the anomaly of one man, because he may have a little real estate in one county and a little more in another county, and so on, having half a score of votes, while another man who may have more property in one place than the other has all combined in the several places, can only have one vote; or that he should have any more right to vote than the young man who has all his interests

in this country, who makes his living here, and who lends his influence and his work in building up the land. He it is who is the first one to volunteer in the defence of his country when called upon, and if he would not volunteer—but he always will—if he would not, it is he who, if it were necessary to make a conscription, the Government would first compel to go to the front. Why, then, should he not have an equal voice in the making of our laws, when he contributes to the revenue of his country as much as the man who owns a little parcel of land, and is equally liable to be called upon for the defence of his country? The principle that prevails in Ontario to-day is that he should have an equal right. Therefore, it is as a representative of that Province I am strongly in favor of the proposition of my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson), that we should wipe out this Franchise Act from our statutes, an Act that was conceived in injustice, and which has been carried out in a measure of the injustice in which it was conceived; an Act utterly useless, and which costs \$2,000,000, if properly revised during each Parliament, according to the figures we have; an Act, which, in the Province of Ontario, and other Provinces where manhood suffrage prevails, limits that suffrage, takes away the rights of the people, and destroys the federal principle which ought to be dear to every member in this House.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 26) an Act relating to the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Bill (No. 35) an Act to incorporate the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 36) an Act to confirm an agreement between the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 37) an Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Imperial Trusts Company of Canada.—(Mr. Hudspeth.)

Bill (No. 45) an Act to incorporate the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 46) an Act to incorporate the Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 8.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 6th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Interprovincial Bridge Company.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Shore Line Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

VANCOUVER ISLAND RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. GORDON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause an investigation to be made in the alleged grievances of certain squatters on the railway lands on Vancouver Island, who claim that they have been denied the right guaranteed them under sub-section 2 of section 7 of the Act passed by the Parliament of Canada, intitled: "An Act respecting the Vancouver Island Railway, &c."?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the transfer to the Esquimaux and Nanaimo Railway Company, the rights of the squatters under the Act 47 Vic., cap. 6, have been reserved and protected, and their remedy (if any) seems to be against the company. An officer of the Department of the Interior will, however, be sent, at an early day, to investigate the alleged grievances, with a view to ascertaining the rights of the squatters under the said Act and the patent of the company. With the permission of the House, I desire to offer an explanation to the leader of the Opposition. When the hon. gentleman's motion was before the House the other day, I stated in answer to the hon. gentleman, that there were no petitions from squatters as referred to in the motion. I found, after further search, that there was a petition sent in 1882, which was brought down with the papers in 1887. I make this explanation because I find I was misinformed. There has, however, been no communication received since 1887.

AID TOWARDS CROSSING THE SAGUENAY.

Mr. COUTURE (Translation) asked, Whether it was the intention of the Government to grant to the inhabitants of the County of Saguenay assistance towards the crossing of the Saguenay in the winter time, either by steamboat or otherwise?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I must state that this matter has not as yet received the consideration of the Government.

PROPOSED WHARF AT ESCOUMAINS.

Mr. COUTURE (Translation) asked, Whether it was the intention of the Government to place a sum of money in the public estimates for 1890-91, to be devoted to the proposed wharf at Escoumains, and what was the amount of that sum?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I cannot now give him any information on the subject; he must wait until the Supplementary Estimates are laid on the Table.

WHARF AT TADOUSAC.

Mr. COUTURE (Translation) asked, Whether it was the intention of the Government to place in the public estimates for 1890-91, a sum of money for the completion of the wharf at Tadousac, and what was the amount of that sum?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to this question I will refer the hon. member to page 53 of the Estimates, which are now before the House, and he will find there the answer to his question.

MALBAIE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. COUTURE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant to Tadousac a daily mail from Malbaie, as prayed for? If not, why not?

Mr. HAGGART. The present service by mail is three times a week in summer by stage, and four times in summer by boats, between Chicoutimi and Quebec; that makes seven services per week in summer. In winter the service is four times per week by stage. The estimated cost of the service applied for is \$941, and the revenue received from that place is \$354. The Department think that the service at present is sufficient.

THE TOBACCO TRADE.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether the Government have received a petition from the tobacco manufacturers, praying for the passing of an Act to compel tobacco growers to sell their tobacco to manufacturers only?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No petitions of that kind have been received by the Government.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you for your loyal Address, and I rely on your wisdom and judgment to aid me in such measures as are necessary to promote the happiness and prosperity of the Dominion.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
February 4th, 1890.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Militia and Defence, for the year ending 30th June, 1889.—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)

DUTY ON FISH IN BOND.

Mr. BOWELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to correct, to a certain extent, the answer which I gave yesterday to the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) in reference to the curing of fish in bond. On further enquiry I find that one or two cargoes of fish were permitted, since the order I spoke of, to be cured in the old way—that is, dried and pickled on the wharf at Halifax. The reason why that permission was given was because the cargoes were purchased before the issue of that order.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

House resumed debate on proposed motion of Mr. Wilson (Elgin):

That, in the opinion of this House, the Electoral Franchise Act ought to be repealed, and that it is preferable to revert to the plan of utilising for the Elections of this House the Provincial Franchises and Voters' Lists.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the motion now before the House, I will take my inspiration from the last remarks which fell from the lips of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) yesterday, who, in closing his address, said, "he hoped that the House would not lose much time in discussing this question, for any member who could give a vote condemning the Bill, could

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

give such a vote on the motion now before the Chair." I tried to learn if anything new had been said on this question, by referring to the debate which took place in 1885, at the time the Franchise Act was passed, but I must confess that yesterday I heard nothing new on the subject. It is true that one of the members on the other side of the House, if he did not speak so long as he did in 1885, at all events spoke louder; and my hon. friend who leads the Opposition appeared to be a little more emotional when he spoke of the privileges of the people and the infringement upon Provincial rights and autonomy. I must say further that I was rather—I will not say disgusted, but discouraged, in trying to peruse the *Hansard*, in finding that the debate of 1885 occupies 1,800 pages, contained in two volumes of the *Hansard*, and in reading over it I ascertained the fact that, when the Bill was introduced, our hon. friends on the other side of the House said that they did not know anything about the measure, and that the House should not be called upon to vote, because the right hon. Premier had introduced it at the end of the Session—although far from the end of the Session it turned out to be. They objected to the Bill, because they said the Premier should not force upon the House a vote on a question which they had not time to study. It is true, the right hon. Premier had already introduced a Bill to the same effect, two or three Sessions previously. But to prove the accuracy of what they had said, my hon. friend spoke for over eight weeks on that subject. It is alarming to the man who consults the *Hansard* of those days. I have read in the discussion which took place yesterday, that one of my hon. friends on the other side of the House said that the Government had carried that measure only by sheer strength of brute force. True enough, but it was not on our side that the brute force was exhibited; and if the House was obliged to sit to the small hours of the morning, we on this side certainly had not much to do except to listen, if we did listen, or to sleep and wake up again in time to ask if a motion was to be put or a vote taken. And I see by the reports of those discussions that when everybody was ready to vote, the eloquence of our hon. friends was not yet exhausted: they were freely quoting extracts from the voyages of Gulliver, and from the explorations of the *Challenger*, in the course of that discussion; I read almost everything in those extracts. It is true, the Chairman of the Committee was constantly calling those members to order, and then they were obliged to discuss the Bill in question. But, Mr. Speaker, to speak seriously on this matter, and not to keep the time of the House, let me ask what were the objections urged against this measure? The objections taken were these—that the Bill should not pass, and the House should vote against it, because it was an encroachment upon provincial rights, an attempt against the liberties of the people, against the principle of a Federal Government, and against the autonomy of the Provinces in the practical carrying out of that Government. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition repeated that yesterday with force and eloquence, but reducing his argument to a minimum. Well, let us meet the question squarely and in the face; is this an attempt to encroach upon Provincial liberty, upon Provincial autonomy or upon Provincial rights. It is not; on the contrary, I maintain that what has been done by the right

hon. Premier and his Government, has been in the line of right policy for the true enactment of the federal principle of government. We do not want to interfere in Provincial matters. I shall not take a lesson or an inspiration from my hon. friends on the other side of the House on the subject of Provincial rights. I have been fighting for them in my Province; I have been fighting for them in this Parliament; I have been opposing an attempt to interfere with them, which was made and defeated in this House, and I had the hearty support of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) on that occasion. I shall not take my inspiration on the subject of Provincial rights from the other side of the House; but I say that if you want to put into practice the independence of the Provinces, you must begin at home, and practice the independence of the Federal Parliament. By whose voices should the representatives in this Parliament be elected? Is it the Provinces that should decide? If you say it is the Provinces, you are encroaching on their privileges; you have no right to ask them to do that duty; you have no right to require them to say who shall come and take their seats here. If you do, you are going to put in conflict the provincial and the federal franchises. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, gave us an example. I am glad to see that my hon. friend is coming quietly and gradually, but truly and surely, to good Conservative principles. He has shown himself to be so by his ultra-loyal utterances last summer in the Province of Ontario, for which I praise him and give him my compliment; but he has scandalised his Radical friends of the Province of Quebec, and the principal organ of the Liberal party in Montreal, *La Patrie*, if I remember well, in committing that great sin of finding fault with the present political tendencies of democratic France. I do not reprove my hon. friend for that sin, for I have committed it before him; but he went one better than I did; for, Liberal as he was, he said he could not approve of the radicalism of the French system of government; he stamped it, as it should be stamped, as the most odious effect of the lower democracy in France; and when he said that the atrocities in that country should be reprov'd by every good man of French origin as he reprov'd them, he went a little further than I did; but he said something that did not displease me, though it scandalised his Radical friends in the Province of Quebec. Everybody knows that my hon. friend is Conservative in instinct, in manner, in every inch of his body, and every grain of his soul. But I must qualify this assertion, Mr. Speaker. I say that every good Britisher in the world is really a good Conservative.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When I say that—and I am sure my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, will agree with me—I make a distinction between a Conservative and a Tory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain. What is the difference?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I shall explain in quoting my hon. friend. I remember one occasion—and my hon. friend will excuse me for repeating the incident—when a friend of his and of mine on an election platform, asked him if he would have a cigar, and he said: “No, Sir, I do not smoke;”

then he was asked if he would have a glass of wine, and he answered: “No, Sir, I do not smoke, I do not drink, and I am not a Tory.” But if he is not a Tory, he is a good British Conservative. Yesterday he told us that he was opposed to that first platform of the Liberal party in other countries and in this country—he is opposed to the platform upon which the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) stood when he spoke: my hon. friend says that, personally, he is opposed to manhood suffrage. I agree with him on that point, and I agree with him also when he says that though it is his opinion, he does not prevent others from having theirs.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend will see that his argument turns against him on that point. My hon. friend is opposed to manhood suffrage; he does not want representatives in this House to be elected on manhood suffrage; but, he says, that although his Province does not want it, he does not wish to prevent other Provinces having manhood suffrage to elect members to this House. Suppose the local cabinet of Quebec—I will not call it a Liberal cabinet; it is not a Liberal cabinet; it is another kind of a Conservative cabinet—not such a good kind—perhaps too much of a Conservative cabinet; but supposing Mr. Mercier and the Legislature of Quebec should establish manhood suffrage as the suffrage of the Province of Quebec, would my hon. friend say: Although I think members of the Federal Parliament should not be elected by manhood suffrage, yet I bow to your decision? My hon. friend had no difficulty in saying that he would bow to Nova Scotia, but Nova Scotia has not manhood suffrage; and that he would bow to British Columbia and to Prince Edward Island, which have manhood suffrage; but in his own Province he is opposed to manhood suffrage. Are we then to have here two representatives in one? Are we to be represented here by the hon. member for Arthabaska (Mr. Laurier), who is opposed to manhood suffrage, and yet who might be elected under the system of manhood suffrage imposed on our Province by a First Minister of Quebec. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson), and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), we have heard exclaiming that the liberties of the people were attacked, that every man should have a vote, and that there should be one vote for one man. There are some phrases which sound very well, and “one man, one vote” has a very attractive ring. But the hon. the leader of the Opposition is diametrically opposed to the hon. members for Brant and Elgin. He says, One man, one vote, you cannot have. If we are to have manhood suffrage, I can understand hon. gentlemen opposite; but if we are to have property qualification, I say that a man should have the right to represent his property in every county where it lies. You have no right to say to me, that if I happen to have property in three counties, I must, without being able to protest by my vote, submit to be represented in two of them by a twopenny-ha'penny scallawag, or a man unfit to be a representative. The hon. member for Brant said, “One man, one vote;” but if we are to go by the Provincial lists, instead of having the one system in the whole country, there is one section of this country where a man has not one vote. I understand that in

Toronto the voter has only two-thirds of a vote (the other third, I am told, is reserved for the Grits). One elector has to vote for three members, and yet he has only two votes. He should at least have three votes. But the Provincial Legislature, in their wisdom, have so arranged it, and, though it may be wise in Provincial matters, I say it is not in Federal matters. So much for the infringement on the rights of the people and on the rights of the Legislatures. But has it not struck my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson)—and I am very much surprised that it has not struck the hon. the leader of the Opposition, who is a very careful leader—that from no Province, not from any one man, from the Premier to the lowest member of the Opposition in any Provincial Legislature, has any complaint been heard that we were infringing upon provincial rights when we took upon ourselves here to define our franchise? Have you heard, Sir, a protest from the Legislature of any one Province? Yes; we had a curious one from the Province of Quebec. We had one from Mr. Mercier, whose policy in matters of electoral franchise I do not wish to discuss, as that is his business. Mr. Mercier has taken upon himself to disfranchise every man who is in receipt of a salary, whether a high salary or a merely nominal one, from this Government. He has refused to every man who is an official of this Government and Parliament the right to vote in Quebec Provincial elections. He refused a vote to men who shovelled snow, after a storm, on the Intercolonial! What has my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson), who is so strong an advocate for manhood suffrage, to say against such an abominable infringement on the rights of the people? Again, the Provincial law of Quebec disfranchises all officers of the Provincial Governments and Legislatures in Dominion matters. But why should the officials of the Provincial Governments be disqualified from voting for members of this House? I do not believe they should, nor do hon. gentlemen opposite. In glancing through the debate in 1885, I find that the corrupt principle which hon. gentlemen opposite asserted was at the bottom of this Bill was the facility it gave the Government to choose servile officers to carry out the law. Hon. gentlemen opposite declared that these officers would be nothing but slaves to the Government. I wish the hon. the leader of the Opposition had been Secretary of State for the last two years, and been obliged to read the letters of the different revising officers; he would then have seen how far they are from being slaves. If ever I have seen independence of mind exhibited and received free expression of opinion, it has been from the revising officers since this law has been in force. My hon. friend need only call for the correspondence, and he will find from it, either that these men, who only hold their positions during good behavior, have been made independent by their sense of duty, or that this bad Government has made a very good choice of those officers.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You were forced to appoint the judges.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We were not forced; but we framed the law in such a way that it should be so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No.

Mr. CASEY. You were forced to change the law.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Let me quote, for the benefit of my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec, where two-thirds of the revising officers are not judges, and will I ask the hon. the leader of the Opposition if he has heard, either here or in the Provincial Legislature of Quebec, which takes upon itself very often to ventilate other grievances than its own, complaints against the Government revising officers in that Province?

Mr. LAURIER. Yes; complaints were made in Parliament here.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There was only one complaint made, and the case was not made out. It is now five years since the law has been in force, and I ask my hon. friend whether everybody is not satisfied with the perfect independence and good behavior and faithful discharge of the duties of the revising officers appointed by the Government?

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I challenge my hon. friend to formulate a single accusation. If my hon. friends opposite wish, I could give them letters from many Conservative electors who have complained to me that really the men appointed by the Government were more of a Liberal shade than Conservative, and complained of the rigor and severity with which these officials performed their duty.

Mr. CASEY. What things people will say!

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They will say the truth sometimes, even outside of this House. It is true that, during the discussion on the Bill, the then member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) complained bitterly, and predicted that all the nominees of the Government for the execution of that iniquitous law, as he called it, would be so much the slaves of the Government that nobody would feel secure in his seat. That prediction has not at all been fulfilled, and my hon. friends opposite know that as well as I do. But a member of the Government is obliged to tell the truth—

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Obligated to?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He ought to.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have a conscience that obliges us to. I was about to say that my hon. friend from Brant—I do not mean the hon. member who spoke yesterday—on one or two occasions did not appear to be very much under that obligation. But I must confess one thing. At the time we first discussed that Bill, it was stated that the cost would be at least a million dollars a year.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; half a million.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not want to be obliged to refer to *Hansard*; but the lowest estimate was about \$500,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes; the hon. member need not object to the statement, because I can quote the authority. It was stated that the Bill would be very costly in execution. That was true. The Government did not deny it; but the Government did in that case as they have done in other cases. I think everyone in the country now admits that we ought to have a Federal Electoral Franchise. The Government never denied that the cost would

be large; but, I think, I stated at the time that the first cost would be heavy in this case, as well as in any other case where a new system was being put into execution; but that the cost would be diminished by degrees, according to the improvements which might be introduced into the system which was adopted. I stated that the cost might reach half a million. I must say that, for the first year, the cost exceeded that estimate; that was not on account of the system, but on account of the time which was lost in the discussion—useless, I might say scandalous, considering the enormous expenditure it entailed—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CHAPLEAU—on account of the scandalous prolongation of that discussion during the Session of 1885, when eight or nine weeks were taken up in the useless discussion of that Bill. I do not count the uneasiness, the harm really committed upon the persons, the bodies of the members, by the endurance they were obliged to submit to; but, taking the expenditure of this House at \$1,000 a day, which is a low estimate, you have an idea of the amount lost in the discussion of that Bill—in the useless part of the discussion of that Bill. Let us put that at \$80,000, which would be a low figure; and it has been estimated at a much larger figure. According to the well scrutinised Report of the Auditor General, an authority recognised by hon. gentlemen opposite, and often quoted by them, the cost of making the lists in 1886 came to \$409,000 or \$413,000.

Mr. CASEY. Quote from the authority.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Is it necessary, when a Minister gives his word on the floor of the House, to quote his authority? According to the Report of the Auditor General the cost was \$413,454.68.

Mr. CASEY. Cost of what?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Cost of the first revision.

Mr. EDGAR. There are \$5,000 to be added to that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have the Auditor General's Report showing the expenditure to 31st January, 1890, for the electoral lists in the Dominion of Canada. The expenditure on the first revision was what I have stated. The first report was \$409,000, but afterwards reports were made which brought it up to the amount I have stated—\$413,454.68.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman does not include in that the use of capital and the wear and tear on the new printing establishment.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have always stated that the wear and tear of this House were not included, and I may add that the wear and tear of the printing house is not included either.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Nor the interest on the capital.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend from Brant yesterday said we would have lost at least two million dollars if the law had been properly executed. The law has been properly executed with a view to the wants of the country, and, remembering that it is a new law, it has been very properly and efficiently executed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Having elections on a list made four years ago.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The law was passed in 1885,

and the elections of 1887 took place under lists which were revised in 1886. I have never heard any complaints in regard to them, or any statement that they have not been an improvement on the previous lists. It is true that some hon. gentlemen opposite complained that the returns of some of their friends were not reported soon enough. It was, perhaps, better. It prevented false representations to be sent abroad as to the result of the elections, as, in order to catch votes, it was stated in some parts of the country that the Government were beaten on all the lines in the Provinces, so as to prejudice the elections in the Territories. I have not heard any statement that the lists, as revised by the revising officers, were not fair. Was it then necessary to have a revision of those lists immediately after the election? We had to look after the system, which was a new one, and we had to look after the expenditure. I do not want to take credit to myself, but I have been working to that end. I do not say that I have succeeded, as much as I would like to have succeeded, in reducing the expenditure, but this return will show that the expenditure has been greatly reduced, and will be still further reduced. My hon. friend said that in four Sessions this would cost two million dollars. This year the revision has been made after three years, and everyone understood that the cost would be considerable. The necessity of printing two supplementary lists has had its inconveniences, particularly as it was not foreseen and took us by surprise, as it took the revising officers by surprise. I was sorry that sickness prevented me for six months from attending to my business, so that I was unable to consult with the revising officers in regard to this matter. Whether they were Grit or Tory, Liberal or Conservative, I should be glad to follow their advice whenever it was possible, but I was not able to follow it last year because I was absent through sickness. I hope I shall be able to follow that advice now; and I know that these officers are as anxious as myself to reduce the expenditure. But what do we see in regard to the revision of 1889? Did it cost \$500,000 or \$413,000? No; it has cost \$150,134 up to this moment, and, including the new furniture, plant, &c., put into the printing bureau for that purpose, amounting to \$1,223, we have a total of \$151,357.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does that pay the whole expense?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It pays the whole, less a very small fraction of the accounts that have not yet been sent in. My hon. friends will believe me when I tell them that when the revision was ended in November and December, the accounts very soon began to come in.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does that include the bureau expense, or just the outside expense?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It includes the new furniture that was put in the printing bureau; it does not include the interest on the cost of the printing bureau itself. It does not include the interest of the plant that was bought for printing the voters' lists. I will speak of that when we come to the item which is to be voted for the revision of the list next year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does it include the printers' wages or salaries?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It does.

Mr. LAURIER. Does it include the price of outside printing?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes; and I will, to-morrow, lay before the House the cost of printing done outside. I know that the Liberal press has been very eager in saying that the distribution of that patronage on my part was something scandalous, and that this year the patronage and expenditure outside the printing of these lists would be enormous. The printers, as well as the revising officers, were not slow in sending in their accounts, and the accounts I have now for all the outside printing amount to not more than \$9,000 up to the present moment. But I must say that our experience shows that the printing, which at first cost, for some reasons depending on the difference in price, 10 cents a name, has cost this year only between 3 and 4 cents a name. When the proper time comes I shall be ready to lay before the House a statement showing that I have exercised all possible economy in the expenditure incurred by the execution of the law. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will complete my argument, and I will say that the law as it stands to-day is an expensive machinery. I do not think it is too costly for the benefit we have derived from it, but I shall say that up to the present moment it has cost too large a sum of money if it had to be repeated every year at the same cost.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am very glad to hear my hon. friends say "hear, hear." I feel that I would say "hear, hear" myself, and I have said it to myself before. If that expenditure of \$150,000 or \$160,000 had to be incurred every year, I would say that the law was too expensive. I said the last time that the expenditure, which was \$409,000 or \$413,000, would be reduced the second time by at least 50 per cent., and it has been reduced by more than 50 per cent.; and I think I can say that the next revision will show a reduction of more than 30 per cent. again upon that figure. But I am not ready to give an opinion to the House now, whether the revision should take place annually or bi-annually; I am still less ready or authorised to give an expression of the intention of the Government upon that subject. But I express my own personal opinion. I do not see that it is necessary, I do not see that it works harder for one side or the other, that a revision should take place every other year. My hon. friend said: You are ashamed of your law, because the law said that revisions should take place every year. So it might; and I think that with the improvement in the machinery that we have for the printing of these lists now, it may become possible, and not very costly, to have the revised voters' lists printed yearly without adding much to the expenditure of the country. As I said, it is my personal opinion that if the cost were to remain as it is, the expenditure would be too heavy to incur every year. But is it absolutely necessary that the revision should take place every year? I will answer my hon. friend. I know something about this law, and the working of it. My hon. friend will say that the changes of residence in a city, the movement of electors from one district or one county from another, are very great—and so they

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

may be at certain times—and if an election were to take place every year, many of the electors would be deprived of their right to vote. Now, speaking of the Province from which I come, I may say that for the last twenty-five years, on an average, we have never had elections on which the lists were not two or three years old. I speak of what I know, I speak of my own Province, and my hon. friend knows it to be true. We might remedy this in the law, and prevent the difficulty which I anticipate by migrations of electors, especially in large cities; that difficulty might be avoided in the law by giving the right to vote in their old district to those who have changed their domicile—that is, giving them the right to vote there for one year at least. Now, I want to answer another observation of my hon. friend. The objection is: You cannot in Federal Parliament, in a Confederation like our own, have a uniform mode of voting. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition quoted the United States. Well, what is the electoral franchise in all the States, with the exception of one or two? It is manhood suffrage, with residence, or with notice of residence, or being citizens of the United States, or declaring one's intention of becoming a citizen of the United States. Can this apply to our country? Will my hon. friend, who is opposed to manhood suffrage, say that we should follow the example of the United States, that we should do as they do there, because really that kind of franchise is uniform in the American Republic? It is not uniform here, and as long as we establish a property qualification, it cannot be uniform. But, Mr. Speaker, we make it to suit ourselves. Is there not now a difference in the qualification of electors in a large portion of the Maritime Provinces and in a portion of the Province of Quebec? Have not the fishermen who belong to a portion of the population which is specially located in one or two of the Provinces, been treated exceptionally? We are obliged to do that. My hon. friend said the value of property in Ontario is not the same as in the Province of Quebec. We know that very well. The vote in towns and rural districts is not the same. But, Mr. Speaker, we could not remedy that, and the Provincial Legislatures could not remedy it. In conclusion, therefore, I say this: The first objection taken, that this Bill was an infringement of provincial rights, has not been sustained, and, in fact, does not exist. The second objection, that relating to the corruption and servility and inefficiency of the officers connected with its administration, has been completely refuted by the work performed by the revising officers all over the country; and I say it to their credit. The third objection, that relating to the expenditure, is one in regard to which I may say that we are steadily reducing the expenditure with the growth of the system, and I hope before long that the improvements will be such that, after one or more trials have been had, a revision will be able to be made every year without incurring much cost to the country.

Mr. CASEY. That the Government feel this to be a serious question, is shown conclusively by the fact that they have put up to defend their case the hon. gentleman, who is admittedly the most eloquent, either in the French or English language, of

hon. members on the Government benches. That he, the champion of the Government, has felt this to be a serious question, is proven by the care with which his speech was prepared; by whom prepared, I cannot say. The result of his speech comes out in the last sentence or two that he uttered. He told the House in the very last passage, which usually contains the pith of a speech, that a franchise cannot be made uniform so long as property qualification is retained, and that, therefore, according to him, a franchise arranged by the different Provinces must be unsound and not an uniform qualification. Why, in 1885, the great argument used in favor of this special Bill which the hon. gentleman has been put up to defend, and almost the only argument used, was, that it would establish a uniform system throughout the Dominion. Has it done so? No. What is the franchise in Prince Edward Island and in British Columbia? Is the franchise there the same as that we enjoy in Ontario, or the same as the hon. gentleman's French constituents enjoy? By no means. In the two former Provinces they have manhood suffrage; in all the other Provinces we have property qualifications. So, on the confession of the champion set up by the Government to defend this Bill, it does not give a uniform franchise, and, on his own confession, it cannot give a uniform qualification throughout all the Provinces. The hon. gentleman has said that we have introduced nothing new into this debate; that the remarks have simply been a rehash of what was said in 1885; that there have been no new facts or arguments advanced. So far as facts are concerned, we have new facts; but I admit we have no new arguments. And the reason is this: the arguments we advanced in 1885, and enforced from day to day, and which in many cases compelled the Ministry to change their policy in regard to the details of the Bill, have been justified by the facts which have occurred since. Does the hon. gentleman want new arguments to prove that the earth is round, or that such a force as the attraction of gravitation exists, and that the solar system is moved by that force? If he does not, it is no more of a reproach to our arguments to-day to say they are not new, than it would be a reproach to the arguments of Newton and Galileo to say that they are not new to-day. The arguments we used in 1885 against this Bill are as old as truth, justice and fair play, and hon. gentlemen opposite will hear them year after year, unchanged in any particular, but reiterated and reinforced by new facts, until this iniquitous and fraudulent Act has gone the way of many Acts that have preceded it. The hon. gentleman has said the chief objection adduced in 1885, was that the Bill was introduced too late in the Session, and yet eight weeks were spent in discussing it, and that, ultimately, it was passed through by brute force. The hon. gentleman said so himself. I am not quoting what he said about us, but what he said about his own side of the House, and he stated that they did not have to do much, but sit still and listen, and go to sleep once in a while, and waken to vote. I am glad to have the hon. gentleman's candid confession of the business of his followers in regard to passing the Bill in 1885, whose duty was to sleep until they were called upon to vote, and then to vote. That is exactly what they did, and of what they complained.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They were called to vote, but did not vote.

Mr. CASEY. They did vote when required. The hon. gentleman has told us that the Government had a sweeping majority, who were ready to awaken when the division bell rang, but whose ears were closed at all other times to the arguments presented on this side of the House. The hon. Minister has argued that this Act is no encroachment on Provincial rights, and he has said, that he does not wish to interfere with those rights. He failed, however, to give us any arguments to prove that proposition. From the commencement of Confederation to the passing of that Act, the Provinces had the right to fix their own franchise as well for elections for this House as for elections for the Local Legislatures. Will the hon. Minister contend for a moment, that the taking away of that right from the Provinces was not an infringement of rights which they had enjoyed since the beginning of Confederation? I admit that this Parliament had a legal right under the constitution to pass such an Act; but I say it was an infringement of Provincial rights, to the extent of taking away from the Provinces rights they had continuously enjoyed, and rights which they could fairly expect to continuously enjoy so long as Confederation lasted, and in that sense the Act was a distinct invasion of Provincial rights. Not only was it an invasion of rights which had been enjoyed, but it was an invasion of rights which should be enjoyed by each Province whether previously enjoyed or not. Who knows so well what is a proper basis for the franchise for each Province as the Legislature of that Province? Would the hon. gentleman be willing to admit that this House knows more about the circumstances of the Province of Quebec as to what franchise would best suit the genius of the people, than does the Local Assembly? We must scout such an idea. No doubt my hon. friend near me would be the first to take up his musket against such a proposal and go to the front. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if you are as patriotic as I believe you are, you would share this sentiment. And a similar argument applies to Ontario. Each Province truly knows what sort of a franchise is best suited to its needs. In Ontario the Local Legislature has seen fit to adopt the principle of manhood suffrage. In Quebec they still adhere to a property qualification. I do not know which is right, but I am aware that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario reflects the opinion of the people of Ontario, and the Legislative Assembly of Quebec reflects the opinion of the people of Quebec, and therefore those two assemblies have the right to fix the franchise for their own elections, and they should have the right to fix the franchise for election to this Parliament. If it were possible to obtain a uniform suffrage for the whole Dominion, I have no objection to it, but we have pointed out time and again, and we have enforced by divisions taken in this House, that the only way by which we could obtain a uniform suffrage for the whole Dominion is by introducing the principle of manhood suffrage. My hon. friends opposite have voted down and decried the only kind of suffrage that could possibly be uniform in the whole Dominion, and they have instituted instead certain property qualifications which are piecemeal, and which are unfair to many Pro-

vinces, and to many thousands of the electors of this Dominion. I think that my hon. friend the Secretary of State gave away his whole case. He is a generous man, a very generous man, when he admitted that this Act was so costly that the revision could not be enforced every year. That was our contention in 1885, but hon. gentlemen opposite insisted that the revision was to be so cheap that we would not notice the cost of enforcing it. Now, the spokesman of the Government, the eloquent champion whom they have put up to defend them, and the Minister who is directly in charge of this Department, admits that this Act cannot be carried into effect annually, because it is too expensive. I contend that a Franchise Act providing for the revision of the electoral lists which is not carried into effect every year, is not practically carried into effect at all. I say that a revision every three or four years, which he tells us is sufficient (and, I suppose from his statement that the Government intend to have a revision only every three or four years), is not enough. I hold that it is not carrying out the law, and that it is not giving to our young men as they grow up the rights which they are entitled to as citizens of this country. Why, Sir, ever since Confederation, in respect to Provincial elections, and up to the passing of the present Act, in regard to Dominion elections, every young man who attained the age of twenty-one years, and had the qualifications required by law, knew that he would have a voice in the government of the country. But my hon. friend the Secretary of State now says to these young men: You cannot have these rights under the present law, you will have to wait two or three years; we will have these revisions exactly when we like, and if we think the list is favorable to us, we will not revise it again until after the next election.

An hon. MEMBER. They will postpone the revision.

Mr. CASEY. Yes; they will postpone the revision when it suits themselves. On the other hand, the Government say: If we have anything to gain by a revision we will have it before we go to the country; and by this system the rights of the electors are not considered at all. The hon. Minister said that the rights of the Province were not concerned in the postponement of this revision, but I maintain that the rights of the individuals of this country are concerned, and by his abject confession it is shown that the Government have passed a Bill that they cannot work. By his admission that they do not intend to work it yearly, he has shown that the Government is doing a direct injustice to the young men of this country, in depriving them of rights which are inherent in them as citizens of Canada and as British subjects. More than that, the Government by this course is doing what is traitorous to the interests of the country, as well as what is unjust to the people. A revision which is only to be enforced every two or three years is disloyal. That word "disloyal" is a favorite one on the other side of the House, and I think I have found a very suitable application for it now. Any Act which provides such a disfranchisement of the young men of the country is disloyal, because it is disloyal to deprive, on the mere whim of a Minister, British subjects of their right to vote which they have acquired according to law. The hon. gentle-

Mr. CASEY.

man does not even propose that this revision shall take place at stated times, but he proposes that it will be left at the will of the Government to say when the revision shall take place; and that means, as I have said before, that the rights of Canadians to vote shall be subject to the whim of the hon. the Secretary of State and of his colleagues for the time being. I am glad, I am very glad, to have heard such a full confession from the hon. Minister, and to be able to herald to the country at large the fact that henceforth the votes of the young citizens of Canada are at the mercy of the Secretary of State. The hon. Minister says that we, on this side of the House, indulged in scandalous calumnies in 1885, when we said that the revisions of this list would cost \$500,000. He told us that the minimum estimate was half a million. Well, Sir, my memory of that debate is quite as good as his, and I venture to say that the maximum estimate from this side of the House was not much more than half a million, while I know perfectly well that the minimum estimate began at \$250,000 and ran up to half a million, and a little over. Now let us consider how our estimates were justified. We find in the Sessional Papers of 1889 a return showing that the cost for the last revision had been \$414,921.76, and that \$5,264 and odd cents were still unsettled. The hon. Minister himself gave the figures at \$413,454; more than a thousand dollars less than the amounts found in the Sessional Papers which were laid before the House. I do not know where he got his figures, or where he arrives at the less sum than the official report. It is a small matter, but still it is worth noticing that he differs from the official report in his statement of facts. For this last year the Minister tells us, on the basis of information known to himself alone so far, that the cost will be \$150,000, and he admits that, even at a cost of \$150,000 a year, it would be absurd and abominable to place such a tax upon the country annually for revising these lists. I think, Sir, that our statements, which he denounced as scandalous calumnies in 1885, have been more than justified by the facts, and that his own humble confession to-day is more damaging to the Government than anything which we stated against them at that time. The Secretary of State says, speaking for his own Province, that the Provincial lists used in elections there have been usually two or three years old. I have heard strong expressions of dissent from that statement from members of the Province of Quebec who sit around me, and I have yet to ascertain how far the hon. Minister is misinformed in regard to that statement. I know, however, that the local lists used in the Province of Ontario are not usually two or three years old, but that they are usually prepared very much more promptly than the Dominion lists and ready for use much earlier in the season. I will leave it to the members for Quebec to defend the promptness of their own municipal officers in that respect. Suppose it were true that the lists, commonly used in Quebec, were two or three years old, I will call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the County of Haldimand, and ask him what was the age of the lists used in that county last election? How many hundreds of men who had as good a right to vote in the County of Haldimand as the hon. the Secretary of State had in his county, were prevented from exercising that franchise by his

iniquitous refusal to enforce the revision of the lists every year? Taking his own statement of the facts in Quebec, be it correct or incorrect, the state of affairs there could not be worse than that which has prevailed in Dominion elections in Ontario since the last general election. Then, he says, look to the United States, and see what is the franchise there; the franchise there, he says, is practically uniform. Why, Mr. Speaker, the franchise in the United States is a State franchise; an exact parallel of what we ask for here. Each State fixes the franchise for itself, and that is the same franchise under which men vote in the Federal elections. The hon. Secretary of State himself has referred us to the United States, and I accept the reference gladly; because, as most of us know, but as possibly he did not know—because there are some things he does not know—the reference strengthens our view of the case, but not his. The United States is a Federal Republic; and we are practically a Federal Republic, though working under monarchical forms; and we find that the same kind of franchise prevails there that we desire for this country. The inference is that if the hon. Secretary of State would only turn his eyes there, he would see that he ought to support this motion instead of opposing it. Now, Sir, I do not think there are any other points in the hon. gentleman's remarks. I am glad he has made this speech, for two reasons: in the first place, because he has confessed that this Act is unworkable; and in the second place, because he has told us that the Government do not intend to work it. We now know two things we did not know before—that the Government admit that this is an unworkable Act, and that they are only going to revise the lists every few years. These are two things worth knowing, and however valuable the time of the Secretary of State may be, I think he has spent some of it to good purpose this afternoon in telling us these facts, so that the young voters who are growing up in the country will learn that they must wait for their votes until it suits his whim or the purpose of the Government to have a new revision of the lists.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Before the vote is taken, I beg leave to engage the attention of the House for a short time to express my opinion on this question. I feel a good deal of backwardness on rising to speak on a question that has been handled so ably by old parliamentarians, but I feel it my duty to express to this House and the country my opinion on the working of this Act. The hon. the Secretary of State, in his very eloquent and forcible address, stated at the outset that nothing new was adduced in the arguments on this side of the House. He must know that although there are no new arguments, there are plenty of old ones to be urged and pressed home until hon. gentlemen opposite are induced to grant a repeal of this Act, which I believe the majority of the people of this country is anxious to have. But almost in the next sentence the hon. Secretary of State stated that the line of argument pursued on this side was different from the line of argument pursued four years ago. If so, something new must have been said. Therefore, I think he hardly considered that point before he expressed himself as he did. The hon. Secretary of State

appears to have spoken on this question wholly and entirely from a Quebec standpoint. It appears to me that he has a crow to pick with two hon. gentlemen, one of whom is present in this House, and the other in the Legislature of Quebec. He appeared to combat the arguments of the hon. leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Honoré Mercier in regard to certain views promulgated by them. But these things do not concern us who live in the west. We have a right to discuss this measure from an Ontario standpoint, and it is wholly from that standpoint that I present my arguments to-day. I believe an injustice is done to the Province of Ontario by this Franchise Act. In the first place, it is unjust to Ontario because it is illiberal. We were told last night by the hon. Minister of Public Works that, in his opinion, this Act was very liberal. He said that from a Quebec standpoint; and not one single hon. member from the Province of Ontario who sits behind him has the moral courage to stand up and speak on behalf of the people he represents. You know, Sir, that both parties in the Province of Ontario are in favor of manhood suffrage. Only two years ago the leader of the Conservative party in the Ontario Legislature moved a resolution in favor of the Government extending manhood suffrage to the young men of that Province, and he was supported in doing so by every Conservative member of the House; and although the Government at that time did not accept the resolution, only two years passed when the Reform party of Ontario enacted a law giving to every young man of the age of 21 years and over the right to vote; and both parties in the Legislature voted unanimously in favor of that Act. Now, Sir, we have in this House a large number of members sitting behind the Government, from the Province of Ontario, and not one of them has put forth a plea for the young men who engaged so actively in their elections and brought out the voters, or asked for them the franchise. As the Dominion Franchise Act does not extend that privilege to the young men of Ontario, we have a right to demand of the Government that the Act should be repealed, in order that the privilege should be extended to them by the more liberal, more enlightened and more progressive Government of Ontario. Now; how do the young men of Ontario argue in regard to this matter? They argue in this way: We are using every year articles upon which duties are imposed, and, therefore, we contribute to the Dominion revenue; we, therefore, should have a voice in the administration of affairs at Ottawa, and in seeing how these moneys are expended; but this right is denied us by the Dominion Government, and if this Act is repealed, the Act of the Ontario Legislature will place us in a position to vote for members of the Dominion Parliament to look after our interests at Ottawa. Again they argue in this way: We have an interest in the public domain of this country. The older people have entered upon their inheritance, but we have not yet entered upon ours; we are standing at the very threshold of our manhood, and should have a voice in the management of that public domain which is being frittered away by the Ottawa Government. Many have pointed out to me a few facts to show how this great inheritance is being dissipated. One gentleman, for instance,

who sits in Parliament, received fifty square miles for \$250, and realised from the same \$200,000. Another hon. gentleman who sits on the Treasury benches, received a grant of land for \$316, and the parties into whose hands that went realised on it \$50,000 or \$60,000. There is another case, that of Hunter's Island, which was sold for \$7,500 to private individuals who afterwards re-sold it for \$650,000, thus realising a fortune out of the inheritance which properly belongs to the young men of this country. And the Government at Ottawa, under the Dominion Franchise Act, refuses to grant to our young men the privilege of voting, refuses to give them the right of sending men to Ottawa to look after their interests and protect the public domain, which is their inheritance and on which they have not yet entered. These young men say also: We have a right to vote for Dominion members, because if any disturbance arises anywhere in this country, it is we who are expected to shoulder arms and bear the brunt of battle; and they point to the rebellion of 1885, brought about by the maladministration of this Government, brought about by the neglect of their duties towards the Métis of the North-West, and they ask: Who were the men, when that rebellion broke out, who left their farms, and their workshops, and their schools, to fight Canada's battles in the North-West, and restore to this country the harmony we now enjoy? If the Government, they say, can make war and force us into fighting their battles, we demand the right to have a voice in sending men to Parliament to represent our interests. They say also, and with much force, for it is an important matter: Give us a chance, upon the very threshold of manhood, to take our share in the affairs of the country, and you will thereby cultivate among us a national spirit; but if you deny us what the United States grant their young men, we will, as many have done, go to the United States, where the full privileges of citizenship will be conferred upon us, and we will be able to take our part in directing the destinies of the country whose wealth and strength we are building up. Refuse to Canadian young men privileges which other countries grant them, and they will certainly go as many have gone. The hon. the Secretary of State says it is not necessary to revise these lists every year, and he gave us, as instance, his own Province, where, he said, very few changes were taking place, and where the lists revised in one year would do several years without change. Let me mention to him a fact in disproof of that statement. A newspaper in his Province, called *La Justice*, stated that during the election in Rimouski, it was found that 350 heads of families, who were on the lists in 1886, had disappeared, and they had not disappeared to take up homes in other parts of the Province, but they had gone to the United States, where they can enjoy those privileges which Lower Canada refuses to grant her young men. In the small parish of St. Mathieu, of 200 names on the list, 48 had gone to the United States since 1886, showing conclusively that the people of Lower Canada are moving, and as those who take their places are not added to the lists, the lists consequently are very inaccurate. Another reason I would press in favor of the repeal of the Act is its cumbersomeness. It requires, as everybody who knows anything of its working, a great deal of machinery to operate it. It

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

requires revising officers, clerks, bailiffs, lawyers, and I do not know how many other officials, to revise these lists; and I appeal, in all soberness, to every Conservative member who has had anything to do with the revision, if it has not been very expensive to the people, as well as expensive to the Government. We have lawyers' fees, clerks' fees, appellants' fees and witnesses' fees, to pay, summonses to serve, registration, postage, and many other sources of expenditure, which weigh very heavily upon those interested in the revision; and when you add those expenses to the expenses incurred by the Government, you will find that this Act is a most expensive piece of machinery which is not at all necessary. We used the other lists for seventeen long years. Was there any agitation from any part of the country in favor of a new method? No. Did hon. members urge upon the Government the necessity of establishing a Dominion franchise? Not at all. Did the people hold meetings and pass resolutions in favor of any change? No. Were there any delegations sent to Ottawa to interview the Ministers concerning it? No. There was no move on the part of the people in this direction. Every county and every Province, Conservative and Reform, was perfectly satisfied with the system followed during those seventeen years. I hold, therefore, that the Act, absolutely unnecessary, should be repealed. Another good reason for its repeal, and a very important one, is the question of expense. There has been some discussion with regard to the amount of the expense. I have gone carefully over the Auditor General's Report, and after adding the different items carefully together, I find the expense of the first list amounts to \$492,625. Let me give you a few figures with regard to the expense in my own county, and if each hon. member would give the expenses in his own county we could tell closer the aggregate expenditure. In our county it has cost us, according to the Government reports, \$8,064 for the one revision. If you will add to that \$7,000 for the second revision, you will find \$15,064 for the two revisions, and if you will add the expenses entailed upon the two parties fighting the lists through the various courts, you will get \$18,000, at least, of expenditure in one solitary county divided into three ridings. According to the population in my county that would be no less than 27 cents per every man, woman, and child in the county, for the two revisions, and there was only one election under the two revisions; so that it cost \$1.19 for every voter who was placed upon the list, the number of voters being 15,363; and it comes to \$1.61 for every voter who polled his vote at the last election, the number being 11,229. If that is not an expensive method for this country to adopt, I should like to hear some explanation why it is not. I would ask gentlemen opposite, apart from their own political leanings, apart from their interests here, but in the interest of their country, in the interest of their constituency, in the interest of themselves individually, if that is not too much expense to entail upon the people of this country, and that for a law which is absolutely unnecessary for the promotion of the public business. That cost comes to \$2.30 on every farm in the County of Huron, and, as that county is largely agricultural, you may say that it amounts to a tax of at least \$2 on every farmer. I

am almost sorry that my friends battled so nobly as they did in 1885, when they fought here for six or seven weeks, night and day, with a determination, a vim, and, shall I say, a valor, in the interest of the country, which has never been surpassed. If they had allowed that monstrosity of a Bill to pass in the shape in which it was first introduced, I believe the representatives of the people of the country would have repealed it long before this. But, acting in the interests of the country, they gave to the country a Bill which was better and more acceptable than if they had failed in their opposition. The Secretary of State to-day admitted that the fighting of the Opposition at that time had purified the Bill and made it better. That the revising officers being chosen from the judges of Ontario was a better provision than that they should be chosen from the barristers or lawyers of the Dominion, because he believed the judges would be more impartial than the barristers selected from the lawyers of Canada. I believe that to be true. I believe that in many parts the revising barristers are acting as well as they possibly can, but they complain in many places that they cannot understand the Act. They say that the changes which have been made render it almost impossible to harmonise its provisions. I know that the revising barristers who are employed in my county are as good lawyers, and as sincere and honest, as any in the country; but one of the revising barristers told me that the Act was not properly understood, and he blamed the Government for not placing an Act upon the Statute-book which could be more easily understood. The clause alluding to students and others attending schools is difficult to interpret. I appeared before the court in Wingham, in order to get my son on the list, he being twenty-one years of age, and a student in Toronto. The judge decided that the Government having repealed that section in reference to students, my son could not go on the list. Afterwards, however, he got new light, and allowed students to go on; and, when he was asked: Why did you prevent Dr. Macdonald's son from going on? he said that there was another student in the riding who was on the opposite side, and he did not allow him to go on, and the one would balance the other. Was that any satisfaction to me or to my son? I say, therefore, that the law is cumbersome, that it is not well understood, and that it is unjust to the party which is not in power. There is no hon. gentleman opposite who will sit down and talk quietly in regard to this matter, who will admit that he would like to place in the hands of his political opponent the making of the lists on which he is to be elected. I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to rise in his place and state that he would desire to place such a power in the hands of his political opponent. It is easy to get names on these lists, and, once they are on, it costs at least \$2 each to get the names off, and sometimes you cannot get evidence to satisfy the judge. It is altogether unjust to the party in opposition, and, if I were on the side of the Government to-day, I would say the same thing. I ask the House to consider this question on its merits, and to extend the right to Ontario to place on the voters' lists its young men to whom it is prepared to give manhood suffrage. In regard to the Province of Quebec, I agree that the views of those who

have spoken should be perfectly considered. They state that they are not prepared to give manhood suffrage to their young men. We spend \$6 in Ontario for every \$1 which Quebec spends on education, and, therefore, we educate our young men in Ontario so that, when they reach twenty-one years of age, they are fit to exercise the franchise.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I challenge the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I will refer my hon. friend to the Statistical Record issued by this Government, wherein the expenses of the educational systems in both Provinces are given. There he will find that we in Ontario last year spent \$3,935,000 on educational purposes, while Lower Canada spent \$625,000 on educational purposes; and, I think, that is about six to one. I do not say this at all in an offensive spirit to the French Canadians, but I say it in order to show that we are preparing our young men for public life, and that, when they attain their majority, we are ready to pass over to them their share in the government of this country. I think this Government should repeal an Act which has cost so much and which keeps certain classes out of the franchise, so that a more enlightened and progressive Government may give to the young men of Ontario a privilege which the Tory Government at Ottawa refuse to accord.

Mr. LISTER. It seems to me, Sir, that on every occasion this question comes before the House, hon. gentlemen on the other side pursue the tactics they did in 1885, and remain silent or else leave the House. The Government, for the purpose of defending themselves from the attack made by the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, have put up one of the ablest men in the Cabinet of the day—by all odds the ablest debater, the most eloquent speaker; but if the defence that he has made for the Government is a defence of this Bill, then I say, unhesitatingly, that the Bill is indefensible. Sir, the words which the young Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his youthfulness and inexperience, thought proper to use to a gentleman on this side of the House the other day—that he “had made the matter as clear as mud”—would apply with great force to the speech made by the Secretary of State. That gentleman is scarcely fair in his criticisms; he is scarcely fair when he states that the Premier of the Province of Quebec had disfranchised the Dominion officials. He ought to have gone on and stated, in all fairness, that the hon. gentleman had also disfranchised every official of the local Government. Sir, I am one of those who believe that it is in the interest of the public service of this country that the men who have pledged themselves, by entering that service, to devote themselves to the service of this country, should be removed from the stir and turmoil of political life, that the moment they become public servants of Canada they should cease to be partisans; and I believe that I voice the feelings of the great majority of the public servants of this country, when I say that if their wish was regarded by the Government, they would not be asked to vote for one party or the other. The hon. gentleman has told us that this discussion in 1885 was a scandalous discussion. He talks about what he knows nothing of. He was not in the House, and he has admitted that he did not even take the pains to

peruse the discussion upon that occasion. Did he tell us that the Bill which was introduced by the Government was the most scandalous Bill that was ever introduced into a free Parliament? Did he tell us that if that Bill had become law in the shape in which it was introduced by the First Minister it would have fettered and manacled the electorate of this country, and that it was through the efforts of the Opposition of this House, day in, and day out, that we even have the law as we find it now upon the Statute-book? Did he tell us, that while the members upon this side of the House were battling for the rights of the people at large, the members who support the Government were called in to vote when the bell rang, or that they reposed upon their seats in sleeping postures? Did he tell us that the Finance Minister had found it necessary to bring a pillow into this House in order that he might rest his beautiful head? Did he point out to us the calm appearance of that hon. gentleman when he slumbered so peacefully on his pillow? Why, Sir, it will be for all time a disgrace to the Conservative party of this country, that they should have introduced such a Bill, and it will be a disgrace to the independence of those who supported that measure, that they should have so blindly followed the Government. Sir, that Bill will last as long as the present leader of the Government lasts. I believe that there is not a single man on the Conservative side of the House to-day who, if he expressed his own free wish, would not say that he wished that Bill were repealed—that we should have no such measure as that. I can say that I have spoken to many a Conservative in this House, and I have yet to find one single man amongst them who will admit that it is an honest measure, that it is a good measure, that it is a measure in the interest of this country. I cannot hope to add anything to what has been said in opposition to this Bill; but I conceive it to be my duty, on this and on every other occasion, to the people whom I represent, to emphasise their disapprobation of such a measure as this. I do not complain of the gentleman who has been acting as revising officer in the county which I represent. He has done as fairly as it is possible for a man to do; but I oppose the principle of the Bill because, while revising officers may act fairly, it is within their power to act unfairly and to disfranchise electors throughout the country. The Government put up the Minister of Public Works to defend this Bill. He bobbed up serenely as soon as the leader of the Opposition had closed his speech, and that hon. gentleman's speech was a complete justification for the complaints which we are now making against the measure. He admitted that this Bill was expensive; he did not pretend to say that it was necessary, but he expressed the hope that they might reduce the expenditure required to carry it out. That hon. gentleman referred to the system of government they had in the United States; and I would remark, in passing, that he is not evidently a very close student of the American system of government, because the account which he thought proper to give us was of the most superficial character. Sir, in passing this measure, the Government of the day have invaded the rights of the Provinces, they have usurped the rights of the Provinces, as recognised

Mr. LISTER.

and admitted for seventeen long years. Suddenly the leader of the Government thinks that it is necessary to deprive the people of this country of the advantages of the system under which they have lived for so many years. He tells us that the present system of preparing voters' lists in this country is in accordance with a federal system. I challenge the Secretary of State, I challenge the Minister of Public Works, the only two men who have dared to get up, out of all the men who support the Government, and make any attempt to defend this iniquitous measure. I challenge these gentlemen to show me any state in the world having a federal system which takes upon itself the preparation of the voters' lists, where these lists are not left to the several provinces or states forming that confederation. This list is an expensive one. As has been truly said by the gentleman who just preceded me: it is not only the cost that the people of the country have to bear in supporting the Government, but it is the cost which individuals have to bear in seeing that the lists for the representation of the parties are fairly made out. I say here that the cost which individuals have to bear in the preparation of these lists almost equals the cost which the Government have to pay for the preparation of the lists. I say that this Act places it in the hands of the Dominion Government, in the hands of the officials appointed by that Government, power to wrong the electors. It is not necessary to say that they have not wronged the electors, for the Act puts it in the power of the officials to do so. It adds enormously to the burdens of an over-taxed people. We have here to-day the Secretary of State admitting that the first revision of this list cost over \$400,000, and he tells us that whenever it is revised in the future it will cost over \$100,000. I venture the prediction here now, that whenever that list is revised it will cost over \$200,000. I say that the estimate that he has given us to-day is entirely inadequate, and does not represent the true amount that has been expended by the Government for the last revision of the list. Sir, in addition to that, what have we upon our hands? If there is a man living, and if there ever was a man born in the world, fond of patronage, the Secretary of State is that man. He lavishes it with a prodigal hand. His friends in the east, west, north and south must live at the public crib, and if they do not get what he wants, he sulks and threatens to resign, until the leader of the Government makes it up again. That hon. gentleman, for the purpose of patronage, for the purpose of placing in his own hands power, invents this magnificent idea of what I call a "white" elephant—the printing bureau. He invents that scheme for the purpose of distributing patronage, nominally because it is necessary to printing the voters' lists of the country. From Vancouver to Prince Edward Island every Tory sheet appears in the Public Accounts for an enormous sum of money. The hon. gentleman said we were going to save that amount by establishing the printing bureau. Look at the Public Accounts, however, and see if it is not a fact that, in spite of the printing bureau, the sheets are down for almost similar amounts as in previous years. With a country such as ours and with the country in its present condition, reckless and profligate extravagance of the people's money should receive the censure of

this House. The sum of \$400,000, instead of being wasted upon useless printing, on giving us a list that is not accurate, and placing in the hands of appointees of the Government the power to disfranchise any man if they think proper, should be expended in erecting necessary public buildings and works throughout the country, and the Provincial lists should be used. This should be done instead of wasting it upon what must always be looked upon as a vast monument to the folly of the Secretary of State, the printing bureau. Year after year, as time rolls on, it will become a sink-hole of corruption, as surely as I am speaking in this House to-day. The Secretary of State, or whoever manages it, will have to be responsible for it. Strikes and favoritism will characterise it from the beginning to the end, and I am satisfied that he will regret that his inventive genius ever led him to erect such a monument in this country. Sir, it is a waste of the public money. Since this Government has been in power, nine years, they have increased the yearly public expenditure by from \$12,000,000 to \$14,000,000. Canada was never in such a distressed condition as it is to-day. Our farms have depreciated from 25 to 40 per cent., while everything the farmer wears and uses has increased in cost from 32 to 100 per cent. The markets for our farmers are shut off on account of the Government's policy, and there never has been, in the history of this country, such appalling distress as exists among the people, from the west to the east.

Mr. HESSON. Draw it mild.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman says "draw it mild." The hon. gentleman draws his \$1,000 a year here, and from the savings of a frugal life no doubt he has a nice little income at home. He is, therefore, not in a position to sympathise with the working people and the farmers, who to-day are receiving less for their labor than ever before in our history; and such a word from him will not receive a response from the people whom he represents in this House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. His family are all in the Civil Service.

Mr. LISTER. I will not say anything about that. Our public expenditure is \$14,000,000 more than it was in 1878, and it is yearly increasing. The Finance Minister declared that he would reduce the expenditure, and I believe he did reduce it in some small matters; but, in spite of the hon. gentleman's efforts, the expenditure is continuously growing, while the power of the people to pay the taxation is becoming less yearly. The First Minister, in introducing this Act, adopted a cunning device to perpetuate Conservative rule in this Dominion. The first little trick was to gerrymander the whole of the Province of Ontario. In order to do it he found it necessary to have a census taken, and in that census to include as residents of the Province of Quebec people who had long ago left the Province and were living in a foreign country. This was done in order to swell the population of Quebec, and thus give increased representation to Ontario. In order to give those three seats to Ontario, he slashed and divided every constituency from the east to the west, for the purpose of keeping himself in power. He grouped counties giving large Liberal majorities and so divided counties that it was possible for

him to stifle the vote of the great Liberal party of the Province and return himself by a very considerable majority. That little scheme was not sufficient. It was feared that an election might still work against the party, and the First Minister introduced what is known as the Franchise Act. Whether it has had the effect of adding to his strength, it is impossible to say. Perhaps I should not have used the word "cunning," so far as the First Minister is concerned. The other day I was sitting at the table with a friend, and a constituent of the hon. member for Selkirk was sitting at one side of the table and, I think, a clergyman at the other. They commenced talking about Sir John A. Macdonald, the leader of the Government. The constituent of the hon. member for Selkirk thought Sir Charles Tupper was the more honest man of the two, that there was no cunning about Sir Charles Tupper, that Sir John A. Macdonald was an old cunning fellow. The clergyman said: That is where you are entirely mistaken; Sir John is not a cunning man at all, he is the most simple man in the world—it is tact you mistake for cunning; tact is a God-given gift, but cunning you know comes from the other source. Following what that gentleman said, I am scarcely accurate in designating the action of the leader of the Government as cunning. Sir, I think this Act is unnecessary, unjust and expensive, and it is the duty of the Opposition, and of every hon. gentleman who is opposed to the measure, to condemn it year after year. For these reasons I shall vote for the resolution of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson).

Mr. EDGAR. It seems that the defence of the Franchise Act has been left to two Ministers from the Province of Quebec. I wonder if it is an indication that the Province of Quebec is the only one in which the Act will be tolerated. If the other Provinces are not to be heard from, I am very much afraid the House and the country will come to that conclusion. Now, Sir, the Minister of Public Works, at any rate, had the advantage of knowing something about the history of the law which he undertook to defend. He was present in the House during its introduction, and, whether he was asleep or not, he was always in his seat when we discussed it. But the hon. the Secretary of State undertook to defend the measure when he did not know anything, from personal knowledge, of the discussion which took place upon it. He told us that he had perused the debate. Perhaps he did; but it did not look much like an attentive perusal, when he claimed for the Government the credit of having appointed the county court judges of Ontario to be revising officers for that Province. If he had perused the debate as he should have done he would have found that the Government proposed to appoint their own nominees among the barristers to decide all questions of law and fact without any appeal whatever, and it was only by working night and day that we, on this side of the House, compelled the Government to make that concession to the public opinion which was aroused on the subject. We had one advantage, however, in hearing the Secretary of State speak to-day. He told us what would be the outside figure of the cost of the revision of 1889, and while I am not at all disposed to think that he is safe in placing the

amount at \$153,000, still, for the sake of argument, we will assume that that figure is correct. I will ask the hon. the Minister of Finance if \$153,000 a year does not represent a capital sum of nearly five millions dollars at the rate at which the last loan was effected for Canada? Even taking the lowest figures given to us by the Government we find that the cost of this annual revision of the lists represents a capital sum of five million dollars; and, consequently, if this motion of my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson) is carried, and if the House repeals this law, the Minister of Finance, without adding one cent to the burthens of the people, can go to London and get five millions to expend on the public works of this country. The Secretary of State further told us, as a Minister of the Crown, that he did not think it was necessary to have a revision of the voters' lists every year. I admire the audacity of that statement, and I do not think I use an unparliamentary term in saying so. Why, Sir, there is no free country in the world which would tolerate a franchise law under which a qualified voter should not have a right to be put on the list every year, nor would it be tolerated that the list should not be purged every year of the bad votes entered upon it. The theory of our Government here is that there may be an appeal to the people whom they represent at any time in any year; and is Parliament to be asked by the Government to suspend the revision of the voters' lists at their mere will, while at any time we may have an appeal to the country? Such a thing should not be allowed to exist. I hold that the declaration we have had to-day from the Secretary of State is the most serious we have heard in the House for a long time, for I believe it to be entirely unconstitutional for this Parliament to prevent the annual revision of the list of voters to elect the members for this House. Suppose an election had taken place in the fall of 1889 (and nobody can ever tell in parliamentary government when an election may be forced upon the people), what condition of things would we have seen? We would have seen a general election, as we have seen many bye-elections take place upon a list of voters, based upon the assessment rolls of 1885. What would we have found in the cities? I know it was so in Toronto, and the members for that city in this House cannot deny it, that if an election had been held in the fall of 1889, there would be many polling places where 75 per cent. of the *bonâ fide* electors would have been disfranchised; that is to say, that the old lists based upon the assessment roll of 1885, contained more than 75 per cent. of names which ought not to have been there, and which were struck out at the last revision at Toronto. Not only would a large number of genuine voters have been disfranchised if an election had been held then, but 50 per cent. of bad votes which were wrongfully on the lists might have been polled. We have then the fact that men who were not honestly qualified, and who were struck off the lists by the revising officer at the last revision, would have been in a position to vote. I contend that the position taken by the Secretary of State is an absolutely unconstitutional position for any Minister to take. It was not the position taken by the Government when it introduced this Bill. With all their boldness they dared not pretend, and they did not even argue, that there was not to be an annual revision. Why,

Mr. EDGAR.

Sir, at the general election, with all their sins to answer for, if they had, in addition, declared to the people that under the new Franchise Act they proposed to suspend its operation year after year, they could not have carried the country. I do not believe, to-day, that the Government have any intention of appealing to the country at the general elections with any such propositions as the Secretary of State made to-day. They have got to say to the people, at any rate: "We will give you a revision every year, and although it will cost a great deal you are entitled to have it." I think that when I am discussing a question of this kind example may be better than precept, and I will inform the House and the country of some matters which occurred in my own constituency at the last revision of the voters' lists in 1889. There is a prosperous little town there called Uxbridge, in which there is a small but intelligent Reform majority. That town has only three polling places, and when the final revision was coming on I thought it proper to give notice to the revising officer to have some seventy-six Conservative voters struck off the lists, on the ground that they were no longer qualified to vote. I gave the notices properly, and I appeared before the revising judge at Uxbridge. The notices were duly proved, the assessor was brought there, and other evidence was given which showed that all those seventy-six names on the list were those of persons not qualified to vote, and they were struck off. I had supposed that the Conservatives in the riding would probably have given the proper notice to strike off an equal or greater number of the names of Reformers whose votes had become bad by lapse of time, but I certainly did not conceive it my duty to give notice to have Reform votes struck off. The result was that for some reason the Conservatives gave no notice at all in that place; and how does the matter stand to-day? In that small town, with its three polling subdivisions, every single Reform vote that was on the list in 1886, whether good or bad, stands there to-day, and if an election comes on under the present lists, every one of those Reform voters, probably a hundred, who are not now qualified in reality, will be qualified by this Franchise Act to vote as much as any other men on the list, while the seventy-six Conservative names are struck off. That, Sir, is a nice state of affairs. It gives my Conservative friends a taste of their own medicine. It is not our fault on this side of the House, however, because we have pressed on the Government over and over again, whenever the Franchise Act has been before the House, to put in an oath of qualification, which will check the casting of votes of that kind, but the Government refuse to do so, and insist that the reviser's list must be final. That is an illustration of the practical working of this beautiful Franchise Act. I say that a law which will allow that sort of thing should never be on the Statute-book. It should be repealed, not only on the general principles which we have heard discussed to-day, and on which its repeal may be justified, but the practical operation of the Act is so outrageous that the people of this country should not tolerate it any longer.

Mr. CURRAN. I think the discussion which has taken place in the last two days on this subject must convince this House that hon. gentlemen

opposite who have spoken would have done far better, one and all, to have said ditto to the speech of their hon. leader, than to have reiterated, more or less forcibly, the arguments adduced by him in his opening speech, as they have done, in their attempts to debate this question. We have heard the same statements made over and over again, without one solitary new idea being expressed on the subject. We have been told over and over again that this law is an invasion of the rights of the Provinces; and in the speech of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), who followed the hon. Secretary of State, any force put into that argument by the hon. leader of the Opposition was lost in his manner of treating the subject. We all know, or ought to know, that there is not one tittle of evidence to show that there is the slightest invasion of the rights of the Provinces by the Dominion Parliament in passing this Act. The passing of this Act was specially provided for. The Provincial lists were to serve until such a law as this was enacted, and that law having been enacted, it has not been claimed anywhere that it is unconstitutional, and it cannot be shown, except by assertion, that any right or privilege of the Provinces has been assailed or in any way infringed upon. The hon. leader of the Opposition said that whilst we had heard great complaints of this law in various parts of the Dominion, we had never yet heard one word of commendation for it. I may say that I have heard and read a great deal of commendation of this law. But it is not surprising that hon. gentlemen opposite should not have heard it; they hear things very late; when other people are convinced of things, they are entirely in the dark. For instance, on the 23rd of February, 1887, there was not a newsboy in any of the streets of the Dominion who did not know that hon. gentlemen opposite had been routed—horse, foot and artillery; but, strange to say, hon. gentlemen and their organs proclaimed that they had a majority of three—so much so that even till the 28th of February the *Toronto Globe* was still claiming that they had carried the country, and that this Government must go before very long. Therefore, it is not surprising that on a matter of this kind they should be still in the dark. But, more than that: we remember the discussion which took place in this House, and which made this House almost a laughing-stock in the country, owing to the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite conducted it. After this question had been seriously discussed for seven or eight days, those gentlemen continued discussing it and everything else, from Milton's "Paradise Lost," down to "Jack the Giant Killer," and almost every other conceivable thing that could be thought of, and after several weeks the Bill became law. One would have supposed that after making this exhibition of themselves in the House, they would have carried on the warfare in the country; but what did they do? Two of the leading spirits of the Opposition went through the country, and discussed the trade question, the North-West question, and other questions, but on no platform was the Franchise Act assailed, on no platform did they say one word about it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. CURRAN. Well, if they discussed it and went thoroughly into it, the people condemned them by a large majority, and still they have not

learnt their lesson; they look on the people of Canada as five or six million people, mostly fools, and that is what leaves them in the lurch, where they were when discussing this Act before. But we are told that we should take the franchises from the Provinces. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Local Legislatures, or those who control them, would attend to their own affairs, we might be justified in allowing them to manage the franchise. But when we see them upon every conceivable occasion not attending to their own affairs, but endeavoring, by means of the power they hold, to interfere with the franchise and make it suit their own purposes, we cannot tolerate in this House that our rights should be taken away and that they should dictate to us who shall come here. Only last year in the Province of Quebec what did we find? We found the Premier of the Province undertaking to disfranchise thousands of men, against the principles of his own party, against what had been preached by his own leader, and by the greatest men of the Liberal party from time immemorial, and against the protestations of the strongest Liberals in the Local Legislatures,—Liberals, not men who had stolen the livery of heaven to serve the devil, but true Liberals, like Lareau and others. Mr. Lareau, in his speech, emphasised as follows the doctrines of the Liberal party:—

"They were face to face with an electoral reform; they had to decide, yes or no, whether a large number of honorable men should be deprived of the right to vote. It was said it would be better for the employé, while others pretended it had been tried in other assemblies and created trouble. Again, had the promoters of this Bill been requested by these employés to deprive them of voting? He did not know, but did not think so. He concluded by quoting a number of authorities opposed to restricting the right of voting to any class of citizens."

Are we to adopt here that principle? Are we to allow a large class of people to be thus disfranchised—a disfranchisement which is not merely against our principles, but against the principles of the party the promoters of that Bill claimed to represent? What did the Hon. Sir Antoine Aimé Dorion, one of the most eminent leaders the Liberal party ever had in this country, say, in 1874, when dealing with the question as to whether those people should have the right to vote. He said:

"With the ballot I do not see why public officials should not vote. With the ballot everybody should vote." That was the doctrine laid down by Sir A. A. Dorion when he occupied a seat here on the ministerial benches. What has been done in the Province of Quebec has been done elsewhere. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries showed in his speech during the last debate on this question, that twice within eighteen months in Nova Scotia the gentlemen who controlled affairs there had changed the electoral franchise, in order to carry out their own purposes. In what position would we find ourselves under the old system? In this position: that upon the eve of an election, any Province whose local authorities were opposed to the Dominion authorities here would be found enacting such a law as to prevent an honest expression of opinion and curtail the privileges and rights of the people. There are various other subjects on which those gentlemen have shown that they are not animated by proper motives. Has it not been apparent to everyone that the majority who now hold power in the Provinces will not restrain themselves within the limits of their own jurisdiction?

What did we see in the interprovincial conference, that great manœuvre on the part of the Premier of Quebec? Did the representatives at that conference manifest any desire to confine themselves to their own affairs? Not at all; they went beyond all their attributes, they dictated what should be the fiscal policy of this country, and what should be its trade relations with other countries. They told us we should do away with the veto here, and transfer it over to Downing street, and thus go back perhaps fifty years or more in the constitutional history of our country. It is to such people we are asked to commit our franchise; it is to them we are asked to leave the decision as to who shall occupy seats in this House. The proposition is absurd. Further, the interests at stake are different. The subjects confided to each Parliament, whether local or Dominion, are different; and the franchise that may suit a local Parliament, having to deal with local affairs, may not suit the Dominion Parliament. That must be apparent to the mind of the most superficial observer. Under all the circumstances, and in view of the fact that, while in some parts the franchise has been slightly restricted, in others it has been largely extended and made nearly uniform, considering that the principle at the bottom of the law is one which meets, and has met, with the approval of the people, I am opposed to any change. In the Province of Quebec this franchise law has greatly extended the franchise, and I have never heard one word raised against it in any of the large cities. Hon. gentlemen opposite dare not, in the face of the working classes, where the wage-earners have been given a vote, go before the people and say they are opposed to this Act. We never heard a remark in the Province of Quebec about this nine weeks' debate, such as those which have been uttered here to-day. The people would have felt that they had been unjustifiably treated, that the money of this country had been expended in an unjustifiable manner, in indemnifying members for six months sitting, when one-half of the time would have sufficed to do the business of the House. That was an enormous expenditure brought about by the attempt of hon. gentlemen opposite to destroy the working of our parliamentary institutions; and the people of this country in the general election which followed showed, by the confidence they expressed in the Administration of the day, that this Parliament had done its duty in passing this law and in asserting its right to say who shall or shall not have representation here. That verdict was one which hon. gentlemen opposite should have taken to heart; but so long as they ignore the facts, so long will they fail to gain the confidence of the people. We have no right to complain, and we do not complain of their course. We are satisfied with the meaningless tactics they adopt on this and other subjects, because they secure to the Conservative party continuance in office.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not intend to take up the time of the House in discussing this important question, had it not been for the speech delivered by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). I must say that I usually admire his style when he addresses the House. He is usually pretty good in delivering an intemperate speech on an occasion of this kind. There are two things in

Mr. CURRAN.

which the hon. gentleman excels: one is performing a duty of the kind he has performed to-day, and the other is singing "Old King Cole," and I cannot really say in which he excels. Now, we have had a little experience in this House of the operation of the Franchise Act in the constituency which the hon. gentleman represents. In that constituency it worked very well in the hon. gentleman's interests, so far as we can judge by the evidence brought before this House. It was shown to this House pretty plainly, that a number of men who were engaged upon the canal in Montreal, were removed from their positions through influence brought to bear on the Minister of Public Works, simply, because they did not comply with the request presented by the hon. gentleman's friend, and vote in the proper way. That is the manner in which the Franchise Bill worked in the interest of the hon. gentleman in Montreal, and because that measure assisted him very much he is evidently very grateful to it. In regard to this measure, I believe the country could well do without it. I believe the system which we had in the past, of electing the members of this House on the electoral lists previously adopted, was more perfect and more satisfactory to the people. They understood that system better and were better pleased with those lists than they are with the present list. We have the opportunity of taking advantage of the municipal lists, which are in a more perfect condition than the present Dominion list; and, I think, at present it is desirable, in view of the crippled condition of the finances of this country, that the Dominion list should be dispensed with and that this Act should be repealed. There is no necessity for it. Throughout the municipalities of this country we have men, both Conservative and Reform, who are elected to discharge the duty of preparing the municipal list, and they are men better qualified to judge who is properly qualified to vote than any judge or other revising officer can be. These men are discharging that duty most admirably, and we have the lists which they prepare without costing the Dominion anything. When we have those lists at hand and can obtain them without cost, it is altogether an unnecessary expense to keep on the Statute-book a measure which is cumbersome, which is hard to work, and which is not satisfactory to the electors themselves. I am sure that, if the friends of the Government would speak their minds, they would admit that this measure is not acceptable to them. We have not had a single man on the Government side from the Province of Ontario, get up to defend the present Act. All those who have defended it on that side, have come from the Province of Quebec. The Secretary of State led the way. It is fitting that he should do so. He was not in the House during the long debate which took place on this measure, but he says it was an unwarrantable thing on the part of the Opposition to delay the passage of that measure. But, Mr. Speaker, we brought the Government to their knees on that occasion. They came to time. We made them come to time. We made it known to them, by the determined stand we took on that occasion, that we would not allow the Government to take into their own hands the power to appoint the men who were to revise the voters' lists. After we went up to midnight on Saturday, after a sitting of, I think, 66 hours, on

the Monday morning the Government came down and gracefully accepted our proposition that the county judges should be the revising officers, and that only when they declined to act would the Government retain the right to appoint the revising officers. We notice that a little advantage was taken of us even in that regard, because we have in Ontario now eight or nine junior judges who were appointed in counties, not because their services were required, not because the work of the county judge was more than he could properly perform, but simply because it was necessary to charge to the expenses of the judiciary, and to add to the list nine judges in order to make them revising barristers, and that was done. However, on the whole, the judges have discharged their duties very creditably. In my riding, the judge who revised the list set to work to get the best and purest list he could get, but the supporters of the Government themselves in that riding are so disgusted with the working of the Act that they declined to take the necessary steps to purge the list of those who should not be on it this year. I am sure there are 150 men who are registered in my constituency to-day as voters who should not be on the list, if it were a proper one, but their names are there because the people would not go to the trouble to get the names removed. That being the condition of things, the Act itself proves, by the experience which the people have had of it, that it is not a proper Act. The people should not have to go before a judge, and to take all the steps required to get themselves put in such a position as to exercise the franchise. It is unfair that the people should be put to that trouble. I say that men should be enrolled without any action on their part, except that of giving their names to the assessor, and, if their names appear on the assessment roll, they should be put on the voters' list. Any additional trouble to which they are put is unnecessary and uncalled for, and should not be tolerated. There are a great many features in this Act which require improvement. In the first place, my experience in the last revision was this: I believe it was the intention that young men who were away attending college or learning their profession, whether it was that of a mechanic or any other calling, should have the right to be registered. We went to the revision this year with the expectation that such men would be put on, but, when we commenced the revision, and the judge began to look into the Act, we found that the very clause which enabled the revising officer to put these young men on the list had been rescinded in the last amendment of the Act, and the judge was powerless to put these men on the list. I know that, in my own riding, there are dozens who are justly entitled to be put on the voters' list whose names do not appear. I hope that, unless the Government decide to rescind the Act altogether, they will, at all events, amend it, so as to enable these young men to be put on the list. The feeling in my riding in regard to this Act, on the part of my political opponents, is that it is a most expensive, a most annoying and almost an unworkable Act, because of the trouble to which they had to go in order to send out notices, and so on. Then, last year the Postmaster General raised the amount to be paid on registered letters, and now, instead of

paying three cents and two cents for registration, it is necessary to put a stamp of five cents for registration, in addition to the three cents when you want to give a man notice that he is to be struck off the list. In many cases the notices have been sent to men who were dead, or who had gone to the States, or who had gone somewhere else, and I have no doubt that the men employed in the Dead Letter office have had a great deal of their time occupied in examining these letters, which were sent to men notifying them that they were to be struck off the list.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. When you left the Chair, we had been discussing the question, whether it would be wise, in the interests of this country, to rescind the Franchise Act. That question has received the consideration of this House at every Session that has been held since its passage. Frequently we have had to amend that Act, but notwithstanding the amendments made to it, the people are not by any means satisfied with the continuation of that Act upon the Statute-book. We feel it our duty, under these circumstances, to press upon the Government seriously to consider the propriety of rescinding the whole measure, and going back to the old system by which members of this House were elected for a great many years. Now, I contend, that under the present circumstances, there is no necessity for the continuation of that Act. We are aware that a considerable agitation exists throughout the country with regard to the question of dual language. Well, Sir, we have a dual system of electing members; we have a dual franchise list: we have a Provincial franchise list and a Dominion franchise list. The Provincial franchise list is prepared by the very same men who prepare the Dominion franchise list—that is to say, the judges are the ultimate authority for purging the Provincial list of any names that should not be on it, and the same judges are the men who purge the Dominion list. Consequently the same lists are perfected by the same ultimate authority, and, under these circumstances, I consider it is altogether unnecessary, in view of the present financial embarrassment to which the people of this country have been subjected, owing to the increase of the national debt and the demands upon our resources, that we should maintain this cumbersome Act which costs the people three or four hundred thousand dollars a year. The Act was not introduced because there was a general expression of opinion throughout the country that it was necessary. There was no expression of opinion whatever. There were no petitions sent to this House asking that such an Act should be passed; but the First Minister conceived in his own mind the desirability of controlling the electorate throughout this Dominion, and of placing under the control of the Government of the day the power of saying virtually who should vote and who should not vote. When that Act was introduced, as has already been stated to the House, it contained a great many objectionable provisions. Those provisions were eliminated by the persistent efforts of the Reform party, to try and secure as good an Act as possible, if an Act we were to have at all. If that Act had

been passed with all the provisions it contained when it was brought down to the House, I believe the people of the country would have risen to such a feeling of indignation that the Government would have been compelled to rescind the Act at once. The Secretary of State said to-night, that there was no great necessity for an annual revision. Now, I think that if the Act is to be kept in force at all it should be revised annually. I am sure those who have taken part in the revision that was made this year, have come to the conclusion that anything less than annual revision will be a great mistake. Taking the old lists this year, that were issued in 1886, and taking those that have to be made in order to make even the imperfect list that has been produced this year, about one-half of the old names that were on the old list have been eliminated, and about as many more have been added. That shows of itself that the changes that are going on in the municipalities and in the towns from time to time, require that if the electors are to be placed in a position that they can exercise their franchise, should any emergency arise, the list should be revised annually. I say it is unfair to the people of this country that their rights to exercise the franchise should be controlled by any Government, and that the Government of the day should be empowered to say just when they shall be properly enrolled, and when they shall be permitted to exercise that right. The Government should not ask to have such a power. I say that if we are to have an electoral franchise list at all, the law should be put in such a shape that the judges should be the absolute power to revise the list, and the Government should have nothing to say as to when the revision should take place. A revision should take place every year. If there is anything at all sacred to the people of this Dominion, it is the right to exercise the franchise, when it becomes necessary that they should do so, and if the law is to remain upon the Statute-book, we should have an annual revision. The Secretary of State said to-night that the first revision cost \$413,000. Well, Sir, I am quite sure from my personal experience, and also from the opinions I have gathered from other members of Parliament, that it has cost the members of this House another \$413,000 in paying lawyers, paying the expenses of issuing summonses, attending to all the necessary routine to get a man put on or to get a man struck off. I am positively certain that if every member of this House were to count his own valuable time, or the time he took to engage others to attend to these particular duties, the steps necessary to bring parties before the court, or to have the names struck off, it would be found to have cost them at least \$413,000 more to carry out the revision of the list the first year. This would make the cost in the neighborhood of a million dollars. Now, the Secretary of State says that, with the changes he has made, the experience he has gathered from the past, he is able to present the country with a revision this year that will only cost \$151,357. I say any person that has taken notice of the manner that the revision has been conducted throughout the country this year, will come to the conclusion at once that the revision is not as perfect and complete as the one that was made in 1886, because the necessary machinery for providing for a thorough and proper voters' list

Mr. McMULLEN.

has not been put in force in each riding. I contend that the necessary steps have not been taken in a great many cases to procure a proper list in each riding. Even admitting the work can be done for \$150,000 a year, it will cost members and candidates a large sum to secure a revision on their own side of politics in their respective counties and ridings. Calculating that it will cost a further sum equal to that mentioned by the Secretary of State, \$150,000, the cost will aggregate over \$300,000 as that involved in obtaining the revision of this year. I am satisfied that that sum is far under the mark, because the Secretary of State has not obtained the returns from several revising officers; and although the hon. gentleman may have made a careful estimate as to the entire cost, I have no doubt that the expenditure will reach nearer \$200,000 than \$150,000. Supposing the cost to be \$175,000, I wonder if it would not be much more acceptable to the electorate, particularly to the farming community, if that amount had been devoted in granting a bounty for every lamb exported. We exported 365,000 lambs last year, and on these a bounty was paid of 50 cents per head to get them into the American market, which is the only market available. Supposing it were decided that instead of spending this amount on the Franchise Act, each farmer should be paid 50 cents per lamb exported, the outlay would reach \$175,000, and a revision of this list would cost about the same amount. If the Government adopted this course, the farmers would be most grateful for that small sum, rather than have the expenditure made on the Franchise Act. But if the Act is to remain on the Statute-book, there should be a revision held annually, and the judges for the several counties should fix a period within which a revision should take place and conduct the work themselves, being paid a fixed sum for their services, and provided with the necessary amendments to the Act to secure a proper and cheap revision. Suppose the Government met with a defeat during the present Session, is there a correct list on which an appeal could be taken? Large numbers of young men who are of age and who are attending our collegiate institutions and seminaries are not on the list for the present year. The reason is that the section referring to them was eliminated last Session when amendments were before the House. I do not think it was the intention of the Minister of Justice to rescind it, but it was rescinded, and many young men who were previously on the voters' list are now deprived of the privilege of voting. In my own riding there are many young men of over twenty-one years, some of whom have been studying law or medicine during one-half the year, who are not entitled to vote, because the provision covering their case was rescinded. I, therefore, hold that even if the expenditure of the revised lists was \$150,000, it was virtually thrown away, because there had not been any proper revision. Why should we suspend the revision of the voters' list for a year any more than we should suspend the drill of our volunteers? We expend public money in order to have the volunteers drilled, in order to have an efficient corps. On the other hand, if we are to have the electorate qualified to efficiently discharge their duties as electors, we want a revision to be made every year, so that at any moment, when an emergency arises, they will be properly enrolled

and be prepared to record their votes. The Act is objectionable for several reasons. First, on account of its expense. It imposes unnecessary expense on the country and on candidates for Parliament, and it is generally conceded that the Act is cumbersome and unnecessary, and the people will be glad to have it rescinded. Further, it is troublesome and annoying. Men have had to walk several miles to have their names placed on the voters' list, when there was no reason why they should be put to that trouble. Had the municipal lists been adopted, men could have attended to their ordinary avocations instead of travelling to distant points in order to secure the right to exercise the franchise under the present Act. Another effect of the Act will be this: that poor men will be unable to afford to become candidates, and will be driven from public life, because of the very large amount of expenses they will be called upon to pay to watch the revision of the list. Members of Parliament have to make considerable sacrifices in attending to their duties, but under the present system, on returning home, they are obliged to put in force necessary machinery to secure proper and exact revision of the voters' list. This is troublesome to members and one which should not be imposed upon them, and this will be the means of driving from political life a great many who otherwise would be elected and would prove ornaments to this House. The Government should not seek to control the franchise of the country. If we are to have a Dominion Franchise Act let us give the whole power to the judges, taking advantage of the municipal machinery of the Provinces and preparing a list over which they will have no control. My own impression is, and I am confident it is the feeling of many Conservatives, that the Act was one that originated with the First Minister, and that it was pressed on his friends and the House because the hon. gentleman made a personal request on his party to place it on the Statute-book. I have no doubt that when he ceases political life, or drops off, the Act will be rescinded; but with that absolute devotion to the First Minister which characterises his followers, hon. gentlemen opposite will support the Act because their leader wishes to have this power, so that the electors will be subjected to be placed on the voters' lists in accordance with, and at whatever time the Government choose to hold a revision. With the present stringency in the money market and the great desire to cut down the annual expenditure, the Government should, in their wisdom, abolish the Act and revert to the old system which has operated so faithfully and well in the interest of all parties, and was not objected to by any, in place of expending this \$400,000 a year to keep a law on the Statute-book which is offensive and annoying to everybody who has anything to do with it.

Mr. PLATT. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is unnecessary to multiply arguments or to reiterate the statements which have been made in support of the motion now before the House. Every member of this House has had the benefit of an experience of what is known as the Dominion Franchise Act during the last few years, and anyone who has benefited by that experience, cannot fail to have arrived at the conclusion that there exists on our Statute-book to-day no Act more un-

popular among the people of this country than this same Franchise Act. I am convinced, Sir, that from every part of the Province from which I come, the prevailing opinion amongst both political parties is that we were better with the Provincial lists in days gone by, than we are with the Dominion lists to-day. The universal opinion among the people is that the Act was unnecessary in the first place, that it is expensive, and that a vast amount of trouble ensues every year in the revision of these lists. We have not only to consider the cost which it is to the country directly, but I am sure that hon. members of both sides will agree with me that there is nothing more disturbing to our peace and happiness, and, I may say, prosperity, than that during the summer months many of the leading men of both parties should be engaged for weeks, and sometimes for months, assisting in the revision of the voters' lists. It has been truly said that the revising officers throughout the country have done their duty, and done it well. I believe that is true of the majority of those officers, but I think, Sir, if you consult the revising officers they will tell you that their success very large depends upon the assistance rendered them by private individuals—by those who receive no pay for their services, but who expend large sums out of their own pockets in order to render that assistance to the revising officers. In the Province of Ontario, (for which I am better able to speak than the other Provinces) I know that upon many platforms of the country, during the bye-elections of the last few years, this Act has been almost universally attacked. It has been stated here to-day, that very few were found sufficiently courageous to attack this law upon the platforms of the country. My experience, Sir, is just the reverse. It has been universally attacked, and I have not yet found a man courageous enough to defend it on a public platform in our part of the country. So unpopular is this Bill, that on many occasions I have heard supporters of the Government of the day declare they were in favor of the repeal of the Act, and pledge themselves to vote for its repeal in case they were elected. I have here in my hands, both the Provincial and Dominion lists. Here is the Provincial list, nicely printed. Ask any sensible man in the community, if it does not contain all the names of men in the county who have a right to vote, and ask him also which list he prefers and which is the most convenient? The universal expression of opinion is that the Provincial lists are the fullest, the most complete, and, by all odds, the best lists on which to proceed with an election. The people prefer Provincial lists, and we can very truly say to them: "You can use that Provincial list without a dollar of expense, or you can take the more defective and a worse list, and use it at an expense to the country of some two or three hundred thousand dollars annually." There can be only one answer to the question: Which do you prefer? And that answer generally is: "We prefer the Provincial list, and wish to return to the system of some years ago." The debate of to-day has drawn out a phase of the question which was not so prominently brought forward in the earlier debate on the subject, and that is, that the representatives of the Province of Quebec on the Government side are those who are principally interested in the support of this measure. I do not remember if such was the case when this Bill was introduced in 1885, but it

seems to me that those gentlemen who have taken up arms in support of this Bill from the Province of Quebec have placed themselves not altogether in the most favorable position in the eyes of their fellow-countrymen. The Minister of Public Works, assisted by the Secretary of State, and ably supported by the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), all cry out against the Province of Quebec, as though that Province was incapable of itself of making such a voters' list as would be acceptable to the people. They seem to ask the other Provinces to come to their assistance and relief. They say that this wonderful man, Mr. Mercier, has done some wonderfully wicked things in connection with the franchise of the people, and they ask for the assistance of the other Provinces. Is Mr. Mercier the whole of the Province of Quebec? Do they have a responsible Government in that Province? Is the Ministry of that Province not responsible to the people, and are not the people themselves responsible for the acts of that Government? Whatever may be charged against Mr. Mercier and his Government, can be indirectly charged against the people of the Province. I say it is unfair for the members of that Province to come to this House and ask assistance to help them to crush out what is the public opinion in the Province of Quebec. If the Government of that Province has done wrong let the people be responsible for it, for they have the remedy in their own hands. For my part, I am perfectly willing to trust the people of Ontario. If Mr. Mowat's Government should do anything which the people there believe to be decidedly wrong, Mr. Mowat shall be called to account, and the people of the Province shall take the responsibility on themselves. I think it would be more manly for the representatives of the Province of Quebec to say, that when a Government does wrong: "We, the people of Quebec, will bring them to account, and we will see that no such illegal and unholy transaction shall be allowed to go unpunished." We have heard it said, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the Opposition is disagreeing with most of his followers on the subject of manhood suffrage. I believe, Sir, it may be truly said, that those who advocated the continuance of this measure to-day are disagreeing with a large majority of their supporters of the Conservative party of this country. We know very well what is the opinion of that party in Ontario on this Franchise Act, and we know very well the awkward position in which the Conservatives from Ontario in this House are placed, when they are called upon to deny to their own Province the fulfilment of that opinion which they have expressed at the polls their Government should carry into effect. We know that a demand for manhood suffrage is the prevalent opinion existing in Ontario, and yet we have the representatives of that Province in this House denying their people the same justice and the same rights with regard to the elections for the Dominion House, which they now enjoy in regard to the Provincial Legislature. I believe, Sir, that the leader of the Government is, perhaps, not exactly in accord with some of the gentlemen who have spoken on his own side of the House to-day. I have never heard that the Premier was so strongly opposed to manhood suffrage. I think I can remember distinctly, when, in 1885, in

Mr. PLATT.

justification of giving votes to the Indians, he gave as one of his principal arguments, that the Indian of the country paid in to the revenue as well as the white man. The Indian, he told us, wore taxed clothes and paid for taxed tobacco, and, perhaps, excised whiskey, just as well as the white man, and this he strongly put forward as a justification for giving votes to the Indians. It may be that that argument holds good in regard to the Indians and does not hold good in the case of the wage-earners and farm laborers of Ontario, who, by this Act, are largely excluded from the exercise of the franchise. It is an unfortunate occurrence, though perhaps not intentional, but it has been brought to the attention of the Government time and again, that by the provisions of this Act which we are now attacking, very many farm laborers in Ontario are excluded from the franchise as their earnings, in nine-tenths of the cases, do not come up to the amount required by the law. Now, Sir, I again express that dissatisfaction which I have always expressed, and I think I am justified in the ground I have taken in voting for the motion of my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson), and I believe that we, on this side of the House, are justified, whenever the occasion presents itself, in attacking this measure. We may be accused of prolonging a debate, but you know very well, Sir, the feeling that has ever been manifested by members on this side of the House with regard to that Act, and we are doing nothing more than showing our extreme earnestness in endeavoring to promote the welfare of the people. I am sincere in my belief that the welfare of the Dominion of Canada will be greatly promoted by the passing of the motion of my hon. friend, and I will heartily give it my support.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, we are at present being treated to our annual dissertation on the evils of the franchise laws; but it is amusing and interesting to those who have occupied seats in this House for a number of years to observe the change which takes place year after year in the nature of that discussion. The first and most notable time that the Bill was under discussion, in 1885, almost the entire gist of the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite was that the Government were controlling the franchise of the country, that the law was intended to favor Conservatives and work against Reformers, that it would not be administered fairly, and that the opponents of the Government would not receive fair play in the making up of the lists. They were told that in all probability the lists would be made up by the judges of the land, in whom almost all the electors of the country had confidence. But at that time the members of the Opposition seemed to have no confidence in them. As time advanced and the Act went into operation, experience proved that the fears of the Opposition were not realised, because when we came back the following Session, although there were a number who still contended that the Act was unfair to the opponents of the Government, there was not anything like such a consensus of opinion on that side of the House that they were unfairly dealt with as there was before in anticipation. The following year we had the subject under discussion again, when we heard still less about the lists being unfairly made up. This year we have not heard a single complaint of that kind, well ground-

ed or sustained, by anyone throughout this discussion, but to-day the gist of the argument is the expensiveness of the Act. For the purpose of making that argument still stronger, some of them have pressed into service the noted printing bureau and its expensiveness, and they have mixed the two things together to attempt to show to the country that the carrying out of this Act is enormously expensive. They have not attempted to divide the expense fairly, to show how much the franchise law is responsible for, and how much the printing bureau. They seem to forget that before we had the printing bureau we had the printing done by contract at a great expense, and that much of the printing was so unsatisfactory that many members of this House expressed a desire that the printing should be under the control of Parliament, because it would be done better, more cheaply and more expeditiously. The Franchise Act had nothing to do with the establishment of the printing bureau; but because the work of printing the lists is done there, these hon. gentlemen drag in the cost of that bureau in their attempt to convince the people that the Franchise Act is responsible for it. Hon. gentlemen talk about the Provincial lists, which they say we have already without costing us anything. Is that a fair argument? Do those lists cost us nothing? The only difference is that the making up and printing of the Dominion lists is borne by the Government, while the cost of the Provincial lists is made up out of direct taxation, paid by the people in the municipalities. Which is the most easy to be borne? Which is felt the most? The people must feel the cost less when the work is done by the Government, and when they are not taxed directly for it. The Provincial lists must be made up and printed. The judges who revise them must be paid, as well as the judges who revise the Dominion lists; so that I do not see how any gentleman can advance the argument that the Provincial lists cost nothing. It is true they cost this Parliament nothing, but if a fair calculation is made, I believe it will be found that they cost the people as much as the Dominion lists, while they feel the expense a great deal more. The hon. member for South Brant told us that in 1885, hon. gentlemen opposite decided that they would every Session bring up this question, and endeavor to have this Act repealed. They came to that conclusion, notwithstanding that the Act might turn out to be one of the best ever put on the Statute-book. They cared not whether it was a good Act or a bad Act, but religiously made that solemn agreement, and they have carried it out, and I suppose they will do so every Session in the future, and that we shall only hear the last of that Act when the last member of the present Opposition dies out. The hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt), after advancing what he has been pleased to call a few arguments, but what I think are merely statements or assertions, says: "I think I have advanced sufficient arguments to satisfy the people that this is an obnoxious law, and should be repealed." What are the arguments he advanced? The sole one was in answer to an hon. gentleman who stated that this Act had not been discussed on the public hustings at the last elections and had not been condemned. The hon. gentleman said: "My experience is the reverse; it was discussed on every platform." Yet, we find that those persons who are responsible for putting it on

the Statute-book were not condemned by the electors. Is it not a curious circumstance that although the Act was so obnoxious that no supporter of the Government would defend it, the electors sent the same men back to Parliament with increased majorities as an indication that they believed that the laws those men were making were for the welfare of the country? Suppose the Act is expensive; have we any law on the Statute-book about which the same cannot be said? I think it is not a valid argument against any law to say that it is expensive. Is not the Supreme Court law expensive to the country? And yet we have several times refused to repeal that law, because it was sanctioned by the matured judgment of able legislators; and if that were a valid argument, it might be used against almost every useful law, whether civil or criminal, which we have on the Statute-book to-day. Then, again, the question is raised whether we should have the lists revised annually or only once in a few years. There seems to be a difference of opinion amongst the members of the Opposition on that point, some saying that the lists ought to be revised annually, and others urging that the expense of revising annually would be so great that that should not be done. From what I can gather from the arguments of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I am inclined to the opinion that he would like to see the lists annually revised, if for no other purpose than to furnish him in the future with the argument that the annual revision is so expensive the Act ought to be done away with. If I am correctly informed, in some of the Maritime Provinces the lists are only made up periodically before each general election, and there have been no complaints that this plan did not work well.

Mr. EDGAR. What Province is that in?

Mr. SPROULE. In Prince Edward Island, if I am correctly informed. There is a tendency in the legislation of this Parliament to make as far as possible our laws universally applicable over the whole Dominion. For instance, we have the Joint Stock Companies' Act, under which companies are incorporated; the Railway Act, the chartering of Dominion railways; and this Act we passed in the endeavor to make a general law on the subject applicable to every Province, which would be much more definite, easily understood and much more national in character than could be any local law. Our criminal law, also, we have endeavored to make applicable over the whole country, as well as our commercial law, and our laws concerning trade and navigation and insurance. In every matter, the tendency of legislation of this Parliament is towards endeavoring to make our laws universal, so that the people in all sections of the Dominion may be subjected to the one system of laws. If that uniformity is found desirable in other lines, why not in this? But, outside of that, the very strongest argument possible lies in the fact that we should have the same franchise for the election of members from every part of the Dominion to this Legislature, and not have each Province exercising a different franchise. Ontario has manhood-suffrage, Quebec has a different franchise, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and British Columbia have different franchises. Now, I hold that as we all come here to sit in the same Parliament, we should endeavor to be elected by the same

class of constituents in every part of the Dominion. We should have members from Prince Edward Island elected by the same class of constituents as those from British Columbia and Manitoba.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not the law, and the hon. gentleman voted that it should not be the law.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that, comparatively speaking, that is the law. Hon. gentlemen opposite had better wait for their laugh until they get something to laugh about. There is no law in all the world which has not some slight exception, and this law is, with one or two exceptions, for the purpose of making it suitable to differences that exist, in harmony with the principle of uniformity on which it is based. We all know that the Provincial Legislatures, in the different Provinces of the Dominion, were tampering with the franchises upon which members of this Legislature were elected. We knew that to be the case, and when we found that to be the case, it was time the Dominion Parliament should step in and take that power out of the hands of the Local Legislatures. What would Mr. Mowat say to-day if the Dominion Government were to change the basis of the franchise on which members are elected to the Ontario Legislature? What would Mr. Mercier say in Quebec if the Dominion Government took the franchise out of his hands? How indignant would not the people of Quebec be if we were to interfere with their local franchise. Yet we are asked to sit quietly by while the Local Legislatures are tampering with the Dominion franchises, and make no effort to remedy the grievance. If there was only one instance instead of dozens given us of this local interference, this Government would be entitled to take under their own control the Dominion franchise, and make a general franchise law applicable to the whole country. In my opinion the arguments advanced against the franchise law are every year becoming less and less—less powerful and less logical; and as time will prove the expediency and value of the law, and as we improve the law from time to time, almost every argument will be swept away from under the feet of hon. gentlemen opposite. When we improve it from year to year, as experience will show, in certain lines it may be changed and as we simplify it and reduce the cost we will find in a few years hence that hon. gentlemen who so strongly oppose the law to-day will be left without a single argument to advance against this measure. It is intended for a good purpose, and, I believe, is effecting a good purpose, and notwithstanding the fact that it causes a little expense to-day, I believe that we should continue the measure, and year by year we will find fewer who will have the hardihood to rise and oppose it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In supporting the motion before the House, I wish to say that I do not do so for the reason that I have to find any fault with the revising officers in my immediate locality. There are four of them within a few miles of my house, and I believe each one has discharged his duty honestly and faithfully, and to the satisfaction of all with whom they came in contact. I have heard the same reports of other revising officers in that part of the country. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) seems to take a great deal of credit to the Government for this,

Mr. SPROULE.

and the hon. the Secretary of State this afternoon referred to the opposition before the House, when the Act was first brought down, as a scandalous opposition. But I need not tell the hon. member for East Grey, and had the hon. the Secretary of State been here when the Act was brought down, he would have known, as the hon. member for East Grey knows, that it was just by that very opposition, which the hon. gentleman now terms scandalous, that we have in office to revise the lists men of that stamp. The Bill, as brought into this House, was a deliberate scheme to take the franchise out of the hands of the people and give it into the hands of irresponsible parties. Neither do I advocate the repeal of the Act on the ground that this House has not the constitutional right to declare what shall be the franchise on which its members shall be elected. I know it has been customary to take that ground; but I am not one of those who look upon the question in that light at all. On the contrary, I say it is the right of this House to provide a franchise by which its members shall be elected. Not only is it their right, but it is their duty to do so; and one of the first duties that devolved on this Parliament after Confederation was to provide the franchise on which its members shall be elected. And the Dominion Parliament did provide that the local franchises in existence in the different Provinces should be the franchises for the elections to this House. In doing so they acted wisely and well. The experience of seventeen years, during which these franchises were used, was in favor of their continuance, and it was generally conceded that this House had acted wisely and well in adopting these franchises. During those seventeen years not one word of complaint was made, nor a single request made in this House for a change, nor was a single petition presented to this House asking for a change. So that, on the ground of expediency alone, this House would have justified, would have been doing the best thing for the country, if they had continued to use that franchise. I need not remind hon. gentlemen that each Province in this Dominion has adopted a different franchise. The circumstances of the country demanded that there should be a difference in the franchise. The very conditions of the people, the mode in which they hold property, the nature of the property which they do hold, their different pursuits and callings, all demand that there should be a variation of the franchise in the different parts of the Dominion, so that, in adopting the franchises of the different Provinces, the Dominion Government did what I think was one of the wisest acts ever adopted by this Parliament, because they respected the different genius of the people in the several Provinces, they respected the different circumstances, and they allowed the people in each Province to provide the franchise in accordance with those circumstances. We have heard from the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) a strange statement in reference to the cost of getting up the list. We have local lists, which are got up without any cost whatever to the Dominion of Canada. The member for East Grey thinks that the getting up of those lists is a great burden on the people, but it is a necessary burden, it is one which must be borne by the people. In order to run municipal institutions and in order to provide the franchise

for the local elections, local lists must be got up. There is no getting out of it. They must have them. And the machinery for providing those local lists is of the simplest kind. They are provided at a minimum of cost to the people of the different Provinces. The hon. member for East Grey says the people bear that burden without any grumbling, and then he pleads that the people ought to be pleased, on that ground, to bear the additional expense which the preparation of a Dominion list entails. It is a strange argument, that because the people are weighed down, as the hon. gentleman says, by one burden, they should be compelled to take an additional burden. The hon. member must take the people of the country to be a very gullible lot, and, when he sees the way in which they bear the burdens which this Parliament imposes upon them from time to time, he may be inclined to apply to them the words of the old patriarch: "Issachar is a strong ass, crouching down between two burdens." There is another strong argument as to the way the two lists are prepared. The local lists are taken from the assessment roll, the whole machinery is within the domain of the local authorities, there is very little expense connected with it, and every provision is made for getting honest lists at the smallest expense that can be incurred. They have a court of revision to which every person in the municipality who thinks he is wronged, either by certain parties being put on the list who should not be there or by parties being left off who ought to be there, can appeal; and in the Province of Ontario the judges have adopted a system which I think is a very just one, that, in cases where the court of revision has refused to rectify a wrong and there is an appeal to the county judge, the municipality is saddled with the expense of the appeal. That is a very just provision, which prevents private parties from suffering in justice. It is far different in regard to these lists which we are now considering. If a person is aggrieved, if he has been left off the list, or if individuals have been wrongly put on, or if he is a candidate seeking the suffrage of the people, he has to go to the expense of having the list revised, and he or some other private party has to sustain the expense of giving the notices, issuing the summonses, bringing the parties before the court, and paying their expenses while they are there. That is a burden which few men in private life are able to bear, and it is one which they should not be called upon to bear. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) pleads that the list, as we now have it, is a uniform list, and the only argument which it was ever attempted to put forward when this Act was before the House in 1885, was that we ought to have a uniform list throughout the whole Dominion. Have we a uniform list under this Act? The hon. member for East Grey says there is a uniform principle underlying these lists, but is it not a fact that in two Provinces at least that supposed uniformity is violated, and that the local lists are those used in the Dominion elections? If you allow only one Province to be an exception, you give away the whole case, and you have no uniformity and no excuse such as that which was pleaded for passing the Act. A word or two in regard to the expense: I remember, when the Act was first brought into the House, that I made a prediction that at least \$400,000 would be required to put the

Act into operation and prepare the voters' lists. I remember how the First Minister sneered at that statement, but we find to-day, by the statement of the Secretary of State, that that amount has been largely exceeded. But that is only part of the expense. There is all the expense to the parties who want to get their names upon the list, there is the expense to the members of this House upon whom the duty devolves of seeing that an honest list is prepared, and I venture to say that those expenses more than double the expense incurred by this House in the preparation of the list. That very circumstance is likely to prevent good men from attempting to find seats in this House at all. Then we had this afternoon the startling information from the Secretary of State—I do not remember the exact words he used, but they were to this effect: that it was not contemplated to have a revision of the voters' lists every year. Why, can you imagine anything more antagonistic to the interests of the country than such a statement as that? We heard to-day from the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) that in one city at least 75 per cent. of the electors had changed between the first revision and the last one. We know that an interim election is likely to happen at any time, and that even a general election may take place at any time. Is it fair that even an interim election should be held on such a defective list as that? Not only that, but every man who considers the matter rightly must hold that the franchise is not something given, that it is not something which this House may give or withhold as they think fit, but that it is a sacred right which the people of this country enjoy, that it is something which they have a right to claim and which they should insist that the Legislature of this country should see that they continue to enjoy. Now, Sir, if for one year you neglect or leave in abeyance the revision of the list, it must happen as a necessary consequence, from the changes that are constantly taking place in our constituencies, from the removal of some, and from others coming of age and acquiring property such as to entitle them to the franchise—it must happen, if an election should take place, that large numbers must be debarred from the use of the franchise, and from the enjoyment of one of their dearest privileges. For all these reasons, on the ground of the expenditure, on the ground of conformity with the opinions and interests of the various Provinces, this Act ought to be repealed, and I intend to-night to record my vote against it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. When this Act now under discussion, was placed upon the Statute-book, I did not have the honor of occupying a seat in this House, consequently I did not have the privilege and pleasure of listening to the arguments that were advanced in its favor. I have listened to-day with a great deal of attention to the arguments which have been advanced, I am sorry to say, only on one side of the House, upon this all important question. The question is of so much importance to the people of this Dominion, if we judge by the amount of money that it costs, and the trouble and expense the people are put to, that it strikes me as something remarkable, that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was the only member from Ontario that had the courage of his convictions to rise and say one word in its favor.

Although the cost to the country of this Act has been already nearly \$700,000, which in itself is no small sum, we must also remember that when we consider the expenses which the people of both parties have been put to, I think I can safely say that another \$700,000 has been lost to the country, making at all events over one million dollars that it has already cost the people. When we consider this matter it does seem strange that hon. gentlemen occupying seats on the opposite side of the House cannot say something in favor of it. No Act that costs the people of this country such an immense amount of money as that, ought to be allowed to remain on the Statute-book, unless there is some good and sufficient reason for it. There has not been in my hearing to-day, one single word advanced why that Act should remain upon the statute-book. The arguments which were advanced before, I believe, have been repudiated now, that it was desirable that we should have a Franchise Act, that would be uniform in its character all over the Dominion, that has been proved to be not the case with the present Act. As was remarked by my hon. friend who just took his seat, when the system is varied from in one particular, the argument falls to the ground. I believe that in no less than two Provinces in this Dominion the franchise is much more liberal than it is in others. In the Province of Ontario, a man must be assessed for \$300 before he has a vote. In the Province of Prince Edward Island, I believe, manhood suffrage prevails. Then what possible arguments can be advanced in its favor? Surely, if there were any arguments to advance the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), whose voice we often hear sounding melodiously through this hall, would be ready to take up the cudgels and say something in its favor. But although the debate has gone on for nearly two days that gentleman has not had the courage to rise in his place and give one reason for the retention of this Act. I am inclined to think that very little can be said in its favor. I am entirely opposed to the Act because I think it is unnecessary. As has been already remarked, the franchise law under which we carried on the affairs of this Dominion for eighteen years, gave universal satisfaction. No single protest was ever heard in this Parliament against that arrangement; we find no petitions coming in praying the Government to repeal that Act, no Legislative Assembly throughout the Dominion uttered any protest against its continuance. Therefore an Act that was in existence for eighteen years and gave universal satisfaction to the people of this country, surely must have been a good Act, and ought to have been retained. Why, then, this Act should have been repealed I cannot say. I contend that the old system was the fairest and best that possibly could be carried out. I say that the system by which the votes of the electorate of this Dominion were taken, was a much fairer system than you can possibly get under the present arrangement. Under the old arrangement the preparation of those lists was always left to local men, men selected from both the Conservative and Reform parties in the different counties, men that were generally selected on account of their uprightness of character, or from holding prominent positions to which they had been elected by the people. Then the means of rectifying any errors or omission that might possibly have been

Mr. CAMPBELL.

made, were easy and within the means of all, and in nearly every case the errors that might possibly creep into the list were easily, cheaply and readily rectified. These local men knew who should have votes, whose names should go on the list, and whose should stay off; consequently under that old system we always obtained an honest and fair list of voters throughout the country. But that is not the case under the present system. I venture to say that the present list prepared this year is not at all a correct list. I know that in the county which I have the honor to represent it does not at all fairly represent the people. Whether the Conservative party have received some private information that an election would not be held upon this list, I am not prepared to say; but at all events the Conservative party in that county took no steps whatever to get names upon that list. The consequence is that there are a great many young men there whose names ought to be on the list but whose names do not appear there. There are a great many names on that list of men who have moved away and have no right at all to vote in the county, yet their names appear there. But, you will not find that in the local voters' list. The man who prepares the local list and the man who prepares the assessment roll is a local man. He goes through the township from house to house, and has a personal knowledge of the work he is performing. But the revising barrister simply takes the assessment roll and goes over the names that appear on the roll, and revises his own list from it. But a great many men have come of age this year and others have come into the county, and unless the two parties took steps to send in their names and certified to them by affidavit or otherwise, they would not be placed on the list. The consequence is that this list, which according to the Secretary of State has cost \$153,000, and a great many bills yet to come in will, no doubt, bring the sum to \$200,000, is an incorrect and unreliable list; and yet it would be upon that unreliable, incorrect and unfair list an election, if one occurred now, would be fought out. At the same time we have a correct list available, which has not cost us one cent. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said, that as the local lists would cost a good deal of money, it was a matter of selection between the two lists; for, he said, the local list is paid by Provincial taxation, while the other list is paid by the whole Dominion. Then the hon. gentleman asked: which is the better one? It is not, however, a question of choice as between two lists. The local list has to be prepared whether we have a Dominion list or not.

Mr. SPROULE. I say both have to be prepared.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Whether you prepare the Dominion list or not, the local list must be prepared every year.

Mr. SPROULE. And also the other. Why not say, do away with the local list.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the preparation of the Dominion list would do away with the necessity of preparing the local list, then we might consider the case as to which is the better one; but when the local list has to be prepared every year, and

you cannot lessen the expense by one dollar by preparing a Dominion list, what is the use of expending \$200,000 a year to prepare another list which is virtually a duplicate of the one prepared by the Local Administration? The explanation is, party exigencies. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) said it was no argument to say that the statute was expensive to carry out, because all Acts on the Statute-book are expensive in their administration. While that may be true, it must be remembered that all Acts placed on the Statute-book are supposed to accomplish some good object and to be necessary in the interest of the people and protect them in their rights and privileges. But this Act is not in the interest of the people, it is unnecessary and very expensive, and should be abolished.

Mr. SPROULE. Every criminal will say that of the criminal law.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As has been pointed out, this Act has cost already nearly \$500,000 for the first list. I venture to say that it has cost the people of the different political parties almost another \$500,000. I know that in Kent it cost the different political parties a good deal more than it cost the Dominion Government, and no doubt the same will apply to other counties also. If that is the case, and if it can be shown that the Act is of no use, that it does not secure the preparation of a better list than already exists or one more in the interest of the people than the old list, which we can have for nothing, where is the necessity of retaining it on the Statute-book? Surely, it would be wiser and more in the interests of the people that it should be repealed. I know that in the county which I have the honor to represent, you cannot find any man, either Conservative or Reformer, who will say that the Act should be retained on the Statute-book. At the last election this Act was charged against the Administration, and it was partly on that account that the Conservative majority of 275 was changed to a Reform majority of 112 votes. The people believe that the money thus expended could be used to better advantage in the public interest. They notice that the expenses of the Dominion have increased during a few years from \$24,000,000 a year to \$36,000,000. They observe that necessary public works are postponed, on the ground that the money cannot be found. In the County of Kent, two or three small public works are required, but the Government reply that they have not got the money and that they cannot afford to carry them out; that the country is poor, and while those works may be in the interest of the people, the Government are unable to carry them out at present but they must stand over. And yet a sum of \$200,000 is thrown away. It is the bounden duty of the representatives of the people to cut down this expenditure, which can be done without detriment to the efficiency of the Government, and wipe the expenditure out by a stroke of the pen; and hon. members are not doing their duty to their country and constituents if they refrain from voting that this iniquitous Act should be repealed.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not trouble the House frequently with any remarks, and I would not do so on the present occasion, except for the fact that it appears to be very difficult to satisfy some of the hon. gentlemen opposite. They are not content to have

discussed this matter for eight weeks on the introduction of the measure, they are not content, in season and out of season, with bringing up the Franchise Act, but once more they insist on forcing it upon the attention of the House. And if we sit still, as we have done, and patiently listen, as we have patiently listened, to their statements, and we have read in the papers and in the *Hansard* every single statement they have made and a great deal more, they stand up and taunt the Government side of the House by stating that we have nothing to say. When they have been fully and effectively answered on every point by the Ministers from Quebec, hon. gentlemen opposite, for want of some argument, next say that nobody in Ontario will defend the Act. It was that statement which called me to my feet. I wish to say to those hon. gentlemen, not only is the Conservative party in Ontario prepared to defend the Act, but, as the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) has said, it was fought out at the last election. In my county one of the great issues raised by my opponents was the question of the Franchise Act. What was the result? Like the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), I may say that the result was that a Reform majority was turned into a Conservative majority. And more than that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) spoke very feelingly of the expenses of the Act in Kent. From all the public press has said, and from some investigations that have taken place there, Kent is a very expensive place in which to run an election, and it is said—I would not mention this, except for the manner in which the hon. gentleman put it—but it is said there were more potent reasons than any question of the Franchise Act to change the majority in that county. Having now for the first time, as a member of the Legislature, taken the responsibility of speaking on this Act, I wish to say that, underlying the principle of this Act, there is something as grave as any question which has hitherto come up in this House. There is a question of national independence in this as contradistinguished from any question of expense. If we are anxious (as I think the majority of the people of this country are anxious) to see Canada a great nation, we must have it distinctly understood that the supreme power of the House of Commons shall be above all the Provinces. Let the Provinces have their rights and let us see that they have their rights, and I ask hon. gentlemen to judge me from my actions, whether upon all occasions when such matters came up in this House, I have not stood up for what I believe to be the rights of the Provinces. But over and above, and superior to all that, we must have a central power around which national sentiment can gather. Now, whether this Act is expensive or not, I say there is in it a higher underlying principle, and that it is indispensable to the independence and power which is necessary to make a central government that we should protect the rights and liberty of the Federal constitution. If gentlemen opposite want to wipe that away, then there may be some reason for their argument, that we should not have control of the power to regulate the franchise for this House. I have listened in vain for any suggestion to improve the Act from hon. gentlemen on the other side. There are sage legislators there, and a great many of the hon. gentlemen opposite have long parliamentary experience, and some are

first-class constitutional lawyers, yet they have not suggested any amendment to the Act. No; they do not want to amend it, they want to crush it out altogether—and why? Simply because the Dominion Government is in the hands of the Conservative party, and if they could get the control of the franchise for this House under the heel of the Reform party in the Provinces, they might be able to prevent the free exercise of the voice of the people in electing members to this Parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh!

Mr. TISDALE. It is all very well to laugh, but I tell you I have been waiting in vain for sensible arguments on that side of the House. I leave it to hon. gentlemen opposite themselves if their arguments do not simmer down to these two: first the expense of the Act, and, secondly, that the Provinces should regulate our franchise. Well, we have heard all that before. I ask hon. gentlemen: if we are not to have higher politics and if we are not to have national sentiment? But, without national sentiment, how are we to attain this end? I would like to see the Franchise Act much cheaper in its operation, but if it were twice as expensive I would support it if stronger arguments are not advanced against its continuance. I always endeavor to be frank and I will say that when the right hon. the leader of the Government passed this Franchise Act with the assistance of the Conservative party, there was a good deal of feeling in Ontario on the question of expense, because we are sensitive on the question of dollars and cents, as we should be, in that Province. I know that in the part of the country from which I come this was a fact; but people did not then grasp the principle, and when the hon. member from one of the Wellingtons said that "we would stick to the Act on account of our love for the Prime Minister," I may reply to him that we stick to it not for that reason but because we have become satisfied that the Premier was wiser in this measure (as he has been in many other measures which have benefited Canada) than those who grumbled at the Franchise Act. There are thousands of Conservatives throughout the Province of Ontario, who, since they have understood the principles of the measure, are determined not to let go of it. You talk of the principle of manhood suffrage in Ontario, and some gentlemen mentioned the United States in connection with the same matter. I maintain that they manage the manhood suffrage properly in the United States, but that the government in Toronto make it as difficult for a man to get on the election roll under manhood suffrage as it was under the most complicated of suffrages. In the United States there is no municipality and there is no political machine allowed to interfere with its operation. They have a registration system by which every man can be registered in the different districts and there is no question whether he is on this roll or on that roll; it is one-man-one-vote, but in Ontario, under the complicated machinery they call manhood suffrage, it is a great many men without any vote at all. Let me tell you that in most cases, the Federal Government of the United States controls its own franchise. It may happen occasionally that the registration is at the same time as for the State election and it is true there may be a few States where the roll is prepared specially for that purpose, but the Federal Government regulates its

Mr. TISDALE.

own franchise, which is another proof that we are right here in our federal principle that we shall have a voters' list for ourselves. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the Provinces should regulate our franchise; but to show the absurdity of that argument let an hon. member propose, in this House, for one moment, that we should prepare the franchise for the Provinces. We are the greater power and unless there is a mistake somewhere we have a better right to regulate the franchise of the Provinces than they have to regulate the franchise of the Dominion. What would the Provinces say if we proposed to do such a thing? Surely it is a sound contention and more to the point that the greater power should control the less than the less should control the greater. I wish to correct the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) and I use the word "correct" because I am quite satisfied that he would not intentionally say anything wrong, but he certainly misled the House woefully in his explanation of the Franchise Act in the Provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. These Provinces do not use the local lists, and the only distinction is that they have a little larger franchise than any other Province. There was added a clause to the Bill that any man in those Provinces who had a qualification under the then existing laws should retain that so long as he retained that qualification in addition to the qualification necessary all over the Dominion. There was no concession to these Provinces by this Parliament, and I am glad it is so, for I do not believe in giving a special right to Provinces. Again the same hon. gentleman misunderstood the question, or he further misled the House when he taunted the Government that they changed the law because the Opposition brought pressure upon the Government so that the judges in Ontario became the revising officers. The fact is the law has not been changed, and the Government if they saw fit to appoint any one else beside a judge can do so. However, the hon. the Prime Minister, as it will be in the recollection of any man who heard him speak, and as it was stated in the papers, said when he introduced the Bill that he intended to appoint the judges as revising officers. I have this confidence in the Premier, and the people of Canada have over and over again shown the same confidence, that when the First Minister says a thing he does it, and that when he makes a statement in this House or in the country they can believe him, because he has been true to them and they have been true to him. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always looked forward to the happy land of promise when they would be in power, but until they get some greater question to attack the Government on than this, I am afraid they will never get there. How are they going to reconcile this matter among themselves if the people insist upon this law, which I claim is right, that this House should regulate the franchise? Because the leader says he will not agree to have what his followers are taunting us in Ontario for not insisting upon; he does not believe in manhood suffrage and will not consent to it, so that his arguments and those of his followers are entirely different. Of course, if you consent that each Province shall have a different franchise, as you are contending to-day, it would be all right.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TISDALE. Do you think that is a logical conclusion? I will show you that it is not. Suppose the Province of Ontario takes a notion to divide itself up into so many franchises that it would get an undue proportion of members—

Some hon. MEMBERS. It could not.

Mr. TISDALE. What I want to show is the absurdity of leaving to any Province that power which it could exercise in regard to this House. Now, some hon. gentleman said that there had been no fault found with the state of things that prevailed before the passage of this Act, and that there was no reason for it. Why, they surely forget how the Province of Nova Scotia changed its franchise within eighteen months. That, I suppose, was the immediate cause of the matter being brought to the attention of the Government of the day, and of revealing the danger to which it was exposed. Probably the old state of things might have gone on if a change had not become necessary from the Act of the Province of Nova Scotia and from the antagonistic position assumed by the different Provincial Governments towards the Federal Government. I think it was a blessing, and I think I shall yet live to see the Reformers of the Province of Ontario satisfied with the principle of this Act, though you may amend it if you please; and if hon. gentlemen opposite were on the Government side of the House, I would support them just as heartily in this. I was a young man when Confederation was started; and there are many who are growing old like myself, who believe in the future of the country, men born in it, who have grown up in it, and who hope with God's blessing to die in it. In the foundation which the right hon. leader of the Government has laid so broad, during the long life that Providence is giving him, he has done many things which hon. gentlemen opposite laughed at, and which many of his own followers doubted, like the Pacific Railway, but which we have lived to see accomplished. I remember well, in the elections of 1874—though this may be a little irrelevant—when hon. gentlemen opposite supposed the Conservative party would never rise again, I had the honor of opposing the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Then you had your chance to establish a National Policy and build up the country; but I remember the incredulity of my hon. friend at the idea of ever building anything like the Canadian Pacific Railway. I mention this to illustrate what I am saying now. If this House does not insist on such rights and powers as will make a Federal Government powerful over all others, giving them their rights, but keeping them within them, we shall never deserve to be a nation, and we shall never have the proper sort of laws and constitution to challenge the confidence of our people.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I have hitherto not taken much interest in this debate; but as I intend to vote on the question, I feel it due to myself, to this House, and to the country to give some explanation of the vote I am going to give. The hon. gentleman who has last spoken referred to the necessity of having a strong central Government. I am one of those who had the honor of assisting at the formation of the constitution of this country in a humble position as a representative of my Province, and I think I can appeal to the right

hon. gentleman to bear me out in this, that on every question that came up, one object I had in view was to avoid the difficulties that had occurred in the country to the south of us in connection with the question of States' rights, where a strong Federal Government was found to be defective. I was anxious that a strong federal power should be formed in Canada under our constitution, and I think we fairly laid the foundation of that intention. Up to this time, I think, there has been no complaint on the part of any one that the constitution under which we live does not give to the Central Government all the power that it finds necessary for conducting the business of the country in a judicious and proper way. Sir, I was proud to be able to give my aid and assistance in England in laying the foundation of a strong central power for Canada; but while I did that, I felt that it was necessary to have a due respect to the rights of the different Provinces, more particularly the smaller Provinces, and I had hoped that in the constitution we had formed no collision would have arisen between the central power and the several Provinces. Sir, later developments—largely arising, I may say, out of what I believe to be the maladministration of the Government who have conducted the business of the country for several years—have led to collisions between the several Provinces and the central power, and have created the very difficulty which led to that great internecine war in the nation to the south of our border. Sir, it is a subject to be regretted. We find that attempts have been made to enforce rights that ought not ever have been claimed. Sir, I will not now illustrate the different points to which I have referred, but I will confine myself to the question of this franchise Act which is before the Chair. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that when the original Bill was before the House I stood on the other side of the House and criticised it pretty severely. I denounced the details of the Act; I found fault with their fancy franchises and their Indian votes, and the troublesome and cumbersome machinery which it was necessary to call into existence to carry it out; but I stood by the right hon. gentleman on one of the main principles of the Bill, and I did so because I believed that scientifically and artistically the principle he contended for was right. The question was whether or not the lists of the several Provinces should be adopted for this Parliament, or whether when passing a franchise Bill we should give to this central Legislature a machinery for the purpose of retaining within itself the power to regulate the franchise of the people who elected the members of this House. Sir, what I did at that day I did honestly. I did it believing it was right to establish that principle, and I do not think there is any hon. gentleman on either side—although many contended against it at that time—who will not admit that, artistically speaking, and constitutionally speaking, it was the proper thing to do. I am free to admit that that influence and that conviction then controlled me, but while I voted with the right hon. gentleman, when that particular question came up, I at the same time condemned the legislation. I voted it cumbersome, and pronounced it to have, as its main object, the enabling of the Ministers of the day to control the free exercise of the votes of the people. I made no bones about stating what my opinions were of the details of what I conceived to

be an iniquitous measure. I have changed my mind about the vote that I shall give when that principle comes up again. It may be all very well to say that it is artistic and scientific that members of this House should control the franchise for the election of members to this House, but when we set in the scale on the one side the enormous expenditure which experience has shown us that Bill creates, and the cumbersome machinery which it has created, and the trouble it gives to the representatives of the people to watch from year to year these lists, and the expense it causes the people's representatives and the people themselves in following these revisers from parish to parish—when we consider the fact that this measure is one calculated to crush out the liberties of the people and to give to the Government a power and influence which will prevent the people freely exercising their votes and freely selecting of their representatives—when we weigh all these defects I feel that, between the scientific and artistic solution on the one hand, and the practical solution on the other, I am prepared to recant the vote I gave four years ago and vote to accept the lists made up by the officers of the different municipalities. Although unscientific in principle, I am prepared to accept this system as being more honest, just, fair and economical, and as being less troublesome and expensive than the present law. I have risen solely to give my justification for the vote I am about to give. From 1867, when Confederation was inaugurated, up to 1885, when this Bill was passed, our elections were conducted under the municipal lists, and during all that time I have had a seat in this House and have never heard one man get up and find fault with the manner in which these lists were made up, or attempt to show that any injustice was perpetrated, or that the people had not a fair representation in the making up of those lists. But what do we find now? We find by the admission of the hon. Minister of Finance, and by the statistics which have been presented by gentlemen from this side, that the cost of making up the first list was between \$400,000 and \$500,000, and that the partial list which was made up this year cost about \$150,000. We find that in defiance of that statute law, which the right hon. gentleman submitted to this House, and caused to be carried, and which requires a yearly list to be made up, they passed over a year, and another year, and just make up the list when it suits themselves. When we look at the dangers on the one hand of giving power to the Administration to do that kind of thing, and the expense to the people on the other hand, we are justified in saying, when neither of these evils exist under the municipal arrangements, which worked admirably for nineteen years, we can afford to repeal this cumbersome Act, and revert back to the former system. I have never gone into my county to follow the revisers making up the lists. I take my chance with the people, and those who choose to follow them and make up their lists can do so; but I trust to the people to return me notwithstanding that. I have been told by some hon. gentlemen here that it has cost them a thousand dollars to follow the revising officers and employ people to inspect those lists. If the system is so expensive as it is said to be, and is so defective in its working, I had rather take

Mr. MITCHELL.

any chance, unscientific though the arrangement may be, and trust to the electoral lists made up by the proper officers appointed by the municipalities, than trust to those made up by the nominees of the right hon. gentleman and those who sit behind him. I have merely made this statement in justification to the vote I intend to give. I shall vote against this Bill. I voted against almost every detail it contained when it was under consideration, and, though I supported the main principle of allowing this Parliament to make the lists, I find now I was mistaken in that. I see now that by the unfair working of the measure, and the enormous expense it creates, not only to the Treasury, but to the members and the people who represent them in the various counties, it is my duty to make this public declaration of the course I now intend to pursue of voting in favor of the repeal of the measure.

Mr. HESSON. I would not trouble the House were it not that we have been taunted on this side with being silent. It has been charged against us that we sit here day after day listening to hon. gentlemen on that side declaim against the provisions of this Bill and offer no word in reply. I do not think hon. gentlemen on that side can complain that we are not willing to listen to their charges, if they have charges. My experience of legislation in this House has been that, when complaints are made which are well founded and reasonable, the Administration is not only willing but ready to make the changes required. When, however, they occasionally do make changes they are taunted with so doing. Who that has had the privilege of a seat in this House from year to year has not heard the charges made against the Ministry that they made those changes after the working of some part of their administration did not prove exactly what the wants of the people required? We know that when the Ministry introduced the National Policy and had to change it from year to year, as experience gave them the information to change it, they were taunted from day to day with having made those very changes. I say it is that which is keeping this Ministry in power. The Government feel that it is the duty of any Government to listen to the complaints of the people, and we have now sat here and listened to a repetition of the stories we heard five years ago from the hon. gentlemen opposite until we were nauseated with the amount of them, when they were doing nothing but speaking against time, because they had adopted a course from which they would not withdraw. But, if we have patiently listened to them, they must give us credit for possessing common sense. Let them make their complaints, and we will assist them as far as we can in getting them remedied, but on every occasion that I have listened to them I have failed to hear one gentleman contend that the judges of Canada are not worthy to be entrusted with the preparation of the list of the voters of this country. I challenge hon. gentlemen to give instances of that. Let them come down to particulars. It is very well to make wholesale charges against the Bill. We are prepared for that. It has been the policy of their party always. I have had the pleasure of sitting in this House for twelve years, and these hon. gentlemen have never accepted any Bill from the Government without complaint. Now they

are complaining because the Government yielded to some of their wishes, and I think it is a hopeless task to attempt to obtain fair consideration for any Bill, no matter how valuable it may be, which is brought down by the Government for the benefit of the people of Canada. We have heard their charges again and again in reference to the National Policy, which has been accepted over and over again by the people. Yet they have the same feeling to-day in reference to that. And now they badger the House and badger the Government and waste the time of the House on this subject, and they compel men to sit and listen to them as patiently as we can. I ask the indulgence of the House for having occupied even five minutes' time, and I would not have risen if I had not been challenged by an hon. gentleman opposite. It is not because I have any doubt as to the working of the Franchise Act, but, when hon. gentlemen draw us to our feet, they must expect to listen to an infliction from this side as well as from that. The hon. gentleman objects to the national franchise, and I think that is a good name for it. What is it that we desire in this country? Is it that provincialism should be continued forever? If this Parliament has not the right to legislate as to the franchise and the liberties of gentlemen in this House, what measure is worthy of the legislation of hon. gentlemen here? We have been taunted because this Franchise Act is not a uniform Act, because, in certain Provinces, special considerations were made on account of the circumstances which existed there. Prince Edward Island had manhood suffrage and British Columbia was under the same conditions, and was it unreasonable, after all, for the Government, during that Parliament, to make an exception in those cases, considering that the gentlemen who had been sent here by a certain class of electors thought they ought not to be asked to disfranchise any of those electors? I think that was a very good reason for the action of the Government in those two particular instances, but the Government is blamed even for that, and it is said, you have not a uniform franchise after all your boasting that you were giving a national franchise to the people of Canada. I would insist upon the franchise being made uniform in those cases when there is to be another appeal to the people. Then, at all events, the electors could not complain that the gentlemen they sent to this House had not guarded as far as they could the rights and privileges of the electors who sent them here. But there is not the slightest hope of convincing hon. gentlemen opposite that anything good can come from this side. The great objection which was made to this Act at the outset was the enormous cost which it would be to the country. I confess, speaking the honest sentiments of the heart, that I thought at the time that possibly it might cost more to us than it was worth under the circumstances, but, that difficulty having now been removed, and the Act working smoothly and satisfactorily, as I believe, everywhere, and the cost having come down to what may fairly be considered reasonable for the election of the representatives in this House under the national franchise, I think we have sufficient to justify us in supporting it, especially remembering what the Secretary of State, in whose charge, I believe, that part of the work is, has stated that for the future he considers there will

be a reduction of 33 per cent. more. Hon. gentlemen have said a good deal about disfranchising the young men of Canada. I think I know them pretty well, having lived amongst them for forty-seven years, from a time when some hon. gentlemen opposite were children or had no existence. I venture to say that there is not a young man in my constituency worthy of the franchise, who is disfranchised under this Act. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said, you are disfranchising the volunteers of Canada, the men who must come to the defence of the country and protect it when the occasion arises. I will ask any gentleman if he can from memory mention a young man in any battalion with which he is acquainted who is disfranchised as a volunteer? Within the last three or four weeks, I have been compelled to attend the revision of the local list for the County of Perth, when there were six or seven hundred appeals, and I have compared the local list with ours, and, if there is any difference. I am satisfied it is in favor of the Dominion franchise, because there are gentlemen of property who are so circumstanced that they cannot live on their property or live in the county, who are still electors under the Dominion franchise, and I think are fairly so as taxpayers, as men who have invested their capital and who own property in this country. I say that a provincial franchise disfranchises those men, and there is not one-man-one-vote in these cases. I know hundreds of them in my own county. I could name forty or fifty in my own city, disfranchised by that act of Mr. Mowat, who will not have a vote in their constituencies, because they have no residence there; but under this Act, where their property is, where they pay their taxes, they are entitled to be registered and entitled to be voters. In that way we are more liberal than the Provincial franchise. Then we give all the officers of the Local Legislatures the right to vote, with the single exception, I think, of sheriffs, and one or two other officers of high rank. Is that not fair? We look upon them as an intelligent class. Here we have the Local Legislature of Ontario and the Local Legislature of Quebec both disqualifying some of the most intelligent men we have in Canada, men who have been selected to serve their country, men who have been employed because of their intelligence, men who make Canada their home. But these men are disqualified by the laws of both Provinces, while I may say the tramp is recognised if he can only get himself enrolled, and it is very easy to be enrolled sometimes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that that statement is true. Intelligent men are disfranchised under both Local Legislatures, and instead of one-man-one-vote, you know well they are not entitled to vote although they may be heavy taxpayers in their own constituency. I can give you an instance of a gentleman residing in the city of Toronto. I do not know that he holds property there, I do not know that he owns a foot of land there, or that he is even registered and qualified to vote. But he pays \$500 taxes in the city of Stratford, and he ought to have a right to vote there in order to protect his rights. He could not retain his vote, however, though he wrote me about it. And what was the answer? He required to be a resident in that constituency.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he will permit me—

Mr. HESSON. Will the hon. gentleman just be quiet and sit down. That is the way you serve me when you are speaking. Now I would like to ask hon. gentlemen one question; I presume some of them will be able to answer it: Why should they complain against the Dominion franchise and say that it disfranchises a large number of people in Canada, especially young men? Let me tell hon. gentlemen—and no one knows it better than the hon. member for Bothwell himself—that the local lists are the basis of our Dominion lists, and every one who is entitled to be on those lists, is upon ours.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. HESSON. I assert it again, it is so. It is true that there is no property qualification required by the Local Legislature. That is manhood suffrage, I admit. It is also true that there is no property qualification required, so far as young men are concerned, under the Dominion franchise. They must be wage-earners, they must have some means of living so as not to be recognised as tramps. Now there is not a young man I presume in the city of Stratford, none that we respect or we consider worthy to be entrusted with the franchise, who is not able to earn enough to qualify himself under the Dominion franchise. I maintain that they are virtually the same. What does the Act require? That he shall be twenty-one years of age, a British subject by birth or naturalisation. Is that not a qualification by itself? That is just the same qualification as far as the Dominion Act is concerned, only he shall have some visible means of support, that is, he shall not be a charge upon the community, in point of fact he must earn his own living. Now, any man that has any interest in Canada we desire to be enrolled rather in that list than in the other. The hon. gentleman seems to desire that a poor wayfarer, if he can only get himself enrolled, may travel from town to town and can turn up as a good voter when he is required, whereas a man with property who has to pay taxes to support that man on his tramps, is disfranchised. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) seems very anxious about the cost of the revision of these lists. That has not been my experience. The hon. gentleman, I dare say, is more liberal than myself, he may be more in the habit of spending extravagantly among his constituents. I think a number of gentlemen on the other side have been in the habit of doing that very liberally; they may be blessed with more means than gentlemen on this side of the House. I can only give my own experience. I have attended every revision held in my county. I found it a pleasure to do so; notwithstanding what the hon. member for Northumberland said, I felt it a pleasure to be amongst my constituents. If I heard any complaints, I was there to recognise them, and to see if they could be adjusted. I think it is the duty of every member to go amongst his constituents, and I do not think a more opportune time could be chosen than that. Whenever an elector may have a grievance of any kind, he at all events, has a right to be recognised, he has a right to express his opinion, and to express it by a vote when the time comes. Now, I have gone, as I said, amongst my constituents and attended
Mr. HESSON.

all these courts of revision. I only spent what it cost for the day, my trip, and my dinner. I heard no complaints anywhere. Every one was treated fairly and right. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) has the very same revising officer as myself; he will know whether I am speaking correctly. I think he has been treated in the very same way. He could spend what he likes. If he chooses to employ a solicitor to look after his business, he can do so. I never heard what that hon. gentleman spent. I have heard no complaints as to the manner in which the revising barristers discharged their duty. The hon. member for Middlesex, who spoke in a very frank and open way, rather favored this, only for the cost; but as far as he knew, the revising barristers had discharged their duties to the satisfaction of all. Now I do not propose to detain the House. I should not have risen at all, but that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) challenged me and said I was a free lance and occasionally interfered in the debates, but at present I was silent. Well, it is not because I do not feel that this Act can be defended. I feel that every year that Act is becoming more necessary to the people of Canada, if we are to become a nation, and is much preferable to leaving the matter to the whim, or to the caprice, of a Local Legislature to form the lists upon which members shall be elected to this House; one coming here to represent men, perhaps, without any qualification whatever, and another coming here to represent electors, who have a money qualification. I say every man in this House representing his constituents should stand upon the very same footing. I am not at all satisfied with the local lists. I think there are a number of gentlemen in this House who know that the local lists are not prepared with the same prudence, with the same skill that could be desired, on account sometimes of political bias. The local lists are prepared with that feeling, at least. We know that the elections in every municipality of Ontario, have for years been fought out bitterly upon party lines. There is not a ward in the city, not a ward in the township, I am sorry to say, where these battles have not been fought, and hon. gentleman opposite may as well admit the truth. If they try to conceal it from themselves, they do themselves an injustice. I may say that in the appointing of the assessor, in the selection of a revision court, in the effort to get not only a party man as an assessor, but a majority of the court of revision—all the way through that list has been in view, in order that each party may strengthen themselves. And so, even to get rid of that difficulty, this is a good Act and one that should not be repealed. If we are ever to hope for peace and harmony in the country and to get rid of party difficulties which exist in municipalities, and many times those difficulties have interfered with the success and prosperity of municipalities, we give the people by this Act the prospect of a solid nationality in the future.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I believe I opposed this Bill at its introduction. I have not changed my mind as to the character of the Bill since then. I believe the Premier changed his mind in connection with it; he consented, after some persuasion on our part, to changes in the Bill. I do not know but there are some heavy indictments in

connection with the history of this Act to be laid against the First Minister. I do not know but that he may be liable to have actions brought against him by certain classes whom he neglected under this Bill. The House will remember that he introduced the measure several times before it passed. The House will also remember that in the Bill when presented he proposed to give the ladies of the Dominion the franchise. But the hon. gentleman broke his promise to the ladies, he committed a breach of promise, and I should not be much surprised if the First Minister and some of his Ministers may yet be tried for breach of promise for neglecting the interests of the ladies in connection with this Bill. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) spoke about the people of the country having given their support to the Premier so long. I have sometimes heard it stated in this House and out of it that the Liberal party, if they could, would do some injury to the First Minister. I do not know why any person should make a statement of that character with a view to arousing the passions of those who support the right hon. gentleman. I believe he has invariably been kindly treated by those who have opposed him. I believe he has received every consideration at the hands of those who have opposed him and who felt it to be their duty to oppose him on public grounds. He has had a pretty long day, and he should not complain of the innings he has had in public life. He has made mistakes, and, in my opinion, a great many political mistakes. He has made mistakes, the effects of which will be felt by the people not only at the present time but for years to come, and will not be recovered from perhaps in this generation. One of the injuries inflicted on the people is the adoption of this Act, and if I except the Gerrymander Bill and the License Bill and a few other Bills, which I will not mention just now, this Franchise Act is one of the most atrocious ever submitted for the consideration of Parliament. There was no good reason why it should have been introduced at the time it was introduced. There was no objection to the lists which had been prepared and used since Confederation. They were prepared by the Provinces in accordance with the well-understood wishes of the people of the Provinces. In different Provinces they necessarily would have different franchises under which they would record their votes. That was the acknowledged principle, and no evil resulted from it. It was also trusting the matter to the people, leaving them to arrange the basis on which they should vote. That was one of the principles had in view at the time of Confederation. I was pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), one who was interested in bringing about Confederation and establishing the basis on which Confederation should be built, and I was highly pleased with his speech and with the principles he enunciated and the intention he expressed of opposing this Act in the interests of the people, not only on principle but on the ground of expense. The causes that led to Confederation are well known. A deadlock existed, owing to local affairs having to be transacted in Parliament. Under the Confederation Act local affairs were to be administered by the Provinces, and hence the difficulties that arose then have since ceased to exist. An hon. gentleman has told the House in regard to

the Conservative platform. It is well known that the Conservative party in Ontario has no platform. Its representatives in the Local Legislature have advocated manhood suffrage. In this House the Conservatives have not advocated manhood suffrage. The Conservatives have a certain platform in one place and a different platform in another. In Ontario, that party gauged the wishes of the people better than have the Conservatives in this House. Some hon. gentleman said it was desirable to have uniformity and that that was one of the objects of the Franchise Act. But we have not obtained uniformity under it; that object has been defeated. Then there was the Indian franchise. They make the Indian an elector in some places and not in others; they gave him a vote in Ontario and Quebec, but not in the North-West Territories and British Columbia. While they gave him a vote under this Act, the Indian Act took away his citizenship; accordingly, he has not the rights of citizenship, although he has the right to decide what shall be and what shall not be the legislation of the country. There are many objections to the Act independent of that of the enormous expense. That is, of course, an objection. That is sufficient to lead hon. members to vote in favor of the motion of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson). The cost has been very great, and if the Act is operated fairly and properly it will continue to be very great; and this House would make much better use of the money expended if they would carry out works necessary in the interests of the country rather than in carrying out an Act which is unnecessary, costly and not in the best interests of the people. By consulting the report of the Minister of Public Works for the last year, I find there was expended on the building for the printing bureau \$125,421.82. I do not know whether there was any more plant previous to that year or not, but I notice for the plant and the printing bureau, according to the Auditor General's Report, there was spent last year \$165,179.97, which makes altogether something in the neighborhood of \$300,000. Then, if we add the cost of operating the Act this far, we find altogether that up to the present this Act, including the printing bureau and its organisation, has cost us between eight and nine hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. RYKERT. A million.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for Lincoln says a million, and the hon. member for Lincoln is sometimes correct in his figures and he may be correct on this occasion. I think that the Government find they have a white elephant on their hands in this printing bureau. Through its operation they are attempting to enter into competition with the press of this country and attempting to do that which is a legitimate business for the press of the country, and which ought to be done by the people engaged in that branch of business. It is natural to suppose that difficulties will arise and will continue to arise so long as the Government enters into competition with the press of the country whose work this legitimately is. By reason of this bureau the business is drawn away from the city and the local press which legitimately belongs to them. Under the Act of the Local Legislatures the local papers throughout the Provinces print these lists, and any gentleman who compares

the local with the Dominion lists will find that the local lists are better printed and are better managed and have more to show for the money expended on them than the lists prepared and printed in this Government bureau. Here at the outset is an injury done to a large and important section of the people of this country, and an injury which we should not attempt to perpetuate. Again, I have just been informed that under this Act the employés of the Intercolonial Railway are placed on the list for three or four constituencies. If that is the case it will be possible for one of these employés to have several votes at the various elections in different ridings, although they have no other qualification than their income of three or four hundred dollars a year. It will be easily seen that if the principle admitted in some of the Provinces of one-man-one-vote was in operation this injustice could not be perpetrated. This, I am told, occurs in Rivière du Loup, St. Flavie and Campbellton, where over 60 of the employés of the Intercolonial Railway are on the list of these three divisions. It has been stated here to-night that the Franchise Act is complicated in the Provinces, and in this connection reference has been made to Ontario. Now, Mr. Speaker, you know that the Act in the Province of Ontario is a very simple one. The lists, as you are aware, are controlled by the municipal councils. They have a court of revision and if any names are omitted they can be placed on by the court of revision of the council and if anybody is left off after that court of revision there is a final court of revision before the county judge, the same gentleman who is revising officer under the Dominion Act. I shall not take up the time of the House much longer in discussing this matter. I believe as strongly as ever I believed that this Act should be repealed. I believe it is not in the interest of the country to perpetuate this Act and I believe, in addition to the enormous expense, the possibility of fraud and injustice being done to the electors are sufficient to justify this House in repealing the Act. I believe that if this House fails to repeal it they will deserve the condemnation of the country.

Mr. WALDIE. The revision of the voters' lists which took place in 1886 was based upon the primary roll of 1885. At the election of 1887 the question of expense was then discussed, but as there was some of that expenditure which had not been paid and was not in the Public Accounts, the amounts stated by the Opposition as the cost of that revision was questioned and was not a factor in the election of 1887. The object of my addressing the House is to point out the danger that will arise from the continuance of the non-revision of the lists, if that is to be the practice from year to year. In the year 1888 the third election in the county which I represent was held since the revision of the voters' lists, and on that occasion there was fully 30 per cent. of the voters who had not the privilege of exercising their franchise. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) said he knew of no volunteers who were deprived of the privilege of voting, but I can tell him that there were 30 of 100 volunteers then drilling at Niagara who were not on the voters' lists of 1888. If the franchise is to remain as it is (and I have no serious objection to this House adopting any franchise they may see fit) it would be in the best interests of this country and in a spirit of economy

Mr. LANDERKIN.

if the municipal authorities were permitted to prepare the lists. The municipal lists are now printed in duplicate, which is to say that there are names on the lists of the municipal voters and the provincial voters, and there could just as well be a treble list with the names of parties who are entitled to vote for members of the House of Commons. If this were done the House would still control the character of the franchise which elected its members. The Secretary of State informed us in his address that it was not the intention of the Government to revise the lists annually. I ask if it is not a most unfair proposition that the Government of the day shall decide when the revision of the lists shall take place. Is it not an essential thing that every one should know the stated periods at which revisions shall take place? Is it possible that it can be meant that the Government shall assume for themselves the right to choose the franchise upon which they shall be elected, and that they can choose for the franchise the lists of 1889 if it suits them, and if it does not suit them they can reject it and revise again. Is it a reasonable proposition that they shall be judge and jury of their own actions? I hold that the revision should take place at the same time throughout the whole country, and that it should not be in the hands of the Administration of the day to say when such revision shall take place. The Administration of the day have the privilege of dissolving the House and calling upon the people to elect their representatives. I do not ask that they should give up that power, but they should not have the right to say what persons shall elect them. If the proposition of the hon. Secretary of State is carried out, and the Ministry of the day can set the law aside which provides that there shall be an annual revision, and only hold a revision when it suits them, I think that is an assumption of power which is not reasonable and which this House should not assent to. The revising barristers have had a great deal of pressure brought upon them by the friends of the Administration of the day to do what would be unfair and unjust. I had an opportunity of conversing with a revising barrister, not one of the Province of Ontario, but of another Province, who said to me: "I am a Conservative, and was appointed by Conservatives, but I admit that this business of revising the lists has been a more unpleasant duty than any I have ever had to perform. I have been pressed repeatedly by active friends of politicians to put names on the list which I was not entitled to put on, and which I refused to put on, and they even presumed to tell me that that was what I was paid for." Although it is to the credit of the revising barristers that they have not been influenced to any extent, in many cases they have been constantly brought under pressure, and that is one reason why I think it would be better to have the primary lists, prepared by the municipal bodies, used for Dominion elections. If that were done, every opportunity would be given to all for the correction of errors made by the municipal bodies by an appeal to the county judge. Now, I think it would be a very serious matter not to have an annual revision of the lists. It was thought desirable to add wage-earners to the list of voters, and yet it is proposed and practiced that for three years all the young men who come of age during that time shall be deprived of

the right to vote. I feel that it would be a greater sacrifice of the rights of the people to have the revision controlled by the Government of the day than to be obliged to pay \$100,000 or \$200,000 a year for an annual revision. I would rather pay the money, and have the lists revised from year to year.

Mr. WELSH. I am going to say a few words on behalf of the Government. I speak for the Province which I have the honor to represent, and I can assure the Government that if they would accede to the demand of this side of the House for going away with this cumbersome Act, they would gain about a thousand votes in Prince Edward Island, although I do not say that they would even then be able to carry the Province. We are accustomed to give our young men votes when they reach the age of twenty-one years; and I think it is unfair that a young man who is born in the country, and lives in it as a taxpayer, should be deprived of his vote. Therefore, I think the Government would do well to let the Provincial franchise be the Dominion franchise also. By doing so they will save a very large sum of money; and I believe the people of the country will be better satisfied. I have listened to the remarks made during this discussion, and there have been many able speeches made, especially by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), who made the question as clear as daylight. I am sure that if this question were put to the vote of the people of Prince Edward Island, ninety-nine out of every hundred would say: "Let us have the Provincial franchise for our Dominion elections."

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There is one class of voters whose case I think has not been sufficiently represented before this House, that is, that of the young men employed by the farmers of Ontario. A great many of those young men have been disfranchised by this Act. Notwithstanding what the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) has said about the wages prevailing in that county, I know that in my own county and throughout the western part of Ontario the majority of the young men who work on farms do not receive sufficient remuneration to entitle them to be placed on the Dominion voters' list. In examining the report of the Bureau of Industries to-day, I found that the average annual remuneration received by that class in the Province amounts to only \$157. I was present last fall when there was an adjourned revision of the Provincial voters' list and a revision of the Dominion list afterwards. Several young men whose names were on the Provincial list were excluded from the Dominion list on the ground of not having sufficient salary. I do not say that the judge acted unjustly; I think he acted perfectly right in not placing their names on the list from the evidence before him; but I say that the Dominion Franchise Act does this large class of enterprising young men a great deal of injustice. The hon. member for North Perth stated that the Provincial and the Dominion franchises are the same, but I say they are not. He says that the Provincial lists are not revised with the same care and diligence as the Dominion list; but he gave himself away when he admitted that the Provincial lists were the foundation of the Dominion lists, so that if the Provincial lists have not been got up with care, it is im-

possible for the Dominion lists to be so. But I state positively, having knowledge of what I say, after sitting for ten years in one of the municipal councils of Ontario, that you can hardly find a single township council where there are not both Conservatives and Reformers, and they both pay strict attention to the revision of the lists; and I know further that in not a few townships, where young men or others who should be on the lists are found not to have been placed there, then the court of revision sits, under a clause in the Provincial Act, the court may adjourn and the assessor become appellant to place names on the list which he had not before him when going round. That has been done frequently, and, therefore, I state that the Provincial lists are prepared with much greater care than the Dominion lists. And if it should be found that a single municipality or municipal council would attempt to manipulate the voters' lists in favor of either party, they have only one year to hold office and the electors would call them to account very rapidly. But, under the present system, the Government has complete control of the lists, and there is nobody to take them to task for not getting them up properly. We have heard a great deal about the appeal to the country and about the Government being sustained in 1887 after the Franchise Act had been passed; but I could mention some potent influences which had been used to control certain constituencies. Let me point out the Gerrymander Act and the Franchise Act, and I might go back before the last general elections and show what took place in the Lower Provinces, when certain gentlemen promised that, if they supported the Government, large subsidies would be granted those Provinces. When in fulfilment of these promises large votes were brought before the House, the statement was made that the granting of certain bonuses was going to shorten the distance to the Atlantic coast by 45 miles, but we found, after large sums had been spent in fulfilment of the election promises, that this distance was only shortened by seven miles. Those are some of the influences that were brought to bear on the electors to induce them to support the Government, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite have the hardihood to say that a fair appeal was made to the electors and that no undue influences were exercised. In connection with my own riding, I have conversed with both Conservatives and Reformers with respect to the Franchise Act, and I have yet to meet the Conservative who would justify the action of the Government in passing that measure. In fact, the very arguments of the Opposition to-day are sufficient to show that it is not in the interests of the people. They say that the expense ought not to be taken into consideration, but I hold that it is the duty of the Government to give the most just and effective measure of franchise at the very lowest cost, especially at a time like this, when such depression is sweeping over the country, and a majority of the agriculturists of the Province of Ontario are suffering severely. What did the hon. the Secretary of State say? He stated that it had cost \$150,000 to revise the lists, and that when reduced to the very lowest estimate the revision will cost \$105,000 annually. This of itself is sufficient cause for us to repeal the Act, when we know that lists as effective, as honest and as much in the interests of the country, can be prepared without all

this expense. I hold that the Provincial lists are better for the people to vote on. Young men of the western part of the Province of Ontario feel very keenly their being debarred under Dominion franchise from voting, when they are allowed to vote under the Provincial franchise, although they are but little affected by Provincial legislation. The only extent to which local legislation affects the young men is with regard to statute labor, but the Dominion Government imposes all indirect taxation, and the young men pay a large amount of taxation according to income—I believe more than any other class of the community, and for this cause, if for no other, they ought to be placed on the lists. I do hope the Government will take this into consideration, and agree to the resolution of my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson), which, as a representative of a rural constituency, I am bound to support.

Mr. WATSON. Coming from the western portion of this Dominion, and from a Province largely interested in the resolution before the House, I feel it my duty to give my reasons for recording my vote in favor of the resolution. In the new Province from which I come, into which there is continually going a large population, a large number of men who could have a vote are disfranchised. The hon. the Secretary of State spoke of the debate on this measure, when introduced in 1885, as a long and useless debate, but the Bill as introduced was intended practically to disfranchise every man, if necessary, in order to elect the present Administration. The Bill, as it was introduced, is not at all the Act which is on the Statute-book, for in that Bill the Government took power to appoint a revising barrister of two years' standing, who might be an irresponsible individual, and who would be enabled to fix up the lists. Were it not for that so-called useless debate, I am satisfied the Bill would have passed in the shape to deprive Canadian citizens of the right to the franchise. We are told that this Franchise Act has cost the country \$413,000 for the first revision. I know that in the county I have the honor to represent that revision cost in the neighborhood of \$5,000, or rather more than \$1 a vote for each vote in that county. That is an expense that could easily be avoided. We are told that a partial account has been made to-day of the expenditure this year, and that the expenditure so far has amounted to \$150,000. I object to this Act more particularly on account of the restriction it exercises on our franchise. In Manitoba in local affairs we have manhood suffrage, and I believe, we are entitled to manhood suffrage in Dominion matters as well. The local system is very simple. All that is required is registration to entitle a man to vote. Under that system we provide, on the one list, that the persons named as qualified to vote for the Legislative Assembly, shall be designed by the letter L, and, for a municipal official, by the letter M. By that means the two franchises are contained in the one list. I claim that in Canada while we raise our revenue by a revenue tax, every British subject twenty-one years of age should be entitled to vote. There might be certain objections to manhood suffrage for municipal purposes or for a Local Legislature, but for Dominion purposes, as long as we

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

raise our revenue by indirect taxation, every man ought to be entitled to a vote. Our local franchise provides for one-man-one-vote. I approve of that. We have had it tested in two elections in Manitoba, and it has worked well. I do not think a man who has his property divided up in three or four districts should have three or four votes, when he may not be worth more than a man who owns his property in only one district. That system also prevents a great deal of expense. For these reasons and for others which I might mention if it were not so late, and if other gentlemen had not spoken upon the subject, I will vote for the motion of my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson). I have no expectation that this House will carry the resolution, judging from the fact that we have men like my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), who does not give his own opinion, but says that he thinks his leader knows more about the subject than he does; and, though he occasionally growls, he is satisfied to support him in this matter.

Mr. DALY. I did not intend to take up the time of the House until I heard the remarks of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson). He has referred to the manner in which the Legislature of Manitoba makes up its municipal voters' list. He has told the House that the list which is prepared under the law of Manitoba contains two columns, one showing those who are entitled to vote at municipal elections, and another showing those who are entitled to vote at parliamentary elections. To show how our friends opposite, who are represented up there by the Greenway Government, carry out the idea of "one-man-one-vote," I may state that my name has been upon the assessment roll for seven years in the town in which I reside, but the enumerator saw fit to leave it off the voters' list, and it was necessary for me to appeal in order to get my name put on that list. Further, as the hon. gentleman knows, owing to the bungling of the Greenway Government in their legislation, every municipal election which was held in Manitoba last December had to be held upon the list of 1888, because the machinery which the Local Government had provided did not arrange for a revision of the lists in time for the elections in December. The consequence is that, although all the municipalities were put to great expense in printing those lists, they were of no avail at the elections and are of no use to-day. I have heard no hon. gentleman on the other side state, and I have no doubt the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) would not say, that as far as the Dominion lists in his constituency are concerned, the provisions of the law are not carried out fairly and above board, that the revising officer in his constituency does not perform his duty properly. We must remember that nearly throughout the length and breadth of Canada the revising officers under the Dominion Electoral Franchise Act are the very men to whom, under the local Acts, an appeal is allowed, showing that the Local Legislatures of Ontario and Manitoba, at all events, have confidence in the officers to whom the Dominion Parliament has entrusted the revision of the voters' lists. The Local Legislature of Manitoba has seen fit to allow an appeal to the county judges, who are the revising officers under the Dominion Franchise Act, so that it goes with-

out saying that, as far as the revising officers in Manitoba are concerned, no word can be said against them. The whole argument, as far as I can make it out, which has been used by hon. gentlemen opposite is the question of expense; but, as the Secretary of State has announced, that expense has been reduced by some 60 per cent. this year, and I have no doubt, as the Department gains experience, even that expense will be materially decreased. I have not heard anything advanced to show that there has been anything wrong in the making up of these lists. I think one hon. member stated that he would like to go back to the days when the lists were made up from the assessment rolls, but surely he knows that the assessment rolls form the basis of the lists under the Dominion Elections Act. Under that Act, any young man who is 21 years of age, who has resided in Canada for one year, who is a British subject, and who has earned \$300 within that year is entitled to be put upon that list, and I would ask the member for Marquette whether he believes there is one young man in his constituency possessing those qualifications who is not on the Dominion list. If there is, it is the fault of himself or of his friends. It comes down practically to manhood suffrage, because as far as Manitoba is concerned, I am proud to say that there is not a young man of 21 years of age who does not earn sufficient to entitle him to go on the Dominion list. I know, from the revision of the Dominion list and the revision of the local list, that they are almost identical, except that the Dominion list is fuller and contains more names than the local. I could go into the question of the way in which those local lists have been prepared, and I could show that our Grit friends are just as capable of manipulating those lists in Manitoba as they are elsewhere. We have had some experience of their capacity in that respect. When the present Manitoba Government were in opposition, Mr. Greenway and others of that party promised that, as soon as they got into power, our local Election Act would be so amended that none but municipal officers would be enumerators, and yet to-day there is scarcely one municipal officer holding the position of enumerator in the Province. They are all or nearly all the appointees of Mr. Greenway and his partisans. In my constituency there are sixteen thousand names upon the voters' list. So that, except Montreal East and Toronto West, I represent more voters that anyone else in this House. Still, I have never heard one complaint from Grit or Tory as to the making up of the Dominion lists, and I have never seen the subject discussed in the newspapers or during the election, either in Marquette, Winnipeg or the other constituencies. As far as my own constituency is concerned, the electors are perfectly satisfied with the Dominion Franchise Act. I do not think any argument has been brought forward to-day to show that there would be any justification for this Government retreating from the position they have taken, that, as far as the federal electorate is concerned, this Parliament, and this Parliament alone, should have a right to say who should vote for the members who are to be sent to this House.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest that we now adjourn. It is now 11 o'clock, and I do not think that the House desires to sit any later.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Don't you think that we might sit for a couple of hours more and finish this?

Mr. LAURIER. If I could hope that a couple of hours more would convince the other side, we might go on. I think we might give the debate another day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Does my hon. friend think that there is no chance of closing to-night?

Mr. LAURIER. I think not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I must accept my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. TROW moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 7th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 56) to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1889, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Erie and Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Lister.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Bill (No. 59) to change the name of the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company to the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil.)

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Rainy River Boom Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 61) to amend the Act to incorporate the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 62) to grant certain powers to the Canadian Millers' Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Home Benefit Life Association.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Moncton and Prince Edward Island Railway and Ferry Company.—(Mr. Landry.)

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 65) further to amend the Criminal Law. He said: The objects of the Bill are: First, to make the seduction of a servant by a master or employer a criminal offence; second, to define and punish incest; third, to make more effectual provision for the suppression of polygamy; fourth, to allow jurors refreshments

when on duty; fifth, to enlarge the powers of judges when dealing with convictions under the Summary Convictions Act; sixth, to authorise a justice to submit a case for the opinion of a superior court; seventh, to make certain provisions as to recognisances under the Speedy Trials Act; and, eighth, to make it clear that courts-martial may send to county goals.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE, CHEQUES AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 6) relating to bills of exchange, cheques and promissory notes.

Mr. LAURIER. Under circumstances which the right hon. gentleman must be aware of, I think the House ought now to go into Committee of Supply. On Tuesday last, when the House was about to go into Committee of Supply, the hon. the Minister of Finance asked me if we had any amendment to move. I informed him that we intended to move an amendment for the removal of the rebate duty on corn manufactured into spirits. My hon. friend asked me not to move that amendment, for certain reasons, and I at once acquiesced to his demand; but I supposed that the hon. gentleman would give me the first opportunity to move that amendment. If we are not given that opportunity now, I do not think the hon. gentleman will be acting towards me with the fairness I have the right to expect from his side of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope that what I say now will convince my hon. friend that we have no desire to act unfairly. We have no desire to prevent my hon. friend from moving his resolution, but the fact is that on Friday, on both sides, a good many members go away, and I do not think it would be fair to the Government to ask a division to-night. The debate would have to be continued over to Tuesday, in order to obtain a complete vote on the resolution. I can quite understand that, in consequence of other notices of motion on the paper, my hon. friend might fear that his motion might be forestalled on Monday, but I shall take care that he will not be put in that position; and, if necessary, I shall give him an opportunity to-night to make his amendment by moving the House into Supply before adjournment, and his amendment will stand over until Tuesday.

Mr. LAURIER. I am quite satisfied.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 49,

Mr. BURDETT. I want to know if the Minister proposes to saddle a man who endorses a note, with \$2.50 for the pleasure of doing so, in the shape of a protest? In Ontario, you get 50 cents for the protest, 25 cents for each notice, and the postage.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). We have not got to that yet.

Mr. BURDETT. We are pretty near it—close enough to talk about it, anyway. I think it is

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

hard enough to pay a note you have endorsed without paying for a protest. Possibly, the Minister of Justice has had no experience of that kind, but we who have had experience of that kind do not want to pay any more than we agree to pay; and we who are not bank solicitors do not intend to pay \$2.50 for the privilege of endorsing a note for a friend. I intend to divide the House upon the question of charging more than the present rates for protesting a note in Ontario. I do not think that anybody can fairly charge more. No man honestly earns more than is now allowed in the Province of Ontario, for protesting a note. A bank solicitorship is simply a sinecure at present, given to some friend of the bank, who makes so much out of it in protesting notes. It is not honest nor fair, when a man sees fit to put his name upon a friend's paper, that he should have to pay some bank solicitor for the privilege of having done so. It is hard enough in many cases, and disastrous enough, to have to pay the liability, without paying an unnecessary and exorbitant charge for it. The hon. Minister of Justice comes from a Province that may have a different rule, and different charges; I am stating the fees as they are charged in Ontario. They are large enough, in all conscience—too large, in my judgment; but I am not in favor of changing laws that are known and well understood. But upon the question of protest, and upon the three days grace, I have a very strong opinion. I think a man who signs a note, knowing what he signs, or a man who endorses a note, knowing what he endorses, ought to pay it at the time he agrees to pay it, and he ought to pay the amount that he agrees to pay, provided he is able to do so; if he is not able to do so, his creditor ought to forgive him. But this charge of \$2.50 in this Bill for a protest, is simply indefensible, and I trust the hon. Minister of Justice will make the charges as they are now in Ontario, or less, if possible.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That is in the schedule—when we come to it.

Mr. BURDETT. It is near enough now. I do not intend to let a dog bite me before I kill him.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). We are not discussing that question just now.

Mr. BURDETT. You are a bank solicitor.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Yes; and a responsible position it is.

Mr. BURDETT. The responsibility consists in drawing the pay.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I will meet my hon. friend on that question when the proper time comes.

Mr. BURDETT. I do not expect to be able to convince solicitors of banks. It is hard to convince men who have their pay in their pocket, but the poor fellow who has his name at the back of a note is easily convinced that he should not pay more than that sum. My experience has been that of having my name on notes and not at the foot of protests. I have strong sympathy with the man who has to pay, and not with the man who is paid for doing little work.

Mr. LISTER. There is nothing about protests in that section.

Mr. BURDETT. You are a bank solicitor, I guarantee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) is a correct one. The subject referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burdett) is one of great importance. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in supposing that I have framed the Bill with a view to suit matters in my own Province.

Mr. BURDETT. I did not say you had.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The fees in all the Provinces, except Quebec, are the same as those in Ontario, and the scale of fees proposed in the Bill is that of the Province of Ontario. It is submitted simply as a suggestion, with a view to making the law uniform in that particular. If the Committee think the fees are too high in Quebec, one of two courses can be adopted: To decline to make them uniform, or to make them uniform by reducing them.

Mr. BURDETT. I am not accusing the Minister of any desire to increase them, but I am simply calling attention to the fact. I presume the Minister is aware that, under the law of Ontario, where notice of dishonor or protest has not been given, and the party endorsing the paper promises afterwards to pay the bill, that is held to be a question of fact, and if found against the promisor he is obliged to pay the bill, although no notice of protest has been given. That, in my judgment, is an infringement of the Statute of Frauds. Promises made after a bill has been dishonored or when overdue, should not be admitted, except made in writing. I do not know whether the Minister of Justice is aware that this has been held to be the law in Ontario.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, and in other Provinces also.

Mr. BURDETT. In my judgment, this system has led to a great deal of hard swearing, and a clause should be inserted in this Bill providing that such promises must be made in writing.

Mr. LISTER. Under this Bill it is not necessary to give a written notice, but if the notice is imperfect, it can be supplemented by a verbal notice. This leads to much litigation. The whole system of presentation and protest will have, ultimately, to be abolished. When a man endorses a note, he enters into a contract to pay the amount, if the maker of the note does not pay. The service of the notice of dishonor is a mere form. I repeat, that if a man accepts a draft or endorses a note, he undertakes to pay it, and he ought to be held liable until it is paid.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). An endorser simply undertakes to pay if the maker of the note does not pay. It is very important that an endorser should have notice, because he may thereby be enabled to take measures to protect himself from loss. I agree that a party should not be placed in a position so that he can avoid payment on some technical objection. I am not, however, prepared to abolish the notice, for I can see that an endorser might be placed in an exceedingly difficult position, and might not know whether the note had been paid or not. If at the time he had notice, he might be able to secure himself from the prior parties. But the party deciding to wait for twelve months and then come upon him, it seems to me,

would, under the circumstances, be a very great hardship.

Mr. BURDETT. The admission made by the two hon. gentlemen who have just sat down calls to my mind the time when the Ontario Legislature, in their wisdom, increased the members' indemnity from \$600 to \$800. A distinguished member of the House at that time said: "This is a subject upon which we can all agree." And, as I find two distinguished solicitors of banks admitting that protests may, and ought to be abolished, I respectfully submit to this House, "that this is a subject on which we all can agree." I, therefore, suggest that the Minister of Justice wipe out of the schedule that little list of fees to those who act as solicitors for banks, so that the poor fellows who are unwise enough, or good enough, to endorse notes will only have to pay the notes, and not pay for the pleasure of some gentleman walking up to the bank and telling him he has got to pay. As we all agree on the question of abolishing protests, I trust there may be no trouble about it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps we may attain the hon. gentleman's object just as well by leaving in the provision for the protest and abolishing the fees.

Mr. BURDETT. That will do just as well.

Mr. LISTER. The difficulty with my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Burdett) is that he has not been able to get appointed solicitor for a bank.

Mr. BURDETT. My reputation is too good for any bank to employ me to do any such work.

Mr. LISTER. So far as this notice of protest is concerned, it merely gives the man who entered into the contract, and who intended at the time he entered into the contract to pay, if the principal debtor did not pay, an opportunity of escaping from the liability which he believed would be incurred. Why should a man who becomes security on a promissory note be in a different position from a man who becomes surety on any other instrument? Why should a man who becomes security for a party's bond, not demand notice that the bond has not been performed, in order to hold him responsible to the same extent as the endorser of a promissory note? This whole law is based on an old fiction which has come down to us from our forefathers, and which is no reason for the additional expense. The whole question of protesting promissory notes is one which is kept upon the Statute-book, not in the interest of the man who has become security, but in the interest of the bank solicitors. The hon. members for Quebec, who are members of the notarial profession, have, I see, very liberal fees indeed payable to them. I do not care whether the Minister of Justice retains that tariff or not, but, so far as I am individually concerned, I think the amount payable to us in the Province of Ontario for that service, if it is to be continued, is abundantly sufficient.

Mr. BURDETT. I have one convert.

Mr. LISTER. I, for one, will support what my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Burdett) suggests—that the fees should not be increased.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). He wants to abolish them altogether.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there is a great deal in what has been said by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister). The difficulty I see is, how is the endorser to know whether the note is paid or not, or into whose hands it has gone. If the note was not a negotiable paper he would have no difficulty, and it would be his duty, by the exercise of due diligence, to ascertain whether this liability existed or not; but a note given by A. to B. in the city of Ottawa to-day, may, next week, be in the hands of some one in Rochester, Buffalo, or New York, if the party is well known, and the endorser may have no means of knowing in whose hands the note is, nor may he be able to communicate with the party for the purpose of ascertaining whether it is paid or not. That is the distinction between a note and a bond, for although it may be assignable it can always be traced, and the property represented may be changed by simply passing from hand to hand. My hon. friend from Hastings says that the endorser ought only be liable for the amount mentioned in the note. That might be a very good rule for the endorser, but it would be a very bad rule for the solicitor whose business it was to make protest, and it would be quite as good an objection against the payment of 50 cents as it would be against the payment of \$5. It is not a question of more or less, as my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Burdett) says, but a question of whether there should be liability or no liability at all. I suppose my hon. friend allows nothing for insurance for every solicitor who takes a note, and who, by negligence, fails to make a proper protest, incurs the liability of the face value of the note, and is bound to pay it. Therefore, although the solicitor takes considerable risk, and is dependent upon his clerks or upon his partner to do the work properly, if they fail, he will have the liability to meet without any compensation whatever.

Mr. BURDETT. My hon. friend misapprehends me. My remarks were all predicated upon the assumption that he who signed a contract, simple, special or of record, ought, if he is able, to perform the contract according to the terms thereof. If he is not able he ought to be forgiven. I do not see any reason why a man who endorses a promissory note for a friend ought to have to pay \$1.50 more or less to find out that he has endorsed that paper, when he who goes security for a friend in a contract, simple or special, or of any character, needs no such notice to make him liable. If I enter into an agreement with a friend or become security for the performance of any contract, no matter whether it is in the United States or Canada, I may be sued upon that agreement or that contract upon its non-performance. I do not see why any difficulty should exist in the case of promissory notes. My own experience is that if I have a note against an individual, endorsed by another, and it is not paid at maturity; it will not be many days before the endorser will hear of it. I do not think it would be asking too much of the holder of a note to notify the endorser without fee or reward. We are simply preserving a relic of past times which is more expensive than useful. It is of no material benefit either to the maker, the endorser, or the holder of the note, that he should be notified in writing, or otherwise, that he has become bound that his principal should perform the

Mr. LISTER.

contract. As to the liability of the lawyer, if the law is changed so that he incurs no responsibility for not protesting, then, where there is no liability and no responsibility, and no duty or work performed, surely there ought not to be any pay. The duty performed in this case is simply perfunctory, formal and unnecessary, and costs a man a dollar or more in many cases, when he is scarcely able to pay the principal. In all fairness, I think this whole system of protesting paper ought to be done away with. I cannot see any difference in a man's liability, either moral or legal, whether he puts his name on the bottom or on the back of the note. Knowing that he has agreed to pay it at maturity, he ought to pay it if he is able, whether it is protested or not. This other system of three days' grace also leads to a great deal of misapprehension. In these days of silk gowns, scarcely any of these gentlemen can agree on a proper mode of framing a Bill on the simplest of all contracts—promissory notes. I, therefore, hope the hon. Minister of Justice will see fit to do away with the schedule of fees at the end of the Bill, at least, if not with the whole system of protesting promissory notes. If he does, I think his action will meet with the approval of the House and the country. It will certainly meet with the gratitude and approval of all unfortunate sinners, who, like myself, have endorsed notes for friends.

Mr. SPROULE. I agree with a great deal that has been said by the hon. member for Hastings, but I think he goes a little too far when he proposes to do away with the notice entirely. When an endorser puts his name on a note, it is done for a limited period, in the belief that the person who makes the note will be in a position to meet it when it falls due; if it were to be for an indefinite period, he would in many instances refuse to put his name on it. The notice informs the endorser that the contract is not fulfilled, and it gives him the opportunity to save himself in the event of the other party endeavoring to make away with the property or being unable, from some unfortunate circumstance, to discharge his obligation. I agree with the hon. gentleman, however, that if the fees cannot be done away with entirely, they should be reduced. I certainly endorse every word he says when he suggests that the party in whose interest the note is drawn should be compelled to notify the endorser at his own expense; but if the sense of the House is different, I think the fees should be made the smallest that would be considered fair compensation for the work done.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that we should be taking a very serious risk if we made any such radical change as is proposed. If endorsers were held liable without notice a man might find himself sued on a note five years after endorsing it without the slightest intimation, and without any recourse against the maker. An ordinary bond cannot be transferred, but a promissory note may pass from hand to hand, and therefore it is not unreasonable to require that the holder shall notify the sureties. That, of course, entails a little expense; and my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Burdett) seems to think that the fees are a great benefit to the bank solicitors. I can tell my hon. friend that it is a pretty serious matter to take the responsibility of protesting notes, because if the solicitor fails to give the proper notice of

dishonor, he may become liable for the whole face of the note. It is a question whether the present practice is not, after all, the best in the interest of the commercial world. If the endorser got no notice, and thereby saved this trifling expense, he might find himself served with a writ which would, perhaps, put him in for very much larger costs. The notice is really for the benefit of the endorser, to enable him to protect himself, and to see that the party who is primarily liable shall meet the note.

Mr. BURDETT. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken cannot comprehend the law of Ontario when he speaks of contracts not being assignable. Of course, we know that promissory notes are assignable by simple delivery from hand to hand; but by an Act of the Ontario Legislature all contracts have been made assignable by any form of writing, without notice to anybody, and the assignee may sue in his own name without any notice to any party to the contract. In order to protect himself against other assignments, he may have to give notice; but that is aside of the question. I do not see any just reason why a man who has agreed to pay a sum of money at a fixed date should be obliged to pay \$2, or \$2.50, for being told by a solicitor, however respectable, that he must pay.

On sub-section *j* of section 49,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to strike out this, because there is no Insolvency Act to which it would be applicable. It was merely inserted with a view that it might fit in with the provisions of an Insolvency Act, should such be adopted.

Mr. LISTER. There are Acts in the several Provinces for the winding-up of an insolvent estate.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This sub-section was not intended to fit those cases. To make a sub-section to suit them we should have to see what the law of each Province is, and would have to recast it—the section.

On sub-section *l* of section 49,

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved that the words "on or before the next following juridical or business day" be inserted.

Motion agreed to.

On sub-section 4,

Mr. MONCRIEFF moved that the following words be added to the fourth line, after the words "at the place at which such bill is dated," "or at his customary address or place of residence."

Motion agreed to.

On clause 50,

Mr. BURDETT. I do not like that word "implied." I think a man who endorses paper, or makes it, should know the ground on which he stands, and that term "implied" is very comprehensive, and ought to be stricken out of the Bill. I think the notice ought to be express and ought to be in writing. In my judgment, if this Bill passes in this shape, the result will be that a notice of protest is not necessary to bind the endorser but is simply given for the purpose of making costs. Where you say a man is excused if not guilty of

negligence, or default, or misconduct, who is to say what is negligence, default, or misconduct? What does "implied" mean? I submit that the term ought to be defined, and a man ought to know what he has to rely upon. That word "implied" ought to be stricken out, and the waiver ought to be in writing. I would go so far as to say that it should be signed by the party in charge, or by his agent. That when a man is relieved from the payment of a note that he has endorsed, by reason of its not being protested, he ought not to be bound to pay that note unless he in writing agrees to pay it. Where he has to pay a fee for receiving that notice, he ought to have some corresponding advantage. The whole result of this clause is, in my opinion, that any man may, for some of the reasons given, be excused from protesting a note, and yet he may get the fees for protest.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I could not undertake to propose to the Committee an alteration of the law of contracts so sweeping as that. We have the law of waiver as regards every right that a person possesses. We have the doctrine of implication running all through the law of contracts, both as to waiver and everything else. The hon. gentleman knows that contracts may be made by implication, rights may arise by implication, and surely these ought to be capable of being waived by implication. There are some very plain cases in which one ought to be held to have waived his rights to a notice of dishonor. For instance, if the person bound, whether endorser or drawer, before the time comes for giving the notice of dishonor, says to the holder that the note will not be paid at maturity, but that he will pay it if he be given a certain time, he makes a binding contract by which he shall get that extension of time. He makes no express stipulation as regards payment by notice; surely he ought to be held, in that case, to have waived notice, when he has received all the consideration, and made all the terms that include notice, and when he has got relief by the notice, knowing that the bill may be dishonored at maturity. The other case the hon. gentleman refers to, is that of a man who ought to have given notice, but, not having given it, afterwards promises to pay. It is not held that he has made no contract with regard to that, but it is simply treated as evidence that he has waived the right which would accrue to him of having notice of dishonor, or that he has waived the right of disputing his liability in consequence of the notice not having been given. If I could view the decisions as the hon. gentleman has given them, namely, that he is held virtually to a new contract, he might fairly hold that the subsequent contract should be in the same form as the original contract, namely, in writing. But the subsequent promise to pay is treated as evidence of an agreement to pay, and that evidence is capable of being rebutted.

On section 51,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to add the words, "or at any place in Canada, situated five miles therefrom." This is to facilitate the making of protests, and prevent hardship likely to occur in country districts.

Mr. SKINNER. Perhaps it would be well, as far as the Province of New Brunswick is concerned, to make the bill payable at one o'clock on Satur-

days. The banks down there, generally close at one o'clock on Saturday and a clerk has to be kept there without any reason, for a couple of hours.

Mr. COOK. That is their business.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think we should have a uniform hour in this matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think so too.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think that the closing of banks at one o'clock on Saturday is a great inconvenience to business men. There is more business done on Saturday in our part of the country than during any three days of the week, and I think it would be a mistake to alter the hour.

On section 54,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any reason why the acceptor of a bill should not guarantee the genuineness or validity of the endorsement as well as the genuineness of the signature? It seems to me that the one should be considered to be guaranteed as well as the other.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will let the section stand.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. The drawer in his own favor, certainly, after he has accepted the bill, should be stopped from denying his signature, but should the bill pass fraudulently into the hands of another party who forged the endorsement, the acceptor should not be stopped from denying the genuineness of the endorsement.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The bill may be endorsed after the acceptance, and that is the endorsement that the acceptor does not guarantee.

On section 60,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that this clause is one which should not be adopted without very grave consideration. If I understand its meaning, a bank would be discharged from all liability, and the honest owner of the bill be defrauded of the entire sum to which he is entitled without having any recourse against the bank. Apparently, the bank is to be discharged from liability if it pays a bill on which an endorsement has been forged. I do not think it is desirable to relieve the bank in such a case. It is the business of the bank to see that they do not pay on forged endorsements or without proper authority. I do not see why the Minister of Justice has introduced this provision, but I certainly think that the present law is more in the interest of the public, and that the banks, to which we have given considerable privileges, should be called upon to see for themselves that they do not pay on forged endorsements.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This provision has been inserted in the English Act in order to relieve the banks from this liability, on the ground of the great convenience which they are to the public; but in this Bill the provision is inserted and brought before the Committee rather in order to obtain the opinion of the country on the subject. For my part I have no strong opinion in regard to it, and, if the House is not prepared to consider it this evening, I will allow it to stand.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This has been the law in England since 1853. It is a question of considerable difficulty, and this entirely changes the principle which has hitherto prevailed in this Dominion.

Mr. SKINNER.

Mr. MULOCK. I quite agree with this provision. I think, when people draw cheques payable to order on banks in which they are depositors, they not only use the bank as an agent to pay money to somebody else, but they cast upon the bank an obligation which it is not bound to undertake—to see that the transaction is a correct one. If cheques are to be handed around to any number of persons, how is the bank to know whether the signature is genuine or not? Of course, the bank is bound to know the signature of the depositor. It has many ways of knowing his signature, but it has no means of knowing whether the signature of the endorser, who may be an entire stranger, is valid or not, and they would be justified in refusing payment, until it was shown that the endorser's signature was genuine. Yet, at present, they would be liable to an action for so refusing. Either a cheque should be made payable to bearer, or the bank should not be compelled to find out the endorser.

Mr. CHARLTON. I cannot agree with the last speaker. If a cheque is made payable to bearer, it may be used as currency, and, in that case, it is the duty of the individual, or the institution paying it, to discover that it is really in the hands of the person to whom it is payable. It is the business of the bank to find out that for itself; and it is easy, when an individual offers a bill payable to order, to require an identification of the person. I think it would be a dangerous innovation if banks were relieved from the liability which they now have in regard to the payment of a forged acceptance or note. The present law works well enough. If a man goes to a bank with an acceptance payable to their order, they are required to have an identification of that man, and it is quite legitimate for anyone in that case to do so; but to say that the banks should be relieved from that liability will be to place in the power of the banks the opportunity to do business loosely and carelessly, and to exonerate them from the consequence of doing their business carelessly. I hope this provision will not be engrafted upon the law of Canada in regard to banks.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subject is too important to finish the discussion before six o'clock, and I, therefore, move that the Committee report progress.

Committee rose and reported progress, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 13) to amend the Act to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

YORK COUNTY BANK.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. TISDALE), moved second reading of Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the York County Bank. He said: The hon. member who has the Bill in charge asked me to move the second reading, as he had to leave for Montreal. There is nothing in the Bill but a slight amendment in one clause. He wanted it advanced a stage, that it might go before the Committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Canada Cable Company.—(Mr. Hesson.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Wallace.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Contingencies—Privy Council..... \$11,000

Mr. McMULLEN. When the Committee rose we had considered at some length the expenditure for cab hire. I object to the item on the ground that the Estimates contain no provision for this expenditure. If we are to have cab hire as an item, it should appear under the proper heading, and be made a distinct item to be voted each Session. It may be thought strange that the Opposition should consider it to be their duty to examine into this matter; but if hon. gentlemen opposite will look back to 1886, they will find that an investigation was held before the Public Accounts Committee with respect to this item. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), who was Chairman of the Committee, will remember that the Committee's attention was drawn to the fact that from the 10th to the 21st of November, 1886, a cab-driver named E. Riopelle drew from the public treasury \$30.50 for driving the President of the Council from November 10 to November 21. When we came to examine as to whether the President of the Council had used Mr. Riopelle's cab or not, we found that the Minister was not in Ottawa at that time, but that he had left Ottawa on the morning of the 10th November and that he had been absent during the entire period in the west. In order to enable the man to draw the money the President's secretary certified the amount as correct. But the President's secretary was also absent from Ottawa, he being with the First Minister on an election tour throughout western Ontario. When such things occur it is the duty of the Opposition to carefully scan and criticise all items of this kind. I do not for a moment say that the First Minister intended to do anything wrong, and I do not wish to be understood as making any such insinuation. It is quite evident, however, from this fact and other evidence that there is looseness in management. The investigation held, had a good effect, for it resulted in items for cab hire to persons not named being cut down, and the expenditure being reduced from \$596 the year before last to \$260 last year. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the First Minister is responsible for the item to which I have called attention. The officers and clerks are responsible; and I am ready to concur largely with the hon. gentleman in the statement that he cannot be expected to know every item and be able to check every account submitted. I admit all that; but if he has found in the past that he is surrounded by persons who are ready to drag him into such a position as he has occupied before the country on this question, when it is shown that \$30 were paid for cab hire which had never been earned, he should either remove those officers or compel them to do their duty. Has the hon. gentleman done so? Mr. Pope, the hon. gentleman's private secretary, certified that account. Has the hon. gentleman divested himself of the services of that official? No; Mr. Pope has been rewarded, and is

now filling two offices and drawing two salaries. Upon that occasion the present President of the Council came to the relief of the First Minister, and endeavored to show that the hon. gentleman had paid his own cab hire. The President of the Council said that he was certain the First Minister paid his own cab hire. We are not insinuating that he does not do so; but all we want is that items should be submitted and information furnished. The whole system has been abused. I do not know whether the First Minister is responsible for having introduced the system of cab-hire charges to and from the House of Commons or not. I have carefully investigated the Public Accounts and have failed to find that while the Mackenzie Government were in power such items were charged. No doubt if the First Minister is called away on public business, cab hire to the depot should be paid, but when he is domiciled in the city the people have no right to be called upon to bear the expense of taking the Minister every morning from his residence to the House of Commons and back. This is not done in any other line of business. The manager of the Bank of Montreal would not dare to charge cab hire to and from the bank every day. The officials of the Government, also, are beginning to learn the lessons taught them by Ministers, and the Public Accounts show that the deputy heads are charging cab hire in a similar manner. If we are to continue such a system the Government should submit an estimate for this expenditure each year, but unless this is done, it is unfair to the people that the present system should be allowed to continue. The President of the Council stated that he attributed the fact of the certificates for \$250 not being furnished to the House largely to the modesty of the First Minister. I regret that such modesty exists, for we should not excuse any gentleman, who, in the discharge of a public duty, would allow his modesty to interfere with giving the necessary explanation in regard to the items in this account. I hope that, in the future, matters of this kind will be as fully submitted and explained to the House as any other item. I dare say hon. gentlemen opposite will pronounce it a small matter on the part of the Committee and of any member to criticise a matter of this kind. The press representing hon. gentlemen opposite have severely handled men like myself who undertake to criticise these matters. But we are now in the commencement of a system which should not be tolerated and which should be stopped in the beginning. As far as I am concerned, were my friends in power tomorrow, I would not support them if they carried out a system of this kind.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, no; you would not!

Mr. McMULLEN. I would not; and the present Government should have not set us the bad example, lest sometime they may be compelled to take the Opposition side of the House, for they will then have very poor precedents for their arguments against those who may then occupy the Treasury benches. I hope that, in future, full explanations will be given of every item, and that we shall not have to complain about this matter again.

Travelling Expenses—Inspector of Penitentiaries..... \$1,631 16

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This item of \$1,631.16 for the travelling expenses of Mr. Moylan seems

to be a large sum of money for one officer of the Government to spend in travelling. It amounts to a good deal over \$5 a day all the year round, and some explanation ought to be given.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The principal part of the duty of the Inspector of Penitentiaries is the visitation of the penitentiaries throughout the country two or three times a year. One of the complaints most frequently made of late years has been the want of inspection of the distant penitentiary of British Columbia. Last year I requested Mr. Moylan to visit that penitentiary, and a large amount of the item was, I have no doubt, incurred in making that visit. The visit was principally required by the fact that complaints had been made in the management of that institution in the press and elsewhere, and although the inspector had visited British Columbia the year before, I thought it necessary to ask for a more particular inspection. Otherwise the travelling expenses are merely the ordinary amounts.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Can the Minister of Justice state how long Mr. Moylan was in British Columbia performing his duty?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that his stay in New Westminster was from two to three weeks.

Mr. McMULLEN. \$1,600 appears a large sum for that length of time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As I have explained, Mr. Moylan visits the different penitentiaries two or three times a year, and the expense to British Columbia had largely increased the item.

Mr. McMULLEN. Suppose he was travelling every day in the year, the sum would amount to about \$5 a day, and his visits to the penitentiaries two or three times a year would hardly account for this large sum.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is there any record kept by the Department of the time occupied by an officer, say like Mr. Moylan, in inspecting the prisons? Has the Department any check as to the number of days he devoted to the penitentiary in New Westminster?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In answer to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I may say that the inspector, like every other civil servant travelling on duty, is allowed his actual moving expenses and his hotel allowance besides. As to the time occupied by the inspector, it is kept on record in the books of the penitentiary; and a minute book of his own as to the duty discharged by him every day is laid before the Minister.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Can we get a copy of that record before the Public Accounts Committee?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Certainly. I think the annual Penitentiary Report, which will be presented in a few days, will show this. In addition to that the other record is available.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This matter was referred to last year when Mr. Moylan's travelling expenses were equally heavy, and we were unable to get particulars before the Public Accounts Committee. If the Minister brings us down the record he refers to, we will be better able to discuss the matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears from the accounts that Mr. Sedgewick, Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. SOMERVILLE.

receives \$3,600 a year, and also \$400 as solicitor of Indian Affairs. Would the Minister explain that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That practice has been in vogue for a number of years—at all events, before I came here. The salary of the Deputy Minister of Justice was always understood to be \$4,000—\$3,600 charged to Civil Government, and \$400 to the Indian Department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I also see he has \$1,491 for travelling expenses. Can the Minister explain that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was an important case before the Supreme Court of Canada, relating to the title of the Dominion of Canada to the precious metals in the belt of British Columbia. The Dominion Government succeeded before the Supreme Court of Canada, and the Province took an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Our counsel there was Sir Richard Webster, but, during the time the appeal was going on, Sir Richard Webster was so engaged on the Parnell Commission that it was impossible for him to conduct our case. We had then to run the risk of instructing new counsel or get some one to go from this side. Mr. Sedgewick went to London and conducted the argument before the Privy Council. The travelling expenses are largely in connection with that business, and no allowance has been made to him for his professional services.

Contingencies—Department of Printing and Stationery..... \$7,500

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. Minister of Marine, in his statement the other day, represented that during 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878, the amount expended for subscriptions to and advertising in newspapers was \$89,007, as against \$59,800 in 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887 and 1888, for the same services. During the former period, there was, of course, no Auditor General, but we find that the advertising of the different Departments was then all charged to contingencies. The statement for the second period should, in reality, be called a statement of amounts paid for subscriptions to newspapers. There are included charges for advertising in one or two Departments, as in the Queen's Printer's Department, but the bulk of the charges are simply for subscriptions. For instance, taking the year 1888 alone, we find, according to the Auditor General's Report, that the amounts mentioned in the Minister's statement for the Governor General's Secretary's office, \$1,203, and for the Privy Council, \$876, are the exact amounts paid for newspapers. We also find that \$903 for the Interior Department and \$200 for the Indian Department were expended for subscriptions, making the \$1,103 charged against those Departments in the statement of the Minister. The amount charged to the Department of Justice, \$452, is also for newspapers; the amount charged against the Militia Department, \$788, is for the same. In the Finance Department, I find that subscriptions to Canadian newspapers amount to \$659.20, American \$45 and European \$87.22, making exactly the \$791 mentioned in the statement. The amount charged against the Public Works Department, \$862, I find is entirely for newspapers; the same is the case with regard to the Marine Department, the Fisheries Department, the Inland Revenue Department,

the Department of Agriculture, and the Post Office Department. I find that the subscriptions for Canadian papers alone in the Customs Department amounted to \$537.90, the amount in the statement of the Minister being given as \$538. The amount charged to the Queen's Printer, \$514, is, I admit, for advertising; but, as I have shown, the large bulk of these items are for subscriptions. On turning to the accounts for advertising in the Auditor General's Report, I find that it is impossible to ascertain the amounts chargeable to the different Departments, but the total advertising for 1888 amounted to \$64,020.62, which I claim should be added to the amount for that year as given in the Minister's statement. If we add it to the total, \$59,800, it actually brings it up to \$123,820, as against \$89,000 expended during the five years of the Mackenzie administration. It seems to me that that explains the discrepancy in the hon. Minister's statement, and it shows how very different is the actual position of the matter from what the hon. Minister's statement represented it to be. It shows that instead of there being a decrease in the expenditure, there has really been an increase of nearly 50 per cent., although I am only taking one year's advertising.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not question the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's statement as to the result of his investigations in the Auditor General's Report with regard to advertising generally. I think I admitted as much the other night, but since the Auditor General's time there has been a separation of these items. For instance, there is advertising and subscriptions charged to contingencies, and there is no doubt the hon. gentleman referred to the other account of advertising generally—advertising charged to public works which were advertised, and so on. But the difficulty in making a comparison, as no doubt the hon. gentleman found, is that it would require a great deal of time in 1874 and 1878 to find exactly from the Public Accounts, under the system then prevailing, the amount of advertising charged outside the contingent account. In fact, from the example given by the President of the Council the other evening, it would be impossible to trace in the Public Accounts the different items of advertising not charged to contingent account, as the vouchers would have to be consulted, and the same examination made of them as the Auditor General makes now. I was referring to the items which appear in the Public Accounts as charged to contingent account, and when I saw in *Hansard* the statement to which the hon. gentlemen has just referred, that that purported to be a statement of the payments for subscriptions to and advertisements in newspapers generally. I corrected it in the proof sent to me and added that much to contingencies, because it was only that statement I had referred to in the recent discussion, and that statement, purporting merely to be a statement of the items as found in the Public Accounts charged to contingencies, was accurate.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I was a little in error in one respect, and I admit it is very difficult to get at the amount in the previous accounts; but, take for instance, 1876: I find in the Customs contingencies, newspaper subscriptions and advertising, \$6,857.

Mr. TUPPER. As stated, yes.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). As stated. It is clear, my hon. friend will not find in the Public Accounts of 1876 any separate account for advertising, as there is in the Auditor General's Reports of this year and last year. But in making up hastily the amount, I was not doing justice to the Government in this respect—that, in adding the \$64,000, I was adding to one year the sum total for years. But take 1878 as compared with 1888. In 1878, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman, he put in subscriptions and advertising \$15,921, for all the Departments, and in 1888 he puts \$11,853 for the same Departments; but if he will add the \$64,000 of advertising, which was divided among the different Departments, not separated as it is this year by the Auditor General, it makes actually \$75,000, as against \$15,000.

Mr. TUPPER. But the hon. gentleman does not go further back and add to that \$15,000 in 1878, the corresponding items charged outside of contingencies. It is very difficult to find those items.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend will find that the contingencies were added; and my recollection is that some years ago, during the time my hon. colleague and friend was in this seat, some discussion on this subject took place, and I think the Minister of Customs then admitted there was a change in the mode in which the accounts were kept. While Mr. Burpee held office, he had charge of the contingencies, and in that way they appeared larger than in later years. I have taken the years 1888 and 1878, and I have shown that, while under the statement put forward by my hon. friend, to a casual observer the amount would appear \$4,000 less than during the corresponding years of the Mackenzie Government, if we add to that the \$64,000 paid for advertising, which I found in the Auditor General's statement for 1888, that will make \$75,000 in one year, as against \$15,000.

Mr. BOWELL. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that in a discussion at some period I had admitted that there was a difference in the mode of keeping the Public Accounts.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Of charging certain things to contingencies, generally, by Mr. Burpee, which are not charged by you. I did not say the mode of keeping the accounts was different. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) rather confirmed me, the other night, in the view I take.

Mr. BOWELL. If that statement were allowed to go uncontradicted, it would leave the impression on the House that the mode of charging contingent expenses had been changed. What I stated was, that there was a large number of extra clerks who were not upon the permanent list in the Customs when I took charge, and who were charged to the contingent account. I had relieved those clerks of any further duty, not having anything further for them to do, and, consequently, they could not afterwards be charged to contingent account; but, where I found there was absolute necessity for keeping on an officer permanently, I put him on the permanent list. But if my hon. friend will look at the Public Accounts to-day he will not find on the permanent list more than one or two, at the outside, over 1878, when I took charge of

the Department. It is true there is a staff connected with the Department of Customs not upon the permanent list, which did not then exist. There is also the laboratory for the testing of sugar imported into the whole Dominion. These officials are not upon the permanent list, but charged under the head of laboratory, and is altogether a new Department. There has been no change so far as charging to contingent account is concerned; but I notice that when my hon. friend referred to the statement of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, while he justly avoided pointing out that I had in any way misstated the facts, when this matter was under discussion when the House was in Committee before, he repeated three or four times there was an item in the Auditor's Report for newspaper subscriptions in the Customs Department, but I did not notice he said there was anything charged at all for advertising, and I take it for granted that if there had been he would have added the two together, to show that the Customs Department had spent a larger amount than appeared for advertising in the contingencies. I do not know why, except it was that the comparison was greater between the expenditure for contingencies in the Customs Department than, perhaps, in some of the others, that he avoided calling attention to that fact, although he repeatedly referred to the Customs Department as having a newspaper account, which is quite correct.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). No doubt the amount expended in 1888 by the Customs Department for newspapers was \$538. Is there any charge in the contingencies for 1888 for advertising, or was that paid in any other way?

Mr. BOWELL. It was not paid in any other way.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I find that \$64,000 was paid for advertising in 1888, but that was not apportioned among the different Departments. This year it is so distributed, and I find there is nothing charged for advertising to the Department of Customs, though there is an amount of \$12.50 charged for printing.

Mr. BOWELL. The \$538 is for newspaper subscriptions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then that is all there is?

Mr. BOWELL. If hon. gentlemen object to such economy, I will try to spend some more next year.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This was previously charged to contingencies, and now it is taken out of that, and the only fair way to make a comparison is to cut out the amount for advertising. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Burpee advertised largely, when he knows that a different system was adopted at that time. No doubt, in that way, he has reduced the amount apparently paid in his Department, and I am not finding fault with that, but simply referring to it because a large amount was charged in 1878 to that Department under a different system of keeping accounts. It is clear that the statement which was made by my hon. friend the other night was misleading, and we find the great bulk of the recent expenditure was confined to newspaper subscriptions and did not include advertising.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think, if the hon. the Minister of Customs chose, he could explain this expenditure to the satisfaction of the Committee. I think he knows why the advertising and printing charged to contingencies while the Hon. Mr. Burpee was in office was much larger than it is under the present Administration. He knows that, at that time, it was necessary, in the interests of the commercial men of the country, to advertise every week, in almost every newspaper, the discount which was allowed on American invoices. That advertisement was placed in almost every newspaper throughout the country, and, if the Minister of Customs would be candid, he would explain that that is the way in which the amount expended on contingencies in the Customs Department during Mr. Burpee's administration was more than that expended under his administration. I give the hon. gentleman credit for his economy. I think, as an old newspaper man, he is too economical. I think he ought to advertise more than he does, because, in fact, he does not advertise at all; but I do not think he should cast reflections upon his predecessor because of an expenditure which it was then necessary to make for advertising in regard to the discounts on American invoices. Those advertisements were published in all the leading newspapers of the country, from week to week and from year to year. It was not that Mr. Burpee desired to be extravagant in advertising or in patronising newspapers, but it was because the public interest demanded that this should be advertised, for the benefit of the men who were transacting their business. That is as well known to the Minister of Customs as to me or to any other business man.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the observations which have been made by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Weldon, St. John) vindicate me in regard to what I said, that the comparative statement laid before us by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was an illusory statement, and did not represent the comparative expenditures of the two Governments. That statement caused the hon. gentleman to attack me with some violence. He said the Committee would not take my *ipse dixit* in regard to it. But it is now clear that my statement was correct, and that his comparative statement, which was prepared with care, and which he should have examined carefully before he submitted it, was entirely erroneous.

Mr. TUPPER. The statement which I laid upon the Table was absolutely correct, and the hon. gentleman cannot show any particular in which it was wrong.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman undertook to institute comparisons between the expenditure of the Government from 1874 to 1878 and the expenditure of the succeeding Government from 1884 to 1888, inclusive. His comparison was made in regard to the expenditure for newspapers and advertising by the two Governments, but he included the newspapers and advertising of the one Government, and omitted the advertising of the other. Can he now deny that that was a misleading statement to put before this Committee? Does he think it is worthy of a Minister of the Crown to submit to a Committee of the Whole a statement which is wholly erroneous from beginning to end? Yet that is what he has done. My

hon. friend beside me has pointed out that, if you add the amount of advertising in a single year, 1888, \$65,000, to the \$11,000 which was given in the hon. gentleman's formally prepared statement, the difference would at once be shown. The hon. gentleman submitted an erroneous statement and thought to profit by that, and to obtain a little cheap praise from the newspaper press supporting the Government in that way. He had placed at the disposal of the press supporting the Government a statement to show that this Government has been remarkably economical in this matter, notwithstanding that this is not a proper comparison between the expenditure of this Government and that of the preceding Government for the like purposes.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is rather excited for an old member of the House, and I am afraid I must have touched upon a raw spot the other night. I was not in any temper, but I ventured to correct him.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). To contradict him.

Mr. TUPPER. I ventured to correct him, and to give him a little wholesome advice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. TUPPER. Surely the hon. gentleman does not consider himself too old to receive advice, and I will give him the advice again—in perfectly good temper and without any ill-will—and that is, that it is necessary, in criticising the Public Accounts, to take pains to analyse those accounts, and not to rush to a conclusion by simply making up the totals. Now, what were we engaged in doing on the occasion to which the hon. gentleman alludes? We were engaged in considering the amounts charged to the contingency account of the different Departments; we were not considering how much any Government had expended in advertising in newspapers. Fault was found with the amount charged in that account, and in no other, for subscriptions to, and advertisements in, newspapers. I think that is a fair statement of the business that was before the House; and the hon. gentlemen were holding up their hands in holy horror at some of the large amounts they found charged to the contingency account in the different Departments. All that I did—and I think it had a pretty good effect, notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman will not take my advice—was to suggest the production of a comparative statement of the amounts charged to the same account in the different years, from 1874 to 1878, and that charged to the same account, from 1884 to 1888. I was particular to guard myself against the charge the hon. gentleman seeks to fasten upon me, of attempting to make the House believe that either of these statements included and covered every item charged for advertising in newspapers. I said that, on examination, it would probably be found that amounts were charged to the contingency account in the different years, both from 1874 to 1878, and from 1884 to 1888, against public works, and, no doubt, in many instances, the amounts for advertising would be found to be large in the period from 1884 to 1888, since a great deal more had been done in public works, and a great deal more important works had been carried on by the Government. The hon. gentleman ought to know that the Government is bound

by statute to ask for public tenders for all these works, and the larger amount of advertising, with the greater circulation of those advertisements for tenders, the greater benefit will accrue to the country. Now, the hon. gentleman need not get so angry, and need not feel so alarmed because some newspapers have copied from the Debates of the House the statement I submitted. I again call the attention of the House to the fact that at this moment, notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman has devoted so much time to this question, the statement that I made is absolutely correct, so far as it goes—and I stated exactly how far it went—and that it accurately represents every dollar that was charged to contingencies, so far as could be found in the Public Accounts. It does not pretend to show, as the hon. gentleman asserts, simply the items for subscriptions for newspapers in one year and advertising in another, when the account showing the items charged to contingencies covers only the subscriptions to newspapers. But I think the hon. gentleman will find, in looking over the Public Accounts from 1874 to 1878, that the account is as I have stated, not the amounts chargeable to contingencies. For instance, I hold in my hand the amount charged for contingencies in the Department of the Secretary of State, which is headed "Subscriptions to, and advertising in, newspapers," and so on through the whole account. It is patent to every one, and was at the time I ventured to take part in the discussion, that in order to ascertain whether there had been extravagance under either *regime* was not to take a particular item and then base a charge upon it, but to examine carefully the vouchers and ascertain exactly if there had been extravagance in the advertising, whether there should have been advertising at all, whether it was the bounden duty of the Government to advertise, and whether a wise discretion had been exercised in the matter. I say it is idle to fritter away the time of the country by hon. gentlemen in this Committee rising to formulate charges in reference to any of these accounts, until they have been thoroughly sifted. There is a proper place to sift them, and hon. gentlemen, in my humble judgment, lose a great deal of valuable time in that quarter in the Committee on Public Accounts. Instead of directing their attention to these smaller items of cab hire, travelling expenses of Ministers and the officers of the Department, these large amounts to which they are now alluding, this account of \$64,000 for advertising should be carefully gone into, not with a view of showing that their opponents are dishonest, that they are charging accounts to the public wrongfully, without having examined the accounts to see whether the money was spent for the purpose that the accounts mention, but whether the amount expended was necessary and in the public interest.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman submitted to the House a statement a few evenings ago, that was intended to be a comparison, not of one contingency account with another, but of two items of expenditure incurred by the two Governments for those years concerning which the hon. gentleman has instituted a comparison. The hon. gentleman was asked whether these accounts or statements that he read to the Committee represented the respective expenditures of the two

Governments for these different years between which the comparison was instituted, and the hon. gentleman informed the Committee that it did.

Mr. TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Surely he does not wish to misrepresent me. I stated several times over that it accurately represented the amounts charged to contingencies in those different years. I said that fifty times.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said these charges in the contingencies were exactly the same, embraced the same items, between the different Governments.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not say anything of the kind. The *Hansard* is there, fortunately.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why, Mr. Chairman, what value had the comparison if a large number of items were left out of one account and was included in the other?

Mr. TUPPER. That is not the question at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What object had the hon. gentleman in instituting a comparison? Supposing the entire printing account had been left out of the present Government vote, would the hon. gentleman have informed the Committee that the Mackenzie Government had expended \$89,000 in those five years, and the present Government had expended nothing at all? Would that not have been a misleading statement? Does the hon. gentleman intend to palter with the Committee by addressing such observations as he addressed to the Committee during the past fifteen minutes? The hon. gentleman has read a formal statement here. That statement is intended to exhibit the relative expenditure of the two Governments with reference to two items of expenditure. If these two items embrace everything in the expenditure under these two heads, then the hon. gentleman's comparison was strictly accurate, was strictly honest; if they did not embrace everything under the heads of these two items, then the comparison read here by the hon. gentleman was, as I characterised it, an illusory and a misleading comparison. I say that these words are not strong enough to represent the action of the hon. gentleman in reading such a table as he read to the Committee a few evenings ago. I will give him some advice, and that is, if he wishes to retain the confidence of the House in any statement which he makes, if he wishes to retain the good opinion of this House, he had better not undertake to present statements of this sort to the House, and he had better take the trouble of seeing whether the comparisons which he produces, or the statements which he makes to the House, are honest and fair statements, or whether they are not.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has, in the hearing of the Committee, made a statement—I hope it was made in the excitement of the moment—which is absolutely and totally incorrect. It shows how impossible it is for the hon. gentleman to approach the subject in the spirit in which I opened it. The hon. gentleman has stated that I made an illusory statement and endeavored to mislead the House, and made this Committee believe that I was giving a fair representation of what was expended from 1874 to 1878 for advertising, and what was expended from 1884 to 1888 for the same purpose. The hon. gentleman has a

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Hansard in his hands. If he will turn to page 252 he will find I said this:

"The hon. gentleman has addressed himself to the interesting question of subscriptions to newspapers, and as I had occasion, a short time ago, to look into the figures and the charges to contingencies in this connection in the different Departments, I am glad to be able to inform him,"—and so on.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Go on.

Mr. TUPPER. On page 256—for there were hon. gentlemen who are as unwilling to understand me as the hon. gentleman seems to be now—he will find I said:

"I did not pretend to base any argument on the figures I gave to the House, and I purposely said so. I did not analyse the different items at all, and it may be, for all I know, that some items which are now charged to contingencies were not charged to contingencies then, or *vice versa*. It only shows us all how necessary it is to make a very careful examination of these items, instead of founding an argument on the mere figures which we find in the Auditor General's Report, or in any other report."

I have said the same again to-night, but the hon. gentleman will not listen, but rises and goes through a long statement which he has made before, in which he directly misrepresents what I said. But, again there were other hon. gentlemen unwilling on that occasion, and are still unwilling, to accept the argument that I was making or the figures I was simply presenting; and on page 262 he will find I said:

"But I went no further than this—that that statement prepared and brought before the House in Committee was an accurate statement of the items chargeable in the Public Accounts against the contingencies for advertising and subscriptions to newspapers in those different years."

I think the hon. gentleman, if he wishes to consider questions of this kind and retain the confidence of the House, should first teach himself before he attempts to lecture others. I have quoted the language I used then, and which I have repeated several times to-night, and the Committee can judge whether I misrepresented the matter or whether the hon. gentleman has persistently done so.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) If the Minister of Marine would apply to himself some of the advice he gave in the early part of his speech, he would benefit himself. The hon. gentleman gave us to understand a few moments ago, that a cursory reading of the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report might give rise to very misleading results; and he gave us to understand that it did give rise to such results, in regard to forming an opinion as to the expenditure for advertising and subscriptions to newspapers. But he has said: "What did I do?" I was not misled by any cursory reading of the Public Accounts or the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. TUPPER. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman said: "I did not depend upon memory or cursory reading."

Mr. TUPPER. I did not say anything of the kind. The hon. gentleman was not here and did not hear me. He cannot find a word of that in the debate.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I am speaking of what the hon. gentleman said to-night when I was present. I will give him from *Hansard* a few remarks he made the other night, and which he has carefully omitted to read to the Committee, and I will

show that the hon. gentleman professed to submit the other night a comparative statement in detail, carefully collated from the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report, showing what money was expended by the Mackenzie Government for subscriptions to newspapers and advertising during five years.

Mr. TUPPER. I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) We shall see in a moment.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) And he showed what had been paid for the same service from 1884 to 1888.

Mr. TUPPER. I deny that absolutely.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman said in submitting that statement:

"I am glad to be able to inform him, and no doubt he will be glad to know it, that the result of the enquiry—" It was not a cursory enquiry, but an official enquiry, and he desired that the country should know it—" has been that in the last two years a great reform has been accomplished, and the expenditure considerably reduced. I hold in my hand a statement showing the expenditure in the five years when the hon. gentlemen opposite were responsible for the amounts chargeable to advertising and subscriptions."

Mr. TUPPER. Go on, and read the whole sentence.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) That is the whole sentence.

Mr. TUPPER. Read the sentences which I read.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) They are not in that speech.

Mr. TUPPER. In the same speech.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) They are in the speech found at page 255, but the sentences I am reading are those delivered previous to the introduction of the statement. Having made this introduction he read the statement. What does the statement show on its face? It reads: "Statement of amounts paid for subscriptions to and advertising in newspapers during 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878." "Statement of amounts paid for subscriptions to and advertising in newspapers during 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887 and 1888." Now it turns out that the hon. gentleman has omitted from that statement a sum amounting to nearly \$65,000 per year for an expenditure on the very subject which the statement he submitted to the House pretended to embrace. If that amount of \$65,000 yearly for the five years, making \$325,000, had been embodied in that statement, and the hon. gentleman had been honest enough to show a real comparison, what would have been the result? Instead of there being a comparison of \$59,000 under the present Administration as against \$89,000 under a like period under the Mackenzie Administration, the figures would show \$89,000 under the Mackenzie Administration as against \$383,000 under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. That is the state of the facts, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) put it in a nutshell. If that was not a comparison which the hon. gentleman submitted, for what purpose was it submitted, what object had the hon. gentleman in view? If he leaves out money expended by his own friends and includes

that expended by the Mackenzie Government, what would be his object? The hon. gentleman will not be accused of deliberately attempting to mislead the House, but he has been guilty of crass neglect in submitting a statement without seeing that it was properly compared and prepared, and submitting it to the Committee, and furnishing it to *Hansard* and to the newspapers, when that document contained statements which were directly the reverse of the facts. That is the position in which the hon. gentleman stands.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman was handsomely beaten in the election in Prince Edward Island, if he made statements of that kind, or in that spirit, to the electorate of the tight little island. I never was so amused in my life, and I am sure hon. members must have been immensely amused, when I saw the hon. gentleman spring into a debate and into a discussion in regard to occurrences which took place behind his back, and yet was so absolutely positive as to what occurred on that occasion, as the hon. gentleman has been to-night. But that is nothing new. The hon. gentleman is always strong in statement, but I have yet to learn that he is noted for accuracy. On several occasions I have seen that hon. gentleman wilt, and even blush under the lash, when hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have shown the extraordinary number of his inconsistencies found on the pages of *Hansard*. Does the hon. gentleman think that no one has been listening to this debate? Does the hon. gentleman think the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was not heard, and that the Committee has forgotten that only five minutes ago I told him that that part of *Hansard* which he quoted was incorrect and was absolutely at variance with the statement I made to the House, and that the moment that statement reached me from the *Hansard* office I corrected it in the proof. I told the hon. member for St. John (M. Weldon) so; and he will recollect that early in the evening I added to that statement, in order to make it agree with what I had stated to the House, the words "charged to contingencies." And the hon. gentleman, without any sense of fair play and acting in a most extraordinary manner, quotes against me the inaccurate statement placed in the Debates by the *Hansard* reporters. And the hon. gentleman after I had given three different quotations from my speech on the former occasion, proving exactly the position I have taken all along, appealed to that speech in support of the statement he endeavored to put into my mouth. The hon. gentleman if he had any desire to make an investigation of the statement only exposed his ignorance of the subject, when he endeavored to make the Committee believe that I came before the House and pretended that that statement covered every item in the Public Accounts for advertising and printing in the years from 1874 to 1878. Does he find the "Anglin" printing frauds in that statement? Did I pretend to include in the expenditure in question that of the *Citizen Publishing Company* of Halifax, which unseated two members of this House, one of them a member of the Government? Was I pretending to give a history of all the iniquities that occurred between 1874 and 1878 in connection with printing scandals and all that.

I simply confined myself to one point (and I have said it several times and I will say it again when the hon. gentleman attempts to put words to my mouth). I confined myself to the point that that paper was absolutely and exclusively as representing the amounts charged in those years against contingencies. I said nothing more then, and I say the same thing now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. Minister evidently imagines he is on the stump, for he has just made a little political speech, for what purpose I do not know. The hon. gentleman admitted to night that he came before the House the other day and delivered a statement that was published in *Hansard* totally incorrect. He knows that without correction that statement has been published from British Columbia to Nova Scotia. Has he taken any means to correct that statement in the newspapers?

Mr. TUPPER. That is not my business.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman would have stood in a much better position before this House if he had openly and manfully come before the House when the question was broached and said: "I am sorry I was guilty of the mistake. I find that the comparison was against me and I will acknowledge it." If he had gone further than that, and said: "When I found I was in error I corrected the error in *Hansard*," he would have acted more manly.

Mr. TUPPER. There is none to correct.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman had stated that he showed in *Hansard* in his revised speech that the comparison was against the present Government instead of in favor of it I would understand it, but instead of making a correction so that the public would understand that the Government of to-day had spent three hundred thousand more than the previous Government he corrected it by putting in the words "for contingencies." How would the outside public understand that? I have not seen his correction; I do not know where it is, but I am speaking from *Hansard* as his speech is here. If the hon. gentleman wanted to correct and to put it properly before the House and before the public, why did he not put in the \$65,000 he omits in his comparison?

Mr. TUPPER. That had nothing to do with the contingent account.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It had to do with the amount paid for advertising, which was then under discussion, and that is the very question we are discussing to-night. We are trying to get at the truth of the facts. Is it true or is it not true that the large amount of \$300,000 was spent for two special services, more by the present Government than were spent by their predecessors in the previous four years? Is that the fact or is it not? Now, if it is the fact, and it has been proved to be so, why has not the hon. gentleman acknowledged it, and placed it against this misleading statement published in *Hansard* and repeated by the press. The hon. gentleman tries to get out of the mistake and the mess he is in by saying that the statement he published was corrected by adding the words "for contingencies" merely—a correction which any one who had not carefully examined the Public Accounts, and who was not thoroughly conversant

Mr. TUPPER.

with the eight years of expenditure compared by the hon. gentleman, would not have understood at all. Therefore, I say that the hon. gentleman does not stand in a favorable position before this House. He does not stand in a position which justifies him in giving advice to any member of the House. The hon. gentleman is in the position of one who has made a serious mistake coming from a Minister, and if he had the frankness to acknowledge it I think we would be prepared to excuse him, on the ground of his rashness, if not on the ground of his youth.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to refer to one or two of the remarks made by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville). I have yet to learn that I have cast any reflection, either directly or indirectly during the discussion, on my predecessor in office. Every word I have said in this debate has been in defence of the Department over which I preside, and I have said nothing whatever reflecting on what occurred previous to that. I am quite willing to admit that the advertising of the discount upon American invoices formed a portion of the large amount that was paid for advertising during the occupancy of the Department of Customs by my predecessor. I say more than that. I say that the advertising which then took place was to a very great extent (and I would not say this were it not for the remarks which fell from the hon. gentleman) totally unnecessary. I am not at all surprised, knowing the tactics that have been pursued by the members of the Opposition in discussing questions of this kind, that they should defend the greatest extravagance and unnecessary expenditure of money, if it were done by their own friends, and that they are ever ready to condemn a member of this Government because he has not followed in the extravagant footsteps of his predecessor. I have no doubt that many of the hon. gentlemen who are unable to attack the administration of the Department on account of unnecessary expenditure in the contingencies would much rather I had followed the course of my predecessor and spent thirty thousand or forty thousand dollars which ought not to have been spent. I tell the hon. gentleman from Brant (Mr. Somerville) that if he makes a thorough investigation of the expenses of the Customs Department from 1878 to 1888—including the amounts that were paid by myself for old accounts, and which will be found in the Public Accounts of 1889—if he makes an investigation of the items of expenditure in the Department, including advertising, newspaper subscriptions, and other expenditures which took place in every branch under the immediate control of the Minister, that I will prove to him that I saved during that time over \$40,000, and performed more work than was performed during the time of my predecessor. I pledge myself to do that if he desires to go into this question. I am not surprised that he says he regrets that I have not spent more money, because if I did he would have then some cause of attack. I spend all the money that I think is necessary to be spent in the interests of the Department over which I preside, and if the hon. gentleman can point out to me that the public service has been injured, or that information that should have been given the country has not been given, by want of advertising in the newspapers, I

will be glad to accept his advice, and in the future will see that the public obtain that information. I explained the other night that portions of that advertising, which had taken place during the last Administration, was unnecessary, and believing it to be unnecessary, and having some little knowledge of the business of printing, I put a stop to that extravagant expenditure, as I did to many other expenditures which I thought were unnecessary in the public interest. That is the defence I have to make for not having spent more money, and that is the explanation I desire to give in reference to the expenditures coming exclusively under the head of "contingencies," so far as the Customs Department is concerned. I should not have made this statement, had it not been for the assertion of the hon. gentleman that I cast reflections on my predecessor. I have not done so, and I trust I never shall. For my predecessor, personally, I had as much respect, and, certainly, I was on as friendly personal terms with him as any member of the House of Commons.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not think there was any intention of singling out the Department of the Minister of Customs. It was only referred to because the amount charged against Mr. Burpee's administration was the largest item in the statement of the Minister of Marine, and great stress was laid upon it. The Minister of Customs made a very fair explanation in saying that he had adopted a different mode with regard to advertising. I understood the hon. Minister of Marine to say that he had spoken to me about this statement after the House had risen. I have no recollection of his doing so, and I could not then have understood him because at that time I had not seen the statement, and I had not been able to catch it when he read it. I asked my hon. friend sitting in front of me if he had it and he informed me that he had returned it. But I understood from the statement put forward by the hon. Minister that a great reflection was cast on the late Minister of Customs, a gentleman whose memory I revere, and whose death was one of the greatest losses ever sustained by the City and County of St. John. It was represented that he had expended \$30,000 for subscriptions and advertising, while his successor had expended only something like \$3,700. Now, we find that last year the contingencies amounted to \$231,975, as against \$175,000 in 1875-76, an increase of some \$60,000, without allowing for the large amount of advertising which is included in the smaller amount. My hon. friend was unfair in his comparison, because it would lead the public at large to believe that the items in the two were exactly the same, whereas we find that actually in one year \$64,000 has been expended by this Government in advertising, which was not included in the statement, and even that year has been exceeded last year by \$13,000. I admit that there is some cause for an increase, but when my hon. friend comes forward to make a comparison to lead the people to believe that the Mackenzie Government were more extravagant than the present Government, I think it only fair to put them on the same basis.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am glad that the hon. Minister of Customs admitted that the statement I made was correct, as to the necessity that

existed during the Mackenzie Administration for more extensive advertising. He admitted that it was necessary on account of the difference in American invoices, owing to the variation between American and Canadian currency.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say it was necessary; I said it was done.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It was done for the information of the business men of the country, and not for the purpose of benefiting the newspapers. I can easily see how it is that the Minister of Marine applied the comparison to the Customs Department. Everybody who knows anything about the working of the present Government, knows that the Minister of Customs is set up as the model man, so far as economy is concerned. He does not advertise, he does not hire cabs, he incurs hardly any travelling expenses. It is well for the Ministry that they have one man in their number who is entitled to some credit in this respect, because if you take him out of the Government you take all the economy from it. He is the only economical man in the Administration, so far as that kind of expenditure is concerned. I can point to the Minister of Public Works as being, with regard to patronage to the newspapers, perhaps the most extravagant man on the Treasury benches. He believes in patronising the newspapers, and he does it most effectively. I can point to the Minister of Agriculture, too, as an extravagant man in that respect; because if he does not advertise extensively he used to send out a great many pamphlets to be printed at extravagant prices, in some cases at fourteen times the price for which they could be printed if they had been given to the contractor. All any man requires to do is to look at the Auditor General's Report on pages 40 A, 41 A, 42 A and 43 A to see that during the past year the Government expended for advertising no less than \$77,359.98 and for printing \$115,335.55. Now, I have had occasion, during nearly every Session that I have had the honor of being a member of this House, to call attention to the extravagant expenditures that have been incurred for printing and advertising, and I am satisfied that I have convinced the country that this Government has been most extravagant in these expenditures. Nor have the expenditures been made in the interest of the country, but almost entirely for the benefit and support of the organs who support the Government. They believe in supporting their supporters, so far as advertising and printing are concerned. Why, I have brought the blush to the face of the Ministers sitting on the Treasury benches when, in a former Session, I have held up before their gaze a seven-by-nine newspaper published in the City of Ottawa, only once a year, and then only for the purpose of putting in a portrait of the Minister of Agriculture, or the Minister of Marine, or the Minister of Public Works—a newspaper called the *Investigator*, on which they expended \$300 or \$400 annually. I pointed out last Session also how a little newspaper in the town of Yarmouth was published merely as an offshoot of another newspaper there, in order to get the Government advertising, and how \$300 or \$400 per year was given to that. I held up one of those papers here, and it was full, bristling with Government advertisements, and the public received no benefit from it whatever. I see by the Public Accounts that this little *Investigator* has

even this year been receiving money, although the man is actually dead and his newspaper has been dead two years.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a balance.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not know whether they have any communication with another sphere or not, but I see that the paper is still drawing money. And the Minister of Customs tells us that he has been very economical in advertising and printing. I admit that he has been, but I say that he is the exception to the rule, for in every other branch of the public service this Government has wastefully and extravagantly expended, year in and year out, enormous sums of money for the purpose of bolstering up their organs all through the Dominion. I say that this money has been wasted, because the advertisements have been inserted in newspapers where the public interest did not require that they should be inserted, and there has been no check apparently upon the money so wasted. Why, if you look over the Auditor General's Report, you will find almost every Tory newspaper, from Gaspé to British Columbia, has been drawing pap from the Government; and, if it was the interests of the public the Government were trying to serve, would it not be right to expect that an advertisement would occasionally be published in some Reform newspapers? But when you take the list of newspapers which have secured the patronage of the Government during the past year, and during every year this Administration has been in power, you will find scarcely one dollar paid to any other than a newspaper supporting the present Government. Yet these men claim they have been more economical in this matter than the former Government. I am surprised that the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—a young man who has not been long in politics, and who has attained the high position he now occupies, perhaps not altogether on his own merits, but because he had a father before him—should speak in the way he has spoken here to-night, and attempt to dictate and give lessons in parliamentary decorum and conduct to hon. gentlemen on this side who have long held positions of public trust, and have filled those positions in a manner deserving of credit. I am surprised that he should get up here and lecture them when he well knows that the statement he made to this House was made for the sole purpose of deceiving members of this House, and deceiving the country at large with regard to this matter. He has admitted to-night that the statement he made was not properly represented in *Hansard*, that the comparison is not complete, and did not give a fair presentation of the expenditure in advertising which was charged to contingencies under the former Government, as compared with the same charges made under the present system of keeping the public accounts. He has admitted, although he seeks to cover up his admission by a multitude of words, the correctness of the accusations made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon); and, although, perhaps, not occupying as exalted a position in this House as the hon. gentleman, I may be allowed to give him a little advice. He is very anxious at all times to give hon. members on this side advice, but I would just advise him to

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

be a little more modest in his demeanor when dealing with hon. gentlemen who are older in experience and have rendered, perhaps, more valuable service to the country than he has, although they may not have obtained as much money from the public purse.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has made the statement that I, as Minister of Agriculture, had paid for pamphlets fourteen times more than they could be printed for. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to name the pamphlets, and when and where the work was done?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have much pleasure in informing the hon. gentleman that, although I do not remember the year—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Wait until I get through. I proved to the satisfaction of the Public Accounts Committee, and have proved on the floor of this House, that, in one particular case, fourteen prices were paid to the *Montreal Gazette* for departmental printing. I am prepared to go before any committee or commission appointed by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, and establish the correctness of my statement that the *Montreal Gazette* was allowed fourteen prices for work done—fourteen times a larger price than the same work could have been done for at the contract prices with the public contractor for parliamentary printing. It was in this case fourteen times; but in most of the cases it was from four to six, and eight times the price which the work could have been done for by the public contractor; and the hon. the late member for Cardwell, the then Minister of the Interior, was in this House when I made the statement, and he never attempted to gainsay the figures and the facts which I brought under the attention of the House.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman pointed to me as the Minister of Agriculture who had paid fourteen times the price of the pamphlets. I deny the statement; and the charge that he made was made against the Department before I had charge of it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have great pleasure in freeing the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of Agriculture from the charge. The late Mr. Pope was Minister of Agriculture at the time; but that does not remove the force of the statement I made. I am glad that my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, has reminded me that he was not the guilty party; but, at the same time, the guilt was there, and he was a member of the Government which was responsible. He was Postmaster General at the time, and he might have had some supervision over the Department which was presided over by the late Mr. Pope. He knew that the money was squandered, and he did not get up in the House when I made the statement and say: Well, Mr. Pope, you made a mistake in giving these men so much money out of the public Treasury—more than ought to have been expended. He did not rise to the occasion then; but I am glad to say that his hands are clean so far as that is concerned.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think something should be done by this House to strike off from *Hansard*

this carefully prepared statement that the hon. the Minister of Marine submitted to us the other night. I do not think it should be allowed to remain in *Hansard*. The statement is certainly incorrect; it is certainly not in accordance with the facts, and is calculated to mislead this House and the country as to the expenditure during the periods named. I really do not know what the Government will do about it. I really do not know what the High Commissioner would do about this were he here. There was none of the family that ever I knew of that could have been guilty of furnishing a statement to the House which was not borne out by the facts; and, if the father of this hon. Minister were to look down upon the deliberations of this House to-night, and see that his promising boy had submitted a statement which was altogether at variance with the facts—that he had, in fact, stretched the truth—what would be the feelings of the High Commissioner, to think that his son had so far forgotten the counsel and example set him by his father in public life? Now, any person on looking at this statement, and knowing the difference in the manner of keeping the Public Accounts at the different periods, will know at once, without further investigation, that it is false and misleading. It cannot be otherwise. Why, in the heading of the statement we find that it purports to be a statement of subscriptions to and advertising in newspapers, when in reality it is only the contingencies that are referred to in the latter period. There may be some palliation for the hon. Minister, for no doubt that statement was prepared by some officer in the Department. I asked for a statement to be made. The clerk says: I suppose you want it made pretty big in the later period? I said to him: I want it made right. And he prepared me a statement like that, and I saw the fallacy of it. I have the statement and am prepared to destroy it, and would not make use of it. I would give the hon. the Minister of Marine some advice: Do not make statements until you have examined them. Do not put yourself in a light before the House calculated to blast your future and damn your reputation, and leave you here in such a position that the right hon. the First Minister cannot any longer retain you in the service of the country. The Prime Minister would not keep a Minister in his Cabinet who would tell a falsehood for a minute. I remember one of his Ministers telling me, in days gone by, that it was impossible for a Government to exist for a day if its policy was honest. He said that a Government which was administered on the principle of honesty could not exist a single hour, and I suppose that policy is the one which has been accepted by the Minister of Marine. I am surprised that he, representing a constituency in the Maritime Provinces, from which I boast my father came, should appear in such a light—if he has any blood about him, he should be blushing now—for having submitted a statement to the House which is known to everyone to be at variance with the facts and the figures, and calculated to put that hon. gentleman in such a position in this House that in future his words and his statements cannot be relied upon by anyone in this House or in this country.

Mr. TUPPER. As the hon. gentleman plays the buffoon very often, we may enjoy his buffoonery,

but I am afraid that to-night it bordered on insolence. If he had a father, or if he has one, I do not think the hon. gentleman would please the old genleman by the tone which his buffoonery has taken this evening. I took his pleasantry willingly. We have got accustomed to smile whenever he speaks, but I am afraid the hon. gentleman does not understand the English language if he thought that, under the guise of being a Court Jester, he could, at this time, and in this place, throw charges of falsehood across the floor of the House. That is the style of argument for a bar-room, but not for the House of Commons. I believe, however, that the hon. gentleman wants to throw up all the rights of this House. He thinks that we should not have a franchise of our own. Well, I do not think we should, if he is a specimen of the result of that franchise. The hon. gentleman has evidently been sleeping to-night.

An hon. MEMBER. Drinking.

Mr. TUPPER. An hon. gentleman makes a suggestion which I do not make, but, when he says that I made a misrepresentation to the House which was wrong in every particular, I shall show that he is mistaken, and then I hope he will feel thoroughly ashamed of himself. He repeated the statement which had been made by some of his friends that I endeavored to show that the expenditure on advertising and subscriptions under one régime was greater than it was under another. I have again and again explained what that statement refers to, and the hon. gentleman, in copying from hon. gentlemen who preceded him, ignored my explanation that the omission to which I have referred, was due to an inaccuracy of the *Hansard* reporter and not to me. Whether it is accurately printed or not, however, this language precedes it, and is what I have stated many times to this Committee. The hon. member for West Elgin interrupted me, and said he was only referring to subscriptions, and I then said:

"I am speaking of the amount of subscriptions and advertising chargeable to contingencies." I leave it to any one to judge of the position of any man who would rise in his place, after hearing that statement, and use the insolence to me which the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has descended to. He referred to my youth and to my family; but I should be ashamed to think that any hon. member in this House would use the language which he has in regard to any other member, and I am particularly ashamed that such a venerable old gentleman as he is should so far forget himself.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Something must be done in regard to this. This cannot be permitted to remain on the Journals of the House, notwithstanding the terrible offence I have committed in attacking the hon. the Minister of Marine, forgetting in fact that he is the Minister of Marine, and saying that I doubt the statement with he submits to be false and incorrect. For having doubted that it seems I am guilty of a terrible crime. It is a wonderful fault that I should rise and appear before the Minister of Marine and not shiver and tremble. It is a wonder that I do not want to go home. It is a wonder that I should want to say anything in regard to the hon. the Minister of Militia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Marine.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, either of them. It is almost as much as a man's life is worth; and the idea of being impertinent to them! My gracious, do you suppose the sun will rise tomorrow? I do not desire to respond to the insulting remarks of the hon. gentleman. I am responsible to the constituents who sent me here for what I do and say, and, when I go back to them, I hope I will not have been responsible for making a prepared statement which can be shown to be entirely at variance with the facts.

Contingencies—Department of Militia
and Defence.....\$8,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Last year we had quite a discussion in this House as to the travelling expenses of the Minister of Militia. It is not a very popular thing to refer to this little matter, but I think the House and the country ought to have some information as to the way in which the Minister spent \$819.71 in travelling expenses last year. The Committee will remember that in the previous year the expenses more than doubled this, but I think he had a visit to British Columbia in that year. I have not seen any statement that he has been paying any more devoted attention to the volunteers last year than is usual, or that he has visited many of the camps, and I should like to know how the money was expended, if it is not considered undignified for the Minister to give the explanation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I fully expected that my hon. friend who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Somerville) would have congratulated me on the great saving I have made in travelling expenses. I find it is almost impossible to satisfy hon. members on the left of the Speaker. If, taking advantage of the criticism of the hon. gentleman, I improved, as the hon. gentleman himself has admitted I have improved this year, instead of receiving that fair share of congratulation which I thought I was entitled to I find the hon. gentleman again stating that, although I had not visited British Columbia, he would like to know where the amount of money which appears for travelling expenses was expended. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman and the House that the expenditure, so far as travelling expenses of the Minister of Militia are concerned, is an expenditure incurred in the interest of the public service. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that although a newspaper man himself, I think that possibly he gives a little too much attention to his own paper, and does not read the other papers, which might convey to him the news that the Minister of Militia had been travelling from one place to another where the different schools of cavalry, schools of infantry, and batteries had been organised; that he accompanied the General when he was examining some of the camps, and that in doing so he was fulfilling his duty as Minister of Militia. However, I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman to-day is bound to admit that there has been some improvement. I think that if he keeps to his work, as he has done in the past, if he sticks to his duty as a member of the Opposition, and continues his criticising, I shall continue to improve every year, and I hope before this Parliament is ended that the hon. gentleman will congratulate me upon having saved a lot of money in the Department of Militia, and I believe that he will be prepared to say that the

Mr. LANDERKIN.

expenditure that has been made altogether in the interests of the service.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I did not rise for the purpose of irritating the Minister of Militia at all. I merely wanted information. Of course, I knew he would explain to the House how very economical he had been himself, but I did not think we would be able to congratulate him until we had the explanations. I have now great pleasure in congratulating the Minister on having effected some saving in the matter of travelling expenses. We all knew that to be a fact. We knew that last year his expenses were about double what they are this year. At the same time, I wanted to get some information as to the cause of those expenses. The Minister is in error in supposing that I devote all my time to newspaper business now, because I have not been in the newspaper business for four or five years, so perhaps I am getting a little rusty on that point, but after this I will devote a little more attention to watching the movements of the Minister, so as to ascertain whether the money is properly expended, and next year I may have occasion to congratulate him if he reduces his expenses to a considerably lower figure than this year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not think the Minister is entitled to take a great deal of credit on account of any reduction this year. It may be an imaginary reduction. If I look at the Auditor General's Report, I find that he expended a pretty liberal amount last year in his Department, something over \$9,000. He spent every dollar that was allowed him, and considerably more. Now, it is a very easy thing for a Minister to get on his feet and declare that every item was expended in the public service, and rendered the service more efficient. We are told that the money is judiciously expended. It may be. We have in these contingencies bald statements, without any evidence showing how the money has been expended, and only by a reference to the Auditor General's Report are we able to say how the money was expended. Now, I cannot for the life of me understand that, year in and year out, appropriations are taken for the various Departments, large sums are taken for the purpose of carrying on the different Departments, and yet over and above that, after making their estimates as to what they really require, we are asked to make an appropriation of \$10,000 or \$25,000 for contingencies. I say that it is a vicious principle. The Ministers, after having run those Departments for a number of years, ought certainly to be able to make an estimate of their requirements closer than they do, so that it would be unnecessary for them to come down and ask us to vote an appropriation of over \$200,000 for contingencies of the different Departments. You know, Mr. Chairman, that it is not necessary. You will agree with me, if you look at the item, that the various Departments ought to make their estimates closer. I say the principle is a vicious; one it gives the Ministers in charge of these Departments the opportunity of using these funds as they may think proper, and then coming down to the House and saying that the money was all expended in the interest and for the efficiency of the public service. Now, I object to this; I say it is unnecessary, and I say that the heads of Departments ought to be

able to make their estimates sufficiently close that sums of over \$200,000 should not be asked for in this House for contingencies. We find in the present year an increase of over \$12,000 in contingencies; yet the Minister of War will get up, with all his bravery—he is a brave man, of course—and say that we ought to give him credit for reducing the expenditure last year by a considerable amount. We see no evidence of its reduction. We see in the Auditor General's Report that he spent over \$9,000. If he will give us some tangible proof of his economy, proof that he spent the money in the interest of the militia force, that he is travelling around to visit "B" Battery, and some other battery, that he is travelling to the seaside to see whether any batteries ought to be established there—if he can bring us an evidence of the saving which he has made we will be prepared to give him the credit for it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. You would not.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am not prepared to give either the hon. gentleman, or any other Minister, credit for the fact that, after making their estimate for the expense of their Department, they come to this House and ask for ten, or fifteen, or twenty, or twenty-five thousand dollars in addition. I say they ought to make their estimates closer than that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. While on this point, I would like to enquire of the Finance Minister if he has established the practice which he proposed last Session in the Public Accounts Committee, when it was shown him that the system he was following in securing money for the travelling expenses of Ministers and other public officers, was a system that ought not longer to be maintained. The system was this: a requisition was made on the Finance Department—say for \$1,000—for travelling expenses for the Militia Department. The requisition was sent to the Department, and on the back of it there was a certificate attached, certified by one of the officers of the Department, that the money had been judiciously expended in the interests of the country. This certificate was attached to the requisition which was made on the Finance Department for the money before the trip was undertaken, and before the money was expended. This system was in force up to last Session; and when the matter was brought to the attention of the Minister of Finance in the Public Accounts Committee, he saw the absurdity of the certificate being attached to the requisition before the money was expended and the trip made, and he promised to establish a different system. I should like to ask if he has introduced a better system with regard to grants for this purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman will find, on looking at the correspondence contained in the Auditor General's Report, that the form of certificate has been changed, and that each Minister certifies that the money which has been advanced for travelling expenses has been expended in travelling in the interests of the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. After the travelling has been done or before?

Mr. FOSTER. A certificate is given to the Auditor General before the accounts for the year have been made up, and after the travelling has been done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the Minister of Militia will state the reason why he hoped to be able to keep his expenditure within \$8,000 this year. The Auditor General's Report for 1888-89 shows that the expenditure reached not \$8,000 but \$9,700. Can the hon. gentleman point out the items on which he is going to effect the saving of \$1,700?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The only way I can answer the hon. gentleman, is by stating that I have been too modest in my demands. I have not asked enough, and I have been trying to keep the contingencies within the amount which I considered would be necessary for the public service; but I have found that the amount was insufficient, and I have to come to Parliament and asked a sum sufficient to complete the expenditure under the head of contingencies. I wish again to tell the hon. gentleman that when he rises and requires certificates to be given as to whether this money is expended in the public interest or not, and when a member of Parliament, a colleague, sitting in this House, comes forward and charges a member of the Government with expending public money which belongs to the people, and of which we are merely trustees, as the hon. gentleman has done, and who has been insolent and impertinent—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I mean what I say, and I maintain what I say.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When the hon. gentleman comes here and attempts to speak—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON,—of the public money being expended—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON,—for trips down to the seaside, I say it is an act—

Mr. CASEY. I rise to order. I say the word "insolent" is a word that no member of the House, be he Minister or not, has a right to hurl across the floor at another member, and I demand from the Minister a retraction of the word "insolent" as applied to any member of the House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I say when the hon. member who sits for West Elgin attempts—

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I rise to order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON,—to speak of public money being expended for trips to the seaside by any hon. gentleman, whether member of the Government or member of Parliament, is, I say, an act of insolence on his part.

Mr. CASEY. I have raised the point of order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I say, moreover,—

Mr. CASEY. When a member rises to a point of order, the member who has been speaking must take his seat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I trust the Minister will withdraw the expression.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, I will not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw, withdraw.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If I have said anything that is offensive to the Committee I am prepared to withdraw it, because I respect my position as a member of Parliament, and I hope

other hon. members will feel that the same respect is due to the dignity of the House as I feel is due to it. If I have said anything offensive to the Committee I am prepared to withdraw it. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I wish to say that in so far as the expenditure which has been criticised is concerned, I have taken every possible care I could as head of the Department to see that it was judiciously expended, and I have nothing more to say.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not want to criticise the hon. gentleman's Department, for I do not understand Militia matters sufficiently. All I asked was, whether the hon. Minister was prepared to satisfy the Committee that \$8,000 would carry him through the year, because I see from the Auditor General's Report that \$9,700 were expended last year. I also desire to enquire as to the items on which the hon. Minister hoped to effect the saving.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not able to specify them. I will try to keep the expenditure within that amount. I endeavored to do so last year, but I found that it was short of what was requisite for the efficiency of the service.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I suppose, although the Minister mentioned the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) he had reference to a statement I made. I think the statement I made was submitted with the intention of ascertaining how it was that there was a discrepancy between the \$8,000 and \$9,700 expended, as appears in the Auditor General's Report. Not only that, but I was desirous of knowing, if possible, where it was that the saving had taken place. I asked him was it looking after "A" Battery; there was nothing offensive in that. I asked him was it looking after "B" Battery; and, again, there was nothing offensive in that. I thought perhaps that some of these items might have been incurred on account of visits to the seaside. I remember very well that, a year ago, the hon. gentleman stated that very likely during the coming summer—on account of the suggestions that had been made—that, perhaps, he might take a visit to the seaside. Was there anything insolent in my enquiring about that? Was there anything incriminating in the remark? I think not. I really must be inclined to the opinion that the hon. gentleman must have lost his temper, or that there must be some reason why he should be more irritable than ordinary when he takes offence at that. I have only used the words he himself used a year ago, when he said that on account of the suggestion made he would very likely take a trip to the seaside. I cannot understand that that is insolent or intended to give offence. I may have given offence by trying to extract information from the hon. gentleman, but he ought to have allowed the little information in his possession to come out without anger. No doubt it was very trying to allow the little information to escape from him, but I am not responsible for that. I wanted the information, and I hope the hon. gentleman will give it to me without charging me with insolence which I had no intention of conveying. He charged me with wrong-doing, and stated that he would no longer stand it; and he tried to frighten me, because, no doubt, he is the Minister of War, and I only a private individual. I hope that he will give me the information I asked of him, and
Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

then, perhaps, we will be good friends afterwards. I will not charge the hon. Minister with insolence, but, of course, if he displays a determination not to give me the information, I will have to think there is something wrong. Although he is Minister of War and I a private individual, I do not think I shall run from him. I want the information and I hope I will get it.

Mr. LISTER. Does the Minister refuse to give the information?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not know what information I can give more than what I have already given to the House.

Mr. LISTER. The information you have given is that you spent that amount of money, and you decline to account for it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I never declined to account for it.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman claims credit for economy during the last year, because his expenditure has not equalled that of the year before. I believe it to be the duty of a Minister, just as much as it is the duty of any employé of the Government, to furnish an account of the expenditure he has made during the year. I do not see upon what principle a Minister of the Crown should put his hand in the public Treasury, and take out one, two or three thousand dollars and ask Parliament to confirm his act, and to say, without knowing the facts, that that money was properly expended. As the hon. gentleman has himself said, a Minister is the trustee for the people. That is the position that members of the Government occupy. They are trustees of the money of the public, and if they occupied that position, so far as an individual is concerned, the courts would require that an account should be rendered for every dollar they have expended. I ask the House why it is that the members of the Government will spend large sums of money and decline, year after year, to give this House any account at all as to how they have spent the money. The Minister of Militia has no doubt done some travelling in the Province of Ontario, but I would remind him that the amount of \$819,711 charged to him will do considerable travelling. I am not saying that he has not spent the money; I am not charging him with any impropriety in this expenditure, but I should say that every member of the Government owes it to himself, and to the House, and to the country, to show that the money they have taken from the Treasury has been properly expended. The hon. Minister claims that he has been economical, and he compares this year's expenditure with the previous year. If my memory serves me a right the hon. gentleman took a jaunt to the Pacific coast. He did not go as an ordinary civilian goes in the ordinary railway cars and pay his fare as ordinary people do, but there was a special car chartered, and my hon. friend the Minister had a few congenial spirits to join him on that trip to the Pacific coast, and this country has to pay the cost. I do not think that is just. If hon. gentlemen, because they happen to become members of the Government, can forget that before they occupied that position they had to travel as other citizens of this country do, and if because they become members of the Government they cease to be ordinary citizens and become something greater,

something finer, and something better, the people have the right to know it. I say that every member of the Government ought to be bound to render an account of his expenditure of the public money. It is a duty that he owes to himself, to Parliament, and to the country.

Contingencies—Department of the Interior \$18,000

Mr. LAURIER. Could the Minister of the Interior inform us whether surveys are now going on in the North-West Territories?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Some were going on during the last season, and we shall have a few surveyors out next year I suppose, but not many.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the travelling expenses of Mr. Burgess, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, amount to \$908.28. Possibly the Minister may be able to give us an explanation of that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is for the year that I joined the Government, and Mr. Burgess, before I came here, started on a trip of duty to British Columbia. He was there on important business, and was taken sick and delayed for some time in the city of Victoria, and the principal part of this item, I think, was incurred on that trip.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that H. E. Hume also got \$549.80 for travelling expenses. What does he do?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He accompanied Mr. Burgess, as his secretary, to British Columbia.

Mr. McMULLEN. It possibly may have been necessary for Mr. Burgess to make the trip to the North-West, but I cannot very well understand why it should be when we have a Land Board at Winnipeg which is supposed to discharge all the duties in connection with Dominion lands, ranches, coal lands, and all other lands. We have home-stead inspectors, inspectors of colonisation companies, inspectors of coal lands, timber agents and all kinds of officials roaming over that country, and I think we should know what difficulty necessitated a trip by Mr. Burgess and his secretary to the North-West at the cost of the country?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot tell just now what was the special duty which necessitated his visit. It was before my time that his instructions were given. There was some special work, which also necessitated the land commissioner at Winnipeg accompanying him—some unfinished work which I think was left by my predecessor. I will find out for the hon. gentleman what it was.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the item might as well stand until we get that information.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I should like to enquire whether the deputy heads of the Departments and other officers under them, when they make a trip of this kind, are required to furnish a detailed account of their expenses, or whether they occupy the same position as the heads of the Departments, who are at liberty to put in a bill for a lump sum without any items? And here I would like to supplement the statement made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) with regard to the advisability, in the interest of the members of the Government themselves, of a change being made in that respect. I cannot for the life of me see why a Minister of the Crown should refuse to submit an

account to the Auditor General and to this House, and also to the Public Accounts Committee if necessary, like any other public servant, showing in detail the expenses he incurs when he makes a trip in the interest of the public. It ought certainly to be the pride of any Minister of the Crown that he is discharging his duty honestly and efficiently, and how he can be content to lie under the suspicion which must rest on every member of the Government who expends large sums of money every year in travelling expenses, I am unable to see. In the Public Accounts Committee we have tried to get that system of detailed accounts established, and I cannot understand why any Minister should have any delicacy about it. I should think, out of respect for themselves, and in their desire to appear honest before the public, that they ought to be willing to submit, just as any other officer, a detailed account of the items of their expenditure, so that it could be properly audited. I think this is a system which ought to be established by the Government, and it would be creditable to them if they established it. I do not say that those expenditures are not made in the public interest, but I am astonished that the men who expend the public money in this way have not sufficient respect for themselves to remove any suspicion that may attach to them from putting their hands into the public chest and spending a lump sum without giving details. I would like the Minister to explain whether the deputy heads are required to give a detailed account.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will find the information detailed on page C 12 of the Auditor General's Report. The various Orders in Council which regulate the travelling expenses of the officers are there set forth.

Mr. McMULLEN. While they are looking up that item, I would like to draw the Minister's attention to a number of items on page C 79. I notice that there is a charge of \$206.08 for 811 boxes of pens for the Stationery Office. How many officials are there altogether in the Department?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman exactly where all those boxes have been distributed. This includes the pens for the Survey branch, where a great number of different classes of pens are used in draughting, as well as the pens for distribution throughout the Department, inside and outside.

Mr. CASEY. In regard to this whole question of contingencies, I have to make one general protest. It is that these contingencies are not of the nature of contingencies really for the most part, but are items which might be estimated approximately every year. If you will take the average of the last ten years for cab-hire, for ink, for boxes of pens—the item to which my hon. friend beside me has called attention—you will be able to estimate very nearly what will be requisite for these different items for the current year; and, instead of putting the large lump sum of \$200,000 at the disposal of Ministers to spend as they like, it would be much more constitutional, parliamentary and business-like if the Government would make an estimate, as they could, of the different items required. If you will cast up the different items for advertising, travelling expenses, cab-hire, telegraphy, postage and so on, you will see that the approximate amount for each year can be very

clearly arrived at, and the amount that must be left to the credit of contingencies would not then exceed \$50,000 instead of \$209,000, as it is this year. When I say that an estimate of the contingencies required can be very closely made out, I am borne out by the fact that the Government are asking this year exactly \$12,000 more than they did the year before. Why do they ask for this increase, if it is not because they have estimated that it will cost \$12,000 more to carry out this service? And it is absurd, therefore, on their part to pretend that they have no means of getting at the approximate amount required. Would it not be just as easy to put down the items in which they expect an increase under their proper heading with the other estimates? It certainly would. But this Government, like other Governments, like to have a fund into which they can dip their hand at any moment, which they call the contingency fund, rather than have themselves tied down too closely to estimates. But when they ask for an amount of \$205,000, a sum which, within the memory of some members of this House, would almost approximate to the revenue of a Province—and I think would approximate still to the revenue of some of the Provinces,—when they ask for a sum like that to be left entirely under their control, under the head of contingencies, I think they ask for what we, if we had a due regard for constitutional principles and our own dignity, should not grant, but which no doubt this House will grant. All we can do is to protest against the principle of leaving this large amount at the disposal of the Government, because if any real emergency occurred which called for more money than was voted, it is always within their power to obtain a Governor General's warrant. I do not intend just now to go into details, but will confine myself to entering a general protest against the principle of placing under the head of contingencies such a large sum as \$200,000, to use a country phrase, "at loose ends," in the hands of the Government, without requiring from them proper vouchers for the expenditure. We have seen to-night that proper vouchers cannot be had. We have seen the hon. the Minister of Militia challenged to produce vouchers for travelling expenses, as to where he went and what public business he was doing, and he has not been able to do so, leaving us under the impression that he was not doing public business at all for part of the time, an impression which we must remain under until he produces vouchers for the actual railway fares, hotel expenses, &c. If travelling expenses are to be paid for any Minister, we ought to know that they have been actually paid out for trips taken on the public service and not taken for the benefit of the Minister's health, or for his pleasure, or for any other private purpose. I would call the attention of the House to one detail under the head of travelling expenses. Under travelling expenses, I find that Mr. Burgess, the deputy head of that Department, is charged with an amount of \$908, and we have had no explanation as to the business upon which Mr. Burgess was travelling. I know Mr. Burgess is a very estimable man, a particular friend of mine, but we must have some explanation of this, and it is due to Mr. Burgess, as well as to this House and the country, that he should show vouchers for every dollar of that amount charged as his travelling expenses. He is a civil servant, just as much as a third-class

Mr. CASEY.

clerk, and he is a servant of the country as the Minister of the Interior is. The Minister has no business to spend a dollar of the public money except in the regular way, and neither has his deputy or any clerk of his Department. When large amounts are put down for travelling expenses it is due to the character of these officials, which I believe to be of the highest kind, as well as due to the House and the country, to show how this money has been spent and to avoid any suspicion that it was spent on pleasure trips or anything of that kind. I will not go into the amounts charged for marking towels, for maps, and so on, which properly come under the head of contingencies, but I think these larger items should not come under that head. As, however, they are so classed, they should be verified either before the House or before the Committee on Public Accounts, which is the same thing.

Mr. LISTER. How long was Mr. Burgess absent during that trip?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think he went out in the latter part of July and did not return until the end of September or beginning of October. He was delayed for about a month, during which he was confined to his bed in Victoria through illness. In regard to what the hon. member for West Elgin has said, I may remark that I am quite sure that not a dollar of this money for Mr. Burgess's expenses would have been paid without the vouchers having been in the hands of the Auditor General. As has been stated by the Finance Minister, these expenses are regulated by Order in Council at a *per diem* allowance. I have no doubt that what brings up this amount to an apparently large figure is the delay which occurred through Mr. Burgess's illness, but for which he would not have been so long absent from headquarters.

Mr. LISTER. Then he was absent from July to the end of September or beginning of October?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think so.

Mr. LISTER. Then there must be some mistake in this amount. I understand the Minister to say that a detailed statement has been filed with the Auditor General?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think it must have been.

Mr. LISTER. Can you speak definitely as to that?

Mr. DEWDNEY. My knowledge of the Auditor General leads me to believe that not a dollar would have been paid if that were not so.

Mr. LISTER. I ask the question because, according to the Order in Council, the amount allowed to officers who go to British Columbia, Manitoba or the North-West Territories, or out of the country, is at the rate of \$5 per diem for travelling expenses. According to this report, Mr. Burgess must have been absent 181 days.

Mr. TUPPER. The \$5 a day is the living allowance, not the travelling allowance.

Mr. LISTER. Does the Minister know that Mr. Burgess was travelling in a special car?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am under the impression that, when I met him in the Territories, he had Mr. White's car, or it was a caboose, I am not quite sure.

Mr. LISTER. I believe it was a private car, and no doubt, in addition to all this, he had a pass from the railway company, so that this gentleman employed by the Government has charged \$908 for a little trip to the North-West Territories which it is very doubtful there was any necessity for. No doubt he was not in good health at the time, and I do not object to the Government making an allowance for that, but we have \$908 paid for six months' work, whereas he was probably working for six weeks or two months at the uttermost, and we have not a single detail of that expenditure, and the Minister is not in a position to give us any information in regard to it. The Government have a right to be liberal or to be prodigal in their expenditure, so far as they pay the money themselves, but when they charge the country with their expenses they are bound to give Parliament a strict account of how the money is spent. The statement has been several times made in this House that the Government are the trustees of the country, and are to give to their masters a proper account of their expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. The remarks of the two gentlemen who have last spoken might leave an erroneous impression. In regard, for instance, to the items for the Queen's Printer's Office, the Department of Indian Affairs and the Inland Revenue Department and others, because they are voted under the head of contingencies, and appear here under aggregated headings, therefore they suppose that no detailed statement has been given. It would be impossible to make up a book which could be handled by members of Parliament if every single item were shown on the pages of the book. Only the aggregate items can be shown here, but before these are paid the Auditor General must satisfy himself that this money is properly expended, and he does that by examining the vouchers which include, under each item, the details of the expenditure. Then he certifies to the expenditure, the payment is made, and the lump sum is put in the book under the proper item. Excepting small items, such as those for washing towels, and matters of that kind, for which petty cash is paid, every one of these expenditures has been submitted in detail, with vouchers, to the Auditor General before the payments were made. The Auditor General has the details, and he examines those details and the vouchers before payment is made, and these details are all given, with the exception of the Minister's travelling expenses, with reference to which the Auditor General does not himself require a detailed statement.

Mr. CASEY. That is just the point. He should require them.

Mr. FOSTER. That matter was fully discussed last year before the Public Accounts Committee, and I am quite sure the financial leader of hon. gentlemen opposite, who was the representative of that party in the Public Accounts Committee, quite agreed, and I think the majority of the Committee quite agreed, that if that was done it was quite sufficient, and that the details given in every other case, and the Minister's certificate given in that case, were quite sufficient for the Public Accounts Committee and ought to be quite sufficient for the House. There are several Orders in Council on the page to which I directed the attention of the hon. gentleman, C. 12, and in one of those, the fourth in order, it is stated that all

advances made to such officers for travelling expenses shall be accounted for within one month from the close of the trip, and the officers shall render the Auditor General a detailed statement of such travelling expenses. Of course if these were asked for by the Public Accounts Committee they could be brought down, but it would be manifestly impossible to detail them in a book or for the Minister to carry them round in his pocket.

Mr. CASEY. These Orders in Council refer to officers in the employ of the Government, and not to Ministers. I do not find any Orders in Council compelling Ministers to give any account of their travelling expenses, for Ministers are not officers in the employ of the Government, and, therefore, do not come under these Orders in Council. I find no means of calling them to book.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You are doing it now.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. the Finance Minister says that only large items are put in the Auditor's Report, but he may be surprised to find that in this report there are items such as N. O. Côté, 50c. for cab-hire; W. F. King, cab-hire, \$1.25; one yard of fawn felt, \$2.50; and other similar items. And then, on the top of all that, we find in one lump sum \$908 for the travelling expenses of Mr. Burgess, and \$248. for the travelling expenses of Mr. Dewdney. All the small items are put down. When a broom is bought which costs 25c. or 50c. it is carefully entered in the Public Accounts, but when a Minister goes on a jaunt which costs \$948 no details are given, and the Orders in Council referred to do not compel, as far as I can see, Ministers to give any account of their travelling expenses, either to the Auditor General or to anybody else. That is exactly what we complain of, that the little things are put down in detail to give an appearance of economy, while the large items are put down in a large sum. The item of travelling expenses is one which ought to be estimated and entered in the Estimates. We ought not to have these contingencies thus entered in a lump sum, so as to allow Ministers to take as much as they like out of them for travelling expenses without giving any details. It is just as absurd to do that as to allow any subordinate employé in the Civil Service to spend what he chooses for travelling expenses without giving the details, for the Ministers are only heads of the civil servants. The hon. the Minister of the Interior would not let any of his clerks do that. I think the country should not let him, or his deputy head, or anybody else in the Department, do that which neither of their colleagues would be allowed to do.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Finance Minister would lead the Committee to suppose that when this matter was up for discussion in the Public Accounts Committee last year with regard to Ministers of the Crown being required to give the details of their expenses, the same as deputy heads and other officers of the Departments, the Committee decided that this was not necessary. Now, I have a pretty good memory, and have taken considerable interest in such discussions in that Committee, and I remember distinctly what occurred when this matter was up for discussion last year, and I do not remember that the leader of the Opposition in that Committee consented to the correctness of the contention taken at that time by the friends of the Govern-

ment present on that Committee, that the Ministers should not give these details. My recollection is that he made no such concession. I can further say that the matter was never submitted to the Committee. You say that the majority of the Committee agreed with that contention. No doubt it did. The Minister knows that the majority of that Committee would always agree with any contention he makes; the Committee is selected in that way. It is to be expected that the majority of that Committee will agree with anything he says, or with anything any other member of the Government on that Committee says, because they are there for that purpose. But as to any expression being taken on that Committee in regard to this matter, I must say that I entirely differ with the Finance Minister. No expression of opinion was taken. The matter was discussed, and it was contended by a number of gentlemen of the Opposition that this system was incorrect, that it should no longer be pursued; and my recollection is that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who leads the Opposition in that Committee, did not make any such concession to the Minister of Finance or to any other member of the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you remember what he said?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No; I cannot tell exactly what he said, nor you either.

Contingencies—Department of Indian Affairs..... \$7,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I want some explanation with regard to the item for travelling expenses, \$1,695.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is for Mr. Dingman, our inspector of Indian agencies in this eastern part of the country. He is continually travelling.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister says that Mr. Dingman is inspector of agencies in this eastern part of the country. What does that cover? What reserves does he visit? How many trips does he make in the course of a year? How far could he be expected to travel? \$1,700 for travelling expenses is an item that cannot go without ample explanation.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Dingman travels to inspect or enquire into any matters that require attention.

Mr. CASEY. What is his jurisdiction?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, wherever it is found necessary to send him.

Mr. CASEY. What reserves does he visit?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know exactly what reserves he visited this year. It is impossible to give that information at present.

Mr. CASEY. Is that information in the Minister's report?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not sure.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister does not know whether Mr. Dingman's work is shown in the report of his own Department or not. He does not know where Mr. Dingman has gone, or what he has done, or how far he has travelled, but we have got to pay \$1,700 for it all the same. It is rather a loose way of doing business.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

Mr. DEWDNEY. A great deal of this was incurred before I came here at all.

Mr. CASEY. But you ought to know the business of your Department, even before you entered into it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to draw the Minister's attention to a small item on page C. 39 of the Auditor General's Report. You will find there "Thos. McKay & Co., reporting on flour, 73 samples, at \$5; 60 at \$4—\$605." That appears to be a ridiculous sum for making a simple inspection of 133 samples of flour.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That has been the charge since we adopted the course of inspecting every sample of flour, of having a sample made of every contract that is let for flour in the North-West Territories; \$5 a sample has been the regular charge by McKay until this year, when it is \$4. He is an expert.

Mr. CASEY. Can't you get it done for 25 cents?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It takes a good deal of time. We had to get the best expert we could. You will recollect that, before I came here, there was a good deal of discussion with regard to the quality of flour used in the North-West, and inspection was determined upon in consequence of that discussion.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister has not met my criticism at all about Mr. Dingman. I find that Mr. Dingman charges \$1,700, less \$5 for travelling expenses; Mr. Vankoughnet, \$24; Mr. Orr, \$63. There is another item of \$37. There are several inspectors of Indian agencies. Mr. McColl, for instance, who inspects the Indian agencies in the eastern part of the North-West and the Keewatin district, who spent most of the summer travelling through that country in a canoe. I do not find any charge for travelling expenses for him.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You will find that under Manitoba.

Mr. CASEY. This is the Department of Indian Affairs, it is not confined to the Eastern Provinces. These are Dominion contingencies. If there are contingencies belonging to Manitoba, they ought to be here too. No other inspector of Indian agencies, except Mr. Dingman, has anything like that amount charged to him.

Mr. HAGGART. Civil Government contingencies.

Mr. CASEY. The Postmaster General explains for his friend the Minister of the Interior that the vote for Mr. McColl's expenses and the others, are charged under Civil Government, not under contingencies.

Mr. HAGGART. No, no; I did not.

Mr. CASEY. That is what I understood him to say.

Mr. DEWDNEY. These are Civil Government contingencies, and none of the Manitoba or North-West contingencies are included in this at all.

Mr. CASEY. They do not come under Civil Government. Then Mr. Dingman is in a different position from the other inspectors and Indian agencies. He is a member of the headquarters' staff—is that it? But although that point may be explained, I maintain it is outrageous that this House should be asked to pass a vote of this kind, without the slightest voucher being laid before the

House or the Committee of Public Accounts. In the same list we find items such as \$2.75, 50 cents, and 70 cents, and yet no particulars are given for an expenditure of \$1,700.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it not a fact that the superintendent of the Indian Reserve at Brantford has been under suspension for some time, and that Mr. Dingman has been discharging his duties?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He has not been under suspension at any time.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is not Mr. Dingman there?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; and he is getting the office into shape, for it has not been in as good shape as I would like to see it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe that \$5 per sample has been paid for testing flour. What quantity is submitted, and what are the operations connected with the testing? No less than \$605 have been paid for testing 133 samples. The hon. Minister could afford to hire a bakery, and bake bread by the barrel to test, and afterwards throw it to the hogs. How long has the arrangement existed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It has existed for several years, since hon. gentlemen opposite complained of Indians being fed with bad flour. The whole responsibility rests on the shoulders of hon. gentlemen opposite. We were determined we would use all means possible to ensure good flour, and at the same time satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not an expert on flour, and do not understand the process of analysis, but I understand \$5 is a cheap rate for an analysis.

Mr. WATSON. It does not need an analysis to inspect flour, and the price paid is absurd. How is the inspection made? Is it on the flour after it has been delivered on the reserve?

Mr. DEWDNEY. When the flour is delivered according to contract on the reserve, samples are taken from a few of the sacks and sent to Ottawa, and these are compared with the samples on which the contract was made. If the flour is found to be unwholesome it is condemned; if it is not equal to sample, a reduction is made on the contract price. As to the suggestion that it is very easy to sample flour, I know it is very difficult to sample it, and although it may appear very nice it may be next to poisonous. I do not know what the hon. gentleman's experience on the matter is, but I am quite sure it is impossible to judge without making a very close and careful analysis.

Mr. WATSON. It does not require any such exact knowledge to tell good flour from flour that is almost poisonous. We know that the hon. Minister had considerable experience with bad flour some years ago. I call attention to the fact that two competent millers could be employed the year round for the amount paid for the inspection. The rates, at all events, should not be more than \$1 a sample. I do not speak without knowing what I am talking about, and I say that the prices paid by the Government are absurd, and that the figures should be reduced.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not only competency but honesty is requisite. Plenty of men can be obtained who would accept \$1 per sample, but they are men I would not trust.

Mr. CASEY. I find a very considerable sum has been expended by the Inland Revenue Department for travelling expenses, Mr. Miall being down for over \$400. Besides, I find the head of the Department down for \$293.75 for cab-hire.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot give the details of the \$400, because the vouchers have been furnished to the Auditor General. Mr. Miall was obliged to visit the North-West and British Columbia, and this accounts for the increase in his account for travelling expenses. Mr. Gerald has to travel as Assistant Commissioner and as Inspector of tobacco and cigar factories all over the Dominion, and his travelling expenses are not excessive when we consider that. With regard to the item of cab-hire, I may say that all the vouchers have been presented for my own cab-hire. I am very glad to notice in the discussion that no remark has so far been made that any Minister did not honestly expend the amount charged to him. There is no charge of pilfering and the charge is confined to the statement that we spent too much money, whereas last year there was an insinuation made that this was a sort of perquisite to the Ministers in addition to their salaries. Sometimes I pay my cab-hire out of my pocket, but, as a general rule, I pay at the end of the month, and that account is kept by the messenger who orders the cab. I give the messenger my own cheque for so much cab-hire as was for my own private use. For my family I keep a horse, and the cabs for my private use I pay out of my own pocket. The vouchers can all be had and every cent there is what should be charged to the public service, and does not include a single dollar for my personal use or that of my family.

Mr. CASEY. I think that after my hon. friend's explanation we are compelled to admit two things: First that Mr. Gerald's travelling expenses must have been comparatively moderate, seeing that he travelled over a great part of the Dominion for the sum mentioned in the accounts, while it cost the hon. Minister \$290 and some odd cents to travel about Ottawa in cabs. The hon. gentleman is entitled to consideration in making the admission that he keeps a horse and does not charge us for the maintenance of that horse. I hold that a Minister has as good a right to charge for the rent of his stable and the keep of his horse as he has to make us pay his cab-hire. The Ministers are paid a salary for discharging their duties towards the public, and these additions are simply perquisites that have accrued by force of custom. I do not say they are peculiar to one Department or the other, but, at all events, they should not be allowed. We ought to give a Minister a sufficient salary to enable him to pay his cab-hire instead of providing for it by contingencies. We feel thankful, however, to the hon. Minister, good and generous Irishman as he is, that he has not charged us with the keep of his horse as well as for his cab-hire.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY—REBATE ON CORN.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LAURIER. I beg to move:

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be Resolved that, in the opinion of this House, no rebate

should be allowed on corn imported for use in the manufacture of spirits.

He said: I make this motion as a consequence of the discussion which we had lately in the House, and I believe it must commend itself to both sides of the House. We on this side are of opinion that if rebates are to be allowed to certain classes of the community, they ought to be allowed to all classes, to which they may be useful. If certain classes of the community are to be exempt from the operation of the Customs laws, it is nothing but fair that similar exemptions should be allowed to all classes which can be similarly affected or benefited. At present distillers can import corn, of course paying the duty provided by law, but after they have converted the corn into spirits to be exported, they are then allowed a rebate of the duty which they have paid: in other words, they are refunded the amount they have paid into the Treasury. On the other hand, if a farmer imports corn to feed cattle and exports the corn after he has converted it into beef, he is not allowed any rebate. Certainly, taking the two things together, there is as much reason to give a rebate to one as to give it to the other. If the distiller is allowed the privilege of being refunded what he may have paid into the Treasury when he exports his goods to another country, there can be no substantial reason given why a similar privilege should not be extended to another industry; and just as beneficial an industry, or a far more beneficial one to the country, I should say. We proposed this policy from this side of the House, and we were met with a double answer from the Government side; but the two answers go in absolutely the opposite directions. The hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby) stated that so far as the distillers were concerned they did not want any rebate at all, and he said further: "There is no use speaking of that class, because nothing could be made out of it, as the rebate was really inoperative." "No spirits," he said, "were exported from this country, and therefore no rebate worth mentioning has been paid out of the Treasury." This was an answer, and the meaning was obvious. It went to show that, really after all, there was nothing in the contention that a similar privilege should be allowed to the farmer, because the rebate gave practically nothing to the distillers. Immediately after we have another answer from a gentleman who represents another riding in the County of Hastings, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, who said, if I understood his argument right, that the rebate provision should be kept on the statute book, because it served the good purpose of being an inducement to distillers to extend their business, and if they did so, we should have in the country the benefit of the labor which they would thus introduce. I have not to enquire at this moment which is which of these two different answers. I have not even to enquire as to the merits of the policy of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs lavishing his favors upon a class who do not want it, and refusing them to a class who do want it. I do not enquire at this moment into his policy. The only argument which I want to offer is this, that if rebates are to be allowed to one class they should be allowed to all classes similarly situated, but if they are not to be allowed to all they should not surely be maintained for a class that does not want them. We should extend the same measure of

Mr. LAURIER.

justice to all classes of the community; and without saying more I beg to move the motion placed in your hands.

An hon. MEMBER. Equal rights.

Mr. LAURIER. Equal rights—yes.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think, Sir, a few words are in order from myself, seeing that a motion to the same effect is on the Order paper in my name. I heard to-day for the first time, and I was very much surprised to hear it from the leader of the Opposition, that he had made known his intention of moving such a resolution to a member of the Government on Tuesday last, and he intimated that he was somewhat surprised to find that the wind had been taken out of his sails by a similar motion being placed on the paper by myself. I beg to say most distinctly that I had no intimation, directly or indirectly, of the hon. gentleman's intention, and I think it shows the impropriety of the leader of the Opposition having any private communications of that kind with the Government. Any such intention, I think, should be given publicly to the House, so that all the members will know it. The notice I put on the paper was put there without any intimation from the Government whatever. It was my own idea. I put it there of my own motion, and without any collusion with them. I state that on their behalf and my own. If it were my desire I suppose I could raise a point of order on this motion, but I shall not do so. I shall yield to the hon. leader of the Opposition the honor and the privilege of moving on this question; and as the reasons he has given meet with my approbation, I will support his motion.

Mr. LAURIER. I simply rise to a personal explanation. I made no insinuation whatever against the hon. gentleman; and as to the conversation I had with the other side of the House, I do not think he is at all fair in imputing any motive at all. I think it is best, in justice to both sides of the House, that due notice should be given.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes; but given publicly, so that all members may hear, and not to one Minister of the Crown.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is right. It should be made public, and, so far as his views are expressed, I shall endeavor to meet them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very glad this explanation has taken place. As the hon. member for Frontenac says, he has given notice of his motion at his own suggestion and instance, without any intimation in any way from the Government. I am very glad, however, that my hon. friend has taken that course, and I thank him for it, because after the communication that took place between my hon. friend opposite and the Minister of Finance it might place my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and myself in a somewhat unpleasant position; it might be supposed that we were attempting to throw the hon. gentleman over, and he does not think so himself. I must, however, take strong exception to the remark of my hon. friend as to the impropriety of communications across the House. If my hon. friend will look at the parliamentary history of England he will find that these communications are actually

required for the facility of the public business, and are really in the public interest. These communications of course are on the responsibility of the leader of the House and the leader of the Opposition, or persons fully authorised by them. They are a matter of everyday arrangement in England, and with the immense amount of parliamentary business there all legislation or administration through Parliament would be impossible if these communications were not daily, I might almost say of hourly occurrence. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 10th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. TUPPER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons the special Report of the delegates appointed in 1889, to enquire into the Herring Fishing Industry of Great Britain and Holland.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 10th February, 1890.

THE DISTURBANCE IN HULL.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to refer to a matter which has excited considerable interest in the country. It is not customary, I am aware, to bring up in the House of Commons breaches of the peace, and disturbances of that character. There has, however, been recently a disturbance, which, I think, calls for some expression of disapprobation and condemnation from the members of the Government. I refer to the riot which occurred in the city of Hull last Tuesday week, where an attempt was made by some Christian ladies, evangelists, to hold services in a hall in that city, which they had engaged for that purpose, and where they were interrupted, driven from the hall, and subjected to the most brutal maltreatment. We may well enquire whether this has occurred in Mexico or Spain, or in some South American State, or whether it has occurred under the British flag in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is this a question which can be discussed now?

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a question that may be properly alluded to now. It is exciting great interest in the country, and the question is whether we shall or not have civil liberty maintained in this country. I bring this matter up in order that the

leader of the Government may express his opinion as to the character of the riot and give it some condemnation in his official capacity as head of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is not a question of privilege, I take it, but I have not the slightest objection to state that I, in common with the hon. gentleman and every other lover of order and freedom of speech, felt very much shocked at the accounts which have appeared in the newspapers, of violent outrage to a number of persons coming peaceably to meet, no matter for what purpose, if that purpose was a legal one. Everybody must regret it, especially as such conduct is calculated to arouse feelings that are apt to be aroused between persons of different religious opinions. These differences in religious matters are frequently those which are most calculated to excite feelings of enmity or hostility between man and man, and, therefore, they are to be avoided as much as possible. I have reason to believe, from the expressions in the newspapers, that the community at Hull were shocked as a whole, and that the corporation were equally shocked and disgusted, I may say, at that exhibition of violence. The law, however, is strong enough in either Ontario or Quebec to put down all such breaches of the peace, whether they are individual assaults or assume the character of riot, and I have no doubt that the authorities in the Province of Quebec will see that sufficient means are taken to prevent a recurrence of any such unfortunate outrage.

Mr. LAURIER. I may be permitted to say, perhaps, that some expressions of opinion should come from this side of the House, especially from myself, as I happen to belong to the same creed that the rioters are supposed to belong to. They are supposed to belong to the Roman Catholic faith, but I am sure they have not learned the spirit of the religion which they profess when they behave in such a manner. I am glad to say that I have reason to believe the authorities of Hull, who are Roman Catholic authorities, will take steps to vindicate the majesty of the law, and to make every one understand that in this country every form of opinion is free and must be protected.

RETURNS.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to call the Government's attention to a return brought down here in answer to an Order of the House for a return showing the amount of money deposited in the savings banks of the Dominion and the Post Office savings banks. The return simply gives the amount deposited in the savings banks, and not in the post offices. Whoever prepared the return merely took the printed abstract published according to the statute, chapter 121, section 16, and pasted it to a sheet of paper. This is not a return in accordance with the motion.

Mr. HAGGART. There is another return brought down, which gives the information wanting.

Mr. FOSTER. When that return was laid on the Table, it was accompanied by a statement of my own that it was only a partial answer, and I brought down the partial answer when ready so as to facilitate my hon. friend in obtaining the information he desired.

Mr. McMULLEN. I applied at the proper place, and the person who was there told me that

this was the only return to be brought down in reply to the resolution.

Mr. HAGGART. There was another return brought down three or four days ago.

FISHERY COMMISSION.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I observe by the report of the Fishery Commission, which has been laid on the Table, that enquiries were only made in Holland and Great Britain, and I should like to know how it was that they did not take place in regard to the fisheries of the United Kingdom. What reason was there for confining them to Great Britain?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is so often that the term Great Britain is used, and sometimes simply England, in speaking of the United Kingdom, that one does not think of such a matter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). For some reason or other you omitted Ireland.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that there was any reason for omitting Ireland, excepting, perhaps, that they want Home Rule and do not want to join with the fisheries of England and Scotland. I may say, while speaking on this subject, that it is very unfortunate, in my opinion, that the United Kingdom has not a name. A soldier on the field of battle may say, "I will fight and die for England," but he cannot say, "I will fight for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland to the last drop of my blood."

ORANGE INCORPORATION BILL.

Mr. WALLACE moved second reading of Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Grand Orange Lodge of British America. He said: As this question has excited a large amount of interest in the country and in the House of Commons, I desire to make a few remarks in moving the second reading of this Bill. The Bill which I have the honor to introduce to the House is quite different in character from former Bills which have been submitted to the House of Commons. As it is now framed, it is more extensive in its character, and I think meets all the wants and requirements of the Orange Association. This Bill in its present shape provides for many things which were not referred to in former Bills. The Orange Association is enlarging the scope of its exertions and its usefulness, and it requires powers which were not necessary some years ago. Now nearly every private lodge, especially those in the cities and towns, has a benevolent scheme attached to it under which sums are paid in and benefits are paid to members who become ill and are unable to pursue their occupations. In Ontario, at any rate, we have also an insurance scheme which has been now developed into very large proportions, and we require to have parliamentary sanction for the operation of that scheme. I believe that, by a recent decision of the Minister of Justice, it will be impossible to carry on our operations in that regard unless we have a Dominion charter, that the charters under which some of these associations have been working will require to be changed, and that Dominion charters will be necessary in order to carry on the insurance scheme. As I have already stated, we have now a large insurance scheme in operation in connection

Mr. McMULLEN.

with the Orange Association, and it is very successful; but this is one of the many important reasons why the Order comes here to-day to ask for an Act of incorporation. In the past, objections have been made to the incorporation of the Orange body, and objections have been made to the form of the Bill. I think those objections will have no weight against the present Bill. We know that the Order of Grangers has been incorporated by the House of Commons, that the Methodist Church of Canada has received an Act of incorporation from the House of Commons, and that last year the Independent Order of Foresters received an Act of incorporation from the House of Commons. We are asking to-day for a similar Act of incorporation to that which was granted to the Foresters. The Bill which I place before the House is exactly on the same lines as the Act which was passed, I believe, unanimously, by the House of Commons last year, in behalf of the Order of Foresters, and was also passed unanimously by the Senate, and that after careful consideration of its provisions. We have followed the same lines and adopted the same rules, which, I believe, were submitted to the Superintendent of Insurance for the regulation of the insurance part of the scheme, and we appeal to the House of Commons to-day to grant an Act of incorporation to the Orange Order of Canada—not as a favor, because we do not and will not come to any Parliament asking for any favors—but demanding a right which has been granted to others, and which we, by our standing, by our past record, and by the constitution and laws of our Association, we believe we are entitled to obtain. It has been objected in the past by some that this Order is a secret Order, and therefore should not obtain an Act of incorporation. In almost every sense it is not a secret Order. We have the Constitution and Laws of the Loyal Orange Association of British America. These are the laws by which every lodge, whether grand lodge, district lodge, county lodge or private lodge, is governed; these are opened to the inspection of every member of this House, and to every man in Canada, and can be found in the Library of Parliament. This is no secret. In this book the objects of the Loyal Orange Association are declared to be as follows:—

"The Loyal Orange Association is formed by persons desiring of supporting, to the utmost of their power, the principles and practices of the Christian religion, to maintain the laws and constitution of the country, afford assistance to distressed members of the Association, and otherwise promote such laudable and benevolent purposes as may tend to the due ordering of religion and Christian charity, and the supremacy of law, order and constitutional freedom."

And the records of the Orange Order in Canada have been in conformity with their constitution; in conformity with that portion of the constitution which I have just read. Not only is the constitution of the Order open for the inspection of everyone, but the proceedings of the Order are also open. I have in my hand the proceedings of the Grand Orange Lodge of British America at the last meeting, which was held in Goderich. We have our proceedings, every line of which is published, and scattered, and is no secret from anybody. We have, besides, our ritual. That is partly secret; but I am not afraid to show the rituals of the Orange Order to anyone of the House, and let him see whether there is anything objectionable or improper

in the rituals of the Order; so that the only things we have that are secret are the signs and pass-words of the Order. Now, Mr. Speaker, knowing as I know, and as most of the members of this House know, that the Orange Association is one that has done in the past useful and good work in Canada, one that is here to stay, one in which we join together for loyal, Christian, patriotic and benevolent purposes, I think we can fairly come to this House and ask you for an Act of incorporation. It is necessary that we should come to this House because our organisation extends to every Province in the Dominion of Canada, and also to the Province of Newfoundland, which we hope to see at an early day joined to this Dominion of ours. Sir, I might call attention to the fact, which has been observed here, that the Independent Order of Foresters, who have likewise their rituals, their constitution, and their secret signs and pass-words, precisely as we have, are also asking for a Bill which is on the same lines exactly as ours, having rituals, having signs, having pass-words, which are similar in their intent. We stand exactly on the same footing as the Independent Order of Foresters. Sir, one of the objections made to the Orange Order being incorporated, and one of the strong objections made when it was last before the House of Commons, was that the association was political. Well, Sir, that is an assertion which I am not called upon here particularly to affirm or deny; but if annexation to the United States is threatened in this Dominion, if our institutions under which we live so happily and, taking everything into consideration, so contentedly and so prosperously, are threatened, or if the connection between Canada and the rest of the British Empire is threatened, you will find, Sir, that the Orange institution is political, that it will be prepared to take sides, and give no uncertain sound if any of these evils are threatened to this country. Now, I will refer to one more particular before I close. During the last Parliament, when the question was before the House of Commons, a member of the Opposition, for a purpose which I cannot but consider an ignoble one, strongly opposed the Act of incorporation. That purpose, as I conceive, was to spread wider those differences of religion and, what is more than difference of religion, those animosities that occasionally creep in among the adherents of the different religions of Canada. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was fairly successful in the impression he made in the House of Commons, but when those members who voted against the Bill went back to the country they were not so successful in being returned again to this House. I have in my hand a list of members who strongly opposed the Bill for Orange incorporation during that Session, and I am pleased to know that they are replaced in this House of Commons by gentlemen who, I believe, are prepared to support the Bill to-day. Therefore I say that, though that hon. gentleman may have made an impression upon the people of the country, they differed with him in the views he then took. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will leave the matter with you. I purposely abstain from making any remarks that would be offensive to any single member of this House whose religion might differ from mine. But while I think I have spoken with moderation, I do not wish that moderation to be misunderstood. If attacks have been made,

or are made to-day, upon the Order which we now seek to incorporate; if attacks have been made—unjust and unfair attacks have been made in the past—I think it will be found, that the members and friends of the Order will be amply able in this House to justify and to defend an organisation whose whole record, both in the old country where it was established, and in this country in which it has attained such a strong and firm footing, is one of loyalty to the constitution, loyalty to the institutions under which we live, and loyalty to the great Empire of which we form part. I move, Mr. Speaker, the second reading of the Bill to incorporate the Grand Orange Lodge of British America.

House divided on motion of Mr. Wallace :

YEAS :

Messrs.

Archibald (Sir Adams),	McDonald (Victoria),
Armstrong,	McDougald (Pictou),
Baird,	McKay,
Barnard,	McKeen,
Barron,	McNeill,
Bell,	Madill,
Bowell,	Mara,
Boyle,	Marshall,
Brown,	Masson,
Bryson,	Mills (Annapolis),
Burdett,	Moncrieff,
Cargill,	O'Brien,
Carling,	Platt,
Carpenter,	Porter,
Charlton,	Prior,
Cochrane,	Putnam,
Cockburn,	Robertson,
Corby,	Roome,
Daly,	Ross,
Davies,	Rowand,
Davin,	Rykert,
Davis,	Semple,
Dawson,	Shanley,
Denison,	Skinner,
Dewdney,	Small,
Dickinson,	Smith (Ontario),
Earle,	Sprule,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Sutherland,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Taylor,
Ferguson (Welland),	Temple,
Foster,	Tisdale,
Gordon,	Tupper,
Guillet,	Tyrwhitt,
Haggart,	Waldie,
Hesson,	Wallace,
Hickey,	Wald,
Hudspeth,	Watson,
Jamieson,	Welsh,
Jones (Digby),	White (Cardwell),
Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Renfrew),
Macdonald (Huron),	Wilson (Lennox),
McCarthy,	Wood (Brockville),—85.
McCulla,	

NAYS :

Messrs.

Amyot,	Holton,
Audet,	Innes,
Bain (Soulanges),	Joncas,
Bain (Wentworth),	Jones (Halifax),
Béchar, d,	Kirk,
Bergeron,	Landerkin,
Bernier,	Landry,
Boisvert,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Borden,	La Rivière,
Bourassa,	Laurier,
Bowman,	Lépine,
Brien,	Lister,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Lovitt,
Casey,	Mackenzie,
Casgrain,	McIntyre,
Choquette,	McMullen,
Costigan,	Massue,
Coughlin,	Meigs,
Couture,	Mills (Bothwell),

Curran,
Daoust,
Dessaint,
Doyth,
Dupont,
Ellis,
Fiset,
Fisher,
Flynn,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gizault,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grandbois,
Guay,

Moffat,
Neveu,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Rinfret,
Robillard,
Ste. Marie,
Somerville,
Thérien,
Trow,
Turcot,
Vanasse,
Weldon (St. John),
Wilson (Elgin),
Yeo,—69.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Queen's, N. S. (Mr. Freeman), has not voted.

Mr. FREEMAN. I am paired.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for Antigonish (Sir John Thompson) has not voted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am paired with the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick).

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) has not voted.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I am paired. I would have voted against the Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) has not voted.

Mr. RIOPEL. I am paired. I would have voted against the Bill.

Mr. SCRIVER. I ask to have my vote struck off, as I am paired with the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) until eight o'clock this evening.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) has not voted.

Mr. CAMERON. I am paired with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth). If I had voted, it would have been against the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the National Construction Company.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Northern and Western Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "the Canada Eastern Railway Company."—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Hereford Railway Company.—(Mr. Ives.)

SHORT LINE RAILWAY—THE HARVEY BRANCH.

Mr. LAURIER asked, 1, Whether there has been any public money spent on the Harvey Branch of the Short Line Railway for surveys or other works since the close of last Session? 2. If so, what is the amount, and under what authority was the expenditure incurred?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Public money has been expended to the extent of \$22,302.28. The expenditure has been partly paid out of the vote for surveys and partly by warrant.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. gentleman say the proportion paid by warrant and that paid out of the vote for surveys?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I have not got that information.

Mr. WALLACE.

MR. P. LESUEUR.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. COOK) asked, Whether the P. LeSueur who draws \$1,024.30 for annual superannuation allowance, is the same person who enjoys the combined offices of Civil Service Examiner and Secretary to the Examiners at a salary per annum of \$1,258.33? If so, is the arrangement to be continued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Secretary of State, who will answer that question, is not present. I understand Mr. LeSueur is the same person, but as I cannot speak as to the figures, the question had better stand.

POST OFFICE AT ST. ROSAIRE.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) asked, Whether the Government have received a report from Inspector Bolduc, respecting the establishment of a post office in the parish of St. Rosaire, in the County of Montmagny? If so, what do the Government intend to do in the matter?

Mr. HAGGART. No such report has been received.

POSTMASTER AT CROW HARBOR, N.S.

Mr. KIRK asked, Whether John Ehler 3rd, of Crow Harbor, N. S., has been convicted of smuggling, or aiding and abetting smuggling, and is he now serving a sentence in the county jail in Guysboro', in terms of said conviction?

Mr. BOWELL. A man of that name has been convicted of smuggling and is now serving a term in the common jail, I believe, for it. I do not know whether it is the same man or not.

Mr. KIRK asked: 1. On whose recommendation was John Ehler 3rd appointed postmaster at Crow Harbor, Nova Scotia, last summer? 2. Why was not Mr. Scott, who was recommended by a petition of the people interested, appointed? 3. Is the John Ehler 3rd, who is now serving a sentence in the county jail in Guysboro', for smuggling, or aiding and abetting smuggling, the postmaster at Crow Harbor, Nova Scotia? 4. Is this the John Ehler who was dismissed from the lighthouse keepership at Crow Harbor? 5. Was John Ehler 3rd dismissed from the lighthouse keepership, shortly before he was appointed postmaster, on the charge for which he was since proven guilty, and for which he is now serving sentence in the county jail? 6. Who is now in charge of the post office at Crow Harbor? 7. Is it the intention of the Government to continue John Ehler 3rd, postmaster at Crow Harbor? 8. If not, will the Government appoint one who may be recommended by a petition of the people interested, endorsed by the representatives of the county? 9. If not, why not?

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the first part of the question: The Postmaster General understood that the appointment of Mr. Ehler would be acceptable to those interested and to be a suitable and proper one. That also conveys an answer to the second part of the question. To the third part of the question the answer is: I have just learned to-day for the first time that this is the party who is undergoing sentence in the county gaol at Guysboro'. I have never learned that Mr. Ehler was dismissed from the position of lighthouse keeper at Crow Harbor. I suppose some employé of Mr.

Ehler is at present in charge of the post office at Crow Harbor. The matter of the continuance of this gentleman is under the consideration of the Government. The Government will study the recommendation of people interested and endorsed by the representatives of the county, and give every consideration to it.

POST OFFICE AT ST. EDMOND.

Mr. FISHER (for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL) asked, Whether the Government have received a petition from the inhabitants of St. Edmond, in the County of Berthier, asking for the erection of a post office in the said parish of St. Edmond? If they have received it, do the Government intend to grant the prayer of this petition, and when? If not, why not? He said: This is in regard to the establishment of a post office, and not the erection of a post office, which might be inferred from the way the question is put in the English version.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not draw any distinction. The answer I got from the Department is, that no such petition has been received.

CHAMBLY AND LONGUEUIL CANAL.

Mr. FISHER (for Mr. PRÉFONTAINE) asked, Would the Government have any objections to the construction by a private corporation of a canal from Chambly to Longueuil; provided that such a company obtained in regular course an Act of incorporation from the Dominion Parliament?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would require an Act of the Dominion Parliament, and the Government have not considered the question.

LAKE ST. LOUIS PIERS.

Mr. FISHER (for Mr. PRÉFONTAINE) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates for the present Session a sum sufficient to secure the erection of piers in Lake St. Louis, as recommended and approved by competent engineers, in order to prevent the dangers resulting from floods in the St. Lawrence, more particularly on the south shore?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will have to wait until the Estimates are brought down.

MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION.

Mr. FISHER (for Mr. PRÉFONTAINE) asked, Whether the Government have under consideration the question of the abolition of the Harbor Commission of Montreal, with a view to placing all the works of the port of Montreal under the control of the Department of Public Works of Canada?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That matter has not yet engaged the attention of the Government.

NORTH-WEST COUNCIL.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, 1. Has the Government received from the North-West Council, or any member thereof, any communication on the subject of the use of the dual languages in the Territories? 2. Are they aware of the existence of a petition either to the House of Commons or to the Government, or to both, in the words or the meaning of the words quoted by the member for

North Simcoe in introducing his Bill (No. 10) of this Session? 3. Will the Government lay on the Table of the House copies of all petitions or communications in their possession received from the North-West Council, or any member thereof, or any other person or persons, bearing upon the subject of dual language in the Territories, before the second reading of Mr. McCarthy's Bill is proceeded with?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A memorial was received by the Government from the North-West Council. That has been laid on the Table of the House this afternoon. From it the hon. gentleman will be able to judge what the meaning of the words in the report is.

THE NEXT CENSUS.

Mr. FISHER (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, in taking the next census, to enumerate only those persons who are actually resident in the country at the time such census is taken, or whether they intend to include persons not then resident in Canada who are alleged to be temporarily absent?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The intention of the Government is to carry out the next census exactly in the same way and on the same principle as the last.

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RAILWAY.

Mr. KIRK asked, 1. When will the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway be finished? 2. Is any portion of it finished now? If so, what portion? 3. Has the Pictou end been completed according to specifications? 4. Has it been taken off the contractors' hands? 5. Have the contractors made any claims for loss sustained in carrying out their contract? 6. If so, is it the intention of the Government to pay these claims? 7. When will the line be open for traffic?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To the first question the answer is: If, when the spring opens, the season is favorable for work and the contractors vigorously prosecute the work, it will be finished in the middle of July, 1890. 2. The portion between Brown's Point and Manitou Road is practically completed. 3. With the exception of a few hundred dollars' worth of work yet to be done. To the fourth question the answer is in the negative. To the fifth question, the answer is in the affirmative. To the sixth question, the answer is that the matter is now before the Government; and to the seventh question, "When will the line be open for traffic," the answer is: When it is completed.

CLAIMS OF MR. HILLIKER.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether the Government have received the report of Fishery Overseer Luke, respecting the claims of Mr. Hilliker, of Clarenceville, County of Missisquoi?

Mr. TUPPER. The Department of Fisheries has received the report of Overseer Luke.

COST OF NORTH-WEST SURVEYS.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) asked, What is the amount per acre for the survey of land in the North-West Territories and Manitoba?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The cost, including the expenses at headquarters for preparing plans and maps, is a little over 4 cents an acre.

EXTENSION OF THE FREE LIST.

Mr. FISHER asked, Whether any petitions addressed to His Excellency the Governor General, or the Honorable Senate, or this Honorable House, have been received by the Government, or any member or any official thereof, praying that corn, cotton seed, flax seed and all cattle food, ground or unground; also all manures, chemicals, minerals, and all materials whatsoever for the manufacture of manures, should be put on the Free List? If so, what has been done with them? How many were there of them? and from what sources did they come?

Mr. FOSTER. This is rather a comprehensive question. All that I can say at present is, that I am not aware of any petitions having been received. If, upon further investigation, I find that there are any, the answer may be modified.

EXODUS OF CANADIANS TO THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for :

Select Committee to consist of Messrs. Patterson (Essex), Kirkpatrick, Mills (Bothwell), White (Renfrew), McMullen, Weldon (Albert), Somerville, Bryson, and the mover, to enquire: 1. As to the extent of the alarming exodus of native-born Canadians and settlers in Canada of foreign birth to the United States. 2. As to the chief causes of such exodus. 3. As to the best means to be adopted to counteract the influences which have hitherto promoted such exodus, and for the purpose of suggesting means for diminishing this serious drain upon our numerical strength and our resources.

He said: I wish, Mr. Speaker, to preface the moving of this resolution with a few remarks. That there is a considerable exodus from this country to the United States is not, I suppose, disputed. Its magnitude is evident from various circumstances. One of those circumstances, which indicates it most unerringly, is the small increase in the population of this country as compared with that of the United States. Our population in 1871 was 3,635,000, in round numbers; in 1881 it was 4,324,000; an increase in the decade of 18·97 per cent. During the decade from 1870 to 1880, the increase in the population of the United States was very much more rapid. The population of that country in 1870 was 38,558,000, and in 1880, 50,155,000, an increase of 30·08 per cent., or 11·11 per cent. greater than the increase in the population of Canada. Now, I do not suppose that it will be claimed that the natural increase of population is greater in the United States than it is in Canada; in fact, it is easy of demonstration that the contrary is the case. It cannot be shown, either, that the immigration to the United States is greater, proportionately to population, than the immigration to Canada. On the contrary, the immigration to Canada between 1871 and 1881 was 46 per cent. greater, upon a *per capita* basis of calculation, than the immigration to the United States. If, then, we have these two facts staring us in the face, namely: that the natural increase of population in Canada is greater than the natural increase in the United States, and that the immigration to Canada has been 46 per cent. greater than the immigration to the United States, while, nevertheless, the increase of population in Canada

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

has been 11 per cent. less than the increase in the United States, these circumstances prove most conclusively that there has been a very large exodus of the population of British America to the United States. Now, when we come to examine the evidence with regard to this matter, we shall be able, I think, to fix pretty conclusively, in an approximate way, the extent of this exodus. We have various sources of evidence bearing upon this question. First, we have the census returns of the United States, which give the nativity of all persons in that country. By the returns of 1870 it was shown that there were in the United States 490,041 natives of British America, exclusive of Newfoundland; in 1880 there were in the United States of British American birth 712,368 persons, an increase of about 47 per cent. in that period. Then, we have the evidence furnished by personal observation. No person can travel in any part of the United States without being aware that there is a large Canadian element in the population of that country. You will find Canadians, Sir, in Massachusetts, in New York, in Michigan, in Illinois, in Minnesota, in Dakota, in California, in Oregon; wherever you go you will find Canadians. It is said that there are 50,000 Canadians in the city of Chicago. And wherever you go in the United States you will find that the Canadians are a class of men who are energetic, who are making their way, who stand high in the estimation of the public, and who form a most valuable contribution to the population of that country. The fact that a person seeking employment is a Canadian is a passport to favor, and other things being equal, will, in most cases, secure him the position asked for. Last fall, while travelling through California, I was told by an old ranchman that he always hired a Canadian in preference to a man of any other nationality, because he secured a man who was both energetic and faithful, and who if he took a situation, did so intending to fill it and to perform the duties required of him. And wherever they are found in the United States, I repeat, they are making their way. They form a valuable contribution to the population of that country.

Now, we have the evidence furnished by the United States census as to the number of persons of British Canadian birth in the United States in 1880; and although we have no positive evidence furnished by the census of the United States of a later day, we have the evidence furnished by the censuses taken in many of the States in 1885, and we have other evidence of various kinds, which serves to render it quite probable that the exodus from Canada has increased, rather than diminished, in volume since 1880. I think there can be very little doubt that that is the case. We have first the evidence furnished by American frontier statistics—statistics taken at the frontier Custom houses of the United States, statistics taken in Port Huron and Detroit and at various other points on the international boundary line where emigrants cross to the United States; and the evidence furnished by these statistics uniformly points to the conclusion that the exodus from this country is gathering in volume from year to year. With regard to the censuses of the States, I may refer to that of Massachusetts. In 1880, the federal census showed that there were 116,601 persons in Massachusetts of British Canadian birth; in 1885 there

were 64,503 French Canadians and 79,966 Canadians from the other Provinces in that State, a total of 144,469 in that single State, being an increase in five years of nearly 28,000 souls; and that increase has, beyond question, been very much greater in the five succeeding years than it was in the five years from 1880 to 1885. Then we have the census returns of Dakota, showing there is an enormous Canadian population in those two States, North and South Dakota. And we have the census returns of Minnesota, showing a very large Canadian population there, and also of the State of Michigan, showing a very large number of Canadians in that State; and the evidence which faces us at every hand forces upon us the conviction that the exodus is gathering volume, and that the number of Canadians in the United States is very large indeed.

I propose to examine, in the light of available evidence, as to what probably is the number of Canadians in that country now; and I make my calculation in full view of the fact that whatever my estimates may be, their correctness or incorrectness will be shown in a very few months by the United States census, which is to be taken in June this year. In view of this fact, I shall present the calculations I have made. The increase in the British American population of the United States from 1870 to 1880 was, in round numbers, 232,000 souls, or an increase upon the number in that country in 1870 of 47 per cent. Now, if that same percentage of increase has been maintained, the number—712,000 in 1880—will be swelled in June next to 1,047,000 of native-born Canadians in the United States. If we took merely the increment from 1870 to 1880, without dealing with the question of percentage, and merely add the increase in number from 1870 to 1880 to the number in the country in 1880, we would have now 944,000 in the United States. I predict that this calculation will be verified by the census returns, and that we will find there are over a million native-born Canadians in the United States at present—probably 1,050,000. Now, that constitutes a direct loss of that number of people to Canada, composed of the best portion of our population—the young, energetic and enterprising, those who have drifted away to seek a larger field, those whose services, energy and productive capacity we can ill afford to spare. There is this direct loss. Then there is what I may term a consequential loss. There were in the United States in 1880, 939,000 children of Canadian fathers, 931,000 children born of Canadian mothers, or, in round numbers, 930,000 children born in the United States of Canadian parents; and if the same proportion holds good now, if the increase in the Canadian population in the United States brings the number up to 1,047,000, and if the number of children bears the same proportion to the number of Canadians that it did in 1880, there are in the United States at present 1,364,000 children born in that country of Canadian parents, or a loss, direct or consequential, in the number of native-born Canadians who are in the United States, and in the number of children born to these British Canadians in that country, of 2,412,000 souls. Now, that is a terrible drain upon this country. It explains why the increase in population of this country has been 11 per cent. less in the last decade than it was in the United States. We have, in addition to this, to scrutinise the immigration returns, to see if we cannot arrive at

some clue that will enable us to form an opinion as to the loss of immigrants coming into this country from the old world and leaving this country for the United States. We had in Canada, according to our own census in 1871, 582,668 persons of foreign birth; we had in Canada ten years later, in 1881, 598,388. The increase in the foreign element of our population in ten years has been thus barely 15,720 souls. Mark that fact, 15,720 souls was the increase according to the census returns in the foreign-born population from 1871 to 1881, but during that period we had received from the old world 342,675 immigrants. Now, what has become of all these 342,000 received, and only 16,000, in round numbers, more in the country in 1881 than there were in 1871? Where have they gone? They have left us. When we come to make a calculation and do so properly, we must take the death rate and strike the balance year by year. We should take the number of people in Canada foreigners, which in 1871 was 582,668; we should add to that the immigration each year; we should take the death rate and see what the loss by death was in each year; we should add to that number the immigration in the following years, and so on, carrying the calculation through for the ten years. There should have been in Canada in 1881, as the result of this calculation, 783,208 persons of foreign birth and there were in Canada 598,388, showing that, with a death rate of 20 to the thousand, we had lost 184,820 immigrants in the decade from 1871 to 1881, who, at the end of that period, were living in the United States. If we estimate the number of children born to these parents on the same basis as the United States returns give with regard to the native-born population, there was an additional loss of 240,000 children, and the consequential loss following that direct loss is 240,000 children born to these people in the United States. Now, the immigration from 1881 to 1890 has been 653,510, estimating the immigration for the present year—the hon. the Minister of Agriculture was unable to give me the exact figures—at 34,000, which the statistician, Mr. Johnston, says is approximately correct. 653,000 was the immigration into this country from 1881 to 1st January, 1890. Now, we lost of that number that came between 1871 and 1881, according to the calculation I have made based upon the census returns and the death rate of 20 to the 1,000 per annum, 53 per cent. of that acquisition to our population from immigration who had left us and gone to the United States, and were in that country alive in 1881. And if we take the same proportion of immigrants from 1881 to 1890 as having emigrated to the United States, we have remaining in that country, at the commencement of the year, 53 per cent. of the entire number, or 346,000 souls. Add to this those remaining in the United States on the first of this year of the 184,000 emigrants there in 1881, which would be 154,000, after deducting a death rate of 20 to the 1,000, and we have a direct loss from this source by immigrants leaving the country of 500,454 in the United States at the commencement of this year. If we add to this the consequential loss incurred in connection with children born to these parents, who otherwise would have been born in British America, figuring that on the same basis of the United States census returns, there was an additional loss of 650,590,

making the direct and consequential loss, on that basis, 1,151,044 souls. This does not take into account one of the immigrants who left this country prior to 1871; it does not take into account, either, the grandchildren of immigrants or of natives of this country who have gone from British America to the United States.

Of course, I realise that the statements as to immigration must be to a large extent matters of speculation and calculation, because the American census returns do not furnish any data which is available for use in this respect, as these people are entered in the United States census as natives of the country from which they originally came. The summary of these statements is as follows:—Native Canadians in the United States to-day, 1,047,466; immigrants who have come into Canada and moved into the United States, 500,454; total direct loss, 1,547,920 souls. Then I assume the children of native Canadians who have been born in the United States at 1,364,664, and the children of immigrants who left Canada and went to the United States, those children being born there, at 650,590. This makes a direct loss of 1,547,920, and a consequential loss to Canada of 2,015,254, or a total loss of 3,563,174 souls. I do not doubt that this is substantially correct, and that it is even within the mark, because, as I have said, I do not take into account any one of the immigrants who left this country before 1871, and I do not count the grandchildren or other descendants of these people. There were 490,000 Canadians in the United States twenty years ago, probably there were 350,000 there twenty-five years ago, and probably there were 300,000 Canadians there thirty years ago. I think the above calculation is a moderate one, terrible as the drain appears to have been and vast as the amount is.

But there are some corroborative facts bearing on this question, and I desire to treat this matter in a perfect spirit of fairness. I do not wish to draw any deductions which are unwarranted by the facts or by the premises, but some of these facts are very significant. I find that the immigration into Canada from 1871 to 1880 amounted to 342,675, and that to the United States amounted to 2,812,190. Canada had an excess *per capita* on the basis of population of 108,326 souls, or 46 per cent. greater than the immigration to the United States. From 1881 to 1889, the immigration to Canada was 653,510, while the immigration to the United States during the same period, the month of December last being estimated, was 4,794,849. In that case, Canada's excess *per capita* was 253,950, or 63 per cent. above that of the United States. For the entire period from 1871 to 1889, the total immigration to Canada was 996,185, and to the United States, 7,607,039, showing a *per capita* excess for Canada of 362,266, or 54 per cent.; yet in view of these facts, we have fallen behind in the race, and our proportion of increase is 11 per cent. less than that of the United States. What does that indicate? What inference are we to draw from this? Have we less room for expansion than they have in the United States? That cannot be asserted, because we have almost one-half this continent. Have we less energy and intelligence in this country? I think we have more. We have a hardier race, living, as we do, in a more bracing climate which produces a population more capable of exertion than our neighbors,

Mr. CHARLTON.

as they show when they are brought into competition in the United States with native Americans on their own soil. Have we a paucity of resources? On the contrary, we have unlimited resources in our fisheries, our lumber, our mines, our fields, our agricultural resources, generally. Our resources are practically without limit, and there is no reason why this country should not have advanced more rapidly, having regard to its natural advantages, the energy of its people, and the other advantages which they possess. Why, then, should there be such a showing as this, in comparison with the United States? I think it is a question which it behoves us to examine into. There may be one cause, or there may be many causes for this state of affairs. Instead of having a population of five millions to-day, we ought to have one of seven and a half millions or eight millions. With that population we would cut a different figure in the world than we do now, and if it is possible to arrest this exodus, and to place this country in a better position than it now occupies we ought to do so. In view of the necessity for enquiring into what can be done to serve our interests in this matter, I move the resolution of which I have given notice, and I wish the leader of the Opposition to name three French Canadian gentlemen to act on the Committee.

Mr. CARLING. I think there is no necessity for a Committee such as proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). We have a Committee of Agriculture and Immigration, numbering something like one hundred members, and I think they are quite able to make any enquiry that is necessary to be made in regard to this question. The figures that have been given by my hon. friend from North Norfolk, I think, cannot be relied upon. He states that the Custom house officers at Detroit and Port Huron have returned a vast number of people as having left Canada and gone to the United States. I think the hon. gentleman will remember that a leading gentleman—Mr. Manning, the Secretary of the Treasury—stated in the United States Congress that the figures that have been given were altogether untrustworthy and unreliable. The census of the United States is to be taken this year, and the census of Canada is to be taken next year; and although my hon. friend and others have said that the population of Canada is falling off instead of increasing, I think they will find themselves very much mistaken, and that the population of Canada will be found to be much greater than they anticipate. We have every indication of that. We find that our railways are carrying a very much larger number of passengers every year; we find that they are carrying a much larger tonnage of freight every year; in fact everything indicates that the country is progressing, that the trade of the country is increasing, and I am sure that if it is increasing, and if the country is advancing and progressing, the population will also be found to have increased. I think that the motion made by my hon. friend at the present time is out of place and unnecessary. If any more information is required it can be obtained through that large and influential Committee which is now organised in this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. member for North Norfolk is not on that Committee, he can be placed upon it.

Mr. BRIEN. Before this resolution is put, I would just like to make a few remarks upon the very important question that it raises. The Agriculture Committee have hitherto failed to take such action as would thoroughly investigate this matter, and I think, therefore, it is important that this Committee should be appointed. There can be no doubt at all that there is a very large exodus of our most energetic and active citizens to the United States. If the cause of that exodus can be ascertained, and I have no doubt that it can be found out by this Committee, it would be very easy to suggest a remedy. In the section of country which I have the honor to represent, there is a very large increase of population, which, however, comes from the eastern parts of Canada, but, in the aggregate, owing to the large exodus to the United States, that increase is not what we should expect and desire. It has been stated in this House upon many occasions that we have not been able to retain our natural increase. Had our natural increase from births over deaths been the same as the increase in the United States, the population of 1871, which was then 3,605,000, would to-day amount to 5,169,200. Besides that, we have spent \$4,644,689 for bringing immigrants to this country, which sum does not include the figures for the present year, as the Agriculture Report has not yet been received. We have received in this country by immigration 2,272,665, which, added to what our population should be from natural increase, would amount to 7,441,865, which would represent our present population if we had kept all our natural increase and all our immigrants. Evidently we have suffered a serious loss of population, and when we consider the large amount of money we have spent on immigration, the matter becomes a very serious one, which this House ought to take means to investigate. I may mention some other facts which show the loss we are suffering from emigration to the United States. In the Detroit medical colleges, 55 per cent. of all the students are Canadians. Now, we know that as the law stands in Canada to-day, students who obtain their degrees in the American colleges cannot practice in this country. It is to be remembered that these young men form part of our most energetic, ambitious and able citizens. We also find that of the veterinary surgeons who have graduated in this country, numbering over 1,000, 400 of them are now practising in the United States, showing another large loss of our most energetic and useful citizens. The number of families which crossed from Windsor to Detroit last year was 2,199, which, at an average of five to a family, would make 10,995 persons which we have lost at that port, and I believe that we are also losing large numbers at other ports. The effects they took with them to the United States amounted in value to \$261,632. When we consider that this exodus seems not only to continue, but to increase, I think it is the duty of this House to accept the resolution moved by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

Mr. SPROULE. I fully agree with every word uttered by the Minister of Agriculture. Last year, I believe, we organised a very important Committee of the members of this House, for the purpose of looking after the agricultural pursuits of the people, and of ascertaining

how far their conditions could be improved, and put them in a better position upon their way through life. Now, I am not going to question the accuracy of the statistics that were given by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), when he announced that such a Committee as he proposes is necessary. But, I can only say that year after year the Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation, of which I have been a member, has been endeavoring, as far as possible, to obtain correct information as to how extensive that exodus has been, whether it has been great or small, and I can assure the House that we have never been able to get authentic information sufficient to prove that there has been an increased exodus as compared with that of former years. We are two great countries, with extensive territory lying alongside by side. Our people are engaged in various pursuits. In some lines those pursuits are much more extensive in the United States than here, and, therefore, many of our young men go there because there are openings which do not occur here. Some also go there for the purpose of acquiring an education. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) gave as a reason why this Committee should be appointed, that a number of Canadians were found in medical colleges in Michigan. I can tell the hon. gentleman that if he had given any attention to the subject he must have known that this is due to the fact that the fees there are much smaller for tuition than in the colleges here. I know that, because I spent a part of my academic life in college there; and whereas the college charges in Canada are pretty high, those at Ann Harbor are merely nominal, something like \$10 for each student. A great many Canadian students attend there, as was the case when I attended there in 1865-67. Did they remain in the United States? Not more than 5 per cent. remained. They returned to graduate in Canada and pursue their professions here, but they went there because they found it much cheaper to get their education at Ann Harbor. We may reasonably ask, if this exodus is going on, what class of the people are going to the United States? Are they the agriculturists? I think the hon. gentleman failed to give any reason why the farmers of Canada should go to the United States to improve their condition. I have before me a statement showing the average value of the crop raised in the States of the Union for a number of years, compared with the average value of the crop raised by the farmers of Ontario. I do not include the whole Dominion, because we cannot obtain correct statistics respecting some of the other Provinces, or, at all events, such correct statistics as we have for Ontario. I find that taking the value of the crop from ten acres during six years, the average value in Ontario is \$18 per acre. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will not dispute these statistics, because they are collected by their own friend, Mr. Blue, statistician for Ontario, who is supposed to be one of the accurate men in this country. He gives the average crop in Ontario per year at \$18 per acre. New York ranks next highest, but the amount is only \$15. Ohio comes next with \$13, Michigan with \$13, Illinois with \$12, Indiana with \$12, Wisconsin \$11, Kansas \$11, Missouri \$11. I need not go over the whole list, but in every single instance the average value is much less than it is in Ontario. I, therefore, ask, why farmers should

leave Canada and go to a country where the soil produces much less per acre from the products of their labor than it does here in Ontario? If I take an aggregate of the years, I find that an estimate for ten years shows about the same proportion. In every instance, Ontario stands prominently at the head of the list, showing that our farmers can raise more value to the acre than those of any State in the United States. I, therefore, assume that our agriculturists are not leaving Canada because they can better their condition in the United States. Are the people leaving this country because there is a lower tariff across the line than here? We have heard so much about our iniquitous Canadian tariff that it might be supposed if Canadians went there, they would go to some Elysian fields where there would be no tariff whatever. But every one knows that the American tariff is very much higher than ours; probably nearly double. So Canadians do not go there to escape our iniquitous Canadian tariff. Why, then, do they go there? Some go because there is a greater variety of pursuits in the United States; because the development of American industries is so much greater than ours, as the wealth of that large portion of the population who for almost a century have been engaged in the remunerative industries, is such that they can invest more largely in enterprises than we can do here. Why do we find that the Americans have an advantage over us? It is because for nearly the last 100 years they have been following closely that policy which we have been pursuing since 1878, the lines of a protective tariff, and they have developed those industries to such an extent that to-day a greater variety of pursuits is offered there for the people of Canada than they find at home. But we have been endeavoring to remedy the evil. We have established a Canadian protective tariff, a national tariff, under which we are building up our industries, so that year after year we are opening up wider fields of pursuit to our people than heretofore, in order that we may be able to keep our people at home. As to the increase or decrease of population, I take but little stock in it, because the figures given by the hon. gentleman can be manipulated to prove any argument. It is not the census of our country that shows it; because the census does not show it. If we carefully go over the census, we will find there is a gradual natural increase in our population.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very gradual.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think it will do us much harm to wait a few years longer. We expect that in the course of a couple of years the census will be taken, and arguments not now forthcoming to disprove the contention of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), will then be available, and I am quite sure it will be found that he is entirely mistaken in the calculation he has submitted to the House, as he has been on many previous occasions. The House has at its command a very important Committee which can investigate the subject, so far as investigation can do any good. I do not see any necessity to appoint another Committee. If the hon. gentleman is anxious to get upon the Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation, in the belief that he can bring out information there that has not been brought out so far, the Government will doubtless be willing to put him there, and the Committee will gladly accept the

Mr. SPROULE.

services of such an able statistician. For the present, there is no need of another Committee. I, therefore, contend that there is no extensive exodus to the United States, and that there are not the inducements for Canadians to go there that the hon. gentleman represents, nor are they going in large numbers, as has been stated by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I confess my surprise at the line of argument adopted by the Minister of Agriculture. One would suppose if he felt confident that the representations made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) were erroneous, he would be only too glad to have a committee for the purpose of establishing that fact. The hon. Minister says that we have a Committee already, but the hon. gentleman has, I suppose, not forgotten that we had this same Committee in 1876 or 1877, and that there was another Committee then appointed to enquire into the cause of the agricultural depression in the country. The hon. gentleman and his friends did not think at that time that the existing Committee was exactly the sort of institution that could make a very efficient enquiry into the specific matter about which enquiry was sought. The hon. gentleman supported the granting of this special Committee.

Mr. CARLING. When was that?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). At the time that the Committee enquiring into agricultural depression was formed.

Mr. CARLING. What year?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it was the year 1876.

Mr. CARLING. I was not a member of the House then.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, the hon. gentleman's friends were, and the responsibility which they assumed I suppose the hon. gentleman will not repudiate now. The hon. gentleman's predecessor submitted a report to this House showing the extensive immigration brought from abroad into our North-West. I think this report shows the immigration to the North-West at something over 150,000 people. The hon. gentleman sought to verify the estimates in these reports by the taking of a census, and a census of the Territories was taken for the purpose of contradicting the statement which had been made on this side of the House. But that census showed that six-sevenths of these people which the report of the Minister of Agriculture said were in the North-West Territories were not to be found there. Now, if we find that six out of every seven persons who were supposed to be in the North-West Territories are not there, I think we may come to the conclusion that the information which the Minister of Agriculture from time to time presents to this House is not more reliable, so far as other parts of the Dominion are concerned, than they are with regard to the immigration to the North-West Territories. This is a serious condition of things which is disclosed by the facts and figures submitted to this House on the present occasion by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). The hon. member (Mr. Charlton) gives us the data upon which that information is based, and no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House rises to challenge it beyond the

simple denial of his belief in the accuracy of the information which the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has put forward. I think, Sir, that upon investigation of our own statistics, as well as from an investigation of the statistics of our neighbors, we may come to the conclusion that the information which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has given us is very nearly accurate. I do not think there can be much doubt in regard to that. We know that the increase of our population by the addition of the immigration from abroad does not by any means represent the natural increase of the population either here or in the United Kingdom. These facts of themselves show how very large the drain is upon the country. Now, Sir, what hon. gentlemen opposite promised when they came into office was this. They said: "You have now a very large exodus of the population from this country; put out the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) and put us in power, and we will adopt a policy by which these people will be kept at home." They got into power for the purpose of putting an end to the exodus which they said existed. That exodus was something less than 23,000 a year during the period of my hon. friend's (Mr. Mackenzie's) administration, but now the exodus has increased to two or three or four times that number. The Government of the day, instead of succeeding in putting an end to the exodus, have in fact driven the people out of the country in fourfold proportion, and after having signally failed—I may say, after having disgracefully failed—in the fulfilment of the pledge which they made to the House and to the country, they now undertake to burk enquiry, lest the real facts of the case should be established by this Committee beyond all doubt. And why? Because it is so much easier to deny the statement made by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) than it is to deny the report that would be presented by the Committee; that the hon. gentleman would prefer to vote against the granting of such a Committee rather than to undertake to argue against the information that Committee would afford. Sir, the proposition of the hon. gentleman to refer the matter to the Committee of Agriculture and Colonisation (an unwieldy Committee consisting of nearly 100 members and totally unsuited to an enquiry about which there can be any serious difference of opinion) shows that hon. gentlemen feel that if the Committee is granted the facts will show beyond all question that they have so far signally failed to adopt this policy, which they stated would succeed in keeping the people of Canada within the limits of Canada. One hon. gentleman has undertaken to tell us what the next census will show, and says that we ought to wait two years for the census, and permit this depletion to go on without any attempt to provide a remedy.

Mr. CARLING. Only one year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says "only one year." It will take fifteen months before the parties are appointed to take the census, and hon. gentlemen do not pretend to say that the House will be in a position to institute an enquiry the moment the enumerators are appointed. It is upon the report of the enumerators that enquiry will take place upon the proposition that has been made, and that report cannot come for a year after the enumerators have been appointed. Now,

Sir, there is another side of the question. I believe that during the last census, persons who ever expressed any expectation of returning to Canada at a future period, whether near or remote, were counted in the census. I would like to know whether that policy is to be adopted next census?

An hon. MEMBER. The Premier said it would.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why, Sir, in that case all these parties which my hon. friend says reside now in Massachusetts and other Eastern States of the American Republic will be counted again as they were counted before. Numbers of men and families were counted then as part of the population of Canada who had never returned to this country, and who, if they are yet living, live in the Eastern States still. By such a system, the hon. gentleman proposes to count people who are out of the country as if they were residents of the country, and then to tell us that the census shows these people have not left it at all. I think the proposition made in my hon. friend's resolution is a reasonable one, and one that the Government ought to meet by granting a Committee and not by undertaking to burk the enquiry.

Mr. FISHER. Before this discussion is ended, I would like to say a few words on the question. I was rather surprised at the line the Minister of Agriculture took when he announced that this Committee was not necessary. My hon. friend of Bothwell (Mr. Mills) just pointed out the example of a few years ago, when just such a Committee as this now asked for was appointed at the instance, I believe, of the hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture more or less declined the responsibility in that case when he said he was not a member of that House at the time, but I would just call to his memory the fact that in the last Parliament just such a Committee as this was appointed, for the express purpose of investigating the question of the agricultural industries of the country, at a time when his predecessor was the Minister of Agriculture, and when the present Minister of Agriculture was himself a member of the Cabinet which agreed to the appointment of the Committee. The Committee was moved for by my hon. friend for Rouville (Mr. Gigault), and the result of its investigations was such that the Government of the hon. Minister of Agriculture were obliged to institute an Experimental Farm, which to-day is one of the good deeds which, I think, the Minister of Agriculture will take most pride for in his administration. That Committee, I think, is a precedent for just such a Committee as this which my hon. friend from North Norfolk has moved for. It is a Committee which certainly does deal, more or less, with questions which come before the Committee on Agriculture and Immigration. But, Sir, the Committee moved for and obtained by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) also dealt with exactly the subjects which from day to day and from meeting to meeting came before the Committee on Agriculture and Immigration. Therefore we do not have to look very far for a precedent for the appointment of just such a Committee as this. The hon. Minister of Agriculture said, however, that in a little while the census would be taken, and then we should learn the exact position of affairs with regard to the population of Canada, and with regard to the number of Canadians who had left the country. Judging by

the character of the last census, I do not think the coming one will give us that information, which is of great value. The right hon. leader of the Government has to-day told us the principle upon which that census is to be taken; it is to be taken in exactly the same way as the old census, which was misleading, and which failed to give us the exact number of people resident in Canada at the time it was taken. It was not a census of the *de facto* population of this country, and if the future census is to be taken in the same way, we shall be unable to tell what our population is, because a large number of Canadians in the United States, who intend to remain there as residents, will be included in that census. But my hon. friends have alluded to the North-West population, and the hon. Minister of Agriculture has given us his prognostications of what the census will show regarding it, and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) depicted in roseate language what a magnificent showing we should expect. What did the last census of the North-West and Manitoba, taken by this same Department of Agriculture, show? It did not show that the predictions of the Government were fulfilled, but unfortunately for the people of this country—

Mr. SPROULE. The calculation was destroyed by the number of persons who went in to build the railway, and then left.

Mr. FISHER. The calculations were made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and if they have been unfulfilled, the fault is their own, and not the fault of those who criticise them. Hon. gentlemen have told us that these calculations of my hon. friend from North Norfolk are not reliable, and the hon. Minister of Agriculture has asserted that the statistics of the United States are not reliable. We who live on the borders do not require any statistics to tell us of the exodus of citizens of Canada to the United States, because we have the lamentable fact before our eyes every day. Unfortunately, this exodus extends beyond the great Province of Ontario. From the Province of Quebec as well the people are going in shoals to the United States to-day. We see the Provincial Government constantly occupied in discussing the problem, how they can best bring about the repatriation of the French Canadian people who have settled in the United States. How is it that both Tory and Liberal Governments find it necessary to do this? Is it because there are no Canadians there from the Province of Quebec? No; it is because the people who understand the Province of Quebec best, and who know where many of the people are who have been born and brought up in that Province, feel that they should do all they can to bring them back. Nor is that exodus confined to the French Canadians of Quebec. Those of us who live in the Eastern Townships know, unfortunately, that the best of our English-speaking youths are to-day in the United States. I can endorse every word that fell from the lips of the hon. member for North Norfolk, when he said that there is in the United States to-day, the cream of the youth of our country; and I do not wonder at it, because I know individual instances—and I think it may fairly be said to be the rule—of young men who have gone there and who have done so well and have so fully secured the confidence of their employers, that their

Mr. FISHER.

employers induce them to write to their friends in Canada, urging them to go and enter the same employment. I could mention instances of men who have written home to their former friends and schoolmates, telling them: "If you come here where we are doing well, we can get you employment at once, because people here are only too glad to employ Canadians, believing that they are more energetic, trustworthy and capable business men than any others they can find in the United States." I am proud of this tribute to our people, and our nationality, but I am sorry to have to acknowledge that in Canada, unfortunately, work is so scarce, opportunities so few, and the scope so small, that our young men are tempted to go to the United States, where they have greater scope and greater opportunities; and if this is the case, it is the fault of hon. gentlemen opposite, who by their restrictive policy have forced the young men to leave their country. It is a misfortune to this country, and one which the country owes to the hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches at this moment. But, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite will perhaps say, in the first place, "This is not due to the National Policy, but to the fact that you and your friends are running down your country;" and in the next place they point to the fact that in the United States there is a higher protective tariff than there is in this country, as a proof that what is good for the United States and has been successfully carried out there, must also be good for Canada. But they forget that the circumstances of the two countries are so different that the same rule cannot apply to both. This country, which is so small in area, in population and in consumptive capacity, cannot succeed to the same extent under a protective policy as the United States. But what are the facts as to the United States to-day? It is true, in the eastern parts of Canada there is an agricultural depression; it is also true that in the Eastern States there is an agricultural depression; and the people of the Eastern States are beginning to feel the effects of that policy in an alarming way. It has taken them many years longer to feel its effects than it has taken us in Canada to feel the effects of a similar policy. To-day in the Eastern States the pinch of protection is telling severely on the agriculturist. Unfortunately for us, we have not had for many years the immense home market which was provided for the agriculturists of the Eastern States by their manufactures. In this country the home market has not been so enlarged as it has been in the Eastern States to a certain extent by means of protection. To-day, the agriculturists and farmers of the United States are feeling this pinch; they are finding that the protection which was held out to them as providing a home market is not able to give them the advantages which they had hoped for. For a few years it did so; but it has not continued, and to-day the depression of the agriculturists of New England is beginning to be severely felt, and it is attributable entirely to the protective policy with they themselves supported in the United States for so many years; and much more quickly and closely following upon the cause is the effect in this country, and to-day our agriculturists are appreciating the fact that this protective policy which protects everybody but them, makes this country a dearer country to live in for the working classes.

and consequently has a depressing effect especially upon our agricultural interest. I do not think it is necessary that we should go into the question as to what has caused this exodus at further length. Already sufficient information has been given in this House to justify the appointing of a Committee to investigate into this fact, because a fact it undoubtedly is. No man who lives anywhere within reach of the border and who sees what is going on can attempt to deny it. That fact being established, we ought to investigate the causes which have produced it, so as to devise some remedy for this state of affairs. The true secret of the opposition of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to the naming of such a Committee is the fact that they dare not face the issue. They dare not have all the facts brought before the Committee, because they know that when that Committee will have finished its labors, its report could not fail to be equivalent to a vote of censure on the policy of the Government, specially their restrictive and protected policy. I do not think I need enlarge further on this point. I believe it would be in the interest of the people to investigate into this matter, and that the appointment of a Committee would lead to legislation which would be of the utmost benefit to the whole Dominion.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has had his usual fling at the National Policy. He is very desirous of having a Committee appointed to enquire into the causes of the so-called exodus, but the hon. gentleman who lives so close to the border ought to give us some reason for the depression which he says exists in the country. He ought to tell why it is that this country has not prospered and the other country has taken our surplus population.

Mr. FISHER. I gave it to you.

Mr. HESSON. If there is one single thing that has made the United States prosperous it is simply this, that they have pursued a policy entirely with reference to the people of their own country, and without any reference to outsiders. That policy they have found to be in the best interests of their people. That policy, no doubt, has attracted the attention of people of the old world as well as on this side, and I venture to say that this policy will be maintained, not only while the Republican party is in power, but even should the Democratic party take office again. The experience of that country has made the fact so evident, that there is no possibility of a party being formed in the United States to-day which would venture, in the face of the experience of the past, to change that policy as a whole. It is most remarkable, that 300,000 of the young men of Canada should leave their own country to go to one where a restrictive policy exists in its most pronounced form. How does the hon. gentleman solve that problem? There is not a Committee in the House, or out of the House, that could solve the problem which is troubling my hon. friend. How is it possible, that young men should be driven from this country, where there is less protection, to the United States, where protection exists in a most intensified degree. The hon. gentleman knows that the most important industry of this country has suffered to-day. Why does he not state the reason for that depression?

It is not because of protection, but it is because the productive wheat lands of the Western States have depreciated the value of the worn-out farms of the east. It is because of the ease with which land in our own western Provinces can be cultivated, that the value of farm products is lessened. Were it not for that, our lands in the western districts would be worth as much to-day as ever. I would ask my hon. friend, if he can possibly establish the fact that if to-day we were to open the Canadian market to American producers, the same prices would prevail in Canada that are now obtained? I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to produce the figures to show to the country that if we took the duty off corn, wheat and oats, and other products of American farms, the farmers of this country would smile and feel their pockets weighed down with gold.

Mr. CHARLTON. Give us the Committee.

Mr. HESSON. No Committee can possibly relieve that state of things. I would prevent every bushel of American wheat coming into this country and every bushel of American oats. Over 241,000 bushels of American oats have been imported in bond into the port of Stratford, which I have the honor to represent, and I would ask hon. gentlemen to bear in mind that if these oats had not been imported in bond they would have been sold in our markets instead of being exported as they now are. I ask the hon. gentleman, who plumes himself as being a representative of the farming interest, would it be in the interests of our farmers to let those oats in free? I venture to say that he would not have the courage and hardihood to go into any constituency of western Ontario and attempt to prove to the western farmers that it would be to their interests to glut our markets with the surplus products of the Americans. Give us the protection necessary to our young people, and you may depend upon their being loyal enough to Canadian institutions to stay here, and build up their fortunes in this country. They will build up here a strong nationality, a healthy and intelligent population. But my hon. friend seems desirous that they should continue to be driven out of the country, as they were in years gone by under the policy of his friends. I can tell the hon. gentleman that, so far as my experience of the farmers of the West goes, whilst they recognise the fact that they have smaller profits from their industry than formerly, they are wise enough to perceive that it is utterly impossible for the Government, if they allowed every bushel of American corn and every barrel of American flour and every bushel of American wheat to come in free, for our farmers to realise the prices that existed fifteen or twenty years ago. They recognise the fact that so long as 160 acres of excellent farm land can be obtained simply by occupying them, and railway facilities offered the holders of these farms for the export of their produce, our farmers east, whose farms are worth from \$50 to \$100 per acre, cannot compete against them in the growing of grain. How much worse then if you open the floodgates of this country to the producers of the American side. That will apply not only to the farmers but to the mechanics of this country. If you destroy one industry, you destroy the whole, and the farming industry is at the

bottom of the whole. There is no possibility of any committee reaching the difficulty. The only thing for the hon. gentleman to do is to get better prices in foreign markets and in England.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HESSON. Yes; I know perfectly well what runs in the minds of the hon. gentlemen. I know the statements which they have given to the country as having come from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that we would give the farmers high prices.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HESSON. We never said so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You did say so.

Mr. HESSON. No; we said we would give them a home market—we would give them their own market—the Canadian market. That would be the duty of any government which was in power. It is our absolute duty here, legislating in the interests of the people of Canada, to preserve our own markets for our own workingmen and our own producers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Like flies on the wheel.

Mr. HESSON. Those hon. gentlemen were like flies on the wheel when they were on this side of the House, and the people remember it, and know that, if they were again on this side of the House, the same thing would take place, and they would allow this country to drift instead of adopting a policy which would promote its interests. I will not now detain the House by giving figures to show how this question stands, but I may have an opportunity at a later date. Hon. gentlemen say that this policy is taking our young men away from us. It certainly is not taking them away from the agriculturists, or it is not necessary for them to go to the other side for anything better than they can get here. If you compare Ontario with eight of the best States in the Union, taking the statement from the Washington Bureau of Statistics and the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, you will find that the average produce per acre in Canada was \$18, against \$15 for the best of the American States, including the State of New York. So much for the farming interest. My hon. friend will remember that in the Eastern States the farming industries have been practically wiped out; that farms are left vacant; that thousands of acres are uncultivated, and that good farm property can be purchased there now for a quarter of the price which they would have brought a few years ago. That would not indicate that it would be profitable for us to export our grain to the United States. There is a good reason here why we should protect our farmers, because, in consequence of the higher prices which farm produce attains here, if you were to take off the protection, the farming industry, which is the best we have in this country, would be absolutely obliterated from the face of the country.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The question which was debated this afternoon is one of great importance to both political parties. There is
Mr. HESSON.

nothing clearer than the fact that a number of our people are leaving our country and finding a home in a foreign country, thus depriving Canada of its strength and prosperity; and, whatever may be the causes which lead these people to depart from Canada and seek a home in another country, I think it is the duty of this Parliament to ascertain, and, if it is in its power, to remove the causes which lead these people away from us. I think it is the duty of members of Parliament, irrespective of political leanings, to find means to remove those causes. I cannot understand why so many of our people leave this country, because I think we have the finest country in the world. There is no country whose soil is more fertile, whose people possess such energy and such enterprise. Our country is a storehouse of the best qualities of mankind, and there is no other that has a higher and better system of education than we have. The mention of the word education brings to my mind a comparison which I drew the other night, and which I regret. I drew a comparison between the education in our own Province and that in another. I think I should not have done so, and I now express my regret for having done so, and I hope those friends to whom I may have given offence will take my explanation in the sense in which I intend it. I was going to say that our educational system is higher than that of the United States. Our commercial facilities are equal to, if they are not better than theirs. We have every facility in this country which we could expect to have for the advantage of our commerce; and why is it that so many of our people leave our country for another? It is not on account of the system of government, because we have a better system than they have in the United States. We have a purer judiciary than they have in the United States, or, shall I say, than they have in any other country; because the judges of this country are able to administer justice in a more impartial manner than judges who are elected. Then, why are these people leaving this country? Is it because of the fiscal policy of the Government? Is it because of the operation of what is called the National Policy? I believe that does lead largely to this exodus, but I believe there are other causes, viz., comparative failure of grain crop, low prices, discrimination of freight rates against the farmer, heavy taxes for Dominion purposes, &c. The present leader of the Government stated the cause of the exodus, in his opinion, from this country in 1877, and I will read an extract from a speech delivered by him, and reported in the *Hansard* of 1878, page 857:

"We have no workpeople. Our workpeople have gone off to the United States. They are to be found in Western States, in Pittsburg, and, in fact, in every place where manufactures are going on. The Canadian artisans are adding to the strength, to the power and to the wealth of a foreign nation, instead of adding to ours. Our workpeople in this country, on the other hand, are suffering from the want of employment. The hon. gentleman opposite sneered at the statement that thousands of our people had left this country to seek for employment in the United States. Why, the fact is notorious that the Government of the Province of Quebec have been taking steps to bring back their people. If these people have not left this country, our Government would not have tried to get them back. Let any man visit any of the manufactories of the United States, and there he will find the Canadian artisan toiling and doing well, and, therefore, not going back. If Canada had a judicious system of taxation, the workpeople would be toiling and doing well in their own country."

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman was returned to

power in 1878 and he placed on the statute books of this country what he called "a judicious system of taxation." Now, in face of this "judicious system of taxation" have the people continued to remain with us? Are they working in Canadian factories instead of the factories of the United States? Are they remaining on the farms of our country instead of going to the Western States and taking up positions on farms there? No, Sir, but the "judicious system of taxation" has driven from this country a larger number than the system of taxation that was in vogue previous to his coming into power the last time. Only 22,000 people, according to the estimates of hon. gentlemen opposite, were leaving this country every year during the *régime* of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie); but nearly 80,000 per annum have gone under the "judicious system of taxation" which the hon. gentlemen have placed on the statute books of this country. I believe that the "judicious system" which was to foster the interests of the farming community of this country has been the strongest element among the causes which have driven people from this country. True, the policy that was placed before the House in 1878 by the present leader of the Government stated that it would foster the agricultural interests of this country. Sir, it has *Fostered* them. At first they were *Tilley'd*, and then they were *Tippered*, and now they are being *Fostered*, and they will be *Fostered* still more before the end of the Session by the hon. Finance Minister, who will add to the taxation of the agriculturists of this country and make them more discontented with this great country than they are at the present time. We have been frequently told that in pointing out these facts, the necessity of which we regret, we are decrying our country; I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen will tell this House and the country that I have been decrying the country in saying that so many people were leaving. But, Sir, if it is disloyal on my part, if it is unpatriotic on my part, if it is decrying the country on my part, as a simple member of this House, how much more unpatriotic, how much more disloyal, how much more is it decrying the country, when such statements as I have read come from the mouth of a man occupying such a proud and distinguished position in the affairs of this country? I do not charge him with unpatriotism, I do not charge him with disloyalty. It was his duty as a public man, and it is my duty as a public man, to point out the facts that are transpiring in our country, and to call the attention of the Parliament of Canada to them, so that by their wisdom they may adopt some plan by which our people will be prevented from taking up their homes in the United States. But, Sir, that was not all the hon. gentleman said. He blamed the Government that was in power that day for driving people from this country, and I think that, using an expression of his own, that "what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." I could turn round and impute the whole exodus to the action of the Government now. Let me read to you what he said in this respect, endeavoring to cast the whole blame upon the Government of that day. This is an extract of a speech delivered by the leader of the Government at Sherbrooke, Quebec, on 7th July, 1877, as reported by the *Toronto Mail*, a

very great friend of the Government at that time. He said :

"It grieved me to the soul as a Canadian, when in Sherbrooke the other day, to be told there, in that beautiful and rising place, which had grown, in my recollection, from a village to a town, and from a town to a city, that the population had decreased under the malign influence of the present Government, and that the young men and young women, who had gone into factories there, were unable to support themselves, and unwilling to be a burden to their parents, were obliged to expatriate themselves and add to the strength and prosperity of the United States. People whom we ought to have kept among ourselves, men, women and children that ought to have been working in our factories, have been drawn away by the unwise, by the demented, to use a good Scotch phrase, by the insane policy, or want of policy, of the present Government."

Now, Sir, that was a broad accusation to bring against the Government of that day. Would I not be quite as justifiable as the hon. leader of the Government in making such a charge as that against the present Government—that by their unwise, by their demented, and, to use the Scotch phrase, by the insane policy of the Government, they were driving people from the country? I do not believe that the whole cause is in the policy of the Government, and that is one reason why I support the resolution of my hon. friend from North Norfolk, when he asks for a Committee to investigate into the causes—for I believe they are many—and to ascertain what they are, and report to this House, so that the Parliament of Canada may take steps to remove those causes, whatever they may be, so as to keep the bone, and the sinew, and the energy of the people in our own midst, to add to the strength and power and influence of our own country, instead of adding to the strength and influence of the United States. Sir, it has been denied by the present Government, that so many of our people were leaving the country. I have a few statistics here which will convince the members of the House, if not already convinced, that a very large number of people are leaving this country every year. I have a very simple calculation which is easily understood, and which I will submit to the House. In 1881 the population of Canada, according to the census of that year, was 4,345,293. The natural increase to that population would be at least 1.50 per cent. per annum over the death rate for these seven years, say 10 per cent. The addition, then, to the population in 1881, would be 434,529. Now, according to the report of the Minister of Agriculture, I find that since 1881 no less than 719,510 immigrants came into this country, who stated their intention of remaining in Canada. Adding those three sums together, we would have the number 5,499,531 of a population at the present day, if we had not lost any. Subtract from that the present estimated population of Canada, 4,972,101, and we have lost during the seven years, 527,230, or each year, 75,321. Now, the loss each year during the *régime* of the Reform Government was 22,000, as against 75,321, notwithstanding the policy which was to foster the interests of the agriculturists and the interests of the manufacturers of this country, and not only that, but it was to add to the population of this country largely by bringing in from foreign countries a large number of people, who were to make Canada their home, and find work in the manufacturing establishments of this country, which were to be fostered by the National Policy. In addition to this, let me give the House a few items

in regard to the exodus from certain quarters of this country. I stated the other day, that in Rimouski, in Lower Canada, according to the lists used in the recent election, there had been an exodus of 350 families to the United States since 1866; and in the small parish of St. Mathew, whose list contained 200 names in 1866, forty-eight of those people had gone to the United States. And, according to statements I have seen in the Quebec papers this year, no less than 120,000 people from the Province of Quebec have gone to the States during the year. Hon. Mr. Mercier denied that, but he acknowledged, if the papers reported him properly, that no less than 60,000 people had left within one year to find homes in New England among those who went before them. If the knowledge of the exodus went to the leader's heart in 1878, not to his heart alone but deeper still into his very soul, surely it will go to his soul to find that the people of Canada are still going to the United States, to add to the strength, wealth and prosperity of that country. According to the report of the United States Consular office in Toronto, 576 heads of families made application there for consular certificates last year. It is well known that hundreds and thousands of young people, men and women, who have no effects to take to the United States, do not require consular certificates; but the 576 heads who obtained them represented 2,880 souls, on an average of five to a family, who left that one particular point, Toronto. But from a report for 1885-6-7 from eighty-four consular points in this country it appears that 13,903 consular certificates were granted to people going to the United States, which means 69,555 souls. I represent a riding of 22,000 inhabitants. I made enquiries in different parts of my riding as to how many people left within the last ten years to go to the United States. I have reports from four of the eight municipalities which constitute the riding, and I have the figures before me, showing that no less than 1,042 persons left those municipalities for the United States within the last ten years. If I add the number who went from the other municipalities, the number would reach about 2,000 out of a population of 22,000, or about 9 per cent. of the total population. And yet hon. gentlemen opposite will maintain that there is not such a large exodus as occurred during the years of the Reform Government. I find the cause of this exodus is largely owing to discontent among the farmers. They have been deceived by the statements made in 1878 as to the benefits they would derive when the National Policy would be established. The House will remember that the farmers were told that their markets were glutted by American produce. Every one is aware that our markets to-day are more glutted by American produce than they were in 1878. Perhaps the House will allow me to give a few figures to prove my statement, and if any one doubts them they can be found in the Trade and Navigation Returns. There were imported from the United States in 1878 1,510 horses. The farmers were told by the Conservatives that those American horses were flooding the Canadian market and if a tax were imposed the Canadians would have their own market. What is the fact to-day? We imported last year 4,089 horses, or almost three times as many as 1878 under a 17½ per cent. tariff. Our farmers were told something similar in regard to sheep. A

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

buyer would come round and say to the farmers: I would give you \$4 per head but the market is glutted by sheep from the United States and so the price is low. When we refer to the returns we find that only 10,505 sheep came into the Canadian market in 1878, whereas last year the number was 43,255. In the face of that fact, where is the protection for the farmers and the home market for Canadians? The farmers have no protection. In 1878 we imported from the United States 2,806,557 lbs. of bacon and ham. The Canadian farmers were told this came into competition with their products, and if a duty were imposed, they would have their own market and a higher price. The returns, however, show an import of 3,653,728 lbs. in 1889. No less than 10,204,237 lbs. of pork were brought in during 1878, but now the quantity reaches 15,205,972 lbs. Thus I might continue to show that the promises made to the farmers in 1878 have not been realised by them, and therefore they are becoming tired of the National Policy, which promised so much and has given so little. Many of our young men are leaving the country, and even the older men, who have been unable to make ends meet, have gone to a country where they believe they can enjoy better advantages than they do here. Another fact to which I wish to draw the attention of this House is this: On whatever we sell to the United States we have to pay a large duty. Our farmers sold 17,277 horses last year and paid a duty of \$422,756. They sent 37,360 horned cattle and paid a duty of \$97,633. They sent 307,775 sheep and paid a duty of \$183,666. They sent of barley, 9,934,501 bushels, on which they paid a duty of \$993,450. On these items, together with hay, potatoes and wool, the farmers paid a duty of \$2,076,110 for the privilege of entering the United States market. In consequence of these burdens imposed on articles exported to the United States, our farmers are determined to go into that country and be free to raise and sell without being called upon to pay duty. But we are told that the Canadian farmers do not pay the duty, and I have no doubt I shall be confronted with that argument this evening. The leader of the Government made a declaration on this subject, and I like to quote his words, because he stands so high in his party and in the country, and his judgment is relied upon by his own followers, by whom he is looked upon, and rightly so, as the head and crown of the Conservative party; and when they lose him they will lose their ground. I do not believe, and I speak my honest conviction, that the Government of which he is the head would last one week were they so unfortunate as to lose him. I believe, Sir, that during the last elections he received one-half of the Conservative votes in this country wholly on account of his being popular as a man and being the centre of the organisation to which he belongs. He is worthy of that confidence from his party. He is a man of great ability, and, Sir, I want to quote the authority of such a man. I want to put him in the witness box; and I always like to choose the best witness. I like to have the testimony of a man in whom hon. gentlemen opposite will have the greatest confidence. The right hon. Premier settled this question in 1878 in the words I quote below on "Who pay the Duties." I know that last Session, a certain hon. gentleman had the hardihood to try to prove that the farmer

did not pay the duty, and that the parties in the United States paid it. I have, however, more confidence in the leader of the Conservative party than I have in the Whip. Sir John Macdonald, speaking in 1878 on the question "Who pay the Duties," wanted to make a point with the farmers, and he did make it, and the farmers believed it. He said:

"I find that the farmers of West Canada and East Canada could not understand there was anything in their barley, for instance, being obliged to pay a duty of 15 per cent. upon going into the United States, whereas the produce of the American farmers was allowed to be brought into this country free. It is said the consumer pays the duty, and that the farmer does not suffer anything. That is the statement, but when I put a simple case, which I have done frequently, I can get no answer."

No, Sir, you cannot get an answer. You cannot get any reply to shake the foundations of the truths you stated. And Sir John continues:

"I put a case in the Eastern Townships of a man upon the imaginary line which was between this country and the United States. Suppose a man has 100 acres on the Canadian side of the line and 100 acres on the American side of the line. Suppose he grows 1,000 bushels of barley on each of his farms. He takes his 1,000 American bushels to the American market and gets \$1 a bushel for it. He takes his 1,000 bushels of Canadian barley to the American market and gets but 85 cents per bushel, because he has to pay 15 per cent. for taking it across that imaginary line. How can it, in this case, be said that the consumer pays the duty? It comes out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers."

I have, Sir, another authority on this question, and a very important one, to put in the witness-box to prove my contention that the farmers pay the duty upon horses. This witness is an hon. gentleman who occupied a very prominent position in the Cabinet of the hon. the leader of the present Government. He is a man who was selected from his party and placed in the Senate, and who was again selected from among the Senators and made speaker of that body; in fact he was afterwards taken from that position because he was considered to be of value in this House, and was made Minister of the Interior. Yea, more, his excellence and abilities were recognised by Her Gracious Majesty the Queen, and an honorable title was bestowed upon him. Surely, he can give good testimony on this question, and surely he is a good witness to place in the box. I refer to Sir David Macpherson. He stated in July, 1878:

"Suppose a farmer in this country takes five horses, valued at \$100 each, to Detroit to sell. The duty on horses in the United States is 20 per cent., which the Canadian farmer must pay before he can enter the Detroit market. That is, he must pay \$20 for each horse, and on his five horses \$100, or the value of one horse at the United States Custom house, before he can take them to the market. Then he will get no more than a Michigan farmer will get for five equally good horses. Suppose that he and a Michigan farmer each sell five horses—each gets \$500 for his horses. The American takes this \$500 home in his pocket, while the Canadian takes home only \$400."

Sir David Macpherson turns around and asks the question that I ask: "Does not the farmer pay the duty on the horses?" I will still give further evidence in regard to this matter, the testimony of a paper which at that time occupied a very prominent position in the Conservative party. In fact, Sir, I believe it was the paper that largely contributed to the success of the election of 1878. There was at the head of that paper at that time a man of eminent ability and one of the most eminent journalists of this country. He wrote editorials then strongly sustaining the National Policy of the then leader of the Opposition, and he afterwards claimed

that by his able editorials he added largely to the success of the party in the country. I refer to the *Mail*. Let me read an extract from one of the articles written by that able journalist in reference to "Who pays the Duty." The extract is from the *Mail* of the 26th July, 1877, and says:

"The buyer cannot possibly give as much here as he does there, because the 15 cents must be paid ere the grain passes the American Custom house. Does any one mean to say that, quality being the same, the American buyer will give more for Canadian barley than for barley raised in his own country or State? The simple truth of the matter is, that, whereas, Canadian barley has to pay 15 cents toll ere it can enter the market, American barley passes toll free, so that the price realised by the producer here is so much less than the price realised by the producer there. It seems like child's play to try to prove anything so plain and so self-evident upon the very face of the matter."

Sir, I have now placed in the witness-box three important witnesses who testify to the position which I take, namely, that the Canadian exporters pay the duty on the articles mentioned, and, therefore, they are burthened to a large extent in getting many of the products of their energy and toil into the markets of the United States. But, Sir, the farmers of the country maintain that the highest duties are placed on the articles consumed by them, while it was maintained here last year (and I suppose will be maintained again) that a large number of the articles which are used by the farmers of this country are manufactured in Canada; that, therefore, there is no duty upon these particular articles and, consequently, that the Canadian farmer need not pay one single solitary cent of duty. Using the ordinary meaning of the word "duty" they are not called upon to pay it, because I understand the word "duty" to mean the money which goes into the Treasury of this country. But they are called upon to pay an increased price on every article they consume, on account of the protection that is afforded the manufactures of similar articles imported into this country.

Mr. GILLMOR. Don't the consumers pay the same duty on the barley on the other side?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No.

Mr. GILLMOR. Do they not?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I can argue that question with my hon. friend and with hon. gentlemen opposite when I am treating of it. I can understand from the smile of the leader of the Government, and from his remark of "hear, hear," that he, too, has changed his opinion from the time he so eloquently discussed these questions upon public platforms in 1878.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Answer the member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor).

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If the hon. gentleman has changed his opinion I would be very glad to hear his reason, and if he can give a good one for the change of opinion, I am sure I will accept it at his hands; but, Sir, until there is shown by my hon. friend to the right (Mr. Gillmor) a stronger and better argument than has been produced by the Premier and by myself, I am bound to hold my opinion, which I have shown is sustained by these three honorable witnesses to which I have referred. But, Sir, coming back to the direct point under discussion; it is stated now, and was stated here last year, that the farmer does not pay one single dollar of duty. Now, Sir, I am going to summon to my aid another eminent man who is

well known in this country, whose name is a household name, a man whose ability is recognised not only by the party to which he is an ornament, but by the party opposed to him in politics—a man who occupied a high position in the councils of this country for many years; a man selected by the leader of the Liberal Government, although opposed to him in politics, to perform the duties of arbitrator in the arbitration on the Fishery question between the United States and Canada, and who discharged his duties with honor to himself and advantage to the country, a man who occupied the important position of Finance Minister no less than three times in the Cabinet of hon. gentlemen opposite, and whose ability and reputation were so noted that the hon. leader of the Government chose him out to be the first High Commissioner of this country to England, and whose services were also recognised by Her Majesty the Queen in conferring high honors upon him. I bring him into the witness-box to get his opinion on this subject. The Hon. Alexander Galt, in his Budget speech of 1863, stated that whatever tariff is placed upon importations, that tariff adds to the price of every article manufactured in the country in proportion to the tariff thus imposed, which is, therefore, a portion of the burden they are called upon to pay, not under the designation of duty, but what is the same to them, as an increased price on the goods they purchase. If that is the case, I hold that a great injustice is done to the farmers of this country in loading them down with such large burdens. Now, Sir, what are the articles used by the farmers which are so enhanced in price? Let me give a small list of them: Hoes, rakes, spades, harrows, seed drills, ploughs, cultivators, scufflers, reapers, mowers, threshing machines, nails, hinges, wagons, carriages, harness, fanning mills, furniture, crockery, clothing, blankets, sugar, flour, pictures, carpets, musical instruments, and a hundred and one other things. All of these articles are increased in price to the farmer by a duty of from 35 per cent. to 80 per cent. It may be said that all these are manufactured in the country, but according to the statement made by the eminent man to whom I have referred, every one of these articles is enhanced in price by the amount of the duty imposed. Now, Sir, the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) said that the prices of goods are lower under the tariff than they were before. Any man who has given thought to this question, knows that things ought to be lower to-day than they were twelve years ago, with all the improvements that have been made in that time in the application of machinery and labor, and with the discoveries and inventions which have taken place. We should not expect everything to be as dear to-day as it was twelve years ago, nor are goods as cheap as they would be if we had free trade. The hon. gentleman in speaking in that way is only begging the question and beating about the bush, and not presenting an argument, because to compare things as they are to-day with what they were twelve years ago, is to compare things entirely unlike. Let me inform the members of this House that no less than \$275,000,000 rests on the farmers of Ontario in the shape of mortgages on their farms. No less than 80 per cent. of the farms are mortgaged, and no less than 40 per cent. of their value is covered by mortgages. Again, I have read in a paper pub-

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

lished in the city of Montreal, called the *Insurance and Commercial Chronicle*, that no less than \$30,000,000 rests on the farms of the Province of Quebec in the shape of mortgages. No less than 24 per cent. of the farms of Quebec are covered by mortgages. When we find, in addition to that, that farm property has depreciated in value, we need not wonder that so many of our people are leaving the country and going to the United States. Let me give you a few facts in regard to the depreciation in the value of farm property in my own neighborhood. I know a farm, within four miles of where I live, which was sold fourteen years ago for \$5,500, and was sold again last fall for \$4,200, or a depreciation in value of 23½ per cent. Another was sold a few years ago for \$4,500, and recently for \$3,500. Another was sold two years ago for \$4,000, and recently for \$3,200. Another was sold four years ago for \$5,150, and a few months ago the owner became insolvent and made an assignment, when it was offered at an upset price of \$3,900, but could not be sold at that. Another which was sold a few years ago, consisting of 214 acres with a saw mill, for \$15,000, was sold recently for \$11,200, or a reduction of 25½ per cent. Another was sold a few years ago for \$7,500, and recently again for \$6,200. Another was sold four years ago for \$11,000, and recently for \$7,500, or a reduction of 31½ per cent. On the whole of these farms there was an average reduction in price of 22½ per cent. These facts are known to myself, and they show the reduction which has taken place in the value of farm property in my own neighborhood. In many cases it has been found that mortgages on farms, a few years ago, only three-fourths of their value has covered their whole present value, so that many a farmer with his family has been obliged to leave to find a home in some other country where he can find better prospects of prosperity. Therefore, it is the duty of this Parliament and the Government to permit my hon. friend's resolution to pass, so that a committee may be appointed to ascertain, by authority, the causes of the depression existing among the farming community of this country, to ascertain the cause of the departure of so many of the bone and sinew of our country to the United States; and when it reports to this House what it has found to be the causes, then let us meet, not as political parties, not as a Government and Opposition, but let both parties put their heads together to devise some means for the removal of those causes and for the retention of our own people at home. We should seek to make this country happy, and prosperous, and great. We have the elements within our country for doing so; we have the people and the resources; and if we make that effort I believe the time will come when we shall have greater reason to be proud of our country than we have to-day, and have no more occasion to speak of depression or of the exodus that has been taking place.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It may not be out of place for me to say a word or two in reference to this resolution. The hon. gentleman in his resolution has moved for a committee to enquire:

"1st, as to the extent of the alarming exodus of native-born Canadians and settlers in Canada of foreign birth to the United States."

Well, I think those of us who have had seats in Parliament during the last ten years have had the

opportunity of listening to hon. gentlemen upon the other side, detailing, year after year, the number of Canadians who were in the United States, and who have gone yearly to that country since the present Administration has come into office; so that, perhaps, as regards the first paragraph of this resolution, no further information is necessary for the hon. gentleman and those who believe with him, than that already in their possession, and which they have been endeavoring to place before the country during those ten years. The second paragraph of this resolution declares that one of the objects of the committee is to enquire as to the chief causes of this exodus. Again, we have had the opportunity during the past ten years of listening to those hon. gentlemen declaring that one of the chief causes of the exodus was the fact that the present Administration had come into office in 1878, and had inaugurated a policy detrimental to the best interests of the people, a policy which had the effect of driving people out of Canada in great numbers from that period down to the present. That has been the reason adduced by these hon. gentlemen during the past ten years for the exodus. It is a reason which has been conclusive to them, if not to hon. gentlemen on this side. Today, it is quite true, we have had another reason given us by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), and that is, that there is a constantly increasing demand in the United States for the energy, perseverance, industry, and the honesty of Canadians to fill situations in that country. There may, perhaps, Sir, be other reasons beyond those that these hon. gentlemen desire to discover to account for the exodus, but the reasons I have given are those which they have adduced year after year, upon the floor of Parliament and from public platforms throughout the country on every opportunity, and the cause which they have specially dwelt upon is their assertion that the present Administration have by their policy driven out of Canada a very large portion of our population.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). An hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." By what process of logic, I would ask, do they account for the policy of the present Administration having driven from Canada a large portion of our population? Is it not true that from free trade England, a considerable proportion of the population emigrate yearly to the United States? Can it then be laid down as a proposition that because in Canada we have adopted the policy of protecting our own manufactures, the natural and inevitable result of that policy has been to drive out people from this moderately protected country to that excessively protected country to the south of us? It seems to me that these hon. gentlemen have convinced themselves, at all events, as to the causes of the exodus, and do not require to make any further enquiries in that direction. My hon. friend in his third paragraph desires that the committee should enquire—

"As to the best means to be adopted to counteract the influences which have hitherto promoted such exodus, and for the purpose of suggesting means for diminishing this serious drain upon our numerical strength and our resources."

From what we have heard from the other side, the best means, from their point of view, of preventing this exodus would be to turn out the present

Administration and bring into their places hon. gentlemen opposite. If they could accomplish that, no doubt they would accomplish all they desire by the agitation they have kept up for the last ten years in reference to this matter; and if they could convince the electorate of Canada that they are correct in their diagnosis of the evils under which they declare Canada is suffering, they would achieve what they have been trying to achieve. But the difficulty that these hon. gentlemen experience is that they cannot make the people believe as they believe. They have been telling us in Parliament certain things for the last ten years, they have been telling the people, during all that time, from public platforms, the same thing, and yet the people declare by their votes that they do not believe in the nostrums these hon. gentlemen propose as a remedy for the evils under which they declare the people are suffering. It has been stated that the Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation has never attempted to deal with this question or to ascertain whether the statements which have been made with reference to the emigration from Canada were correct or not. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Brien) made that statement in his speech this afternoon. I have only to draw the attention of my hon. friends opposite who have been members of that committee during the last few years to the fact that this matter has engaged the attention of that committee, that in 1884 we had a very extensive enquiry into the facts in connection with the alleged exodus from Canada to the United States, and that it was demonstrated, so far as the evidence of disinterested witnesses could demonstrate, before the committee on that occasion, that no such exodus had taken place as was alleged by the statisticians of the United States up to that time. It is true that our hon. friends on the other side, who were members of that committee, did all they possibly could to discredit the evidence of witnesses who appeared before the Committee; but I have in my hands a report of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation of 1884, in which the declaration is made by a disinterested witness, who had the means of knowing—who was in point of fact one of the officers who sent the return to Mr. Nimmo upon which that gentleman based the statement that a very large exodus was taking place from Canada to the United States—that the figures and the statements of Mr. Nimmo were based upon the merest guess work, that there was no foundation for them at all, and that in point of fact they existed only in the imagination of the people of the Bureau of Statistics in the United States. I know, as a matter of fact, that many of our people do go to the United States. It is characteristic of Anglo-Saxons that they have a tendency to move about, to seek to improve their fortunes, and I do not see that there is anything improper in our young men seeking wider fields for their talents than they can find in Canada, if they can find them in a foreign country. It is a tendency of the Anglo-Saxon nature; and no legislation we can enact here, no enquiry we can make with respect to this movement will prevent our people from going to the United States or prevent the people of the United States from coming here; and we know that when Americans find there is a field for their energy and enterprise in Canada, they do not hesitate to make this country their home. Have we not right here in our midst,

under the shadow of this building, the best possible evidence that some of the people of the United States have found in this country an outlet for their energy, talents and perseverance, and that they have become some of the best citizens we have in Canada? There is no possible way, in my point of view, by which we can remove this tendency of Anglo-Saxons to seek to better their condition. Whether it be in the American Union, South America, Brazil, the Argentine Republic, the Indies, or any other part of the world, they will seek to better their condition. So I say that there seems to me to be no reason for the resolution which my hon. friend has placed upon the paper, nor does there seem to me to be any necessity for the appointment of a committee to enquire into those circumstances with which my hon. friend proposes to deal by means of that committee. If my hon. friend desires to investigate these causes, I believe there will not be the slightest difficulty in having his name placed upon the Committee of Agriculture and Colonisation, where he will have the fullest opportunity of enquiring into all these matters. There is no reason why the House should appoint a special committee to enquire into these circumstances, and I believe the committee over which I have the honor to preside is amply competent to investigate all these subjects which the hon. gentleman proposes to have investigated by the special committee he asks for.

Mr. WATSON. I did not intend to take any part in this debate until the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) referred to the committee of which he is the chairman. When I was first elected, I think at the first meeting of the committee afterwards, the deputy Minister of Agriculture was examined before that committee. The hon. gentleman has said that the statements made by that gentleman are reliable. That committee has often investigated matters of this kind, but we have found that any investigations which depended upon the statements of deputy Ministers of that Department were not reliable. It was the boast of hon. gentleman that, by spending large amounts of money, there would be, by 1885, 375,000 people in Manitoba and the North West. I was not surprised to hear the speech of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), in which he assured the House that everything was prosperous, and that we were actually keeping people in the country by means of the present policy, because I remember his statements in 1883. I had then to contradict the statement of the deputy Minister of Agriculture that 13,000 American citizens had come over and settled in Manitoba. I contradicted that statement because I knew it was not true. At that time the member for North Perth was surprised at my contradicting the statements of the deputy Minister, and he said, to use his own language: "If we get a good report from the deputy Minister, for God's sake let us have it." He was anxious that everything which was stated by that official should be taken for truth. When the census was taken in 1885, instead of 375,000 people which we had been told ought to be there, we found there only 108,000 people. That was the time for the members of the committee to discover why the people who were expected were not there. I think one great reason was that the reports furnished by the deputy Minister of Agriculture were false, because the

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

people who were supposed to go into that country were people who were employed on the railway, and that showed that the report was not reliable. One very good reason which was given to the committee was that the Grand Trunk Railway Company were circulating American literature and inducing Canadians to go to the American North-West. But what was it that prevented our Canadians from going to our own North-West? It was that hon. gentlemen opposite who, by their restrictive railway policy, prevented competition in the carriage of freight in the North-West. I think it is important that there should be a committee to investigate the causes of the exodus. There are many causes for it, but I think we should retain, if we can, our Canadian people in Canada. In the North-West we have plenty of room for them all, though they may be crowded out in eastern Canada; but I only regret that those who are so crowded out do not find their way into the Canadian North-West. While we are glad to have European immigration, it is important that our own people should go there. It was stated this afternoon by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) that our Canadian young men are in great demand in the American North-West. So they are in our own North-West, and it is to be regretted that Canada to-day is only a sort of breeding ground for the United States. From the statements which have been made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I have no reason to doubt that he has looked into this matter carefully, and it is clear that no attempt has been made on the other side to contradict his figures. In regard to the matter of immigration, I think the Government ought to take the means not only to keep Canadians on Canadian soil, not only to offer inducements to them to go to our own North-West, but also to induce immigrants from Europe to go to our North-West and to settle our fertile plains. We find that the other colonies are spending large sums of money to induce immigration, but I am afraid that the Government and the members on both sides of this House have listened too much to the clamors of the trade unions in Eastern Canada. I believe that large sums of money spent to bring immigrants into the North-West, would be for the benefit of the whole of Canada, and I hope, instead of recalling all the immigration schemes, as at present appears to have been done, the Government will adopt some plan to induce immigrants to come from the old countries to the North-West. Our lands are not depreciating in value, but they should be made to advance in value, and the only thing to be done is to get the people in there to cultivate the soil. I should like to see the Government accept the motion before the House, and appoint a select committee which might enquire into the causes of the exodus, and advise the Government as to the best means of preventing our people going out of this country. At the same time, the Committee might show the Government how they might bring other people into the country. I do not believe that we can ever have a correct estimate of the number who leave the country or who come into it. The present system is a mere farce. The people coming into the Canadian North-West are simply examined by a man coming into a train at Port Arthur, who rides, probably, as far as Port William, about four miles, and then gets out of the

train. He counts the people on that train, and the result is that the Government are credited with a certain number of immigrants, whereas, in a great many instances, many of the people riding on those trains, and who are apparently settlers, are simply passing through the Canadian North-West on their way to Washington Territory. I hope that the Government will see fit to accept the proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and appoint a committee to investigate the matter.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not intend to prolong this discussion, but I wish to say that I cannot vote for the motion, and for a very good reason. I, myself, have no faith whatever in the figures and deductions of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton); and as far as gentlemen on this side are concerned, what is the necessity of such a committee when they know all about it? They know the reason why the exodus exists. I agree with one remark that fell from my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson). I do believe that it is a great mistake to abandon an energetic immigration policy; and if my hon. friends on this side, instead of moving for a fishing committee, would make a motion in favor of an energetic immigration policy, they would find that some of the Tories would be voting with them.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I believe that some of the statements that have been made in this House today are a poor advertisement of our country, especially when we are told that there is such an enormous exodus going on from Canada. Is it true that we have had an emigration from Canada into the United States, but it is true, also, that a large portion of that emigration has returned to Canada. Since the inauguration of the National Policy, since we have started large manufacturing industries, a large number of those Canadians who went to the other side of the line to learn trades have come back, and are now working in our own factories. We are now forming a class of men who have no need to go abroad to find work or to learn a trade. They find in our own country the work they were looking for in the past and for which they had to go away. I say that instead of working against the interests of our country, the National Policy has, to a large extent, prevented that emigration that we have had to deplore in the past. Speaking of my own Province of Manitoba, perhaps I will astonish some of the members of this House when I tell them that about one-half of the population of my own county, Provencher, is composed of Canadians who at one time were residing in the United States, and who have come back to Canada to enjoy the freedom of our country, and to settle on the fertile land of the Red River Valley. They are men who had left the Province of Quebec in former years, and went into the States to try to better their condition, but when they heard that Manitoba was such a fertile country, and that that part of Canada could offer them what they were looking for, they came back by two and three hundred at a time. I may say that several of the parishes in my constituency are settled chiefly by men who at one time resided in the States; and, therefore, if we have to deplore the absence of some of our inhabitants, we have the satisfaction of knowing that they are coming back to-day. Let us consider the movement that has been going on during the past three

or four years of emigrants who left Manitoba to go to Dakota and to the northern part of Minnesota. What did we see last year, and what do we see this year? We saw that most of those who went across the line, thinking they could better their position, have come back, or are willing to do so, and will come back to Manitoba sooner or later. Of course, we cannot locate people according to our own wishes; we cannot say to them, you shall go there, or you shall remain here. People will go wherever they choose, and, if they find they have made a mistake, they will correct it; and they did find that they were mistaken in going across the line, and they are now coming back. With regard to the policy of the Government on immigration, there is room for some improvement. It was thought at one time that by advertising the country at large, we would bring in immigrants. I think myself, that when the Government adopted that policy it was, perhaps, a little premature, because the Province was not ready to receive a very large immigration. We had not all the railway communication that we might have expected at that time. But now that Province is ready for immigration. We have railways in almost every direction, and the settlers are spreading out from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We are now ready to receive a very large immigration, and I hope that the Government will see fit to give better inducements to immigrants, and to increase the amount devoted for that purpose.

Mr. FREEMAN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speeches that have been delivered by hon. members on the opposite side of the House.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. I hope I am included.

Mr. FREEMAN. Very much of what has been said seems familiar to me. It strikes me very forcibly that I have heard the same arguments and the same statements iterated and reiterated in this House before. It strikes me that we have something in this House like a company of people gathered together, who have exhausted their conversational powers, and they are going over the whole thing again, in order to use up the time. I do not say that is the object the hon. gentlemen have in view, for I do not think it is; but that is about what they are doing. We are told that people are leaving this country, and are going to the United States in great numbers, that they are building up the country on our southern border and neglecting the interests of our great Dominion. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be exceedingly troubled about it; they have been for years telling us these facts and their hearts are very sore in consequence. They lament greatly that our people are going away, and one would suppose from their statements that their first desire is that the people should be retained here and those who have left should be induced to return. I question, however, very much if they have any such desire, and if they do not wish to maintain this old grievance, because I have been very strongly impressed with the idea that the object of hon. gentlemen opposite is not so much to get the people back or to prevent emigration from the country as to secure seats on this side of the House. They imagine that this story of the people leaving the country will be a stepping-stone by which they will exchange places

with hon. gentlemen on this side. That is the great object for which they labor. With regard to a committee appointed to investigate the cause of the people leaving the country, I ask myself what is this committee to do? I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will say they are to ascertain the causes which drive away our people. Why do we wish to investigate that matter by a committee of half a dozen or a dozen members? Hon. gentlemen opposite have told us a score of times what the causes are, they have not failed to go into the details of the case. They have investigated the matter, gathered information from all quarters, and have stated the results of their labors distinctly and clearly to the House from time to time. I have listened for several years to the debates, and there can be no mistake as to the conclusions at which they have arrived. What are those conclusions? They say, in effect: look at the state of the country since we left office in 1878, look at the prosperity we brought it by our policy, look at its progress and prosperity then, and at the people remaining at home, happy and contented in their own country; look at what we did for the country? At length by some strange influences the people were led to cast us aside and let the Tories come in, and look at what has been the position of affairs since then? Look at the ruin which you have brought on the country and how the people have left it since you came into power; let us come back to power and we shall restore that prosperity which prevailed when we were in office. That is, in effect, the whole argument they present: You get out of the way and give us the administration of the Government and we will bring back prosperity; we will carry such reforms as will keep the people on this side of the line and give prosperity to the country and labor to the people, and we will again have that prosperity we enjoyed during 1874-5-6-7-8. I think, however, the people do not want that kind of prosperity again. But we have not been without committees. I have sat here and listened to statements with regard to a committee that was appointed by this House and have not given much heed to that committee, in regard to which I will not speak any further; but I know of another committee, one composed of the bone and sinew of the country, which is in possession of all possible information on this great subject and all other subjects connected with the country's prosperity, and which numbers between half a million and a million of people, and that committee sat in 1887. The committee took this matter into consideration and made a report, and as a result of that report hon. gentlemen are sitting on this side of the House. That committee will report again within a comparatively short period, and they will supply the place of the committee which hon. gentlemen opposite ask. Let me say that the Conservatives are quite satisfied to leave the question with that committee and to await its report. Hon. gentlemen opposite may talk, and I hope they will talk and do all they can to reverse the report of that great committee which will sit two or three years hence, and I wish them joy in their labors. Let hon. gentlemen opposite work on, and the more they labor and talk the greater will be the majority given by that committee to this side of the House. In regard to the fact that people leave this country, I may say that it is a fact which no one wishes to deny. We certainly do not wish to deny facts, for

Mr. FREEMAN.

we believe in truthfulness and righteousness in everything. We admit that a great many of our young people go away—the old people who have learnt wisdom stay at home—and they go over the lines to see the great United States, the great Yankee nation, the glories of a great Democratic country. They go also for another purpose. The great object for which our people go there is to get work. Where are they found? Are they found farming? I speak more particularly for my own part of the Dominion, and I say very few of them are found following agriculture in that country. The great majority are found in the manufacturing establishments of the United States, and there is hardly a town in the Republic, certainly in the northern portion of the United States, where you cannot find a large number of Nova Scotians in the manufacturing establishments. If you will give our people the same labor on this side of the line they will never go to the United States, and they will be prepared to remain at home at a less remuneration than they receive on the other side of the line. What have hon. gentlemen opposite done towards increasing our manufactures? What is their policy in that regard. Their policy is one quite the reverse of a policy of increasing our manufacturing industries. It is due to the policy of the Liberal Conservative party that our present manufacturing establishments are in operation in this country. It is the policy initiated by the leader of this Government which has given to the people that employment in manufactures which they now enjoy. Are hon. gentlemen opposite not laboring for this unrestricted reciprocity; this something that nobody can define; this something that they do not understand themselves; this great something, like a great balloon that flies all around the country, and at which they point and say: "Yonder is something beautiful, if you can only get it." We are told by them that this unrestricted reciprocity is to bring us wealth. What does it mean? It means a return to that state of things which existed when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and when all through this country we had the surplus manufactured goods of the United States distributed all over the country, underselling our own manufactures, because of the poorer quality of the imported article and driving our manufactories out of existence. If gentlemen opposite had their way our people, not in less number but in larger numbers, would go over to the United States to help to build up that country and to help the manufacturers of our own country to their ruin. We might delve away in the mines and get ores out, as Mr. Wiman says "In order to enrich the Americans, by bringing them into their country so that they would refine and prepare them for use," and we might dig and delve on and put the seed in the ground and get the grain and hand it over to them to prepare it for the people of this country. That is what we did in our own Province some years ago. We sawed wood and sent it to the United States, and there they made our buckets and washboards and everything of that kind and sent them back to us while we paid the freight back and forwards and the cost of their manufacture in a foreign country. We would have the same thing again to-day if hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. Let me just say here that notwithstanding the vociferations of

one hon. gentleman on the opposite side, when last Session he held out his hands and declared that these emigrants to the United States, these sons of ours, who have left our Dominion, can meet the people of any country of the world and fight their way, and if they find their equals, they never find their superiors. He even told us that Canadians were prospering so much in the United States, that they got to be captains of their ships. That is a great way up when they are captains of ships. I agree with that hon. gentleman that you may take a Nova Scotian and place him beside a man of any country in the world, who has not had superior advantages, and he is equal to any one of them. I have seen my fellow-countrymen in different parts of the world, and I have never seen a Nova Scotian take a second rank yet. I will not say so much about Quebec and Ontario men, because I don't know so much about them.

Mr. COCHRANE. They will take care of themselves.

Mr. FREEMAN. My friend says they will take care of themselves, and I have no doubt of that. I have seen my own countrymen of Nova Scotia, in all parts of the world and they were never second best, but in nine cases out of ten they were first best, and they are never afraid to meet the natives of any country in the world. But you must not handicap them, for we are not so far superior to the people of all other nations that we can afford to be handicapped. It is one thing to be weighted down with unnecessary burdens and another to meet men on equal terms. There are numerous advantages which the manufacturers of the United States have over us, and which would enable them to drive us out of our own markets, although we may be superior to them or equal to them in skill and administrative ability. I do not want to see our countrymen delvers in the mines, hewers of wood and drawers of water, as they would be to this great Yankee nation if hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. I have nothing against the Yankees. In fact, I rather like the Yankees, but I like my own country best. I like my neighbor and I like my neighbor's family, but I like my own family the best, and I would not give much for the man who does not like his own family best. We are suspicious of a man the moment we see him leaving his own wife and going to his neighbor's house; and let me tell you the moment I see gentlemen on the opposite side of the House going to the other side of the line and coquetting with the people there, and saying: "Oh, you are lovely over here, you are beautiful over here, if we could only come here and live with you and have your advantages we could leave the old folks over there." The moment they do that they are neglecting their own people and their hearts are estranged from their homes and community on this side of the line. They may talk as they like about their loyalty, they may ridicule us about over loyalty but I never yet saw a man who had too much loyalty, and I don't think I ever will. I have, Sir, seen a great many who have not enough loyalty, and when they ridicule us about our loyalty let them remember that they are being suspected of not having that true loyalty which Canadians ought to have. I am speaking now of the men who are doing the manipulating and who are

laboring most scientifically to get transferred from that side of the House to this. I believe, Sir, that if they were placed on the Treasury benches to-morrow they would forget all that buncombe they are giving us now. During the years it has been my lot to live in this country, to work in this country, to observe what is going on in this country, to read what is written about this country, and to travel around and keep my eyes open to see what is in this country, my impressions—I should not say my impressions but my convictions—are that we are as prosperous in this country as they are in any country in the world. My impressions are that we are doing as well as any country in the world, and that taking the country all and all, we are as wealthy as any other people. I am now speaking especially from the stand point of my own Province, and I will ask you to come down with me and look over my own county which if not one of the wealthiest counties of the Province of Nova Scotia is certainly not one of the poorest. It has not got the same advantages as some other counties, for we have been deprived of many advantages which other counties possess. Other counties in the Province have railways where ladies and gentlemen can travel in comfortable cars at the rate of twenty or thirty miles an hour, while we have to travel by means of horses and carriages at the rate of seven or eight miles an hour. The grain and other produce which we raise we have to send to market with horses over poor roads, covering only ten or twelve miles a day. We labor under greater disadvantages of this kind than other counties in the Province except one. But I hope—more than that, I am confident—that this liberal administration which we have on this side of the House will this year relieve us from those disabilities. I am sure that our cries for help have gone up to the ears of those gentlemen, and that they, with their broad and liberal views of the wants of this country, will this year come to our relief; and if they do, instead of speaking for ten or fifteen minutes, I will speak for an hour when the question of the support of the Government comes in question. If you come down to this county of ours, Sir, I will show you where the people have increased their wealth during the last twenty or twenty-five years, where a great many of them have doubled their wealth and have become comfortable and prosperous. But we are not a wealthy people; we do not expect to be wealthy, for there are a great many fishermen there, and they never look forward to much wealth; but all the people are comfortable, they have the necessaries of life in abundance, and they have some of the luxuries of life also. We have no persons who are clamoring for a soup kitchen in our county, and I am told there was once a time when there was such a thing as a soup kitchen in this Dominion. I am told that this country had fallen to so low a position that the people were clamoring for labor and could not get any, and a soup kitchen had to be established. I hope it will never come to that again; I hope the people will be wise, and never suffer hon. gentlemen opposite to bring them again to that condition. I am glad to see that this country is prosperous, notwithstanding all that hon. gentlemen opposite tell us to the contrary. Let them open their eyes and go through the country, and see the indications of its prosperity. When a man gets poor he begins to retrench, he begins to lop off

some of the things he can do without ; but, instead of our people lopping off anything that may be considered a luxury, they are in fact increasing their luxuries. We have twice as many sewing machines in the Province of Nova Scotia as we had ten years ago ; we have twice as many organs, pianos and other luxuries. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House laugh. Perhaps they do not know what it is to be without those luxuries, but the poor man who has been without them for years appreciates them when he gets the means of purchasing them. These things show that our people are not getting poorer, but are increasing in wealth, not in leaps and bounds, as we are promised when Mr. Wiman becomes the master of this territory, but by a steady accumulation, year after year, beyond what is needed for the support of the family—a little of something laid by and put into the savings banks. Examine the deposits in the savings banks, which are another indication of the prosperity of the people ; no surer indication can be found. Tell a man who had not a dollar in his pocket on the 31st of December, 1888, but who has a hundred dollars on the 31st of December, 1889, that he is growing poorer, and he will tell you that you are dreaming. The people who have deposits in the savings banks know that they are better off than they were when they had none. These are the indications of their increasing wealth, and hon. gentlemen opposite are wasting their breath and their time when they attempt to convince the people of Canada that they are growing poorer instead of wealthier. Let me tell them that the people are seeing the falseness of their prophecies ; the people are intelligent and observing, and they can see that those gentlemen are not telling them the truth, and the best thing they can possibly do is to turn over a new leaf and tell the people the truth, and show that they have some better plan, some scheme by which they are going to bring greater prosperity to this country. They say that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government made great promises previous to the introduction of the National Policy. They take good care not to make any promises, Sir. At one time they were going to give us free trade, but since that time they have been promising us everything and nothing ; they have been promising us a phantom ; let them tell us what they are going to do. They talk about unrestricted reciprocity, but they cannot give it to us ; we have to go to the Americans to see whether we can get that. What is their scheme ? What are they going to do to give us this greater prosperity ? Let them give us a well-defined policy, and then we shall understand what they propose to do, and will give them credit for being earnest and honest in this matter. My own impression is that we do not want this committee, and I shall vote against the granting of it.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Seeing that my colleagues who speak the English language, Mr. Speaker, have exhausted their arguments on the resolution now before the House, I trust that I may be permitted to express my own in French—more especially as the French language is soon to be suppressed in our debates. The resolution now submitted for our consideration seems rather to demonstrate that the Liberal party are seeking for a new political programme which will produce some effect upon the population, than a remedy suitable

Mr. FREEMAN.

for the healing of the real ills which afflict the people of this country. The hon. members who now condemn the policy of the Government by attributing to this policy, the emigration which is directed towards the American Republic, ought to have, when they were in power and they controlled the majority in this House, when the emigration was much more considerable than it is now,—they ought, I say, to have sought for some means of curing this regretful plague. No persons more than we do, Mr. Speaker, desire to see stop this flow of emigration which runs ceaselessly in the direction of the neighboring Republic. But it is not, certainly, by adopting the policy of the hon. members of the Opposition that we shall witness the stoppage of this evil. For if we look at England, the natural home and the mother country of free trade, we find that it is the British Isles which people our uninhabited wilds and which furnish to the American Republic the largest contingent of emigrants which is guided to those vast and peopled States ; so that, Mr. Speaker, it is not by adopting the policy of the hon. members of the Left that we will be able to heal the sore of which they complain. On the other hand, let us look upon the American Republic. The hon. members on the other side of the House attribute this emigration to our protective tariff. But why, then, does the American Republic, which has a protective tariff much greater than our own, see the emigration from all the countries of the world head itself towards her shores ? There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, in the arguments of the hon. members which can make me believe that a Committee could discover anything new in this regard. It appears to me that the policy of the present Government has been of a nature to cause to cease as much as lies in our power the current of emigration which sets towards the American Republic. This Government does all that lies in its power to develop the resources of our country, and, let it be stated as an aside, that when the hon. members who now sit on that side of the House occupied the ministerial benches, and we reproached them with permitting our citizens of all origins to leave for the Republic, the hon. members and the Minister of Finance of that time did not utter the same language as the hon. mover of the resolution now before the House. The hon. Minister of Finance of that time said that we must bear our sorrows in patience, and that there existed no cure for our troubles. Now, the hon. members seem to have changed their opinions ; and because the present Government has changed the fiscal policy of the country, and for the greatest good of the country as the results show ; because the hon. members see their policy of free trade dead for a long time to come probably, they seek now to make carping enquiries into a policy which has produced its fruits, and fruits beneficial for our country. The hon. members, Mr. Speaker, see no cure for this tendency to emigrate,—for what they call the depopulation of our country districts. They see no other remedy than that afforded by a Committee. I believe that this Committee might serve the political interests of these gentlemen, and that by making an investigation, by summoning the attendance of witnesses and of experienced persons from all parts of the country, they might perchance discover a programme of political action more

beneficial than that which they have advocated so far. I do not deny but that the policy of the Government might be improved. I believe that improvements might always be found in a policy however good it may be. But I see no other improvement to be adopted than that of developing the protective system which has worked such good results up to the present time. And I will venture to make one suggestion to the Government—a suggestion which has probably reached their ears before this—that is, to give a little more protection to the agricultural classes. Circumstances have changed since 1878. Agricultural production has considerably increased in the American Republic and in almost all the countries of the world. We have at the present day a very considerable competition with the American farmers. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Government might impose higher taxes on agricultural products which reach us from foreign countries. Amongst other things, the meats which come to us from Chicago and the Western States of America might be taxed a few cents a pound, which would be a benefit for the agricultural class of our country. We are in a condition, Mr. Speaker, in the great Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec to furnish all the meats required for consumption in the cities of the Dominion of Canada. We are prepared to produce beef and pork in great quantities. If our agriculturists had sufficient protection, they could produce all the meat required at reasonable prices. And it appears to me that the Government might add a few cents to the present duty on American pork and beef, which encumbers the markets of Montreal and Toronto as well as the markets of all the other towns of the Dominion. If the hon. members of the Left are really in earnest for the improvement of the condition of the agricultural classes of the country, they will have to support this proposition. As I have no doubt but that these gentlemen are sincere in asking for the improvement of the agricultural classes; as likewise I have no doubt that they are sincere when they desire to stop the flow of emigration now setting towards the United States, I trust that they will support this proposition and that they will thus place the agriculturists in a position to hold the Canadian markets, by stopping this ruinous competition with the American Republic. In fact the Republic competes with us to our ruin, not only on the foreign markets, but even on our own markets. I do not see what we would gain by free trade with the United States, for it is certain that in the raising of grain we cannot compete with the immense production of the American West. The grains are cheaper there to-day than they are in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Maize, barley and oats come into ruinous competition with similar products from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the Government owe to the agricultural community which has heartily accepted industrial protection, in order to have more populous towns and to have a greater local market, the Government owe it, I repeat, to the agriculturist to grant him the protection, which he now asks for, to his meats. We could by this means produce more meat; we could furnish our markets with a product superior, so far as regards the health of individuals, to that which

comes to us from the American West, and we could provision our markets at prices which would not certainly be exorbitant; which agricultural protection would be, on the part of the working and trading classes, a just return for the advantages which we have secured for them by accepting the principle of industrial protection. Under all circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I will be ready to support the Government in the furtherance of of this policy of protection which has produced, whatever the Liberal party in this House may say, results most auspicious for the whole country, for the Province of Quebec as well as for the other Provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. TISDALE. There appears to be a want of unity on the other side of the House and a want of confidence in the proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Very little has been said in its favor on that side, and I cannot see how the hon. member, in the short speech which he made, could convince any hon. gentleman to support his motion. At any rate, I am satisfied that there is no necessity for this committee, and I have not heard ten words from any hon. gentleman on that side showing the necessity for it. It appears to me that it is simply a sort of side attack on the National Policy. As the hon. gentleman introduced the subject of the exodus to the United States, it struck me that the scope of the enquiry might have been enlarged, and he might have asked for information as to the large number of Canadians who are in Dakota this winter and who were induced to go there by the speeches of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. If we can believe the representations which have been made, there are to be found in Dakota a great number of Canadians who are suffering more than any people are suffering in Canada. Though hon. gentlemen opposite talk very strongly about the difficulties which beset our own North-West and speak of its deterioration, or its "going back," if I may use that term, I have not heard one of them who, before he got through, did not answer his own argument on the subject of the National Policy. Take some of the remarks of the hon. member from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) in his long speech. As to the arguments in it, the House can judge whether they were sound or not, but I was amused, after he spoke about the exportation of horses, bacon and sheep, to hear him go on to show that, notwithstanding the National Policy, we exported more of those articles now than before, while at the same time a great part of his argument was taken up to prove how much poorer we were. He had hardly got through with that point when he said that he could give many more proofs that we were importing more now than we were before the National Policy, and were paying more duty on the importation. It seems to me extraordinary that the result of the National Policy should be that we exported and imported more than before, and still were poorer. The hon. gentleman wanted to show that we were paying the duties both ways, and he introduced the question which has been discussed till every one is tired of it, as to who pays the duty. The hon. gentleman, however, said we paid the duties both ways, and those statements are but an illustration of the absurdity of the proposition which is answered by the gentlemen who propound it. If it is true that we export more,

and also import more, the hon. gentleman answered his own argument, because the country cannot be getting poorer if it sends more out and gets more in than it did before the National Policy was established. If the hon. gentleman had looked into his statistics in reference to the importing of the cattle and horses he would have found another great evidence of prosperity, because in the great majority of cases those articles which come into the country are improved stock, which come in free. What does the importation of improved stock mean, unless it shows that the country under the National Policy is improving in every way. Outside of Ontario I know very little, but I know a great deal of that Province, and I have yet to find that the farmers there are getting poorer under the National Policy. On the contrary, they are better off and are producing better stock. Wheat used to be the greatest staple in the Province, but the continuous cropping led to a less growth of wheat, and that proved to be better for the farmers, because they took to stock-raising, and to-day probably the personal property of the farmers in Ontario is nearly as valuable as their real estate. This shows that, if we are importing more largely, it is because the farmers are improving their stock and because they are competing in a country between which and us some gentlemen opposite desire to put up a wall, on the same terms with our neighbors. In reference to mortgages, I hope the next time the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) speaks on the subject he will inform himself first. If he goes to the State of Ohio, or to New York, the Empire State, or to Michigan, or to any of these rich frontier States, he will find that the mortgages are double, and in some cases five and seven times the amounts they are in Ontario. I cannot see where there should be any pleasure in stating only one side—and surely it must be a pleasure, because it cannot do this country any good. I admit that I was surprised at the fine strain in which the hon. gentleman commenced, when he stated that this was the finest country under the sun, that our education and our administration of justice were better than they were in the United States; but then he wandered into his usual strain when he speaks of the material interests of the country. If the farmers of this country are in the position which he represents, is it not strange that they have not sent deputations here asking to have the tariff better arranged for them. All the other interests have done so, and I am sure the Government would be glad to do anything they could for the farming industry. Members representing rural constituencies are taking some steps this Session to have the interests of the farmers better regulated, and they will be. In the rural constituency which I represent, I know that the farmers approve of the policy of the Government. The hon. gentleman stated that the present system of taxation drove agriculturists out of the country. Is that true? I do not think it is. It was merely a statement. I think the beauty of our system is that while it resembles the United States protective tariff, it is better. Because there they have a number of taxes which are not necessary, and they tax articles which should not be protected. Our system is a great improvement upon that. Further, I think any inquiry of the sort the hon. gentleman proposes to have made by this committee would produce no result. What pos-

Mr. TISDALE.

sible result can the hon. gentleman say it would produce? Can anything new be shown which has not been discussed or will not be discussed in the House? The hon. gentleman, who is Chairman of the Agriculture and Colonisation Committee, knows that things were very fully investigated there, and I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) say that in that committee the evidence produced by the Government could not be relied upon. Well, it is a new doctrine to me that when a committee is appointed to make an enquiry the Government produces the evidence. The hon. gentlemen could have had any evidence brought before that committee that he chose. I never heard of any witness being refused an examination. If the hon. gentleman had any evidence to bring forward then, why did he not produce it? If he knows of any now, if the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) knows of any, let them bring it forward, and no doubt the Government will make them members of the committee. If they have none to bring why go to the expense of appointing a select committee when all these statistics can be got at otherwise. I have come to the conclusion that we are bound to have a very long Session if we are to have debates on all these minor questions. Would it not suit the hon. gentleman's purpose just as well and have an equal effect upon the electorate, if they would make one grand attack on the National Policy and discuss all their points in the one debate, instead of having these numerous debates and endless motions. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have a very irregular policy. They keep bringing up the same questions and repeating the same statements all leading to the one point, which is an indirect attack upon the National Policy. If they would only make one comprehensive motion and not accuse us of having nothing to say, we would sit still like good boys and let them talk for a week if they choose, although we have heard already everything they have to say. On all these motions no doubt the Government will be sustained, and I am quite sure hon. gentlemen opposite will not improve their position in the country in thus prolonging the Session far beyond the time necessary to get through with our practical business. Let me say a few words with regard to our North-West. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Larivière) mentioned a fact which pleased me very much, and one which I can corroborate personally, when he spoke of Canadians coming back from the United States to Canada. They say it is dangerous to be a prophet in your own land, but I do not speak exactly in the spirit of prophecy, because it is rapidly becoming a reality, when I tell you that, as the hon. member for Provencher has stated, Canadians are returning in large numbers to our North-West and not only Canadians but Americans as well. Let me tell you where I first got the information about this. In the city of Chicago there is a British American Society, composed of Canadians who have gone there, whether they have become American citizens or not, and the secretary of that society told me that through his correspondence he knew there was a large exodus from the American Western States to the Canadian North-West. It was last summer that he spoke to me and he said: "Mark my words, the largest and earliest emigration to the North-West will be from the North-Western

States, not only Dakota but Kansas and Nebraska, and from the Territories where there is very little good farm land. The advertisements that were sent abroad directed the tide of emigration to those quarters, but the settlers are becoming disappointed; they find the land is not what they expected, they find that tempests, frosts and drouths, according to the different localities, prevail. The people are very poor; they cannot sell their grain; they are burning their corn, as they did this year; it does not pay them to dig up their potatoes, and there is a feeling rapidly setting in among them in favor of emigration to the Canadian North-West." I can confirm that statement. Every year the emigration from the United States will grow larger. We have evidence from the hon. members for the North-West that those who went away are coming back, and others with them; and the volume of emigration will be endless once it sets in, particularly from Dakota. People who have settled there, and took all they had and their families with them, have had to mortgage their farms, as the crops failed one year after another, and land that looked so rich and flourishing was unproductive through want of rain and moisture. The result will be that from those North-Western States we will get an excellent class of emigrants, because they are pioneers, and know how to take up and cultivate land in a new country and establish their own homes. The strongest opponent of the Government opposite must agree that the land in our North-West and Manitoba is of most excellent quality and unsurpassed in fertility. All what we want is immigrants, and immigration is rapidly setting in. But I tell you, Sir, that enquiries such as this, predicated upon the idea that there is an extensive exodus, are calculated to do much harm. The exodus which hon. gentlemen opposite speak of is largely exaggerated. They seem to be glad to exaggerate and to rely on these statistics, which are most untrustworthy. I looked in an almanac of the United States to-night which gives the immigration to the United States up to 1886, and according to it the average immigration from all the British possessions has been under 15,000 a year instead of 75,000. The statistics are given there every year; but these frontier statistics, on which hon. gentlemen opposite lay so much stress, are entirely unreliable, and intended to give an exaggerated impression of the exodus from Canada. Hon. gentlemen may say what they please about the United States, but there is one thing in which we should take example by them, and that is speaking well of one's country. The Americans fight their political battles with much vigor, but in the House of Congress no one dare run down his own country, because they have a summary way of dealing with men who belittle their own home. Members of Congress may belittle an opponent or attack all the actions of either party as to their hearts' content, or even make personal attacks, but the instant any one abuses his country he is not safe. Well, I do not believe in that sort of thing, but still I would be very glad if hon. gentlemen opposite would adopt some other tactics. Of course they may say that it is none of my business, but in all sincerity I would like to feel that when the time comes, as it probably will, when hon. gentlemen opposite will take control of the affairs of the country, they will have faith in their country. If

they stand by the country, the country will stand by them. I would like them to be satisfied, as I am, that having unrivalled natural capacities in Canada, if we stand by the country it will stand by us. Any reasonable man ought to be content with the progress our country has made from one year to another. Take, in a winter such as this, the history of any State in the Union, or the history of the whole United States, and look at the condition of any country in Europe, and you cannot but be convinced that there is no people in the world better off, more comfortable and better provided for than our own; and if we do not stir up a spirit of discontent and dissatisfaction with the way things are progressing everybody will be reasonably well satisfied. I am satisfied for one that in the different constituencies throughout the country, notwithstanding that hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavoring to create an excitement about our present manner of government, our present relations with Great Britain, and the contemplated change with respect to the United States, there is very little excitement about it. Our people are a good, sensible, level-headed lot of people, and I do not believe that any number of motions of this sort will discourage the Canadians. But it is the effect abroad that we may have to deplore, and that will injure us most; it is the effect of such speeches that have sent many poor Canadians to the wilds of Dakota, where now they are sadly in need of relief. I wish hon. gentlemen to think and feel that they are taking a great responsibility upon themselves when they make the statements they do in regard to this country, and in regard to another country about which many of them know very little. Distance lends enchantment to the view, and they think that because the United States has 60,000,000 of people, and can make bigger cities than we have, because they have longer railroads and more of them, that because they are a great, big people, therefore Canadians would be better off there than they are here. Now, I do not believe that. I believe that Canada is large enough for the most ambitious man. I think that the world has yet to produce a finer country than ours. At the present time we are much in the same position that the States of the Union were when they first separated from Great Britain. We are 5,000,000 of people, and we have immense natural resources of mines, minerals, timber, with millions of acres of undeveloped land, and it all belongs to these 5,000,000 of people. In the United States all these things are developed. Their mines are beginning to be exhausted by their immense manufacturing industries; their timber is being swept off, their farms are settled up, and why should 5,000,000 people give up this vast heritage to 60,000,000 of people? I am not one of those who believe that this country will settle down to this view, and will accept a political party that is endeavoring to bring about this end, a party that is all the time hunting for something abroad to belittle and discourage us Canadians. I tell you that we have the germ of a great country here, and we have great possibilities before us. And more than that. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) made a statement more true than he supposed, when he spoke of the administration of justice in this country. I tell you that liberty here is liberty; in the United States,

because of their political institutions and their elective judiciary, liberty is not liberty. We know here that if a man commits a crime he is going to be punished for it; if the rich man wrongs the poor man he goes into court, and there they are equal. But how is it over there? The law is precisely similar, but the administration of justice, owing to the fact that they elect everybody there to administer justice, is not at all so certain. We read long histories of criminal trials; we read of the rich men carrying their cases from one court to another. And you talk about combines here, and monopolies, and all that sort of thing. Why, they cannot touch those on the other side of the line. As I said, I think no other people in the world have a heritage equal to that possessed by these 5,000,000 of Canadians. All we have to do is to wait, and the Americans will come to us. They will come to us as their minerals become exhausted, as their timber is used up, and as their old settled farms are exhausted. They must come to us, and why should we go to them? Why should 5,000,000 go to 60,000,000? Would he not be a foolish man who has a mine of his own, to go and ask a hundred people to come and help him to make money out of that which he has been fortunate enough to discover? Would he not be a foolish man, who has found a fine tract of timber, to ask a hundred men to come and help him cut it down instead of reaping the benefit of his own discovery alone? And so in everyway. Canada, with its 5,000,000, has all these things, and the 60,000,000 or the 65,000,000, as some hon. gentlemen are fond of saying, would be glad to come to us; and if we do not get enough settlers from the States the immigration from Europe will grow every year; and so it will be our own fault if we do not in the future go on and grow, and reap all these benefits. Why, it was only the other day that Confederation took place. What were we then? Do you not remember that people said then that the leader of the Government was crazy, and that his colleagues were crazy? The hon. member himself who moved this resolution, and in the very riding that still returns him, counted up, in the election of 1874, that to build the Canadian Pacific Railway would mortgage every farm in Canada for so many thousand dollars. Well, is not the Canadian Pacific Railway built? And I ask the hon. gentleman to-night where are the mortgages on the farms? Why, people do not know that they have paid out any money, so far as taxation goes. We have got our farms, our land; we have got railways, and we are known all over the world. We have got a shorter route than the Americans to China and Japan, and Americans have to patronise our road and our lines of steamers when they go across. I tell you that instead of Canada being in danger of having to go to the United States, we are going to build up our nationality, and they will have to come to us.

House divided on motion of Mr. Charlton:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Bain (Wentworth),
Barron,
Bécharé,
Bernier,
Mr. TISDALE.

Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lovitt,

Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brien,
Burdett,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casgrain,
Charlton,
Couture,
Davies,
Dessaint,
Doyon,
Edwards,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,
Fiset,
Fisher,
Flynn,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Guay,
Innes,
Jones (Halifax),
Kirk,
Lang,

Macdonald (Huron),
McIntyre,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,
Meigs,
Mills (Bothwell),
Mitchell,
Neveu,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Platt,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Rowand,
St. Marie,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Trow,
Turcot,
Waldie,
Watson,
Weldon (St. John),
Wilson (Elgin), and
Yeo.—63.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Barnard,
Bell,
Bergeron,
Boisvert,
Bowell,
Brown,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corly,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Curran,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Dawson,
Denison,
Desjardins,
Dewdney,
Dickinson,
Dupont,
Earle,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Freeman,
Gigault,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Heason,
Hudspeth,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Joncas,
Jones (Digby),

Kirkpatrick,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
La Rivière,
Lépine,
Macdonald (Sir John),
McCulla,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McKay,
McKeen,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Massue,
Moffat,
Moncrieff,
O'Brien,
Pope,
Porter,
Prior,
Putnam,
Riopel,
Robillard,
Ross,
Rykert,
Skinner,
Small,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thérien,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Vanasse,
Wallace,
Ward,
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Wilson (Lennox),
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westmoreland).—64.

Motion negatived.

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 11th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the Hamilton Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the South Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 68) to incorporate the West Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 69) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 70) respecting the St. Lawrence International Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Brandon and South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Scarth.)

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Summerside Bank.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Bankers' Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Confederation Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Calgary Water Power Company (Limited).—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the Elbow River Water Power Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. BERGERON moved :

That the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be further extended to Tuesday, 18th instant, and the time for presenting Private Bills to Tuesday, 25th instant, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Committee on Standing Orders, as contained in their sixth report.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, there is a matter to which I desire to invite the attention of the Government. I have no doubt that the members of the Government, in common with other members of this House, have observed a somewhat remarkable series of letters which have appeared within a few days in the columns of the *Globe* newspaper, purporting to be signed by a member of this House, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), and involving seriously the names of other members of this House. It is not my intention at present to discuss or comment upon these letters, but I desire to ask whether the attention of the Government has been called to them, and whether the Government intend to take any action in this House in regard to the matter? I deemed it right to give notice to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) that I would to-day call attention to this matter in the House, in order that he might give any explanation in regard to these letters, if he so desired, which might seem good to him. As I said, I do not intend to comment upon them now, but I should be glad to know from the Government

whether they intend to take any notice of this correspondence?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think those statements appeared on Saturday last in the *Globe*. That is a periodical which I do not usually peruse, but my attention was called to this matter on Sunday morning, and then I saw the letters which were published in that paper. Some of those letters surprised me very considerably. I do not think that, as far as the Government are concerned, or as far as any member of the Government is concerned, they have much to do with the matter. As to the very interesting letters published in the newspaper between the gentlemen who are stated to have had the correspondence, they stand on their own merits or demerits—I have nothing to do with that. I can only say that, as far as the Government are concerned, and as far as the members of the Government who were in power at the time when these transactions took place are concerned, they are quite willing that any investigation that might be suggested should be gone into. There is not the slightest objection to that. As to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), every hon. gentleman in this House knows that he is a strong man in battle and can fight his own battles and defend his own position. As yet, the Government, having had other matters before them, have not really considered the correspondence which has been spoken of. I do not suppose that all my colleagues have had time to read those letters; I have not yet finished the perusal myself; but I can only state that, if that correspondence in any way, in any phrase or sentence reflects upon the honor of the Ministry or of any member of it, we are quite ready to defend ourselves and to ask for the assistance of hon. gentlemen opposite in the investigation. This, however, is hardly a question of privilege unless raised by the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not know whether at this time I shall be permitted to make a full statement of the facts connected with this case or not, but I do not desire to shrink from the question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it would be well to enter upon that now. We might do that on another day.

Mr. RYKERT. There might be a day fixed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; I think it is due to the hon. gentleman to fix a day, and I will arrange with him for a day on which the discussion may take place.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman will remember that I applied to him yesterday morning to fix a day for this question, and I wish to have that day at the earliest possible time.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think you would need a week.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must differ from the First Minister in regard to the question whether this is or is not a matter of privilege. I think any question which may involve serious reflections upon a member of this House does become a matter of privilege, and I think, if the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) desires to make an explanation, it would be well that the explanation should be made now, so that the House, which has seen the correspondence, should, in fairness to the hon. member, hear what he has to

say upon it. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman will make his explanation in such a way, that it will not provoke any lengthened debate, and I want it understood, that no one on this side of the House desires to deprive the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) of the right which he and any other hon. gentleman whose character is impugned in the public press has to make an explanation. With all deference to the leader of the Government, I think it might be well to do that now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a Government day and we want to get on with the public business. I have no objection to fix the discussion for to-morrow instead of to-day. I may point out that the hon. gentleman opposite did not end with a resolution, which is necessary in a matter of privilege, but he can do that if he chooses. I think the hon. gentleman had better postpone the discussion until to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER. To-morrow is the day fixed for the debate on the French language in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Suppose we say Thursday. That would give us time to look at the dates of the letters.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. member for Lincoln does not speak now, it is not by reason of objection from this side of the House.

Mr. RYKERT. It will necessarily take some time, but as the leader of the Government says this is a Government day, I have no objection to postpone the matter, but I shall take the first opportunity I have to give an elaborate explanation of the whole matter, to the satisfaction of hon. gentlemen opposite, probably.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will say Thursday. It is either a matter of privilege or it is not. If it is a matter of privilege the hon. gentleman can give notice to-day.

REBATE ON IMPORTED CORN.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, and the motion of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I desire to say that the Government consider this question, not as one to be discussed like ordinary motions—on its own merits. The Government consider that it is one of a series of motions which appear on the paper, affecting—I do not say attacking, but affecting—the fiscal policy of the Government. That policy is well known; that policy has been known since 1879. The Government, therefore, say that they will resist the premature discussion of this proposition on the paper, affecting the fiscal policy of the Government, the tariff policy of the Government, if you like, the protective policy of the Government. On this occasion I desire to make this announcement, Mr. Speaker, that the Government intend to bring down a tariff measure during the present Session of considerable importance, and affecting considerable interests, and that the subject, in all these motions and resolutions that appear upon the paper, including this one, will be brought up at the time when the Government come down with

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

their tariff measure; but they will resist any premature motion, even by my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, until that period.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The announcement, in point of fact, means this, as I understand the question: that the Government of Canada, who, with the information in their hands, cannot fail to be aware that the agricultural interests of Canada, and notably of the great Province of Ontario, are at present in a state of extreme depression, and have been notified of that fact by the bodies representing the farmers of Ontario, are not disposed to raise their little finger for the purpose of relieving these depressed and suffering interests, are not even disposed to allow an obvious, an extraordinary anomaly in the tariff to be removed, even when, as I have excellent reason to know, many of their own strongest supporters are disposed to insist that the farmers of Canada at least should not be insulted—because it is an insult, practically—by saying that other bodies infinitely of less importance to the well-being of this community should receive an indulgence which is entirely refused to them. Now, Sir, I have had occasion at various times to note how exceedingly severely the duty on corn, and the duty on the importation of certain classes of grain similar to corn, press on the best interests of the farmers of Ontario. I know that in the section where I reside, though I do not represent it now, the distress which, as the First Minister must know, was extreme in the course of the last year or two, was very seriously aggravated by the fact that, in their extreme need, the suffering farmers were compelled to purchase fodder corn for the use of their animals at a greatly increased price, by reason of the duty. Now, a few days ago my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin) proposed that we should give the same indulgence to the farmers—who certainly represent one-half, and perhaps the best half, of this community—which the Government had freely accorded to the producers of a fluid which, I think—he will correct me, if I am wrong—my hon. friend the Finance Minister was wont to characterise as distilled damnation—begging the pardon of the House for quoting him on this occasion. Under these circumstances, I say, there is no just reason whatever why, if you refuse to grant this paltry and insignificant favor to the agriculturists of Canada, you should not at the same time equalise things and take the privilege away from the distillers. I say, Sir, that if there be any real honesty in the temperance gentlemen on the other side who are in the habit of supporting the right hon. gentleman, they, at all events, ought not to favor the distillers of Canada at the expense of the agricultural class. Now, I do not think that there is any occasion for me, or, indeed, for any of us, to enlarge greatly on the subject. There can be no plainer or clearer proposition than the one that is now laid down—that if you are going to have a protective tariff, if you are going, as you say, to foster the interests of all classes of the community, the very first and most obvious duty is to extend equal privileges to them: either grant to the farmers a rebate similar to that which you give to the distillers, or put them all on an equal footing. That is only fair, that is only just and right; and, therefore, I trust that my hon. friend will not be cajoled by the promises of the First Minister, to

remove from the proceedings of the House this most equitable resolution. I hope that he will press it to a vote, and that he will give those hon. gentlemen who represent the agricultural interests, and in particular those hon. gentlemen, including the Minister of Finance, who have arrogated to themselves the special care of the temperance interest of this Dominion, the opportunity of showing that they, at any rate, are disposed to give as much fair play to the farmers of Canada as to the distillers and manufacturers of an article that my hon. friend was wont to describe in those terms.

Mr. BRIEN. Before this motion is put, I would ask the indulgence of the House to say a few words with regard to it. The motion which the hon. leader of the Opposition has placed in your hands is one which meets with my entire approval. The situation in the locality which I have the honor to represent, is one of a peculiar character. The remedy proposed by the resolution of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is one which, I believe, would be in the best interests of the Dominion as a whole. It is not fair that the whole Dominion should reap an advantage at the expense of the inhabitants of the corn-growing districts. I take it that it would be quite unfair to them. As we have a protective policy, it is just and fair that protection should be dealt out to all parties and to all sections. The National Policy is sectional in its character; and if it has been established in order to raise revenue and to encourage industry, then those industries which are peculiar to certain sections of the country should be protected as well as other industries. I could not, therefore, vote for the motion of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin). With regard to the general principle of granting rebates, I am not going to discuss that question at the present time. While the protective policy is in operation, there should be justice in its application. My objection to the continuation of the privilege given to distillers is, in the first place, that it has a tendency to reduce the price of corn; and, in the second place, that it is a privilege granted to an industry which, I think, does not require any special privileges. Were a special privilege of this kind granted on the imported material, such as sugar, it would enable industries to be established in the corn-growing district which is also a large fruit-growing district, and the people would be able to manufacture large quantities of preserved fruits for both home and export. With the permission of the House, I desire to read a short extract from the *Canadian Journal of Commerce* with respect to the importance of the fruit-growing industry in this country, and the extent which it is followed. That journal says:

"The distinction of being the largest fruit-growing county in Canada is claimed by Essex, in western Ontario. The past season's apple sales were 70,000 barrels, costing the purchaser \$122,000, including buyer's incidental expenses. There was also sold 5,000 baskets of peaches for \$3,750, \$5,000 worth of pears, \$5,000 worth of small fruits, \$1,500 worth of cherries, and \$1,000 worth of plums, a total of \$138,250. The figures relating to Essex County's immense grape crop, which has attained a national reputation, have unfortunately not been compiled."

If others who wish to establish industries in the fruit-growing section have to pay an import duty on sugar entering into manufactures, the distillers should do the same on materials which enter into composition of the products manufactured by

them. The distilling business is a sufficiently profitable one already, and I have no doubt that, if they were satisfied with a little less profit, they could do without a rebate. My strongest objection to this special privilege being continued to this industry is, that the industry is not one which it is the true interests of the country to encourage. The less the liquor traffic is encouraged the better, and due respect should be paid by the Government to the temperance sentiment of the country. There is not the least doubt that it is an interest which, in all its details, is a curse instead of a blessing. I do not think any man would attempt for a moment to deny that fact, or to say that it is conducive to the welfare of the community in which it may be situated. While I object to the consumption of the article at home, I also object to the proposition that, while we do not wish to have this traffic ourselves, it is quite proper to encourage the distilling business if the liquor is exported, for I hold that if intoxicating liquor is injurious here, it is injurious wherever it may be consumed. It can easily be shown that even from a financial standpoint alone this industry involves great financial loss to the Dominion, instead of being a benefit. As regards the cost to the country, as far as my information goes, the amount of liquor consumed is an entire loss. In order to show that the distilling industry is one already profitable, I have only to quote from the census of 1881. The distillers' capital is entered as \$1,303,100; value of the raw material, \$1,092,100; value of product, \$1,790,800; wages paid, \$116,230; hands employed, the paltry number of 285. The profits, deducting wages and cost of raw material, were \$572,230, or equal to 44 per cent. on the capital employed. The amount of wages paid in proportion to the profits is much less in this industry than in others, and it is, therefore, less advantageous to the laboring man. The percentage of wages paid to the value of the product is only 6 per cent., while in other industries it varies from 20 to 25 per cent. From my standpoint on this question, all the liquor consumed and all the liquor manufactured in the country entails a financial loss, and, more than that, it is a loss in various ways. The cost to the consumer and country of the amount of spirits used last year, as gathered from the Inland Revenue returns, was as follows:—Consumption of spirits 1,176 gallons per head, equals 5,808,000 gallons, which, at \$5 per gallon, gives \$29,400,000. Consumption of beer, 2,633 gallons per head, equals 13,150,000 gallons, which, at 50 cents per gallon, gives \$6,575,000. Consumption of wine, 143 gallons per head, equals 715,000 gallons, which, at \$6 per gallon, gives \$4,290,000; or a total of \$40,265,000. This cost is exclusive of the vast amount expended on the administration of justice and on the maintenance of paupers and criminals, and these items will add largely to the total. This capital, instead of being employed in an industry which is injurious from every standpoint, might be engaged in industries that would be profitable to the state. The corn is taken by the farmer to the distiller, by whom it is sold as liquor to retailers, and they each in turn obtain their profits. The retailers sell it to the consumers, and they also have to obtain their percentage. But what does the consumer obtain? Nothing but loss of health, and he is probably induced, under the influence of

liquor, to commit some crime for which he has to pay the penalty of the law. From a financial standpoint, therefore, the distilling industry is injurious, and from a moral standpoint it is injurious; and whatever is injurious to the community is injurious to the country at large. I hope this motion will be carried. I am sure that no man having any desire to promote the welfare of the people will vote against this resolution, nor will any man who has temperance sentiments at heart and who wishes to promote the time which we all look forward to, when a prohibitory measure will be adopted by this Legislature, be found on the side of those who support the Government in this matter. I think it would be well if the Government would show the people that they are desirous of paying some attention to the great agitation which is being carried on in the country in favor of temperance. At the same time, the adoption of this motion would be an intimation to the distillers not to invest more money in their business, so that they cannot claim compensation for vested rights, in case the prohibitory measure which we all look forward to being carried in a short time at least shall become the law of the country. If the sentiment of the country is manifested by the results of the voting, when the people have been given an opportunity to express their opinion on these matters, then we may expect prohibitory legislation to be introduced into Parliament at a very early day. I think the present time is opportune for us to cease to encourage an industry which is detrimental to the moral, financial and intellectual welfare of the people.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This question, from a fiscal point of view, is one which admits of a very great difference of opinion and a very great deal of argument, but that question is not concerned in the motion now before the House. The question now before us is: whether a rebate shall be given upon corn admitted for a certain purpose. I take it that it does not matter for what purpose that is, whether for making whiskey or anything else; the fact that a rebate is given to a certain class on corn is sufficient to make it detrimental to the farmer, because it is obvious that, however small the amount of the rebate may be, yet, to the extent of that rebate, the imported corn comes in direct competition with the coarse grains of this country. It does not matter whether the rebate is one dollar or one million dollars. Whatever it be, to such extent does that corn come into competition with the coarse grains of the country. This is not a time, when an important principle like this is concerned, to do anything which would give the farmers of the country a reason to find fault with the operation of the National Policy. It is because I am a supporter of the National Policy that I certainly will not sustain the Government in retaining that rebate, no matter how trifling the amount may be, or no matter what little effect it may have on the revenue of the country. This is a question of principle, inasmuch as I hold that to the extent of that rebate of duty, the coarse grain from the United States comes into competition with the coarse grain of this country. The question of its bearing on the temperance movement is of comparatively little importance, and that I do not propose to deal with. As a consistent supporter of the National Policy, especially as affecting the farmer, I am bound to vote for any motion

Mr. BRIEN.

which looks towards the abolition of this rebate. I take this course, not on a general question of rebates, but because in this particular case the giving of the rebate puts our farmers, to the extent of that rebate, in an inferior position with regard to the American producers of Indian corn.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in error in the statement he has made. There is no portion of the residue (if it may be so termed) of the corn, used in feeding purposes, which receives any drawback. On the contrary, the rebate is given on the proportion of a bushel of the corn from which the spirit is extracted. They pay $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents on each bushel of corn, and when they manufacture that into spirits, they receive two-thirds of the $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents as a rebate, provided the spirits are exported. The other one-third is supposed to cover, and does cover, and more than cover, that which is fed to the cattle. So, in fact, that which is fed in the country to cattle pays the duty. I have the Order in Council to this effect before me now.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I quite understand that a rebate is given only on a very small portion of the corn used even in distilleries. But I say that, to that extent, it is unfair to the farmers that it should be given.

Mr. BOWELL. Why?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Because if the distiller buys a bushel of Indian corn and brings it into this country subject to a duty of whatever number of cents per bushel may be imposed, and when he sends the whiskey to France, or wherever it goes to, he gets a rebate on the amount of corn exported for the manufacture.

Mr. BOWELL. He only gets two-thirds.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It does not matter whether it is two-thirds or two-tenths. The principle is the same, and, unless I am very stupid, I certainly think that I am correct in believing that, as regards the amount of that rebate, it deprives the farmer to that extent of the benefit of the National Policy. I understand that to be the case, and it does not matter, as I say, whether the amount be great or small, it is to that extent inconsistent with the principle of the National Policy. As a consistent supporter of the National Policy, I certainly cannot consent to that which seems to me to be injurious to it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The First Minister has to-day made an announcement not embraced in the Speech which was put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General. That Speech, as speeches are supposed to do, foreshadowed the legislative policy of the Administration for the Session. But there is nothing in that Speech with regard to the financial policy of the Government; there is no statement there that it was the intention of the Government to make any alteration whatever in the fiscal policy. The Government did not announce to the House that this subject was under their consideration. They did not announce to the House that they had discovered any serious defects, and that they were anxious to revise the tariff which had, with so much difficulty and after so many interviews, been imposed upon certain articles for revenue purposes and for the purposes of protection. Now the right hon. gentleman

comes down to the House, at this fourth or fifth week of the Session, and informs the House that this subject is under consideration. I think we may fairly infer from the observations of the First Minister, how the Government will consider this question and what conclusion they are likely to arrive at.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Don't prophesy unless you know.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman tells me not to prophesy unless I know. I venture this prediction, whether it turns out true or whether the result is that I misconceive hon. gentlemen opposite: "The Government will be like Captain Scott's coon, and on this question they will come down." The hon. gentleman knows that last year he came down handsomely with reference to the duty upon saw logs, and he came down too after voting down a proposition submitted to this House on that question. Now, it seems to me, Sir, that it would be only fair to this House, in which the Government has so large a majority, that they can well afford to take the House into their confidence, if the Government were to announce now what their intention is upon this question. Why should the Government call upon their supporters, as they are calling upon the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), to choose between voting according to their convictions and according to their fealty to the Administration? They call upon the hon. member for Muskoka to choose between his devotion to the Government and his devotion to the National Policy, and the hon. gentleman has announced to the Finance Minister—and it was, no doubt, a painful announcement for him to make—that, if compelled to make the choice, he must support the National Policy and let the Administration go. Now, it seems to me that if the Government seriously contemplated making changes in the tariff, those changes ought to have been announced when His Excellency the Governor General made his Speech at the opening of Parliament. Why should the Government tell us what they intend to do with regard to the business of banking, with regard to the subject of bills and promissory notes, and with regard to certain other matters, and on this subject keep perfectly quiet? This much I think is tolerably clear—that the Government had not any policy on the subject, that they were not prepared to alter—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we had no policy on the subject, how could we put it in the Speech?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have just explained why it is not in the Speech. I say it was their duty, if they intended to make a change, to announce it in the Speech. But the hon. gentlemen have been trying to do what, in the fable, the old man did who owned the ass.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are the man on this side.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They have been trying to please everybody, and the result may be, after all, that they will not please a great many. The Finance Minister has not yet met with all the deputations who were seeking alterations in the tariff. I believe that hon. gentleman has been interviewed on several occasions since this Session opened. He could not tell the House whether

there would be changes in the tariff or not, for he could not tell whether any changes would be seriously sought or not; but, having met with A, B, and C, and all the other letters of the alphabet, the hon. gentleman, who is anxious to please those who are dissatisfied with the tariff as it is, will be able, after a while, to come down and tell us what he and his various interviewers have agreed upon. The legislation, instead of being thought out and worked out by this House, as the representatives of the people, will be thought out by those who wish to have the tariff altered to suit their own circumstances, and the hon. gentleman will come down here with a mandate informing us what we are expected to do. What the House is expected to do, is not what the people have generally desired, not what they have promised the people they will perform; but it is what those particular parties who are seeking to amend or manipulate the tariff to suit themselves have determined upon, what they have told the Finance Minister they are ready to accept, and beyond which they are not ready to go. And so, having received his instructions from those irresponsible parties, he comes down to the House with his instructions to the supporters of the Government, and the result is, that the Administration and those who support them are here merely to register those changes which various interested parties from time to time seek to obtain at the hands of this House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not wish to discuss this question particularly, but one thing strikes me, that, after the announcement made by the First Minister that there are to be tariff changes, and very important ones, it is desirable that the Finance Minister should bring down his budget at a very early day. Trade is sufficiently depressed now; and should the fact go to the country that very great, and, I should judge from the statement of the First Minister, almost radical changes, are to take place in the tariff of the country, business will be almost paralysed, and, therefore, I think it is desirable, in the interest of the country, that those changes should be announced by the Finance Minister at the earliest possible moment. That hon. gentleman knows, as does the First Minister and every business man, that what is most desired by the business men of the country is something like stability in our tariff. These incessant changes, this excessive tinkering with the tariff, is ruinous to many business men, and it is to be regretted that hon. gentlemen opposite, who are never tired of extolling the beauty and perfection of their tariff, should find it necessary to constantly tinker with it, to daub it up in certain places, to put in a new stone here, and pull out another there. It is to be hoped that, when the changes are made this year, the tariff will be, in their estimation, what they have always claimed it to be—perfect in its nature and its structure.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not have spoken, as it is not profitable at this time to debate this question, except for some expressions which have fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, with regard to the statement of the First Minister. As my hon. friend has amplified and exaggerated that statement, I thought it well to call attention to it. I was not aware that the First Minister stated that very great and very important changes were to be

made in the tariff. As I understood him, he said that certain changes would be recommended, and some of them were of an important character; but that is far from stating, as my hon. friend put it, that very great and very sweeping changes were to be made. I did not know that it was possible, in the opinion of the hon. member for Brant, that the trade and business of this country could be any further depressed than it is. According to the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite in the debates that have taken place, it would seem almost impossible that a more depressed state could be induced in the country than is at present the condition of the country, so that my hon. friend need not, from his standpoint, have any very great fears that the moderate announcement made to-day will tend to paralyse the state of business which, according to the hon. gentleman, is already greatly depressed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Your power for evil is not all gone yet.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend finds to-day a great objection to any attempt being made to better the tariff, and, of course, if anything is done on the recommendation of the Government this year, it will be to make the tariff better and more perfect than it is. My hon. friend has a great horror of attempting to tinker the tariff, and yet almost every day of his life he expresses the opinion in this House that the tariff is very bad, that it is injuring the trade and best interests of this country, and that something ought to be done with it. My hon. friend is not quite consistent. Neither, I think, is my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who spoke about the various processes that preceded the recommendations of changes in the tariff. Why, Sir, I think the only way in which a Government can act is first to put itself in touch with the country, and find out, by the most extensive investigation it can make, what are the wants of the country and the state of its industries; after having done that, it is in a position to make up its mind what it is best to recommend. It is surely not taking anything away from the prerogatives of the most independent members of this House, to give that thorough investigation preceding a thorough consideration, both to precede any changes in the tariff which may be recommended by the Government of the country.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier :

YEAS :
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Lauderkin,
Bain (Wentworth),	Lang,
Barron,	Langelier (Montmorency),
Béchar, d,	Laurier,
Bernier,	Lavergne,
Borden,	Livingston,
Bourassa,	Lovitt,
Bowman,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brien,	McIntyre,
Burdett,	McMillan (Huron),
Campbell,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Meigs,
Casey,	Mills (Bothwell),
Casgrain,	Neveu,
Charlton,	O'Brien,
Choquette,	Paterson (Brant),
Cook,	Perry,
Couture,	Platt,
Davies,	Rinfret,
Dessaint,	Robertson
Doyon,	Rowand,
Edwards,	Ste. Marie,
Eisenhauer,	Semple,
Ellis,	Somerville

Mr. FOSTER.

Fiset,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Guay,
Innes,
Jameson,
Jones (Halifax),
Kirk,
Kirkpatrick,

Audet,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Barnard,
Bell,
Bergeron,
Boisvert,
Bowell,
Boyle,
Brown,
Bryson,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Colby,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Coulombe,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Dawson,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Dewdney,
Dickinson,
Dupont,
Earle,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Ferguson (Welland),
Foster,
Freeman,
Gigault,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hesson,
Hickey,
Hudspeth,
Ives,
Joncas,
Jones (Digby),
Labrosse,

Sutherland,
Trow,
Turcot,
Waldie,
Watson,
Weldon (St. John),
White (Renfrew),
Wilson (Elgin),
Wright,
Yeo.—69.

NAYS :
Messieurs

Landry,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Lépine,
Macdonald (Sir John),
McCarthy,
McCulla,
McDonald (Victoria)
McKay,
McKeen,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Massue,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moffat,
Moncrieff,
Montplaisir,
Patterson (Essex),
Perley,
Pope,
Porter,
Prior,
Putnam,
Riopel,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross,
Rykert,
Searth,
Shanly,
Skinner,
Small,
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thérien,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Vanasse,
Wallace,
Welsh,
White (Cardwell),
Wilson (Lennox),
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland).—104.

Motion negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for West Hastings has not voted.

Mr. CORBY. I declined voting as an interested party. I refer the hon. gentleman to Room No. 16 of the House of Commons.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I., has voted and was not present when the question was put.

Mr. WELSH. That is right.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Department of Secretary of State—Contingencies \$9,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon gentleman explain that increase?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The accounts which are in the hands of the hon. gentleman from the Auditor General's Report, show the necessity for this increase. Last year and the year before the vote was reduced, and last year the vote was exceeded, amounting to \$11,000. I have succeeded this year in reducing the amount to the actual expenditure for the year, and I think I could pledge myself that the expenditure will not this year exceed the \$2,900 more which are now put in the Estimates, but which are \$2,000 less than what was spent last year.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the hon. gentleman explain what the item on page C—68 of the Auditor General's Report for advertising consists of?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is the advertising of passports issued by this Department at a certain rate, and informing people who wish to have passports to apply to the Department of the Secretary of State.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What countries are they needed in?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I could not state the number of countries where they are needed; but we have issued a large number, although not such a large number as would warrant the expenditure of advertising.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has taken particular care that these advertisements should come before the eyes of the travelling public at large by advertising in the *Hull Vallée d'Ottawa*, the *Ottawa Canada*, the *Montreal Prix Courant*, the *Montreal Trait d'Union*, the *Three Rivers Journal* and the *Winnipeg Emigrant*. It does not strike me that, for instance, the *Ottawa Canada* is a journal of such wide circulation, and so much read by the travelling public, that the hon. gentleman should have spent \$134 to advertise passports in it. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain why he selected these special papers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I suppose the advertisements were asked for and given, as in every other Department, and as my hon. friend would have given them had he been in my place.

Mr. CASEY. We are not discussing what I would have done, but what the hon. gentleman has done. I want to know from him why he has chosen to advertise a matter of passports, which concerns the travelling public alone, in papers having a purely local circulation?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I suppose other papers put larger advertisements or they might have advertised that before. The advertisements were given to the newspapers when they were asked for, and it happens that this particular advertisement has been given to the papers mentioned.

Mr. CASEY. The necessity was this, that the newspaper which applies for an advertisement gets it, and the Minister does not exercise any discretion as to the usefulness of advertising in one paper.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No. Sometimes I exercise my discretion and refuse.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are losing our population quick enough without advertising passports to send them away. Hon. gentlemen should take steps to keep what we have got and bring in others.

Mr. CASEY. Without wishing to be hypercritical at all, I notice that the amount of travelling expenses last year in this Department came within a few dollars of \$1,500, of which the hon. Minister himself spent \$379, Mr. L. H. Tache \$616, Mr. F. Colson \$350, and there are other smaller sums. I do not say that these expenditures are wrong, but I think they are large enough to require explanation.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I must confess that some of these travelling expenses are rather large, but the expenditure has been incurred for the business of the office. My Department is not the same as it was, and a good deal of work has been required in connection with the printing bureau which has rendered necessary a considerable amount of travelling. It may be that a less amount should be required, and I can only say that, unless it is necessary to expend so much, the amount shall be smaller in future.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is another item which I think requires explanation. There is charged for postage in Ottawa \$239.40, and for postage in France \$12.14. There is also another item which I am surprised to see: cab hire in France for the Hon. J. A. Chapleau, \$9.53. I cannot understand why we should pay cab hire not only here but in France.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have been more surprised than my hon. friend to see that last item, but I dare say, during my stay in France on business last year, there may have been something to be transacted by the Department, which was not done by me, but must have been done by a clerk or an officer of the Canadian agency there, who put it to my account. I assure my hon. friend that the whole of my cab hire in France was paid by myself. I am perfectly sure that whatever this was, it was in no way disconnected with the business of the Department or of the Government. I may add that the postage in my Department is very large. I have already stated that I am obliged to be the writer or the scrivener for the whole of the Departments. I write letters on behalf of Her Majesty in this country in every direction, and I am charged with postage for all Departments inside and outside, even for letters sent to foreign officers and foreign Governments. The postage is large, but I am sure that my hon. friend does not mean to say either that we are using postage stamps for our own purposes, or that this was not an expenditure warranted by the business of the Department. I am sorry that there is such a large amount for cab hire for myself, but, as my hon. friends know, I have been for two or three years in not very excellent health. I am sure they will be rejoiced to know that next year I will be able to walk more as a man in good health, and will not require to be driven so much as before.

Mr. McMULLEN. The statement of the hon. gentleman confirms the charge which has often been made from this side, that cabs are often hired by other parties than the Minister, and this statement in regard to the item I referred to shows that this is true, and that these items may be put in without his knowledge and consent and without his knowing anything of the debt. This is a matter which requires the attention of the House, the attention of the Opposition, and the immediate attention of the Government and every member of it. Then,

in regard to the postage question, no doubt that postage is handled by the officers of the Department. If the hon. gentleman has an officer who charged \$9.53 for cab hire improperly—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Not improperly.

Mr. McMULLEN. May not a certain quantity of the postage be improperly charged? I find a very peculiar item here: of 75 cents for a bottle of alcohol. It does not say whether that was purchased in France, or in Ottawa, or anywhere else. It is a small item, but perhaps the Minister required it. I think, however, it would be better to have these small amounts brought in at the end of the statement in future without such detail as that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If my hon. friend had been in my Department, perhaps the amount might have been larger, but I should think that ~~most~~ have been bought in France, for the price is very cheap.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think there is another item which requires some explanation. On page A 9, we find Arthur Arcand, extra clerk, Secretary of State Department, 365 days, \$912.50. The same gentleman who is paid that amount for the whole 365 days, also gets \$500 for engrossing the Commons Address to Lord Lansdowne.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have already stated that Mr. Arcand is one of the artists in the Department—and he is an artist—who do the engrossing work. He was paid out of contingencies, and one of the reasons for the decrease of \$2,000 arises from the fact that we pay him \$2 a day on the permanent staff. He does not work less than the necessary hours, and, if he has illuminated an address to one of the Governors of this country, surely the hon. gentleman will not grudge him the small pay he received for what he did for the House of Commons.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I now understand that this gentleman's services are worth \$2 a day.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, at least.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman paid him \$1,412.50 for last year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; \$912.50.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman paid him \$2 a day for the whole 365 days, but during a portion of that time he earned \$500 extra.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He might earn \$3,000 extra if he did work outside of his office hours, in illuminating. I think that work was done for the House of Commons and not for the Department. I may say, in regard to the three or four men who are employed in that sort of work, that better men, more conscientious men, more economical men, could not be found, and that not an hour is lost in the performance of their duty and not a dollar is paid to them more than is necessary for the performance of that duty. If they choose to work outside at night, it is their business and not ours what others may pay them. My report shows the work the clerks in my Department have been doing during the year, and no reflection or remark can be passed upon those gentlemen without a great deal of injustice.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not wish to pass any remarks that would be unjust to any one, but the Minister will see himself that fixing the salary at \$2 per day—I do not know whether that would include 365 days or not—

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We were paying \$2.50 per day, and now they are appointed as permanent officers with a regular salary.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). These 365 days include Sundays.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, he does not ask them to work on Sundays?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, Sir.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is about \$3 that he has as an extra clerk. It will be to the credit of the Secretary of State if he has secured a man worth \$3 a day to work for \$2.50.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He gets \$2.50 a day, and I must say that he does more work than he is paid for.

Mr. CASEY. In that case, why not pay him according to his work? You are cheating the man.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If my hon. friend was paid \$500 to illuminate an address, and if he was paid a salary in proportion to the commissions that are received by hon. gentlemen opposite as Queen's Counsel, he would make \$3,000 a year. I may say that Mr. Arcand, Mr. Drouin and Mr. Matton were in the United States, and one of them refused a great deal higher salary than he could have commanded here.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How long was it after the Address was passed by the House of Commons, before it was, presented to Lord Lansdowne?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know; that is not my business. I answer for my Department, and, I suppose, that is enough. I do not pay the money myself.

Mr. CASEY. It is an extraordinary fact that the Civil Service employes of this House should be so much more patriotic than the members of the Government. Men who will refuse higher salaries in the United States to work for lower salaries here, are scarce in the country, and I congratulate the Secretary of State upon having some of them in his Department. I am not finding any fault with Mr. Arcand at all, nor do I think that my hon. friend from Brant is finding fault with him for taking this money. But we want to understand how it was that there were 365 days in the year in the Secretary of State's Department, and \$912 was paid by the Department, including Sundays. Being paid for Sundays, on which no man may work, may explain it. There is an item for extra clerks and messengers which will be found on page C 22. The details amount to \$5,297. I think this amount is too much to be paid out in contingencies. I have no doubt that the Minister has been long enough in his Department to be able to form a good idea, from year to year, how many of these people are wanted. I think we ought to take a special vote for extra clerks and messengers, instead of paying them out of contingencies. I have no doubt that he can explain this item all right. Whether he has paid these men for 365 days, I cannot say.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I agree with my hon. friend. When the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, it was the custom to keep what were called supernumerary or temporary clerks employed

from year to year, and after a number of years they were put upon the permanent staff. I think my hon. friend will find that this year a very good step has been taken in this direction. I have pointed out that the expenses for contingencies last year were \$11,000, and I do not think my contingencies this year will reach more than the amount that I have asked for. I agree with my hon. friend that when an officer is put upon the permanent list he should no longer be charged to contingencies. I have tried to do so, and I am going to do so, as far as my Department is concerned.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will the Secretary of State please explain who fixed the price for the engraving of this Address?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I say he was not paid from my Department. My Department had nothing to do with it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to know who did it?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When the proper Department is under discussion my hon. friend will repeat his question.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like information with regard to postage. As I understood the other day when the Government explained this matter, it is only the foreign postage that is charged to the several Departments. As I understood the Secretary of State to say to-day, he is charged with postage for letters sent.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; I pay the correspondence for the whole Dominion.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Well, in the Dominion?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Outside the Dominion, also.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is only the postage outside the Dominion, not postage inside the Dominion.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In the Dominion we do not have to pay.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to have an explanation with regard to this, because the Finance Minister gave us information the other day to the effect that each Department has the right to frank their own letters. Well, if the Secretary of State's Department has a right to frank all letters that circulate in the Dominion, certainly the business of his Department must pertain more particularly to the Dominion of Canada than to foreign countries. If it is only the foreign postage which is charged to his Department, then I think this is a very large amount.

Mr. HAGGART. His Department is charged with the postage to Great Britain and the United States, and other foreign countries. It is not in the Dominion.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What the hon. gentleman stated to the House led us to believe it was the postage for the Dominion.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; you would have a great deal larger amount than that. All the business and exchanges of documents between the Dominion Government and the High Commissioner amounts to a large item—I do not speak for the House of Commons—all this is sent to my Department—and we have to pay postage on it. I have already protested against that. I say that I have to pay postage on business that does not belong to my

Department. I have contended that the correspondence with the High Commissioner should be charged to the President of the Council. There is other correspondence, of which I will give an example. The result of the explorations of the *Challenger* has been presented to two or three universities in Europe, two or three in England, and one was presented to the Library, and we are obliged to post them from our Department. Of course, we cannot object to pay a few cents for postage.

Mr. CASEY. I see the hon. Minister has had a good deal of binding done during the year. This item of 312 volumes—would he be able to tell us what they were for?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I suppose that it will be in the next account.

Mr. CASEY. I see that 312 volumes were bound at a cost of \$270.71. I did not know that there was a library in connection with the hon. gentleman's Department.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. gentleman will come to my office he can consult the authorities, for there is a very good reference library, which did not exist when I took office. That library will be there when my hon. friend takes the position as head of the Department.

Mr. CASEY. Of course I shall be gratified to find that library in existence. It seems, however, to be a wrong principle that each Department should establish a supplementary library. There is a general library here, and reference books can be had by any of the Departments on sending a messenger over. The principle of forming supplementary libraries for each of the Departments is certainly one that should not be encouraged.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the Minister give some explanation in regard to advertising the statutes?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We are obliged to advertise the statutes. When the Bill that was passed two years ago came into force we were obliged to advertise books for sale, instead of giving them away. We have advertised the sale of statutes pretty largely, and the returns are encouraging, compared with previous years.

Mr. LANDERKIN. A few years ago the statutes were supplied to magistrates. Many of the magistrates have complained recently to me that they have not been furnished with copies of the statutes, but only with portions that refer to criminal law. No less than \$758.58 have been expended in advertising the sale of statutes, and if these had been given to the magistrates, the expenditure would have been a more judicious one.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It would have cost twenty times the amount, and produce no greater results.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There would have been very little additional outlay, and probably the administration of justice would have been more efficiently carried out.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The magistrates receive not only the criminal laws, but the revision, and every public Act which concerns the administration of justice.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But the magistrates complain that the statutes they receive are in pamphlet

form, whereas formerly they received the statutes in bound form. It is impossible to preserve those now received by them, and they are frequently obliged to send here and there to get other copies in order to adjudicate upon cases. I contend that it would be much better to expend money in giving magistrates the statutes in proper form, than in advertising in newspapers that the Government have a number of the statutes on hand for sale.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When the magistrates have received a certain number of pamphlets they might send notice of having such a collection, and possibly I might ask a vote of the House to have them bound.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. In advertising statutes for sale, it must be remembered that the hon. gentleman has expended more for advertising the statutes than he has received from the sale of copies. The sales amounted to \$619.27, while the expenses for advertising reached \$757.57, or an excess of \$136.30. I do not think business men would conduct business in that way.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They always begin in that way; they spend money in advertising first, and make money afterwards.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If they did so, they would lose money continuously. The Secretary of State has undoubtedly used bad judgment in this matter. Moreover, the advertisements with respect to the statutes are confined to a very limited district. The hon. gentleman evidently imagines that people residing outside the Ottawa valley do not require the statutes for their guidance. The Secretary of State has evidently shown too much good nature in dealing with newspapers. The hon. gentleman admits that he gave the advertisements to those who came to solicit them, but he should have had backbone enough to refuse them when he was satisfied that it was not in the public interest that money should be expended in that way. I call the Minister's attention to this subject as it cannot be justified, and I fancy the hon. gentleman will not attempt to justify it.

Mr. CASEY. There is a remarkable connection between the manner in which advertisements are given out by the Secretary of State's Department and by the Queen's Printer. The names of the *Vallée d'Ottawa* of Hull, *Montreal Prix Courant*, *Montreal Traité d'Union*, *Three Rivers Journal*, appear in both accounts. I notice that scarcely an English paper, except the *Winnipeg Emigrant*, appears in the list of the Secretary of State's Department. In advertising the sale of statutes we find only *United Canada*, the *Ottawa Journal*, and the *Waterloo Journal* as English newspapers, and the Minister surely should exercise some discretion in giving out advertisements. If they are meant to be of any use, they should be given to papers that are read. In the list there are only two or three papers which English-speaking citizens are able to read. As for the others, the papers are of small circulation and influence even for French papers. The hon. gentleman must give some justification of the way in which he has spent this considerable sum on advertising, beyond that of first come first served.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the remark had been made by one of the thirteen of the party of Equal Rights, I could have understood it, but I am surprised it should have come from the hon.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

gentleman. These advertisements are small and the larger ones are kept for other newspapers. I know this has not, however, been done with a view to make any discrimination, and I am sure there has been no favoritism in the direction in which the hon. gentleman appears to insinuate.

Mr. CASEY. If there has been no favoritism, it is a very remarkable coincidence that nearly all the papers receiving advertising should be papers in the hon. gentleman's own language, of which the bulk of the people of Ontario are ignorant. I have no fault to find with advertising in French newspapers. I believe the use of the two languages is absolutely necessary, and for that reason these advertisements should be published in English as well as in French.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) and the Secretary of State are viewing this question from wholly different standpoints. The hon. member for Elgin is regarding the question purely from a utilitarian standpoint, as to what the public are to gain by the publication of these advertisements. That is not the point from which the Secretary of State considers the question. He is trying to hold the balance evenly between various applicants for charity. Now, the hon. gentleman states that small papers receive small advertisements, for which small sums are paid, but papers of more influence and wider circulation receive advertisements of greater value; and so, the more influential the paper and the greater the circulation, the greater the value of the advertisements received. That might be a very charitable and magnanimous thing on the part of the Minister to do, but then there is the further consideration of the advantage that the public ought to derive. It does seem to me that it would be well worth the Minister's serious consideration to look at the question from the standpoint put forward by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), and see what the public are to gain by this advertising in newspapers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the Secretary of State what need there is to advertise the sale of the statutes? I do not think there is a lawyer, magistrate or any other person in the Dominion who, if he wants a Dominion statute, does not know that they emanate from the Government at Ottawa and that they can be obtained here.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is this difference: Every one was under the impression that the statutes were given away for nothing, and we have advertised so as to disabuse their minds of that impression and to let them know that they are to be paid for.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You might as well give the statutes for nothing as to fritter away the value of them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That question I have answered.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would ask the Secretary of State what is the difference financially between the position of giving the statutes for nothing and advertising them for sale at a loss? If he had given the statutes for nothing to all who applied for them, the Government would be about \$137 in pocket. It is a ridiculous exhibition to advertise statutes for sale and pay \$137 more for advertising than is received for the sale. The Minister has

sacrificed more by advertising than if he gave the statutes away for nothing.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. And he has only informed the public partially, because the great mass of the people of the Dominion must be still laboring under the impression that the statutes are to be had for nothing. It is only those who reside in the vicinity of Ottawa, and Three Rivers, and Montreal, who know that the statutes are charged for. It will, therefore, be necessary for the Secretary of State to inform the other portions of the Dominion, by advertisement, that the statutes are for sale, and we may have a duplicate account for this next year. I think the Secretary of State had better own up that he made a mistake when he inserted these advertisements and showed the partiality which he did. The Secretary of State says it is a small matter; but I find that *Le Canada*, of Ottawa, received \$181.72 for advertising those statutes and \$134.80 for advertising "passports." Those are not very trifling items for those two small advertisements. I think the Secretary of State will have to give some better excuse for this wasteful expenditure of public money.

Mr. CASEY. I must again call the attention of the Minister to the very large item of \$5,274 for extra clerks and messengers in the Queen's Printer's Department. I hope the Minister will be able to give me the same assurance in regard to this as he did in regard to the other items—that he is going to put such men as are necessary on the permanent staff, and not hire them out of contingencies.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. A number of these officers have been put on the permanent staff during the year. On account of the peculiar circumstances of the printing office a great deal of extra work which had to be done in the past will be done in the regular course of the Department when completely established.

Mr. CASEY. The next item is one which requires a little more explanation. It reads: Carter and horse, J. Donovan, \$1,200. The idea of paying a carter \$100 a month seems to be extraordinary, and, unless the Minister explains it on the ground of skilled labor, I do not see how it can be justified. I think it would be cheaper to buy a horse and rig and hire a carter.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If I thought it would be cheaper I would recommend it, but I think it is not. This is the man who has charge of the transfer of blue-books and stationery, &c., from one Department to another, and I think the service is well and properly done, and done with great economy.

Mr. CASEY. That is the man who brings the blue-books around?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, I believe so.

Mr. CASEY. That is no explanation as to the amount of this charge. He uses a one-horse rig, for I am quite familiar with its appearance, and the idea of paying a man \$100 a month for such a service as that is something outrageous.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is speaking of something he does not know, and I do not say that to be unpleasant to my hon. friend. I can say that the work to be done is very laborious. This man has a horse, and another man is along with him doing the work. If the hon. gentleman

can get me a man to do the work as well at the same or a lower price I will give him a job.

Mr. CASEY. If a man goes along with him he must be paid extra, for there is only a charge for one man here.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the Minister please explain the item of \$245.45 for advertising the *Canada Gazette*.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I cannot say exactly, but I think it is in connection with the advertising of those making applications to Parliament. While on my feet I may say that this year, for the first time, the *Canada Gazette* has yielded a surplus instead of a deficit.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it not a fact that a calculation was made some time ago with regard to the first six months' work done by the Printing Bureau under Government supervision, as compared with a similar period under the contractors, that that statement was intended for the information of this House, and that being found to tell against the Government supervision it has been withheld?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend must know that I am not in the habit of concealing anything, even if it is something which may necessitate an improvement. The information of which my hon. friend speaks I have asked for, and before the Session is over I will present to Parliament a comparative statement of what we have paid before, what we are paying now, and what we shall have to pay if the system is continued. I do not know whether the statement has been sent to me or not, but if it has been it will not be withheld from the House; and if it should be withheld I know that the first man who would look for it is my hon. friend.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I merely asked whether it was correct that such a statement was prepared, and kept back because it was unfavorable to the Government?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Contingencies—Department of Public Works..... \$7,000

Mr. CASEY. The personal expenses of Mr. Roy are such as to require explanation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My travelling expenses, as the hon. gentleman sees, are only \$51. When I travel I always take my private secretary, Mr. Roy, with me, for when I am absent from my Department for weeks together, my correspondence follows me, and I transact the business with my private secretary during my absence. Of course, I do not charge for my travelling expenses, unless I am travelling in the public service. While on this subject, I may refer to the charge of \$326 for postage. When I am absent from Ottawa I frank the letters I send away, and the post office which receives them charges the postage against my Department, because, according to the law, I understand the franking privilege is limited to the Capital.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman's own travelling expenses, considering the amount of work he has to do and the necessity he is under of visiting various parts of the country, certainly stand in a highly favorable contrast with most of the items of that sort, and are as low as anybody could reason-

ably expect them to be. I must here, however, again protest against the formation of a departmental reading room, as shown in the cost of the newspapers. I also notice a charge of \$2,165 for stationery, which, I think, is so large that it should be estimated for especially, and apart from contingencies.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The quantity of stationery, the hon. gentleman will see, must vary according to the work to be done and the number of persons employed. Besides, according to the Order in Council regulating this matter, the stationery is supplied only on requisition from each Department, and the requisition is sent by the Deputy Minister in such a way as to limit the quantity supplied.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Does the private secretary sometimes travel without the Minister?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How does the hon. Minister account for the expenditure of \$51 for himself for travelling expenses, while his secretary has spent \$611.90? If the secretary only went with the Minister and made no independent trips, how does it come that his expenses are so heavy?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It may appear so by the figures, but I only charge to the Government such expenses as I incur in the public service. If I go, however, travelling for recreation, which I require as well as any other man, of course I bring my private secretary with me and my correspondence follows me; and my private secretary must be paid, of course, his travelling expenses.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is this system carried out by the other Ministers of the Crown? Are they as economical as the hon. gentleman?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know what are the habits of my colleagues. I am speaking for myself.

Mr. WILSON. Will the hon. gentleman inform me whether, in the item for departmental contingencies, the expenses of the survey of Kettle Bridge canal is included? I moved for a return, but have been unable to get it up to the present. Has any provision been made, and, if so, what amount to defray the expenses of that survey?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not included in this, and the return will come down very soon.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. Minister has not stated whether there is any hope of these large subscriptions to newspapers being reduced.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The list of newspapers is now being looked into, in my Department, with a view of reducing that item considerably. I could not do it before, having had too much to do, but gave orders to have it done as soon as possible.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot avoid urging upon the Government the suggestion I made the other day—that, instead of there being a departmental reading room for each Department, there should be a central Press Bureau, where all the papers would be taken, and where a clerk would look over them and cut out and send to each Department the items concerning it. That would save the subscription of twelve sets of newspapers, and ensure better information for the Departments than is obtained under the present system.

Mr. CASEY.

Contingencies—Post Office Department..... \$35,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This is an increase of \$10,000 over the Estimates last year.

Mr. HAGGART. It is, but it is a decrease in the expenditure. Last year we estimated too low, and the expenditure was \$40,372. The amount now asked is \$5,000 less than that. I intend, I suppose, to expend just as much on my contingencies this year as last, less the amount of clerks taken from the non-permanent list and put on the permanent list.

Mr. CASEY. There are two ways of fixing these accounts when the expenditure goes beyond the estimate. One is to reduce the expenditure, and the other is to increase the estimates. My hon. friend has chosen the latter plan, and he may be able to keep within these \$35,000, but this is the largest amount asked by any Department for contingencies, and it is too large an amount to be left at the disposal of any Minister. No doubt the hon. gentleman could show exactly how last year's vote was spent, and very possibly would show it was justifiably spent, but \$44,000 is more than should be left at the disposal of any Minister, and when the contingencies of an office amount to that sum they should be estimated for as separate items. If we look through the accounts of this Department for last year, we see the item of \$12,312 for extra clerks and messengers. The hon. gentleman has led us to expect that a large amount of that will be knocked off by making some of the clerks permanent. Next year I hope this item will have almost disappeared, because it is one that should not exist. I find again nearly \$11,000 under the head of stationery and office printing and binding. That is too large a sum to be at loose ends in the Department of any Minister. Here is an amount for binding of \$2,063. What could the hon. Minister of this Department have wanted with that \$2,000 of binding out of contingencies, as there is a provision in the regular Estimates for binding the reports of these Departments.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is this provision?

Mr. CASEY. On page C 72 of the Auditor General's Report. The very last item there is a charge for binding of \$2,063.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman asked why it is I paid \$2,063 for binding when there was a provision in the Estimates of last year for binding besides this. Where is that provision?

Mr. CASEY. There is a provision for publishing the reports of each Department which is not to be paid out of contingencies.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is that provision?

Mr. CASEY. The item should be charged as an item of binding, and not in contingencies. It is easy to know the number of reports that require binding.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman may be right, but this is the way it has always been done.

Mr. CASEY. But the hon. gentleman is a new broom and ought to sweep clean.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find on page C 47 for calculating interest, \$1,848.11. I suppose this is in connection with the contingencies in the Post Office savings banks? I would just draw attention to the salaries paid to some of those officers. For

instance, Mr. Walter Rowan is paid twelve months' salary as postmaster, \$1,200, and for computing interest he is paid \$32.62 besides. There is Richard Shaw, who receives for his twelve months' salary as postmaster, \$1,400, and for computing interest, \$28.21. There is J. R. Smith, salary as postmaster, \$1,400, and in addition to that for computing interest, he receives \$47.55. I would like to ask upon what principle this computation of interest is paid for, and how it is that postmasters who are engaged in the employment of this Dominion, and are receiving the respectable salaries of \$1,200 and \$1,400 each, receive this amount in addition for computing the interest on deposit receipts. I do not understand why men who are paid such liberal salaries are allowed to charge the country for the work of a few moments in computing the interest of these receipts.

Mr. HAGGART. I explained this matter last year. This work requires a certain amount of intelligence and aptitude in making the calculation, which are wanted at stated times, and it has been found that the better plan is to employ those who are engaged in that work generally and to keep them for longer hours for this particular purpose. It is the form which, I think, is adopted in England; it is the form which is adopted in the United States. These men are conversant with the books and the accounts with which they have to deal, and it has been found practically that they are the parties who alone would be capable of doing this work. There was a proposition to put an amount in the Estimates to pay for this work being done, but it was found that the only practicable way was to employ these parties who understand the books to do this work during extra hours.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are these parties who have so much intelligence and knowledge of the work, those who are named here as postmasters?

Mr. HAGGART. No; these are parties who are employed in the inside service—in the Savings Bank Department.

Mr. CASEY. The Postmaster General seemed to misunderstand me in regard to what I said as to the estimates for printing and binding. At page 30 of the Estimates, under the head of Legislation, there is an item for binding newspapers, &c., \$2,000. Then there is another item for printing, binding and distributing the laws, \$1,000 (which was \$6,000 last year). There is another item for printing, printing paper and book-binding, of \$75,000.

Mr. HAGGART. That is for the House of Commons.

Mr. CASEY. This, I think, includes the issuing of departmental reports, because there is no book-binding done in any other shape, that I am aware of, except the binding of the reports.

Contingencies—Department of Agriculture \$20,000

Mr. CASEY. Why is there such an amount charged for postage in this Department?

Mr. CARLING. It is on account of the large amount of literature sent to the old country.

Mr. McMULLEN. In reference to Mr. George Johnson, who is down for twelve months' salary, \$2,400, I would ask if that gentleman is a permanent officer?

Mr. CARLING. He is now a permanent officer, but last year he was paid out of contingencies.

Contingencies—Department of Marine, \$9,000

Mr. CASEY. Who are all these gentlemen who had so much allowed for their travelling expenses last year?

Mr. TUPPER. There was Captain McElhinney, who was allowed for bringing out the Government steamer. Then there were Mr. Chipman's moving expenses from England to Ottawa; and Mr. Anderson, who is the engineer of the Department—his expenses have been charged to contingencies instead of to the works on which he has been engaged.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that C. C. Chipman is down for a large amount.

Mr. TUPPER. That is in consequence of his removal from the High Commissioner's Office in London to Canada. There are vouchers for all the expenditures.

Mr. CASEY. I enter the same protest here as I did in regard to the Department of Printing and Stationery. I think it ought to be estimated for separately.

Contingencies—Department of Fisheries \$3,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe that it is the custom to pay for 365 days in the year in the Department of the Secretary of State, and in the Department of Fisheries, and at Rideau Hall. I should like to know if that is a confirmed principle in all the Departments, that all men, when they are hired by the day are paid for every day, including Sundays?

Mr. TUPPER. Extra clerks are paid for every day, including Sundays.

Committee rose; and, it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Care of and cleaning Departmental Buildings \$20,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is included in this item?

Mr. FOSTER. The caring and cleaning of the departmental buildings. The details are to be found in the Auditor General's Report, C 74.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think that you will find that the cleaning and repairing of these buildings are already taken under the heading of departmental buildings, and that if that be the case you ought not to have such a large item as this. We find charwomen paid for cleaning, washing, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that this does not take place in any of the Departments, with the exception of two or three persons in one Department, I think. That Department, if I mistake not, is the Privy Council, in which there are a few women whose services have been paid for by that Department, and that arrangement has not been disturbed. They are old servants who have been employed for a considerable time, and always paid in that way.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Would the Minister explain why it is that in giving the number of days there are 365 counted, for which employes are paid? Do these people work Sundays and Saturdays all the year round? You will notice that on page 74 C, and further down, you will find some credited with 366 days. Has the Government added another day to the year?

Mr. FOSTER. That may be for great merit.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the rule with regard to employes? Are they allowed for Sundays and Saturdays too?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that there are two classes; there is the first, under the heading of laborers, those are persons who are employed by the year; and the others are paid by the year, the number of days being stated. How the 366 days apply in two cases, I do not quite know, unless there may have been something running over from another year.

Mr. CARLING. Leap year.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Would it not be better just to charge for working days—312?

Mr. FOSTER. These laborers are employed every day. They have to keep the fires going.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that in all the Departments all the hands are paid for 365 days' work.

Mr. FOSTER. In this Department?

Mr. McMULLEN. Throughout the several Departments. I notice here, that the Finance Minister makes an exception in case of the women; they are paid for only 312 days. Can he explain how it is that women are not paid for Sundays, while men are?

Mr. FOSTER. Because the women do not work on Sunday.

Mr. McMULLEN. Neither do the men work on Sunday.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, they do.

Mr. McMULLEN. They do not at Rideau Hall. Gardeners do not work on Sunday, I hope.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not on that item now.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to remind the Minister that when we come to that item we will want explanations about it.

Printing Bureau—Cleaning, &c..... \$3,300

Mr. INNES. This is a large item for that purpose, and I think we ought to have some explanation from the Secretary of State.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a new item, because the Printing Bureau is a new establishment. It was not included under the general head for cleaning, and, I believe, for this reason: that being a printing bureau, and having all the paraphernalia which is necessary to a printing bureau, it was thought best to have persons there to see after its cleaning and its care, who are kept permanently, and they are in some way under the supervision of the Bureau, while all these others are under the superintendence of Mr. Conroy, who is paid for that purpose. Probably some one who is acquainted with the management of a printing office on a large scale would understand why that was necessary. Anyway, it has not been estimated for under the

Mr. FOSTER.

heading of Departments generally, but it is estimated for by itself. I am not sure whether that includes the caretaker or not.

Mr. INNES. Of course, we know that this is a separate Department, but it is quite a new establishment, and it seems to me that this is a very large amount indeed to charge for cleaning it. There are only two or three large apartments. I cannot understand why so much money should be required for cleaning a new establishment where everything is supposed to be in spick-and-span order.

Mr. FOSTER. It is for cleaning, &c. That may include some caretaking.

Mr. INNES. That would come under the Department of the Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery. There are two messengers and a caretaker. That cannot be included in the cleaning of the establishment.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make a note of that, and bring down the information.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It seems absurd to vote \$3,300 to take care of that new building and to keep it clean. Any one who has been in the building knows that it is a splendid building for the purpose, and there can be nothing required in the way of cleaning it except sweeping. It is possible that cleaning means caring for the machinery.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably it does. I know there is some good explanation for it, because it passed under review at the time we considered the estimates, and it was considered to be a fair item to put in.

Administration of Justice..... \$66,090

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. An increase of \$1,500 is asked on account of the vote of last year being insufficient.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). According to the Auditor General's Report, the Minister did not expend the whole appropriation by \$6,987. I cannot, therefore, understand why an increased amount is required.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The amount was expended last year and a small sum over.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). With regard to travelling expenses of judges in Manitoba: do we require to pay as large a sum for travelling expenses now, when there are railroads through many parts of the country?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At that time the Supreme Court of the North-West Territories was not established. We had stipendiary magistrates, and they were allowed a round sum of \$1,000 each for travelling expenses. Since that time we have paid the actual moving expenses, and a *per diem* allowance besides.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Only a little over \$2,000 were expended last year, and yet the Minister is asking for over \$4,000 this year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The sum depends on the amount of business to be done each year. We have been accustomed to take a vote of \$4,000, which is always sufficient and sometimes more than sufficient, and last year we had about \$1,000 over. Still, I would prefer to take the usual vote. The scale of payment for travelling expenses is

fixed, but the total amount expended, of course, depends on the amount of business to be done at the various points at which the judges hold courts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the item of \$9,000 for judges in British Columbia, I notice there is an increase of \$3,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This increase is in consequence of the appointment of the county court judges authorised last Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the Minister compute the white population of British Columbia to be? It really appears to me that the expenditure for judges in British Columbia exceeds reasonable bounds. We have five principal judges and four county court judges for a Province whose population, at the latest date of which we have authentic statements, did not exceed 55,000.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 60,000, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is out of all proportion to the number in other Provinces. Manitoba, with twice the white population, has eight judges instead of nine, and I need not say that the number compares very disadvantageously with that of the larger Provinces, where, however, the population is gathered more closely together. We have allowed this matter to be fairly run into the ground, and I cannot see why nine judges should be required for so small a population as that of British Columbia. I am well aware that the judges have to travel great distances.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has stated the best reason that can be given, and that is, the great distances in that country. The figures were before me when I proposed last Session to take authority for the appointment of county court judges. It is true, as the hon. gentleman says, that the staff is much larger in proportion to the population, and that the cost of the administration of justice is much larger proportionately than that of any of the other Provinces. Seven or eight years ago the Provincial Legislature passed an Act providing for the establishment of county courts, and at that time, from negotiations carried on between the two Governments, it was considered sufficient, to meet the views of the Province for the time being, that an additional judge should be appointed to the Supreme Court, and the positions of county court judges remained unfilled. That was done, but, in consequence of the growth of the various settlements and to secure vigorous administration of justice, the Provincial Government has continuously pressed the appointment of county court judges. In the Act of last Session we did not make provision for the appointment of county court judges in all the courts established by the Provincial statute. We made provision for three, I think, and, as a result of the improved communication in the country and of localising the judiciary, the travelling expenses of the judges are from 50 to 60 per cent. less than they were six or seven years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In addition to those nine gentlemen to whom we are paying in British Columbia \$40,000 a year, pensions are paid to five stipendiary magistrates, or county court judges, who were retired at the time of the incorporation of British Columbia into the Dominion, and they receive pensions amounting to

\$8,000 or \$9,000. It was understood at the time the pensions were given, that if it should be found necessary again to employ county court judges, their services would be utilised, if they were proper persons to serve, as they were represented to be. None of them have been re-employed by the Government; so that, as a result, we have four county judges on full pay with allowances, and we have also these stipendiary or county court judges who were superannuated a few years ago.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Those gentlemen on the superannuation list were, as the hon. gentleman will remember, appointees of the Crown when the Province was a separate colony. It was under the arrangement with the home Government at the time of Union that we provided pensions for them. Not one of them has the qualification for a county court judge. They were really stipendiary magistrates and not county judges, and not one of them was a lawyer, I believe. I think one or two are settled in the Province, but they are not lawyers.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the Minister mean to conclude that the British Government, a Government which is so particular to appoint efficient officers, especially on the judiciary, appointed men who were really unfit to be re-appointed, now that we required them? It was with the understanding that they were to be re-appointed, if thought desirable, that pensions were granted them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have not said that.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is the only inference that can be drawn from the hon. gentleman's remarks.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They really held different offices, and were not properly county court judges, although they may appear so on the superannuation list. They were, in fact, police magistrates.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think these parties were gold commissioners and stipendiary magistrates prior to the Union. Their duties were under the control of the Local Legislature, at all events so far as they were gold commissioners; and, if I remember aright, it was provided at the time of the Union that their pensions would fall on the Treasury here, and not on the Provincial Treasury.

Mr. MITCHELL. They had the power to determine in civil matters, which is one of the powers of the county court judges.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Gold Commissioners Act was passed after the Union, I think. I remember that it formed the subject of correspondence as to its being *ultra vires*. I think at the time of the Union they were not gold commissioners.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is one of the bad bargains we got from British Columbia. We have had a good many of them and among others we can refer to Mr. Trutch.

Mr. FOSTER. But we have large profits.

Four Official Arbitrators, at \$1,000 each. \$4,000

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That item was formerly in the Estimates under Public Works. The arbitrators are not arbitrators properly so called, but are referees of the Exchequer Court, and it has

been considered proper to transfer the vote to the Department of Justice. This vote will be dropped under Public Works this year. It is for the same salaries as last year and the same parties.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it not a fact that the duties of the arbitrators since the establishment of the Exchequer Court are now nearly all discharged by one man. I see by reference to the Auditor General's Report, that one of the arbitrators received \$1,365.49 last year for travelling expenses, out of a total vote of \$1,500. If he consumed nearly all the vote for travelling expenses he must have discharged nearly all the duties.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The duties are not all discharged by one person. The item which appears there is, I presume, an item for only one Department, probably Railways or Public Works. The referees are Mr. Cowan, Mr. Crompton, Mr. Muma and Mr. Simard, and all of them have been employed more or less. Mr. Cowan is very aged, Mr. Simard has been somewhat unwell, and Mr. Crompton has a good deal of work and so has Mr. Muma. Besides the duties of these gentlemen as referees of the court, they usually assist as referees for the purpose of investigating claims of the Government before they are litigated. In some cases, instead of their expenses being charged to the Arbitrations and Awards, they are charged to the work in respect to which their expenses have been incurred; and in other instances, I believe, they have been paid out of the contingencies of the court.

Mr. INNES. Mr. Cowan is a very old man. Is he able to travel at all?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I see there is an item here for him, and I suppose he does. I know he has been discharging his duties at the city of Ottawa within the last twelve months.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Does this \$1,500 in the next item include all the travelling expenses of the arbitrators?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As far as I know it is expected to include all. There has been a good deal of work last year in connection with the Cape Breton Railway, and that, of course, will cease now. I think the \$1,500 will probably include all.

Supreme Court of Canada—Librarian... \$1,000

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That item for a librarian is a new item. The members of the House who are accustomed to attend the library of the court, are no doubt aware, that up to the present time the library has been in charge of a caretaker merely, who has received \$500 or \$600 a year. I need not explain to them, at any rate, that the library is becoming a very large and valuable one, and for its safety, as well as for the convenience of those who resort to it from time to time, an efficient librarian should be provided, capable not only of taking care of the books, but of attending to their classification and arrangement. The vote is a new one, but I think it is a necessary one.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is Mr. Ternent to be the librarian?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I may say that among the members of the bar who attend the Supreme Court, I think there is but one opinion as to the manner in which Mr. Ternent discharges his

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

duties. He has kept the books in very good order, he is exceedingly attentive, and to place him under another person, after he has attended the library so long, would be scarcely fair. I think he has been there ever since the beginning of the court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He was appointed about 1879.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I know that ever since I have been attending the Supreme Court he has been there, and it seems rather hard that he should now be placed in an inferior position, after having acted so long to the satisfaction of the members of the bar and of all others who are in the habit of attending the court. I quite agree with the hon. Minister of Justice that the library is a very valuable one, but its quarters are very inconvenient. A portion of the books are in one room, where the lawyers prepare their briefs, another portion is in another room, marked private, and reserved for the use of the judges, and another portion is in the extreme opposite end of the building. It seems to me that something ought to be done to have the books put together where they would be convenient of access to the professional gentlemen who attend the court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the accommodations for the library are very bad indeed. Last Session I asked the Minister of Public Works to take a vote, which he did, for making an addition to the building, so that new chambers could be provided for the judges, and the rooms now occupied by them could be turned into one and used for a library.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has not assigned any reason why Mr. Ternent should be superseded. I think he is a very competent librarian. I do not think it would be possible to go and enquire for a work, whether a text book or a report, which he could not at once put his hand upon. I do not suppose it has ever fallen to his lot to look after the selection and purchase of the reports; I do not know on whom that devolves.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The registrar.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then, as long as Mr. Ternent is fit for the public service, I do not think a more efficient officer could be had as caretaker and librarian.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am very glad to hear that that is the opinion of my hon. friends opposite. When I said that it was not intended that he should be the librarian, I did not mean to say that he should be superseded and dismissed; on the contrary, a better provision is made for him in the next item than has been made in previous years, and if, on an examination of the whole subject, Mr. Ternent is considered to be as efficient as my hon. friends suppose him to be, this vote will not be used at all. My impression, and the information I have received, though I must admit it is perhaps inadequate in consequence of my going there so little, is that he is not well adapted to be a librarian. I should be glad to be corrected in that respect if I am in error, and this \$1,000 would be saved; but it has been represented that he is not sufficiently educated, and has not had the training, especially in law books, necessary to make him an efficient librarian for so large a library.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My experience has been that Mr. Ternent, for many years back, has discharged the duties of his position with assiduity and intelligence, and has paid very great attention to the wants of those who have used the library. He has been found there at all times, has been courteous and kind in his demeanor, and has a perfect run of the books and can, at any moment, find any that are called for; and the books are kept in capital order. My experience, as well as that of those with whom I have conversed, is that he has in every way discharged his duties as to fairly earn any promotion or increase of salary which the Government should determine upon. I cannot see what necessity there can be for appointing an additional librarian, for I have never met any one who would deny Mr. Ternent's ability to discharge the duties in any way. He is not only a caretaker, but he is an intelligent man, pretty well read, and capable of using his pen; and, taking him all in all, I think he deserves an increase in his salary and the appointment of librarian, if that is to follow.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What my hon. friends opposite say with regard to the appointment is entitled to the greatest possible respect, and in view of that I will drop this vote of \$1,000.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I am very glad of that. I will say another thing: that he looks very sharply after us to see that we return the books. He deserves a great deal of credit for that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The vote of \$700 for the caretaker of the library has been heretofore paid, to the extent of \$500, out of the contingencies of the court; but it is a permanent charge, as we must have such an officer. It is an increase of \$200.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Very well deserved.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is partly accountable by his having to attend, for the convenience of the bar, when the Supreme Court is sitting.

Printing, binding and distributing Supreme Court Reports..... \$2,000

Mr. MITCHELL. To whom are these reports distributed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. To the Supreme Court judges. I think that is the only distribution made of them. All the rest are for sale.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to draw attention to the delay in publishing these reports. I never could understand why they are so far behind time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There has been heretofore a great deal of delay, but I was under the impression that in that respect there was some improvement.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A little.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have spoken to the reporters repeatedly about it, and every Session I have had a report in detail of the number of cases, and the reasons for delay in every case. It so happens that the information was never called for; and if my hon. friend will remind me of this later, I will see that he is furnished with a report. The reason given last Session was, that they had been very much delayed by the printer.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it the intention of the Government to have these printed in the Government Printing Bureau?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is to be hoped that the new type will be better than the old.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I understand steps will be taken to make the necessary additions to the library.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

For the purchase of Law Reports and Text Books for the Supreme Court Library..... \$2,500

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I explained to the House last Session the circumstances under which that vote was asked. The American reports were largely behind, and when I asked the House last Session for a vote I gave the House to understand I would ask the vote this year also, in order to obtain the American report.

Exchequer Court—3rd class clerk..... \$800

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is an increase of \$200. I would explain to the Committee that the organisation of the staff of the Exchequer Court was purely tentative the year before last. We knew nothing of the amount of business which would require to be transacted there or the grade of clerks that would be required. I took the ordinary vote for a third class clerk and a second class clerk, but I think that the amount of business done justifies my request that the vote shall be increased. The officers are the registrar, who receives \$2,000 a year, and a second class clerk at \$1,150. This clerk does a considerable portion of the duties of the registrar when he is absent as referee, as he frequently is, in taking evidence, and besides that, he occasionally acts as registrar to the judge on circuit and does work as a stenographer as well, and in that way undoubtedly saves a very large proportion of a salary. The duties devolving upon the third class clerks are decidedly laborious, and for an active, intelligent and suitable man, the sum of \$800 is as little as can be paid.

Salary of Registrar of the Vice-Admiralty Court, Quebec..... \$666 66

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This is a sort of legacy handed down from old Canada to the Dominion, and in connection with this, I wish to express my regret that the provision for court room in St. John and Halifax hitherto granted, is struck out in the Estimates. Now the registrar and marshal in Quebec are paid a salary in addition to their fees, while the registrar and marshal in other courts have to depend on the fees alone, and I think that the Government ought not to discontinue providing accommodation for these courts. The Vice-Admiralty Court is under the control of the Dominion entirely; and while Halifax is the seat of Government, St. John is not, and no Provincial building is there provided. The Dominion Government should see that provision is made for the holding of this court. Formerly, when the evidence was taken before the registrar, it was not so important, but now the witnesses are examined in court, and it is necessary that room should be provided for their attendance. A case has already occurred in New Brunswick, where the Vice-Admiralty Court had to sit in a criminal trial in a case

of piracy, and they had to use the county court house. One hundred and fifty dollars a year is not a large item, but it gives a very commodious room where the court can meet. The court itself is a very important one, and I hope some steps will be taken to give these courts as much jurisdiction as the High Court of Admiralty of England. I do not know whether any correspondence or communications have lately taken place between the two Governments, but it seems to me to be very important for the Maritime Provinces that the jurisdiction of those courts should be extended. Under the present system, the proceedings are very speedy, and decisions can be reached in a very short time, compared with the proceedings in the ordinary law courts. If this amount, small as it is, is taken away from these judges, you will compel the judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court to find what place he can to hold his court. I think the accommodation should be provided for him, and that the cost should fall upon the Dominion. It is not a Provincial court—the Province has no control over it—but it is controlled entirely by Imperial legislation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I should be very sorry that the cost of furnishing proper accommodation for this court should fall upon the judge, but the view I have taken is that provision for that accommodation should be made by the Provincial Government.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Why?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. For the reason that provision is made for other courts in the Provinces by the Provincial Government, and the Admiralty courts are no more Dominion courts than any other courts in the country. Those courts are established and the judges are appointed for the Provinces. It is true that they act under Imperial legislation; but the judges of the Provincial courts in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are appointed by this Government to do the work of the Province, and I have never heard any pretence that it is incumbent upon this Government to provide for their accommodation. In Halifax, I know that the Vice-Admiralty judge generally occupies the rooms of the Supreme Court. There is always sufficient accommodation for him. Two rooms were fitted up for his accommodation in the basement, and they would have been so fitted up if this provision had never been made. In St. John, there should be a provision made for the accommodation of the judge of this court as in the other Provinces; but it is unreasonable to expect this Government, providing, as we do, the salary of the judge, to provide also a room in which he is to hold his court. It is not at all within my contemplation that the cost of providing the room should fall upon the judge, but I fully expect that provision will be made by the Provincial or municipal authorities. In St. John, I have written to the judge with the view that he should communicate with the Provincial Government in reference to his accommodation. If we are to rent offices for these judges, we must furnish the rooms and provide caretakers, and that means the beginning of a very considerable expense.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. gentleman seems to think that these courts are analogous to the ordinary Provincial courts, but the latter are created by the local authorities. They

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

can either add to the number of judges, or diminish it, or create new courts. It is true, that the power of appointing the judges rests with the Dominion Government in those cases, but in regard to this court the Provincial Government has nothing whatever to do. It is a court entirely outside the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government, both as to its constitution and as to the mode in which it is carried on. In St. John, one difficulty has been, that the county court house is wanted for other purposes. The court house is not only used for the purposes of the courts, but also for the city council. It belongs to the city, and we contend that the city is not obliged to provide the accommodation for this court, and that this court being under an exclusive jurisdiction, it rests upon the Dominion to provide for its accommodation. We do not ask the Government to pay for a caretaker, but the judge is only paid \$600 a year, and the result will be that the court would be held in some small room, where the judge will be in such a position that the court will lack dignity. I do not think the Province will recognise its liability to provide accommodation for the Vice-Admiralty Court. It never has done so. Before Confederation, the appointment was in the hands of the Imperial Government, and since Confederation it has been in the hands of the Dominion Government. In Halifax, the chief justice of the Province happens to be the judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court. In St. John, the judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court is not a member of our bench, but in Nova Scotia the office seems to be connected with the chief justiceship of the Province, and I can understand that the chief justice can easily get the use of the court house. Even in that case, I think it would be proper that provision should be made by this Parliament for the accommodation of that court. The sum is not very large, not really as much as the salaries which are paid to the registrar and marshal at Quebec, the former getting \$666 and the latter \$333, in addition to the fees which the registrar and marshal receive in other places. I think it would be wise to drop those two items rather than to drop this one, because in Halifax and St. John the registrars and marshals depend entirely on fees for payment for their services. I do not think it is fair to continue to pay these amounts and to discontinue the payment for the accommodation of the Vice-Admiralty judges in St. John and Halifax. The Vice-Admiralty Court in St. John is a very important one, and we do not want to have it sitting in such a place as it did sometimes formerly, when it was held in the first room that could be got.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My hon. friend has said that there is a great difference in the organisation of the courts, the Vice-Admiralty Court being under Imperial enactment, and the other Provincial courts being under Dominion enactment. I cannot see what difference that makes. They are all for the benefit of the people of the Province in which they exist, and they are established to do the business of the people of the Province. My hon. friend says the Provincial authorities have never recognised their obligation to provide for the accommodation of these courts. In the Province of Ontario we have the Maritime Courts organised under Dominion legislation, and judges appointed by the Dominion

Government. In some places, that court transacts a good deal of business, but we have never paid one cent for rooms for the judge. In the Province of New Brunswick, I am told—I stand corrected, if the hon. gentleman says I am wrong—there never was any provision made by the Dominion Government for rooms for the judge, until some six or seven years ago. Down to that time the judge's apartments had been furnished just like those of the Superior Court judges, by the Provincial or municipal authorities.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). They were not. For a short time the court house was occasionally used by the late Judge Hazen, and when Sir William Ritchie succeeded him he was not permitted to use the same room.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No expenses devolved upon this Government in connection with this accommodation until six or seven years ago. In Nova Scotia no charge was made for it. My hon. friend says that Judge Hazen was a city judge, and therefore got the use of the building. His successor was a judge of the Supreme Court, the same as in Halifax, and one would suppose that for the same reason, and on the same principle, he might have sat in his own court room with just as much authority, just as much right, whether he sat there as chief justice or otherwise. So it has been in Halifax. The present judge at St. John is a county judge, and I presume the Province furnishes him with suitable apartments as county judge. There may be some merits in the claim which I have not sufficiently weighed, but, so far as I know, it seems to me that the local authorities should take charge of the provision of necessary accommodation.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. gentleman is in error in saying that the Province provides these rooms for the county court judges. The Province does not provide any court rooms; they are provided by the municipalities of the city and county of St. John, which provide the court house. It has been so for six or seven years. I do not know how it is about the Maritime Court. It seems to me that if we are going to have it all taken away, then let my hon. friend drop this \$6,000 for Quebec and treat us equally all round.

Mr. DAVIES. I want to know on what ground that vote is defended? The Minister has spoken once or twice with respect to the request of the member for St. John for an appropriation for the use of the Admiralty Court in St. John, but he has not answered the question as to the appropriation of \$6,000 for the registrar and salary of the marshal in Quebec. It may be all right, but why should we pay that in Quebec and not in the other Provinces?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The items to which my hon. friend calls my attention now are salaries for the judge, registrar and marshal. The difference between them and the item we have just been considering is this; that was an item for court house accommodation, in addition to the salaries already voted. I do not feel myself called upon at present to defend the amount of the salaries which are paid in the Province of Quebec. Those salaries, I understand, were fixed before the union of the Provinces, and have been current for a long time. The officers who held these offices were appointed

upon those salaries, and I could hardly ask Parliament to reduce them.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). We find that the judge in New Brunswick and the judge in Nova Scotia get each \$600 for this purpose, and I find that the judge of Quebec gets \$2,000 a year. I venture to say, that there is as much business done in Halifax and St. John as there is in Quebec. Then besides the \$2,000, the Minister will recollect that the Quebec judge gets fees in the Admiralty Court in addition. Besides, in Quebec, we find a salary for a registrar, who also gets fees, and a salary for a marshal, who also gets fees. The registrar and marshal in St. John and Halifax do not get any fees, and still the Minister is going to take away this \$150 granted for the purpose of providing suitable accommodation for the court. In that case he should also cut down these two salaries which are not given to any other courts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not prepared to do that, considering that these salaries were established before the union of the Provinces and were established when the officers took them. There is a great difference between cutting them down and cutting down the perquisites which grew up, one item six years ago, and the other item three years ago. But as regards these salaries it is true, as the hon. gentleman has said, that the amount of business in St. John and Halifax each is as large as that done in the Province of Quebec, and there is no reason or principle why a larger salary should be paid in that Province than in any other. The only extenuating circumstance for the disparity is that in the Province of Nova Scotia the judge of the Vice Admiralty Court is likewise the chief justice of the Province, and receives a salary of \$5,000 a year. In the city of St. John the judge of the Vice Admiralty Court is a county court judge, receiving a salary of about \$3,000 a year, in addition to the salary voted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The amount of salary paid to the judge, to the registrar, and to the marshal, I was not speaking about, because I do not know sufficiently what their duties are. Under the British North America Act we are obliged to pay the salaries of the judges of these several courts, but neither expressly nor by implication is this Parliament called upon to vote money to pay the salaries of the subordinate officials of that court, and there is no reason in the world why we should be called upon to pay them to the registrar and marshal of the Vice Admiralty Court, Quebec, more than we should be called upon to pay the same salaries to the same officers for discharging the same duties in the Maritime Provinces. It seems to me to be a practice which has grown up without any defensible foundation, and if the Minister is not prepared to drop the item to-night, I think it is a matter which he should carefully consider, because I do not think that we should be saddled for all time with the payment of these salaries unless there is some good reason for it, either arising out of some contract we have made or arising out of some duty laid upon us by the British North America Act.

Mr. SKINNER. I wish the Minister could see his way clear to continue the amount. A few years ago it was considered a grievance in our community that there was no court house in which to hold the Admiralty Court, and no court room available.

The judges' chambers were entirely unfit for the holding of the court with the requisite dignity, nor did they give accommodation for members of the bar or witnesses; and it came down to this, that the court would have to be held there unless a certain amount was paid by the judge out of his own pocket for a court room. Of course, he would not do so. Correspondence was opened with the Government here and it extended over a considerable time. At last the question was considered settled by a very small grant being made to meet the exigencies of the case. It is not as if a very large amount were asked or required. It is only a very small amount, and under the arrangement to which I refer a court room was properly fitted up, which gives excellent accommodation, and if this grant is withdrawn it will have to be abandoned and the court will have to be held in the judges' chambers. It may be said that the Province should provide a suitable court room, but even if it were the duty of the Province to do so, it must be remembered that the Province is very limited in its income. Since Confederation the cost of running the Province has very much increased, and the income has not increased in accordance with its requirements. In this Parliament we can increase our revenue by a vote of Parliament. There they cannot increase their revenue by any vote they may pass unless they go to direct taxation, which they have no wish to adopt as yet, at all events. The revenues of the Province render it impossible for it to go further in the administration of justice than it has done, and if this amount be dropped and if the Government will not provide this very small allowance for a court room for the Court of Admiralty, we shall be driven to go to the judges' chambers, which are wholly unfitted for the purpose. If the amount was, say, \$1,000 a year I could understand the weight of the objection. But when the amount is so small, and when it was settled six or seven years ago and expenditure consequent upon that settlement was made, it is going further than is necessary to cut off that small grant at the present time. I wish the Minister to see if he cannot continue the grant for another year at all events.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is to be regretted that the Minister cannot see his way clear to continue the small grant to St. John, although there is something in the argument that all the Provinces should be placed in the same position with regard to providing accommodation for the Admiralty Courts. If the hon. gentleman were to place it on that ground alone, his position would be a more defensible one than the position he has taken to-night. I was glad to hear the Minister say that he did not feel called upon to defend the grant to the judge of the Admiralty Court at Quebec, and the grants to the registrar and marshal of that court. That fact would lead us to infer that that hon. gentleman had some doubts in his own mind as to the fairness of continuing a grant which, at the time it was made—I have no doubt under the control of the Legislature of Quebec—might have been considered fair under the circumstances. But I presume the Minister will not contend that this Dominion is pledged by any agreement or understanding or undertaking to provide salaries for those, if they have been extravagant at that time, for all future time; and there-

Mr. SKINNER.

fore, I think, we have good cause for complaint that the salaries of the judge, registrar and marshal of Quebec are voted, when there is no vote at all for a registrar or marshal in either St. John or Halifax. The hon. Minister is aware that the business done in the Admiralty Courts at either Halifax or St. John is as large or larger than that in Quebec, and under those circumstances, he should be prepared to place the officers of those courts in as favorable a position financially as officers of the court of Quebec. What I most strongly object to is this, that we are pledged to maintain these old salaries which were fixed before we had anything to do with the Province of Quebec, and if it is found that in other parts of the British Dominion the functions of the Vice Admiralty Court can be administered as they are in St. John and Halifax, then it becomes the duty of the Government and the Minister to place all the courts in the same position, and if he cannot make a grant to St. John and Halifax as the House does to the court in the Province of Quebec, the hon. gentleman should adopt a better course, and one which would meet my views more—reduce the salaries, cut off the grants made to the registrar and marshal, and diminish the judges to the same amount as granted in other places.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There could hardly be a word said in defence of the smallness of the sum of \$600 voted to the judges at St. John and Halifax respectively, except for the fact that those judges already hold judicial positions which return them fair emoluments. I do not want to be understood as admitting that we are pledged to this scale for all time. As regards the present judge at Quebec, we are pledged to continue the present salary to the present judge. That, I think, it will be right to do, and it is inconsistent with right principles that the salary of the judge should be dependent on the vote of Parliament from year to year. It should be fixed by law, in order to make the judge independent, as are our other judges, and not dependent on his salary being dropped or raised from year to year by the Government. I repeat, that I do not consider we are pledged to pay the judge's present salary beyond the term of the present incumbent, and I am not aware as regards the other two salaries that we are pledged even to that extent. I desire that this vote should be granted for the coming year and during the twelve months I will carefully revise the circumstances under which the votes have been taken from time to time, and if it be not inconsistent with good faith, I will have the amounts dropped from the next estimate. If I am not able to drop the votes I will explain the reason to the Committee.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The inference to be drawn from the hon. Minister's remark is that the judges of the Vice Admiralty Courts in Nova Scotia are sufficiently paid, because they hold other judicial offices. The Admiralty judge may, however, hold no other judicial office whatever, but be entirely independent. I quite agree with the hon. Minister that the salary of the Quebec judge should not be reduced during his incumbency, but it is not very long since the office became vacant, not more than about three years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; it must be six or seven years.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I trust that the hon. Minister will restore this vote this year. As I have pointed out, the practice is very different from what it was a few years ago. Then it was not so important to have a proper court, because the counsel and the judge were the only ones to attend, and the evidence was taken before a registrar and read to the judge. Now, as the hon. Minister knows, it is an open court, where witnesses are called at the trial the same as in a court of assize, and there is pressing necessity for proper accommodation.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the Minister on this occasion has acted very correctly. If this item was a very large one, and if our friends fought it with the tenacity they display over this small amount, I am afraid the Minister's life would hardly be worth a year's purchase. I understand my friend to say it is wrong to grant these salaries to the judges in Quebec, but that we are perfectly willing that should be done provided we could get a place to hold our courts in St. John and Halifax. I do not understand that sort of justice, and I think it is hardly a fair way to force the Minister to act. We are to suppose he is administering justice, and yet they are trying to make him do an injustice, not only to Quebec, but to Halifax and St. John. On this occasion I think I must support the Minister and say that he is doing right.

Mr. BURDETT. This discussion proves one thing, and that is, that the time has about arrived when there should be an entire re-adjustment of the salaries of judges. I believe that there should be some system adopted and uniformity established in that direction. It appears to me that judges do not know quite where they stand in regard to their incomes, and that Parliament hardly knows what we are paying for the administration of justice. It is not only a question in Ontario whether the judges are paid enough or whether they are not paid enough, but whether men cannot earn much larger incomes at the bar than on the bench, and, therefore, the bench has no great attractions for the bar. I notice also in the County Courts that there is quite a marked distinction between the salaries of the judges in the different Provinces. In Ontario the senior judges get from \$2,000 to \$2,600 a year, and the junior judges are paid in every case \$2,000. In all the other Provinces the County Court judges get \$2,400, except one County Court judge in New Brunswick, who receives \$3,000 a year. In each case the travelling allowance is, I believe, the same. This appears not to be a correct system, unless there is a very great difference in the work performed. Whether he works or not, a man who accepts the position of judge is expected to devote all his time to his duties. He is not permitted to employ his time in any other service, so that he might just as well be at work as idle. The great *desideratum* in selecting judges is to get men who are fit for the position, and who are enabled to live by the salary they receive, and are, therefore, above being obliged to increase their salaries in performing other services. My opinion is (and it is pretty strong on this point) that when a man is appointed judge he ought to devote his whole time to that service, and he ought to be sufficiently paid by the country

to enable him to do so. I think the time has come when the Minister of Justice should consider the whole question of the salaries of the men who administer the laws of the land. I trust that before next Session of Parliament the Minister will have time to take this matter into consideration, and formulate a Bill that will remedy the defects of the present system. Vacancies occur too frequently on the bench, and it would be better if some permanent system were adopted by which new appointees would know exactly what they may expect.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). There is no trouble in filling a vacancy.

Mr. BURDETT. The Minister of Justice is much better able to answer that than I am. I quite agree with the member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson), that there is no public office vacant but that there are many men willing to take it. This, however, is an office which should seek the man and not the man the office, and the best man who can be got ought to be got for the judiciary. I am not saying whether it is advisable to increase the present salaries or not. It appears to me, and I know the fact is, that leading barristers and very many lawyers, who have anything like a fair business, earn more money than the judges on the bench, without having to do any more work, and in many cases not so much work. I think, therefore, as I have already intimated, that the time has arrived to consider this whole question, with a view of having it perfectly well understood what a man is to get when he goes upon the bench. It is an unquestioned fact, that in the Province of Ontario of late years, the services to be performed by the judges are much more arduous than they have been in the past, and these labors are continually increasing. As our laws are enlarged and developed, they necessarily cast more work on the judges in their administration, and this question ought also be considered in that light. The jurisdiction of the lower courts, whether rightly or wrongly, has been largely increased of late, and for increased services the judges should get increased pay. Of course, in some instances their appointment as revising barristers has enabled the judges to increase their income. It is pretty difficult for a judge, who has a family, to maintain them in the position he and they should occupy in the county, upon \$2,000 a year. I, therefore, ask the Minister to take this matter into consideration, and I trust he will bring down a measure next Session covering the whole matter.

Mr. COOK. I think it is very necessary in the public interest that there should be another appointment made to the Queen's Bench division and the Common Pleas division of the Ontario courts. There are now only three judges in these courts, and the business of the courts is increasing so materially that suitors are often at a very great disadvantage. Frequently the judges are not able to attend to all the cases; and the consequence is that cases are postponed from time to time to the great loss of suitors, who have sometimes to bring their witnesses from long distances, perhaps three or four times, before the cause is disposed of. I think there should be another judge appointed to each court, and I do not believe there is a legal gentleman in the Province of Ontario who will disagree with me in this opinion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not doubt that the judges have more than they can do to overtake the work in Ontario; but before we can make an appointment, provision must be made for it by the Provincial Legislature, and the last communication I had from the Attorney-General of Ontario, was that he was not entirely satisfied that a case could be made out for additional judges, but he might find it necessary to ask the judges to call in the services of some of the County Court judges, to assist in performing the work at Toronto.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). May I ask, to whom the money for the Vice-Admiralty Court rooms in Halifax is to be paid?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is paid to the commissioners of the court house in Halifax.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understand that the Government has made an appointment of a junior judge for the County of Elgin, but I see no provision for his salary in the Estimates, as the same number of junior judges are provided for this year as last year. I would like to know whether any representation has been made by the senior judge as to the desirability of appointing a junior judge. We, who live in that locality, have expected that, perhaps, at some future time, a junior judge might be appointed, but we were informed that the Government would not make an appointment unless the population reached a certain number, or unless there was a strong representation made to them. I do not know that the senior judge has been in any way incapacitated for performing his duties efficiently. I think he is quite capable of performing all the work required of him, and not only so, but he accepted quite readily the position of revising barrister under the Franchise Act. I have no objection to the gentleman who has been appointed. He was my late opponent. I am very sorry he is out of the way, for I think I should like to run an election with him as an opponent again. I think he will make a very good judge, but I really cannot understand, unless a reason be given me, why the Government thought it necessary to make the appointment at all. I am satisfied that the senior judge is able to perform all the duties outside of the revision of the Dominion voters' list; and this appointment shows the absolute necessity of doing away with that Franchise Act, because it necessitates the appointment of junior judges in the Province of Ontario, and very likely in the other Provinces as well. I am inclined to think that the appointment in this case, of a junior judge, at a salary of \$2,000 a year, was for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Franchise Act. I should like any information the Minister can give me on the subject.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may say, in answer to the first question, that we do not depend on the despatching of another judge to find a salary for the gentleman who has lately been appointed in Elgin. The fact is that the salaries of judges and junior judges are provided by statute, and can, therefore, be paid without any vote of Parliament, and they are, perhaps, inserted on page 19, which the hon. gentleman evidently refers to, merely for the information of the committee and not for the purpose of fixing the amounts which have to be paid. As regards the judgeship in Elgin, it is true, as the hon. gentleman has stated, that the

Mr. Cook.

Government have not been disposed, except on representations from the senior judge, to make appointments unless the population reaches sixty thousand. The provincial statute authorises the appointment in any county where the population is forty thousand, and the Government, having adopted the principle of appointing one where there are sixty thousand of a population, have made however the provision that a special allowance should be made, in computing the sixty thousand, for the additional business furnished by cities and towns and large villages. I am not quite aware what the present population of Elgin may be, but I think it falls somewhat under sixty thousand, even making the additional allowance for the town of St. Thomas, and for the other towns and villages within the county, but my impression is that it does not fall far short of sixty thousand, if we add the fifty per cent. allowed for the additional business which always centres in cities, villages and towns. A junior judge was appointed there, as the hon. gentleman seems to have foreseen, on the strong representation of the county judge that assistance was necessary in the discharge of his duties. He did not represent that the work thrown upon him by the Franchise Act, and which he was at liberty to relinquish if he pleased, was the cause of that representation, but he did call our attention to the fact that since we had adopted the principle of requiring a population of 60,000, the work of the county judges had been very much increased by provincial legislation. I am glad to know that the senior judge, as the hon. gentleman says, is a very capable and active judge. We must remember, however, that he has reached the very ripe age of about seventy years, and, notwithstanding the fact that he is physically a very active, energetic and faithful officer, his request under those circumstances to have the assistance of a junior was a reasonable one, and certainly we had it, and had it in strong terms, before we made the appointment.

Mr. ELLIS. This expenditure for judges' travelling is fixed by statute. Last year \$3,200 were asked for the travelling expenses for the judges in New Brunswick, and this year a similar amount is asked, but last year \$3,700 were expended, and Mr. Justice Palmer appears to have got a larger travelling allowance than any other travelling judge. His expenses for travelling, amounting to \$1,100, exceed by \$400 those of any other judge. How can a judge in equity draw such a large amount? I understand he holds a court at one or two places in the Province, but I do not understand by what possible means he could be entitled to a much larger travelling allowance than any one of the circuit judges.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is an equitable proceeding.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The travelling allowances in Ontario and the Lower Provinces are not regulated by moving expenses or *per diem* allowance, but each judge receives a fixed allowance of \$100 for each court he holds. The judge has simply to return the number of courts that he holds, that is to say, the number of places he holds courts at, and he is entitled to receive \$100 for each court. We have no authority to control the fixing of the circuits of the judges; they make the circuits to suit the public convenience, and we do

not undertake to control them as to whether the circuits are too numerous or otherwise.

Dominion Police.....\$21,000

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The new block which has just been occupied and the printing bureau require an increase of the staff. There has to be a guard in attendance at the door night and day in each building, and the printing bureau has to be supplied, and in addition there is what is called the departmental mail which is under the charge of the police, and the printing bureau has to be supplied with that.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). There is a charge here of \$54 for overshoes. Do you supply the police with clothing?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, with the whole uniform.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). You clothe them as well as give them a salary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Our police, which I think is a very efficient force, are not as well paid as the police force in the cities generally.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). They get \$600 salary besides all their clothing.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I made the comparison when I asked to increase the pay two years ago, and I have a memo. here which will furnish information as to salaries paid.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It seems rather strange that police should be required down at the printing bureau. As a rule printers are supposed to be civil servants in all respects, and I think it is an imputation against their honesty that guards should march up and down and watch them. I cannot see any more necessity for guards being there now than when the contractors did the printing. The men who work there cannot be expected to feel comfortable with policemen in the building watching them. If the services of the police are to be paid for, I suppose it is as well to have the men there as anywhere else, but if they are not going to be of any service it would be much more comfortable to the men who are at work that they should not be under the supervision of the police. I can understand that some time ago there was a necessity for the services of the police when the Secretary of State or the superintendent of the Bureau of Printing telegraphed all over the country for extra hands to whom he promised three months' work, in order to get out the Government voters' lists, and after those men came here the Government saw fit to dispense with their services long before the time of their engagement would expire. This caused considerable excitement among the printers. There might have been occasion then to have policemen there, but I do not think there is any occasion under ordinary circumstances, and I think the printers would work more harmoniously and would do better work if they were not under the supervision of a police force.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The printers are not under the supervision of a policeman, and I think, if we in Parliament are able to stand the imputation which is implied according to the hon. gentleman from having a policeman at our doors, the printers might be able to stand that also. The policemen are there just as they are here and in the other

buildings, to take care of public property, to prevent the intrusion of people who have no right to be there, and, after nightfall, to see that the buildings are secure against fire, intrusion and damage of every kind.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When I was down at the printing bureau a week or two ago, I found there was a regular doorkeeper appointed there. What is the use of a doorkeeper if you have a policeman?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not responsible for the doorkeeper, but I was requested by my colleague who has charge of that building to provide a policeman there, as the policemen are provided in the other Government buildings for the purposes to which I have referred.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is a matter of guard there, and of regard here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The memorandum which I have, states that the increase of \$2,000 is caused by an increase to the force of four men in consequence of the new printing bureau, being placed under its surveillance and the extension of the departmental police mail service to that building, the Geological Museum and the Supreme and Exchequer Courts building. The number of letters delivered by the police mail last year, was 43,144, an increase over 1888 of about 5,000, and over 1883 (the first year of its operation) of about 17,000. The strength and pay of the force are as follows:—1 commissioner, \$1,700; 1 inspector, \$2.25 per diem, \$821.25; 2 sergeants, \$1.90 per diem, \$693.50 each; 27 constables, \$1.50 to \$1.65, \$547.50 to \$602.25. A comparison with other forces shows the following:—In Toronto, the chief receives \$3,000 and allowances; deputy chief, \$1,950; inspectors, \$1,200 to \$1,400; sergeants, \$1,000; constables, \$1.30, \$1.50, \$1.75 and \$2.00 per day. In Hamilton, the sergeant-major receives \$1,100 and house; sergeants, \$800; constables, \$1.40, \$1.75 and \$1.85. The force has, in addition to the supervision of the various Government buildings, the charge of the fire appliances, and since 1883 has had charge of the grounds around the buildings, which prior to that time were protected by watchmen employed by the Department of Public Works; and later, the Government having assumed the care and maintenance of the Major's Hill Park, it was found necessary in summer to have a constable there night and day for the protection of the shrubs, plants, &c., and to keep in check the rowdy element that would otherwise be an annoyance to the public who frequent it. The services of the force are also being constantly employed on special duty by many of the Departments of the public service. There are also thirty-eight constables appointed to the force at the nomination of other Departments (more especially the Indian Department), who are remunerated and equipped by those Departments, but whose duty it is to make returns to the Commissioner of Police at Ottawa at stated intervals. This latter note is added simply to show that the duties of the chief here are increased in that way, though those 38 constables do not belong to the Dominion Police force proper.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I must protest against the idea that there is any necessity to hire police-

men to watch the printers. I think that item ought to be struck out. It is not required, and I know the men are very much annoyed that they have to be watched by policemen, that they are to be looked upon as dishonest men, because policemen are put there to watch them. These four policemen are not required there, and it is an insult to the men who are employed in the bureau. No other printing office in the country requires policemen to watch its workmen. If the Government insist upon this item, I think the expenditure should be charged to the printing bureau, because it is only fair, in making a comparison between the cost of the printing under the Government and what it was under the contractors, to add the cost of the four policemen to the former. There is another item in the police force account which to me appears absurd. I find: R. W. Powell, M.D., for medical services, \$44.75. The Government give good salaries to the police, they give them good clothing, they give them underclothing, and even, as my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) has pointed out, they furnish them with overshoes. Do they pay their doctor's bills as well? Why should they not pay the doctor's bills of the clerks who work in these buildings as well as the doctor's bills of the policemen who watch these buildings? I should like to have some explanation of this.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have already explained that we employ no policemen to watch the printers at all, and that the increase of four policemen referred to is the total increase of the force required for the large block opposite and for the Supreme and Exchequer Courts building, as well as for the printing bureau. As to the doctor's account, I cannot at this moment state what the services were for, but we certainly pay for no medical services, except in the case of injury which has occurred in the service of the Government.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Somerville). I consider that the Government are the best judges of those whom they have in their employ. I have no doubt that the Government themselves think it is very necessary that all the Departments should be carefully watched. They have been occupying that position for a long time, and I agree with them that they all require watching. I should like to have the Dominion Police watch the various Departments presided over by the members of the Government. I think a more vigilant watch would be a wholesome thing, not only for the printing bureau but for all the other bureaus we have in Ottawa.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Does the operation of the Dominion Police force extend out to the Agricultural Farm, to watch the chicken house, and the horse blankets, and root house?

Mr. CARLING. We have not come to that yet.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We have built a hen-house out there at an expense of over \$3,000 this year, and it must be a very good hen-house. They have a lot of good hens, according to all accounts, first-class hens. I think that the Dominion Police ought to have supervision over the Agricultural Farm hen-house. I would like to ask the Minister if there are any police out there?

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know whether there are any police out there, but I understand that the pleasure of going to that place is so great that nobody requires to be paid for it.

Mr. INNES. I suppose the same force are on duty at the new building on Wellington Street?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, that is included.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many are watching the new building on Wellington Street?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think only two.

Kingston Penitentiary..... \$155,263.23

Mr. McMULLEN. It will be within the recollection of the hon. Minister that we had considerable discussion last year with regard to the expenses of the several penitentiaries, and the Auditor General last year gave us a *per capita* cost for the several penitentiaries. I see that he does not do that this year. I think the country is entitled to it, and I would like to know why that particular calculation has been cut off this year. I would also like to know from whom the supplies are bought for the inmates of the Kingston Penitentiary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. All the supplies, excepting, it may be, some casual purchases, are procured by contract. If the hon. gentleman desires information as to the names of the contractors, I can get it from the reports. As to the *per capita* statement, there is such a statement here, but it will be more in detail in the report that I will present to Parliament, I hope, to-morrow. At page C 120 there is a statement of the comparative cost, but I believe it is not figured out *per capita*. If the hon. gentleman desires that, I will have it in my report and if he needs it before going into this item we will let this stand.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we ought to have the calculation of the *per capita* cost. We had it last year, and it was a considerable guide for us.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know any particular reason why it was left out. But it was not full or complete at all as affording a comparison, for two reasons: in the first place it was necessarily only an approximation, we would have to take an average of the prisoners, whereas the number would be larger at one time and smaller at another. By the table which will be appended to my report, I think we will go more into detail as to the population of the prison, showing the population from time to time. Furthermore, as I explained to the Committee last year, it was somewhat unreliable for the reason that it necessarily took no account of stores at the beginning of the year and stores at the end of the year.

Expenses in connection with the *Patent Record*.....\$10,000

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). There is an increase of \$2,000.

Mr. CARLING. We pay so much for each number of the *Patent Record*, and it is in accordance with the number of patents issued. The receipts of the Patent Office are increasing rapidly every year, in fact they now more than pay the whole expense of the Department. I think the receipts last year were something like \$80,000.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is this *Patent Record* printed in the bureau?

Mr. CARLING. No. It was under contract for five years, and the contractor has been notified that the contract will run out, I think, some time this year.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How are the *Patent Record* publications circulated? We each get a copy; what becomes of the other copies?

Mr. CARLING. I will furnish the information.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The amount for printing the *Patent Record* appears to be very large. It is not a large publication or contains many pages.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Burland has had the contract for the publication for several years, and he was notified, when the printing bureau was about to be established, that it would be discontinued so soon as the printing bureau was able to do the work. They have not so far been in that position, as a lithographic plant will be required; but when the bureau is in a position to do the work, the publication will be taken from Mr. Burland and published by the Government.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it the intention to add a lithographic plant to the printing bureau?

Mr. CARLING. It will be necessary for the *Patent Record*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When does Mr. Burland's contract terminate?

Mr. CARLING. It terminated some months ago, but it was extended for six months, but when the printing bureau is ready to do the work, it will be transferred to the Department of Printing.

Mr. INNES. I should like to ask if the Minister intends to do anything to make better arrangements for the models in the patent room. Although, the Department has been removed to spacious premises in the new building, I find the patents have been huddled together in the same way as they were in the old western block. No better means of examining them are afforded than prevailed under the old system. As the Department now occupies large and new premises, the public and those interested in patents should be given a better opportunity of examining the models.

Mr. CARLING. The models have just been removed from the western block to the new block, and the Minister of Public Works is making an estimate of the cost of placing the room in a good condition to examine the models.

Mr. McMULLEN. The *Patent Record* is an unnecessary expense, and I hope, when the contract ends, its publication will cease. I have distributed several copies to architects, mechanics and others and I have not heard any one say it was useful. It was originally published in the interest of some particular party, and it has been maintained since. If anyone wishes to obtain information they can obtain it in the Patent Department, and the *Record* is a totally useless publication.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The suggestion of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is a good one. The publication is not in the interest of the public, but of persons who procure patents and they should pay for the publication.

Mr. CARLING. The publication is very important for inventors, and the amount of fees collected for patents was \$80,000 last year. The expenses of the *Record* come out of these fees.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is there a similar publication in the United States?

Mr. CARLING. I am told there is, and that it is published by the United States Government.

Mr. INNES. How many subscribers are there to the *Patent Record*, for which I notice \$3 a year is charged?

Mr. CARLING. I will give the hon. gentleman that information later.

Criminal Statistics \$4,000

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I observe by the Auditor General's Report that amounts of \$1, 5 and 2 cents are paid for each report.

Mr. CARLING. These sums for returns are fixed by statute. The Bill was brought in by Mr. Blake, when he was Minister of Justice.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What I wish to know is the reason why this different scale of payments is followed?

Mr. CARLING. I am not able to give the information. I can only say that the rates are fixed by statute, and I cannot alter them.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister must be mistaken. Another point requiring explanation is this, that while \$4,000 was voted \$11,300 was expended.

Mr. CARLING. The number of returns may vary in different years.

Mr. CASEY. The difference between \$4,000 and \$11,000 is very considerable, and the Minister should be able to state the reason why he believed that the expenditure will not exceed \$4,000 for the coming year.

Mr. CARLING. I do not know that I can give the hon. gentleman any further information.

Health Statistics..... \$10,000

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We would like some information in respect to this item. Each year when we ask for information we have been told that the return is handed in and if we look very carefully over it we will see the whole working of this branch. I have taken every opportunity to ascertain what value we receive from the expenditure of this money and I must confess that so far as I have been able to ascertain all the benefit in it is derived by a few individuals who have the collection of the health statistics as well as those who have situations here in Ottawa and are receiving good salaries. I have time and again called the attention of the Government to the fact that this matter should be controlled by the various Provinces.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My friend behind me says no, but I hold it to be the duty of the Dominion Government, as far as it possibly can, to utilise all the machinery of the Local Legislatures, and to allow the Local Legislatures to do the work if they possibly can, as efficiently as the Dominion. It is wrong in principle for this Government to assume to control matters which they cannot control nearly so well as the Provinces. In almost every town, village and township of the Province of Ontario they have established efficient boards of health, well organised and carefully looked after. If any occasion arises the boards are immediately called together, the health officer

notified and energetic means taken to prevent the spread of disease. Why, then, not allow the Provinces to carry on this work when they can do it much better than the Dominion? If you have a large number of persons here in Ottawa to whom you wish to give situations on account of services rendered to the Government, why not give them a salary to assist the provincial health boards and ascertain how they do the work? I blame the Minister for not attempting to utilise these various provincial boards to as great an extent as he possibly can, for I believe that it is in the interests of all parties to allow the Provinces to arrange the general health affairs of the people of the Provinces. We have enough duties to perform here without assuming to take under our control that which belongs to the Provinces, and I hope the Minister will give us the assurance that he is going to utilise this provincial service and make this law really beneficial and operative, instead of being, as it is, a dead letter on the statute book, and keeping up this law for the purpose of maintaining a few hangers-on in Ottawa. I am prepared to render the Minister all the aid and assistance I possibly can if he will adopt a scheme which will utilise the information at the disposal of the Provinces, and if he will endeavor to make this health protective service a really efficient one.

Mr. CARLING. My hon. friend seems to think that the gentlemen who are appointed in the different cities and towns are as he said supporters and hangers-on of the Government. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is not aware that the health officers are selected by the different municipalities and that we appoint the sanitary officers selected by the municipalities.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am aware of that.

Mr. CARLING. Then I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to charge the Government with the appointing their hangers-on for the purpose of giving them salaries.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I had reference to the hangers-on about the city of Ottawa.

Mr. CARLING. This information is gathered in the different centres of population, in cities in Ontario and the other Provinces, and I believe it is carefully and well done. Whenever a board of health is established in a town having a certain population, and a medical officer appointed, that medical officer is selected by the Government to return the statistics and to revise and certify to the copies of the cemetery register made by the caretakers. I think the system works well and is giving satisfaction. We have officers in different centres all through the Dominion who furnish us with these statistics, which I believe are very useful and well worth the amount of money expended upon them.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It seems to me that the heading ought not to be "Health Statistics" but "Death Statistics." I think most of these men who furnish statistics are either grave-diggers or undertakers.

Mr. CASEY. Or doctors, which comes to the same thing.

Mr. CARLING. The mortuary statistics which are called "returns" are copied by the cemetery caretakers and revised by professional men.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I see a large number of undertakers in the list.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think there is very much in what my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) states, and I should like to have detailed reports from these various health officers, but I have not been able to find any. The principal returns they send in are the very returns referred to by my hon. friend: the number of deaths and burials that take place in the locality. They go to the sexton and they copy the statistics from his books, perhaps giving him 10 cents for the privilege of doing so, and these are the returns they send down here. Is it right to misname these, health statistics? They are death statistics, if you will; but they are no indication of the health of a locality or of what it is necessary to do to preserve the health of the locality, and it is absurd to speak of this as a useful branch of the public service. I believe the money is to a greater or less extent squandered. If the Government were desirous of making this branch useful to the country, they would utilise the various health boards in the different Provinces; but they make no attempt to do that. All that these officers report is the deaths of the people in the different parts of the country, and they obtain those from the sextons and grave-diggers.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman gave one of the very best reasons for this vote when he admitted that he was not aware of similar arrangements for looking after the public health in other Provinces to those existing in Ontario. If they do not exist in the other Provinces, it is the more imperative on the Dominion Government to obtain from them statistics showing the rate of mortality in the various parts of the Dominion; and this information naturally suggests to the intelligent professional man, if he finds the death rate low in Halifax as compared with Toronto, to enquire into the causes of the difference. The result of gathering these statistics is that we find comparisons constantly going on not only between various cities in Canada, but between cities in the United States and cities in Canada. Where the statistics show a low rate of mortality, the first duty in a medical man is to ascertain the cause: Is it salubrity of climate, the nature of the surroundings, social conditions, or the attention of medical men to the regulation of ventilation and drainage? I have looked over this report carefully, and I say it is a very important, interesting and valuable one, and the sooner the Government branches out very much further in the same direction, the better for the health of our people. We have a good work done in Ontario, which, however, might be done much better; but we do not know that the same is being done with equal success in the other Provinces, and, therefore, the greater necessity for the Government taking it up. A report has been distributed as a result of the work of the committee appointed here in regard to the nature of consumption when conveyed from animals to the human system, and it is a very valuable document, and one that will play a very much greater part in the future than it has done up to the present time. I say that this is a very wise and important expenditure of money, and I believe a very much larger amount could be expended to the advantage of the health of the people of this country.

Mr. CASEY. A short time ago I made a slight mistake as to the item we were discussing, but I was not able to discover it from anything the Minister said, and I do not believe he discovered it any sooner than I did myself. It was from a causal remark of another member that I found out the mistake. And now, when an explanation is required in regard to these health statistics, I find that the hon. Minister has to be defended by an hon. gentleman who, report says, might possibly succeed him in his Department. That hon. gentleman has told us that it is very important to know the death rate in different cities, and to know why it is different in different cities. That is the very thing we are not informed by these reports, and that is why my hon. friend from East Elgin is correct in saying that they are not health statistics, but that they are merely mortuary statistics collected from the sextons and undertakers of each town. For instance, I find that the two leading contributors of information in St. Thomas are the two leading undertakers in that city.

Mr. CARLING. These items are certified to by the medical officer.

Mr. CASEY. On looking over the list of parties paid for making these statistics, I find a very wide difference. For instance, Charlottetown in P.E.I., and Victoria, in B.C., are places about the same size, but in the former thirteen persons have been paid and in the latter only two; and while the officers in each place are paid about the same amount, there is a very considerable difference in the amounts paid in the different places. In fact, as the hon. member for East Elgin says, I have no doubt that the whole system of what is called collecting health statistics is a system for putting a little money into the way of supporters of the Government in each town. In every case the gentleman put down as an officer is a friend of the Government, and these men are paid \$120, \$150 or \$200 for gathering a few statistics, which they can do without any exertion at all, and these payments are really contributions towards their maintenance. That is what they are in the town of St. Thomas, and I believe that is what they are everywhere else, and I must join in the protest of the hon. member for the east riding against the whole affair. We are spending over \$11,000 for returns which we could get by copying the reports of the local boards of health. The hon. gentleman knows that this is really a means of paying the doctors from the different towns for giving us a report of their victims. No doubt the doctors are very useful members of the community, but to pay them both for putting us under the ground, and then making a return is going a little too far.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. In Ontario we have an effective system in operation of which the Government should avail themselves; we have boards of health, not only in cities and towns but in the townships, and these boards furnish not only statistics but valuable information with regard to the health of these localities. The report submitted by the hon. Minister of Agriculture only gives us information with regard to the deaths and by no means gives the complete statistics which are obtained under the Ontario system. I do not know what systems if any are followed in the other Provinces, but if the hon. gentleman

would take those of Ontario he would make a great saving and have a more reliable report. I agree with the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Casey) that the plan adopted by the Government is simply a means of furnishing a little pap to the doctors, grave-diggers and undertakers who support the Government, and does not furnish any information to warrant the expenditure in obtaining it.

Mr. ROOME. I must agree with the hon. member for Grey that this Government has established a principle which has not been carried far enough. It is necessary that the collection of the statistics should be made under a system controlled by this Government, because although in the Province of Ontario the work is carefully done, in the other Provinces there is no system adopted, and it is just as necessary that all the statistics in the Dominion should be collected through one head centre as that we should have a Minister of Agriculture or any head of the Department in Ottawa. It is very important that we should have not only mortuary statistics, but births statistics as well, in order to make comparisons and be able to estimate accurately our national health as well as national wealth. The money that has been spent is well spent, but the collection of statistics should be extended further, and the system established perfected.

Mr. PLATT. As regards the returns furnished us annually by the Minister of Agriculture, it makes but little difference whether they are complete or incomplete, correct or incorrect. The question is as to their practical utility at this time. Several years ago we questioned the propriety of spending this large sum of money, and the plea put forward then was that the expenditure was intended merely to serve for the ground work of a system which would be of some practical utility. Year after year we have gone on spending and issuing the same kind of report, and I cannot conceive of any useful purpose the report serves. This large volume goes into the hands of a few people, who glance it over, some of them very cursorily indeed, and people are anxious to see whether something will grow up out of this which will be of use to the community. Mortuary statistics are of no use except for the purpose of leading to an enquiry, and to the establishment of some regulations or system that may improve the sanitary condition of the people. My own opinion is that the money we are now spending might be much more profitably divided amongst the various provincial boards to assist them in perfecting the work or in establishing boards where none exists. So far as Ontario is concerned, I am satisfied that the expenditure of money by this Parliament is money thrown away. I do not know that the Ontario Board itself relies to any great extent upon the assistance of the Dominion officials. I am very glad that my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Roome) has seen fit to bring this matter before the House, and I hope that something may result from the motion which he has placed upon the paper. I am certainly opposed to the expenditure under this item if it is to produce no better results than it has in the past.

Mr. INNES. There is a little periodical published in this city, called the *Health Journal*, which is regularly forwarded to members of Parliament. I do not suppose that is done without

some remuneration, so I would ask if it receives any subsidy from this Government ?

Mr. CARLING. That does not come under this item, but it will come up later on.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I must congratulate the Minister of Agriculture, who possibly may feel a disposition before long to be exalted to a position more agreeable to his tastes than his present one, upon the assistance which he has received from the two aspirants to his present office. I warn him that they are dangerous characters, as they say doctors always are, and I would advise him to be cautious in accepting the advice of these two aspirants to the position of Minister of Agriculture. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) got to his feet first, and defended this item, as he always has done. He conveyed the idea to the House that I did not fully understand the question, or I would know that no other Provinces had a health board except Ontario, and that, therefore they could not be expected to adopt means by which the health of the different localities could be ascertained. He went further and stated that it was very desirable to know how many people die in a particular locality in order to judge of the condition of health in that locality. I certainly did not know that that was the way in which to ascertain the state of health in a locality. I thought there must be something else reported in order to ascertain that, but my hon. friend, in his zeal to show his ability to conduct the Department of Agriculture, did not think it necessary to obtain any other information. I may inform my hon. friend that there are other Provinces which have health boards.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said he was not aware whether the other Provinces had or had not.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think I am capable of using words to convey my ideas, and, therefore, I can tell my hon. friend that I did know that there were other Provinces in which boards of health were constituted very much on the principles of the boards of health in Ontario. In regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Roome), that we should have a central board here, to which all information should be sent, so that the whole of these health statistics should be arranged from Ottawa, I do not think that could be efficiently worked. I think this matter can be very much better conducted under the supervision of the Provinces, that they understand how to control these matters better than the Dominion could, and that, if we would attempt to make this service efficient, we should adopt the principle suggested by my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Platt). I do not think we would derive any benefit from having all the reports of the different officers throughout the Dominion sent here and examined in regard to the health or the longevity in each locality. As a rule, these officers make no attempt to ascertain the condition of affairs. There may be a physician in a town who tries to make a report of that kind, but from the rural constituencies, we get practically no information. The statement of the health of Ontario, for example, when it is limited to the towns and cities, without the rural municipalities making any returns, is of no value whatever, or rather it is worse than useless, because it is misleading. I think it would be better to drop this

Mr. INNES.

item altogether, than to leave the reports in the present condition.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 12th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that the petitions which he had presented praying for an amendment of the North-West Territories Act, be now read and received.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 77) to amend the Act for the suppression of combinations formed in restraint of trade. —(Mr. Wallace.)

P. LESUEUR.

Mr. COOK asked, Whether the P. LeSueur who draws \$1,024.30 for annual superannuation allowance is the same person who enjoys the combined offices of Civil Service Examiner and Secretary to the Examiners at a salary per annum of \$1,258.33 ? If so, is the arrangement to be continued ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. LeSueur is a superannuated officer, and therefore cannot by law be compelled to do official duty except at a salary not lower than he received in his former position. He receives \$1,024 of superannuation, \$400 as a commissioner and \$700 as secretary of the commission for the Civil Service examinations. He receives a lower salary than he received when he was in office.

FREE CARRIAGE OF PRIVATE MERCHANDISE ON GOVERNMENT STEAMERS.

Mr. LANGEVIER (Montmorency) asked, Whether the attention of the Government has been called to the allegation that goods are being carried for merchants and others from Quebec and elsewhere to Gaspé, or other ports on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, on Government steamers free of charge ? If so, has any enquiry been made respecting the matter, and with what results ?

Mr. TUPPER. I observed in a newspaper some time ago, during the last summer, that it was charged that the steamer *La Canadienne* carried passengers and goods to Gaspé. Having observed that, I called upon Commander Wakeham, the commander of that ship, for an explanation, and, after stating that he carried the usual ship's stores, some of which had to be left at Gaspé and stored there during the season, he says :

" I had some things which I had purchased and was anxious to send to my home in Gaspé by the *Miramichi*, on the 29th of April, but on trying to ship them I was

refused by the agent, who refused to take them, as the steamer was not certain of calling at Gaspé, on account of the ice. These things I did bring down on board my own vessel. When I was trying to get my freight down on board the *Miramichi*, I met there a gentleman who was going down to Gaspé on her. She could take him, as he could be landed anywhere on the coast, but the purser would not accept his parcels. The gentleman came to me and asked me to take his trunks with mine, and I did so. We had not a cartload between us, and the *Miramichi* had refused to take them. It would have suited us both much better could we have got our things by the *Miramichi*."

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Whether the Oxford and New Glasgow Railroad, or any and what part of it, has been completed? Has the Government taken over from the contractors all or any; if any, what part of such road? If not, why is not the road taken over? Is any part of such road now being operated by the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 1. The Oxford and New Glasgow Railway is not completed. The sections between Oxford Junction and Oxford Village and between Mingo Road and Brown's Point are practically completed. 2. No part. 3. Because the work of construction is not completed. 4. No part is being regularly operated, but freight is being carried over the three-mile section between Oxford Junction and Oxford Village.

CAPE CROCKER INDIANS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What was the annuity per head paid the Indians on the Cape Crocker reserve in Bruce County in the years 1887, 1888, 1889?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The annuity per head paid the Indians on the Cape Crocker reserve in Bruce County, in the fiscal year 1887-88, was \$33.36, and in 1888-89, \$35.40.

TRIAL OF PETER PAUL.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether the Government have defrayed all the expenses of the trial of Peter Paul, an Indian who was tried at Walkerton some time ago? If so, what was the total amount, and to whom paid?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The funds of the Chippewas of Cape Crocker were charged with the expenses of the trial of Peter Paul. The total amount of expense was \$283.84, which was paid to A. B. Klein, Esq., of Walkerton, barrister, on the recommendation of the Department of Justice.

SHORT LINE RAILWAY—HARVEY BRANCH.

Mr. LAURIER asked, What is the amount of expenditure incurred for surveys on the Harvey Branch of the Short Line Railway, since last Session, paid by warrant?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. \$13,782.28 was paid under the Governor General's warrant up to 11th February, 1890.

WHARF AT ST. LOUIS, N. B.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, Whether the wharf at St. Louis, Kent County, N. B., has been completed? What was the entire cost? Has there been any revenue derived therefrom?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The wharf at St. Louis, Kent County, N. B., was completed on the 25th day of June, 1889, at a total cost of \$1,897.-65. No revenue has been collected.

POST OFFICE AT LÉVIS.

Mr. GUAY (Translation) asked. Whether petitions have been forwarded to the Government, by the Municipal Council or the Board of Trade of the Town of Lévis, asking for the erection of a post office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I must state that enquiries were made in the Department, and that no such petitions were found.

THE DISTURBANCE IN HULL.

Mr. CHARLTON. On Monday last I referred to the outrage on the previous Tuesday at Hull, and I understood the Premier to assure the House and country that a recurrence of an outrage of that kind would be guarded against by the Government, and that the authorities of Hull would take proper precautionary measures to secure the privilege of freedom of speech in that city. Last night a disturbance occurred there again.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. member going to make a motion?

Mr. CHARLTON. No; I am making a statement to the Government, for the purpose of eliciting from the Government some information as to their intention with regard to this important matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would be more regular if a motion were made.

Mr. McMULLEN. I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not deem it necessary, and I think the House will agree with me that it was not necessary, to formulate a motion in regard to this matter. It is a matter out of which I have no desire to make political capital, no desire to say anything embarrassing to the Government, but the occurrence that took place in Hull last night was one of a character which, I think, demands the attention of this House. Miss Wright and some other ladies associated with her were mobbed and maltreated last week, Tuesday night. They went there again last night, and the disturbances were of a more aggravated nature than before. The assault was a murderous one, and the fact that murder was not committed is more a matter of good luck than of lack of intention on the part of the rioters. The reports inform us that 1,000 men assembled around the building where the services were being held, and assaulted the evangelists with a fusilade of stones, shouts, imprecations and curses, and that when the party inside emerged from the building and an attempt was made to reach Ottawa, they were followed by a hooting and howling mob, and two or three members of the party were stricken down with stones. Now, Sir, it is evident that the means adopted by the authorities of Hull for the purpose of preserving order were utterly inefficient. I say, Sir, that only six policemen to cope with 1,000 rioters is perfectly preposterous, and the good name of this Dominion is involved to some extent in the circumstances connected with this riot. We take pride

to ourselves in this country upon being a law-abiding people; we profess that liberty of conscience is enjoyed, liberty of speech, liberty for promulgating religious views, anywhere under the British flag. That law has been denied in Hull, and been denied under the most aggravating circumstances; and the spirit of intolerance that exists there, and that has been manifested upon two occasions, is a spirit which, if not checked, is liable to spread. It is not improbable that it will be impossible to hold Protestant services in various parts of the Province, unless this spirit is suppressed. The proper way to deal with a mob is to put it down promptly and mercilessly. Severity at the start is mercy at the end, and if you allow a mob to get the upper hand, if you allow this spirit to gather headway, the coping with this spirit will become a matter of very serious danger, and the Government will not be discharging their duty if they do not see that this spirit manifested in Hull upon these two occasions is suppressed and checked. And it is their business to see it is done. I think there is a precedent for this action. If my memory serves me, in 1878, my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) who then led the Government, directed the means for a peaceable Orange walk in Montreal. He alienated the Catholic support, and I doubt whether he gained any Orange votes, but he did secure to that part of our fellow-countrymen the right to parade the streets. There was a time in New York when the Orangemen determined to walk the streets. There were thousands of Irishmen prepared to prevent them, but the authorities surrounded that procession in front, in rear, and on the flanks with a body of 5,000 men. And I think that, when it comes to a question in this country of civil and religious liberty, the right to promulgate any views on any religious topic, the Government should see that those rights are secured and guaranteed to our people. It may be said that Miss Wright was injudicious, that she ought to have kept away from Hull, that she must have been perfectly well aware of the treatment she was likely to meet with, and that she was really provoking a disturbance by going to Hull. I do not think it was Miss Wright's duty to consider the state of public feeling in Hull. She believed she had a mission there, that she was called upon to go there and proclaim what she believed to be the truth. She was actuated by the highest motives in the matter. She is not, however, the first person who has been injudicious in this sense. St. Paul himself was rather injudicious. He was subjected to stripes five times, he was stoned once, he was thrown into prison, he was chained to a soldier for two years, and carried to Rome to be tried before the Emperor, and was, finally, beheaded, simply for being injudicious and running contrary to the prejudices of the people of that time. The whole progress of Christianity is marked by so-called injudiciousness, and Miss Wright was acting perfectly in line with all Christian history in going right to Hull, into the hardest quarter of Hull, and preaching what she believed to be the truth to the toughs of that city. If this spirit, I repeat, is to prevail in this country, if we are not to secure religious tolerance, if the Government do not consider this matter one of sufficient importance to command their attention, then it will be a serious mistake, in my opinion, on the part of those who lead this Government and this country.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is, no doubt, moved by the strongest Christian feeling, as well as philanthropy, in the manner in which he has brought this subject up twice. But, I think, if the hon. gentleman, instead of bringing up this question in this House, evidently for the purpose—the motive is good—of exciting public indignation, he might have done better. He says that Miss Wright was injudicious.

Mr. CHARLTON. I said nothing of the kind. I said it might be plain that she had been injudicious.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have the pleasure of knowing Miss Wright, and, I believe, she is a true Christian, and is anxious, according to her own views, to spread Evangelical religion. I say, as all hon. members of this House will say, that we should be only too glad to see her unmolested in her mission, and allowed to press her peculiar views on any audience she might address in this country, so long as she does not offend against the laws of the land. But it occurs to me that the hon. gentleman, instead of making speeches on the floor of this House, had better have gone and been one of the escorts of Miss Wright. But he says that St. Paul was injudicious; and, no doubt, the hon. gentleman thought that he, too, would be injudicious to go to Hull and get forty stripes instead of one. The hon. gentleman ought to know, and, in fact, he does know, what the law of the land is. He knows perfectly well that the administration of justice, especially of the criminal law, rests with the Governments of each of the Provinces of the Dominion. He knows that those Governments have, so far as I know, fully accepted the responsibility, and that peace and good order have been kept in all the Provinces. I have no doubt that if this riot or riotous proceeding had been called to the attention of the Provincial Government, as it ought to have been, either by the hon. gentleman or those who take a great interest in this particular mission of Miss Wright, the Government of Quebec, even Mr. Mercier, the supporter of the Jesuits, would have seen that the law was obeyed in Hull. All that had to be done was simply for any person to get two magistrates, if there was any fear of a riot, to sign a requisition, and the whole Militia force of the country would be brought out to protect Miss Wright and those who went with her. That has been done frequently, and wherever there has been any thing like riot or disturbance—and we have had disturbances in Upper Canada and Lower Canada, and we have had riots for various causes—whenever the magistrates called out the militia, they were on hand to effectually protect every British subject, every Canadian citizen, in the full enjoyment of his rights. There was apparently, from my reading of the newspaper this morning, a very great want of energy on the part of the municipal authorities; but I speak with some reserve, because we have only the statement in the press. It is very disappointing, however, I must say, that this lady could not go there with her friends and companions unmolested and hold meetings and see people, so long as the proceedings were not contrary to law or to morals. But all we can do is to express as individuals our strong disapprobation at such supineness, such want of energy, and want of a sense

of responsibility—if the statements are true—on the part of the local municipality. I would ask the hon. gentleman to rise and say what the Dominion Government could do. What can we do? We have no power to administer the law of the land as regards the administration of justice. If the disturbances assume the proportions of a rebellion, then the military law comes in, military considerations arise, and then a power vested in the Dominion Government must be exercised and great would be the responsibility if the Dominion Government did not exercise it when disturbances amounted to rebellion. But so long as these are mere breaches of the peace, we are utterly powerless. Look at the statutes of the land, look at the constitution, and you will see that the Provinces, as regards the administration of criminal justice, retain the power they possessed before Confederation. The whole power they possessed, except that they will have to invoke the intervention of the Dominion, or, at all events, of the Military Department of the Dominion, if the civil force is unable to secure the protection of the subject. The hon. gentleman is doing no good by bringing up this matter here. He has had no design to do good, the House will see that. The hon. gentleman wants to pose as a special protector of certain classes and certain individuals. I must say that I look down upon the course of the hon. gentleman. If he had really wished to protect Miss Wright and keep order in Hull, he should have gone with her and stood by her, instead of coming here whining, in order to raise a cry in the country, when he would not raise his finger for her protection or for the protection of anyone with her.

Mr. CHARLTON. One or two remarks made by the right hon. gentleman call for a reply from me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoken ; order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order unless he has the unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He has spoken.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the remarks of the Prime Minister call for some reply, and if the House will permit—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; spoken ; sit down.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move the adjournment of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You are too late. It has already been moved.

Mr. MITCHELL. The reason I speak is because I think when a gentleman is attacked he should have an opportunity of defending himself.

Mr. BERGERON. He is the attacker himself.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know nothing of what happened before I came into the House, but I will move the adjournment of the debate, and I will do it simply for the reason of giving the gentleman who is attacked an opportunity of defending himself.

An hon. MEMBER. He was not attacked ; he commenced it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not approve of what my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) has done, but I think he has the right to have an opportunity of defending himself, and I move the adjournment of the debate.

An hon. MEMBER. There is no debate to be adjourned.

Mr. LAURIER. The remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) called from the First Minister an answer which was somewhat warm in tone, and the First Minister himself will agree, that on the spur of a moment he made some charges against my hon. friend to which it would certainly be unfair to refuse him the right to reply at this moment. I do not claim that my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has the right to go over the ground covered by his previous remarks, but every one will agree with me that he should have the right to give some explanation of the charges that are brought against him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I brought no charges.

Mr. CHARLTON. It was not my desire, in the remarks I had made, to excite religious animosity and prejudice in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoken ; order.

An hon. MEMBER. Why did you make them?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman wants to make a personal explanation, I cannot deny that right to him, but it must not exceed the very limited field to which personal explanations are confined.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have to say that, in my opinion, the First Minister has no right to impute to any member of this House—no matter how humble he may be—any motives of the character he has imputed to me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair ; order.

Mr. CHARLTON. The course taken by the Premier was simply a piece of special pleading, to cast reproach and discredit on the position I have taken.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. He asks in a sneering tone : “ Why had I not gone over to Hull with Miss Wright, and acted as escort to protect her, instead of raising this question in Parliament ? ” Does the hon. the leader of the Government wish to have a civil war in this country ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does he wish the private citizens of this country to form themselves into an escort for the purpose of maintaining the laws which it is the bounden duty of the authorities to uphold ? Would he like to see a thousand men marching from Ottawa to Hull to enforce for Miss Wright the rights which she is under the law entitled to. The right hon. gentleman is inciting to riot and inciting to bloodshed in the arguments he has used on this occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No ; order.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman said that if I had any desire to do good I should go over to Hull to protect this young lady. I say again that the hon. gentleman had no right to impute any such motives to me that he did. I feel as every Protestant in this House feels, and as every lover of liberty in this country feels, that a gross outrage has been perpetrated, that the rights of free speech have been trampled into the dust,

that the rights of the subject have been disregarded in a city of this land, and that the Government of this country, through the course taken by the First Minister, are laying themselves open to the charge of trying to palliate the offence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not come whining to this House, as has been said. I arraign the Government in the light of the public opinion of the country.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to say that the best interests of the whole community of Canada depend upon our observing—I will not say the tone or the language of the First Minister—but that fundamental rule which he laid down for our action in this matter. So long, Sir, as we feel that it is for the Province to act, we may well as citizens of Canada who do not dwell in the Province, watch the course taken by the Province, and express our opinions as citizens of Canada, as to what ought to be done, but we ought not to attempt to interfere, either coercively, threateningly or otherwise in a capacity in which we have no right to interfere, as members of this House. There is a Legislature sitting at this moment in Quebec, which has charge of this matter. There is a Legislature there sitting to whom the proper observations relative to what has taken place to our great regret in the city of Hull, might have been addressed. Let them be addressed there. Let us not despair—I shall not say despair, but rather let us confidently expect that in the Legislature to which this matter properly belongs, it will be brought up and that justice will be done. I can assure the hon. gentleman who has brought this question before this House, that the prospects of liberty and justice being advanced are not brightened, rather, they are darkened, when an attempt is made, by bodies which have no power to speak authoritatively in the matter, to interfere in a question belonging to provincial rights.

Mr. FLYNN. I cannot help saying that I am at a loss to know what motive the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has in bringing this matter twice before this House. There is not a man in this House who does not deplore the unfortunate occurrence of last night, but the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) must have known, as he has been told by the leader of the Government and by my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), that this House has nothing to do with it. If that hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) was animated by a sole desire for the public peace of this country, why, when he came here at the opening of the Session, did he not call the Prime Minister's attention to the fact that the rabble of the neighboring city of Toronto attacked a high dignitary of the Catholic Church? If the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was animated by a high and disinterested desire for our public welfare he would have brought that matter forward. Now he brings this matter forward, when it ought never to have been called, to the attention of this House.

Mr. BERGERON. He did it for the galleries.

Mr. FLYNN. I fear he brought it forward for the purpose of exciting the passions which unfortunately exist in Canada to-day; passions which ought not to exist, but which are excited and

Mr. CHARLTON.

fostered by the conduct of that hon. gentleman for the last twelve months; passions not calculated to promote the material interests and prosperity of the country, passions which, if raised, will make people glad to leave this country. I hope, Sir, that the majority of the independence and intelligence of this country will be prompt to stamp out the efforts of these braggarts, these fanatics and these firebrands, and that they will soon find that they no longer have any influence to disturb the peace of the community.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House has referred to the rabble in Toronto who attacked the Archbishop on his arrival in that city not so very long ago. I can say, Sir, for the city of Toronto that the mayor and the municipal authorities took every precaution that was necessary for the protection of that prelate on his entrance to the city. I can say that they called out the whole police force of the city, and that the attack that was made was publicly regretted and apologised for by every one in authority there, and that, after all, it was only the act of some half-dozen misguided young men and boys. These incidents which have occurred across the river last night and last night week, are incidents most regrettable in their character. In the first instance, we were told that they were the acts of some men under the influence of liquor, or of some thoughtless rabble; but last night the affair assumed a more serious aspect, and we are told there were a thousand people there, and that they went repeatedly to the stone quarries to get supplies of stones. Captain Joshua Wright, whom I saw last night in Hull, told me that he was struck down by a stone striking his forehead, that he was kicked after being knocked down, and that he was insensible for many minutes. He and his friends were attacked by men whom he knew, in a most cruel manner. This was the more regrettable, as he was performing a mission of peace. He had asked the citizens of Ottawa in a letter to the press, not to go to Hull and interfere, because he believed the citizens of Hull were peaceably disposed, and would be disposed to control any mob element that might show itself. It is regrettable that the mayor of the city and alderman Wright and others had so underrated the strength of this movement and the mob element in Hull, and it may be that the offer which was made to Miss Wright and refused by her in the first instance, that an escort of sufficient strength should accompany her, will be accepted on the next occasion, and that they will probably see that Miss Wright and those associated with her in her work are protected. I wish to make just one further remark. The hon. member for North Norfolk has mentioned that in 1878, on the occasion of the disturbances in Montreal, Mr. Mackenzie secured for the Orangemen of that city the right to walk. In that I think the hon. member is mistaken. A deputation met Mr. Mackenzie—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. This is not the question.

Mr. WALLACE. I am replying to what was stated. A deputation met Mr. Mackenzie and he made substantially the same statement on that occasion that the right hon. Premier made on this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question now before the House, on the motion for adjournment, is what happened in Hull last night, and it is useless to go back to discuss what took place in 1878.

Mr. WALLACE. I was simply replying to what was said.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would point out that the hon. gentleman opposite was allowed to state that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie allowed the Orangemen to walk. My hon. friend behind me says that that is a mistake, that my hon. friend then took the same course as I advocate, and as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) pressed just now. The matter was left to the local authorities, and on the requisition of two magistrates, troops were called out and peace was preserved.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

BEHRING SEA SEAL FISHERIES.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I see it stated in the Washington correspondence in one of our dailies, that the United States Government are making preparations for a return of the police to Behring Sea, with a view, of course, to the exclusion of Canadian fishermen from those waters. I would like to know whether the Government have any information on the subject, and whether any steps are being taken to protect the Canadian seal fishermen there from depredations of this sort?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have no information of any such preparations on the part of the United States, and I may say I do not believe it. Negotiations are now going on with the Government at Washington, which will, I hope, pursuing the language of the Speech from the Throne, result in a satisfactory settlement of all those matters.

CENSUS RETURN OF PAGANS.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for :

Return showing the names of the six Pagans returned for the parish of Ste. Elizabeth, in the County of Joliette and Province of Quebec, in the census returns of 1881, as appears from the original schedule of the enumerator for that parish.

He said: I have just one word to say about this matter. These six Pagans, so-called, I am informed, consist of a Presbyterian family of French-Canadians, one of whom is a very respectable minister in this city. If it is the custom in the Province of Quebec to classify Protestants as Pagans, it evinces a state of feeling in that country which is much to be deplored, and I wish to know whether this charge made is correct or not—whether these six Pagans are, in point of fact, a Presbyterian French family consisting of six persons?

Mr. LAURIER. I would like my hon. friend to understand that the enumerator who took the census in the parish of Ste. Elizabeth is not the whole Province of Quebec.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Very probably the enumerator mistook the term *presbytérien* for *païen*, the termination in each case sounding alike.

Motion agreed to.

LANDS CLAIMED UNDER THE MANITOBA ACT.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE. Though I would very much desire to have the information I proposed to ask for in the motion opposite my name, namely, for a list of every lot of land in the Province of Manitoba claimed under the provisions of the Manitoba Act, and occupied or possessed before the transfer, at the same time as I am informed that it would cost \$1,500 to prepare such a list, I do not wish that such a large expenditure should be incurred. I hope, however, that the hon. the Minister will, in a future report, publish the information asked in this return, as by so doing he would save a good deal of expense in the future to parties purchasing land, who wish to find out about the titles of the same. I therefore ask that the motion be withdrawn.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I should be most happy to give the hon. gentleman any information I possibly can, since the hon. gentleman withdraws his motion on learning the enormous cost it would entail.

Motion withdrawn.

INDIAN RESERVES, MANITOBA.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE moved for :

List of Indian Reserves within the Province of Manitoba, giving location and area of each one, number of Indians belonging to it at the time of location of such reserve, and number now actually living on same.

He said: The object of this motion is to find out whether some of those reserves, which are almost deserted, should not be thrown open to the public, in order that settlement might not be interrupted. Located as they are in the midst of settlements, they are an obstruction to colonisation, and therefore the Government should throw open to the settlers those reserves which are not now occupied by a sufficient number of Indians.

Motion agreed to.

EXTENSION OF THE DERBY BRANCH RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL moved for :

Copies of all papers, correspondence and agreements between the Government and the proprietors of the extension of the Derby Branch Railway in relation to the said extension.

He said: I regret very much that the Minister of Railways is not in his place, because it is a matter of some little importance.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps better defer it.

Mr. MITCHELL. He is in the House, and if he does not remain in his place to defend himself in matters affecting the Department I am not responsible. I wish to say, in relation to this matter, that there is a road in connection with the Intercolonial, which was built by the Government as a branch to that road, extending from the point where it crosses the two branches of the Miramichi, up to a place called Indian Town, some sixteen or seventeen miles from the connection with the Intercolonial road. There is on the other side of the river running from Chatham, first, the Chatham Bridge which connects the important town of Chatham with the deep water, and then the Northern and Western extending to Fredericton and crossing at Blackville, near Mr. Farley's mills. The two roads converge to one point, but

after the building of the Derby branch there was a gap of eight and a half miles which required to be finished, to complete the road on the north of the river and connect with the junction of the Northern and Western at the Farley mills. I applied to the Government some years ago for the purpose of getting them to extend the Derby branch by building across that break of eight and a half miles. I pleaded to the Government to build that link as a continuation of the Derby branch as a Government work, which they had built and owned. In place of doing that, the hon. Minister of Railways recommended that a subsidy should be given for the building of that section, and that subsidy was taken up by the owners of the Northern and Western. They built the link between the end of the Derby branch and the crossing of the Northern and Western at Blackville, but though they have had that built for several years, the road has never been opened to the public, and the public money has been appropriated for a purpose which gives no benefit to the people. This is a matter the Government should take some notice of. I make no complaint against the proprietors of the Northern and Western road, who built and owned that link, but I do say that when a subsidy is given out of the treasury to build a railway, those who build that railway should be compelled to operate it, and give the public the benefit of the money expended in this connection. That is the point which I take. Though that eight and a-half miles of road has been built for two or three years or more, it has never been operated. The people get no benefit from it, and the money which has been voted might as well have been thrown into the sea as expended where it was, if it is not operated. The expenditure was necessary, the connection was necessary, it was desirable that the road should be built and operated, but for some reasons that the Northern and Western people probably understand in their own interest, it has not been operated, and the people have had to pay the money which has been expended, and the expenditure of which should inure to their benefit. I hope some member of the Government will take down the points which I have made, and will let the Minister of Railways know what is required in regard to this matter. I hope he will also note what I now state, that what we require is to know: first, whether or not the Government have entered into any arrangement that the road shall not be operated; and, secondly, whether the Government have entered into any arrangement that the road shall be operated? I desire to get any correspondence which has taken place between the Government and the proprietors of the Northern and Western road. These gentlemen are friends of mine and supported me at the last election, but I owe a duty to the people of the country which I am determined to press, and I contend that where men receive public money, and have the treasury left open to them, in order that they may give a public benefit; where they receive the money and build the road they are bound to operate it, unless there is some arrangement between the Government and themselves that it should not be operated. I therefore ask for this information. I do not blame the Government or any one in reference to this matter, but I want to get at the facts. Where a subsidy is granted,

Mr. MITCHELL.

where men accept that subsidy for the construction of a railway, and own and control that railway, the Government should take care that these men should be compelled to operate the railway when it is built. This is a standing scandal in the county.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course the papers will be brought down, but I have a note here to the effect that, so far as can be discovered by the records of the Department, there is no arrangement for operating this branch of the railway.

Motion agreed to.

REBATE OF DUTY UPON MALT.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved :

That whereas distillers are allowed a rebate of duty upon malt imported for use in the manufacture of spirits for export, it is, in the opinion of this House, but just and right that farmers and stock raisers who import corn to feed cattle or other stock for export should also receive a similar rebate.

He said: This is another of the drawbacks to which I have the honor to call the attention of the House. I say that this discriminates against the great farming masses of this country, and hence I consider it objectionable and believe it should be removed. I reiterate now what I said the other day, that all these drawbacks which discriminate against any class of the people of this country shall have my uncompromising opposition. I am bound to press matters of this character upon the House and the country until I find even-handed justice meted out to all classes in this country. I think it is about time that this drawback should be removed. I think it is not in the interests of this country or tending to preserve that harmony which should exist between all classes in Canada. Equal rights to all has been my motto always, and I will continue to advocate that policy, and nothing but equal rights will suit me. Anything else shall have my opposition in and out of this House. For these reasons I move this resolution.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I desire to say a few words to show the importance of this motion. As a matter of fact, malt is not imported for the manufacture of spirits, and therefore there is no drawback to be given. There is an excise duty on malt produced in this country of one cent per pound, and the amount which has been received by the Government from that source in three years is about \$38.

Motion negatived on a division.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will allow the other motions of which I have given notice to stand.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire this courtesy to be extended to me. When we ask that a motion be allowed to stand, I think it is usual to allow it. If the Premier does not desire to use that courtesy, we will take the yeas and nays. I wish it to stand for public reasons of my own, and I think they would be satisfactory to the House and to the Premier to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I will smother the hon. gentleman with roses and allow it to stand.

THE BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. BAIN (Soulanges) moved for :

Copy of the reports, estimates, &c., of Thos. Munro, Esq., civil engineer, on the enlargement of the Beauharnois Canal, or the construction of a new canal, on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, between Lakes St. Francis and St. Louis. Also all papers, petitions, letters or other documents relating thereto, since 1st February, 1889.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that motion can be agreed to, although I well understand the object of my hon. friend. But further enquiries are going to be made, and some very important subjects have to be considered. The whole matter is so very important, that it engages the most earnest attention of the Government. There is a confidential report, but we must have a full report on all the subjects.

Motion withdrawn.

POST OFFICE AT PIERREVILLE, P.Q.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved for :

Copies of two enquiries and reports made by Messrs. Bourgeois, King and Bolduc, respecting the post office at Pierreville, P.Q.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no objections to bring down all the papers which are usually brought down, but the reports of the inspectors are generally printed as confidential.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Strike out the words "and reports."

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE AT PALMER ROAD, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY moved for :

Copies of all petitions, letters, &c., to the Department at Ottawa, praying for a post office at Palmer Road, P. E. I.; also all correspondence to and from the Post Office Department at Ottawa and the Post Office Inspector at Charlottetown, P.E.I., on the same subject.

He said : I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that a petition, very largely signed by influential men, was sent to the Department praying for the establishment of a post office in that locality. The reason why a post office is needed there is because there are fishing establishments in the locality, and the people who are interested in the fishing industry are compelled to travel backwards and forwards two or three times a week to obtain their correspondence. Instead of placing the post office at the cross-roads, the officials have carried it a mile and a half or two miles further, and it is a long distance out of the way. These fishermen very naturally applied to Senator Howlan last winter to present their petition for a post office to the Department. The Minister, in answer to Senator Howlan, declared that the office would be opened as soon as possible, and Senator Howlan wrote to a certain gentleman at Palmer Road giving the answer of the Department to the petition. His letter reads as follows :—

"OTTAWA, 20th February, 1889.

"I duly received yours of the 8th inst, covering the petition, &c., for a post office. I went immediately to work with the Department, and this morning I am informed the office will be opened as soon as the necessary arrangements are made."

Senator Howlan naturally supposed from this, and I myself would have supposed from this, that the post office would be established as soon as the necessary arrangements could be made. But we find that

March slips through and April, May, June and July, without anything being done. Up to July nothing had been done towards establishing the post office, and I find that Senator Howlan wrote to the Department, and the answer he received from the Assistant Postmaster General was as follows :—

"OTTAWA, 20th July, 1889.

"DEAR MR. HOWLAN,—I am afraid the Postmaster General has forgotten the Palmer's Road post office. I will call his attention to it the first opportunity. He is away just now.

Yours faithfully,

"WILLIAM WHITE."

It appears up to that time no action was taken with respect to the establishment of the post office ; but Mr. White assured Senator Howlan that so soon as the Postmaster General returns he will bring it to his notice ; and he gave the Senator to understand that the post office would be established. Senator Howlan, on the receipt of that letter, wrote to the people interested, to the following effect :

"CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I., 24th July, 1889.

"I enclose you a letter, which I received in answer to mine, which will explain itself. It appears your post office has been overlooked, but will be attended to in due time."

Well, that due time has not yet arrived ; it is still "to-morrow" with respect to the establishment of this post office, for nothing has been done. When I asked the Postmaster General the reason why it had not been established, the answer I got, and I suppose it was the correct one, was that Mr. Hackett had written a letter that the post office was not required. If Mr. Hackett or any other person, whether a defeated candidate or a private gentleman, knew better the wants of the people than the people themselves or their representatives in this House, or the Senator who represents Prince County, and who is the only Senator who represents it, it is time we should know it. If the demands of the people of the Island, backed up by their representatives in this House and in the Senate, are to be frustrated by a defeated candidate or by any one else, it is time we should know it. I want the Government to know this, that the people of the Island are not satisfied to put up with this sort of rough treatment much longer. What have they done elsewhere ? Perhaps if we get the opportunity at the next election of sending six more representatives, the Island might return twelve men occupying seats on this side of the House. It is a wrong done to the people. It is done because the Government are led to believe that the people are all Grits ? That is a mistake, because, unfortunately there are some Conservatives living there. This is an example of using Government influence in the wrong direction. The Postmaster General should not take upon himself the responsibility of depriving these people of a post office without having some better information than he has obtained from a man, who, I believe, never saw the place, who has no interest in it, who cares not whether there is postal accommodation afforded or not. Those people are, however, paying their taxes, and the people of the Island are shouldering their share of the burdens of the country, and are as much a consuming people as any other people in the Dominion ; and when they are thus neglected it is time they should rise in their dignity and insist on getting their rights, as regards the establishment of post offices. How

have I and my colleagues been treated in these postal matters? The outgoing Postmaster General, who is now Governor of Nova Scotia, told us a few years ago that he had ordered a post office to be established at Baltic, Malpeque, Lot 18. When we went a year ago to the Postmaster General, asking the reason why that post office had not been established, he again said that a letter had been received from Mr. Hackett stating that it was not required. Mr. Hackett, however, never saw the place. He does not know who lives there, he hardly knows in what township it is; and I am doubtful whether he knows whether it is in Prince Edward Island or Kamschatka. I hope the Postmaster General will promptly see the necessity of establishing this post office. It is time that the hon. Minister should know something about this, and it is very poor satisfaction to me or to the people to be told by the hon. gentleman that he knows nothing about it. What have we got a Post Office Department here for if it is not to give that information to the people's representatives and to the people at large which we may lawfully expect? If the Postmaster General establishes a post office there he will do an act of justice. We don't come here asking any favors, but we ask what is lawfully due us and what we have a right to get. We are not going to Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, or anywhere outside of this capital; we have a right to ask for our rights here, and we do ask them. I trust the Postmaster General will see his way to order the post office to be established and so save these poor people from travelling two miles one way and two miles back, through bad roads, in order to mail their letters, when they ought to be able to do so more conveniently.

Mr. HAGGART. I might state that the Government have no objection to bring down the papers in reference to the application for the establishment of a post office at Palmer's Road station. The hon. gentleman was mistaken, when he said that the Post Office Department promised that a post office should be established there. There has not been any promise of the Department to that effect. An enquiry was ordered to be made as to the suitability of the place for a post office, and the Post Office Inspector replies that it is a sparsely-settled portion of the country, that there is another post office within a mile and a quarter also called Palmer post office, and another within five miles. The receipts from either of these post offices do not justify the establishment of another post office there. It was on that account solely that there was not a new post office established there, and not as the hon. gentleman states, from the recommendation of Mr. Hackett that no post office should be established.

Moción agreed to.

SICK MARINERS' FUND.

Mr. FLYNN moved for:

Copies of correspondence in connection with a claim made by the District of St. Peters, in the County of Richmond, for medical attendance and board of Kenneth Chisholm, a sick mariner, belonging to the schooner *Jeanie*.

He said: This claim is made by the District of St. Peters, in the county I represent, under what is known as the Sick and Distressed Seamen's Act. The head of the Department considers that it is not

Mr. PERRY.

liable to pay the amount, and bases his opinion on the 6th section of chapter 76 of the Revised Statutes, entitled "An Act respecting Sick and Distressed Mariners." When the hon. Minister announced to me that decision, I looked over the Act carefully, and after reading the whole chapter, I thought that it was not proper to interpret the Act from that isolated passage. I know that in bringing this matter before the House, and in taking issue with the hon. Minister's interpretation, I am at a great disadvantage, as the hon. gentleman is a lawyer, who had the reputation in his own Province of being a good one, and my knowledge of law is very limited; but I will state my reason for the view I take. In the first place, the interpretation put upon that statute by the hon. Minister of Marine has never been put upon it in the last twenty years, or since, a little after Confederation, the Act was placed on the Statute-book. Ever since that time every sick mariner, when the owner of a vessel or a captain paid tonnage dues, was entitled to relief from the Dominion of Canada, and it is only within a very few months that a different interpretation has been placed upon the Act. The Department has always taken a broader, more liberal, and, in my opinion, more just view of the statute than it has taken recently. As I have stated, the rule of interpretation of statutes is not to take an isolated section and to say that it means so-and-so, but to bring to it the context and also the spirit of the Act; and if the statute is ambiguous or confused in its meaning, I believe the rule is to endeavor to ascertain what was the intention of the Legislature. I hold that it could not have been the intention of the Legislature, in passing this Act, to have it administered according to the interpretation the hon. Minister puts upon it. In substantiation of that view of the interpretation of statutes, let me quote from Maxwell, a high authority on the subject. Speaking of the statutes, he says:

"They have frequently more than one equally obvious and popular meaning; words used in reference to one subject or set of circumstances may convey a meaning quite different from what the same words used in reference to another set of circumstances and another object would convey. Many admit of indefinite extension or restriction, according to the subject to which they relate, and the scope and object in contemplation. They may convey faithfully enough all that was intended, and yet comprise also much that was not; or, be so restricted in meaning as not to reach all the cases which fall within the real intention. Even, therefore, where there is no indistinctness or conflict of thought, or carelessness of expression in a statute, there is enough in the natural vagueness and elasticity of language to account for the difficulty so frequently found in ascertaining the meaning of an enactment, with the degree of accuracy necessary for determining whether a particular case falls within it. But statutes are not always drawn by skilled hands, and they are always exposed to the risk of alterations by many hands which introduce different styles and consequent difficulties of interpretation. Nothing, it has been said by a great authority, is so difficult as to construct properly an Act of Parliament; and nothing so easy as to pull it to pieces. The literal construction then, has, in general, but a *prima facie* preference. To arrive at the real meaning, it is always necessary to take a broad general view of the Act, so as to get an exact conception of its aim, scope and object. It is necessary, according to Lord Coke, to consider, 1. What was the law before the Act was passed; 2. What was the mischief or defect for which the law had not provided; 3. What remedy Parliament has appointed; and 4. The reason of the remedy. According to another authority, the true meaning is to be found, not merely from the words of the Act, but from the cause and necessity of its being made, from a comparison of its several parts and from extraneous circumstances. The true meaning of any passage

is to be found not merely in the words of that passage, but in comparing it with every other part of the law, ascertaining also what were the circumstances with reference to which the words were used, and what was the object appearing from those circumstances, which the Legislature had in view."

These passages, I think, sustain my contention, that the construction put upon the statute by the hon. Minister is too narrow, too limited, and not in accordance with the intention and spirit of the Legislature when the Act was passed. Now, Sir, the Act makes the payment of tonnage dues compulsory. No vessel can be entered or cleared from any port in the Dominion of Canada, unless the owner of the vessel pays those dues. The tonnage is 2 cents a ton on every vessel under 100 tons, payable once a year, and if the vessel is over 100 tons it is payable twice a year. It is the duty of the collector of the port where the vessel enters or clears to transmit these dues to the Finance Minister or the Receiver General, and they are kept as a trust fund known as the Sick Mariners' Fund, for the benefit of sick and distressed mariners. Now, if the interpretation put upon that statute by the hon. Minister of Marine is a correct one, then this fund could not be, as it purports to be, for the relief of distressed mariners, but it would be only a fund for the relief of a limited number of distressed mariners. My contention is that a vessel having been compelled to pay certain tonnage dues before entering a port and clearing, and the law stating those dues will form a fund for the relief of sick and distressed mariners, if any one of the crew become sick or disabled, he is entitled to relief from that fund no matter where that seaman may be landed. The hon. Minister puts another interpretation on the Act. He says that, according to the sixth section, the mariner is only entitled to relief where there is a marine hospital, or, in the absence of a marine hospital, only where the vessel has paid her tonnage dues, limiting the relief that could be afforded to the chance of a marine hospital being at the port, or of the tonnage dues being paid there. Now, in the Maritime Provinces, where there are so many ports, there are not more than fourteen or fifteen marine hospitals. Take the case of a vessel clearing, just as the case in point, from the port of Charlottetown and being obliged to land a sick mariner in the port of St. Peters, Cape Breton, where there is no marine hospital and no sick mariners' fund. According to the interpretation of the hon. the Minister of Marine, that sick mariner is not entitled to be cared for out of the fund; but my contention is, that no matter where the fund is collected that sick mariner is bound to obtain relief wherever he is landed, and that relief ought to be paid for by the Department out of the fund for sick and distressed seamen. Let me suppose that a vessel sails in the early spring from Charlottetown, having paid its dues, and goes down to the Bras d'Or Lake to trade in that section, and a man falls sick on board and has to be landed at St. Peters. He can get no relief. Why? Because the vessel paid its dues where the custom collector would not clear it if the dues were not paid, and because there is no marine hospital at St. Peters. If that interpretation of the law is the interpretation given by legal gentlemen, I hold that such was not the intention of the legislation, and that for the last twenty years such interpretation has never been acted upon. Even in the port of

Arichat, cases have occurred month after month, there being no marine hospital there, of sick seamen having to be cared for, and the question was never asked of the captain, "Where did you pay your dues?" But, if it was found he had a receipt for the payment of the tonnage dues, no matter in what port he paid them, the sick mariner was provided medical attendance and board, and the bill for the expense sent to the Department and paid. That has been the interpretation for the last twenty years. That was the interpretation acted upon when the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) presided over this Department, and while he presided he gave general satisfaction to the people, and that is the interpretation acted upon until very recently. If the law is, as the hon. gentleman contends it is, it is a narrow and limited law, and I hold that it was the intention of the Legislature which passed it, that it should have a wider scope and a more general interpretation. I had a conversation with the hon. Minister, and not agreeing with his views of the law, I stated, and he consented to it, that I would put the question in order to elicit a discussion in the House. I have, as briefly and plainly as I possibly could, laid the matter before the House, and I now leave to hon. gentlemen who are conversant with the law to say whether my view or the hon. the Minister's is the correct one.

Mr. TUPPER. When the hon. gentleman spoke to me some time ago about this case of Kenneth Chisholm, I had no idea that his opinion of the result of our conversation was that we would submit the legal question to this House for decision, but I understood the hon. gentleman wished to bring up the question as to whether the Act relating to sick seamen and distressed mariners was broader than my interpretation of it. First of all, in reference to the case of Kenneth Chisholm, I do not think that under his, or any construction of the Act, that case could have been entertained. I wrote to the hon. gentleman some time ago that my information was that the collector had reported that the master of the vessel upon which Kenneth Chisholm was a seaman had never reported the case, or made any application to him for landing or providing for the seaman, and he had no recollection where the vessel paid sick mariners' dues the year in question. So that the case on which the hon. gentleman asked this House for an opinion was a case in which the master neglected every precaution and in which there was not the slightest evidence to show that he had paid the tonnage dues. In reference to the construction of the Act, I do not think there can be much difficulty. Clauses five and six state that wherever there is a marine hospital for the sick seaman of a Canadian vessel which has paid her dues in any port in Canada, that sick seaman may gratuitously be received and treated at that marine hospital, but if a ship comes into a port in Canada with a sick seaman and there is no marine hospital—not merely a marine hospital in which sick mariners are received—but one in which mariners are exclusively received, in that case the master, when he claims treatment at the hands of the Government through the Collector of Customs, must pay dues there, no matter whether he paid his dues before or not. The Act states that expressly, but the hon. gentleman appeals to a practice which he says I admitted

prevailed in the Department. I could not speak of the practice of the Department twenty years ago, but I was informed in the Department that this construction of the Act had not been adhered to. I have no authority to pay a dollar out of what is called the Sick Mariners' Fund unless the payments are sanctioned by the Act, and I should be very sorry to have a discretion put in my hands to decide on special cases, when the payment might not be contemplated by the Act. Although the statute is very clear in the two sections to which I have referred, it goes on to refer to the case of sick seamen who do not come within those clauses, and this is the provision :

"Any shipwrecked, destitute or otherwise distressed seamen may, by authority from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, be temporarily boarded and lodged, and taken care of, at any Marine or Seamen's Hospital devoted exclusively to the reception, care and treatment of sick mariners."

Even in that case the Minister of Marine is not able to say where these seamen shall be cared for, and the Legislature has taken great pains in that regard. As to the policy on which that Act was founded, I might remind my hon. friend that we must follow the Act very closely in the administration of the funds, and now more than ever, because last year this fund, which was intended to be self-sustaining, had an amount of receipts of about \$39,000, while about \$41,000 was paid out. Since Confederation, we have expended about \$11,000 on account of this fund over and above what we have received ; so that, while there is not the slightest intention on the part of the Department to refuse or to deny any privilege to which a sailor may be entitled under the provisions of the statute, there has been a very eager desire, as far as I am concerned, to see that none of the money constituting the so-called Mariners' Fund is expended for any purpose which is not within the provisions of that Act. Of course, if it should become the policy of Parliament to go further and to make a sweeping provision for the event of sickness occurring amongst the mariners, the Department will have to carry out the will of Parliament, but, in that case, it will have to be considered whether the fund should be self-supporting or not. The papers in regard to the case of Kenneth Chisholm will be brought down, but I may say that there was no intention to depart from the provisions of the Act in that particular.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This is a rather important matter to the Maritime Provinces, and I think the construction which is put on the Act by the Minister of Marine is a very narrow one. It is true that the language of the statute is not very clear, but it is provided that at certain ports this duty shall be levied and paid by certain vessels for the benefit of this fund. Vessels of less than 100 tons are to pay only once a year, and those over 100 tons three times a year. These vessels are to have the benefit of the Act whether they pay once or three times a year, but, if the construction put upon the Act by my hon. friend is correct, a vessel which enters a dozen ports in the course of a year would have to pay every time she entered a port, and that would conflict with the policy of Parliament, as expressed in the Act, that vessels of more than 100 tons should pay only three times a year, and vessels under 100 tons once a year. The fifth section provides that

Mr. TUPPER.

the master or person in command of any vessel paying any such duty may send to the Marine Hospital, where it exists, any sick mariner belonging to his vessel, and where such hospital does not exist, he may send him to any hospital designated and appointed by the Department. It is clear that where the rate has been paid once a year in the one case or three times a year in the other, the sick mariner would be entitled to the benefit of that provision, and it is very peculiar that this change should be made, because, if the contention of the Minister is correct, the master may send the sick man to a hospital in a port where arrangements have been made by the Dominion authorities for that purpose, after paying three times in the year, but, if the vessel goes to a port where there is no marine hospital, he must pay over again. The sixth section says :

"At any port at which such rate or duty as aforesaid is received, and at all for which there is no marine or seamen's hospital or other hospital so designated and appointed as aforesaid."

And so on. Taking those words and reading them with the other words of the Act, I am inclined to think that it should be read as if it were at any port where such money is received, that is, the ports designated in the 4th section, and in that case there is no reason for the contention of the hon. gentleman that the duty should be paid at the particular port where the sick man is left, but that it should not be distinguished from the port where there is a hospital designated by the Government. I think it means exactly the same as the 5th section, that, wherever such duties are collected, the sick mariner is entitled to be received in any port.

Mr. TUPPER. I admit the argument the hon. gentleman is now making is almost unanswerable, but if you will read on, you will find the words "which shall be paid by the master or person in command" of such vessels paying the duty.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I admit that, to a certain extent, the construction put forward is strictly a narrow interpretation of it, and would maintain the position taken by my hon. friend ; but when I read the whole language I cannot construe it so, and bring the whole Act into harmony. If a vessel goes to any port in those Provinces where there is a marine hospital she has got to pay the duty every time, but if she goes to a port where there is no marine hospital she is only obliged to say that she has paid at some other ports three times. Take a vessel belonging to Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia ; she would probably visit half-a-dozen ports in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia during the year. If that vessel goes to a port where there is a hospital and a sick man wants to enter it, the master makes his entry and pays his charge to the sick fund ; but when he goes into a port like Shediac where there is no marine hospital, he produces a receipt that he has paid three times, and if he got sick two or three days afterwards, he would have to pay again. A man who would put himself in a position to take advantage of this Act would have to pay again, although he had paid three times during the year in order to get the benefit. That would be the result of my hon. friend's construction.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I must admit that the section under discussion is most unfortunately worded ;

I must further admit that, if the construction put upon by the Minister is correct, there is no doubt that the object and the intention of Parliament in passing this law will be in many cases entirely defeated. Now, if I understand the contention of the hon. gentleman aright it is this: that a vessel paying the sick mariners' fund fees, if she has a 100 tons burden, is obliged to pay once in a year, and the statute says not oftener. It is not affirmative that she shall pay but once in a year, but it is negative that she shall not be compelled to pay more than once. She is only entitled to pay once; she is not obliged to pay oftener in order that she may obtain the benefits which are to be derived under this Act for sick mariners. Vessels of over 100 tons are compelled to pay three times in the year, but not oftener. So if a vessel is under 100 tons she pays the sick mariners' fund fees once in a year, and comes under the statute and is entitled to the benefit of that statute which it is intended to confer upon sick or disabled mariners. Now, if that vessel goes into port where there is a hospital and the master produces an order, whether he pays the fees in that particular port or not, under the fifth section, there is no doubt that a sick mariner can be taken to that hospital and has a right to be treated. Supposing a vessel leaves Yarmouth, and she goes to Halifax, where there is a hospital, after paying her fees in Yarmouth three times, if she is over 100 tons, or paid them once, if under 100 tons, then she is entitled to the benefit of the sick mariners' fund. If she goes into a harbor where there is a hospital, whether it is a port where she has paid or not, under the fifth section, the sick mariner is taken care of and cured without any expense, and without the payment of fees. Then she goes into the port at Arichat, we will say, where there is no hospital, and, if I understand my hon. friend aright, she is not entitled to the benefit.

Mr. TUPPER. Unless she pays the dues.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That construction, it seems to me, may be technically correct; it is very hard to reconcile the words in the Act with any other construction. But the hon. gentleman will see that it is entirely opposed to and defeats the object of the statute. Take this very vessel we have in view. She leaves Yarmouth and goes to Halifax. One of the seamen breaks his leg and is immediately taken to the hospital and placed under care and treated. The vessel goes into Arichat and one of the seamen becomes disabled, and has to go on shore. They say: We will not take care of you because there is no marine hospital here, and you did not become sick until you arrived at Arichat. That is not the intention of this section. This section says: If you go into a port where there is no hospital, but the vessel has paid a fee which the law requires and which the law says she shall not be obliged to pay more than once, then the collector of that port may take charge of him and take the seaman to the nearest public hospital and pay his fees. My hon. friend points out that he must pay his fee in starting. If a foreign vessel goes into a port it must pay the fees when it makes its entry. That is clear enough under the fourth section. But another vessel, a coasting vessel, when she starts off in the spring of the year, if she wishes to enjoy the benefit of the sick mariners' fund, must pay the fee at the port where she leaves. If she does that, under the construction

which I am sure that the Department wish to be put upon the Act, the mariners would be entitled, whether they were in a port where there was a hospital or not, to the benefit of the mariners' sick fund and the seamen must be taken care of. I frankly admit that the section is very unfortunately worded, and that by one construction of it a man cannot be taken care of until the vessel pays all the fees over again. But I cannot see anything in the Act to justify or sanction the compelling of a man to pay the fees twice, when, in the second sub-section of section one, it is stated that he has to pay the fees once, but not oftener. If the Minister does not amend the section, he would not offend against any kind of construction if he were to place a broad and reasonable view upon the sixth section, and carry out what was, no doubt, the spirit and intention of Parliament, namely: that a seaman on board of a vessel which has once paid into the sick mariners' fund should be entitled to the benefits of the fund, whether there was a hospital or not at the port where he was landed; and if there was a hospital, he should be taken there, and if there was not a hospital, he should be taken to the nearest public hospital at the public charge. It seems unreasonable that a man should receive medical attendance if he happens to be disabled at a port where there is a hospital, but if at a port where there is not a hospital, that he should be thrown on the charity of the world. That was not the intention of Parliament, although it may not have been expressed very clearly, and the hon. gentleman will be doing natural and common justice, and carrying out the wishes of Parliament and the spirit of the statute, if he should strain the language a little so that a sick mariner on board a vessel which had paid the fees should be entitled to the benefit at whatever port he might be landed.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not catch the point until it was brought out by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), and I never had the question before me. I would be the last man to construe this or any other section against seamen, if I could possibly avoid it. While I will consider the views of the hon. and learned gentlemen opposite, I must say that, on the first blush of the argument, I cannot agree altogether with the argument of those hon. members. They have drawn my attention to sub-sections two and three of section four, and a great deal of argument has been founded on the words "but not oftener." All I understand those words to mean is this: that no vessel should be compelled to pay more than that amount of dues once.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The words are "shall be liable."

Mr. TUPPER. We can compel the vessel to pay that amount once, but not oftener. Another section comes in and says that, although we cannot compel you to pay more than once in the case of one voyage and three times in the case of other voyages, yet, on the other hand, you shall not have any gratuitous assistance for your sick mariners at a certain class of port, unless you again pay that amount; we will not compel you, for the Act says you can provide for your own sick seamen and make provision for them, but if you come to a port where there is no marine hospital, and you have not paid the dues at that port, Parliament has said

distinctly, not by the words quoted by the member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), but by the rest of the section, that there shall be no gratuitous assistance. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the balance of the clause, which he omitted to read, and especially to the words "Captain or person in command, paying such rate or dues at such port." I think those words enable us to meet the otherwise unanswerable argument of the hon. gentleman for St. John.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Suppose a sailor goes to a port where there is a marine hospital; he has a right to be taken to that hospital and cared for and all expenses paid. The anomaly is that if a sick seaman is left at a port where there is no hospital, this is not done.

Mr. TUPPER. Not unless he pays the dues. It is an arbitrary way of raising the funds.

Mr. MITCHELL. There has been a good deal of hair-splitting indulged in as to the meaning of the terms of the Act. The Act was passed, I believe, under my administration of the affairs of the Department, and the fact that it was a consolidation may possibly have led to some indefiniteness about it. I am not prepared to offer an opinion as to whether the Minister is right in his contention or not; but I am prepared to say this, that in the preparation of that Act there was no intention to exclude mariners who met with misfortune at a port where there was no marine hospital. The Act was based upon this fact: that we desired that the institution should be self-supporting, or comparatively so, and where a ship had paid the sick dues at any one port, the mariners were entitled to be taken care of, if accident or misfortune overtook them. That was the spirit of the Act. If the Act was so drawn as not to clearly express the intention of its framer, it was my misfortune. But I think when one takes up the Act and examines the spirit of it, and reads the different sections, as has been done by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and by the Minister, it is hair-splitting to raise the question that, because the vessel entered a port where there was no hospital and did not pay the dues, the expenses of a sick mariner should not be met out of the general fund, to which the ship had contributed. I take that to be the spirit of the Act, and during my administration of the Department for seven and a half years such a question was never raised, and I think the Minister, in considering the matter, will probably conclude, whether he is legally and strictly right in his contention or not, that the spirit of the Act is clear, and that when a ship contributes to the fund for the support of sick mariners, seamen should get the benefit of the fund when misfortune overtook them. I think the Minister, after consideration, will see that it is well to give a liberal construction to the Act which the hon. gentleman has presented. That is the view I take of it, and I think the Minister will see the propriety of adopting that course.

Motion agreed to.

TIDAL OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. CURRAN moved for:

Return showing the annual losses of ships since 1868 in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and on the Atlantic coast, owing to tides, currents and fogs, with the name and

Mr. TUPPER.

tonnage of each vessel, and such particulars in each case as to the causes and extent of damage, as may be in the possession of the Government.

He said: I desire to make a very few remarks at present, in connection with this subject, which I wish to impress, not merely on the hon. Minister in charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the members of the Government, but also the other members of this House. I trust that the Government and Parliament will see the necessity for making tidal observations and observations in regard to the currents in Canadian waters. The members of the various scientific associations, combined with those who are engaged in navigation, have been impressing this matter upon the Government for very many years past, and I believe that a petition signed by not less than 399 masters and officers of ships frequenting those waters has been laid before Parliament. Such was the importance and force of this representation, that promises have been made by the Minister that some steps would be taken in order to arrive at the desired results. The petition to which I refer states that a practical knowledge of the currents for the purpose of navigation does not now exist; that it is attainable by a properly conducted system of observations, and that the petitioners can make a practical use in navigation of the results of the observations. Some time ago a series of questions were issued to the leading shipmasters of the country by a committee of gentlemen formed in 1885, and the answers of these leading shipmasters were sent to the Department in connection with this matter. It is, no doubt, generally known that in England tide tables are published for the British and Irish waters. I hold in my hand the report for 1885, in which all the observations are given for British waters; and in the United States we have also those tide tables published; and although they do not give so much information as the British tide tables, yet they give the results of the observations on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. The rules of the Imperial Board of Trade require that masters of ships should take a certificate of competency; and to obtain the certificate they pass an examination which, in the case of those desiring a certificate for the coasting trade, includes a knowledge of the tides and tidal currents which are reported upon in the volume I have just referred to. The testimony as to the value of such surveys may be judged from the high authorities which have pronounced upon it, a work on practical navigation, which has received the approbation of the naval authorities of Great Britain and the United States, being supplied to the fleets of both countries. That work is entitled "Wrinkles on Practical Navigation," by S. T. S. Lecky, Master Mariner, R.N. That gentleman puts two books, namely, the Admiralty Tide Tables, and Galbraith & Houghton's Manual of the Tides and Tidal Currents in a list of sixteen books, which he says:

"May be considered absolutely essential to safe navigation in the present day when the question of speed enters so largely into the calculation."

The testimony of Staff Commander Maxwell, R.N., quoted in the previous letters which were sent into the Department, may be also referred to. The petitions of the shipowners, of agents, and of boards of trade presented during the last five years, have asked that those tidal observations should be

made, and the shipowners and agents, from their close connections with shipmasters, may be regarded as representing the views of the latter on the matter. The whole subject is one which deserves the most serious consideration of the Government. I believe it has been so far only a question of lack of funds to proceed with the work, as well as the opinion expressed in certain quarters that any moneys that may be available would be better employed in perfecting the lighthouse system. At all events, the gentlemen who have given this subject such earnest attention, men of high scientific qualification, men who are deeply interested in the navigation of our waters, who have experienced so much difficulty in the past, and who have been claiming the attention of the Government for so long a time, will, I trust, now meet with some encouragement from the hon. Minister at the head of the Department. Whilst I have quoted here a number of authorities showing how important this matter is, I believe that there will be no evidence so convincing to the public mind as the information contained in the annual wreck list since Confederation. If the hon. Minister will consent that a return shall be brought down showing the returns during the past twenty-one years it will convince all those who take an interest in the matter that the subject is one well worthy of consideration.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I quite appreciate the object my hon. friend has in asking for that return, and, in fact, I thought of making a similar motion myself. I would ask my hon. friend to amend his motion by making provision for the Bay of Fundy as well as the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Mr. TUPPER. The words "and Atlantic coast" can be added to the motion. I have no objection to bring down the return.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That will be satisfactory.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

BERTHIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL moved for :

Copies of all petitions from the inhabitants of St. Gabriel and St. Damien, praying that their mails be sent them by railway; also, of all letters forwarding these petitions, of all reports from the Post Office Inspector, and of all orders issued by the Postmaster General respecting the aforesaid petitions.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no objection to bringing down all the returns asked for by the hon. gentleman. The only reason the prayer of the petition was not granted was that it would entail an expenditure of over \$1,200, and the Department did not feel justified in making that expenditure in view of the small receipts from that neighborhood.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL moved for :

Copies of all petitions praying for the closing of the Post Office at Fernetville, in the County of Berthier, and the erection of a Post Office at the Berthier Junction Station, on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway; also, of all petitions opposed to this proceeding; also, of the letters forwarding these petitions; also, of the report of the Post Office Inspector in this matter; and, speaking generally, of all documents bearing on this subject.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no objection to bringing down these papers, except the report of the inspector, which is always considered a confi-

dential report. The motion should be amended by striking that out.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

LAND DAMAGES IN COUNTY OF YAMASKA.

Mr. LAURIER moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the Government, or any of its Departments, and the Corporation known as the "Président et syndics de la commune de la seigneurie d'Yamaska," respecting damages occasioned to their lands by the dam erected in the Yamaska River.

He said : I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to this question. The Government some years ago erected a dam across the Yamaska river for the purpose, I suppose, of improving the navigation of that river, although their intention has not proved to be very clear. It so happens, however, I am informed, that if their intention was to do good in one direction, they have been unfortunate enough to do a great deal of wrong in another direction. The banks of the Yamaska river for some distance above its junction with the St. Lawrence, are very flat, and constitute, as we say in French, *une commune*, and are held by a corporation. These banks are very fertile, and I understand that in consequence of the erection of the dam, the lands have been flooded, to the great loss of the owners. I understand further that the corporation have put in a claim to the Government for compensation for the injury they have suffered. The object I have in making this motion is to ascertain whether the Government have received these communications, and whether they intend to take any steps to meet the petition or to further its object.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A claim was received, I think, in November last. The matter has been referred to the chief engineer of the Department, Mr. Perley, who, unfortunately, has been very ill and is still incapable of taking it up; but as soon as possible it will be investigated.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return of amount of wharfage dues collected at the Government pier or wharf at Digby, N.S., during the year 1889, specifying the several amounts paid by passenger steamers landing passengers and freight at the said wharf, and the names of such steamers.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Return showing: 1. The total amount of money expended in dredging McGregor's Creek, in the town of Chatham, Ont. 2. The amount expended for piling and planking the same. The name of each contractor, and amount of their several contracts. 3. The amount of money paid property owners for damage done to their property in consequence of such dredging, with the name and amount paid each property owner. 4. The name and amount of all claimants whose claims have been rejected or which are still under the consideration of the Government.—(Mr. Campbell.)

Copies of late reports made by the Engineer of the Public Works Department respecting works to be carried out at Rivière du Sud, in the County of Montmagny.—(Mr. Choquette.)

Return showing the number of reports of the Geological Survey published respectively for each year of the last ten years, the number sold each year, the number distributed gratuitously, and the number still on hand.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Copies of all petitions and correspondence respecting the request for the construction of a siding, on the line of the Intercolonial Railway, at the station of St. Jean Chrysostôme, in the County of Lévis.—(Mr. Guay.)

Statement showing the names of all persons who sold to the Dominion Government since 1st January, 1886, property located in St. Laurent and Lauzon Wards in the town of Lévis, with a view to widening the roadway of the Intercolonial Railway, and an extension of the station at Lévis; the amount paid to each proprietor, the amounts paid for commissions, the rate of percentage, and the persons to whom such amounts were paid.—(Mr. Guay.)

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the St. Stephen's Bank.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 33) respecting the People's Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 16) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Samuel May.—(Mr. Denison.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Interprovincial Bridge Company.—(Mr. Perley.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Shore Line Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 56) to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1889, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Erie and Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Lister.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Bill (No. 59) to change the name of the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company to "The Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company."—(Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil.)

Bill (No. 61) to amend the Act to incorporate the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 62) for granting certain powers to The Canadian Millers' Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Home Benefit Life Association.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Moncton and Prince Edward Island Railway and Ferry Company.—(Mr. Landry.)

THE RAINY RIVER BOOM COMPANY.

Mr. DAWSON moved second reading of the Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Rainy River Boom Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This Bill is nearly similar to the Rainy River Improvement Company's Bill introduced in 1883, which was referred to the Railway Committee, and there recommended to be withdrawn. This Bill should also be referred to the Railway Committee.

CYPRESS HILLS TIMBER LIMIT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would ask the First Minister if it would be convenient, as I

think it lies with the Department over which he presided before, to order a copy of the Order in Council in reference to the Adams or Cypress Hills limit to be laid on the Table to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

THE *MODUS VIVENDI* WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government to a statement which I observed in some American papers in relation to an interview alleged to have been held with the British Ambassador in Washington in reference to the *modus vivendi* being about to expire, in which it is stated that the British Ambassador said he had received no instructions, and nothing had been done, as far as he knew, to continue the *modus vivendi* or to substitute anything for it. I think this is a matter of some importance, and, therefore, I call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is correct. There have been no instructions conveyed to the British Ambassador at Washington that the *modus vivendi* is continued.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. McCARTHY moved second reading of Bill (No. 10) to further amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 50, respecting the North-West Territories.

Mr. DAVIN moved in amendment:

That this Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be Resolved, That it is expedient that the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories be authorised to deal with the subject of this Bill by Ordinance or enactment, after the next general election for the said Territories.

He said: This, Sir, is, after all, a North-West question, but I need hardly say that I am quite aware that it is the privilege, and even the duty, of every member of this House to concern himself with any public question whatsoever; and I congratulate the North-West that my hon. and learned friend (Mr. McCarthy) has taken a tardy interest in our welfare. I am not aware that he ever took a very great interest in our welfare until very lately. He himself tells us that he sat in this House time and again when this measure was before it, and that he actually did not know that the 110th clause existed until the spring of last year. Well, in an ordinary member that would be an extraordinary thing, but in a distinguished advocate it is a very marvellous thing indeed. But I think I understand why it is that he has taken this interest in us in the North-West. We had here a question last year which I do not intend to go into at present, but which has been agitated throughout the country in a manner that I do not think was either edifying or statesmanlike; and I rather think that my hon. and learned friend discovered that, on that question, he had taken an illogical stand, that he found, after defending his position for a considerable time, that the position was indefensible, and, in order to let himself down easy, he took up questions that would have been settled in the Territories without his aid or the aid of anybody else outside of those Territories. Now,

this speech, to which I had not the honor of listening—

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I happened to be in Hamilton at the time, under more auspicious circumstances, but I have read that speech carefully, and the remarkable thing about it is that it is one of a series illustrating the law of evolution; because they go on bit by bit; they repeat themselves considerably, but still, at each step, my hon. and learned friend shows that the doctrine of Darwin is applicable even to great politicians, and he illustrates the law of evolution. I said a moment ago that I had not the honor of hearing that speech, but, Sir, I had the honor of reading his speech that had been delivered in Ottawa, a speech going over the same ground. It was, after all, the same old stuff, but with a little evolution. So that, although I did not hear the speech I am tolerably familiar with my hon. friend's opinions on these subjects, and I may say that in the course of a pretty long political life, in the sense that I have been studying politics all my life, and have had an opportunity of hearing most politicians in England and Canada, and prominent politicians in France, I have never met with speeches so wanting in logic from so distinguished a man. Those speeches have two peculiar characteristics. The one is that my hon. and learned friend has taken to dilating on questions that, from his busy life, he was evidently not conversant with, and I am sorry to say that from a somewhat cold manner he has lapsed into violent appeals to passions that can do nothing but harm. Now, Sir, this question is a local one, and for that reason I consider that it should be dealt with by the Local Legislature. Some French gentlemen have gone in there, because we have had a small French immigration. Some of our most useful citizens are French gentlemen. They have come there with much wealth, and one of them is a coffee grower, M. de Roffignac Von Brabant who has started south of Whitewood the cultivation of chicory. This House will probably be surprised to hear that Canada has become a coffee-growing country. We have in the North-West coffee plantations at the present minute, and when my hon. and learned friend next goes there we shall be able to regale him with a cup of coffee, if with nothing better, before he dilates on his favorite topics.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. French coffee?

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, I forgot, that would not agree with my hon. friend. Well, Sir, the view that I take is this, and it is a view that I have taken here twice in regard to the second homestead. I say that if that law is on the Statute-book, a French gentleman who has gone into the North-West under that 110th clause has a right to complain if it is repealed without his having something to say. We have a certain *quantum* of French population along the Saskatchewan; we have a small French speaking population to the south, and although they are greatly outnumbered, the bare fact of their being outnumbered is a reason why, without giving them a hearing, we should not repeal this clause. Now, as I said, this speech is a part of a series. I will say that on some subjects in which I am conversant my hon. and learned friend has laid down most extraordinary propositions, and, among others which I will deal with presently,

that the North-West has been a losing game to us. Here is a proposition that he states:—

“There is no such thing as a Celtic skull.”

I must not say Keltic, although I have been trained at the university to say Keltic; still, I remember that the last time that I spoke and used the word Keltic, an hon. gentleman, who is a Scotchman, and a friend of mine, asked me, “What on earth were you talking about kilts the whole time?” So I must not use the word with a k, but with a soft c, and say Celtic.

“There is no such thing as a Celtic skull any more than a Saxon skull; no such thing as Celtic hair any more than Saxon hair; it is only—”

Mark the proposition he lays down.

“It is only by language and by the community of language that men are formed into nations.”

Now, let me make this remark. He says there is no such thing as a Celtic skull or a Saxon skull. I suppose there is no such thing as a Jewish skull or an Aztec skull; and yet I have read some very scientific treatises in which I have seen the differences in skulls pointed out. Again he says:

“It is plain that what makes a nation is language, and therefore when one speaks of a race, as these distinguished writers have done, one means a community speaking the same language.”

Now, I will explain how my hon. friend has fallen into such a proposition as this. He has read treatises on language, especially as it affects modern thought; and it is rather—I do not like to say it, I do not like to say that he did not understand it, because it would be impolite, and I could not be impolite—but I will say this, that he is so busy a man that he has not time to inform himself properly, and perhaps he is too much of a *nisi prius* advocate to be accurate, and too much of a mere lawyer to be a statesman. But remember the two propositions that he lays down. The first proposition is, that language makes the race and the nation; and as you may have seen in his speech delivered at Ottawa, he lays down the proposition that with diversity of language to make a nation is impossible. Now, the important thing about that proposition is this: It is sent broadcast into ignorant ears, and if that last proposition is true we may despair of Canada. That is the important thing about these hurried deductions from superficial studies. My hon. friend, in his Ottawa speech and in the speech delivered in this House also, talks about making this a British colony. Sir, is not this a British colony? Let us be just. Why is it a British colony? It is so because of that very Lower Canadian French race that seems to act like a red rag on a bull on the mind of my hon. friend; for we know this very well, that there was a time in the history of Canada when that race had just passed over to the British flag, when temptations were held out to them to join the thirteen colonies, and if they had not been true to their new-found allegiance, if their loyalty had not been impregnable against the seductions of Franklin and others, we should have had no British colony here to-day. Let us be just, if my hon. friend cannot be generous. I will say this, because I want to help my hon. friend. My hon. friend does not profess, he says, to be a very devout man, but still he complains bitterly that the Roman Catholic Church is tolerated in a manner in this country that our laws hardly permit. That is his language, addressed to ignorant and passionate ears. I have the documents

here if it is dared to be questioned. That, I say, is the language addressed by the hon. gentleman to ignorant and passionate ears. It is stated in these speeches. The history of Canada is reviewed; it is mourned over that certain things were not done in the past, and it is mourned that certain things were not done when the French Canadians numbered only 60,000. But does any man in his senses suppose that, if they had not been dealt with with that wisdom, moderation and generosity that England has practised in regard to all races with which she has come in contact in building up her colonial Empire, we should have a British colony here to-day? I want to help my hon. friend. In the intervals of a busy life he is undertaking a crusade against a million and a-half of people; because it is a crusade, and he is undertaking a crusade against the Catholic Church. Nobody supposes that I have any leaning to that church. I am a Radical on religious subjects—that is to say, I am a very low English Churchman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! Oh!

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing a lawyer mainly, and I am addressing a legislative assembly, and everybody knows that, according to the old Roman law, I can become an English churchman by adoption; so I have become one by adoption. I want to help my hon. friend, because I have devoted some time to the study of history. I tell him that no assault from outside, no matter how great, no catapults that have been brought against that church from outside have ever done it the least harm. The only harm that ever came to that church has been from volcanic eruptions from within, and then the overflowings have carried away some of her fairest possessions. So that I help my hon. friend. I tell him this: the way to strengthen the Catholic Church is to assail it, and the way to solidify and make French Canadians united—and I do not think the French Canadian is a very objectionable person, for some of the most charming men and most intelligent men I ever met were French Canadians—but still, as my hon. friend, with his superior culture, does not like them, I may tell him that if he wants to make the French Canadian permanent and the French language enduring, the way to do it is to put the backs of the people up by such assaults as he is making throughout the country. To show that I am speaking by the book, let me read some passages here. I forgot, when dealing with the race question, to read a sentence in which my hon. friend says:

“They will gradually or rapidly, as he hoped, adopt English methods and English ways of thought, and this country will be, as it ought to be, an Anglo-Saxon community.”

Fancy speaking to a popular audience like this:

“We came together; we assembled in a common Parliament; but by the skillful direction of the French-Canadian vote, and the desire for power among the English, and consequent division among them, the French Canadians were ultimately able to place their feet on our necks and impose laws on us contrary to our will.”

I think myself it is not too much to say that, for a man of my learned friend's experience as a statesman, it is really a monstrous thing, in view of his high position in Canada, to have addressed language like that to any audience. How did he tell them he intended to move this Bill? I confess the eloquence surprised me; because, although I had

Mr. DAVIN.

often heard my hon. friend in this House and elsewhere, I did not think that lyric rapture was his forte. This is the way he described it:

“And I have undertaken the task—and a more glorious task I never undertook—(loud cheers)—that I shall be the mover of that Bill.”

To be the mover of a Bill of one clause, when there was no danger, no guns pointed at my hon. friend, and to describe that as the most glorious task in his life leads me to wonder what was the character of the other glorious tasks he performed. The only comparison I can think of is this: I once called on a college friend of mine who had married for money a wife who was somewhat old, and he said to me when I was leaving at night, “What do you think of her, Davin?” “Well, Jack,” I said, “I wish I had known your taste, for I think I could have got you something older than that.” Well, Sir, if I had known the hon. gentleman's taste was in that direction I think I could have got him at least as glorious a task. Why, Sir, when I read that, I remembered a joke of my hon. friend the Premier the other day. That right hon. gentleman, speaking of the member for Victoria (Mr. Earle), said, with his usual ready wit, that we were better off in this House than the House of Commons in England, for we had an “earl” amongst us. When I read that glorious statement of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I thought we were better off still, for we have a hero in this House—a hero who chants his own epic, and there he sits. I say, Sir, that there is no foundation whatever for these propositions laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy), and I will prove that these propositions are false and misleading, and that, therefore, for a statesman as my friend is, and for a man of great influence and popular power to disseminate those fallacies throughout the country, is a very great crime and a very great misdemeanor at the bar of history. I would not care in the least what he proposed to do if he did not fall into such fallacies, misleading as they are and calculated to beget ideas which may indeed tend to the disruption of this country. Now, Sir, I will prove that there is not a tittle of foundation for his arguments. My hon. friend, when he was making his speech on this subject in the House, resorted to authority. It was a very natural thing for a lawyer to do, yet I may say this, that what I should expect from a statesman would be “reasoning” on this question. I should expect from him that he would reason this question from historical facts; and the historical facts bearing on it are numerous enough. I should expect reasoning from him from the existing political phenomena in Europe, and then I should expect that he would draw deductions. But what does my hon. and learned friend do? He comes to us with authorities like a lawyer going before a court of appeal, and what, let me ask, are his authorities? Magazine articles, and some of them written by trumpery writers whose names will not even go down the gutter of time. Now, the hon. gentleman might have gone to many existing countries for a parallel. He might have gone especially to Switzerland. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) suggested Switzerland, and then my hon. and learned friend (Mr. McCarthy) interjected the remark, “The French language is an exception in Switzerland.” What the meaning of that observa-

tion is I do not know. How is it an exception in Switzerland? The only meaning of that utterance of my hon. friend could be that the language was exceptionally used in the federal state. Why, Sir, there are only three federal states that I know of: Canada, the United States and Switzerland, and in two of these the French is an official language. Let me say that Canada need not be ashamed to go to Switzerland for a comparison. There is scarcely a country which my reading makes me acquainted with so calculated to inspire interest and so full of historical incidents that are imperishable. The development of that country has been extraordinary. The differences in its formation, its elevations, its soil and its climate are great and varied; and although Canada stretches across an entire continent, and Switzerland is in the heart of Europe, hemmed in by mighty empires, sometimes in great danger, often menaced, fought with by more powerful nations, yet like the milk-white Hind of Dryden.—

“Oft doomed to death, but fated not to die.”

The commerce of that country at present exceeds *per capita* the commerce of any country in Europe. Her imports are about \$150,000,000, and her exports, I think, \$140,000,000. Notwithstanding the difference I have spoken of, we know, Sir, that there is an analogy between Canada and Switzerland in the produce of our dairies, in the produce of our cornfields, in our mighty forests, and even in our Alpinescenery, which if any of you have visited, you know that its sublimity need not blush even in the face of Mont Blanc. There is a remarkable physical analogy between the countries, and when you come to compare the systems of government there is a more remarkable analogy still. The very same questions that are relegated to the Provinces in Canada are relegated to the Cantons in Switzerland; and the very same questions that are given to the Federal Government in Canada are given to the Federal Government in Switzerland which meets at Berne. How many languages have you in the Parliament at Berne? Why, Sir, five languages can be spoken there, and three of these are official. I am not saying that I approve of this. I am only stating facts from which deductions can be drawn. But here is my hon. friend, a statesman that might be a Gamaliel to me, at whose feet I ought to sit; here is my hon. and learned friend dilating on this question and telling us, in the face of the fact that Switzerland has endured since the 12th century, that it is the oldest republic that ever existed, that its people are contented and prosperous, that with two languages a nation is impossible! And does not every one of us know what admirable articles they manufacture there? Who does not know something about the interest that attaches to that country? Yet, in face of the fact that that prosperous nation has three official languages, my hon. and learned friend goes abroad and tells the people that, if there are two official languages in the country we can never hope to make a nation—that we may throw up the sponge and write “Ichabod” over our country! A mere statement of the fact without any argument to support it is a *reductio ad absurdum*. My hon. and learned friend tells us, that you cannot have a nation unless you have only one official language. Well, thereby hangs a tale; and I think the tale I am about to unfold will be a political caudal appendage that

will cling to my hon. friend for a long time. You know, Sir, that when the hon. gentleman spoke in this House a short time ago, he gave us the authority of Professor Freeman, who he said was a great man. Now I will give you the same authority, which the hon. gentleman read, and if you excuse me I will read it out of the book which bears the sacred mark of my hon. and learned friend. It reads:

“And now, having ruled that races and nations, though largely formed by the working of an artificial law, are still real and living things, groups in which the idea of kindred is the idea around which everything has grown, how are we to define our races and our nations? How are we to mark them off one from the other? Bearing in mind the cautions and qualifications which have been already given, bearing in mind large classes of exceptions which will presently be spoken of, I say unhesitatingly that for practical purposes there is one test, and one only, and that test is language. We may at least apply the test negatively. It might be unsafe to rule that all speakers of the same language have a common nationality, but we may safely say that, where there is not community of language, there is no common nationality in the highest sense. As in the teeth of community of language there may be what for all political purposes are separate nations, so without community of language there may be an artificial nationality, a nationality which may be good for all political purposes, and which may engender a common national feeling; still, this is not quite the same thing as that fuller national unity which is felt where there is community of language. In fact, mankind instinctively takes language as the badge of nationality. We so far take it as the badge that we instinctively assume community of language as a nation as the rule, and we set down anything that departs from that rule as an exception. The first idea suggested by the word Frenchman, or German, or any other national name, is that he is a man who speaks French or German as his mother tongue. We take for granted, in the absence of anything to make us think otherwise, that a Frenchman is a speaker of French, and that a speaker of French is a Frenchman.”

My hon. friend comments on that:

“I think that will not be denied as a correct doctrine.” And, of course, what he seeks to make out is this: that the teaching of that article is the teaching he had laid down in his proposition, that it was necessary to have community of language in order to have a nation. I cannot believe that my hon. friend meant to deceive this House, and therefore I am thrown back on the alternative, that he did not understand Freeman. That article, Sir, does not deal with the question my hon. friend tried to make the House think it dealt with. Freeman takes for his text the extraordinary circumstance of a lot of Magyars going to Constantinople to congratulate an Ottoman general on a victory on the ground of their kinship; because, as you know, the Magyar is a form of the same Semitic speech, if it be Semitic, that is spoken by the Turks. He does the same thing as Max Müller who deals with an extraordinary phenomenon in modern life, brought about by a strong bent to philological studies; for people are giving in this late day an importance to language that was not given before; and when you read the article, you will find that Freeman uses the word “exceptions” in an extraordinary way. He actually uses the word for the majority, and why does he do it? Because he lays down this proposition: that there are now certain nations which are formed on this language idea, but he says the exceptions all over Europe are very large. Now, if the House will bear with me I will give them an idea of this article; but, first, let me ask why did not my hon. friend read on? You will see in a minute. If he had gone on, he would have read that all the larger countries of Europe

provide us with exceptions—England, France, Germany, Italy, even Austria. Freeman points out that there are islands which both speech and geographical position seem to mark out as French, but which are English—as truly English, as truly devoted to England, as truly a part of the British Empire in feeling as the people of London. I allude to the people of the Channel Isles, of the same blood precisely and coming from the same district of France as the French Canadians. They are, I will say, as true to England, I believe, as the French Canadians are to Confederation. Why? Freeman asks. Because circumstances led them to cleave to England though their kindred in Normandy became French; and one again and again sees in the article—which I hope my hon. and learned friend did not read—that circumstances control more than language. The insular Norman, though speaking French, did not become a Frenchman, and he is to-day a loyal part of the British nation speaking French.

“These instances,” says Freeman, “and countless others, bear out the position, that while community of language is the most obvious sign of common nationality, while it is the main element, or something more than an element, in the formation of a nationality, the rule is open to exceptions of all kinds, and the influence of language is at all times liable to be overruled by other influences.”

Now, Sir, take Quebec: will any man suppose for one moment that, notwithstanding the mount-bank utterances of the present Prime Minister of Quebec, notwithstanding this stuff about the tricolor, and hustings nonsense of that sort, to which nobody pays any attention, and notwithstanding those articles in the press, which my hon. friend thinks decisive—he knows very well that there have been articles in the English press of Canada which if a man were to take as an exponent of the sentiment of the Canadian people he would be regarded as demented—will any man suppose that if Quebec could to-day do what she pleased, she would cut the painter with this country and England, and go over to France? You know very well, from the character of the people, from their political and religious convictions, that they cling to the British flag. Now, Freeman points out that political and other reasons forbade the annexation by Germany of quite a number of countries; and then he comes to those parts of the world where people who are confessedly of different races and language, inhabit a continuous territory and live under the same flag. He instances—and, of course, my hon. friend, when quoting Freeman, fought shy of this, which would be all right, you know, before a jury, but it is not right before the jury of the people of Canada—the Swiss Confederation, which he says has what my friend quoted him to prove that it could not have, namely, a full right to be called a nation in a political sense:

“It has been formed on a principle directly opposite to the identity of race and language. That Confederation is formed by the union of certain detached fragments of German, Italian and Burgundian nations. German is undoubtedly the language of the great majority of the nation. But the two recognised Romance languages are each the speech of a large minority forming a visible element in the general body. * * * While German, French and Italian are all recognised as national languages by the Swiss Confederation, the independent Romance language which is still used in some parts of the Canton of Graubunden, that which is known specially as Romansch, is not recognised.”

Mr. DAVIN.

Mark his words in that article:

“It is left in the same position in which Welsh and Gaelic are left in Great Britain, in which Basque, Breton, Provençal, Walloon and Flemish are left in the borders of that French kingdom, which has grown so as to take them all in.”

Now, what does Mr. Freeman say of this Swiss Confederation, which has five languages and three official languages?

“Yet surely,” he says, “the Swiss Confederation is a nation. For all political purposes the Swiss Confederation is a nation, one capable of as strong and true national feeling as any other nation.”

Yet this man has been quoted to prove that Canada, with two languages, could not be a nation! May I not apply his language to Canada, and say that surely Canada with her two official languages, even if they continue to prevail, can surely become a nation. Then my hon. friend quotes this writer again to prove that identity of speech is necessary to make a nation, and that diversity of language is fatal to the existence of a nation—that two or more official languages are fatal to a nation, and that identity of language and race will alone make one. What does Mr. Freeman say? He says:

“We now come to the other countries in which nationality and language keep the connection which they have elsewhere, but in which nations do not, even in the roughest way, answer to Governments.”

Can you have a greater repudiation than that of my hon. friend's theory? Here is a language and it in no way answers to the Government that exists.

“In eastern Europe,” Mr. Freeman tells us, “a nation's nationality, as marked out by national feeling, has altogether parted company from political government.”

And he instances Turkey, Austro-Hungary, Greece, Bulgaria and Servia:

“In all these lands,” says he, “there is no difficulty in marking off the several nations—that is by speech only—in no case do the nations answer to any existing political power. In these lands, moreover, religion takes the place of nationality. The Christian renegade who embraces Islam becomes a Turk, even though he keep his Greek or Slavonian language. Even the Greek or Armenian who embraces the Latin goes far towards parting with his nationality.”

Can anything be plainer than that Mr. Freeman teaches the very contrary of what my hon. friend quoted him to prove. Therefore, I have concluded, because I know my hon. friend is an honorable man, that he did not read the article, or he read it in such a cursory manner that he did not grasp the ideas that inspired and infused it. Well, all I can say is, that if he takes up his knowledge as certain birds take their food, on the wing, it is no wonder his conclusions should be so flighty. My hon. friend comes from the country whence I myself come. Ireland can boast of him amongst her distinguished lawyers. Does identity of language make community of sentiment, community of race, and community of nation there? Why, do we not know that for hundreds of years the Saxon has been denounced in the Saxon tongue? So that there were at my hon. friend's door facts that might have prevented him, if he had the time for reflection, from falling into the errors he has fallen into. Now, I hardly think it worth while to deal with his allusions to Mr. Mercier, his allusions to French newspapers, his quotations from *The Month*. *The Month* he cited as an authority. Why did he quote *The Month* as an authority? “Why,” he said, “it was an authority last year, and it ought to be an authority now;” but, if I remember rightly, my

hon. and learned friend the Minister of Justice quoted it last year to prove that certain views, which had been quoted from a review by my hon. friend, had not been acknowledged or accepted as the views of a certain section of the Christian Church. That, as I remember, was the way it was used; but if it was made an authority last year improperly, that would be no reason for repeating the error. Then my hon. friend quoted from the *Catholic World*—to prove what? To prove that the French Canadian is hostile to and is parting company with the English. Well, my hon. friend knows very well a large class—a class for which I have the greatest possible respect; my own blood, I suppose, flows in their veins—exists which have not the same regard for England that I have. He knows very well that the people for whom the *Catholic World* is written are people who would like to hear that certain sections of the British Empire were hostile to its flag; and to quote that as an authority seems to me an extraordinary thing. But, as the hon. gentleman was looking for reviews, there is a review—I do not know whether it came into his hands—which is one of the first reviews of the world. I refer to the *Andover Review*, in which there is an article *ad rem* on this question, an article dealing actually with the question of race in politics, and written by one of the most distinguished of living men. As we are treating the House to articles from reviews, and as I have the precedent of my hon. and learned friend to guide me, I will tell the House what is stated in this article, written by Horatio Hale, and headed, "Language as a Political Force." On page 175, Mr. Hale says:

"Two or more communities speaking different languages may live in harmony under one Government when this Government is a federation and each of these communities is allowed to manage freely its own local affairs."

Then, on page 176, he says:

"This result will be delayed to some extent by the wisdom which has been shown by the British Government, in not merely granting the utmost possible freedom to its colonies, but in stimulating the exercise by them of the powers of such self-government to the utmost possible extent. This remarkable political sagacity—"

Mark the way he regards the policy of the British Government:

"This remarkable political sagacity, unprecedented heretofore in history, is naturally rewarded by an attachment of the colonies to the mother country, which has been hitherto strong enough to overcome the attraction of a population almost conterminous, speaking the same language and enjoying equally free institutions. If Canada had been governed from England in the manner in which Cuba is governed from Spain, it certainly would now not be a British possession."

Then this same weighty writer says:

"The Swiss Republic is a notable instance of the manner in which communities speaking several different languages can be enabled, by the large application of the method of local self-government, to live in harmony under one general authority, for which, under such a system, all the members of the Confederacy may come to feel an equal and intense attachment."

Then, on page 178, he says:

"The danger to freedom and the constant liability to disturbance which result from the inclusion, in a large population, of a small community speaking a distinct language, can be removed in only two ways. The one is by the extinction of the separate language, and the complete assimilation of the people who speak it. But this is a slow process, requiring usually several generations, and perhaps some severities hostile to good government. The other, and far prompter and surer mode, is by the application of the method of local self-government in some form."

On page 182 he says:

"France alone, in her domestic policy, seems to have solved the problem and dispelled the peril. Universal suffrage, departmental councils, and equal laws of inheritance, have transformed Germans, Bretons, Basques and Italians into Frenchmen as loyal and devoted to their country as any of their French-speaking compatriots. This is a practical lesson which statesmen of all countries would do well to lay to heart. The strongest and most enduring of bonds is found, not in kindred or in force, but in free institutions and"—

In what?

—"in equal rights."

Now, I say that that article was worth quoting, and much better worth quoting than *The Month* or some obscure French paper. Now I come to a very delicate subject. My hon. and learned friend is taking a deep interest in the North-West, and it is a proverb that we must not look a gift horse in the mouth. He tells us here:

"As a matter of dollars and cents, as a matter of mere money, the acquisition of the North-West has been a losing speculation, and, except for the purpose of building up a great nation, which we are willing to do"—

And so on. I tell the hon. member that he has had plenty of evidence on this subject. It has been shown again and again, in this House and elsewhere, that the acquisition of the North-West was not a losing speculation. Is there a man in the country who feels the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Is there a man in the country who objects to the cost of that railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Except some dreaming pessimists? Look at the increased wealth, in the last seven years, of Montreal; look at the increased wealth of Toronto; look at the increased wealth of the manufacturing towns in Ontario; look at the extension of manufactures in Ontario; look at the fact that merchants and manufacturers tell me that the North-West is a magnificent customer to Ontario. The hon. gentleman goes on to say something about the depreciation in the value of farms. I have looked into the reports of Mr. Blue, and I know he generally takes a gloomy view of things, but he does not say that the farms of Ontario have depreciated in value. We know that, as farms grow old—and they are not always cultivated as they should be here—they cannot be expected to be kept up to their original value; but I do not think the utterances of the hon. gentleman on this subject were the utterances of a statesman. Look at the fact that the North-West has been opened up, that we have a vast railway there; that we have farms there to which our children can be sent; that we raise wheat in the North-West, of which I have a specimen here, the like of which cannot be produced in any other part of Canada. I have specimens of wheat which have been grown near Regina, Moose Jaw and other parts of the district which I have the honor to represent, and nine-tenths of all that wheat have been graded No. 1 Hard from year to year. Is not that an acquisition of wealth to this country? If the hon. gentleman were right, we might apply to his statement Horace's illustration where he speaks of plucking one hair after another out of a horse's tail. If this North-West country is of no value, of course the more you diminish the size of Canada itself, by a parity of reasoning, the richer it will become. This is one of those utterances which, I think, are inexcusable

in a man of the hon. gentleman's experience. I have already shown that my hon. friend has been guilty of the most glaring inaccuracy in other points; but he also told the House, in his carefully considered speech, that a newspaper published in the North-West, called, I think—let me see—the *Regina Leader*, never said a word about the dual language; that it had been silent upon that subject while other papers had spoken about it. I might refer the hon. gentleman to the issue of that paper of September 10, 1889, and here I find a whole column headed "The Dual Language," from which I will read a few passages to the House:

"It is palpable in a country such as ours, moderation is absolutely necessary in order that it shall develop, progress and culminate. If in any province or territory two languages are unnecessary in official work, then the proper thing is to discuss in a calm and collected manner the question whether their use shall be continued or terminated. Mr. Dalton McCarthy in one of his speeches said he did not know that the French language was required by law in these Territories. Yet he was in Parliament in 1877, when Mr. Mills brought in his Bill to amend this Act and, not to be more particular, he was in Parliament, in 1886, when the Revised Statutes were passed, yet he did not know until the early part of last session that such was the law. This throws a remarkable light on the ignorance of eastern politicians regarding the North-West, and might indeed give rise generally to curious reflections. He is evidently not aware that the subject has been discussed among politicians in the North-West, or that had he never raised the question it would be raised here. Everybody acquainted with our leading men knew how the matter stood. Let it be raised, but when raised let us discuss it as statesmen should discuss it, without violent or offensive language. We need hardly say that Mr. McCarthy having sat in Parliament since 1876, having voted on the Revised Statutes, is one of the persons who passed the law in its present state. He is responsible for it. Like every political and administrative question its expediency or the reverse may be properly discussed. If it should be decided that in any part of the Dominion the dual language is not necessary, let it be abolished without exciting cries or dithyrambs, and *vice versa*."

I hear one of my hon. friends laughing at the word "dithyrambs," but if he will get a dictionary and look up the word, he will find that it bears a strong application to that speech at Ottawa to which I have referred.—

"In regard to race questions we say this: in the Dominion of Canada every man is equal before the law, and whatever be his mother tongue, whether he be Celt or Saxon, Celt-Latin or Saxon-Celt, whether he be Scotch-Indian or Franco-Indian (*Métis*), he stands on the same footing under our constitution before the law, and try to give the Saxon or the Celt or the Celto-Latin any predominance or to seek to suppress or unjustly repress one or the other would be to take a course contrary to civil liberty and to the constitution which secures equal rights to all. We are in a new country in the North-West, let us make a new start and discuss any question that may arise, not in the deceiving glare of prejudice, but in the clear cold light of reason; nay, in the broad illumination of the Gospel of our Lord, who taught us that all men are brethren. If the continuance of the dual language is to be discussed it should be discussed in the same practical temper, the same absence of excitement, as we would discuss the building of a bridge over Boggy Creek. It is not necessary to be violent or offensive or to rail at this or the other section of the community, but to take up a question of practical action in a practical manner and looking at it on all sides come to what will have, under such quiet and balanced conditions, a chance of proving a wise conclusion."

The Swiss question is then dealt with. But the fact that my hon. friend, in a carefully prepared speech, could state that that paper had made no reference whatever to this question, shows the glaring inaccuracy that characterised the wild effort. Now, the federal system to which I referred, requires two things. You must first

Mr. DAVIN.

have a body of communities such as we have in Canada, such as they have in the United States, such as they have in Switzerland, and these communities must have a common bond of sentiment. They must desire union but not unity; they must have a loyalty to their State or Province, and at the same time a loyalty to the Federal Government. If, of course, they desired union, the proper thing would be a central government; but where they desire to come together and get something that will give them the impress of a nation and yet keep autonomous their own State or Province, the proper solution is a Federal Government, and that Federal Government is called to deal with different races, with different languages, with men of different religions, as we see in Switzerland and as we see in Canada. Sir, I consider that here in Canada we have all the conditions that are necessary to produce a strong federal people. In peace, the loyalty to the State or Province will be high. In war, the loyalty to the Federal Government will be high. If Canada were assailed from without to-day you would find that every feeling that is provincial in the breasts of Quebeckers, in the breasts of New Brunswickers, in the breasts of Nova Scotians, in the breasts of the people of the North-West Territories and British Columbia, would all disappear in the grand federal feeling that they should fight for their common country. Why, Sir, how little language has to do with preventing people from becoming citizens of a country. I have travelled in Alsace-Lorraine where the people speak German. They are now under the German flag, but gladly would they go back. They fought gallantly under the French banner. A more loyal part of France than Alsace-Lorraine did not exist. Then take the Bretons. I saw in the summer of 1870, Gen. Trochu review 300,000 Breton Mobiles in the streets of Paris, and there was not a man under the rank of officer who could speak French; yet these men, when the hour of peril came, went into battle and fought just as gallantly and just as eagerly as the men who spoke French. Now, Sir, harangues like these, whose dangers I have exposed to-night, I hope will cease. They can reflect no honor on my hon. and learned friend, and I speak with truth when I say that I would be jealous for his honor. There is no position that he could attain, there is no reputation, however bright, that he could make, which would not give me great pleasure. But such harangues as these can reflect no credit on him as a statesman, and they are capable of doing incalculable damage to his country. I, for one, whether we have a dual language or not, have no fear whatever for Canada. I am perfectly certain of Canada's future. History teaches me lessons that history, if he studies it, will teach my hon. and learned friend. Why, Sir, does he know anything of the genesis of nations? Does he know how one country after another has risen, and how they have spoken different languages, and how they have come together, and fought under different banners, and lived under different governments, and gradually become assimilated until the difference of language disappeared, and sometimes a new language was evolved? History will teach my hon. friend that he can dispel those fears that have tortured his imagination, and with which he has sought to inflame the passions of the people of this country. The main propositions that are behind his speech, I have shown to be absolutely without

foundation; I have shown that the deductions he has drawn from those propositions are fallacious; I have shown that the authorities that my hon. friend has quoted, and has paraded before this House, actually teach something else; and I do hope that there is that grandeur of soul in my hon. and learned friend that he can come to the conclusion that he has been in error, and will determine to mend his ways.

Mr. O'BRIEN. In the very few words that I shall address the House on this occasion, I shall be conscious that, perhaps, I may have as little sympathy from the great body of this assembly as I had upon a certain occasion during last Session; but if what is said in this debate upon the side which I propose to advocate, has as much weight in the country as the agitation which was set on foot last winter, then I for one will be perfectly content. Not because it has had, as alleged, the effect of stirring up strife and setting race against race and creed against creed, but because it has had the wholesome effect of leading the people distinctly to understand the position in which they are placed, and to understand the tendency and necessary consequences of the policy which has been pursued for so many years past. I say, if we accomplish that result, we are doing a good thing, even if we may irritate the feelings of people less sensitive to the facts of history than to declamation, and such language as we have heard from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I neither propose to emulate his declamation, nor to wander over as many subjects as he has touched upon, and in the end to say nothing whatever on the subject at issue. The hon. gentleman has said a good deal about his reading and learning. If all the effect of his reading has been to enable him to speak for one hour and say nothing, then I for one do not care to have that sort of learning. With respect to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman in regard to the hon. gentleman for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I can well leave them to my hon. friend, in whose hands the hon. gentleman has very foolishly placed himself. I shall endeavor, after one or two observations on the historical references made by the hon. gentleman, to go to the question at issue in this matter. He has talked about Switzerland, and has endeavored to draw the inference that different languages may be spoken and officially used in one country, and yet it be one nation. I meet that statement by the simple declaration that Switzerland, or Austro-Hungary which he might have cited, is a federation of different races and different nations. Now, I say there is no analogy whatever between that and Canada. I say we have not, we cannot have, and never will have in this country two nationalities. I deny that there are two nationalities in the sense in which the term is applicable either to Austro-Hungary or to Switzerland, and, therefore, the analogy does not hold good. Coming to the question really before us, there are two methods by which it is proposed to deal with it. It is admitted by the hon. gentleman who has moved the amendment that a change is required. If a change is not required there is no object in moving his resolution. The hon. gentleman proposes to deal with it from a local point of view, the point of view from which the hon. gentleman says it should be dealt with. The other method is

to deal with it from the point of view which was put forward by the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill, and that is the national point of view. I will first deal with the local point of view. We have before us evidence which clearly shows the opinion of the people in the North-West. If we take the press of that country we find, from a little examination of it, that of all the newspapers published in the North-West there is not a single one which advocates, the retention of the dual language. I may remark that, in speaking of the newspapers, I do not include the illustrious journal to which reference was just made, for either one of two reasons—and of these two the hon. gentleman can take his choice—either that journal is so well represented in this House that it is unnecessary that the editor should read his own articles for our benefit, or else, if he chooses to take the other alternative, a newspaper so largely subsidised by public money as is the *Regina Leader* is hardly to be considered as an independent organ of public opinion. The hon. gentleman did not tell us what the opinion in the North-West is; he did not venture to do that, because if so, he would have been obliged to admit that public opinion there demands such a Bill as that introduced and advocated by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I will read opinions from those newspapers, published since my hon. friend gave notice of his intention to introduce this Bill. The *Calgary Herald*, 1st February, 1890, said:

"There is no denying the fact that the citizens of our town, and, indeed, of the North-West generally, are in favor of abolishing the dual language system."

The *Lethbridge News*, 29th January, 1890, said:

"The great voice of the people of the Territories is certainly against it (i. e. the dual language) and those who uphold the system are in a small minority."

The *Saskatchewan*, 16th January, said:

"There must be but one official language if there is to be a united nation * * * and to the condition of this coalescence, the abolition of the dual language is absolutely essential."

The *Moosomin Courier* said:

"We are pleased to be able to state that the two North-West Senators, Messrs. Perley and Loughhead, are determined to support Dalton McCarthy's Bill to abolish the official use of the French language in the North-West. They will, by such action, truly represent the sentiments of the vast majority of the people of the North-West."

The *Qu'Appelle Progress* uses language similar to the above, as does the *Qu'Appelle Vidette*. The remaining papers either do not refer to the subject or express no opinion in regard to it. If the hon. member (Mr. Davin) is not in favor of adopting this course, he does not represent the opinion of the people of the North-West whose cause he is sent here to advocate. The hon. gentleman says it is a North-West measure. I take issue with him upon that point, for two or three reasons. In the first place, it is a North-West question, but it is also a Dominion question. And it is a Dominion question, because this Dominion Parliament legislates for the North-West, and has declared that the North-West is not in a condition to have the full powers of constitutional government and the management of its own affairs, and it is a mere piece of opportunism, an attempt to avoid our own responsibilities, to throw on the Legislative Assembly of the North-West the power of dealing with this question. What is more; they do not ask that it should be left to them, nor do any of

their newspapers do so. They all support the Bill introduced by my hon. friend and oppose that provision in the existing act, which was incorporated in it without the knowledge of the father of it, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills); and the people of North-West declare that the dual language should be struck out as a provision which they do not require, which is not in their interest, and which should not be imposed on them contrary to their wishes. Another reason is, that this should not be made a local question. This reason is one which may not be acceptable to many hon. gentlemen, but it is one which will have great weight in the country, that it is not desirable to throw into the Local Legislature of the North-West a bone of contention which may cause trouble there in two or three years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am glad to find the hon. gentleman express his approval of my sentiments, because if we do what this resolution proposes we would enable a minority in the North-West Provinces to exercise the same power and control over the destinies of that country that a minority has exercised over the destinies of this country, an influence and power which has not been for the best interests of the Dominion. That is another reason, because it can be very well understood that if this power of continuing two languages is made a subject of local legislation, that minority may, by taking advantage of party conflicts, do what in our history has been done frequently, and what was done in old Canada, exercise a controlling power to which neither their number nor their influence entitled them. That is a very important reason why the power should not be placed in the hands of the Local Legislature of the North-West. Those are two very decided reasons why we should not deal with it as a local question and give away the power which belongs to us and to no one else. Another reason why hon. gentlemen should object to the amendment is, and it is a reason which is a very important and practical one, that, if the amendment were carried, it would not be worth the paper on which it is written. It does nothing—it does not repeal the statute. What assurance have we that the people of the North-West would ever get the power to do what the resolution asks? Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that by a resolution of this House we can repeal a clause of an Act of Parliament?

Mr. DAVIN. It could be done.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It will be done when Parliament chooses to do it, but we have no assurance that the majority of this House will do it. The hon. gentleman's amendment, if carried, leaves the matter exactly as it was before, and it does not meet the wishes of the people which the hon. gentleman professes to represent here, nor does it meet the expressions of public opinion made in the newspapers published in that country. Therefore, I say that this amendment, if carried, is a perfect nonentity. It will not produce even that system of evolution which the hon. gentleman referred to. I cannot even pay him the left handed compliment which he paid to my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that his speech was a system of evolution, for evolution means some-

Mr. O'BRIEN.

thing to be evolved. That cannot be said of the speech of my hon. friend for *ex nihilo nihil fit*.

Mr. DAVIN. You should say *nihil*.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Upon the grounds which I have stated I say that this House cannot recognise the deduction which the hon. gentleman endeavored to draw from his historical reference to the incidents of other nationalities. Let me disclaim entirely (although very likely the disclaimer on account of the very great representations already made may not amount to much) any intention to demand the total abolition of the French language, we demand the abolition of the French language as an official language in the North-West, where only five-sixths of the people know the language, and this has been treated as an attack on the French language *per se*. Those who make that statement know that it is absolutely without foundation. They must know that nobody desires to interfere with the French language in any way where it is useful or necessary. Hereafter I venture to say that there will be but one language in this Dominion and that will be the language which should be used in all the new Provinces of this country; the language which must be the official language of the Dominion if this is ever to be a great or prosperous country. If the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) had carried his historical references as far as Austro-Hungary, to which the analogy would more closely apply, he would find that the people of that country, where there are more than five languages spoken, have to come to precisely the same conclusion as the hon. member who introduced this Bill, and he would find that in Hungary, where there are the Magyar, the Saxon and Roumanian languages, all used in the ordinary pursuits of life, the Hungarian language is imposed as an absolute necessity, because it was discovered that the use of all these different languages led to discord and rendered government impossible. On the other hand, in Austria, where there are several languages of a similar character, the attempt made by the recent Government to allow the use of all these languages in official documents has led to endless confusion, has fomented discord, and brought about endless trouble in the community. Even here, the analogy does not hold good no more than in the case of Switzerland, because there we have distinct nationalities federated for special purposes. And everyone knows that the Emperor of Austria is also King of Hungary. I do not intend to occupy the time of this House any longer, and I will merely recapitulate the grounds upon which I object to this amendment. It means nothing, it does nothing, and it produces no effect. It is no answer to the petitions which have been sent here asking that a change should be made in the law. I further say that this is not a local question, and for the reasons I have given that it cannot be properly dealt with as a local question. The duty and responsibility connected with the matter belongs to this House, and they should not, and ought not, delegate it to any one. The question should be dealt with as the Bill of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) proposes to deal with it. Those who do not like the Bill can vote against it and say that the French language shall continue in the North-West Territories. Those who think there ought to be but one language, in accordance with the well-

understood wishes of the people, should express that opinion by voting for the Bill, but if they vote for this resolution they are wasting time and doing absolutely nothing except giving those who do not care to face this question, and vote in a manly way, an opportunity of getting out of it without compromising themselves in a way in which they are unwilling to do. With these few remarks I again declare my intention to vote for the Bill, and against the amendment, for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I cannot hope to entertain the House with the splendid eloquence and vivacity of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), but with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations on the Bill now under discussion. What I have to complain of in the speech of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), is that from beginning to end it had a tendency to offend our French Canadian fellow-citizens and was not at all addressed to the question which he presented to the House. That question in itself, it seems to me, is a very simple one. It is, whether looking to the character of the population of the North-West, it is expedient to continue the use of the French language in official documents. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), instead of confining himself to the question of the expediency of the use of the French language in the North-West, went back to the treaty of 1763, and he made it appear by every word that he uttered that nothing in the legislation of Canada, nothing in the legislation of Great Britain affecting Canada was so distasteful to him as the recognition of French as an official language with us. I dissent entirely from the conclusions he has drawn from his premises. He said that the treaty of 1763 made no mention of the use of French as an official language, that the treaty of 1774 made no mention of the use of French as an official language, that the Constitutional Act of 1791 omitted any recognition of it, and that after Lord Durham had made his report upon his visit to Canada in 1839 it was declared that only one language should be officially recognised. The hon. gentleman stated also that it was not until 1848 when the British Parliament repealed the statute of 1841, that French obtained an official recognition in Canada. Now, the recital of the facts is perfectly accurate, but the inference drawn seems to me to be wholly misleading. Surely when we know that from 1774 down to 1841 French was actually in use as an official language, the whole argument of the hon. member for Simcoe falls to the ground. It was true, as he says, that there was nothing in the treaties and nothing in the Acts of Parliament in reference to it, but, in spite of treaties and in spite of Acts of Parliament, French was the language principally used in official documents in the Legislature. I have here, for instance, the Journals of the Legislative Assembly of 1844-45 containing a report made by a select Committee, of which Hon. Mr. Papineau was chairman, on the subject of the use of the French language, and although it is a little lengthy, I think it is of sufficient importance to justify my reading it to the House. This is the address reported by that committee, which was unanimously adopted by both chambers of the Legislature:

181

"To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty :

" MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN :

" We, Your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Provincial Parliament assembled, must humbly beg leave to approach Your Majesty, for the purpose of renewing the expression of our faithful attachment to Your Majesty's person and Government, and of representing—

" That, sensible of the advantages we enjoy from Your Majesty's care and protection, and which, we trust, may long be continued to us under Your Majesty's parental sway, it is, at all times, our duty to submit for Your Majesty's most gracious consideration, such matters as may have a tendency, with any class of Your Majesty's subjects, to diminish that contentment which we are well assured Your Majesty desires should exist in every portion of Your dominions.

" That the French is the native language of a very large class of Your Majesty's subjects in this Province; of this class the great mass indeed speak no other language; in it the largest portion of their laws and the books of their system of jurisprudence are written; their daily intercourse with each other is conducted; it is the language in which alone they can invoke the blessings of Heaven on themselves and all that is dear to them. A language indispensable to so many of Your Majesty's faithful people, cannot, they will believe, be viewed by their Sovereign as foreign, when used by them.

" That Your Majesty's Royal Predecessors placed the language spoken by the two great classes of Your Majesty's subjects in this Province on the same footing, affording, in this respect, equal justice and facility to all.

" That this principle was never departed from until the Act reuniting these Provinces was passed."

The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would have the House believe that no official recognition was given to the French language until after 1848, although in this address of 1844 it is stated that the predecessors of the then Governor General placed the French language on the same footing as the English. It goes on to say:

" That in the very first Session of the Legislature, under that Act, it was indispensable to translate into French every public record and document. That the debates were not, and could not, unless a portion of the representatives of the people were silenced, be carried on without its use. That in courts and judicial proceedings it was found equally necessary as before the Union, and for every other practical purpose, it is as much used as it ever has been."

When that report was taken up in the House, the following proceedings took place;—

" Mr. Papineau, in speaking to the motion, was understood to say that 'he could not suppose the home Government would have any objection to this amendment in the Union Bill'; and in proof of this he read from a despatch from the Colonial Secretary, addressed to Lord Gosford, which stated that the home Government conceived that no interference should be made with the language of the French Canadians. He likewise stated that it was satisfactory to notice that the English part of the community and of that House had no objection to this amendment. This was the best proof of their good-will towards his, Mr. Papineau's, compatriots.

" Mr. Attorney-General Smith was sure that the motion would be received with the greatest satisfaction by the whole House; and that in this instance there could be no difference between members on either side of the House.

" Dr. Dunlop said that the motion was so reasonable and just, he hoped it would be carried by acclamation.

" The motion was then put and carried by acclamation, every member rising, and with a good deal of clapping and cheering."

And that was in a legislature composed of an equal number of representatives from each Province of Canada, by the unanimous voice of that legislature, after an experience of three years during which the French language, so far as that legislature could do it, was abolished. In view of that fact, and in view of the fact that since then the French population has multiplied four or five times over,

why an effort should now be made to repeal the French language, and regret should be expressed that that language is still in use in this country, I cannot conceive. It is as impossible, by an Act of Parliament, to prevent the use of the French language in this Canada as it is by any similar act to root out the prejudices that are latent in some men's minds. Now, Sir, the amendment before the House recognises the federal system under which we live, and it is a somewhat curious fact that in the Province of Quebec, in respect of municipal matters, the right is conceded to each local municipality to declare whether its proceedings shall be published in both languages or in one language only. Article 243 of the Municipal Code of Quebec enacts:—

"In any municipality, for which there is no Order in Council, in virtue of the 10th section of the Consolidated Municipal Act of Lower Canada, the publication of every notice, by-law, resolution or order of the council, by posting, reading aloud, or insertion in the newspapers, must be made in the French and English languages.

"In every local municipality, for which there is such an Order in Council, the publication of every notice, by-law, resolution, or order of a county council, and of every notice from the secretary-treasurer of the county council, by poster, by reading, or in the newspapers, may be made only in the language prescribed in such Order in Council, in place of being made in English and French."

And if hon. gentlemen will turn to the Quebec *Official Gazette* of the 4th of January of this very year, they will find there this notice:

"QUEBEC, 23rd Dec., 1889.

"Notice is hereby given that a petition has been presented to the Lieut. Governor by the Municipal Council of the township of Eardley, in the County of Ottawa, to obtain the authorisation to publish in English only all notices, by-laws, or resolutions made or passed by said council."

So that in the Province of Quebec, where the French people are in such an immense majority, the Local Legislature has been liberal enough to provide that in exclusively English or almost exclusively English communities the use of the French language may be abandoned altogether. Sir, the amendment, as I understand it, proposes that the same principle shall be extended to the North-West—that the people of the Territories shall have the opportunity of declaring their will through their representatives as to whether the French language shall be continued in use there or not. Now, the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is a good deal disturbed by the fear that the amendment, if adopted, will fail of effect; but he must know that it is a distinct instruction of the House to the Government, and if the Government fail to act on this instruction they must resign office. The hon. member tells us also that it is not desirable to throw a bone of contention among the people of the North-West, but he has no objection to a bone of contention being thrown among the people of the whole Dominion. Is it not a very much greater source of objection and irritation for the Parliament of Canada to impose a language upon a people of any Province than it is to allow that people to say what language or how many languages shall be used in their legislature? Those people pay the taxes and they have the right to say what expenses shall be placed upon them. Up to this time the people of the North-West have not had much to complain of in this respect. In fact, were it not for the lamentable agitation that was started in Ontario and Quebec

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

principally, last summer, I doubt whether the subject now under discussion would ever have been alluded to at all either in the North-West or elsewhere. Certain it is that from the time the amendment was made in the Senate to the North-West Territory Act of 1877 down to the summer of 1889, when these unhappy religious differences were brought into the political arena in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, not one complaint was made, so far as I am aware, by any newspaper or anybody in the North-West Territory that it was a hardship upon them and inimical to their well-being as a national community that the French should be recognised as an official language. It is only since it occurred to some gentlemen that political capital might be made out of it that this question has been agitated at all. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) answered in every particular, I think, the speech made by the hon. member for North Simcoe in introducing his Bill the other day, but I will trouble the House with one quotation bearing upon the case, and it is from the author selected by the hon. member himself. I refer to Professor Freeman. He says in one of his lectures, speaking of the Swiss Confederacy—and I may say that Professor Freeman maintains that in many important particulars the federal system of Switzerland is superior to that of Great Britain or that of the United States:

"An artificial nation was thus formed, a nation not marked out by the usual signs of blood or language, but still a nation by adoption. But it is adoption without assimilation. The Lombard of Ticino, the Burgundian of Vaud, has been raised to the level of his former German master, but he has not adopted their tongue, neither have they adopted his. In your union you adopt citizens from all parts, but what you adopt you assimilate, wherever the physical laws of nature allow assimilation. All, sooner or later, are merged in a one body; all become members of what I venture still to call the English people. To you the sight must seem strange to see two states of the same Union side by side, speaking wholly distinct languages; it must seem yet more strange to you to find one state all but wholly Catholic, another all but wholly Protestant, and to learn that the laws which in either case secure civil equality to the minority are in most cantons of recent date. Yet, with all this diversity, the Swiss people, Teutonic and Romance, Catholic and Protestant, undoubtedly form a nation, though a nation artificially put together out of fragments of three elder nations."

Showing that in the case of Switzerland according to the authority selected by the hon. member for North Simcoe, in spite of diversities of language and religion, a nation vigorous and prosperous has been formed under a system of Government in many respects superior to that of Great Britain and the United States. There is not an hon. gentleman in this House who will take exception to the view that if it were possible to have one language it would be an advantage, but it is useless to-day to lay down that view as an argument. If we could all be by a process of reasoning made English, it might be to the general advantage, but the day has gone by, when anything can be gained by insisting on the suppression of a language spoken by a large minority in this country. We have to deal with facts as they exist. Without doubt under our present system the assimilation of the people is being gradually brought about. From personal knowledge I may say that in the Province of Quebec, throughout the Eastern Townships and the Montreal districts, there are more French people speaking English than English people speaking French. In fact it is worthy of remark

that in that Province ten Frenchmen learn English to one Englishman who learns French. But as *L'Etendard* said the other day, if efforts are made to antagonise our fellow-citizens, the French Canadians, if they are to be deprived of what they consider their rights, they will become more exclusive than they have ever been in the past. What has been the teaching of the past? We know that down to the rebellion of 1837 the French held themselves completely aloof from their English speaking fellow-subjects, whom they regarded as an alien and hostile race; but after the rebellion and after the union of the two Canadas in 1841, a different feeling began to set in, and a different state of affairs began to prevail. The French speaking people obtained the measure of self-government they desired, and according to the testimony of Earl Grey in one of his letters to Lord John Russell:

"The consequence of this was that the French Canadians and the Liberal party in the western division of the Province, seeing that their leaders and friends were admitted to their just share of power and influence, that no distrust of them was evinced by the Government and that the Government really was to be carried on strictly in the spirit of the constitution without any preference being shown to men of any one party or any one religion, became on their side reconciled to the Imperial authority which was exercised, and proved themselves worthy of the confidence which had been placed in them by the loyalty and attachment they manifested to the Crown. So soon and so decidedly were the healing effects of this policy experienced, that when the news of the French revolution of February, 1848, reached the Province, it occasioned no disturbance or alarm. In the state of public feeling and opinion which Lord Elgin found prevailing on his arrival in Canada little more than a year before, there can be no doubt that the intelligence of this startling event would have produced most formidable excitement, if not actual disturbance. Instead of this there was a most perfect tranquility and security. All efforts to create opposition to the Government amongst the French Canadians utterly failed; they heartily and steadily supported the Government, and took every opportunity to manifest, by addresses and resolutions, the strongest spirit of loyalty to the British Crown."

That was the effect fifty years ago of a policy of conciliation and fair play, and every chapter in the history of Canada shows that where efforts have been made to antagonise the sentiment of French-Canadians, or to compel them to speak a foreign tongue, they have become only the more exclusive and refused the more obstinately to assimilate with their fellow-citizens of British origin, but that when, on the contrary, a policy of fair play, conciliation and justice is pursued, they have manifested the most unswerving loyalty to the British Crown and Canada. Sir George Cartier called himself an Englishman speaking French, and I believe there are to-day more French Canadians who are proud to call themselves English-speaking Frenchmen than ever before, and that the number will steadily increase if a policy of fair play and equal justice be continued. The events of the past year, however, have not tended to encourage this assimilation, and every fair-minded man must regret the agitation which has been made in this House and out of it on this race and language question. I believe in the policy of provincial rights in a matter of this kind. The question of a dual language is to be dealt with by this Parliament of Canada so far as federal affairs are concerned, but I believe that, so far as provincial affairs are concerned, it should be dealt with by the Provinces, and to the Provinces I am prepared to relegate it. I trust our French Canadian friends will take the same view, and that they will not allow the source

from which this proposition emanates to warp or bias their judgment in the matter. Of course they believe that, but for the agitation which swept over this country last summer, this proposition would not have come here, but they must also be aware that nine-tenths of the people in the Territories belong to other races than French, and that, judging from the tendency of colonisation in that territory, that population is likely to be larger in proportion in the future. The tendency to colonisation on the part of the French population is practically confined to the eastern part of Ontario, and our French Canadian friends must be aware that their interests, not only as French Canadians, but in every sense, are not jeopardised, and cannot be jeopardised, by the abolition of the use of their language in the proceedings and the documents of the North-West Assembly.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) I cannot, Mr. Speaker, allow this debate to be concluded without expressing the opinions I hold on this matter, as being a French Canadian. This question is certainly one of the most important which can be brought before this House. It concerns not only the limited French population in the North-West, but looking at the terms in which it is couched, it influences the peace and prosperity of the country, and, more especially, the entire French Canadian race. The Bill brought in by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is, on the face of it, directed against the use of the French language in the North-West. But if we read the speech which accompanied its introduction, and if we read the preamble of the Bill itself, we shall there find set out the principle that there should exist throughout the whole of the Dominion but one and only one official language to be employed in the legislatures and in the courts, namely, the English language. This is a principle, Mr. Speaker, which for my part I can in no way accept. I am of the opinion of those who assert that this is not a mere local question; but that it is a question of the gravest moment and which concerns the whole Dominion. I am also opposed to the amendment made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), because I see in it only an attempt to obtain by an oblique course what they do not dare to ask for directly. The Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe is supposed to be based upon a resolution passed by the Council of the North-West Territories, asking that the use of the French language, before that body and before the courts, be prohibited. If there is any justification in this House taking up the question it is evidently the fact that the Council of the North-West should represent the opinion of the people of the North-West, and that, consequently, there would be a moral obligation for this Parliament to carry out the wishes so expressed by that Council. Now, Mr. Speaker, if, relying on this fact, this House is of the opinion that the French language ought to be abolished,—if we decree its use to be forfeited because we believe these resolutions to represent the views of the people, it is evident that by surrendering to this same Legislature the right to decree the abolition of the French language, we act exactly as if we had decreed it ourselves. If they wish to abolish the French language, let them say so plainly. If they believe that it is in the interest of the peace of the country that a single language should be spoken in the

Territories, let them have the courage to say so. If, on the other hand, they desire to avoid exciting the passions of the people, if they wish to avoid rousing their prejudices, if they wish to avoid cause of disappointment, if they desire to maintain peace, tranquility and the excellent harmony which now exists among the various races, let them declare that the retention of the French language in the North-West is a measure in the interest of the country and let them reject this Bill. At the time of the organisation of the Territories, it was thought of importance to the erection and the peopling of the Territories that the use of the two languages before the courts and before the Legislature should be authorised. Nothing has occurred since to modify this position. The principle which the amendment lays down is a dangerous principle; if it is good to leave to a Local Legislature the right to decide questions of this importance, touching the privileges granted to a whole race; if it is good to grant this to the North-West Territories, how can you refuse it to the Manitoba Legislature, which desires, in her turn, to enact the abolition of the French language? If it is pretended that the wish of the legislatures should be acceded to at Ottawa; if it is admitted that a legislature can decree the abolition of a right established and recognised, how will you be able to refuse the exercise of this right when the House of Commons is in question; how shall we be able to go to the foot of the throne and represent to the Queen and to Her Government that the use of the French language was guaranteed us by the Constitution which was given to us by an Act of the Imperial Parliament? They will reply to us: You have thought it right to leave to the majority in the Provincial Legislatures the right of decreeing the forfeiture of the French language in one Province; to-day, the House of Commons by a majority decrees the cancelling of this right at Ottawa, by virtue of what principle do you oppose this decision? It is plain, Mr. Speaker, that if we wish, with success, to defend the rights of our race and of our language; if we wish to maintain our institutions, we should not allow him to lay down this principle, because if we admit the principle, we shall be obliged to submit to the consequences, whatever they may be. This is why, for my own part—and I trust that I represent the opinions of no small number—I cannot support more strongly the amendment made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)—although he has backed it in terms of great sympathy with the French language—than I can support the Bill itself. I do not wish to give to a legislature, which has declared itself hostile, the right of decreeing, when it shall see fit, that the French language shall cease to be spoken officially in the North-West Territories. I have heard the reasons given in support of the Bill and of the amendment. One of the reasons given is that the French population in the North-West is small in number. The French population of the North-West is about one to six, which is at least as great as the proportion of the English population of the Province of Quebec. And yet with what indignation would that person be received who would say: The population of English descent is small in numbers in the Province of Quebec; it costs several thousands of dollars to translate the public papers into the two languages, let us abolish the English tongue. Let us suppose,

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

(what is an impossibility) that a majority should adopt a similar resolution, how could this House refuse to the French majority of Quebec the right to abolish the English language, when it is desired to grant to the English majority in the North-West the right to abolish the French language. It is also stated that this population is poor. This is a good reason why we should come forward in its defence. If the population is poor; if it is but poorly able to defend itself, it remains for us, the representatives of Provinces richer and more at liberty, it is for us the representatives of a people capable of taking care of themselves, to assume charge of their interests before this House. It is also said that it is not represented. Why is it not represented? It is because the counties have been so divided that they cannot choose their own representatives. In order to establish that the Government divided up the Territories in such a manner that this population cannot secure a representation, I will cite the words of that illustrious man who has passed forty years of his life in the North-West Territories, Monseigneur Grandin, who says that, looking at the division of the counties, it is impossible for the French population to be represented. It has been stated, and I believe the statement to be correct, that each and every one of the members from the North-West was entreated to adopt the paternity of the Bill by seconding the motion of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and that they had one and all refused. I trust that they will continue to represent with impartiality all the elements which form the population of the North-West, and that they will prevent by their vote and voice the injustice which it is attempted to commit. Now, Mr. Speaker, complaint is made of the evils caused by the existence of two official languages in Canada. It is strange that the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) should be the first one to find out these great inconveniences. All the statesmen who have come from England, being without prejudices and having official duties to perform; those who have been entrusted with the charge of representing the Crown of England in Canada; all those who have taken the pains to study the question, have declared that the French language was not an evil but a benefit; that it was one of the most effectual guarantees for the loyalty of the French population to the Crown of Britain; that as matters stood there was a friendly contention between the two races to do most for the progress and advancement of the country. The hon. the Secretary of State cited the other day the opinion of Lord Elgin. Who does not remember the speech of Lord Dufferin, wherein His Excellency affirmed that the existence of the English and French races in Canada, was one of the greatest means of promoting the progress of the country by the emulation which of necessity existed between them. If the hon. the member for Simcoe had read a little of the history of Canada, or at least if he had desired to understand the lessons derived from it, he would have discovered that every time that an attempt had been made to deprive one portion of the population of its rights and privileges guaranteed by the constitution or by treaties, he would have seen I say, that such attempts have been followed by discontent, disorders and even by revolutions. It is only when the country has been governed according to its wishes; when all its rights have

been respected, and when each one has felt that he could exercise in peace and without constraint his religion and speak his own language, that peace has entered into their souls, that contentment has possessed every one, and that prosperity has come again in a solid and permanent manner. The same causes will produce the same effects. They will produce the same effects not only in the North-West, but throughout the whole of the Dominion, for the simple and very natural reason that if no respect is shown for the rights of our race in the North-West, we have no longer any guarantee that they will be respected elsewhere; and the French population will come to find out that they must place themselves in a position of defence against the aggression with which they will be constantly threatened. This is a condition of affairs which should not be tolerated. It appears to me that all the statesmen in this House should hold out the hand to one another, and come to an understanding to discourage the schemes of fanatics like the member for Simcoe, who labour to inflame the population, and to stir up the prejudices of race, in order to hoist themselves into power, even on the ruins of their country. With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to move the following amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin):—

That all the words after the word "Resolved" in the amendment be struck out and the following inserted instead thereof:—"That the official use of the French and English languages in the Legislature and the Courts of the North-West Territories was established by this Parliament in the well understood interests of the people of the said Territories, in order to promote the good understanding and the harmony that should exist between the different races, and with a view, by a liberal policy, to promote the colonisation and settlement of those vast domains; that nothing has happened since to excuse or justify the withdrawal of the privileges granted only a few years ago; that the result of the proposed legislation would be to create uneasiness and discontent throughout the Dominion and to put in doubt the stability of our institutions, and thereby to hinder and delay for a long time the development of the immense resources of the Canadian North-West."

Mr. DENISON. As the seconder of this Bill, it is only right that I should place on record my reasons for the course I intend to take. In approaching this subject, I wish to say I have no feeling against my loyal fellow-subjects of French origin, or against the French language, and I would be only too glad if I could speak the French language well; but I think it is not in the interests of the North-West Territories, or in the interests of Canada as a whole, that we should adopt the French language or continue it in the North-West Territories. If it is decided by this House that it is wise to have two languages in the North-West, the question which presents itself is, what other language shall we choose in addition to English? Shall we choose French, German, Cree, Icelandic, or Russian, or any other language. If we take the population numerically, and adopt the language of the strongest in that sense, we would have to adopt, as was suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the Cree language. In the early days up there, the English half-breeds spoke English and Cree, and the French half-breeds spoke French and Cree, and the Cree language was the common language between them all. But, if we rule that language out, shall we adopt French or German? I understand that now the

Germans in the North-West equal, if they do not exceed the French there, and, if that is not the case now, I fancy it will not be very many years before the Germans will far exceed the French in the North-West. I was in the North-West twenty years ago, in the year 1870. It was then a Crown colony, or had been shortly before that. It was a British Crown colony, governed by the Hudson Bay Company, by means of a Governor and a Council. The Hudson Bay Company held that country from the time when they got their charter in 1670, until it was bought from them by the Dominion Government. It has been claimed by some that that is a French land; in fact Bishop Grandin, in his letter which we have on the Votes and Proceedings of the House, has claimed that it is French land, he speaks of it as "our land." I cannot see how he can claim anything of the kind because, as you all know, it has always been held by the Hudson Bay Company as a Crown colony under the direct authority of the British Government from the time of their charter. I would like to read a few lines from Hargrave's Red River. On page 87 he says:

"With regard to the administration of justice, the laws of England of the date of Her Majesty's accession, so far as they are applicable to the condition of the colony, are understood to regulate the judicial proceedings. The regulations passed by the Council of Assiniboia are of the nature of by-laws."

And to show further, the interest that was taken in that colony by the British Government on more than one occasion, they found it necessary to send up troops to Red River colony, through a vast wilderness, by the Hudson Bay route up the Nelson River, and by a very long, harassing and tedious journey. On page 93 the same author says:

"For a space of time extending over 15 years a regular military force was quartered at Red River. In 1846 a wing of the 6th regiment of foot, a detachment of royal engineers, and detachment of artillery, under command of Colonel Crofton, were ordered to the settlement, where they arrived in the autumn of the same year. The entire party consisted of 18 officers and 339 men. They reached their destination by way of York Factory on Hudson Bay, over the route between which point and the settlement they conveyed their guns and stores by the usual means of inland transport used in the country. They were sent out under secret instructions from the war office. Colonel Crofton himself remained for only one year, at the close of which he was succeeded by Major Griffith, who, along with the troops under his command, returned home in 1848."

On the next page we find:

"From 1855 till 1857 there were no troops resident in the colony, but in the latter year a company of Royal Canadian Riflemen came out. This corps formed part of a regiment of seven or eight hundred men which were peculiarly a Canadian force, being recruited for service in Canada, though supported by the Imperial Government. After the first two years of its residence had expired the entire body of officers was relieved by gentlemen from other companies of the regiment, and in the year 1861, after having been stationed in the country for four years, the company returned to Canada by ship from York Factory."

You will see, Mr. Speaker, by that, the interest that was taken in the North-West country, by the Imperial Government. You will see that there was no pretence then, that it was in any sense a French colony, or retained at any time by the French. In 1870, the population was very small, some ten or eleven thousand, mostly half-breeds. As we know there is not one representative in the present North-West Council who speaks the French tongue. I went over the Canadian Pacific Railway line this summer, and from the time that I entered the Territories to the day I left, it so happened I did not hear one word

of French spoken. I cannot see that there is any great cry on the part of the French in the North-West for a dual language. If it is a good thing for the French race to have the French language used in the North-West Territories, it must also be a good thing for the German race that their language be spoken there also, because they are growing and increasing very rapidly. On my return I came back by the Northern Pacific road, and I am glad to say that our road is in every respect superior to it, and is indeed a most magnificent road, and it passes through a far better country in every respect. In fact the whole of the Northern Pacific country seems to be altogether barren, except on the Pacific slope, where there is some good land. I could see that the land was all occupied; I could see that our neighbors have settled pretty nearly all that country except, perhaps, a small portion on the Pacific slope. They have occupied all the mountain lands for pasture, they have occupied all the valleys good for tillage. As you will remember, not very long ago when the Oklahoma district was opened for settlement, it was surrounded on all sides by people who rushed in so as to be able to get land. That is conclusive proof, to my mind, that our neighbors to the south have pretty well overrun all the land they have, and I think that they are not likely to have any new territory to throw open unless they seize more Indian reserves and open them for settlement. That being the case I have every ground for saying that there will be a very large immigration into our own North-West Territories within the next few years. We have there a great lone land, a land, I suppose, as big as Europe, without any inhabitants to speak of. There are very few or no inhabitants in a vast extent of territory which will be opened for future settlement. When we think of the large immigration that is increasing every year, when we know that immigration has been pouring into the United States for years, when we know that that country is already about filled up, we must become convinced that the tide of population is sure to turn towards our own Territories. Now, is this House to say that we are going to allow these foreign settlers who come in there, to say what language they shall speak? I hope not. I think that we should let all these foreigners who reach our shores understand that when they set their foot in the North-West Territories they have got to become Canadians and speak the language of this continent. It has been said that Switzerland is a parallel case to this Canada of ours. Now, mark you, I am not referring to Quebec, it is out of the question to speak about Quebec; I have devoted myself entirely to the North-West Territories and it has been suggested that Switzerland is a parallel case. It is not a parallel case for this reason: In Switzerland they had a dual language from the very beginning, whereas we have a great lone land empty now and waiting for settlement. As you know, Switzerland was peopled from the south by Italians, from the east by French, from the north by Germans. They were living in secluded valleys where they were left undisturbed for a long time, and when they found they were attacked by a foreign enemy they combined for common defence. When I read the history of Switzerland for the first time, I was surprised to learn what great dissensions they have had in that country during several generations, and it has only been when

Mr. DENISON.

attacked by a common enemy that they combined and made a common defence. I would like, with your permission, to read something from Bishop Grandin's letter. He says:

"After the annexation the immigrants came in great numbers, and I can tell you that out of every hundred there were but ten Catholics; the English and Protestant population thereupon increased rapidly, and in a few years we must be content to find ourselves in the minority."

And further on:

"You are also acquainted with what is going on this very day at Regina. In spite of the efforts of the Hon. J. Royal, Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West, and the Hon. Judge Rouleau, all our representatives, not one of whom is a Catholic, demand, with two exceptions, the abolition of our language and the amendment of our school laws in order to impose upon us the so-called secular schools which are nothing else but anti-Catholic schools, even admitting that they are not Godless schools."

Further on he says:

"If even one-fourth of those who emigrated from your Province during the past ten years had come to us, we would still constitute the majority, or would at all events be a powerful minority which would have to be taken into account and against which none would think of enacting extraordinary laws. To people this territory, to people *our land*, as the aborigines call it—and the Half-breeds and French Canadians have some right to use that expression: for French Canadians discovered this vast country; French Canadians and Half-breeds opened it up to religion and colonisation—to settle *our lands* there are sent men from every nation, men without faith and without religion; Mennonites are brought from a great distance, even Mormons are admitted and are seemingly held up as examples to the Blackfeet."

I have read these extracts to show that even Bishop Grandin admits that the immigration of English and other people has enormously increased there. I desire to make one more quotation before I resume my seat; it is from the *Mail* of 15th November, 1889. In an interview between Premier Mercier and a reporter of that paper, the reporter asked:

"When you said in your address before the Club National last week: 'Let us hope that these principles may never be misunderstood, and that we may not be called upon in any of our Provinces to have recourse to reprisals, and to remind the majority who may be unjust that there is a minority which stands in need of protection,' did you mean that as a threat to the Protestant majorities of other Provinces and to the Protestant minority here?"

"Not as a threat," replied Mr. Mercier; "but surely as a warning to the majorities in the other Provinces. To be frank, I must say that I intended and I do intend to-day to state that equal rights must apply to the minorities in every Province, and if the Federal Act is to be applied in some other Province against the rights of the minorities and to the abolition of their Separate schools where they exist by law, I do not see why the same rule should not apply to the minority of the Province of Quebec. I stated that the minorities had no rights because they were French or English, Catholic or Protestant, but that they had rights because they were the minorities entitled to be protected and to enjoy the same rights as the majorities. This being the principle, I do not see why the minority of the Province of Quebec should have more rights than the minorities in the other Provinces when the same law applies, when these rights are consecrated by the same constitution, and when the same interest exists. So, to be clear, my intention was to say that if the Catholics or the French of the other Provinces are not treated as they ought to be, I do not see why the Protestants and English in the Province of Quebec should be treated otherwise. I understand perfectly well the responsibility that I take, and I do take it with intention. It is not a threat, as I said, but a warning, which I hope will be sufficient to prevent the majorities of other Provinces from being unjust."

Now, are we to be deterred from doing our duty, from doing what we consider to be in the interests of our country, by any threats or warnings from

Mr. Mercier? I hope not. I, for one, have no idea of being influenced by the threats of Mr. Mercier or his friends. I will take any course in this House I choose, ignoring Mr. Mercier and anything he may do or say. I wish it to be understood that when he speaks his remarks have no influence or effect over me. I believe the course I am taking is the correct one, that it is the one in the interests of the land of my birth, and the land that contains everything that I hold dear.

Mr. MULOCK moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That the debate be the first Order of the day to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 13th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Duck Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Hesson.)

WHARFAGE AT BEDIQUE, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, What is the amount of wharfage collected at Hurd's Point wharf, Bedique, P.E.I., during the year 1889?

Mr. TUPPER. \$443 was derived in revenue for the year ending 30th June last. The entire receipts for the calendar year ending on the 31st December last, were \$68.36.

WHARFINGER AT TIGNISH, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether the wharfinger at Tignish, P.E.I., has made a return to the Department of Marine of the money collected for wharfage during the year 1889? If so, what amount has been collected?

Mr. TUPPER. Nothing was collected by the wharfinger, but a suit has been brought for dues not paid.

STE. ANGÈLE DE MÉRICI MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. Fiset asked, Whether the hon. the Postmaster General has received the petition which I forwarded him on behalf of the freeholders of the Parish of Ste. Angèle de Mérici, asking for a daily mail service? If he has, whether he intends to acknowledge the receipt of the said petition and to grant the prayer thereof?

Mr. HAGGART. There is no trace in the Department of any such petition.

MATANE BRANCH LINE.

Mr. Fiset asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, this year, to take into their

serious consideration the petitions which have been forwarded to them respecting the railway called the Matane Branch line? Whether they propose, this Session, to grant any subsidy whatever to the company regularly formed, and which has obtained a charter from the Legislature of the Province of Quebec for the construction of this branch line?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government will take this application and these petitions applying for subsidies, into their serious consideration during the present Session.

COLONEL WALKER POWELL.

Mr. LISTER asked, Whether Colonel Walker Powell, Adjutant General of Militia, has tendered his resignation to the Minister of Militia or the Government at any time during the past five years? If so, for what cause; and on what conditions did he agree to remain in his present official position?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that the Adjutant General presented me with a letter, which, upon opening, I found to be a proposal to resign his office. I returned it to him, not wishing to accept it, and he withdrew it without any conditions.

IMPORTATION OF MINING MACHINERY.

Mr. LISTER asked, Whether the Government has allowed any machinery used in the copper or nickel mines at Sudbury to be imported free of duty, or to be used in bond? Has the importation into Canada of any mining machinery been permitted without the payment of duty during the past five years?

Mr. BOWELL. Application was made for the admission, free of duty, of some machinery that had been used in the mines of the United States, for use in the copper and nickel mines at Sudbury, Ontario, which was conceded by Order in Council. The British Columbia Government appropriated a sum of money to purchase machinery for the purpose of erecting reducing works in the Cariboo district, British Columbia, upon which duty was paid, and application was made to the Dominion Government for a refund of said duty as such machinery was not manufactured in Canada. That application was granted. No refund has been made, for the reason that it has not yet been shown to the Department what portion of the machinery imported is not manufactured in Canada. When that is done, a refund will be made.

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

Mr. BRIEN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place mail clerks on the Detroit, Lake Erie and Essex Railroad; and also on the Leamington and St. Croix Railroad, this Session?

Mr. HAGGART. Mails are not yet carried on the Detroit, Lake Erie and Essex Railway. Whether they will be carried or not is at present under consideration. In answer to the second question, I beg to say that the mails are carried by the railway company, and there is no necessity for a railway mail clerk.

POSTAL FACILITIES IN ESSEX COUNTY.

Mr. BRIEN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a post office at New Canaan, County of Essex, during the present Session of Parliament?

Mr. HAGGART. An application has been received for a post office at a place called New Canaan. Upon the application being referred to the Inspector, he reported that there is a station named by the railway company "New Canaan." There are two or three houses in sight, but no appearance of any village starting up. Mr. Weldon, the person who seeks the office of postmaster, proposes that one Walter Boyle, who lives at about a quarter of a mile from the Corners, shall act as his assistant for the time being, and that next fall, he will put up a building for a store at the Corners, and take the post office into it. Mr. Weldon now resides at Gesto, which is about two and a-half miles east of New Canaan. An office at the Malden road is, under present circumstances, not required, and until Mr. Weldon or some one else erects a store and the place shows some signs of improvement, the question of opening a post office there might be left in abeyance. The application is, in my opinion, premature. On account of there being no settled site as to where the post office is proposed to be established, I am unable to state just what a semi-daily mail service would cost from the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway, in case that railway be used for mail purposes.

JUNIOR JUDGE FOR ESSEX COUNTY.

Mr. BRIEN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint a junior judge for the County of Essex during the present Session? If not, when?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have had no application on the subject recently, and the matter has not been considered during the last few months.

PRIVILEGE—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. RYKERT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to make a personal explanation in regard to certain matters which have appeared in the public press during the last few days. In the *Globe* of last Saturday there appeared a large number of letters purporting to be written by myself in regard to a timber limit in the North West Territories. And in the *Globe* of Tuesday last a reference is made to this correspondence, and the charge is also made that I, as a member of this House, have been guilty of a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act, and that I have used my position as a member of Parliament for my own personal and private gain. It is also alleged that connected with that transaction are certain Ministers of the Crown, who, it is alleged, took an active part in respect to this matter. So far as I myself am concerned, I care not what the public press may say about me. I have been in Parliament a great many years, and the result of all attacks has been that I am still here a member of this House, and I have occupied the position as representative of my own constituency for upwards of a quarter of a century. This whole correspondence was published during the last

Mr. HAGGART.

election; it was talked about throughout the country, and as a result, my majority was increased from the normal one of about 100 to about 500. So you will see, Mr. Speaker, that so far as my constituents were concerned they took no stock whatever in this correspondence or in matters published throughout my constituency in regard to this matter. I would not, Sir, upon this occasion take any objection to what has been said were it not that something has been said reflecting on members of the Government. I am able to defend myself on any public platform in this country, and I am prepared to do so on all occasions, but when it is said that Ministers of the Crown are connected with me in a matter which is alleged to be not of a proper character, it is my duty at the very outset to satisfy this House that they have nothing whatever to do with it. I entirely exonerate the Government from anything improper. It must have struck hon. gentlemen, on reading this correspondence, that there is something very peculiar about it. In the first place it is a private and confidential correspondence. It also appears that those letters were written in answer to other letters addressed to myself, and that some of the letters which have been suppressed are of a very important character. It must also have suggested itself to persons reading it that all this correspondence took place after these limits in the North-West Territories were granted to Mr. Adams, and that this has nothing whatever to do with my position as a member of Parliament. I propose today to supply to the House and the country some letters which have not been published, which will go a long way to explain the reason why some of the correspondence was written by myself, and also give several explanations regarding that correspondence, without which it might appear somewhat strange. Let me say in the first place, as regards my being guilty of a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act, and as having prostituted my position as a member of Parliament, that, according to the law of the land, a law placed upon the statute book by the late Government, the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, that any person had the right to make application to the Government for a timber limit in the North-West Territories without tenders being asked. The old law had been repealed by the late Government, so that any person could apply to the Government for the purpose of obtaining a limit in the North-West Territories. It is well known that this was taken advantage of, but I will not enter upon this question on this occasion. But in accordance with the law as it then stood, and the law is on the statute book, any company, composed of members of Parliament or other persons, had a perfect right to go to the Government and ask for a timber limit in the North-West Territories. I will state the facts briefly. On behalf of Mr. John Adams I was applied to to get a timber limit in the North-West Territories. The correspondence leading up to that has not been published, and I propose to supply that, although I will not trouble the House with reading the letters in full, but I will place them in the hands of the official reporters of the House. I submit them in order to set myself right before the country and the House, and also to explain several observations made in the letters, which have been published in the *Globe*. Mr. Adams, knowing that he had a perfect right to

apply for a timber limit, wrote to me on 15th December, 1881, asking me to procure for him a limit in the North-West Territories, and asking me what proceeding he should adopt in order that he could get that limit. I replied, on 22nd December, that I received his letter, that I did not know when I would go to Ottawa, and if I could be any aid to him when I got there I would be pleased to assist him. I asked him in reference to different matters up there which will appear in the correspondence. On 28th December, Mr. Adams wrote to me. He said :

"I think I have a good thing up here, and I am told by a timber agent that if I only apply to the Government I can get hold of it. Now, I do not know how to apply and want you to help me, as I know you can if you like. Perhaps you can better yourself by helping me, as I will pay you well for all you do for me. Can I get up a company up here and apply for limits? I can get good men to help me. I have made a good deal of money up here and hope to make more.

On 11th January I wrote to him :

"I know nothing of the prospects of getting limits, nor do I know what are the rules of the Department about applying. If you send me particulars of what you want, I will see the Department or send to my agent at Ottawa and enquire."

Then, on the 25th January, I wrote again :

"I am delighted to hear you are making money. Nothing would please me better than to see you here again with a fortune. As regards the matter you speak of I shall be pleased to assist you and the company in any way I can, and, of course, I would be glad to better myself in any way which is fair and honorable. It seems to me you ought to organise a company with good men as you suggest, and then apply to the Government. I expect to be in Ottawa in two weeks, when I can perhaps do you service. Keep me posted as to what you want."

I may state here that when the application was sent to me, there was no location defined, and knowing that the Government would not allow a person to roam all over the North-West Territories, I asked that some specific description be given, in order that the Department would know what territory would be looked over by Mr. Adams to get the limit. On 10th February, 1882, I wrote to Mr. Adams :

"I cannot make out from the memo. sent me where the timber limit is, or the boundaries of the same. I have made enquiries in the Department, and they tell me it is necessary to state, as nearly as possible, the boundaries, in the application, within which you wish to select fifty square miles—you cannot have any more,—but they will not permit you to wander all over the country. Think they will let you select the limit out of a defined area of 400 square miles. I am afraid you are going into a very uncertain speculation, and better make more enquiries."

Again, on 19th February, I wrote as follows :—

"After talking the matter over with you yesterday, I put in your application, but I am afraid you will have to be more definite in your description. They tell me in the office there is no timber within the area fixed by you. I will try to have application allowed soon as possible."

On 20th March I wrote him again :

"Your application has been granted, but the Minister tells me that he thinks it will be worthless to you, as the limit is a good many hundred miles from any railway, and there is not likely to be any for years. They tell me you will have to take timber 1,300 miles by water to Winnipeg, and then compete with timber from the disputed territory. This is your own business, and you must be contented with the right to select within an area of 400 square miles. The Government will not let you play Cook & Sutherland upon it."

On the 25th March Mr. Adams wrote to me :

"Why cannot you get a bigger piece to select from, as I do not know anything about the territory. It will cost a large amount for the survey. Don't you think you can take a share in it or get up a company in St. Catharines? I will be liberal to them."

On 27th March I wrote :

"I cannot see any use in telling you a dozen times about the extent of territory that you can select from. You have now more than is usually granted. I am getting full instructions ready for the surveyor, and you can send him just as soon as I get the order. I would not invest any money in any such speculation, nor can I advise any of my friends to put money in a place of which I know nothing."

On 8th April he writes :

"What keeps the instructions back; can't you hurry them up? I am sorry you did not get 800 square miles to pick from. I think the delay will make it very costly to have the survey made. I think I can get up a company in Winnipeg to pay \$40,000 or \$50,000; then you can apply for another for me."

This, Mr. Speaker, you will see, will explain all the observations made in the letter which is published under my own hand on 8th April. I used the same expressions as Mr. Adams made in his letter to me. On 10th April reference is made to the same transaction, and on 11th April the *Globe* also refers to the same. On 16th April Mr. Adams says :

"What is keeping back the order for the surveyor? I am getting very uneasy. Just as soon as this is settled, I can get up a company for \$30,000 or \$40,000, or put in the whole for \$70,000 cash. If I succeed, I wish to go for something else I have on hand."

After the order was sent up to Mr. Adams, and he sent a survey party to look over the timber and to locate his limits, word came to Ottawa that the Canadian Pacific Railway were cutting down this timber, and I told him to notify the manager of the company not to trespass further on this limit. On 2nd July I received a letter from Mr. Adams, as follows :—

"I sent you word to-day that the Canadian Pacific Railway was cutting my timber; and after getting answer, notified the company. They have cut a good deal of the timber; and I think they will have to pay for it. Muckle thinks I can get the Canadian Pacific Railway to purchase at \$60,000 or \$70,000, and I am trying to get them to bite at it anyway."

This expression is explained in one of my letters. The letter continues :

"Can they not get the balance of the timber in the 400 miles? I will tell them to see you in Ottawa. I would like to work the limit if the Canadian Pacific Railway will not buy. It will pay better than all the cash we can get."

What appears in my letter of the 24th is already explained. Adams writes to me from Winnipeg on 18th July :

"Mercer is back from the limit, and he will write you fully to-day. It is a great limit; and I am now satisfied the limit is well worth \$150,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they must have the timber, as there is none nearer than Winnipeg. But they are a hard people to satisfy about the value, unless Muckle will tell them all about it. I will try to get them to feel the men in the office here. I will go to Ottawa as soon as you are ready."

The letter of 25th July says that the surveyor has arrived and was preparing the documents to send down to Ottawa. On 3rd August, after the papers were sent Mr. Adams, he writes :

"I am so anxious about the affair that I will leave for Ottawa next week, and will meet you in Toronto on my way. I have got a regular bonanza. Don't let them beat me out of it after all my hard work and expense in paying thousands for surveys. I was talking to McCarthy about getting up a company; but Peter has not much faith in it. (That is Mr. McCarthy of Winnipeg.) I think I can sell for \$80,000 or \$90,000 cash, or I might get up a company and double that amount and take half in stock."

Then I telegraphed to him that the field notes had arrived, but that the oath of the surveyor had not

been attached to it, and he ought to have a new application sworn to. Later on an application was made to have this license issued, but in consequence of some opposition made to it in the Department which is not necessary for me to refer to, it was delayed for some length of time. I mention that fact, because, in one of the letters of 14th Sept. it is stated that Mr. Bowell was helping. Now, the facts are briefly this, in explanation of what the hon. the Minister of Customs did. The application was sent here for a license, and the Minister being away at Rivière du Loup, I was compelled to ask some person in the Government to assist to have that put through as early as possible. I applied to Mr. Bowell and asked him if he would watch it, and when the opportunity arrived to speak of it. In no way did I ask his influence, for, on the contrary, the whole matter had gone beyond the range of influence altogether. The matter had passed out of the hands of the Department, and it was only necessary to have an order issued for the final issuing of the license. Therefore, I simply asked the Minister of Customs if he would look after the matter and see that the thing was satisfactorily arranged for me. That is all the correspondence which leads up to this matter. All the other correspondence referred to has reference entirely to what took place after the license had been issued, and after the Government had refused to renew the license in consequence of the application made by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the alternate sections. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me here state to the House that when this application was made for this timber license, there was no railway within 400 or 500 miles of it. At that time the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were expected to carry their line up to the Yellowhead Pass. During the Session of Parliament after this license was granted the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made application to this Parliament to change their location, and the result was that the location of the railway came within twenty or thirty miles of this limit, so that it was by pure accident that it became valuable. You will see by the correspondence that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company set to work cutting down timber on the limit, in consequence of Mr. Muckle, their timber agent, who was interested in this very limit with Mr. Adams, having induced them to cut down the timber in order to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to buy it. I make that statement, because it was referred to in the correspondence. But when I applied to Mr. Van Horne in Winnipeg, at the instance of Mr. Adams, who telegraphed instructing me to go there, Mr. Van Horne stated to me that if the timber was cut down he would make it good. Up to that time the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made no claim; but in January, 1883, after the limit was sold, then for the first time it was discovered that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had made up their mind to secure the limit if at all possible. They claimed the alternate sections. It then became my duty, as representing Mr. Adams, to see the sale of the property carried out. Mr. Sands, who had secured the limit, insisted that I should see that the transaction was completed. I came to the Government, went before the Department, and asked them to renew the license. They said that it could not be done, because the Canadian Pacific Railway claimed the

Mr RYKERT.

property. I urged as strongly as I could that it was the duty of the Government, having given the license long before the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had located their line, to see that the licensee was protected. I was urged to do so by Mr. Sands, whose correspondence I have here, and who insisted on it being done by myself. He said, on 21st February, 1883:

"I trust you will be able to protect my interest in this land transaction, for which services I will be happy to pay on demand."

On 10th April, 1883, he wrote:

"Should anyone interfere with my limit, I shall telegraph you to advise how to proceed."

Again on 4th May, 1883, he wrote:

"I trust you will continue to uphold and defend my rights and title to the whole limit on Cyprus Hills, and that you will soon be able to obtain for me the necessary limit."

On 5th June, 1883, he wrote:

"Hence, I trust, and am in hopes still that you will succeed in getting me a license for the whole limit, in which event I will have lost nothing. If, however, you fail to induce your Government to do this act of justice, you will undoubtedly get me a license for the even-sections as soon as possible."

On 23rd Sept., 1883, he wrote:

"Trusting you will look after my interest and not let any opportunity slip that may tend to increase my claim or strengthen our side of the case."

In consequence of this, I urged very strongly on the Government that it was their duty to protect this licensee, and not to allow the railway company to go into the unsurveyed territory and take that property. I fortified myself with an opinion from a distinguished member of the firm of Blake, Kerr, Lash & Cassels, of Toronto, which confirmed my own opinion that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had no right, in consequence of the deflection of their line, to take away the license given to another party in the unsurveyed territory. The title was passed by the firm of McArthur & Tupper, of Winnipeg, a firm composed of Mr. McArthur, Mr. Dexter, Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Tupper. The moment it was found that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were endeavoring to take this timber limit, or to destroy it, I telegraphed to Mr. Sands to send Mr. McArthur to Ottawa in order to show what they had done, and in order to have the matter set right. That is the reference I made to Mr. Tupper and Mr. Macdonald coming here. Those young gentlemen came here and did their duty in the matter, and asked nothing for their services and got nothing for them. They did what they were bound to do, according to the law, as the solicitors of Mr. Sands. I wish to refer here to one of the letters, a portion of which is printed as follows:—

"I have to go to Ottawa to-morrow night to fight the matter out, which I do not like. I mean to have all the hardest part of it to do. I have Bowell working for me, and if we succeed in beating the railway, we will have to pay the amount we agreed to pay, as you recollect, when we two were at the Queen's Hotel."

This letter is not printed properly; there should be a full stop after, "Bowell working for me." I put the matter before the Government, and they thought that it was fair that the license should be renewed if at all possible. I thought that the agreement made between Mr. Adams and myself at the Queen's Hotel in Toronto should be carried out, that if any person would cause the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to abandon

their claim, they should be paid for it. There were several persons in this city—Mr. Muckle, Mr. Kirby and others—who offered their services, and claimed that they could have this difficulty removed by the payment of \$5,000 or \$6,000 each, and these are the persons referred to in my letter. After consideration, it was decided that it was better to buy out the Canadian Pacific Railway claim and pay these gentlemen the money they asked, but no member of the Government, directly or indirectly, ever insinuated that any money was to be paid for their services, or anything of the kind. It was the duty of the Government to see that the license was properly and satisfactorily carried out. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no use of my enlarging much longer on this question. I have explained the correspondence leading up to this transaction. The limit was applied for when any person could apply for it, and what took place, took place in consequence of the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who finally sold out their rights to Mr. Sands for \$2.25 per acre, after working the limit for upwards of a year. So that you will see, so far as I was personally concerned, all I did was done in my capacity as Mr. Sands' friend and entirely in his behalf. In my position as a member of Parliament, I acted in good faith, and in obtaining that license I did what any other member of Parliament had a right to do. I had no faith myself in the enterprise, not knowing where the property was and not thinking it worth anything, and the whole thing was carried out by me in good faith, and did not affect my position as a member of Parliament. Of course, I am not responsible for the publication of this correspondence, which I had hoped we had heard the end of after the trouble we had in the County of Lincoln, and after all this correspondence had been hawked about the country, and after the attempts that were made to induce me to buy it, which I refused to do. I will read to the House a telegram which I received to-day, voluntarily, from Mr. Patterson, of St. Catharines, who was my opponent in the last election, a gentleman distinguished in that city, and who acted as the solicitor of Mr. Adams in the suit between that gentleman and me, which suit, I may say, was settled amicably out of court. The correspondence had nothing whatever to do with that settlement, but it was in consequence simply of a suggestion coming from Mr. Samuel Blake, who acted for one party, and Mr. Osler who acted for the other, and it was agreed that the correspondence should be destroyed, and Mr. Patterson's letter was telegraphed to me to-day, referring to the correspondence published in the *Globe* of Saturday last, as follows:—

"I beg to say I am more surprised than yourself at the publication of this correspondence. The suit was settled agreeably to my client, and one of the terms of the agreement was that the correspondence should be copied and no use made of the copies, and this, speaking for myself and to the best of my belief, for my clients, has been faithfully adhered to. If the correspondence has been given publication by me or my client, it must certainly be a gross breach of faith and in violation of the signed agreement entered into."

I hold the original agreement signed by the counsel for the parties in which the whole matter was discussed. Now it has been dragged to the light of day, and I care not for myself personally, so

long as I entirely exonerate the Government from any blame in the matter. I am prepared to defend myself, and have done so successfully in the County of Lincoln, where I was returned by a majority of five hundred at the last elections.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the right hon. the First Minister brought down, as he said he would, copies of the Orders in Council referred to in this agreement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman asked me for it, and I consented to bring down the papers, but I did not know he wanted them for this discussion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will leave it on the Table, that will do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to make a motion. I do not propose to go into a discussion and lose time by so doing, but merely beg to move:

That whereas certain matters and documents reading as follows:—

I presume the House will permit me to consider these as read.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand from the right hon. the First Minister, that the House will consider them as read.

—certain matters and documents reading as follows: * * as published in the *Globe* newspaper of 8th February, containing divers statements affecting certain members of this House, and it is expedient that the House should have an opportunity of examining the same, it is ordered that the said letters above cited be printed in the Votes and Proceedings for the use of members.

The House is now in possession of the hon. member for Lincoln's explanations. I desire that the House should have the other documents which piece out the documents the hon. gentleman has referred to; and when the House is fully seized of them, we will be in a position to deal with this matter. I should be very glad, therefore, if the House will permit me, to include in that motion:

"And any other papers or correspondence that the hon. member for Lincoln desires to have included."

My wish being that the House should be seized of everything.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have asked the hon. gentleman, as it is a matter which affects him so considerably, if he requires a notice, and he only brings the condition, which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is willing to grant, that besides the papers that hon. gentleman has moved for, the hon. member for Lincoln will be at liberty to put in the Votes and Proceedings any other papers in connection with the matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose all the hon. gentleman's papers are dated?

Mr. RYKERT. They are all in regular order. I have never put anything irregular before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would make it more convenient for the use of hon. gentlemen if the letters the hon. gentleman wishes to interpolate were placed in order, as some of them are letters in reply to those contained in the document I have handed in.

Mr. RYKERT. I have a hundred more if the hon. gentleman would like to have them.

Mr. SPEAKER. As this motion must go into the Votes and Proceedings, what papers are required should be described.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Lincoln will put in within twenty-four hours all the papers, and we will have the whole story.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection in the world to that.

Mr. SPEAKER. The correspondence should be defined, so that we may know what papers are to be printed in the Votes and Proceedings.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would suggest that, in order that the hon. member for Lincoln may put in all his papers, the hon. member will postpone his motion until to-morrow, and all the papers can be put in to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection to that. It is perfectly fair that the hon. member for Lincoln should put his side of the question as fully as he pleases.

Motion withdrawn.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for Lincoln, I suppose, will send me within a reasonable time a list of the papers he wants inserted, so that I can add them to this motion, as suggested by the First Minister.

Mr. RYKERT. I will hand them to *Hansard*, but will not copy them for the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not require the hon. gentleman to copy them. No doubt the *Hansard* will copy them, and he can get them back from *Hansard*. All I want is to be enabled to make this motion in the form suggested by the First Minister.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand the hon. member for Lincoln to say that he has handed in to *Hansard* all the papers he purposes to include. If that be the case, is there any object in delaying the motion, or does the hon. gentleman wish to hand the papers to the hon. member for South Oxford so that they may be included?

Mr. RYKERT. I propose that they shall go to *Hansard* at once, and they can be got back from *Hansard* and handed to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BOWELL. Before this question is closed, I desire to say one or two words in connection with the use of my name in this correspondence. The explanation given by the hon. gentleman of the conversation he had with me while the right hon. the First Minister, who was then Minister of the Interior, was absent at Rivière du Loup, is substantially correct; but he might have added that he had represented to me that the Canadian Pacific Railway had diverted their line some distance to the south in order to enable them to take possession of this timber limit for which he or his friends had obtained a license. If my recollection serves me right, I replied that in such case I thought his interests ought to be protected, and that I should bring the matter before my colleagues at the earliest possible moment. If that be a crime, I am sure it is one I have committed a great many times since I have been a member of the Government. There is scarcely a member of the House, who has had any business with the Customs Department—and they are not a few—to whom I have not given precisely the same answer. To

Mr. RYKERT.

that portion of the correspondence I have no objection, but when I find the letter of 28th January, 1888, couched in the language in which it is, I am of opinion it must either be a misprint or that the hon. gentleman was singularly unfortunate in selecting language to convey his ideas of what he was doing in Ottawa in connection with the extension of the lease or the re-issue of the lease to him, and, therefore, must enter my solemn protest. I find in the letter of 28th January the following language:—

“I have to go to Ottawa to-morrow night to fight the matter out, which I do not like. I mean to have all the hardest part of it to do. I have Bowell working for me. And if we succeed in beating the railway, we will have to pay the amount we agreed to pay, as you recollect, when we two were at the Queen's Hotel. I have not slept any for a week on account of this. We must keep perfectly quiet.”

A little further on he says:

“I am engaging all I can to assist me at Ottawa, and we will have to pay them well for it, as we cannot afford to lose this.”

This language has to be taken in connection with the language of 12th February, in which he says, writing to Mr. Adams:

“I have not yet succeeded in doing anything, but I am pulling wires in every direction. John A.'s son from Winnipeg, McArthur's partner, is here, and I intend employing him to go for his father. I think if you had young Tupper here and paid him pretty well he would help us materially. The Canadian Pacific Railway has a great hold on the Government, and we must counteract this in some way.”

I may say, to avoid any charge of misquotation, that I am omitting certain portions of these letters. He goes on:

“I am completely sick of it, as it is something I had no right to expect, and which I should not be called upon to undertake. If it costs all we spoke of, we had better do it than let it go.”

In another letter, dated 5th March, 1883, he says:

“I have not yet succeeded in getting anything done in the limit matter. I have brought Macdonald and Tupper from Winnipeg, and hope they will be able to induce their fathers to act properly in the matter.”

Mr. RYKERT. It should be “promptly.”

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is evident that what the hon. gentleman intended was that what was done promptly was done properly.

Mr. BOWELL. I think, if the dates are looked at, the hon. gentleman will find that it was not done promptly. The writer goes on:

“I am almost discouraged at the delay. Sands is writing me daily about it. He knows all about it. Some persons sent him the papers containing the statements. Will make any effort this week, and must do something, if we have to let a note apiece go.”—

Whatever that may mean. Then, on the 8th March, he writes:

“I find difficulties surrounding us in every way in reference to the limit, and I find that the Canadian Pacific Railway have certain Ministers working for them. I am afraid it will cost us each six or seven thousand dollars to get this made all right. I have five or six at work for me, and have agreed to pay them well if they succeed. Muckle was here and told me the limit was all within the belt, I am afraid they will do their very utmost to defeat me. I want to be satisfied that you are sure I am doing what is right, and also that you will back me out in all that I do in the way of payment.”

On 28th March, 1883, I find the following:—

“I am having a hard time with the limit matter. It will cost us each at least \$5,500 to get this through. I have laid my ropes so that I expect to have it settled in a few days. I have a dozen at work for us. You must be prepared to pay the amount of your share at any time, as it will have to be all cash. * * * I had Tupper and Macdonald brought from Winnipeg, and they have been working hard for me.”

In regard to this correspondence, I have simply to say, that while I admit the interview to which the hon. gentleman refers—and every Minister has to grant interviews to any and every gentleman who has business with the Government—I cannot reconcile the language in the subsequent letters which I have read with the explanation which the hon. gentleman has made. If the statements in those letters mean anything, they mean that the Canadian Pacific Railway had certain members of the Government working for them, in order to deprive the hon. gentleman of a right which he had obtained for his client in these limits; that the balance of the members of the Cabinet were working for him, and that, if they succeeded in obtaining what he wanted, they were to be well paid. The hon. gentleman denies that. I cannot possibly imagine that he intended to convey that meaning, but I repeat what I have already said, that, either he has been singularly unfortunate in his use of the English language to convey his meaning and his ideas, or he meant to convey to the men for whom he was working, that he had purchased the balance of the Cabinet for the sum of some \$5,500. I should be glad to have from the hon. gentleman before this discussion closes an explanation of this point. I do not think it is necessary for any member of the Cabinet to make a distinct and positive, or even an indirect, denial of the statements made in those letters even, if my interpretation of the language used be correct; but I must again repeat, and with a good deal of emphasis, that I can put no other construction upon that language. I hope to hear from the hon. gentleman that he did not intend to convey that construction. If he did, I desire to give it, in the most emphatic language, the most positive denial.

An hon. MEMBER. A lie.

Mr. BOWELL. I might in such a case, as suggested by an hon. gentleman opposite, designate it by stronger language. In justice to Mr. Hugh John Macdonald and Mr. Tupper, I am bound to read a telegram from the former gentleman. In these letters it is stated that Messrs. Macdonald and Tupper were brought to Ottawa in order to operate upon, or compel, or induce their fathers to do what the hon. gentleman thought was right. In the last letter I read, he says:

"I had Tupper and Macdonald brought from Winnipeg, and they have been working hard for me."

On the 11th February, Mr. Macdonald telegraphs as follows:—

"Our firm acted as solicitors for purchasers of Rykert limit and charged ordinary fees. Neither Stewart—

That is Mr. Tupper—

"nor I had any interest in the limit or acted for or received any money from Rykert, and never went to Ottawa about the matter. Am writing.

"HUGH J. MACDONALD."

It is only justice to these gentlemen that I should read this to the House in reply to the statement that they were brought here to operate upon their fathers in this matter. That is a question which I leave the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) to settle with Messrs. Macdonald and Tupper. I deem it justice to myself and to this firm to have made the statement, and having done so, I leave the matter with the House to form their own opinion as to the character of this correspondence and those who are assailed in it.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman certainly could not have understood my explanations with reference to the payment of moneys. I distinctly stated that it was agreed at the Queen's Hotel, in Toronto, that certain moneys should be paid to parties who had volunteered their services to get the Canadian Pacific Railway claim removed, and these are the persons referred to in my published letter. One of those gentlemen said he could get it removed for \$5,000, another said he could get it removed for \$3,000, and they made certain propositions. I stated distinctly that no member of the Government, either directly or indirectly, ever took anything or asked for anything. I put that as strong as I could. As regards the telegram received, all I can say is this: that I wrote to Mr. McArthur, the senior member of the firm, asking him to send those gentlemen to Ottawa. Mr. Sands also either saw or wrote Mr. McArthur, other persons saw him, Mr. Adams saw him, as he informed me, asking him to send those gentlemen down to explain the matter, and explain in what position the limit was. I saw these gentlemen in Ottawa and spoke in reference to that matter. I urged them to see that the facts in connection with the matter were fully explained to Ministers. That is as clear as noonday, I am quite satisfied that these gentlemen, when they come here, will recollect distinctly the conversation, for I asked them to go and see what could be done. Sir Charles Tupper distinctly stated to me that the line having been deflected by the railway company, they were bound to protect the licensee. He said he would take the bull by the horns and see that the matter was properly attended to, if at all possible.

Mr. McCARTHY. I find that my name is mentioned in this correspondence, and certainly, under other circumstances, I should not have thought it of sufficient importance to bring it before the House; but as the matter is now mentioned here upon the floor of the House, I think it well to state what my connection with the transaction was. In the month of January, 1882, at the request of two constituents of mine, of the name of Shortreed & Laidlaw, a lumbering firm, I forwarded to the Minister an application for a certain limit which they described, and of which, I think, they sent a plan. In response to that I received a reply that the limit would not be sold at that time, which reply I communicated to my constituents, Messrs. Shortreed & Laidlaw. I have not any recollection, though at this time I would not say it was impossible, that I ever interfered in the matter further until the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), as is stated in this letter, told me that the Government had arranged, or the Department had arranged, that this limit should be sold, but that as Messrs. Shortreed & Laidlaw's application was first, some arrangement would have to be made with them. A brother of Mr. Laidlaw, Mr. William Laidlaw, was acting, as I had learned, as solicitor for the firm of Messrs. Shortreed & Laidlaw. I communicated with him, and from that time out the arrangement was made by Mr. William Laidlaw and the hon. member for Lincoln. The arrangement was, as I remember it, that the limit that had been applied for by Messrs. Shortreed & Laidlaw should be granted to them if it turned out that

the timber was upon that part; and if there was any timber to be found there; at their joint expense a surveyor should be sent up; and if timber was not upon the portion for which they applied, then the limit was to go to the gentleman for whom the member for Lincoln was acting. I heard nothing more of the matter until some time, I think late in August, when I was again appealed to by these gentlemen, who said that they had learned that something was being done which they did not think was fair or right by their claim. They begged of me to come down to Ottawa and see about it. I put them off; I said it was useless to go, the Ministers were away, but I promised to write, and I did write to the Department, claiming that nothing should be done until I had an opportunity of coming to the Capital. When I came here afterwards, in the month of September, I found the limit was granted to the applicant, Mr. Adams, for whom the member for Lincoln was acting. I reported that to my constituents, or rather to their solicitor, Mr. William Laidlaw, and my connection in the matter practically then ceased. They were very much dissatisfied. I need not go into that now, because I had no connection with that. They were very much dissatisfied indeed, and I think they appealed subsequently to the Department with reference to it; but, practically, from that time out, I had nothing more to do with it. I had no interest, direct or indirect, with Messrs. Shortreed & Laidlaw; my whole concern was in forwarding the application of my constituents, this lumbering firm that I have spoken of.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think, before we depart from this very interesting subject, it is desirable to say something more about it. I feel it to be due to the Minister of Customs to say that, whatever other people may think of his conduct in this matter, his explanation entirely removes any doubt that might have existed in the minds of any person in relation to that correspondence. I am sure that there is no gentleman in this House who read that correspondence but will pronounce it an infamous correspondence so far as it relates to the Minister of Customs. Therefore I think the House should feel that he has given a full and ample explanation, and has quite removed from himself and his reputation any suspicion that he ever received any money, or acted in any way improperly. There are other members of the Cabinet here who were in that Cabinet at that time. I must say that having been myself a member of a Cabinet for a long time, and having sat with some of those gentlemen, particularly my right hon. friend, I feel sure that not one of those gentlemen ever received, or would receive, any such means to promote an object such as referred to in that correspondence. I think it is due to those hon. gentlemen themselves, it is due to their position, it is due to the honor and the credit of Canada, that they should severally disavow, as the Minister of Customs has done, any connection with that transaction, and repudiate the idea that men occupying the high position of advisers of Her Majesty would sully their position, or tamper with their reputation and character, by being guilty of anything such as imputed in that correspondence. I do not believe that one of them would do it, and I should be happy to hear a statement of that kind from them.

Mr. MCCARTHY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not the slightest objection to make such a statement. I thought that I had done so, the other day, when the matter was first brought up. In the beginning of this transaction I was Minister of the Interior, but before it was all finished, I think, Sir David Macpherson was Minister of the Interior. I am sure neither myself nor my successor in any way received any consideration of any kind, pecuniary or otherwise, for any of the transactions concerning this license. I almost think that the House would not even require this statement from me. The hon. member himself (Mr. Rykert) disavows any such intention, although I quite agree with the Minister of Customs that the language is singularly unfortunate—it is singularly unfortunate. As regards the solicitors who were employed by Mr. Adams, I think they were my son and the son of Sir Charles Tupper. Those are both young men, fighting their way as solicitors. I cannot speak about the wealth of my son's partner, but as far as my son is concerned, he had to fight his own battle. I gave him his education, and that is all. He is fighting his own way, and I believe he is doing it honestly and uprightly. Whatever may be his faults, I am quite sure that want of honor or honesty is not one of them. There is a remarkable discrepancy between a statement in the telegram that the Minister of Customs has read from my son, and the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln. He says that these two gentlemen were here; this telegram says they were not here; the letter which will be here, I suppose, this week, will most likely throw some light upon this discrepancy. As for myself, I can throw no light upon it, because I do not remember the persons of either of these two gentlemen. I dare say that most probably they have written—at least Mr. McArthur, who was then their partner, was looking after this matter. And whether he carried on the correspondence on behalf of the clients of those two gentlemen, I cannot say. The correspondence in the Department will, however, show who carried on the correspondence on behalf of Mr. Sands, who bought from Mr. Adams. It will be shown whether Mr. McArthur or Mr. Tupper, or the firm as a whole, carried on the correspondence. I will lay this correspondence before the House.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McCarthy for second reading of Bill (No. 10) to further amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter fifty, respecting the North-West Territories; the motion of Mr. Davin in amendment thereto, and the motion of Mr. Beausoleil in amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, in considering the proposition embraced in the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I feel that it is impossible to limit the discussion to the mere matter involved in that Bill. If the proposition before the House was, from beginning to end, the question whether or not the French language should be discontinued as an official language in the North-West, the discussion would be reduced to narrow limits, and I fancy a rather satisfactory conclusion would be arrived at. But when we

consider the utterances of the hon. mover of this Bill, both without the House and within it, I feel it is impossible to consider the question in that narrow light, but we must bear in mind the object the hon. gentleman has in view and all its consequences, far-reaching as they may be, and consider whether or not it would be wise to meet his view as presented in this Bill. I find that in a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman in the village of Stayner on 12th of July last, that the hon. gentleman, before an admiring and appreciative audience, dealt with the general question of the French language in Canada; and quoting from the *Empire* of 15th July, I find the following words attributed to him:

"To-day thousands of dollars worth of French literature has been printed for which there is no use; but the Lower French Canadian has got what he wants. He has got it in the law that there shall be two languages, and he has made a blow at the new Province. When the dual language is abolished in the North-West, there is plenty more to be done by-and-bye. Let us deal with the question of the dual language in the North-West, and let the people deal with French in the schools of the English Provinces; and when these two questions have been dealt with, we will have accomplished something, and paved the way for the future."

And further, in his closing peroration, in order to convince his admiring friends that he meant business on that occasion, he used this closing expression:

"Now is the time when the ballot box will decide this great question before the people; and if that does not supply the remedy in this generation, bayonets will supply it in the next."

Again we were favored with an expression of the views of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) on 12th December last. He, on that occasion, delivered an address in Ottawa, and a printed copy of that speech has been distributed pretty generally, and I have been favored with a copy. In that address I find the hon. gentleman referred to the report of Lord Durham in 1840, and quoted from it with appreciation. Referring to Lord Durham's report, he quoted:

"First, and above all things, then, he held that the French language must be stamped out."

Then the hon. gentleman goes on to declare what the vested rights of the French Canadians are in respect to their language, and returning again to Lord Durham's report, he quotes from it, substantially as follows:—

"Lord Durham realised that so long as they were permitted to be educated in their schools in the French language, to be instructed in the literature of France instead of in the literature of England, they would remain French in feeling, and no matter what they might call themselves, they would be French to all intents and purposes."

Those words I have read are, I presume, quotations by the hon. gentleman from the report of Lord Durham, and then he goes on to comment on them himself:

"Is there any shadow of doubt that Lord Durham was right?"

He appears to take the position that the French Canadian should not be permitted to be educated in French, or indulge in French literature, or in French at all. Such was the report of Lord Durham, such was the utterance of the hon. gentleman. He proceeded to say:

"Is there any shadow of doubt that between these two races, of all races in the world, if they are ever to be united, it must be by the obliteration of one of these languages, and by the teaching in one of these tongues?"

There we have the hon. gentleman for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) taking the ground, clearly and unmistakably, that there must be an obliteration of the language, either of the French Canadians or the English-speaking people of Canada. He took that ground on the 12th of December, he took it on the 12th of July, and he took it in this House in introducing this measure, comparatively harmless in itself, to deal with the question of the French language in the North-West Territories. In view, therefore, of his utterances I feel we cannot discuss this question in the limited sense of its having reference to the North-West Territories only, but in regard to the broad proposition taken by my hon. friend that, in order to secure the unity of a country and the development of a proper national spirit in our land, we must obliterate the French language and literature and all that is dear to the French Canadian people of Canada. That I understand to be the hon. gentleman's proposition; and giving him credit for honesty of purpose, which I am willing to do, the hon. gentleman endeavors to justify his position by laying down a proposition. In his address to this House, in introducing this Bill, the proposition he submitted was substantially this: that there must be unity in language in order to have unity in a nation, and that in order that a nation may realise all its possibilities there must be but one language. Let me say that the hon. gentleman rested that proposition entirely on a misapprehension, as was pointed out last night by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), of the meaning of Professor Freeman's article from which he quoted. Professor Freeman on that occasion stated most distinctly and positively that for all political purposes unity of language was not necessary. He was the only respectable authority the hon. gentleman gave; the others were anonymous, with the exception of Professor Max Müller, who cannot be considered as having dealt with this subject politically. Professor Freeman, the only authority on whom the hon. gentleman depends, proves nothing at all in support of his proposition. But even if Professor Freeman did take that view, I will offer to the House some facts of history as against the opinions either of Professor Freeman or of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I will lay down a proposition and endeavor to prove it by facts, not opinions. I think the facts of history will justify one in making this assertion—that, as a rule, every nation of any note has at its earlier or later periods been composed of races speaking two or more languages. I think I can further assert with confidence that history does not disclose the case of any great nation, which has acquired enduring greatness, and in which there is but one language spoken. I will address myself to arguments in support of that first part of my proposition. Suppose we unfold before the mind's eye a map of Europe, and see what is the condition of affairs in the great nations of Europe to-day. If the object of the hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) is the development of this country, if his object is for the good of this country, if it can be made manifest that countries have been great, and can be great, and that the greatest countries on the earth to-day are those in which more than one tongue is spoken, surely there is no necessity for the advanced views of the hon. member of North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). During

the debate yesterday, there seemed to be some reference made and some distinction drawn as to whether certain languages in different countries were used officially or by toleration. Whilst there is quite a difference, yet, so far as the attitude of the member for North Simcoe is concerned, that distinction does not enter into the question, because he proposes to obliterate a language, not to have it tolerated, and his efforts seem to be directed to prevent us from even thinking in a foreign tongue. Although I think there is little difference in treating the question as a matter of philology or politics, I will mention a few of the great nations in Europe in which, as a matter of permission, various languages are freely tolerated and exist according to law. First of all, we have Spain. In Spain there are two languages tolerated, the Spanish and the Basque. In Sweden there are four languages, the Swedish, the German, the Finnick and the Latin. In Switzerland there are four languages, French, German, Italian and Roumansche. In France, the French, Italian, Breton and Basque; and in the Netherlands, Flemish, Dutch, French; and in Great Britain, although the different languages have largely disappeared, yet still there are traces of those that have been tolerated there. We have in the Channel Islands the French language, and in the Island of Man the Manx language. The remains of the Erse language, I am glad to see, is being revived in Old Ireland; and the Gaelic, in Scotland, was until recently the only language spoken in some parts of the north and north-west. We have these languages in addition to the dominant Anglo-Saxon in Great Britain. For the purposes of this illustration I think we can fairly draw on the history of our own land, and prove from our own experience that a common language is not absolutely necessary to a nation's greatness.

Mr. TROW. Do not forget the Welsh.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Trow) reminds me not to forget the Welsh. I am glad he reminded me, for the Welsh is a language which is not only tolerated, but which is also the official language of Wales up to the present day. Then, we come to Austria. While German is the dominant tongue in Austria, she tolerates a vast number of languages other than the dominant one—for instance, the Hungarian, the Bohemian, the Czech, and others. In fact, next to Russia, there are a greater number of different languages and dialects spoken and tolerated according to law, in Austria, than in any other country in Europe. Let us take Germany, which has undergone many changes philologically. Although the dominant tongue to-day is German, there are many dialects of the old Slavonic, the Polish and other languages. Russia permits, according to law, about 100 languages—among others, the Finnish, the Caucasian and the Slavonic. So, we therefore see that those nations of Europe which I have mentioned are nations in which at no time has there been a common language as a matter of law or custom. If my hon. friend's proposition is right, and if he is correct in his contention, then these nations have all been failures and not one of them is working out its own destiny properly. I will now state to the House those nations of Europe which may be said to have a homogeneous language. They are but four—Italy, Portugal,

Mr. MULOCK.

Denmark and Greece. These are the only nations in Europe to-day in which we may say there is but one language. I am giving part of my case away when I admit that these four countries are homogeneous in regard to language. Whilst I may say that Italy has been homogeneous in language for 1,200 years, many tongues have come and gone, but the Italian is a sort of a compromise which has come to be the dominant tongue. But there was no Italian unity because of the uniformity of the Italian language. Italian unity is but yet in its infancy, and if the unity of language is destined to develop a nation, as my hon. friend says, how comes it that for 1,200 years unity of language in Italy entirely failed to develop such a result. I have given these facts from a philological standpoint, and now I will address myself to the subject from a political point of view. More than one official language is tolerated in the following countries: Switzerland has the French and German, and Spain the Spanish and Basque. The latter is spoken in several provinces in the north of Spain and the south of the Pyrenees. The Basques are a hardy race, and even in Spain, which is so far behind us in political advancement, they allow the Basques to maintain their own separate Parliament, and conduct their own deliberations in the Basque tongue, which is unintelligible to the ordinary Spaniard. In Austria the official language is German. In Hungary, Magyar, Bohemian and others. In Great Britain the official languages are French in the Channel Islands, and Manx in the Isle of Man,—not forgetting, of course, the dominant tongue. In the Isle of Man, to this very day, it is the law that all the official proceedings of their small Parliament, the Tynwald, shall be published in the English and Manx languages; and at the close of the Parliament, in order that the people shall know the decrees of Parliament, it is the duty of the Governor, accompanied by the high dignitaries and the people, to go out to a neighboring hill, to read the decrees in the two languages, that all men may know the laws that are to bind them. Further, in Great Britain, if we presume to be official languages those which are tolerated in the schools, we have the Welsh language recognised in the Government schools in Wales, and, recently, the Irish language taught in certain of the public schools of Ireland. So much for the history of language so far as Europe is concerned, which I think sufficiently sustains the proposition I have laid down, that unity of language is not essential to national greatness. I go a step further, and I say that unity of language does not necessarily produce national unity or national greatness. In support of that proposition I will call attention to the state of Greece. Greece is a country which, I think, will specially illustrate the proposition of my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy), if such a proposition as his can be established at all. Greece is composed of many little provinces, but at all times the people spoke the Greek dialect, and Greek was substantially the language of Greece for all time. But yet, Sir, there was no unity of national spirit in Greece at any time. Greece from time to time was welded together by outside influences; but there was no cohesion in Greece itself by reason of language or anything else; and whenever some strong influence from without was withdrawn, the Greeks fell to destroying each other. Did you ever hear of a Greek boast-

ing that he was a Greek? The boast of a Greek was that he was a Thessalonian, a Spartan, or an Athenian; not a Greek; but if they had been influenced only by community of language, we should never come across the phrase in Grecian literature, I am a Greek, in preference to, I am an Athenian. Take another prominent instance: take the case of Germany at a period when she may be considered to have been homogeneous in language. Germany has undergone many philological changes; I speak of the old Roman Empire, founded by Charlemagne in the eighth century. That empire became practically German in the thirteenth century, in consequence of the influence of the Teutonic knights. For a short period they succeeded, by great force of character, in establishing the German language and displacing the Slavonic. Thereafter, from the fourteenth century to the Peace of Westphalia, three hundred years afterwards, Germany was considered as illustrating that which my hon. friend depends on: it was a country homogeneous in language, and should have been a united and powerful land, bound together by that strong national spirit, to be developed, according to my hon. friend, only by community of language; but what does history tell us? Can my hon. friend point to a nation in ancient or modern times that, for three hundred years, was more torn by internal dissensions—by wars, rebellions and fratricidal disturbances—than that empire. Why, Sir, government became an absolute impossibility in that country. If community of language would accomplish anything, it had its community of language. But what did it accomplish? It accomplished the Treaty of Westphalia. The Germans, speaking German as they did, could not live together, and they dissolved the partnership, Prussia taking one section of the empire, and Austria taking the southern portion. If national unity of spirit or greatness were to be secured, and placed on an enduring basis by community of language, there of all cases was one, even in modern times, that should have had the result boasted of by the hon. member for North Simcoe. They have not since been able to agree, though speaking the same language, and in our own time we have found those two German-speaking peoples falling upon each other, until at last Prussia expelled Austria, her sister country, from the German Confederacy as the result of the war which ended with the battle of Sadowa, in the last third of a century. Now, suppose we adopt the policy of the hon. gentleman, and go in for an obliteration of the French language. That is the proposition we are face to face with. The hon. gentleman has thrown down the gage of battle to the French Canadian people. This Bill is but a commencement, a skirmish before the great battle that is to go on all along the line later on. But suppose that attempt, absurd as it is, should succeed, do you not think that before making it, we might well turn up the pages of history again, and see with what results such attempts have been followed? In the consideration of this question it might probably be instructive to remind the House that when the French and Anglo-Saxons first came together, and an attempt was made to make one language prevail over the other—I refer to the period succeeding the Norman Conquest—for 300 years French was the language of the royal family,

the courts, the schools, and, as much as possible, the churches.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And the nobility.

Mr. MULOCK. And the nobility. Every effort was made to impose the French language on the Anglo-Saxon people. The result at the end of 300 years, at the time of Edward the Third, was that the French and the Anglo-Saxons had become strangers to each other. The lawyers in the courts were not understood by the witnesses, the jurors drawn from the Anglo-Saxons could not understand the witnesses. At last, it became absolutely impossible to carry on business. The Anglo-Saxon language at that time was in a far greater danger of extinction than it is to-day, because at that time the subjection of the Anglo-Saxons in Great Britain was most complete. The Normans were a strong and powerful race, and, of course, the times were more barbarous than the times in which we live, although my hon. friend would have us go back to those times. The relative position of the dominant and the subject classes was far more dangerous to the predominance of Anglo-Saxon institutions than can possibly be said to be the case to-day; but under the most discouraging circumstances one force prevented the extinction of the Anglo-Saxon language. The people had that vitality in themselves that enabled them to resist the threatened danger, and at last the French language had to be withdrawn as an official language, and in less than half a century it almost ceased to be spoken—

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MULOCK—and to-day we have nothing left from that invasion except some advantages to our literature and our vocabulary. My hon. friend says “hear, hear,” and I suppose he would draw the conclusion that that ought to take place here if we ceased to permit the French language to be official. But that conclusion cannot be drawn, because there was no compulsion put upon the people to abandon the use of French; the matter was left to the voluntary action of the people. The only legislation on the subject was that the law was changed to the extent of making the Anglo-Saxon language the language of the courts, and shortly afterwards it was taught in the schools; and not by coercion, but by toleration, the Anglo-Saxon assumed its pre-eminent position and has maintained it ever since. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me remind the hon. gentleman of another case, namely, the case of Poland. Russia made every possible attempt to persecute the language of the Poles out of existence; and, without being tedious, I may say that the pages of history disclose that the persecution to which the Polish language was subjected made that language more dear to the Polish people and more studied, and has added more to its dissemination and permanence than anything else could have done. And the same can be said of the Bohemian language; and as a singularity of the tenacity of language under coercion, I may point to the case of a small race or tribe called the Wenders who live in the vicinity of Elbe, who are Prussians politically, surrounded on all sides by Germans. An attempt was made to obliterate their language. Their population consists of but a few villages, surrounded on all sides by people speaking the

German language, and yet the result of the attempts to destroy their language—I am speaking now of comparatively modern times—was, as set forth in a letter from their pastor to the mayor, that the pastor could no longer understand his flock, nor the flock the pastor. They did not give up their language; they simply ceased to attend the schools; they ceased to learn in German, which was an unknown tongue to them; and nothing was accomplished except to keep them in ignorance and to develop a bad feeling. Now, does the hon. gentleman suppose that by the methods he is advocating, methods of force and coercion, he can accomplish what he has in view? Let me remind him of the consequences, politically, of such attempts. Schleswig-Holstein at one time constituted two duchies of Denmark. The people spoke German. King Christian IX attempted to force upon them a change of language. What was the result? They became disaffected. They got encouragement from a foreign power, Prussia; they rose in rebellion; they were lost to Denmark and became Prussian. Such was the natural consequence of interfering with one of the institutions of the people. Let me refer to another historical case of modern times, within the political life almost of the hon. gentleman—the case of Lombardo Venetia. That was once a part of Austria, and their language Italian. Austria, not profiting by the experience of Denmark and other experiences, endeavored to destroy the Italian language of Lombardo Venetia, and to impose upon the people the German language. What was the result? The people, just as in Schleswig-Holstein, rebelled, and they found sympathisers, as all disaffected countries can, from without. Italy and France came to the rescue, and the result was, instead of Austria accomplishing what she was aiming at, destroying the Italian language, she lost both those two great Provinces, which became, in 1859, and still are, part of the empire of Italy. Now, what has happened in the case of these two great countries which, under coercion, transferred their allegiance to another flag, will happen wherever the same attempt is prosecuted. Does not the hon. gentleman see that he is proceeding in the most direct way possible, in the light of the past—which is the only guide to us to-day in these matters—to destroy this Confederation by causing our French Canadian subjects to become disaffected and to seek sympathisers outside, and to, perhaps, ultimately part company with the Canadian Confederacy. Does he desire that result? There can be nothing accomplished by force. Acts of Parliament and Orders in Council will not make men love one another. We cannot change men's nature by Acts of Parliament or Orders in Council. If we could, I should be the first to vote for an Act of Parliament to change many things in the constitution of my hon. friend, the mover of this Bill. I would with both hands go in for making him a man of different opinions. Suppose, as a matter of experiment, we were to do to him what he is seeking to do to the French Canadians, only the converse—suppose we were to pass an Act of Parliament to make him a French Canadian Catholic, would we succeed in making him one? He has gone back on his Celtic origin, and I am sure that no attempt by force would accomplish such result; and if he would be

Mr. MULOCK.

tenacious then of his own views, can he not picture to himself the effect of repression and coercion upon those to whom he seeks to have applied that treatment? Let me refer to a case briefly touched upon by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) last night, the case of Alsace. Alsace, at one time, was a part of Germany, but became French, Alsace and Lorraine having been transferred to France by the Treaty of Westphalia. Alsace was German in language and race, but by being treated with kindness by the French people and not persecuted, came to love France which had conquered her; and during the Franco-Prussian war, when attempts were made to recover Alsace, as was stated eloquently last night, she was one of the most loyal supporters of France which had conquered her two centuries before; and to-day the Germans, in endeavoring to do what my hon. friend is seeking to accomplish—to repress the use of the French language in Alsace—have eliminated the sympathies of the Alsacians, many of whom have left the country, while those who remain are so disaffected that they can be only kept in subjection by the presence of a large standing army. Such is the effect of endeavors to change the language of a people by coercion. History shows that where attempts are made to destroy a language, the people often construe those attempts as assaults upon their religion. For example, a movement is going on at present by which Canada is profiting. We have coming to Canada the Mennonites and Lutherans from the Baltic. Why are they coming here? Because Russia has been endeavoring to cause them to give up their own language, the German, and to adopt the Russian, and these Mennonites and Lutherans have conceived the idea that this is an attempt to coerce them into joining the Greek Church. They construe it as an assault upon their religion; and there are many instances in history where similar attempts have been similarly construed. We cannot, therefore, blame the French Canadians if they, too, should come to the conclusion that this movement is an assault on their religion. However much men may protest to the contrary, if the French Canadians get this idea into their heads, we cannot blame them, in the light of precedents which justified such conclusions in the past. I wonder that hon. gentleman has not discovered that he cannot rule the hearts of the people by force. If you desire them to abandon any of their institutions, you must leave it to them to do so voluntarily. Does not *Æsop's* fable of the traveller and his coat assist us in this question? The more violently the wind blew upon him, the more closely he wrapped his coat about him, and only threw it off under the benign, loving and beneficent rays of the sun. What are the duties of a parental Government with regard to its subjects? Is it not the duty of the Government to publish its decrees in a language known to all who may be bound by them? Clearly, there can be no more self-evident proposition than that, and this is a proposition which ought not to be required to be made good by argument in the present day. Even the barbarians admitted the soundness of it; and we have numerous instances in history where the barbarians, up to the time of the Christian era, and since, published their decrees, their laws, and their history, in the languages of all the people, in order that all the people might know them. It

might assist my hon. friend if I gave him a still higher authority. Even if the authority of the barbarian does not bind him, let me quote from Holy Writ one verse in reference to the history of King Ahasuerus. We find that :

"He sent letters into all the King's provinces, into every Province according to the writing thereof, and to every people after their language, that every man should bear rule in his own house, and that it should be published according to the language of every people."

I am only quoting those authorities of which there is actual evidence to-day. I am sure my hon. friend will not question the tradition of this book, but I will not quote the ordinary historians, though I may refer him to the reign of King Ptolemy V, of Egypt, who, though a powerful Greek ruler, distributed his laws amongst his people in different languages, and had them inscribed upon stone; and these laws, which were inscribed upon stone, are in existence to-day in the various languages of the people. Tracing the practice of nations, barbarian nations and those of later date, you find an invariable practice to make known to the people in their own language the laws which were to be binding upon them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) has been born too late. He should have been born long prior to the barbarian people.

An hon. MEMBER. Before the Flood.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the Flood. What does he ask us to do now? He asks us to dispose of this question without any knowledge of the conditions of the people of the North-West. We do not know whether they will understand English or not. It may be that nine-tenths of them do understand English; but suppose there is a proportion who do not understand English, what then? The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) said last night that a great number of them speak Cree, and therefore the laws of the North-West should be printed in Cree; and the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said it was only a local question which should be settled in the North-West. I ask if it ought not be settled after hearing the facts of the case, and settled by those who are most competent to judge? Should we be called upon in this court to deliver judgment before we hear the evidence? The hon. gentleman would not ask such a decision from an ordinary court of the land. Then, why should he ask it from this, the highest court and tribunal in the land? If this is to be settled according to the views of the people, the proper tribunal must be the North-West representatives or some other tribunal, after learning the facts of the case. But the hon. gentleman went further. He intimated that no man could be a loyal citizen practically unless he spoke the dominant tongue of the country. In making that statement he has, no doubt, inadvertently cast a slur upon many of the loyal citizens of the British Empire. Would he accuse of disloyalty the Highlanders of Scotland, the Welsh, the people of the Channel Islands, and here in this country the Scotch population of Cape Breton, Cornwall and Gleggarry, and other parts, and the Germans? We have found that even the Indians were to be trusted in the hour of need, that they were true to our institutions, and we can point with pride to the pages of Canadian history to obtain facts to disprove the assertion of the hon. gentleman.

We have records in our history which are dear to the Canadian people. Who does not recollect Tecumseh and Tyendinaga, whose remains lie in a chapel in the constituency represented by my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson). Those men represented the loyalty even of the savage tribes of Canada in our early troubles, and though not speaking our tongue, were loyal to Great Britain. If all the other citizens of the Empire who do not speak the Anglo-Saxon language have been true as they have been, what is there to be found in the pages of history since the French Canadian people became citizens of Canada to make my hon. friend doubt their loyalty to British institutions? Their loyalty was sorely tried. Shortly after 1759, the date so frequently referred to by my hon. friend as that of the conquest of the French Canadian people, within twenty years from that every effort was made to cause them to change their allegiance from Canada, and with what result? I cannot conceive the loyalty of a people being subjected to greater strains than that to which the French Canadian people were subjected to during the events which immediately succeeded the Treaty of Paris. What were the events which were going on across the border at that time? The thirteen colonies were in revolt, and were anxious to destroy British rule in America, and they were anxious to get the French Canadians to throw in their lot with them. At that time, General Washington issued a proclamation appealing to all the passions, the fears, the cupidity and the prejudices of the French Canadian people, to throw off their allegiance to Great Britain and to join the Union. That appeal was made accompanied by threats of invasion; the invasion followed, and the war continued for a length of time; and who were the strongest to help to sustain the British arms and British institutions during that period? Where did the French Canadians make default or prove themselves unworthy citizens of Great Britain during that time? The records of the attitude of the French Canadian people under those trials, ought to be sufficient to save them from the insults which are now heaped upon them. Let me read some of the appeals which were made by General Washington to the fears, the passions and the prejudices of the French Canadians at that time, to induce them to throw off their allegiance to Great Britain:

"We rejoice," said General Washington, "that our enemies have been deceived with regard to you; they have persuaded themselves—they have even dared to say—that the Canadians were not capable of distinguishing between the blessings of liberty and the wretchedness of slavery; that gratifying the vanity of a little circle of nobility would blind the people of Canada. By such artifices they hoped to bend you to their views, but they have been deceived. * * * Come, then, my brethren, unite with us in an indissoluble union; let us run together to the same goal. * * * Incited by these motives, and encouraged by the advice of many friends of liberty among you, the grand American Congress have sent an army into your Province, under the command of General Schuyler—not to plunder, but to protect you—to animate and bring forth into action those sentiments of freedom you have disclosed, and which the tools of despotism would extinguish through the whole creation. To co-operate with this design, and to frustrate those cruel and perfidious schemes, which would deluge our frontiers with the blood of women and children, I have despatched Colonel Arnold into your country, with a part of the army under my command. I have enjoined upon him, and I am certain that he will consider himself and act as in the country of his patrons and best friends. Necessaries and accommodations of every kind which you may furnish he will thankfully receive and render the

full value. I invite you, therefore, as friends and brethren to provide him with such supplies as your country affords, and I pledge myself not only for your safety and security but for ample compensation. Let no man desert his habitation—let no one flee as before an enemy. The cause of America and of liberty is the cause of every virtuous American citizen, whatever may be his religion or descent. The united colonies know no distinction but such as slavery, corruption and arbitrary domination may create. Come, then, ye generous citizens, range yourselves under the standard of general liberty—against which all the force of artifice and tyranny will never be able to prevail."

This proclamation was circulated broadcast among the people of the Province. In every household, in every hamlet, this insidious document found its way, to induce them to throw off their allegiance. But they resisted—they resisted at the point of the bayonet, which is to be their fate in the next generation, according to the threat of the hon. member for Simcoe. As though that was not trial enough to their loyalty, we find old France itself sending out an emissary to beseech them in the name of France, in the name of the land they came from, in the name of the literature which, he says, makes them unworthy citizens, in the name of all that is dear to them; the King of France beseeches the people to throw in their allegiance to the American colonies. They did not do so, but they drove the invaders from the country, with the help of the English people. For some twenty years, until 1812, they continued quietly to enjoy the blessings of peace under the British flag; and if ever their loyalty was tested it was in 1812. On that occasion the peculiarities of the situation were marked. England was engaged in a European war and a war upon the Continent, in each case one of her opponents being France itself. There was England on the one side, and France and the United States upon the other. On which side did the Lower Canadian people range themselves at that time? Did they then prove themselves unworthy subjects of Great Britain? No, Sir; but they arrayed themselves by the side of Great Britain, and by the side of Canada, against the institutions of France itself, against their mother land; they arrayed themselves in support of British institutions in Canada. Therefore, I say it is the duty of all who are true to history, who propose to give credit where it is due; it is the duty of all who are not of French Canadian origin; it is our duty, in the name of our loyalty, to repudiate these slurs upon the nationality of French Canadians, and to say, that in their hands, as I believe, our institutions are as safe as in the hands of the hon. member for North Simcoe, or of the whole nation, if it were of his way of thinking. I find nothing in French Canadian history, since their union with Canada, to justify the charge that they cannot be considered loyal and worthy citizens of our country. On the contrary, I think their whole record is the most complete refutation that could be produced of a large part of the argument of my hon. friend. Now, Sir, languages will come and go, languages will die, and perhaps it may be, in the flight of time, that the French Canadian language will disappear from this country. But, if it is to disappear, let it disappear in a way that will be a source of strength and not a source of weakness, not as the outcome of force and violence, but as other languages in the past have disappeared. If time permitted I could read from the pages of

Mr. MULLOCK.

history to show how nations, in the great struggles for supremacy, according to the spirit of their times, have extended their sway, and their language has, for the time being, accompanied their influence. We remember how the Greek States extended their sway from the Mediterranean to the confines of India, and carried with them the supremacy of the Greek language. We read how Rome extended her sway throughout western Europe, and the Latin language, for the time being, became the language of the people. But as their influence decayed, so their language decayed. Sir, the fact that the growth of language, the development of language, appears to be an incident to a nation's supremacy, to a nation's energy, proves to my mind, that its existence depends upon the people themselves, it does not depend upon coercive measures. Sir, I think the very fact that there is a diversity of language is not a danger, but it is a circumstance that must give value to the language itself, as an institution prized by a people. They must consider it a prize calculated to induce them to redouble their energies and their resources in all those directions that will make their country great, and with the decline of their greatness their language must also decline. Therefore if languages have to go down, let them go down as they have done in the past—go down as nations have gone down. But let them remain as incentives to people and to races to develop their energies, and, in this light, I conceive that diversity of language, instead of being a source of weakness, may be made an occasion of great national strength, developing, to make an application of the theory, a spirit of emulation amongst our French Canadian people, amongst all our people of different nationalities, so to promote their influence that their language may maintain its permanency. Entertaining these views I am not prepared to consent, as far as my voice goes, to any violence towards any of the institutions of this country that are dear to our people, and that are not contrary to the best interests of Canada. If the hon. gentleman, in introducing this measure had limited the whole case to the question involved in the enacting clause of the Bill, I think he would have done his cause infinitely more good than by the manner he has adopted, and to a great extent he would have avoided much of the bitterness that has been imported into this country. If I may venture, even at this late hour, to read him a bit of advice, it would be that, if his motive is, as I am bound to assume that it is, the welfare of Canada, then, before this debate is closed, and before it is too late, let him make clear exactly where he stands upon this question, let him make clear any ambiguity as to his ulterior object, and deny that this is the commencement only of a war upon a race that is not entitled to be so treated; or admit that it is, as he declares, and seems to say, an attempt to obliterate the French language and the French literature from Canada? If so, Mr. Speaker, there should be but one answer from the people's representatives here. We are sent here to save the Union, not to destroy it. The hon. gentleman says—and I wish to give him credit for good faith—that he is in favor of making this a British colony. But he is adopting a course little calculated to make British institutions permanent in Canada. Such being my conclusion, I feel

unable to agree with the hon. gentleman in the legislation he asks, and I shall, therefore, cast my vote in the direction I have indicated—to have this matter settled by the people's representatives in the North-West, who are best able to settle it, or by such other tribunal as may be suggested after they shall have the fullest opportunity of enquiring into all the conditions of the country; believing, as I do, that neither the North-West Council nor any other tribunal to which it might be relegated by this House, will betray the trust reposed in it, but will act justly towards all the people without fear, favor or affection.

Mr. GIGAULT. Harmony prevailed in this country. French and English-speaking subjects were working hand in hand for the prosperity of this country, by that means endeavoring to strengthen and secure the safety of the British Empire. Thanks to the wisdom and prudence of Canadian and British statesmen, burning questions which had created animosity in the past, had been removed from the arena of politics. The French language and the Separate School questions had been settled by the Constitution of 1867. Every one hoped that those questions would not be agitated any longer. But a cloud, threatening our tranquility, has appeared on the horizon. The Bill presented by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), is objectionable chiefly on account of its preamble which shows the intention of the hon. gentleman. Moreover, we have his speeches outside of and inside this House, and we know what is his aim and what is the chief aim of the school of which he is the head. I believe that all persons who wish well to Canada should seek to stop the crusade which has been organised, and which is being made by the hon. member for North Simcoe. By the preamble of the Bill, that hon. gentleman says that unity of languages is absolutely necessary for national unity. Mr. Speaker, the British legislators have not been of that opinion. At the very doors of the English metropolis the French language is spoken, namely, in the Channel Islands. What do we see in India? There the English Government, so far from compelling the inhabitants of that colony to speak the English language, compels the Government officials to learn Sanscrit and the vernacular languages of India. What do we see in the Cape Colony? The Dutch language was not spoken there before 1882, but in that year a law was passed in the British Parliament allowing the debates to be made in that colony either in English or Dutch. In the Mauritius Islands the debates are conducted either in French or in English, and last year an ordinance was enacted by which the French language may be used before the courts of law in the Seychelles Islands. So, the policy which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is following here, is contrary to all the legislation which has been passed, and which is now being passed by the British Empire. The policy followed by the hon. gentleman is not a British but an American policy. He was not formerly an admirer of American institutions, but to-day he seems to abandon the British spirit in order to imitate American institutions. The hon. gentleman has been kind enough to remind us that the French Canadians are a conquered people, and he stated, at the same time, that the Treaty of Paris did not secure to us the use of our language. The hon.

gentleman should not forget that, if the Treaty of Paris does not secure to us the use of the French language, there is the international law, a law common to all nations, which secures to us some rights and gives us some privileges, and it is such that it secures justice to the conquered as well as to the conqueror. I am not propounding a new idea. The Quebec Act was framed upon the report of the then Solicitor-General of England (Wedderburn). He made a report to King George III; and what principle does he lay down at the beginning of his report? He says:

"Canada is a conquered country. The capitulation secured the temporary enjoyment of certain rights, and the treaty of peace contained no reservation in favor of the inhabitants except a very vague one as to the exercise of their religion. Can it, therefore, be said that by right of conquest the conqueror may impose such laws as he pleases? This proposition has been maintained by some lawyers who have not distinguished between force and right."

The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) will please note these words, that "the proposition that the conqueror may impose such laws as he pleases has been maintained by lawyers who have not distinguished between force and right." Does the hon. gentleman wish only the law of force to prevail here? Further, the Solicitor General adds:

"It is certainly in the power of a conqueror to dispossess those he has subdued at discretion, and when the captivity of the vanquished was the consequence of victory, the proposition might be true; but in more civilised times, when the object of war is dominion, when subjects and not slaves are fruits of victory, I hope men are not going to be treated as slaves. No other right can be found in conquest but that of regulating the political and civil government of the country, leaving the individuals to the enjoyment of their property and all the privileges not inconsistent with the security of the conquest."

These are the principles laid down by the then Solicitor General of England, principles which have guided the British Parliament in legislating for her colonies. What has been the effect of that legislation? It has been such that England has preserved a strong hold upon her possessions, which to-day are more than 8,000,000 square miles in extent, and the population of which numbers more than 200,000,000 of loyal and devoted British subjects. Such has not been the success of other European countries in the government of their foreign possessions, for they have acquired possessions and colonies and lost them, because they were not faithful to the principles laid down by Solicitor General Wedderburn. These ideas are not only those of that English legislator, for we have some other eminent authorities which are accepted all over the world, and which endorse the proposition I uphold. Montesquieu, in his work entitled the "Spirit of the Laws," says:

"One of the great principles of the spirit of conquest ought to be to render the condition of the conquered as much better as possible: this is to fulfil at once the law of nature, and a maxim of state."

"It may sometimes be necessary to change the laws of the conquered people; it can never be so to deprive them of their manners, or even of their customs, which are often all they have for manners. But the surest way of preserving a conquest is to put, if it is possible, the conquered on a level with the conquerors, to grant them the same rights and the same principles."

So we find that the author of the "Spirit of Laws" clearly says that we ought to put the conquered on the same level as the conquerors, and grant them the same rights and the same privileges. That is the way we in this Dominion wish to be treated.

The French Canadians do not want favors; they want only the rights which are proper to every man. In the discussion of this matter we should not yield to prejudices, we should demand only the triumph of fair play, of justice, and of the principles which should guide the rulers of nations. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says that he does not wish to interfere with the rights granted to the French people under the British North America Act. Can we hope that he will be faithful to this promise? That gentleman has twice approved of the North-West Territories Act, and yet to-day he disapproves of what he approved of yesterday. If he changes so often, must we not suppose that he will forget the promises he made in his speech, and that, faithful to those different speeches he has made in Ontario and elsewhere, he will continue on with his crusade against the French language, and against the Separate Schools. There is another strange accusation which has been made by the member for North Simcoe. He goes so far as to say that we should not read French literature. Does he not know that we have always had here Governors and representatives of the British Empire, who are not ashamed to read French literature? If we judge them by the manner in which they speak French, we must come to the conclusion that they have read a good deal of that French literature; and yet these gentlemen have remained loyal to the Crown, have remained true friends of the British Empire, and have always been found ready to protect the best interests of Great Britain. The member for North Simcoe has alluded chiefly to the report of Lord Durham, and he states that Lord Durham was an eminent statesman. But eminent statesmen generally make laws which remain a long time on the Statute-book. What do we see with respect to the law founded upon the report of Lord Durham on the French language? A few years after that constitution was adopted, it was found necessary to abrogate the clause which permitted only the use of the English language, and that abrogation showed that Lord Durham, far from being an eminent statesman, was a short-sighted legislator, whose views could not be accepted. I have heard, with a good deal of pleasure, the speech made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). The remarks which he has made are certainly such as we should all take pride in, but I cannot approve of the conclusion to which he has come. It is this Parliament which has the right to frame laws and a constitution for the North-West Territories, and so long as that right rests with this Parliament we should not shrink from the duty and the responsibility which devolves upon us. We ought to frame laws which we think just and fair. We ought not to forget that the inhabitants of these Territories have their eyes upon us, and wish us to do justice to them. Some members say that the majority in this case must decide. I do not agree with that, Mr. Speaker. Justice and right are and will be justice and right, whatever may be the decision of the minority or of the majority, and there are certain rights and certain principles which cannot be set aside for the sake of the majority or for the sake of any decision which can be made by them. The legislation I advocate has already been sanctioned by our constitution. In order to protect the English minority

Mr. GIGAUULT.

in the Province of Quebec, we have made special provisions in the constitution to respect their feelings, and to hinder agitators from interfering with their rights. There are similar provisions in our constitution to protect the Catholic minority of Ontario, and the Fathers of our Confederation have acted wisely in putting the questions which affect these minorities in such a way that they are protected from the passions of the people which may be inflamed by agitators for sordid motives. A member of this House has rightly said that, if there had been no agitation on the Jesuit question, the dual language question would never have been agitated in the North-West. In fact, in the North-West the people were quiet until the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) thought fit to pay a visit to the inhabitants of that portion of the country. Another hon. gentleman said that if we allow foreigners to come to this country, we are not going to make laws for the purpose of rendering official the languages spoken by those foreigners. Does that hon. gentleman contend that the French Canadians are foreigners and aliens to this country? Does he forget that we are the members of a race which discovered and civilised this country? Surely that hon. member, when he made that assertion, did not reflect and did not consider the position we have occupied in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks. The hon. member for North Simcoe says that the Treaty of Paris does not secure to us the use of our language; but there is one thing to which I can appeal for the preservation of that language: It is British fair play. We have appealed before to it, we have before laid our complaints at the foot of the Throne, and we have been successful enough to obtain justice. I hope that the same fair play will continue to be extended to us. We have not to deal with this question as the members of a certain race or class; we must consider and deal with it in a manner to promote the best interests of this country; and, according to British legislators, the best policy to be followed with respect to different creeds and races is to respect their feelings, and I hope that policy will continue to prevail.

Mr. CURRAN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I ask your indulgence on this occasion when a question of so much importance is engaging our attention if I make the few observations I am about to address to the House in the language attacked by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), the proposer of the Bill now under consideration. I seize this opportunity to speak in the French language as one of the representatives of the Irish Catholics of the Dominion, who have also been attacked, in an unjustifiable manner, by the member for North Simcoe. That gentleman sought to establish by some authority that the Irish Catholics in Canada are not the friends of the French Canadians, and not only are we not their friends, but that we are their bitterest enemies. I think I speak with a knowledge of the subject, when I state that if in a distant past, when our immigrants reached this country poverty-stricken, totally ignorant of the French language, unable to understand those with whom they were thrown in contact or to make themselves understood by them, certain difficulties did arise, that to-day not only as between the Irish Catholics and the Protestants, who have never had any difficulty as to

language, but as between the whole Canadian people whatever their origin or creed, with the exception of those who make a trade of appealing to prejudices, to the detriment of Canada's future, there never did exist in our country a stronger sentiment of unity or a stronger desire for the moral and material progress of our people, than that which exists to-day. Were a stranger to enter into our deliberative assembly now and find us occupied in the discussion of this question, what opinion must he form of us? We are here in a new country; we need to develop our immense resources, agricultural, industrial, mineral, and all the exhaustless wealth that Providence has placed at our disposal; we have a country extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and sparse as is our population, we have made such progress as to challenge the admiration of the world; and here we have this prosperity placed in peril by the discussion of questions in the Parliament of Canada utterly devoid of interest to all with the exception of the fanatics who have provoked the debate. What can be the object of these agitators? Can any patriotic motive inspire them? The march of events within the past few years is not unknown to us. We know how the question was raised and precipitated into the arena of public discussion, and I may ask, is there one worthy citizen, whatever his race may be, who will be found to state that the authors of this agitation are animated by honorable motives? The question now before us has been represented, on the one hand, as purely local, and, on the other, as one of general interest; to me it appears that had this question been raised opportunely it should have been dealt with from a purely local point of view; but when we consider not only the preamble of the Bill now before us, in which the hon. member for North Simcoe attacks all the French Canadians hold most dear, but the violent and outrageous speech in which he introduced it, it is difficult not to comprehend the motives that inspired this legislation. As has been well stated already, the people of the North-West, without distinction, the earliest settlers, and those who at the cost of great sacrifices went in there for the purpose of colonising those vast regions, were living in peace and security, building up the country by their united efforts and extending to each other a helping hand and not one word was heard concerning the abolition of the French as an official language. But for reasons best known to himself, a man who proclaims himself an apostle of equal rights for all, arouses an agitation for the purpose of depriving those who have made so many sacrifices of the right to speak their own language, or to have it officially recognised in that section of the country. Is there any justification for the hon. gentleman's conduct? Not a single individual in the region referred to has raised the question, but we have this self-constituted patriot, who declares his desire to form here one British nation by a single dash of his pen, and who appears to be an admirer of all that was odious in the penal legislation of days gone by, laws that bring a blush of shame to every Englishman's face, going into that country to arouse their passion and prejudice, and not only to disturb those who were living there in peace and harmony, but seeking to disjoint all friendly relations between the people of the older Provinces. Mr. Speaker, we cannot discuss this question in ignorance of the state of affairs that

exists around us. We have to deal with things as they are. It is all very well to say, here is a local question that concerns the progress of the North-West Territories solely. That cannot hold, the position has been complicated in such a manner by its mover that we cannot avoid its determination in the broader sense, nor the inevitable conclusions to which the presentation of the question leads us. Some have said this is merely a monetary question involving the expenditure of public moneys, whilst nearly all have urged that not only are the people of the North-West interested but all Canada is involved. One thing is certain, on a subject of this kind a proud race will never allow their noblest aspirations to be interfered with by mere monetary considerations. Therefore, when we discuss this question, which, if it does not interest all Canada, at all events involves the sympathies of a million and a-half of French Canadians, we cannot do otherwise, in view of the onslaught made by the member for North Simcoe, than to respect and uphold the sentiments of a chivalrous people who have done so much for the development of our country, and we must above all be careful not to trample upon their sacred rights. What is the history of this legislation? I have no desire to prolong the discussion by reiterating what has been so eloquently said by those who have traced in glowing terms the history of our French Canadian compatriots. I shall confine myself to the amendment introduced by the Hon. Senator Girard when the Bill for the North-West Territories was discussed before the Senate. The hon. Senator caused the insertion of the French language amendment and there was not one dissentient voice. That amendment was unanimously confirmed by the House of Commons. I have carefully noted the attitude of the press on the subject in Ontario and Quebec as well, at that time. Not a single newspaper, either English or French, not a single organ of either political party published a syllable of condemnation of that legislation. On the contrary, it was everywhere conceded that not only was an act of justice being done to the French inhabitants of the North-West, but that the best means was being adopted to induce French Canadian immigration to the Territories and prevent their exodus to the United States. No doubt the strongest inducement for them to go there was to say to them: "You will enjoy there all the privileges you possess in the Province of Quebec," and that, Sir, was the motive that prompted the Girard amendment. Well, Sir, from that date until last summer no complaint was heard either in the press or on the platform or elsewhere, nothing was ever hinted that the progress of the Territories was being retarded by the official use of the French and English languages. The hon. member from Simcoe, in all his speeches, has held himself responsible for that legislation, and that he had made no move for years until he commenced his agitation in Ontario and then proceeded to disturb the minds of the people of the North-West Territories. Until the hon. gentleman's crusade, nothing was heard against the legislation that he now seeks to have repealed. Under such circumstances, we naturally ask ourselves: What is the object of this agitation? What interest can it promote? The hon. gentleman tells us in one of his speeches that the French Canadians desire to establish another Province of Quebec in the Territories. Have they ever sought, either in Parlia-

ment or in the press, to discourage immigration to that region, either of British, German, Swedish, or any other worthy settlers? Have they not always sought to encourage such immigration? Have they sought, in any manner, to disturb the harmony existing heretofore in the Territories? We shall have to wait a long time for any proof of such assertions. In concluding these few observations which I make in French, so as to show that we, the Irish Catholics and the French Canadians and the Protestants of this country likewise understand each other, I beseech those hon. members who seek to agitate the people to let us wage our political warfare on the legitimate ground of politics; to let us make our endeavors so that harmony may prevail among all races; to allow us to work together for the maintenance of the bonds that unite us. Under those conditions we shall see the country neither agitated nor threatened, but united; we shall have a country where every French Canadian, every Irish Canadian or any other Canadian may live in peace. It is a fortunate thing that we should have, as leaders of the French Canadian members of this House, statesmen who shall lead their compatriots by way of a wise and conciliatory policy and establish the reign of harmony and peace, and in that path I shall always follow them.

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

After Recess.

Mr. ROBILLARD. Mr. Speaker, if this Bill had been moved by an ordinary member, I would have sat in my chair and given a silent vote; but as the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is the mover of it, I beg to address a few words to the House as a Canadian from Ontario, speaking French, if you like; for I call myself a Canadian, and it is the only name by which I call myself. The hon. member has been going through the country, and has very seldom lost an occasion to throw mud at us. Sir, the very preamble of his Bill I look upon as an insult to any French Canadian in this country. The idea that the fact of my speaking French is a barrier between me and my English-speaking neighbor I deny. It is true, Sir, we speak French, but we are learning English as fast as we can, and we are proud of it. Why should we not be? I say that every sensible French Canadian would wish to have his children learn English as well as French. I would not be doing my duty to my child if I did not allow him to learn English, because if he did not he would not have a fair start in the world with the children of my English-speaking neighbors. But when I hear men like the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) say that they are not attacking our language, I may say to him that people do not feel the insult that is given to others. That hon. member is not so sensitive as the hon. member for North Simcoe, because he has taken up the cause of people who have never asked him, people who do not suffer; for I challenge the hon. gentleman to show that there was ever a complaint in the North-West on this subject before he went up there himself to sow the seed of dissension. As the hon. gentleman knows, the people of the North-West do not pay that paltry sum of \$400 or \$500 which the use of the language there costs. I do not know the amount for which the hon. gentleman

Mr. CURRAN.

is on the assessment roll, but I venture to say that his share of that cost does not amount to a mill. I say that the preamble of this Bill itself is a false pretension and a false proposition. Although I speak French and am a Roman Catholic, I can live at peace with my English and Protestant neighbor. I do not care whether he is an Orangeman, a black Presbyterian or a Methodist, I can go and walk with him arm-in-arm on Sunday morning, and he drops into his church and I into mine, and we can escort each other back to our homes afterwards in a friendly and neighborly way. The time is past when people may hate each other for God's sake. My hon. friend from North Simcoe professes to do all this for love of the poor French Canadians; he wants to get us out of the crushing power of the clergy in Lower Canada; he is sorry to see us going to the States, and he invites us to go to Ontario; but what does he say? If you come into Ontario, you must shut your mouth; you are not allowed to speak your language. I know something of what I am speaking about, for I had the honor to represent a county in eastern Ontario, where people often come from Lower Canada, and I have always been proud and glad to see them, because they have been peaceable and respectable and moral citizens, though they could not speak a word of English. According to the idea of the hon. member for North Simcoe, these people may send their children to school, but the school must be taught by an English teacher. The hon. member, with his great love for the French Canadians, would not allow one to teach a school in Ontario, no matter how efficient he might be. The hon. gentleman will not deny that fact, for I have his own words for it in a speech he made in December last in the city of Ottawa. You know, Sir, he is one of the fathers of this Imperial Federation scheme. I will not say much about Imperial Federation, because it has not yet assumed a practical shape, and I think it will be a long time before it does; but, Sir, he is the father of another party—a party that made a great racket in Ontario and in the capital of this Dominion—what they call the Equal Rights party, but what I call the Unequal Rights party, from the way they put it in practice. Under the wing of that Equal Rights agitation, under the pretence of British fair play to the French Canadians, he said he would not allow a French Canadian to teach in a French county, were he ever so clever a man, because, there being French blood in his veins, the tendency of this teaching would be to Frenchify and not to Anglicise the people. That is the way he shows his great liberality. I would like the hon. gentleman to show his affection and love to his wife in that way. I would like to see him come to her with sweet and warm words in contradiction with his acts. Acts are stronger than words. Let him act towards his wife as he does towards us; let him lose no opportunity to trample on her feet, to hurt her feelings, and to deprive her of her rights, and he will soon come to the conclusion, to which I and the rest of my countrymen have come, that, although his words may be sweet and warm, his heart is cold. I might give him the advice which I gave my wife when I took her. I said to her: Here I am; I wish you to try and make yourself happy with me, with all my faults, as you find

them out, and you will stand a better chance of correcting me, and will be happier, than if you used the broomstick. I say to the hon. gentleman that I acknowledge we have faults, but no more than other nationalities, and if he had more intercourse with us, if he would show himself more liberal and to have more heart and more love for us, and use his energy and great talents to seeing if he could not make himself happy, even if we did sometimes hurt the drum of his ears with a French word. I am not going over arguments that have been used before, and used better than I could hope to apply them. As far as community of language is concerned, that question has been discussed by men who have better command of the English than I, but I may say, *en passant*, that no later than last summer, when I was in Switzerland, I attended the great feast of the vine-growers, which takes place only once in every twenty-five years; and at that feast, which was held in a little town on Geneva Lake, there attended about seventy-five thousand people, speaking French, Italian and German. One would say "Good day" in German and the other would answer in French or Italian, or *vice versa*, and they seemed the most happy and contented people I ever met. Therefore, it seemed to me not necessary that there should be unity of language in order that a people might be happy and contented. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is driving at. He has gone through the different Provinces exciting sectional feelings; and I am sorry to see such a course taken in a new country composed as this is of different nationalities, who have been put here to work shoulder to shoulder in the chariot of progress, instead of working against each other. It is not by raising sectional or racial feelings that we can progress and prosper; and, therefore, I look upon such proceedings, whether conducted by the hon. member for Simcoe or anybody else, as fraught with danger in a community like this. I am not a pessimist. I have faith in the future of my country. And why? Because I believe there are enough men of good, sound sense, and broad, Christian, patriotic views, to crush out the fanatics, no matter where they come from. Were it not for that belief I would despair for my country. We can tolerate the fanaticism of ignorant people, for they know not what they do, but when we find men of education raising these issues, I cannot explain their motives. I ask myself, what does the hon. gentleman mean? Does he expect to govern by coercion? and if he could do so, would it be desirable? If he meant civil war, I could understand him; but he must remember that in that case we are 1,500,000 of French Canadians whom he will have to exterminate, for we will not run away. We are here to stay, and stay we will. Therefore he will have to exterminate us, and that will be a very big undertaking. We have stood a great deal of pressure, and I am certain we will survive the McCarthy pressure. A good deal that I had to say has been better said before, and, therefore, I intend to be short; but, before taking my seat I wish to say that the hon. gentleman's mode of showing his love to the French Canadians is a very singular one, and Mademoiselle la Canadienne will look for another beau besides the hon. gentleman. I must protest, in the name of peace, in the name of harmony, and in the name of my country, against the proposition

of the hon. gentleman, and intend giving my support to the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil). The amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia advances a principle which I cannot admit, that because a majority ought to govern they can alter our constitution as well; and if this amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia were adopted, there would be nothing to prevent a majority in this House going to the foot of the Throne and saying: We have admitted the principle that the majority ought to rule, by leaving to the majority of the North-West to decide as to the abolition of the French language, and, therefore, as we are the majority in the Confederation, we can decide to abolish it in the Province of Quebec or in any other Province. I do not want the Federal Government to relinquish this power which it has. I think it was the well-considered view of the Fathers of Confederation, when they left that power to the Federal Government, and that is the only safety which the minority in any Province possesses. Therefore, I will support the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), and will vote against the two other amendments. If another amendment were to be moved, leaving this matter over until after the election, but without divesting ourselves of the power which this Parliament possesses, I would support that, but otherwise I will support the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), in the preamble to his Bill, declares that:

"It is expedient in the interest of the national community of the Dominion, that there should be community of language among the people of Canada, and that the enactment in the North-West Territories' Act allowing the use of the French language should be expunged therefrom."

The hon. gentleman has made a very able speech, but I do not think he has made good his proposition. He has failed to establish that community of language is essential to the prosperity of any country. In the British Empire there are three hundred millions of people, speaking many different languages, and, certainly, not one-fifth of that number speak the English language. Yet, the British Empire on which the sun never sets,—this great empire with all its diversity of languages and of peoples is prospering. Judging from this, a community of language is not essential to the prosperity of a nation. With regard to this particular matter, I may be pardoned if I give a brief history of the settlement of the French in the North-West. It is well known that the French of Lower Canada spread themselves over the North-West Territories long before the English had come even to Hudson's Bay, that they were at Lake Winnipeg, that they were on the Red River, where Manitoba now is, and that they were on the plains of the Saskatchewan a hundred years and more before the English had even come as far west as Lake Winnipeg. In regard to the rights of those French people, who were there at that time, those rights were secured to them in the same way, by the Treaty of Paris and the capitulation of Montreal, as they were secured to the people of Lower Canada. It is expressly stated in the capitulation itself that it extended to the "*countries above*," meaning the settlements on the Saskatchewan and the other portions of the western country.

The French Canadians inhabiting what was then known as Canada, including that territory, were all put in the same position by the Treaty of Paris. I believe that that will not be called in question. What the French did in that country, rendered the subsequent settlement of it possible. Verandrye, who was then celebrated as much as the great African explorer, Stanley, is to-day, had as great difficulties to encounter as Stanley has had in Africa, in a country which was unknown, which was peopled by savage tribes, where his followers were on one or two occasions nearly exterminated by the natives; but he showed great fortitude and made his way through that unknown country until he planted the colors of France at the Rocky Mountains. It must be acknowledged that the French have done a great deal for the settlement of the North-West. It has been stated by an hon. member that that country was for a long time treated as a Crown colony. This was not precisely the case. It was a colony, but not a Crown colony. It was a colony under a proprietary government, the government of the Hudson's Bay Company, something like the proprietary governments that were formed at one time in the States to the south of us, in Pennsylvania for example, and in Maryland, in which latter proprietary rights were given to Lord Baltimore. That was the sort of colony it was, and that colony flourished and grew. At the time that the North-West Territories fell to Canada there was a large population of French there. In fact, I may say that the population was almost entirely French and Indian. There were a certain number of English and Scotch settlers, but the majority of the people were French, descendants of those who were engaged in the fur trade, some being descendants of the Scotch who, in the year 1780 or earlier, went in very large numbers to the North-West and spread their establishments, not only along the Saskatchewan, but to the Arctic seas and to the shores of the Pacific ocean. By whose aid did they go there? By the aid of the French. By whose assistance was British Columbia—that Province of which we are so proud—secured to England, if not by that of the French voyageurs? I think enough has been said to show that the prosperity of nations does not depend altogether on the community of language. That has been shown in the very able speech of my hon. friend the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and also in that of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock). They have entered into that question and I think their arguments are quite enough to upset those of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), so I shall not delay the House upon that subject, except to say that, even in England itself, there were differences of language, and indeed many different languages were spoken within a comparatively short period. There were the French, the Welsh and the Gaelic besides other languages, and I think it was not much over a century ago that a number of Highlanders who could hardly speak a word of English leagued themselves together in several regiments under the name of the "Black Watch." Very little English was spoken amongst them, and yet that Black Watch fighting for England became as celebrated in European warfare in modern times as ever the Macedonian legions were in ancient history. As to the loyalty of the French, I do not think much requires to be said. They have shown their attachment to

Mr. Dawson.

British institutions on many occasions and have been ready to shed their blood in defence of the British flag. Let me mention one case that we know, of the battle of Chateauguay: I am proud to say that the son of the hero of that battle was on my staff for many years in the North-West, De Salaberry. Sir, that De Salaberry was French essentially, and he won a great battle under the British flag. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this matter had better be left for time to settle. What necessity is there for bringing it up now? What have the people of the North-West to complain of? A few documents will be published in French in order that the French people may understand them. There is still a considerable French population there, and I think that the matter might be left to settle itself. No doubt English will largely preponderate, as English settlement flows in. Those who cannot speak English now will, in the course of time, learn to speak it, and the whole country will become English. We hear much about an exodus of French who are said to be leaving Lower Canada, and I would be very glad indeed to see them going up to the Saskatchewan and settling in that country. The French make excellent settlers; they are our best pioneers in a new country, and they get on in harmony with all people. There is no more peaceable people, no better settlers, no more admirable people for settling a new country than the French Canadians. They are a moral people, a good people, and good workers. I say that time will cure all this, and, in my opinion, the matter had better be left to the people of the North-West Territories themselves. Let them work out their own destiny. Throw the country open to the French and English, but do not throw disabilities on any class of the community. Allow the French to grow and prosper. Let them use their language for a few years. It is only for a few years; in the North-West Territories it will die naturally of itself, and the whole French population will be engulfed by the larger English element. Of course, the French language will endure permanently in Lower Canada, but in that western country which is now filling up with another population, the French language cannot be expected to last a great while. In the meantime, I think it had better be left to its own course.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not wish this debate to close without saying a few words, especially in answer to the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The hon. gentleman has taken upon himself the task of legislating by himself, alone, without being asked to interfere in any way. He wants to legislate for half the continent. There was no petition from the people of that country to interfere in their favor. They had their own representatives here, and those representatives, coming fresh from the people, were certainly the natural defenders of that population. However, the hon. gentleman being a member of Parliament, thought he had a right, and I suppose he had, to interfere and introduce the Bill now under consideration. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the reason that the hon. gentleman brings that Bill before Parliament? It is for the purpose of preventing a portion of the population of the North-West from using what God has given them, the French language. It is their mother tongue; they know no other language than that. But the

hon. gentleman, with his Equal Rights principles, says: "You shall not say a word, unless you utter it in a language which you do not know. Equal Rights! my good friends." If those are the Equal Rights of the hon. gentleman, I do not think that his political career will last very long. Fanaticism has never lasted, and this is fanaticism in all its vigor, in all its force. What has that population in the North-West, that speaks French, whether they are a thousand or whether they are one hundred—what have they done to the hon. gentleman that he seeks to prevent them from using their language—more than that, knowing in their own tongue the laws that are enacted for their protection, or which they have to obey? The only thing that they have done to the hon. gentleman is this, that their blood is not his blood. It is not their fault if they have not the blue blood of the hon. gentleman. Their blood is the blood that their good mothers gave them, and that blood is French. They were born so; they had nothing to say when they were born. When Providence brought them into the world they came with French blood, and when they could speak, they spoke French. They came from different parts of this continent, especially from Quebec. They went up there knowing that the subjects of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen had the right, under the laws of the Kingdom, to speak in French, provided they did not speak treason. These men have not spoken treason. The hon. gentleman has never stated that in his Bill, or in his speech. He dare not say so; because these men, I may tell the hon. gentleman, from first to last, up there, and in all the Provinces of the Dominion, are as loyal subjects of the Queen as the hon. gentleman is, or his children, or his ancestors. We do not boast of our loyalty as French Canadians; because it is in our hearts; it is in our veins. It is a duty on our part; because we are well governed and well protected by the laws of England, and by our Most Gracious Queen. It is a question of love with us, and we love our Queen, and we love our country; we are loyal to our Queen and loyal to our country. Why should we be treated differently from you, Englishmen; from you, Scotchmen; from you, Irishmen; from you, Scandinavians; from you, Germans? Is your blood better than ours? Is your birth better than ours? Were your ancestors better than ours? Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. gentleman will excuse me if I say, no. They are as good as ours; but ours are as good as theirs. Sir, I feel keenly on this question; because my race is a sensitive race; it is a proud race. I do not speak of the others. I have no doubt that they are as proud and as sensitive as mine. But we do not like to be attacked; we do not like to be sneered at and to be humiliated, especially by the hon. gentleman, who has no right to speak in that way, or to sneer at us. The hon. gentleman tries to find standing ground, and the position he takes is this: that the use of the two languages is expensive. That is one of the reasons he offers for his action. Expensive in what manner? At this time there is no French Canadian who speaks his language in the North-West Assembly, but a French Canadian spoke it in the last Legislative Assembly, and others will speak it in the Assembly after the next election, because there must be some, the hon. gentleman may depend on that; for although he may choke some French

Canadians, he cannot choke enough to have the race disappear. French Canadians are quite able to defend their rights, and they will defend them; and to think that he will succeed in having a race numbering a million and a half or a million and three-quarters, with as many on the other side of the line, disappear and wiped from the land of their ancestors is a delusion on the part of that hon. gentleman. He had better learn a little French, which he does not know, and study our history, and he will learn from it that no attempts of that character have ever succeeded. But the hon. gentleman spoke of the expense; and what is the expense? The translation and publication of the journals and ordinances of the North-West have cost since that institution existed there \$22,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In thirteen years.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of that amount, the French translation and publication have cost \$4,000 in thirteen years, which is equal to less than \$400 a year. If that is what is on the hon. gentleman's conscience, if that is what is troubling his patriotism, let him understand this, that henceforth I will pay \$400 a year out of my own pocket for the translation of the laws and journals; so that this country which the hon. gentleman loves so well, and which he is convulsing for the sake of \$400 a year, need not be called upon to pay this amount, and, if the hon. gentleman is afraid it will not be paid, I am ready to enter into a contract with him or with the North-West Council that the \$400 will be paid on the first of January each year. But that is all a sham. It is not for that purpose the hon. gentleman has taken action—he has another purpose in view. He wants to tyrannise over the French Canadians of this country, he does not like them, he hates them—he hated them from the moment he came into Parliament. He showed it once—he must remember it—in a certain place where we were all congregated, and from that moment he saw that having shown his hatred to our race he could never recover the good graces of that race, unless he made the *amende honorable*. He did not wish to do that, he would not apologise; but he said: "I will be an enemy to that race so long as I sit in this House." But others have adopted the same course, and they have not succeeded any more than the hon. gentleman will succeed on this occasion. The object, however, of the hon. gentleman is disclosed in the preamble of his Bill. He seeks to introduce the thin end of the wedge, and, if he succeeds in that, then he will go a little further and seek to destroy the race from the North-West to the Atlantic. I defy the hon. gentleman to do it; that is more than his strength can accomplish, and he will not succeed. He may destroy a few French Canadians in the far-away North-West, but he may be sure of this, that, if he closes the mouths of our people in the Legislative Assembly of the North-West, if he prevents French Canadians having the rules of the House, and the journals of the House, and the laws of the country in their own language, they will do as they have done elsewhere—they will do without them. One day they will be twenty times more numerous than they are to-day. They will be growing quietly, and one day justice will be done to them by the force of circumstances. That is what we have seen from one end of the country to the other. We have seen it from the time this country

came under a British régime. After the cession of this country by the French to the English, our people had no right to use the French language in courts of justice. The position was exactly that which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) wishes to establish in the North-West. He has gone back a century. Who would have thought that a young legislator, such as he is, would have gone backward instead of going forward and endeavoring to do some good for his country and assisting its prosperity? The hon. gentleman has, however, gone back to that ancient time. What was the position then? The people were prevented using their language in the courts of justice, English alone being used. But French Canadians or Frenchmen at that time who had passed under the sceptre of the King of England could neither understand nor use the English language; and what did they do? They had law-suits and difficulties, as neighbors must sometimes have, and they had debts to collect. They said to themselves: "We cannot go before the judicial tribunals; we are not understood, we do not speak English but French, these judges are English and do not understand our language." What did they do? They did this: When two neighbors had a difficulty they went to their priest and asked him to hear the case and decide between them. The case would then be argued before the priest, and he would give judgment, and they submitted to that judgment. And the judicial tribunal did not see them. A little later the American revolution took place. England remembered that the French Canadians were the large majority of the people of Canada, that they were not properly treated, that it was an injustice to them to treat them as they had been treated under the English régime, and that they had shown no disposition to act disloyally, and, therefore, the British Government restored them to their rights, they gave them their liberties and all the rights they could expect until responsible government was brought about, sometime later on. That was the result. In England they did not say, that because those 60,000 or 70,000 French Canadians have not our blood and do not speak our language we will treat them as if they were pariahs, worse than the Chinese who come into the United States are treated. No. They said: We will treat them as British subjects, and restore to them their liberties, franchises and rights to which they are entitled. The hon. gentleman in order to strengthen his case, which he saw was very weak, tried to show that from the beginning we had not the legal right to use the French language in our Legislative Assembly. The hon. gentleman went as far back as the capitulation of the country to show this, but he ought to have remembered that when the capitulation took place, we had no Parliament and no Legislature, and, therefore, the question of language in the Legislature could not come to the minds of the French Generals who made these capitulations with the British Generals. It was out of the question at the time and nobody thought of it. But, let us consider what is granted in these capitulations. Among other things the French people, who had to submit to the fate of war, are guaranteed that the privileges of their race in Canada shall be preserved. Among these privileges surely their language must be one of the most sacred. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

says, however, that those men should have gone to school immediately and learned that beautiful English language which he speaks so well. Well, the people themselves did not think so, and they do not think so now. They think that the French language, which is the language of their mothers and their fathers, should be preserved intact by them, and that is what they have done, from the beginning of Canada as a British colony. That is what they have done up to this very day and that is what they intend to do for the future. We intend to keep our language sacred, and we intend speaking the French language notwithstanding all the attempts of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I may tell him that we would speak that language even if this Parliament refused us the use of the French language in our courts or in the Legislature. We would speak it as we spoke it notwithstanding the prohibitory law which the hon. gentleman invoked in showing that up to 1841 there was no legislation on that question. He told us that in 1841 when the Union of the Canadas took place the French language was prohibited, and when he told us this he was smiling and rejoicing and would have laughed had he dared. He rejoiced to see that the Parliament of England, after the rebellion in Upper and Lower Canada, declared that English should be the only language. The hon. gentleman passed very lightly on the rebellion in Upper Canada, and he spoke only of the rebellion of the French Canadians in the Province of Quebec. I will deal with that later on. He points out to us that in the Act passed at that time we find the language mentioned, and that the Act provided that the English language only should be used in Parliament. Well, the Union of the Canadas took place. The first Parliament was called together and it met under that law which said that the English language was the only language to be used. What was the first Act of that Parliament? It was to elect a French Canadian, the Hon. Mr. Cuvillier, as Speaker of that House, and why did they elect a French Canadian to be the Speaker? It was because they saw on the benches all around a large number of French Canadians returned as their representatives by the people of Lower Canada—French Canadians, some of them not speaking a word of English, elected by the people, although the people knew that that law was on the statute book stating that not a word of French should be spoken in the Parliament under the Union. Mr. Cuvillier was elected, the members began to speak, and strange to say (to the horror of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), no doubt) French speeches were delivered in that Parliament. The French Canadians used their own language as was their birthright. There was a law of the Imperial Parliament telling them that the English language only was to be used, but there was a law above all that, the law of nature, which told them that the French language should be used, and they used it. In a very short while after the Parliament of the United Provinces of Canada met, it passed a law on the 18th September, 1841 (5 Victoria, chapter 11, which was entitled "An Act to provide for the translation into the French language of the laws of this Province, and for other objects relative to them." We, therefore, see that although the Parliament of Eng-

land said that English alone should be used, the then Parliament of Canada passed a law to say that everything connected with the laws of the country would be translated into French. We see, therefore, that notwithstanding the English law, the French language was used in Parliament by the members, was used in the translation of the laws of the country, and in 1844, or a few years afterwards, a petition was sent to the Queen in England, praying that that portion of the Union Act, which prevented the French language being used legally in Parliament, should be abrogated. That petition was granted, and the men of that day were patriotic enough, were just enough, and were liberal enough to pass a law unanimously giving that right to their fellow-subjects, the French Canadians. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) goes on and says that the only time when the Parliament of England permitted or allowed the use of both languages was in the Confederation Act of 1867. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to think and to know that I was one of the Fathers of that Confederation Act, and that I used the little influence I had with my colleagues and with the Government of England, when we were sent there as the representatives of Canada, to secure that that clause should be inserted in the Act of Confederation. It was inserted so that we, the French Canadians of this country, should have the same rights in that respect as our friends and fellow-countrymen, and that we could use the French language in Parliament, as you, the English speaking members, can use your own language. Does not the hon. gentleman now see that I, a French Canadian, having every drop of blood in my veins French, am, notwithstanding, trying to speak his language, and trying to be understood by members of this House. I could make my speech in French, but I know that I would not be understood by all members of this House, and I wish to be understood by them all. I wish them to understand that I am speaking this evening on behalf of my countrymen of French origin. These are not the only countrymen I have, for I consider that all the members of this House, whether they belong to one race or to another, are my countrymen as well. If we wish to be one people, if we wish to be a nation, we should do what has been done in the three kingdoms. You find a number of languages, a number of dialects in the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; but how many languages are spoken under the shadow of the great and noble flag of England? It is the glory and the joy of the British Empire that all nationalities are welcome under that glorious flag, and that it covers and protects them all. I remember reading in the history of my family of one of my ancestors who fought in Canada for the French while they were the possessors and rulers of this country, and who afterwards fought for the Kingdom of France in Virginia. He had been sent there with others, and was made a prisoner by Colonel (afterwards General) Washington, and was kept there chained within his cell. But he escaped and came back to Canada. The war in this country having resulted in bringing down the flag of France and bringing up the flag of England, what did he do? Did he conspire against the flag and the King of England? No; he had loyal blood and a loyal heart; he had principles, and his principles and convictions told him that

now that this country was under a new flag he should fight for his new Sovereign as he had fought for his old Sovereign the King of France; and, as my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) said, he fought against the thirteen colonies which rose in revolt against England. Although a Frenchman, speaking French, and having only French blood in his veins, he fought against the French army on the frontier commanded by Lafayette, and in the face of proclamations from the King of France, and appeals from Bishop Carroll to the religion of the French Canadians. The French Canadians had hardly seen the French flag depart across the frontier or taken down from the Quebec fortress, when they recognised their duty to fight for their new Sovereign. They did not love their new Sovereign then; they had not time to know him or to love him; but they fought like good and loyal men, and they carried the day, and this country has remained to this day one of the brightest gems of the Crown of England through the arms and the blood of my ancestors and the French Canadians generally. If those French Canadians, so much despised by the hon. member for North Simcoe, had not been there to defend this country and to keep it as a portion of the British Empire, where would the hon. gentleman be to-day? He would not be here to fight us and despise us and try to put us under his feet. No. I do not know where he would be; but at all events he would not be here to fight that battle that will end in his defeat, he may be sure of that. I cannot imagine that the hon. gentleman has not some other idea than fanaticism in a movement of this kind. He would have us believe that his object is to make this country a happy country, a country where the people from one ocean to the other, and from the North Pole to the American frontier, will speak English. Well, the hon. gentleman will have gone to his grave, and all his children, and all his grandchildren, and all his great grandchildren will have gone there too, and even after that there will be three or four million French Canadians speaking French. He need not try that; he will not succeed. It was tried before when we were a great deal fewer in number than we are now, and it did not succeed. The hon. gentleman spoke of the report of Lord Durham. Well, Lord Durham was a very able man, but we know how he went out of this country. He had not finished his work of examining the state of the country, and he left it in a huff because he was not sustained in England in the disposition he had made of certain political prisoners whom he had exiled to Bermuda against all law, the same thing as the hon. gentleman is trying to do. The hon. gentleman says that in that report the reasons given by Lord Durham were these;

"I expected to find a contest between a Government and a people; I found two nations warring in the bosom of a single State; I found a struggle, not of principle, but of race; and I perceived that it would be idle to attempt any amelioration of laws or institutions until we could first succeed in terminating the deadly animosity that now separates the inhabitants of Lower Canada into the hostile divisions of French and English."

The hon. gentleman read that, but he took great care not to speak at all of the struggle that was going on at the same time in the Province of Upper Canada, now the Province of Ontario. He knew perfectly well that the cause of the struggle in Upper Canada was that the people were not

allowed to govern themselves, but that there were a certain few called the Family Compact, who had all the places, all the power, and who ruled the country as they pleased, and the people had no voice or power. That was the cause of the trouble in Upper Canada, and the hon. gentleman did not say a word about it. But the state of affairs was exactly the same in Lower Canada. There was no fight between the races. The immense majority of the people were French, but men were sent from England to govern us, and our people had no right to have a voice in their own government. They had to submit to having all their judges and executive councillors and legislative councillors of one stripe; and in the Legislative Assembly, they could not even do what they thought proper with their own money. That brought about a struggle. The cause of that struggle was a good one; but, according to the authorities on matters of that kind, a people has no right to rise in rebellion unless they have the strength and the means to enforce a recognition of their rights. Our people had not that strength. In Upper Canada as well as in Lower Canada they rose and fought, and were defeated; and they should have expected defeat, because they had neither the money, the ammunition, nor the guns. Well, in England our people were not heard. The constitution of Lower Canada was suspended, but not that of Upper Canada. The Upper Canadians were treated better than we, because, I suppose, we were nearer the sea and could be got at better; but that would have been a strong reason to have done the contrary, and have left us our constitution and taken it from those who were further away from the reach of England. But that was not done. We did not complain: we are a race which has suffered a long time, and we have been in the habit of suffering, but we never lose heart. We always cling to our principles and our ideas, we know what are our rights, and when the time comes to assert them, we assert them. To-day is the time when we must assert them against the hon. gentleman who seeks to have the majority of the House set them aside. I hope this House will not consent to that, but will show the hon. gentleman that his ideas of persecution and fanaticism are not those of the majority of the people, and will show that the majority speaking the English language are not disposed to do us—who are in the minority, but a large minority—an injustice. We have confidence in the majority; we are not beggars here, we are not asking favors, but what we ask is the continued enjoyment of the right we possess by nature and as British subjects. We have the right to speak our own language. What harm would it do the North-West for the thousand or so—I do not know how many French Canadians there are in the North-West—to be allowed to speak their own language. How much would the North-West be depreciated, how much would it lose, by allowing those French Canadians who have gone there confiding in the law of Parliament, confiding in the protection given them by the British laws, to speak their own language. Supposing two or three of them should be elected at the next elections to sit in the Legislative Assembly there, these men will not speak in both languages. After I have spoken in English, I do not intend repeating my remarks in French, though I have the right to do so. I would never think of doing that, because I know

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

that the great majority of members understand the broken English I am speaking now. These two or three men will not prolong the sittings of that House, and if they have anything to say, they will say it in their own language, and that is all. Then, what harm can be done to that country? In what way will that country suffer by allowing that right? But the hon. gentleman says: "There will be so many French Canadians there, and I do not like that. I do not want French Canadians to be there." But he cannot help himself. The law may be passed, but the French Canadians will go there. They are in the habit of going everywhere. They went there long before the English people did, and when that country was purchased by us from the Hudson Bay Company, we found a large majority of French Canadians there. But nobody complained of that and we took them in. Now the majority is English speaking. Why, then, should you maltreat the French Canadians? Why should you not treat them as friends and brothers? I think you should treat them as you would wish to be treated if you were in the minority. Supposing the majority here were French and that instead of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), a French member would get up and say that in the North-West there were only a thousand or five hundred English speaking men, and that the others were all French, and ask that these Englishmen be forbidden to speak their own language, would you find that just? Would you agree to that? Would you say that was proper treatment? No. You would say it was oppression, you would speak of rebellion and of the rising of thousands of men from other Provinces to protect these five hundred.

Mr. BERGERON. Bayonets.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. And I would say that you were right, in claiming justice for your compatriots as we do for ours. The people in the North-West, never thought of this question until the hon. gentleman, after his fiasco here last Session, thought that as he had had very little success then, he would try something bigger, in order that his name should continue to be before the public, and that he might have the chance of doing something. Well, the hon. gentleman went up there as a missionary. He said to the people of Manitoba, that they were oppressed, that the French language should disappear, that those Frenchmen were a nuisance, and that they should abolish the French language. More than that, he said that the separate schools should disappear. Then he went on to the North-West, and tried to impress the same views upon the people there, and I have no doubt that if the two languages had been used in British Columbia, the hon. gentleman would have exercised his efforts on these people too. But he was saved of the trouble, as the two languages do not exist there. The Province was settled, and had its constitution before it entered Confederation. But the hon. gentleman, nevertheless, wishes to impress upon this Parliament the necessity of interfering in this matter. Well, that is a most dangerous proceeding on his part. The weapons he uses can be used by two and not only by one, and if injustice is done anywhere, that is generally followed by injustice elsewhere. I hope there will be no such injustice done. I would be the last man to retaliate; and if injustice should

be done to my countrymen in the North-West, I would prefer to suffer a thousand years, than to retaliate by doing injustice to others. I want to be well understood. The minority in the Province of Quebec speak the English language. The minority speaking the English language are divided into two sections, the Roman Catholics and the Protestants. The French are there in a large majority. Well, for nothing in the world would I consent, with any influence I might have on my French Canadian countrymen, that they would do the smallest injustice to the other races in my Province. I know that, though there may be one or two men who, at the moment when they are excited and are in all their glory or in all their glorification, may make threats of that kind, hon. gentlemen need not attend to these threats or these amplifications, but may be assured that the people of the Province of Quebec, as a whole, the masses of the people, would never consent to anything of that kind. If there were any chance of that being done, I would, even during the Session of Parliament, leave my seat here and go down into the Province and call meetings, and say: Do not commit an injustice, though injustices were committed towards you at the beginning of the colony, that has gone by; we are treated properly, our institutions are protected, our language is protected, and notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman wishes, it will be protected and will continue to be used, our religion is safe, and we may pray and adore God as we please; but we wish our neighbors to have the same freedom to speak their own language, the English language; we wish to have their institutions protected as ours are; we wish them to have their own temples and to adore God as they please, and they must be protected accordingly in doing so. If occasional exceptions to that occur, they occur not only in our Province but in other Provinces. They are momentary ebullitions which are to be deplored not only in our Province but in the other Provinces; but the sense of justice always takes the lead, and soon the remedy comes and the protection is extended as it was before. I do not wish to delay the House too long, but, as I do not intend to make several speeches on this question, no matter what the number of amendments may be, I wish to say a few words further. The hon. gentleman in order to show how kind he is to our race, how kind he is to his neighbors, what good-will he has towards us, what a great heart he has towards his French Canadian friends, subjects of the same power, says:

"Let hon. gentlemen remember that when this country was ceded to the British Crown there were not more than 60,000 or 65,000 French Canadians"—

He is sorry to see that we are now a million and a half.—

"I think that number includes, though I am not quite certain, those who dwell on the banks of the Illinois, and who did not become a part of the Dominion of Canada."

Here comes the beauty of his speech:

"However that may be, instead of encouraging them in the use of their language, had a policy being pursued of inducing them—not by any harsh means at all, not by any aggravating measures—to speak the English tongue, I want to know whether to-day, instead of the difference, the cleavage of race which we see going on, and which is becoming more and more pronounced, and which is calculated to rend this Dominion in twain, if some stop is not put to it—I would like to know whether we would see the spectacle that we see to-day? I think it is perfectly plain that we would not see it. I think no injustice would have been done"—

Of course not.—

—"and that in one generation, or in two at most, my hon. friends that now represent the Province of Quebec, or their ancestors, would have been speaking English"—

What do I speak to-day?

—"and would have been English in deed, English in sentiment, just as much as those who have gone to the other side of the line, no matter what country they come from, whether from Austria, from Italy, from Germany, or any other country in Europe, who have now become assimilated and form part of the American people, not merely in name, but in truth and in fact."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the kindness of the hon. gentleman surpasses anything I could have imagined. He is so good; he is so kind; he would have wished to choke us, not by any harsh means, not by any aggravating measures, but only by a choking process. That is all. The hon. gentleman must know that the French Canadians have contributed, and do contribute, largely, and within their means, and according to their numbers, to the prosperity of this country. They do it in their own way. They do not do it in English; they do it in French. I wonder if an act done in French is not as good as if it were done in English. I wonder if the hon. gentleman, when he gives something to charity, or puts some money on the plate on Sunday, for the poor, does not as good an act as my hon. friend, on the other side, who speaks French. The hon. gentleman may be sure that the day will come, when he speaks French, when he will see that I am right. I am convinced that he is learning French now. He is now against us because he does not know French, because he does not understand the acts of our people; he does not know what literature we have; he cannot read it, he cannot appreciate it, he cannot understand it, and, therefore, we must forgive him a great deal on account of that ignorance, a word which I do not use in any bad sense, but in reference to his ignorance of that language. The hon. gentleman says that, if such a policy had been pursued as he indicates, it would have made the French Canadians speak English. That is what he wants to do now, but this we will not allow him to do, to adopt a principle that may be used afterwards from one end of the Confederacy to the other. That will not be allowed. I am sure the large majority of this House do not intend to break this Confederation into two or three parts. They do not intend to destroy this country. This hon. gentleman speaks of uniting the country; he says he wants a united people all speaking the same language; and yet he is doing his best to divide this country, to divide us as to races, to put the French and Catholics on one side, and the Protestants on the other side. He will not succeed in that attempt. I know a great many Protestants who will not agree to that, and I know many Catholics who will not allow it. If we intend to prosper in this country, and to see our institutions succeed, we must be united, and we must not be quarrelling as we have been for the last few days, and must not divide our people by races. The hon. gentleman thinks that by his Bill he is destroying us. He will see, before many days or many hours are over, that his little scheme has the contrary effect, that it is uniting us on both sides of the House against him, that it is uniting us as one man. And what good will that do? Is that

what the hon. gentleman wants? He never thought of it. He thought we would be divided in politics. There is no politics in this. It is a question of race and nationality. It is a question of self-preservation, and if he thinks that we are to allow the hon. gentlemen on the other side, who have the same sentiments, the same aspirations and the same blood as we have, to be choked, he will find himself mistaken. We will go together to preserve our autonomy, our language, our institutions—everything which is sacred to a nation. Our forefathers have been buried in the Province of Quebec. There are the very grounds where we go and pray for their souls, as good Catholics, and does he think that we will abandon that country, that he is going to chase us away without a struggle? We would be untrue to our blood. The hon. gentleman wants us to abandon our language, he wants us to change our names as well, because our names cannot remain as they are. My name, Langevin, is a French name. I do not know how he would call me in English. But he may be sure that we will not repudiate our names, we will not repudiate our blood, we will not repudiate our ancestors. We do not want the hon. gentleman to despise us. We would deserve to be despised, we would be unworthy of our blood, if we allowed him to do so. Mr. Speaker, I wish to mention another point, but I will do so briefly, because my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has alluded to it in a very eloquent way, and in French, this afternoon. French is not his own tongue, but he wished to show that he, of another race, he, an Irishman, had the same feelings that we had, and that he would not allow us to be trampled upon, as the hon. gentleman wishes. The hon. member from North Simcoe quoted *The Month*, as follows:—

“While freely admitting that the French Canadian is behind his English speaking neighbor, not only in farming, but in commerce, trade”

What did the writer in *The Month* know about that? He never saw it.—

“trade, and all kindred branches, we must not take for granted everything that this same English speaking neighbor says of him. One of the most striking and curious things in the social life of Lower Canada is the latent hate which the French and English speaking races have for each other. It is a sad thing to say, but truth requires that it should be said, that English speaking people, no matter whether they are English, Irish or Scotch, have rarely a good word for their French neighbors; and it is still sadder and more unaccountable that of all of those English speaking people, the Irish are those between whom and the French there seems to be the least rapport, and the greatest enmity.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is not a word of truth in that. This is as false as a place that I will not name.

Mr. BERGERON. That is where Mc. will go.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have lived all my life in the Province of Quebec, except, of course, during the time that I have lived in Ottawa, and enjoyed the confidence the majority of this House and the people have had in me and in my colleagues. I know that the two races—when I say the two races, I mean not only the Irish, but the Scotch and the English in the Province of Quebec, as well as the French—agree very well; they live alongside each other, and the hatred that is mentioned in this magazine, and that the hon. member for North Simcoe brings up here as evidence of a necessity of changing our language, does

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

not at all exist—far from it. The hon. gentleman from Montreal Centre gave some examples, and I will give some more. When Irish immigrants were coming into this country, and when a ship fever broke out among them, and they were detained at the quarantine station at Grosse Isle, and the living cargoes of these ships were landed, what did the clergy of the Province of Quebec do? We saw that Cardinal Taschereau, then only a priest, went to their assistance. He had no business to go, because he was then at the Seminary at Quebec, but he offered his services, and a number of others along with him, to rescue these poor Irishmen. A number of Sisters of Charity, also speaking French, went to Grosse Isle to attend to the wants of these poor, sick people, and a number of them lost their lives while caring for these poor Irishmen, women and children. And when these men and women, the fathers and mothers of poor orphans, were gone, what became of these children? Were they left there on the island to die? No. French Canadian families adopted them, they were well taken care of, and they became French Canadians. The hon. gentleman calls that absorption of race. I wish we could see more of such an absorption of races, not only among the French, but among the other races. I believe if a thing of this kind occurred in Ontario, and that French Canadians were the sufferers, I am sure that their orphans would be well taken care of and adopted into English-speaking families. So much to show the hatred of the races. We adopted their children when they were orphans; we came to their rescue when they were suffering. More than that, when our people suffer, when French Canadian families are in want, and there are any Irish families in the neighborhood, the hearts of the Irish people beat with sympathy for our people, and the Irishman and his wife come to the relief of the French Canadian families. That is the hatred that exists in the Province of Quebec. I hope that before this debate is through we will hear a few words from the members of the Province of Quebec who speak the English language, and who are Protestants. I hope that they will come out and express their opinions and say how we treat them, and how we treat the English, Irish and the Scotch in our Province. Let them come out. I do not know how many of them will speak, or whether any of them will do so, but I hope they will speak in order to repel that assertion of the hon. member for Simcoe. The hon. gentleman, at the end of his long speech, asked:

“Now, are we going to perpetuate this system of things? Are we going to permit it to grow into what might be called a vested right: so that by-and-bye a French Canadian can urge, and with some degree of truth: ‘I have left my own home in the Province of Quebec and have gone and settled in the North-West Territories relying on the faith of an Act of Parliament, by which it was said I should be allowed to have my language.’”

Vested rights by law! As if a man had not a right to speak his own language. Who gave the hon. gentleman a better right to speak English than a French Canadian to speak French? The French were here long before the ancestors of the hon. gentleman. They all spoke French, and they increased largely in numbers. I suppose it was the design of Providence that it should be so, and they have multiplied to such an extent that the hon. gentleman is frightened, and they con-

tinue to speak French, and will continue to do so for a long time to come. The hon. gentleman makes his speeches in English, but he does not want to allow another member to speak in French. Why does he not try to prevent the German from speaking German, and see how that will be received. The hon. gentleman said this :

"I will only say, in conclusion, that while I have thought it right at this early stage to make a statement of the reasons which have actuated the course I am taking, I desire here, as I have done elsewhere, to disclaim any feeling of hostility of any kind against the French Canadian race or the representatives in this House. I desire to say that I have no such feelings.

"Mr. BERGERON. Thank you.

"Mr. McCARTHY. My only desire is to promote the welfare of us all, and I think our truest interest will be found in trying to create and build up in this country one race with one national life, and with a language common to us all."

How can he create one race, how can he make of the French race, to which I belong, an English race? These are only words which sound well ; but, if the hon. gentleman will allow me to say it, there is no truth in them. They are verily only catch-words. I hope the hon. gentleman will not succeed in his motion. I hope there will be sufficient justice in this House to prevent such an event, and that hon. members will be far-seeing enough to discern that this measure is only calculated to divide this country, to create disunion, and that if it is persisted in, events may occur which may cause this House to regret its action for many years. We have created this Confederation ; we have prospered under it. We may have disagreed as to the methods of raising money—that is a matter of opinion ; nevertheless we have prospered under this Constitution. We have large prospects. We have become an united people from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Up to the time of Confederation we did not even know the leading men of other Provinces, and they hardly knew more than two or three men from our Province. We had no intercourse with them ; there were barriers between them and us. All these have disappeared. Now, men in Halifax call themselves Canadians as do the men in British Columbia. I went to British Columbia when they were just getting the political machine into operation. They were uncertain as to the future, and did not know what was coming. I went there for the purpose of assuring them ; I went there for the purpose of knowing the people in the country. I succeeded to this extent, that they accepted the new Government with pleasure ; they knew there must be something good in it for them when they became a member of this great Confederation. I hope we will show that good feeling among ourselves, that union and harmony which will induce our neighbors in Newfoundland to unite their fortunes with ours. I hope the time will come when they will do so, and then this great Confederation will comprise all British soil from the Atlantic to the Pacific. But in order to accomplish this result we must not tyrannise over one race or another. Let our neighbors speak the language they think proper. We are all subjects of the Queen, and we are equally loyal whether we speak one language or another. We do not want to change our relations, but we desire to maintain British institutions. Our constitution is modelled on the constitution of Great Britain. We have the same Queen, the same flag, the same aspirations. Why, then, should we make a large portion of our

population unhappy, and create dissensions in our midst? I apologise to the House for occupying so much time, but I feel keenly on this matter, and I thought, under the circumstances, I should express my opinion, and having said so much I resume my seat.

Mr. LAVERGNE. This question is of so much interest to the French Canadian people that I feel it to be my duty to take part in this debate. I do not wish to occupy much of the time of the House, but I feel I would not be doing my duty if I gave a silent vote on this matter. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in introducing this Bill, gave a history of the establishment of the French language in this country. He quoted from old documents, and went as far back as the time of the cession of this country to England. He might have completed his history by saying that this language, which he seeks to wipe out, was established here two centuries before the time of the cession. This language was the language of the country in the 16th century. The hon. gentleman, in speaking of the Treaty of Paris of 1763, told the House that this treaty did not contain any provision which guaranteed us the use of our language. But he has told us that since the cession, we have practically enjoyed the use of that language, and that finally, in 1844, the right to its use was embodied in our legislation. What was the conclusion at which the hon. gentleman arrived on these facts? His conclusion was, that we were not entitled to use it. I must say I was rather surprised knowing the hon. gentleman's ability, to find him arrive at such a conclusion from such premises. I draw an entirely different conclusion from them. If we have enjoyed those rights for a century, if they have been embodied in our legislation since 1844, I think we have a perfect title. I know the hon. gentleman does not profess a great deal of love for us. He admits that being bound by the treaty we should enjoy the rights which were guaranteed to us by Great Britain and no more. Very likely if the hon. gentleman had been employed to assist in making the treaty, he would not have granted the rights we obtained. He would rather have favored deportation, and our fate would have been the one allotted to the Acadians. Fortunately for us the hon. gentleman came too late into this world. The British Crown thought it their bounden duty to deal fairly with us and treat us generously, and it was part of their policy to give us the rights to which we were fully entitled, for they well knew that if they wished to form a nation here, the people must be allowed to use their own language. In fact, Sir, although the French people were not very numerous and were scattered over the country it was impossible to govern them without allowing them their own language. It is very sure that if these rights had been refused to them, the Union Jack which now floats on the Citadel of Quebec would have been removed not very long after the cession and the Stars and Stripes would have replaced it. I say, Sir, that although the hon. gentleman, Mr. McCarthy, said it was a big mistake on their part to grant those privileges, yet I maintain that from a British standpoint it was an act of wisdom that the British should have done what they did. We have enjoyed these rights for over a century, we have grown to be a people of over

a million living in this country, and our existence is very evident, although it may not please the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I may say that I feel quite at home in this country; I believe that I am entitled to feel at home in this country, and I will add to this assertion a French phrase which no Englishman can disclaim: *Honi soit qui mal y pense*. The hon. gentleman in order to show the disadvantage of the dual language has quoted to us part of the report of Lord Durham or of Mr. Buller as we may choose. It has already been read by the hon. the Minister of Public Works and I will not cite it, but it was quoted by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy), to show that there was a struggle between the two races at that time. I say, Sir, that it is not a fair argument, and that it does not give a fair idea of the actual situation in this country. But if we go back to this time, what do we see that the French people were fighting for? They were fighting for their love of British institutions. They were fighting to obtain their rights, and as a result of that fight, they finally succeeded in obtaining responsible Government. It was no wonder that Lord Durham found the people a little excited at that time, but the quotation does not represent the situation of the country either then or at the present time. To show the inconvenience of the dual language, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy), has cited certain extracts from the newspapers or magazines. I may say that I believe the hon. gentleman in his researches for the truth, was sincere, but I also say, that if he had the intention of misleading this House, he could not have sought information from better sources to attain this object. One of his quotations was the following, which I will read with your permission:—

“ We are Englishmen speaking the French language,” said the late Sir George Cartier, the colleague and close personal friend of Sir John A. Macdonald. Before this he was the undisputed leader of the French Canadian element in Canada; three years later he was unmercifully beaten at the polls for Montreal East by an obscure young lawyer by the name of Jetté. The crushing defeat was the French Canadian way of punishing Sir George for his ultra-loyal speech and the misrepresentation it embodied. Not that French Canadians are not well affected to the Empire as things go; only it must be understood they are well affected as French Canadians.”

I say, Sir, that this extract, as well as the other which has been cited by the hon. gentleman, is a tissue of falsehoods. We all know very well—and it does not take a very long memory to recall the facts of the election between Sir George Cartier and the Hon. Mr. Jetté. I may say, by the way, that Mr. Jetté was not an obscure lawyer and this is one of the first falsehoods in the quotations. Mr. Jetté was one of the leading barristers of the Province of Quebec and very shortly after he was made a judge of the Superior Court and he has added honor to the bench in the administration of justice. This, however, only shows the sources from which the hon. gentleman has taken his information. The defeat of Sir George Cartier cannot in any way be assigned to the reasons which are mentioned in that article. Gentlemen from Montreal know exactly the cause of that defeat, and if I recollect well the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway had something to do with it, and Sir George Cartier had, besides, perhaps, a little quarrel with some high dignitaries of the church, which helped to bring about that result. His defeat was in no way connected with the

Mr. LAVERGNE.

reasons which are given by that writer. Again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman made the following quotation from the *Mouth* :

“ While freely admitting that the French Canadian is behind his English-speaking neighbor, not only in farming, but in commerce, trade and all kindred branches, we must not take for granted everything that this same English-speaking neighbor says of him. One of the most striking and curious things in the social life of Lower Canada is the latent hate which the French and English-speaking races have for each other. It is a sad thing to say, but truth requires that it should be said, that English-speaking people, no matter whether they are English, Irish or Scotch, have rarely a good word for their French neighbors; and it is still sadder and more unaccountable that of all those English-speaking people, the Irish are those between whom and the French there seems to be the least *rapprochement* and the greatest enmity.”

This was written in 1885, and although I am not an old man, I can give evidence upon this point, and I can, from my own knowledge, declare that this statement is a complete falsehood; I live in Arthabaska, surrounded by the Counties of Megantic, Drummond and Richmond, where there is a mixed population, and which counties are fair sample of the condition of things existing in counties inhabited by people of different races. I speak from experience, when I say that there are no better friends than the English and the French in my section of the country. I know as a practicing lawyer that when there are discussions or quarrels, they are not between English-speaking and French-speaking people, but between English among themselves and French among themselves; and that statement will be corroborated by every member who resides in those sections of the country. It will be corroborated by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), and the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Ives); in fact, Sir, by all the members who represent what are called English counties, in which there is a mixed population. This was given as an argument to show the great inconvenience of the dual languages, and when we come to examine the facts, we find that they turn the hon. gentleman's argument against himself. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the Hon. Mr. Mercier, and he has told us that he represented the opinions and feelings of his countrymen. I presume, Sir, that is not altogether admitted by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. However, I say that the hon. gentleman could not find any argument there; what he brought as an argument would, in that instance, turn against him also. Mr. Mercier did not receive a very strong support in the English counties in the general election of 1886; but since that time the Protestant and English minority in the Province have manifested their approval of the course of Mr. Mercier on more than one occasion; and if Mr. Mercier, under provocation, has not always measured his words, in his legislation he has given entire satisfaction to the English minority. I go further, and I say that he has given them their full share of the patronage and favors, and I am glad he has done so, and I think that in every Province the minority should be treated in a particularly considerate manner. Now, when Mr. Mercier came before the people in 1886 what was the result in the County of Megantic, for instance? He was in Opposition at that time, and the candidate opposing his policy, Mr. Johnson, was returned by a majority of 280. The

election was annulled, and another election took place, when Mr. Mercier put another candidate in the field, and that majority of 280 against him was turned into a minority of about 150. Take the County of Ottawa, which may surely be considered an English county. Mr. Cormier, in the general election, was returned by a fair majority, but the election was annulled, and in the election that followed Mr. Mercier's candidate was returned by a majority of 1,200. In Brome, the Hon. Mr. Lynch, in the general election, was returned by a majority of about 300. Mr. Lynch was appointed a judge, and an election was held last fall. Mr. Mercier put into the field a candidate who had many disadvantages. He was not a resident of the county while his opponent was; he had also the disadvantage that, although a prohibitionist, he had against him the Dominion Alliance, who chose to support the other candidate, in which, I may say by the way, I think they acted very unfairly. What was the result of that election? Notwithstanding those disadvantages, the majority of 300 against Mr. Mercier was reduced to 116. I will take a still more recent election to show that the policy of Mr. Mercier has been supported by the English minority of the Province of Quebec—the election in Quebec West. Mr. Murphy was elected in the general election of 1886 by a majority of 5, and this winter he came before the people once more, when he was returned by a majority of nearly 200; and if we consult the returns we shall find that in the three English polling sub-divisions he polled a very much larger majority than he had done in 1886. Now, Sir, that is the expression of the sentiment of the English minority in the Province of Quebec, and it is no argument to say that Mr. Mercier has been aggressive towards the English people; but we have a right to deduce from these facts the conclusion that once more the argument of the hon. member turns against himself. Now, Sir, I will not enter into a discussion of the arguments based on phrenology or on the formation of the French skull or the Saxon skull; I think the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) did entire justice to that part of the subject. I must say that I regret very much that this question has come before the House, for two reasons: As was said by the hon. member from the North-West, who spoke yesterday, this measure should not have come from the quarter from which it has come. It comes before us under bad auspices. We know, Sir, what are the aims of the hon. gentleman who has brought it forward, and if I may judge from the facts and the arguments brought before us, I do not think he ever expected to carry the legislation he is presenting to this Parliament. We know that he has been more cautious in his expressions in this House than he has been elsewhere, but we have a right to go beyond this House. The speech which he has made in this House is very different from what he said in this city before the Equal Rights Association. Let me read a few lines from that speech. In the beginning he says:

“I have to thank you most cordially for approving of my course in Parliament, on the question of the Jesuits' Estates Act, and still more for your endorsement, if I may consider you have endorsed it, of the policy I am now promoting, and which I shall continue to promote, viz., the abolition of the dual language system and of Separate Schools in Manitoba and the North-West Territories.”

I will read another short extract from that speech:

“We have no hostility to Quebec; their good is our good. They are being extirpated from the land—are being driven away in hundreds of thousands by the iniquitous tithe law imposed by the Act of 1774—consecrated by the Act of 1867. What does history teach us? It is a poor farming country in Quebec or possibly it is farmed by a poor class of farmers. The people are already overburdened, and they are fleeing by hundreds of thousands from these burdens. I saw a statement the other day that two hundred heads of families in Rimouski have disappeared across the borders within a few months. Is it to be wondered at? Do you think that people will continue for centuries to be tied down by tithe, fabrique assessments, &c., when there is a land of freedom for them across the border? If it is an object to us to keep our people here, I want to see the French Canadians kept here so long as their interests are not antagonistic to the rest of the Dominion, and this can only be obtained by doing away with laws of this kind.”

And the hon. gentleman obtained loud cheers at this moment. If this is meant for provocation, it does not reach us, we would simply despise it; but if it is meant as an argument in favor of the legislation the hon. gentleman is calling for now it is very unskilful. It has been pretended that the use of the French language in the North-West Territories practically is of no consequence; but if it is of no importance, I should say, why do they not leave it alone? I should say that it would die out of itself through not being used; and later on, if the proportion of French in the population of the Territories goes on decreasing, and the French language is practically of no use, it might then be the time to ask for legislation; there would then be no protest from any quarter against it, and these disagreeable discussions and fictions would be avoided. We are now asked to pass this legislation. I am convinced now, after hearing the hon. gentleman's speech on that question, that to do so is perfectly impossible. It might, and I do not say that it will not, ultimately result in becoming a question of provincial rights or a question of autonomy; but I say for the present, although I am not quite ready to view the question as my hon. friend for Berthier does, although I am not quite ready to say that I am going to support his amendment, this question is now premature, and for this reason I shall certainly oppose the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have heard so many criticisms on the Bill and the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that I confess I feel some reluctance in rising to discuss or criticise the speech which that hon. gentleman addressed to the House. I may say at the outset that the preamble to the Bill and the speech which was delivered in its support are of far greater consequence than the Bill itself. I regret the speech of the hon. member in introducing the Bill which we are now called upon to consider. That speech points, not simply to the disuse of the French language in the North-West Territories, but to its total disuse throughout the Dominion for social and literary as well as for official purposes. The hon. gentleman declared that we can only become politically united in one State by having but one language. The Bill of the hon. member, though but of little practical importance, is accompanied by a speech that the House cannot at all ignore. The hon. gentleman has evinced the most bitter hostility to all his fellow-countrymen who speak the French language, and who are of French origin. He, it seemed to me, in that speech, was far more anxious to wound the susceptibilities of his friends and

fellow-countrymen who speak the French language than he was to secure a more permanent union of the various Provinces that are united in one Federal State. The hon. gentleman said, in addressing himself not only to the French members in this House, but to the French people throughout the country: You are a conquered race; you have no right to aspire to equality, and at best you are but Gibeonites in the midst of Israel. The hon. gentleman quoted the observations which I made some thirteen years ago on this particular clause which he proposes to strike out from the North-West Territories Act, and I supposed the hon. gentleman had quoted those observations with approval. I said then that the question was one that the Government thought it was better should be left to the Council that was about to be established. Why? Because we thought then that it was not necessary that we should decide in advance of actual settlement whether there should be two languages or one used. We did not think it was wise to propose the use of both French and English in those Territories until we were quite sure that there would be both French and English colonists found there. When that Bill went to the Senate an hon. Senator, representing, I think, the Province of Manitoba, proposed this particular amendment, and I will say now that if that amendment served to conciliate any section of the half-breed population, if it prevented those people from being misled by mischievous persons, then it was a prudent provision, and it has proved infinitely cheaper than gunpowder and police. I say that at this day, after that clause has been thirteen years upon the statute book, it is not possible for our French countrymen to complain that any impediment has been put in their way in emigrating to or in settling in the North-West Territory; and if to-day there are but few French people colonising the North-West Territories, it is not because they have been put in an inferior position by the legislation on the statute book. Thirteen years have gone by since that provision first became a part of the law. During that period racial jealousies have been kept dormant. There has been little expense to the country in consequence, and the statement made by the hon. Minister of Public Works this evening shows that the cost of public printing in both English and French in the North-West Territories has been something less than the cost of maintaining three policemen during the same period of time, and the cost of furnishing those who speak the French language with official documents in their own tongue has been less than the maintenance of a single policeman. I venture to say that, so far as any burden upon the public treasury is concerned, this House cannot for a moment attach any serious importance to the question the hon. gentleman has raised. There has been no murmuring of Grecians against Hebrews, there has been no complaint that there has been partiality shown or wrong done or negligence exhibited towards any portion of the population. The sources of discontent in this particular were cut off, at the very beginning, and what we proposed at the start might now perhaps be carried out without fear of injustice and without any serious objection. In fact, I have heard no objection stated, unless it be in the speech which the hon. gentleman who moved this Bill addressed to the House. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

McCarthy) spoke as if it were an offence against British institutions that any of Her Majesty's subjects should speak French. He assumed that the speaking of French was at variance with allegiance to the British Crown. He reminded the French Canadians that this is a British colony, that they are a conquered race, and cannot therefore stand on a footing of equality with Her Majesty's subjects who speak the English language. That it was an unwarrantable presumption on their part to aspire to the rights of freemen, unless they were willing to lay aside their mother tongue. He said the use of the French language was not guaranteed by the Treaty of Paris, that it was not mentioned in the Act of 1774, or in the Constitutional Act of 1791; that, in fact, there was no authority to use the French language in Canada until the year 1848, and that the calamity which was then inflicted upon the country was repeated in the Confederation Act of 1867, and care must now be taken that the evil then introduced should not be further extended. It seemed to me that the hon. gentleman forgot that we have no Act of Parliament authorising us to stand upon our feet instead of upon our heads, and yet the great majority of the people of this country have the ill-manners to do so without the authority of an Act of Parliament, and they manage to get along with a considerable degree of comfort. I would like to know what constitutional rule the hon. gentleman has in view when he comes to the conclusion that French could not be lawfully spoken in a Colonial Legislature without the express permission of an Act of the Imperial Parliament. Why, Mr. Speaker, the great majority of Her Majesty's subjects do not speak English—they cannot speak English. A law requiring them to speak English would doom them to silence. When a Legislative Assembly was granted to the people of Lower Canada, it was granted to people who spoke only French. The vast majority of those who were elected to the Local Legislature to represent those people knew only French. French was the only means of communication between the representatives and the represented, and it would have been a mockery on the part of the Crown to have issued letters patent authorising some one on its behalf to call a Legislative Assembly and to doom that Assembly to silence after it was called together, because no member might have been capable of speaking the English tongue. It is clear that that Assembly did not understand that any such permission from the Imperial authorities was necessary to authorise the use of the French language. It was the only language they knew. The people of the Province spoke French at home; they heard French spoken at church; they used the French language in the market; and I do not know why the rule of convenience should be abrogated in the Legislature or by the Government, when it is followed in every other sphere of life. I might remind the hon. gentleman, that the most influential oration that any man ever made, on the most splendid theme which could inspire oratory, was delivered to Jews and Greeks, Parthians and Medes, Elamites and dwellers in Mesopotamia, and they all managed to hear him in their own tongue. There was no violation of the principle of nationality; but, although it was then proposed to establish a common brotherhood between men of altogether

different races, it was never suggested that they should undo the mischief which had been done in the reign of Peleg. To secure the desired union they were to bring men together on a common platform although the relation proposed was much closer than that of common citizens of the same State. The hon. gentleman assumes that, when Canada became a British Province, its people lost the right to use the only language they knew, because its use was not guaranteed to them by the articles of capitulation or the treaty of peace. He assumed that it was an unwarrantable presumption for the people of Canada, without such authority, to use that language. Well, I have always understood, that the subjects of Her Majesty are sworn to bear true and faithful allegiance to Her Majesty, but I have never heard that they were sworn to speak the English language. I do not know, if we were put to the test, how many of us who can speak no other language would be able to pass the ordeal, if we were put on trial for an improper use of the Queen's English. There is no constitutional rule of which I am aware making the use of English an indispensable accompaniment of Parliamentary Government or of allegiance to the British Crown. A man may be a British subject put on trial for treason and convicted without knowing a word of English. He may talk Italian in Malta, French in the Province of Quebec, Dutch at the Cape, Hindoo at Calcutta, and Chinese at Hong-Kong, without in any degree sacrificing his rights or lessening his obligations as a British subject. The law does not extend his responsibilities beyond his powers. The hon. gentleman himself had no voice in saying who his parents should be, or in determining the place or time of his birth or the language of his childhood and education. All these matters were determined for him by the supreme authority of Providence, and this is his vindication in regard to his nationality and the use of the language which he employs. There are upon the Royal Arms certain mottoes, and it happens that they are all in French. One of them means in English "God and my right." That traces the rights of men to their original source. That source, high above every human authority to the contrary, is the one to which every free man traces his right to resist wrong and oppression. It is from that source that the French Canadian derives his right to speak the language of his fathers, and any law which attempts to deprive him of those high rights which belong to him, in the manner in which the hon. gentleman proposes to wipe out and obliterate the use of the French language, would be a law doing violence to those very objects for the maintenance of which a Government exists. The hon. gentleman speaks of the conquest of Canada as something which made the French Canadians less than ordinary British subjects. He spoke as if they were Helots among Spartan freemen. He says practically to them: How dare you talk about your rights? Do you not know that you are a conquered race? This matter is very important because the notion has gone abroad that, in consequence of Canada having been a conquered country, the same right does not exist to use the French language in the Province of Quebec that exists to use English in the Province of Ontario. There can be no difference in that respect. The views with regard to conquest and the rights acquired by con-

quest that have been sedulously propagated of late are altogether erroneous. It is true, as Lord Mansfield has said, in a very important judgment, that you may put your enemy to the sword and confiscate his property as an act of war and during war. This in theory was the law. This may be theoretically the law still, although Turkey, sixty years ago, in making war upon Greece, acted upon practices that fell far short of this absolute rule, and humanity, it was held, justified the interference of the great powers of Europe. Now, what may be done as an act of war and during war is a wholly different thing from what may be done after the war is consummated. If the country surrenders, if articles of capitulation are signed, those parties who were enemies and aliens before, at once become subjects, and their persons and property is entitled to protection at the hands of the new sovereign. The person and the property of the new subjects do not stand in any different position from the property and the person of those who were subjects by birth. The Sovereign succeeds to public property. The ancient law continues until he expressly changes it. For as long as the conqueror fails to create a legislative assembly he has a right of government, subordinate, of course, to his right as an integral part of Parliament. But if the sovereign chooses, by letters patent, to authorise the calling of a legislative assembly, the moment those letters patent are signed, and before that legislative assembly is called, he has exhausted his power. The subjects of the country he has acquired by conquest then have the right of representation, and after the right of representation is given, they stand in no different position from the subjects of the same sovereign in a colony formed by occupation and settlement of those from the parent country. And when that assembly is established, without any Act of Parliament, without any expressed power being given by the Imperial authorities to do so, its members may speak English or French, Dutch or Italian, just as the assembly itself sees proper. It is for that assembly to determine what shall be the language employed. In this regard the Crown has no power except as a part of that assembly or as a part of the Imperial Parliament. Thus, in the Ionian Islands, English, Greek and Italian were in use as long as the islands were under the British protection. The Island of Corfu is largely settled by Italians; other islands were mainly peopled by Greeks. English merchants were found in all of them and when a Government was given them, all three languages were used, and they were used because it was convenient. The public authorities, did not feel that it was necessary, to deny to these people, the rights or practices which were felt to be necessary to every section of the community. Unless, then, for the purpose of giving offence, the hon. member's reference to the French of Canada being a conquered race is wholly without relevancy. Language, under our constitutional system, in legislation, in the courts, and in the administration of Government, is regarded as a vehicle of thought, as an instrument for conveying intelligence. It is used as a means to an end, and it is never regarded as a symbol of sovereignty, or of subjection. That is true in every colony where representative Government has been established. I would like to know what the hon. member for Simcoe hopes to gain by insulting two-fifths of the population of this country. Is it to the

advantage of this country that one race should be arrayed against another? Can it promote the well-being of the country in any sense, that Frenchmen should find it impossible to live with those speaking English? Will it be easier for this House to follow the only rational common sense rule in this matter, the rule of convenience, if once the passions of the population are excited, and men are disqualified thereby, to reason? Does he think Frenchmen will remain unmoved by his insults? If the hon. gentleman insists upon treating the French population of this country as the Jews were formerly treated, he must expect that they will act as the Jews are said to have acted. And then what Shakespeare has put in the mouth of Shylock might be used by the French Canadians in this country. The French Canadians may say:

"I will take this course, for if it will feed nothing else, it will feed my revenge.

"He has scorned my nation, thwarted my bargains, cooled my friends, heated my enemies, and what is his reason?

"I am a French Canadian. Hath not a French Canadian eyes? Hath not a French Canadian hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? Fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as an English-speaking Canadian is? If you prick him will he not bleed? If you tickle him will he not laugh? If you poison him will he not die? If you wrong him shall he not have revenge? The villiany you teach him he will execute, and it shall go hard, but he will better the instruction."

Such, to my mind, is the state of feeling which the hon. gentleman, by his speech, and by the preamble to his Bill, is doing his best to awaken. Lord Macaulay said on one occasion, that whenever he had mastered a new language he always felt as if he had acquired a new sense. The hon. gentleman proposes to act towards the French population of this country in much the same way that the brother of Robert, Duke of Normandy, acted towards him. He proposes to put out their eyes. He says: Forget your mother tongue, forget the orators and statesmen, the novelists and historians, the poets and philosophers of France. and then you will begin to qualify yourselves for becoming good British subjects. If you understand the language, in which they spoke or wrote, if you appreciate its beauties, if you admire its expression or its wisdom, or its elasticity, then it is impossible that you can be a loyal subject, it is impossible that you can be devoted to the maintenance of the federal union. That is the position that the hon. gentleman has taken. I cannot help asking myself: Does the hon. gentleman understand the character and bearings of the demands that he is making on behalf of the State? Does he know that he is demanding of the French Canadians sacrifices that are dearer than life itself? Does he not know that he is asking for the destruction of one of the most important rights for the existence of which governments are maintained? The state is not an end, the state is the means to an end. Part of the duties of a state is to protect life, liberty and intellectual freedom, not less than the general public welfare. It has not right to undertake to destroy the mental vision of one section of a population with the design of creating it anew. It is no part of the duty of the state to destroy the capacity for studying one field of literature, nor to attempt to create the capacity for studying another field of literature.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

There may be forces at work in a state—social and intellectual—which operate to create one nation out of two or more older ones. History, however, is plain that when these changes are brought about and a new order of things is created out of old conditions, there are many forces and factors which work in the direction of resisting and transforming old nationalities into new ones, but these forces operate slowly. The circumstances under which they operate are wholly different from anything we have in modern civilised society, and that result was not to absorb one race by another, and to perpetuate one of two races, or one of three, but to form a new race, a new nationality, out of the materials which these old races furnished. It can be shown that the factor of the hon. gentleman is the very weakest of all the influences or forces that might be employed for the purpose of accomplishing the end which he has in view. Look at the condition of things in this country. You have three great sources from which intellectual life is drawn, the United Kingdom, the United States and France. Our English speaking population receive their inspiration largely from the literature of the mother country and of the adjoining republic. Our French fellow-countrymen rely more largely upon French sources of culture, literature and information. The time may come when one of these sources of inspiration may be dried up; I will not undertake to speculate upon it, or to say that such will be the case; but this I do say, that no Legislature in the British Empire has any right to undertake such a task on behalf of any portion of the population. If such a state of things does come about, it certainly will come about from a condition of things wholly different from that which the hon. gentleman proposes to establish. It will arise from causes very different from those which the hon. member asks us to put in operation. The proposition of the hon. gentleman to convert all the people of this country into English by simply terminating the official use of French in the first instance and its use for every other purpose hereafter, reminds me of an incident related in one of Captain Marryat's novels. I remember the case of old Mr. Simple who invented a machine for the reformation of character.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was old Mr. Easy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Forty years have elapsed since I read the book. The old gentleman invented a machine which acted upon the principle of suction and pressure. It was applied to the heads of reprobates and was designed to make them men of exemplary lives. He was a great believer in phrenology, and by the application of the machine to conscientiousness, veneration and benevolence, applying the principle of suction, he drew out those organs to their proper dimensions, and then by applying pressure to bibativeness, destructiveness and other carnal propensities, he pressed them down and diminished their size to such an extent that he made every person to whom he applied his machine a perfectly model character. So complete was this machine in his estimation that he hoped practically to put an end to the controversy about the relative merits of faith and works. The hon. gentleman proposes something like that in his Bill. The process is equally summary and simple, by which he hopes to make a

single race into a single state. The speech of the hon. gentleman, shows how very general and sweeping is the revolution he proposes to accomplish, and yet there can be no doubt whatever about the very humble beginning of this new policy that is suggested in the Bill which the hon. gentleman has submitted to the House. Where a people are without education, literature or history, the experiment of doing away with a language might be made with more success, and I tell the hon. gentleman he had better begin his experiment with the aborigines of this country, rather than with our French population. He will have no literature to contend against, and, if the hon. gentleman's view is correct, he should make it a crime to publish a book, newspaper, or periodical, in, say, the Algonquin language. The hon. gentleman might insist that all the Indian children should learn English instead of Cree or Ojibbeway or some other Indian tongue. He might make it a crime to give them instruction in any language except English. But if the hon. gentleman is going to succeed even with the Indian population he would require to make it a criminal offence for a missionary to undertake to learn the Indian language with a view to speaking it. He ought to insist on his speaking English and nothing else to the Indians. What does the hon. gentleman propose? If he applies the same principle to the Indian population as he proposes to apply to the French population, he will have missionaries, traders and schoolmasters speaking to Indians only English. And by that process he would expect to make Indians Englishmen. I think the hon. gentleman might discover some impediment in the way. I know no reason why the schoolmaster and missionary should be allowed to talk Algonquin and state officials should be denied that privilege. I do not know why men should learn their duty to their Creator in Algonquin and be compelled to learn their duty to the State only in the English. It would indeed be a mockery to pretend you were going to convert the Indian into an Englishman by providing that the magistrate who tries him for some petty crime shall conduct the proceedings in English. It seems to me that if the hon. gentleman is to succeed he must adopt a policy more thorough than that marked out in his Bill. I do not know, but I am inclined to think, that the hon. gentleman will scarcely be able to get all his ordinary supporters to sustain him in adopting such a policy as I have indicated, and yet it is not an unreasonable one, if the experiment is to be tried at all with any hope of success. If the hon. gentleman cannot succeed where there is no history, no press, no literature, no philosophy, daily read and studied to be overcome, how can he hope to succeed when these subjects fill the minds of old and young, delighting the one and affording solace to the other? The hon. gentleman says that language makes the nation. I do not agree with him. The hon. gentleman confuses cause and effect. The same forces which operate through a long period of years, which serve to change people of different races or tribes into one nation, also serve to modify their language in the same way. The two things have a common origin and are operated upon by the common cause, so that which makes a new nation also, at the same time, makes a new language. I should like to know whether the hon. gentleman supposes that he could bring about the fusion of

the English and French in Canada, looking at the number of each and the comparative vitality of the language of each, without producing a language very different from either. I do not know if the hon. gentleman undertakes to prove that two millions of French and three millions of English could make one people with one language, the English, at the end. I am perfectly satisfied it would be neither English nor French, though it might be a blending of both. The hon. gentleman has but to look at the Latin races of Europe to see what the effect of fusion is. If such could be accomplished the language would be a wider departure from English than the modern Italian is from its Latin parent. There is a principle known in mechanics illustrated by the parallelogram of forces. You have various forces acting upon a body at the same moment of time from different directions. It obeys them all, but it does not take the direction from any one of them, the direction taken is the combined action all of those forces acting upon it; and, if you undertake to bring about fusion of races, you will simply apply that law to a condition of things in the intellectual and mental world. You have a new condition of things if you succeed, and it is one wholly different from that which existed in the one case or the other. There is an illustration of this in *Ivanhoe* by Sir Walter Scott. Sir Walter tells us of the influence of Norman and Saxon upon each other, and how out of their fusion modern English came forth. He shows that certain Norman words take the place of certain Saxon words and the reverse; and how the names of animals used for the purposes of food repeat the history of the early relation of the two races. They are in the care of the Saxon when they are in the field and receive Saxon names. When they are slaughtered and brought to market and find a Norman consumer they have Norman names. And so the pig becomes pork, the ox becomes beef, the calf veal, and the sheep mutton, and these words repeat the history of the relation of these two races quite as well as the ordinary history of these races. The hon. gentleman forgets that it was a whale and not a cod that swallowed Jonah, and so if he will insist upon three millions of people in this country, swallowing two I am afraid that the individual who attempts that feat would be a different looking personage afterwards from what he was before. Now the inadequacy of the means that are employed, and that the hon. gentleman's Bill suggests, becomes perfectly obvious. The official use of a language is limited and that official use cannot secure that unity of races which the hon. gentleman seeks and without which he says there cannot be political cohesion. The business of the modern state is so restricted that the official use or disuse of a language can have no appreciable effect upon its general vitality. Suppose the hon. gentleman were entrusted with the power to do what he thinks ought to be done, suppose he goes into a French settlement for the purpose of administering justice; he sends a judge who knows only English, he is among a people who speak and know only French; the causes are heard, witnesses are called who know only French, lawyers are employed who know only English, if a jury is summoned it must be a jury who would know only French; how is the hon. gentleman going to carry on the administration of justice? Is he going to employ any

number of interpreters? If the hon. gentleman were to adopt such a policy I may say the people would not have a very great deal of confidence in the administration of justice. It would be made very cumbersome, much more costly, much more distrusted. Then these people amongst whom he establishes this English institution, this official use of the language, go to church on Sunday and hear a sermon in French, they read newspapers that are printed in French, they read French authors, Lafontaine's fables, Béranger's poems, Lamartine's history or St. Simon's memoirs, Victor Hugo or Prevost-Paradol; all these and hundred others are daily read and studied. I would like to know what chance there is for success when those mighty dead are encamped around the people for their protection and for the perpetuation of their language as the Angels of the Lord are encamped around those who fear Him. It is true that there have been many tribes scattered throughout Europe of one race, settling within the territories of other tribes and absorbed by them. It is said the Ostrogoths and the Lombards became Italians, the Franks and Burgundians became French; certain Slavs and Wends who settled in Prussia became Germans, but in every case the absorption of these made the race by whom they were absorbed different in language from what it was before. But these tribes were without a history and without a literature. They had no past unceasingly influencing the present, and projecting itself into the future. They were subject to new environing influences. They were cut off from their kindred and entered upon the heritage of a new world of thought and feeling, of hopes and desires, as completely as if the world in which their primitive character had been formed no longer existed. M. Bluntchli in writing on this subject says, with reference to the action of the Roman Government in undertaking to denationalise tribes within the provinces of the Empire:

"Language is the most peculiar possession of a people. It is the strongest bond which unites its members and the chief means by which it reveals its character. For these reasons, a state cannot deny to a nationality its language nor prohibit its literature. It is, on the contrary, the duty of the state to give free play to a language, and to promote it, and the general interests of civilisation are not injured thereby. The suppression of the native languages of the provincials by the Roman authorities, was a fearful abuse of the power of the Government."

And in reference to that abuse, the hon. gentleman asks us, perhaps not in his Bill, but certainly by the preamble of his Bill, and by the speech by which it was supported—to do the same thing. The same writer says, with reference to the English Government in the last century in India:

"The English Government made one of the most serious mistakes, when in 1773, it wished to force the forms of English law and judicial procedure in Bengal on the Hindoos, who were unprepared for it."

From that policy the Imperial Government has long since withdrawn. It has for years regarded language as a mere instrument of the state and not a badge of either sovereignty or humiliation. There can be no doubt which is the wiser, the more magnanimous course to adopt. There can be no doubt whatever which policy will most largely contribute to the contentment of the people. The ties of family are stronger than the ties of nationality, the ties of nationality are, for the most part, stronger than the ties of state. This is a condition of things that is ordained by Providence. The hon. gentleman (Mr.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

McCarthy) may complain of it, but he cannot alter it, and it is as true in this country as it is true in Switzerland, Austria or Russia. Let me invite the House to two or three sentences from Bluntchli and also from Niebhur. Bluntchli says:

"If the moral or intellectual life of a people is attacked by the power of the state, its members are driven to the most determined resistance. Men can have no juster cause for resistance to tyranny than the defence of nationality. Legality may suffer in the struggle, but law is not injured."

And Niebhur has not hesitated to maintain:

"Common nationality has higher claims than political relations which unite the different nations of one state."

The speech of the hon. gentleman had but little relevancy to his Bill. He quoted authorities to show that by one language the people were made one nation. I am not going to contest the soundness of the doctrines he read from Freeman and from Müller. There is a very ancient authority, however, which says that at one time the people were of one language and one speech, not in a very advanced condition of society, that they deliberately abused their advantage, that the unity of the race was broken, and that language was diversified by Divine interference. The race was broken up into classes, and they were scattered over the world, and sent to school. The currents of that division have flown into a great many channels, and men have gained more advantages from the division, than they have endured misfortunes. The limitless capabilities of the human intellect have been shown; through many vicissitudes, the race has, in each class, learned much, and all have been advanced to a higher elevation, to a purer atmosphere, and a wider field of vision. Those differences in language and nationality have frequently prevented combinations which, if accomplished, could only have resulted in working folly and mischief. The hon. member wants a united Empire; he insists that the whole British Empire should be united in one confederation. Well, if the doctrine he has laid down, with regard to Canada, is sound, it is equally sound when applied to the whole Empire; and so we must have three hundred millions of people speaking the same language. I am inclined to think, if it were a question to be determined by a majority, that the Hindoos would have their way, and instead of all of us abandoning French and learning English, we should have to give up both French and English, and learn Hindoo. We have, according to this view, not simply to undertake to establish English at the foot of the Rockies, but a common language at the foot of the Himalayas as well. The hon. gentleman insists on a unity and cohesion which is denied by Providence to modern states. Ancient governments were united; ancient governments counted men as nothing; the individual had no rights as against the state; but in every modern state there is an element of clay as well as of iron; there is an element of dissolution as well as of strength, and that element is the individuality of men. You recognise the individual as having rights distinct, and separate, from the state; you recognise his right, when those rights are encroached upon, to stand up in their defence, and you put in jeopardy the existence of the state itself for the purpose of maintaining them; and without respecting those rights the state itself cannot endure. Why should we unite for the purpose of maintaining a government unless it is going to serve some purpose

that will contribute to our progress, material, intellectual or moral, or in some way promote our happiness? If we unite for the purpose of government, it is in order that we may, through the agency and instrumentality of government, accomplish something for ourselves. Now, does the Bill give effect in any way to the doctrine which the hon. gentleman says is necessary for the establishment of a united state? The hon. gentleman says that unity is vital. Unity is well nigh vital to the existence of a nationality, but all experience shows that unity is not absolutely necessary to the maintenance of a state. The hon. gentleman, by his policy, proposes to confine his efforts at reform to remote regions where few men dwell, and he allows the barrier which he says threatens the permanence of the state to exist here at the capital. Let us go far away from the seat of war, in order to conquer. Could there be greater infatuation? The hon. gentleman, when he was speaking, heard cries of "*écoutez*," on this side of the House, and he thought this a word of reasonable import, a word that endangered the unity of the state. If hon. gentlemen on that side and on this had said "hear, hear," we should have been in no danger; the permanency of the union would have been in no way threatened; but to say "*écoutez*" was a very different thing, and calls for the serious consideration of every member of the House. Now, the hon. gentleman has quoted paragraphs from Freeman and Müller, but those quotations do not sustain the argument of the hon. gentleman. His contention is not theirs. The hon. gentleman confounds nation with state. Professor Freeman and Professor Müller do not do so. They could not say what the hon. gentleman says without being contradicted by the condition of things existing in almost every country in Europe. The Gypsies are a nation; the Jews are a nation; the Poles are a nation, but neither Gypsies, Jews nor Poles are a state. The United Kingdom is composed of English, Irish, Scotch and Welsh; there is one state, but there are four nationalities. England has an immense predominance in wealth, numbers in literary and legal force over Wales; the Union has existed for eight hundred years, and there is no probability of Wales being absorbed as a part of the English nation and losing its national identity, Welshmen are still Welshmen and not Englishmen; they are still two nationalities in one state, not less united politically because they are still two nations. The political bonds between Ireland and England are exactly or very nearly the same as those between Wales and England. Ireland perhaps is not so well united as Wales, but the line of cleavage is not between those who speak Erse and those who speak English. Mr. Parnell reckons a much larger number of English-speaking Irishmen among his followers than those who only speak Erse. The truth is that the line of cleavage is through the English-speaking population, and it is due to other causes than difference in language. The Crofter and the Cockney, though not able to understand each other, may nevertheless entirely agree in political sentiment. The hon. gentleman quotes this sentence from Max Müller:

"A common language is a common bond of intellectual brotherhood, far stronger than any supposed or real community of blood. Common blood without a common language leaves us perfect strangers. A common language, even without common blood, makes the whole world feel akin."

Now, I do not question that, as Professor Müller uses the expression; but I altogether dissent from the use the hon. gentleman has made of it. Professor Müller is considering man as a social being, not as a member of that highly official organisation known as a Federal State. Why, Sir, the English people and the people of the United States speak the same language. Are they politically united? Are they drawn together, or have they, for the past century, been drawn together in the way the hon. gentleman has spoken? Are England and the United States more inclined to unite politically than England and Wales, than England and the Highlands of Scotland? The hon. member cannot answer without destroying his argument. We in Ontario speak English, and so do the people of New York and the people of Virginia; but is the hon. gentleman more inclined to a union on the banks of the Potomac than on the banks of the Ottawa? If the hon. gentleman's argument has any value, the hon. gentleman himself would prefer a union with the United States to a union with the people of the Province of Quebec. Switzerland has, as several hon. gentlemen have stated during this debate, three nationalities—the German, the French, and the Italian, who are all loyal to the republic. Many centuries ago these different nationalities found their way through the glens and valleys of the Alps, and if race and language were the strongest considerations they would have formed parts of Italy, France and Germany. But for four centuries they have been a united country. The French population of Switzerland have not been less loyal to that government because they have on the western border a people speaking the same language; the Italian population of the south have not been less loyal to that country because they have on the southern border a people speaking the same language and of the same race. If you had to apply the hon. gentleman's doctrine to Switzerland, how long, I ask, would that union last? Suppose the German population were to insist that the union has no value because the people do not all speak the one language? I would like to know whether the French, sooner than be denationalised, would not seek a union with France and the Italian population a union with Italy? There can be no doubt whatever of what would be the result in this respect. The hon. gentleman read from Professor Freeman the statement:

"As in the teeth of community of language there may be what, for all political purposes, are separate nations, so without community of language there may be an artificial nationality, a nationality which may be good for all political purposes, and which may engender a common national policy."

That is precisely what we have here. Such, too, is the position of Austria, of Switzerland, and of the United Kingdom. The hon. gentleman will see that in the very quotation which he makes from Professor Freeman the fact is stated—and it would be impossible that he could say otherwise—that it is possible for people of different nationalities to combine together and to form one state. It is true that where there is but one language there is less friction than where there are several. It is true that there may be less danger of division and of certain forms of party strife where all the people are of one nationality than where they are of several. But that is not the question which is presented for our solution. The question

is not whether Sweden is in a better position politically than Switzerland, whether Italy is in a better position than Austria. We may all admit that a state whose people are all of one nationality has less difficulty in Government than where they are of different nationalities; but the question is, having different nationalities, whether it is a wise thing to undertake to enter upon a policy of changing their nationality and of remodelling many nationalities into one? Suppose Austria, which is composed of many nationalities, which has Poles, and Czechs, Hungarians, Bosnians, Tyrolese, Dalmatians and Germans—suppose Austria were to undertake to convert all these different nationalities into Germans, I would like to know how long the Austrian Empire would be likely to endure? In my opinion it would not last a year. There can be no doubt whatever that the result would be the very reverse of establishing a united population. Instead of having an empire federated together of different nationalities, you would have that empire broken into fragments and several independent states springing out of its remains. Governments are dear to men in proportion as they preserve to them what they most dearly prize, and a man must be so environed that he must feel that he has laid his nationality aside before it case become to him a matter of indifference. There have been periods in the history of Europe when other grounds of union were sought than those of nationality, when religion was made the basis of political unity and when every man, who in faith, differed from the established religion, was held to be an alien and treated as such, and was denied the ordinary rights of a subject or a citizen. Now, that is true in Mahomedan countries to-day. James I and Charles I regarded unity of religion as necessary to the existence of a state, just as the hon. member for North Simcoe regards language, and they tried to mould the people of England into their way of thinking. They were resolved to treat those who dissented from the state religion as aliens and foreigners having no claims to the rights and privileges of subjects. Did this policy crush out dissent? Did it secure that unity of opinion deemed essential to the unity of the State? Not at all. The result was that the prisons and the fleets were filled with some of the most exemplary, industrious and intelligent portion of the population; hundreds were driven to Holland and thousands to the wilds of North America. The Kingdoms was rent by civil war, the king was executed, and a new order of things established. There are claims on men stronger than the claims of the state. There are rights which the state has no right to invade, and which, if it attempts to invade, it is a man's right to defend. It is not often that a man comes to the point in his relation to the State where the roads part, but when he does, if he is a man of high character, he takes a counsel of conscience and his self-respect and obeys his Maker rather than the law which would degrade him. In the hours of trial he finds a higher law written upon his heart, obedience to which makes him the more a man, and the cause of justice and freedom are promoted by his triumphs if he succeeds, by his misfortunes, if he fails. What the hon. gentleman proposes to-day to do away with here is permitted elsewhere. What the hon. gentleman thinks is a bad thing here, English ministers and statesmen of all parties have for many of years taught was

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

necessary elsewhere. I need but refer to a few instances. At the Cape Colony there are two races: the Dutch and the English. Both languages are used in the legislature as both are used here. In the courts, the law provides that the superior court judges may permit the use of both languages and that the judges and magistrates of inferior courts must, that the barristers and attorneys have the right to use both languages; and it also provides that if one-third of the electors in any judicial district ask for the conduct of the judicial business of the district in both languages, their request must be granted. Then, if you look at the Island of Mauritius, that island was without a representative government of any sort until 1885. The Governor then was authorised by letters patent to provide for the election of a council. The voters' list was prepared and the Governor, in sending home to the Colonial Secretary a copy of that list, tells him that 3,300 on the list are Roman Catholics, 450 Protestants, 295 Hindoos and Mahometans, and 15 Chinamen. The Colonial at Secretary that time, our present Governor General, when he received that report from Governor Hennessey, wrote him a despatch which contains this paragraph. He asks:

“Whether the notices regarding the registration of voters were published in any language besides English and French? If not I should fear that many of the Indian population, who are entitled to be registered, may have been altogether unacquainted with their privileges.”

Showing that the Colonial Office not only encouraged publication in English and French, but also suggested the propriety of publishing in all the languages spoken by those who would be entitled to vote, and the Governor replying to that in a despatch written some two or three months later, said that the notices with regard to the voters' lists had been published not only in English and French, but in Tamul-Urdu and Chinese. So that the House will see that no party in the United Kingdom takes the view of the hon. member for Simcoe. Public men have long ago recognised that differences of language are not incompatible with the Union of the State and that any attempt to fuse different races by such heroic measures as the hon. member for Simcoe advocates would have the very opposites effect. The rule of convenience is the rule which governs. It is held that every man who is a British subject, and entitled to be a voter is entitled to know in the only language he understands what his rights are. That is a question of convenience and it is treated in every instance as a question of convenience. The English language is not regarded as the mark of a British subject *par excellence*. A foreign tongue is not regarded as a mark of inferiority, but as an instrument of communication which the Government have a right to use when they can best promote their relations with the people by using that language, whether it be Dutch, German or French, or any other tongue. The hon. gentleman always forgets how very slowly a language dies. If you have a large settlement where marriages may take place, where public worship may be carried on, a century may go by without absorption taking place. A few years ago, I visited a German settlement north of the city of Philadelphia, a German settlement which had been established over a hundred years ago. Those people have learned English in the schools, they talk English, you do not distinguish

them from the rest of the population, but in their own intercourse they still speak German. A fragment from that settlement came into the county of Waterloo, I think more than sixty years ago, and I believe they still speak German. It is therefore a mistake to suppose that a language dies readily because it is not officially used. The fact is that the official use of a language makes very little impression upon its vitality. The interference of the state in the direction of repression and discouragement will make no difference. If you have a poor population coming amongst you, and they are compelled to go into families where they have to speak English, in time they may abandon their own language and speak yours, but it is a very different thing when you have a colony of a number of people speaking their own language in that place. The 19th article of the constitution of the Austrian Empire provides that :

“All tribes in the state have equal rights, and each has an inviolable right to maintain its nationality and language.”

It is clear from that that the Austrian Empire is not organised politically on the unitary principle advocated by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and the hon. membr for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Even in the despotic government of Russia, there is no attempt to denationalise the various populations in the great majority of instances, except for political offences. The people of Finland, who were for 500 years under the government of Sweden, where Swedish was the official language, when that became a Russian province after the Treaty of Tilsit, not more than one in ten spoke Swedish, have not been interfered with in the use of the Finnish language by the Government of Russia. Justice is administered and the government is carried on in that language. There is no attempt to impose the Russian language upon that people. The education of the people and the schools and all their affairs are carried on in their own language. The Russian Government has fostered the national tendencies, and Finland is loyal to Russia, because Russia has encouraged her to be Finnish, and has not insisted upon her becoming Russian. She has been weaned from any desire to reunite with Sweden, by giving full play to her national instincts and her national aspirations. In regard to this a modern Russian author, Tikhomirov, says :

“It is difficult to picture two social types so unlike as Russia and Finland. Finland is an honest hardworking citizen, whose life is lucrative, based on reason, but always monotonous and sometimes sad. Russia is a reckless student, sometimes drunk, sometimes starving, capable of every folly, but capable also of sublime things, and always more concerned with great problems of humanity, than with paying his landlady. These two characters so wide asunder harmonise the better the less Russians and Finlanders meddle with one another's affairs; this is in fact the *modus vivendi* of the two peoples. We may lay it down that as long as Russia does not prevent Finland from living according to her own taste, that country will remain her faithful ally. In the Crimean war Finland fought bravely for Russia; in the last war against Turkey the Finlanders fought valiantly for Russia upon the far off plains of Bulgaria.”

The satisfactory result that this Russian writer represents as having been accomplished in Finland by which its loyalty has been secured to the Russian Government, has been attained by means the very opposite to those which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) proposes to apply to the French population in Can-

ada, for I have not been discussing so much the particular provision of the hon. gentleman's Bill, as the matter of his speech and the preamble to his Bill. There is one instance in modern Europe where the views of the hon. gentleman have been applied; I refer to the case of the United Netherlands between 1816 and 1830. It is well known that, after the fall of Napoleon and his exile to Elba, the members of the Congress of Vienna came to the conclusion that it was desirable to establish a somewhat strong state on the north-eastern borders of France, and they consequently made a provision to unite Belgium and Holland. At that time Holland had a population of 2,280,000, and Belgium a population of 3,380,000. They were given equal representation, and provision was made for a government in most respects was satisfactory to the population of each country. When Napoleon escaped from Elba, it was thought desirable in the emergency to confer special powers upon the king, but he continued to exercise those powers for many years after the emergency had passed. During the period in which he exercised that power, the king forbade the use of the French language. Half the population knew nothing else. The king insisted that justice should be administered in all the courts in Dutch, and the result was that all the judges in the Belgian section were compelled to resign, and nearly all the lawyers had to abandon their profession. The king also provided that no one should be licensed to teach in a public school unless he could speak Dutch, and consequently half the teachers in his kingdom had to resign. Private schools were then established in the Belgian section of the kingdom, and then the king issued a new decree forbidding private schools to be established without the king's license and so they were shut up. Then the king thought it necessary not only that the people should speak one language in order to have united government, but that they should have only one faith, and so German and Protestant professors were appointed in Roman Catholic colleges which had been established for the education of Roman Catholic students. The King of the Netherlands had, at all events, the courage of his convictions. He did not try to enforce these provisions in a far off corner of the country where there were few Belgians, but he made these regulations in a country where there were 400 Belgians to the square mile. The result was to establish two geographical parties. One-half of his kingdom was arrayed against the other half; and in one-half 60,000 men were soon under arms fighting for the rights which the king had disregarded. The result was that two states were established where there was one before. The English Government which was at first anxious for this union, exhibited an equal anxiety for its abolition, because if Belgium had not received the active support of England, it would assuredly have become a Province of France. The condition of affairs which existed there is well shown in the life of Lord Palmerston by Sir Henry Bulwer, who was the British Minister at the time. He says :

“The language of society, language of the bar, the language of the great portion of the people of all ranks, was French; but this did not signify. It was in vain that a lawyer had consumed the best years of his life in the study of his profession. He was to teach himself a new tongue, or the capital of his labors was to be wrested from him. Some quitted the bar, others, induced by long habit, still continued at it, but prepared themselves to see the honors,

the applause and the practice they had been accustomed to receive, transferred to others who had been so fortunate as to be born on the north side of the Mordyke. The loss of these persons was not merely that of an honorable livelihood; it is necessary to penetrate our own minds with a sense of those high feelings of pride and ambition which animate men who have reached the head of their profession, in order to appreciate the extent of that injustice, which this foolish and tyrannical ordinance inflicted."

Now, the hon. gentleman proposes a half century later to try the same experiment in a British colony. I do not believe, if his experiment could be carried out, that it would be a whit more successful than the experiment of the Dutch King in the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. I may say that the revocation of 1848 made a great change in the treatment of nationalities. They then came to the front. States were based on dynastic and class interests and paid no regard to race in fixing territorial boundaries. But since 1848, no attempt has been made to mould different races into one except in Austria, and she fell into line after disasters of Sadowa. About thirteen years ago this clause of the Bill which the hon. gentleman proposes to repeal, was introduced for the first time. The opinion I then expressed, I think, is an opinion that ought to have some force to-day. Of course, it is only a question of time with regard to the matter, because it is one about which the people of the North-West Territories must legislate when they become a Province. The present assembly of the North-West is not a constituent assembly, it is simply a legislative assembly. It has no power to alter the constitution under which it carries on the limited amount of legislation that it may at present accomplish. But I could not help observing that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), instead of referring to the members from that territory in this House to ascertain the opinion of the country upon this subject, refers to the opinion of a Legislative Assembly in the North-West Territories who have no power to deal with the question at all. Now I think that in many of these things the people must be assumed to be qualified to exercise the powers of self-government. They may go astray. I do not always approve what has been done in this House. I do not often agree with the policy of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, but I do not on that account deny the right of the people of this country to self-government. My own opinion is that if we regard this question as a matter of convenience, there ought to be no great difficulty in dealing with it. We are seeking to settle that country, we are seeking to secure immigration into that country. Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches occasionally issue pamphlets printed in Scandinavian, in German, in French, for circulation upon the continent of Europe to invite people to settle there. The hon. member for Muskoka and the hon. member for Simcoe vote an appropriation for the purpose of bearing the expense of printing, translating and publishing these pamphlets. I would like to know whether those hon. gentlemen say that you have a right to publish a pamphlet in Scandinavian and send it to the other side of the Atlantic for those people to read to induce them to come here, but that you have no right whatever to give them anything Scandinavian to read after they arrive in this country. Now, let me suppose that to-day there are 20,000 Norwegians coming out and forming a settlement in the

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

North-West Territories. You have provided municipal institutions there. They elect a council. If they do, they must select some of their own people, or they must go outside and invite somebody to come in and represent them. How are they going to carry on their business when they do not know a word of English? Are they going to meet and keep quiet, or are they going to speak privately to some one who understands English and have their words translated into English, and published when none of them understand a word of it? It is perfectly obvious that if you have a diffused population, if you have English and others mingled together, that the one readily absorbs the other. You may provide that there shall not be a continuous settlement of people of any nationality other than those who speak English, if you think that is the proper course to adopt. If there is a French population in the North-West diffused through the English speaking population, and they are in the minority, it is impossible but that they will learn to understand each other. If you have several thousand people from the Province of Quebec speaking French and knowing nothing else, forming distinct colonies or settlements, it would be a matter of convenience to translate your public documents, and for your public proceedings in that locality to be conducted in French, and I do not believe that you delay the general use of the English language by one hour by adopting that policy. I do not see how you can, for it is the private and unofficial use that determines the general use of the language. Now, the hon. gentleman knows that he has not taken even the first step towards the unity of the population of the North-West from a linguistic point of view, by simply providing for the official use of the English. The hon. gentleman, if he does anything, must go further, and he must prohibit the introduction of French books, and the circulation of French newspapers, the use in the schools public and private, he must prohibit the use in the pulpit, he must prohibit the use everywhere, of the French language, or his interference is an ineffective and an impertinent interference. If the hon. gentleman is not prepared for that, then he had better leave the laws of society—those forces of which I have spoken—which, after all govern these things, to operate freely in the way in which they operate most effectively. In my opinion, the question of the use of a language, or of more than one language, in a territory, depends entirely upon whether you have a mixed population or whether you have settlements separate and distinct from each other, and it seems to me that you have in the North-West Territories, no expression of opinion upon that question which would warrant legislation such as the hon. member for North Simcoe proposes. I think the question should be determined on the lines and according to the principles which I have mentioned. Now, Sir, I may say this: The hon. gentleman has delivered several speeches on this subject outside the House, and one in it. It seems to me that his labors have produced conflict of race, and I may go further and say, conflict of religion as well. It is possible that a section of the population sympathises with the hon. gentleman in the object with which he has set out; it is possible to break up the union, to repel immigration, to delay settlement. It is possible to make here geographical parties and so prevent the people of this country from acting in political union;

but, unless the hon. gentleman goes so far as to regulate the domestic use, the use in business, the use on the public platform, the use in the pulpit, the use in the press of the language, it seems to me that he has not taken the first step to carry out that policy which he marked out in his speech and in the preamble to the Bill he submitted to this House; unless he is prepared to undertake this formidable responsibility and carries it to a victorious conclusion, he will not have hastened the general use of English by a single hour. The hon. member and they who support him have made their new departure for the more perfect union of our people, filled with envy, hatred and bitterness towards two-fifths of the population.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is twelve o'clock, and the hon. gentleman for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has just risen to speak. I am quite sure he will make a speech of considerable length, and it will most likely be replied to, and as there is not the slightest chance of our having a division to-night, I will agree at once to the suggestion that the debate be adjourned. I will also suggest that it be made the first Order of the day for to-morrow.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the hon. gentleman had better name Monday, because there are a great many members to speak yet.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That the debate be made the first Order of the day for to-morrow.

I will simply say, in reply to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that if a great many members are going to speak we shall require Friday and Monday, too.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 14th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have had an informal communication across the floor with the hon. leader of the Opposition, and we find that a great many members on both sides of the House want to leave town to-night. With the consent of the House, the debate which is set down as the first Order of the Day, will be proceeded with, but there will be no division taken to-night, and at ten o'clock, if the House will permit, we will go into Supply.

Mr. LAURIER. It is understood that there will be no vote to-night, and that the debate will not be concluded, but will be resumed on Monday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Don Improvement, Toronto.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 82) to confirm an agreement between the Montreal and Western Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

PRIVILEGE—THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As arranged yesterday, I will now place in your hands, Mr. Speaker, a motion which was not formally introduced then. I may mention that I have received a package of papers from the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), which he has requested me to include, and therefore I add to my motion: "together with certain other letters furnished by the hon. member for Lincoln and appended hereto." My motion is:

"That whereas certain letters and documents reading as follows:—

"WINNIPEG, 15th December, 1881.

"DEAR MR. RYKERT,—Would like to see you very soon about something I have discovered in the West, and want you to tell me what I am to do to get hold of same. When will you go to Ottawa? I think I see something good.

"Yours truly,
"J. ADAMS."

"St. CATHARINES, 22nd December, 1881.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I duly received your letter of the fifteenth, and have to say in reply that I cannot tell you what time I will go to Ottawa. If I can be of any aid to you, I shall be pleased. Hope you are doing well. Has the boom yet subsided? I hear St. Catharines men are a little mad in speculation.

"Yours truly,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"St. CATHARINES, 11th January, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I know nothing about the prospects of getting limits, nor do I know what are the rules of the Department about applying. If you send me particulars of what you want, I will see the Department, or send to my agents at Ottawa and enquire.

"Yours truly,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"WINNIPEG, 18th January, 1882.

"DEAR MR. RYKERT,—I think I have got a good thing up here, and am told by a lumber agent that if I only apply to the Government I can get hold of it. Now, I do not know how to apply and want you to help me, as I know you can if you like. Perhaps you can better yourself by helping me, as I will pay you well for all you do for me. Can I get up a company up here for limits? I can get good men to help me. I have made a good deal of money here and hope to make more.

"Yours truly,
"JOHN ADAMS."

"25th January, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I am delighted to hear you are making money. Nothing would please me better than to see you here again with a fortune. As regards the matter you spoke about, I shall be pleased to assist you and the company in any way I can, and of course I would be glad to better myself in any way which is fair and honorable. It seems to me you ought to organise the company

with good men, as you suggest, and then apply to the Government. I expect to be in Ottawa in two weeks, when I can perhaps do you service. Keep me posted as to what you want.

"Yours truly,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"10th February, 1882.

"DEAR ADAMS.—I cannot make out from the memo. sent me where the timber limit is or the boundaries of the same. I have made enquiries in the Department, and they tell me it is necessary to state as nearly as possible the boundaries in the application within which you wish to select fifty square miles (you cannot have any more), but they will not permit you to wander all over the country. I think they will let you select a limit out of a defined area of 400 square miles. I am afraid you are going into a very uncertain speculation, and better make more enquiries.

"Yours truly,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"OTTAWA, 19th February, 1882.

"DEAR ADAMS.—After talking over the matter with you yesterday I put in your application, but I am afraid you will have to be more definite in your description. They tell me in the office there is no timber within the area fixed by you. I will try to have application allowed as soon as possible.

"Yours truly,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"20th March, 1882.

"DEAR ADAMS.—Your application has been granted, but the Minister tells me that he thinks it will be worthless to you, as the limit is a great many hundred miles from any railway, and there is not likely to be any for years. They tell me you will have to take the timber 1,300 miles by water to Winnipeg and there compete with lumber from the disputed territory. This is your own business, and you must be contented with the right to select within an area of 400 square miles. The Government won't let you play Cook & Sutherland upon it.

"Yours truly,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"25th March, 1882.

"DEAR MR. RYKERT.—Why can you not get a bigger piece to select from, as I do not know anything about the country? It will cost a large amount for the survey. Don't you think you can take a share in it or get up a company in St. Catharines? I will be liberal to them.

"Yours truly,
"JOHN ADAMS."

"27th March, 1882.

"DEAR ADAMS.—I cannot see any use in telling you a dozen times about the extent of territory that you can select from. You have now more than is usually granted. I am getting full instructions ready for the surveyor, and you can send him just as soon as I get the order. I would not invest any money in any such speculation, nor can I advise any of my friends to put money in a place of which I know nothing.

"Yours truly,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"THE AGREEMENT.

"Memorandum of agreement made this third day of April, A.D. 1882:

"Between
"John Adams, of the City of Winnipeg,
"Of the first part,
"And
"Nannie Maria Rykert, of the City of St. Catharines,
"Of the second part.

"Whereas the above named John Adams has, through the intervention of John Charles Rykert, obtained certain limits in the North-West Territories, at or near the Cypress Hills, and has, in consideration of the services of the said Rykert, voluntarily given him, agreed, to and with the said party hereto of the second part, to give to her one-half of the proceeds of the said limits, after deducting all expenses connected therewith;

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

"Witnesseth that the said party of the first part, in consideration of the sum of one dollar to him in hand, paid by the party of the second part, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, and in further consideration of the premises, hath agreed, and by these presents doth agree, to assign and transfer to the said party of the second part one-half interest in the limits applied for and to be granted by the Government at or near the Cypress Hills, in the North-West Territory, and to pay over and account to her for one-half of all the net proceeds of the sale of all timber thereon, or for the purchase money derived therefrom, after deducting all expenses and charges in connection therewith.

"Witness the hands and seals of the parties hereto the day and year above written.

"(Signed) JOHN ADAMS.

"(Witness) J. C. RYKERT."

"IF HE COULD ONLY SEE M'CARTHY.

"8th April, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS.—I was engaged nearly all yesterday running back and forward to the Department in connection with the limit. The clerks were driven to death with some colonisation matter, and could not complete the matter. I have an appointment for Monday at 11 o'clock, when I hope to get the copy of the notes and full instructions for the surveyor. I see that the application of Laidlaw was put in on January 12, '82, before yours? you will see. I got hold of the paper and examined for myself, so that there is no humbugging. They sent a surveyor named Lynch out there to examine the whole country. I hope you will be able to select a good lot from the large country you have to choose from. We have twenty miles by twenty, which is equal to 400 square miles. You had better not let a moment slip, but have all ready, as I expect to give full instructions by Tuesday at the latest. If I could only see McCarthy we would have no difficulty at all. I hope to see him early in the week. Let me hear about the coal in the Souris district, also enquire about the timber limit in the East.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"8th April, 1882.

"DEAR MR. RYKERT.—What keeps the instructions back? Can't you hurry them up? I am sorry you did not get 800 square miles to pick from. I think the delay will make it very costly to get the survey made. I think I can get up a company in Winnipeg to pay \$40,000 or \$50,000. Then you can apply for another for me.

"Yours truly,
"JOHN ADAMS."

"10th April, 1882.

(Re Limit.)

"MY DEAR ADAMS.—After calling at the office eight or ten times I got the enclosed copy of Order in Council. It will be pushed through very likely to-morrow if the Government is not too lazy. You will see they give us 400 square miles to choose from. If this is not satisfactory I do not know what is. Get your surveyor ready, and I will have his instructions in a few days. They give us six months.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT.

"If you can get \$40,000 let it go, and we will get another. Try McCarthy. Perhaps he will buy."

"11th April, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS.—I, to-day, saw McCarthy, and he was terribly surprised to hear that I had got the limit, as he was refused point-blank. He is willing to join with us in the survey, and I go to Hamilton to get Laidlaw to say where he wants the limit. He has written me he will do almost anything if I will assist him in getting his. I will write you from home on Thursday. The Order in Council went before the Government to-day, and it is likely it will pass at once. Instructions will then be given to the surveyor. We are awfully lucky, as the Deputy told me that no other man could have forced them to yield.

"J. C. RYKERT."

"16th April, 1882.

"DEAR MR. RYKERT.—What is keeping back the order for the surveyor? I am getting very uneasy. Just as soon as this is settled, I can get up a company for \$30,000 or

\$40,000, or put in the whole for \$70,000 cash. If I succeed I want to go for something else which I have on hand.

"Yours truly,
"JOHN ADAMS."

"St. CATHARINES, 16th April, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—You will see by the enclosed letter that my letter to Gardiner was taken out of the post office by the wrong man. I am expecting the instructions by to-day's mail. What keeps them, I cannot tell. The order was passed several days ago. Laidlaw is to meet me in Hamilton to-morrow. He has not yet got his order, and is now of the opinion that I have more INFLUENCE THAN MCCARTHY, who told me he was refused by the Government. I hope you have really made a good strike, after all the trouble and annoyance. I expect to write you on my return to Ottawa.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT.

"Have you engaged any surveyor?"

"21st April, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—Until I returned here to-day, I thought instructions had been sent to you, as they were promised some days ago. The Order in Council has been finally passed, and this although every effort was made to induce the Government to alter their minds. It now only remains to have the survey, and of this you will have to be the best judge. Laidlaw expects to get his, now that you have succeeded; and yesterday offered to pay one-half of the expenses, and will see you as early as possible as to this. He was very anxious to know how much I was to get, and I told him that it was very little, if anything. He says the limit is a splendid one, and thinks that his is worth \$50,000 at the lowest. He thinks you and he can join together and put into a company. McCarthy wrote me that your limit is not worth a cent. This is poor encouragement; but Laidlaw, who has had the Cypress Hills explored, says they are good. Will write fully to-morrow.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"24th April, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I have daily gone to the office for instructions and copy of Order in Council. I now enclose order, which you will see gives you the right over 400 miles. This is the largest privilege ever given to select from, and none has ever passed in the same speedy manner. I enclose memorandum of one of the clerks, showing he will prepare instructions in a day or two. I will keep at him daily. Get ready to leave at once. Laidlaw offered to bet me \$1,000 I could not get the order passed for you, as he had been refused in January and again in February. You ought to get up company, if possible, and sell half for, say, \$35,000, or the whole for \$70,000. If this is done, I will go for something else.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"10th May, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—Laidlaw only got his order passed this week, and he had to get me to help him; so you see who had the influence with the Government after all. You must tell the surveyor to examine the whole limit, and after picking out the best for us let him pick out another, so that I can put in another application if there is enough timber. He might also examine the limit south and see what there is there. If he can pick out two he ought to get the true description of it. I think the best way is to go by Fort Benton. Let me hear from you.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"2nd July, 1882.

"Received telegraph that C. P. R. cutting timber in the limit.

Answer.

"To JOHN ADAMS.
"Notify manager of company not to trespass on your land.

"J. C. RYKERT."

"2nd July, 1882.

"DEAR MR. RYKERT,—I sent you word to-day that the C. P. R. was cutting my timber, and after getting answer,

21

notified the company. They have cut a good deal of the timber, and I think they will have to pay for it. Muckle thinks I can get the C. P. R. to purchase at \$60,000 or \$70,000. I am trying to get them to bite at it, anyway. Can they not get the balance of the timber in the 400 miles? I will tell them to see you at Ottawa. I would like to work the limit if the C. P. R. will not buy. It will pay better than all the cash we can get.

"Yours truly,
"JOHN ADAMS."

"WINNIPEG, 18th July, 1882.

"DEAR MR. RYKERT,—Mercer is back from the limit, and he will write you fully to-day. It is a great limit, and I am now satisfied the limit is well worth \$150,000 to the C. P. R., and they must have the timber, as there is none nearer than Winnipeg, but they are a hard people to satisfy about the value, unless Muckle will tell them all about it. I will try to get him to feel the men in the office here. I will go to Ottawa as soon as you are ready.

"Yours truly,
"JOHN ADAMS."

"St. CATHARINES, 24th July, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I am in receipt of your favor, and am pleased to learn that the limit has panned out all right, as I was in great dread it would be a failure. I am in a certain sense glad that Laidlaw has failed, as he acted so infernal mean about it. I think if you can get \$80,000 you better sell immediately, or less than that. If as good as you say, the C. P. R. can give us at least \$60,000 and expenses. You better see them at once, and if they will bite at all tell them I will assist them in getting all the timber within the twenty square miles. It is important to realise the cash when we can look out for more. Have you stopped them from cutting? This is necessary. I see by the papers that the C. P. R. is cutting timber at the Cypress Hills. I do not think it will pay to work. The cash is very much better. I would not delay at all in seeing the company. Perhaps Muckle can urge them to buy.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"25th July, 1882.

"DEAR MR. RYKERT,—Surveyor preparing his report, and it will be sent to you immediately. Hope I can sell to the C. P. R. and get rid of the limit, as I would rather have the cash and then I could get up a company for another limit.

"Yours truly,
"JOHN ADAMS."

"St. CATHARINES, 1st August, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I duly received your letter to-day and hasten to reply to the same. It will be necessary, I think, that I should see the report before it goes in. You had better get the surveyor to send his report addressed to the Minister, under cover to me, and I will examine same before taking to Ottawa. It will also be necessary to send the instructions which I forwarded to you, so that I can see that they are fully complied with. It seems to me that he ought not to be paid in full until you ascertain that his report is all O.K. I hope he has done as directed. It may be necessary for me to correct them, and, therefore, I think they better be sent to me first under cover. If all right, I will send them on. I still am of the opinion that you better sell out bodily and get the cash, if they will pay you \$75,000 or \$80,000. We would then be in a position to go in for something larger, if possible. What are trees worth in the ground standing? What, also, are telegraph poles worth? That notice in the paper is pretty well got up. I guess I can see who wrote it or dictated it. Can you not get some railway man in whom you have confidence to go to Van Horne and tell him the railway company ought to purchase, and that the limit is well worth \$150,000. Some such a game as this might take well.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"There is no necessity for you coming to Ottawa at all. I can get it all done without you. All they do is to mail a lease, as usually done. No use in wasting money travelling."

Letter referred to in August 8th *Globe* :

"3rd August, 1882.

"DEAR RYKERT,—I am so anxious about this affair that I will leave for Ottawa next week, and will meet you in Toronto on my way. I have got a regular bonanza. Don't let them beat me out of it after all my hard work and expense in paying thousands for survey. I was talking to McCauley about getting up a company, but Peter has not much faith in it. I think I can sell for \$80,000 or \$90,000 cash, or I might get up a company at double that amount and take half as stock.

"Yours truly,
"JOHN ADAMS."

"St. CATHARINES, 8th August, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I duly received your letter yesterday. It is utterly useless for you to come here at an expense to get the matter closed up. Just as soon as I get the surveyor's report I will proceed to Ottawa and get the license as early as possible. It will likely take some time. I really hope you have the bonanza you expect you have. It will be satisfactory to know after my hard fight with the Government that I did get what you anticipated. I would not go through the same difficulty again for twice the amount. I never spent such six weeks before as I did while endeavoring to force the Department to do justice. The fact of their having refused McCarthy before had a great deal to do with the delay and refusal. Poor Laidlaw. I am pleased he did not get the start of this child. He thought he was very smart and had all the influence of the country at his back. I think another time they will recognise the fact that J. C. R. is not very easily defeated at anything. If you can get \$80,000 you had better sell, or if you can get up a company for say \$140,000, or even less, you reserving $\frac{1}{3}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$ of the stock, it might be better. This would enable you to have a considerable lot of money, and still have an interest in the result. It seems to me that while the matter is hot it would be well to do something in this way in Winnipeg. I shall wait very anxiously for the surveyor's report, so that I can get the matter satisfactorily closed up. The people here are delighted to know that you have got a good thing. What does McCarthy think of it now? He wrote me that there was nothing in it last winter.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"Tel. as to Field Notes referred to in Globe, Aug. 19:

"August 18, 1882.

"TO JOHN ADAMS.

"Field notes arrived. The oath of surveyor not sworn to. Get him to draw up and swear to another, which I will attach to report. Answer.

"(Sgd.) J. C. RYKERT."

"Laidlaw interfered with granting Order in Council.

"St. CATHARINES, 19th August, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I duly received the report of the surveyor last night, but unfortunately the oath was not signed by him, and I at once telegraphed you to get him to mail me another oath duly signed and sworn to before a commissioner or magistrate, with his signature. I can attach it to the report. I have been terribly disappointed at this mistake, as I intended leaving here to-day for Ottawa. This will delay me at least another week. I see by the report that there are 37 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles of timber instead of 50 miles. If this is all timber, as it appears to be, you will have a grand future. Would it not be well to make an effort to get up a company, putting in the land at \$150,000. We might take stock to the amount of one-third. How would it do to give Wolf, say, \$5,000 to get up a company, or whatever you can agree upon. I read Laidlaw's letter. He thinks you are mistaken as to the limit he applied for having no timber. Now that it is well known that you have a grand limit, I think there will be no difficulty in getting up a large company. I want Mrs. R.'s half to bring her in \$50,000 if possible. I hope you got telegraph and that you have sent me the oath. It is important that the magistrate or commissioner should sign his name as well as the surveyor.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"J. C. R. Tel. to Adams:

"Aug. 28, 1882.

"TO JOHN ADAMS,—Laidlaw trying to upset arrangement. Decision end of next week.

"(Sgd.) J. C. R."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

"St. CATHARINES, 14th September, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I wanted to see you this morning but you are always so impatient it is hard to keep you in one spot. On Saturday next I hope to have the Order passed in Council. Bowell has promised me he will do all he can to put it through. It may take all the week. I will be in Toronto to-morrow, and expect to leave by train for Kingston to-morrow night. Saturday morning I will telegraph you where and when to meet me. I want to see you. I feel quite confident we are all right.

"Yours,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"St. CATHARINES, 6th October, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I am waiting very patiently, expecting every day to hear from you in reference to the limit. I hope you will soon be able to organise a company at the figure we mentioned, viz. \$250,000. If, however, you can get \$200,000 in cash I would be inclined to let it go, and then go in for something still better. I hope we can realize a hundred thousand each. We deserve something for the trouble we have gone to and the amount of flesh we have lost, thinking over it. It is really a wonder that I succeeded for you at all, when we consider all the opposition we had. I will leave here on receipt of telegram, if you think I can do any good. I have written Calvin Brown, of Minneapolis, to try and get up a company. He is a pretty good hand for that. Would it not be well to enquire at some of the Yankee cities, what you can get a portable saw-mill and machinery for? It might be important to have it ready to take over the C.P.R. this fall when they have built another 100 miles, as I suppose they will do this fall. It is likely they will be within fifty miles of the limit before the winter. Telegraph me if anything likely to come out of it.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"St. CATHARINES, 28th November, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—It is clearly understood that Hunter was to have all over \$175,000. If he is not satisfied we cannot help that—a bargain is a bargain. I thought Mercer would reach the place by Friday last as he can go all the way to Swift Current by cars. I hope I shall hear from you this week by telegraph, and that they have closed up the matter. I cannot do any business, as I am so much annoyed about this and so anxious. I cannot be away from here on the 11th, 12th and 13th of December, as I have Court at that time.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"St. CATHARINES, 12th December, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I have been very much put out by this additional time given to the parties to purchase, and am fearful the delay will very much prejudice us in the event of their falling to carry out the agreement. I can get up a company which will run the whole affair, advance all the money we want for the working, and take one-third of the profits. This is as good as we could expect, as everybody want one-half to run it. I can get good men on whom we can rely. Did you agree to give thirty days from the time they accept to pay the money? If so, this will put us into January. I have lost all my fall Courts through this. I had two Courts this week, and being afraid that I might be required any day, I let all the business go, which will hurt my office very much. This will not be of much account, however, if we can close up this matter. Don't let them beat you down away. If any person has to come down, Hunter must, and not us. The securities ought to be so that they can be easily handled and not all in one lump, as we will have to give Hunter his. Don't take me up until you know I am required.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"St. CATHARINES, 25th December, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—What is the reason that some person writes the full particulars of our business to some parties here? Mercer or some member of the family has written all the facts to Seymour, and he is telling them all about the city. This is very injudicious, and contrary to what I asked you to do. It is of the utmost importance to keep the sale out of the papers, or we may be injured at Ottawa. Already they are threatening the Govern-

ment to bring the matter before the House, and, if they do it, will perhaps hurt us very much. If Sir John knows the facts, he may prevent the transfer being recognised. Now let me again urge you to see that this is kept quiet. Why does Mercer want to tell all the Seymour family? You might as well publish it in the *Globe* at once, as they tell all they know on the streets. Let me know as early as possible the day Sands will go up, so that I can be prepared.

"It is important also to pay the next year's rent on the 1st of January.

"Wishing you all a Merry Christmas.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"WINNIPEG, MAN., 16th January, 1883.

"Received from John Adams thirty-five thousand dollars in cash by drafts on the Bank of Montreal, and four notes of Louis Sands for thirty-nine thousand two hundred dollars, payable in one and two years. All payable to the order of Mrs. N. M. Rykert and in full of the moneys payable to her under agreement.

"J. C. RYKERT.
"Her Attorney."

"MANISTEE, MICH., 22nd January, 1883.

"Hon. J. C. RYKERT,
"St. Catharines, Ont.

"DEAR SIR,—I have been informed by parties from Cypress Hill region, and also by papers, that the Canadian Pacific R. R. Co. have, and are now cutting and hauling timber, ties, &c., from the Cypress Hill limit.

"Will you please make the necessary enquiries, and if true that they have been cutting, &c. please inform me how to proceed in order to arrive at settlement with them, for which information, &c., I will settle with you in due time. I have written the superintendent of said company at Winnipeg, but he may take no notice of it.

"Respectfully,
"LOUIS SANDS,
"Per MAGRAN."

"ST. CATHARINES, 27th January, 1883.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I could not until to-day ascertain why they delayed in sending me the renewed license. By to-day's *Globe* I see that the C.P.R. claim the limit is within the twenty-four-mile belt, and that they are entitled to the alternate sections. I see by the map that they are at least thirty miles away. I have not yet heard from the Government, but expect to hear to-night. It will be very important to get a surveyor to go there immediately and ascertain exactly where they run their line. You have the description of the limit or, if not, McArthur has it. Let the surveyor go at once and measure exactly from the centre of the railway to the limit. He can find the township corner and tell exactly. It will be a terrible thing if we are to lose half of the limit. Keep this perfectly quiet, or Sands will be scared to death. If the C.P.R. are entitled to the alternate sections, we must buy them out. Can't lose one minute in sending a surveyor. It will not take him but a few days to measure and show where the C.P.R. runs. Perhaps this map in our railway office will show this.

"I have not slept a minute for the last week, being anxious about the renewal. Surveyor ought to go there for \$8 or \$10 per day. It is very important for me to show them this at Ottawa as early as possible.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"ST. CATHARINES, 28th January.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I wrote you yesterday to get the distance between the limit and the railway surveyed or measured, in order that we might know whether or not the limit is within the railway belt; that is, within twenty-four miles from the railway. I have heard from Gouin, of Ottawa, that the C. P. R. have claimed it is, and that they are entitled to every alternate section, just as the *Globe* states. If this is so, we are in a bad fix, as Mr. Sands will claim that he has been defrauded, of course. You sold in good faith and relied upon the Government renewing the license. I have to go to Ottawa to-morrow night to fight the matter out, which I do not like. I mean to have all the hardest part of it to do. I have Bowell working for me. And if we succeed in beating the railway, we will have to pay the amount we agreed to pay, as you recollect, when we two were at the

Queen's Hotel. I have not slept any for a week on account of this. We must keep perfectly quiet. I telegraphed you to-day to go to the C. P. R. office and examine their map or plan of the line. That will show where they run. If they go, as their printed map shows, between 12 and 13 townships, then they are over 24 miles away, as we are in 7 and part of 8. If they run through the north part of township 12, we are still all right. I think the limit does not quite run up to the boundary; that is, the timber. I am engaging all I can to assist me at Ottawa, and we will have to pay them well for it, as we cannot afford to lose this. The limit is worth at least \$200,000, even if the C. P. R. get a piece of it. I will telegraph you from Ottawa; and, if necessary, you will have to send a surveyor to measure exactly where they run and the exact distance from the limit. Under any circumstances, I think they are 24 miles from the timber. It may be they may take a small strip. At any rate we must know at once. Don't send out till I telegraph from Ottawa.

"Yours, &c.,
"J. C. R."

"12th February, 1883.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I have not yet succeeded in doing anything, but I am pulling wires in every direction. John A.'s son from Winnipeg, McCawthra's partner, is here, and I intend employing him to go for his father. I think if you had young Tupper here, and paid him pretty well, he would help us materially. The C. P. R. has a great hold on the Government, and we must counteract this in some way. I am completely sick of it, as it is something I had no right to expect, and which I should not be called upon to undertake. If it costs all we spoke of, we better do it than let it go. I expect to be in Toronto on Friday morning, as I will likely leave here Thursday. Call at the Queen's on Friday, at nine o'clock, as it is likely I will arrive during the previous night.

"Very truly,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"OTTAWA, 5th March, 1883.

"DEAR ADAMS,—I have not yet succeeded in getting anything done in the limit matter. I have brought Macdonald and Tupper from Winnipeg, and hope they will be able to induce their fathers to act properly in the matter. I am almost discouraged at the delay. Sands is writing me daily about it. He knows all about it. Some persons sent him the papers containing the statements. Will make any effort this week, and must do something if we have to let a note apiece go.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

9th March, 1883.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I find difficulties surrounding us in every way in reference to the limit, and I find that the C.P. R. have certain Ministers working for them. I am afraid it will cost us each six or seven thousand dollars to get this made all right. I have five or six at work for me, and have agreed to pay them well if they succeed. Muckle was here and told me the limit was all within the belt.

"I am afraid they will do their very utmost to defeat me. I want to be satisfied that you are sure I am doing what is right, and also that you will back me out in all that I do in the way of payment. Of course if you do not want me to fight the thing through let me know, and I will drop it right away. Even if we lost the amount I have mentioned, we had better do so than lose all, as we surely will, if we let these rascals have their own way. I think they have Muckle here for that very purpose.

"Very truly,
"J. C. RYKERT."

"28th March, 1883.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—I am having a hard time with the limit matter. It will cost us each at least \$5,500 to get this through. I have laid my ropes, so that I expect to have it settled in a few days. I have a dozen at work for us. You must be prepared to pay the amount of your share at any time, as it will have to be all cash. When this is settled we must get rid of all the notes and have an end of it. It has completely used me up. The excitement and strain is too much for me. I had Tupper and Macdonald brought from Winnipeg, and they have been working hard for me.

"Faithfully,
"J. C. RYKERT."

" MONTREAL, 28th April, 1883.

" TO J. C. RYKERT:
" Van Horne will do nothing; is taking timber off whole limit. Determined to have it, right or wrong.

" D. BERGIN."

" MANISTEE, MICH., 4th May, 1883.

" HON. J. C. RYKERT, Ottawa, Can. :

" DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 30th ult. and 2nd inst. are both received, and contents carefully noted. I have telegraphed you to-day that I wanted the whole of the Cypress Hill limit and would write you. Consequently I will endeavor to explain my views and ideas in this matter. When I went to Winnipeg last winter, and paid out \$200,000 in cash and notes for the purchase of the Cypress Hill, and paid a large fee for legal advice, I little thought I would have to go through this siege of anxiety and trouble, not knowing the law and rules regulating those land limits in your country. I relied entirely upon the legal and friendly advice given me at Winnipeg, and, having paid all that the Cypress limit is worth, I feel somewhat as if your Government ought to protect me in this matter. Under the present circumstances, it looks to me as if I had paid my money, etc., to parties for land upon which they had no rights or titles, but, on the other hand, if they had a right and title to said limit, they certainly had right to the whole. Hence my claim for the whole of said limit. I have no fear of any fights with the C. P. R. Company and I do not think it would be to their advantage to injure themselves by injuring me. They certainly must be business men. But I propose to be candid and fair in this matter, and as I wish to have no litigation, I will entertain any of the two following propositions:—

" (1) If the amount of money and notes paid for said limit, viz., \$200,000, is returned to me, I will assign my claim and title to said Cypress limit to the Railroad Company or any one else.

" (2) If all my notes given—\$100,000—are cancelled and returned to me, I will be satisfied to take half, or even sections of the limit for the amount paid in cash. On any other conditions it would be impossible for me to get back the full price, viz.: \$200,000 as per contract. Had I known or expected any trouble in this land matter, I should not have ordered my mill machineries, engine, boilers and logging apparatus, all of which will be ready to ship to Manitoba in ten or twelve days, and will be of considerable loss to me if I am not allowed to operate as first anticipated. You write and telegraph that you wish that I should look up and measure some other limits in Moose Mountain or west in the Territory. You must remember that it will require at least a couple of months for a surveyor to look up and measure a part of the limits mentioned, and, besides, what security would I have to invest again a large amount of money in looking up any other limits, if the Railway Company have a right, or can at any time work their way into any limit which they fancy may be of some benefit to them. Hence I trust that you will continue to uphold and defend my rights and titles to the whole of the Cypress limit, and that you will soon be able to obtain for me the necessary license.

" Respectfully,
" LOUIS SANDS,
" Per MAGRAN."

" STADACONA HALL, OTTAWA, 6th June, 1883.

" MY DEAR RYKERT,—I have yours of the 5th inst. Tupper said he would see George Stephen about your matter. Stephen writes me to-day that he has seen Tupper, but does not speak of your business. He (Stephen) is to be here on Saturday and will dine with me. I will then talk your affairs over with him, and afterwards write or telegraph you.

" Yours faithfully,
" (Signed) JOHN A. MACDONALD.

" J. C. RYKERT, Esq., M.P.,
St. Catharines, Ont."

" TORONTO, 2nd July, 1883.

" DEAR MERCER,—I waited over until this time (3 p.m.) in the hope of seeing you. I saw Sir John, and have, I think, made satisfactory arrangements for the license, which will satisfy Sands. The arrangement is to purchase the right of the C. P. R., and then take a patent direct to Sands for his half and license for the other. Ultimately Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

you will get patent for the whole. Negotiations are going on with Stephen and Sir John, and they expect to close them in a few days. You must manage to let me have the \$5,000 before you go, or, failing this, I will take note maturing January next, and pay your \$5,000. I prefer you negotiating the same yourself.

" I will leave here this afternoon at 3.55, and will expect to see you in St. Catharines to-morrow morning. It is likely I will have to go again to Ottawa Tuesday or Wednesday.

" I am quite pleased with the result of my work here. It has been a hard go. Not another soul could do what I have done in this, for the C. P. R. is powerful. Laidlaw and McCarthy are also doing their very best. Of course, I will not use any money unless I succeed here, that you can rely upon.

" Tell me when you will meet me.

" You must not fail to have ready the means or its equivalent.

" Faithfully,
" J. C. RYKERT."

" ST. CATHARINES, 5th July, 1883.

" By telegraph from Ottawa, Ont.

" TO J. C. RYKERT, M. P.—Stephen demurs to the price. I write from Rivière du Loup.

" JOHN A. MACDONALD."

" HOUSE OF COMMONS, 23rd Jan., 1884.

" DEAR MERCER,—I wrote you yesterday at the Hotel Baltimore as requested. I mentioned the fact that Sands had been to see me, and tried very hard to have the notes renewed. I told him they were in the hands of the bank, and he finally agreed to pay them, which he did five days before they were due.

" I fully satisfied him as to the whole matter, otherwise I am afraid he would have repudiated. So you will find that you have been paid the notes. This is really a grand thing for us. There is the devil to pay in the House about the whole affair, and it is really too bad that I am compelled to bear all the brunt of it.

" I hope you are enjoying yourself. Why not come on here and let me show Mrs. Mercer the Lions of Ottawa. I shall be in St. Catharines on Saturday, 2nd Feb.

" Faithfully,
" J. C. RYKERT."

" HOUSE OF COMMONS, 20th Feb., 1884.

" MY DEAR MERCER,—I have got the syndicate matter all satisfactorily arranged for the company. I have written Sands to-day. I knew I could fetch them to time.

" I wrote you to St. Catharines, as I did not get your address until to-day.

" Very truly,
" J. C. RYKERT."

" ST. CATHARINES, ONT., 19th Jan., 1885.

" MY DEAR MERCER,—I got word to-day that Sands would pay the notes at maturity. That is to-day. I have not heard from there to-day, but expect telegraph to-night. I am certain they will be paid. The bank discounted them of Mrs. R., but I have not yet enquired if they have heard anything.

" Very truly,
" J. C. RYKERT."

" SANDS' LETTERS.

" February 21st, '83.—I trust you will be able to protect my interest in the land transaction, for which services I will be happy to pay on demand.

" April 10th, '83.—Should any one interfere with my limit, I shall telegraph you to advise how to proceed.

" May 4th, '83.—I trust you will continue to uphold and defend my right and title to the whole limit at Cypress Hills, and that you will soon be able to obtain for me the necessary limit.

" June 5th, '83.—Hence I trust and am in hopes still that you will succeed in getting me a license for the whole limit, in which event I will have lost nothing. If, however, you fail to induce your Government to do this act of justice, you will undoubtedly get me a license for the even sections as soon as possible.

" September 23rd, '83.—Trusting you will look after my interest and not let any opportunity slip that may tend to increase my claim or strengthen our side of the case.

"February 18th, '84.—If, however, it is now a settled fact that I cannot get the whole limit purchased from Adams and the syndicate will allow me to locate a certain number of sections, not exceeding eight in all, and which they claim, as soon as the snow and weather will permit in the spring, I will have them looked up, and will pay their price, viz., \$3.00, allowing Government price, \$2.28.

" LOUIS SANDS' AFFIDAVIT.

"It may be as well to add to this interesting correspondence the affidavit made by Louis Sands, in February, 1887:—

"State of Michigan, }
County of Manistee. } [L.S.]

"Louis Sands, of the City of Manistee, lumberman, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

"That on or about the 16th day of December, 1882, he was induced by the representations of P. B. Hunter, a broker of Winnipeg, to pay ten thousand dollars for the refusal of the Cypress Hills timber limit at the price of two hundred thousand dollars, if the said limit should on examination turn out as represented and contain one hundred million feet of good lumber.

"He then procured the services of Henry S. Hudell, a land surveyor, who resided in the city of Manistee, and in whose integrity he had until that time the utmost confidence, and he sent the said Henry S. Hudell up to the North-West to locate the said limit and report thereon.

"The said Henry S. Hudell proceeded to the North-West for the purpose aforesaid, and reported that the limit was as represented, and contained one hundred million feet of good pine lumber; and that he has been informed and verily believes that the said Hudell was bribed to make such a report.

"That on the receipt of the said report, he, the said Louis Sands, proceeded to Winnipeg and completed the said purchase, and at the time of the completion of the said purchase there were present Messrs. Rykert, Adams and Hunter, and I then and there paid for the said limit ninety thousand dollars in cash and one hundred thousand dollars in notes payable in one and two years from the date thereof, with interest at eight per cent., besides the ten thousand dollars cash previously paid.

"Forty-nine thousand one hundred dollars of said notes were made to John Adams, and by him endorsed without recourse to N. M. Rykert and in her name discounted at the Bank of Montreal in Winnipeg, twenty thousand dollars were given to R. B. Hunter and by him discounted, and the balance, thirty thousand nine hundred dollars, were retained or disposed of by the said John Adams.

"Upon the completion of the said purchase, he purchased a saw mill, and at once transported it, with equipments, to the said limit, at a cost of forty thousand dollars; and upon the arrival of said mill he discovered, for the first time, that the said limit was not at all as represented; that instead of there being one hundred million feet of good lumber, there was not timber enough to make twenty million feet of lumber, and that the said timber was small stuff, and would cost more to manufacture than it can be sold for in that part of the country.

"After purchasing the said limit he found that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was entitled to every odd section of the said limit, which comprised one-half of the whole limit; he then was compelled to pay an additional sum of four thousand six hundred and eighty dollars to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company before he could do anything thereon.

"That the license for said timber limit was in the names of Joseph Benjamin McArthur, and John Charles Rykert, and by them assigned to him, the said Louis Sands, on the 21st day of December, 1884.

"(Sgd.) LOUIS SANDS.

"Sworn to and subscribed before
me at Manistee, Michigan, this
3rd day of February, A.D. 1887. }

"ADOLPHUS MAGRAN,

"Notary Public,

"Manistee County, Mich. "

" AGREEMENT.

"ADAMS vs. RYKERT.

"This case is settled. The defendants not admitting liability, but in consideration of the relations existing between the plaintiff's late husband and the defendant, J. C. Rykert, agree to pay the sum of which

sum is to be accepted in full satisfaction of all claims between the parties in their own capacities, or in the plaintiff's capacity, as administratrix of her late husband all letters and correspondence produced when given up to the parties writing the same, and no use is to be made of any copies of the same that may be retained.

"S. H. BLAKE,

"Of Counsel for Plaintiff,

"B. B. OSLER,

"Of Counsel for Defendant.

"J. ADAMS.

"8th May, 1889. "

"13th February, 1890.

"J. W. INGRAM, Esq.—Referring to the correspondence published in the *Globe* of Saturday last, I beg to say I am more surprised than yourself at its publication. The suit was settled agreeable to my clients, and one of the terms of the agreement was that the correspondence should be given up and no use made of the copies, and this, speaking for myself and to the best of my belief for my clients, has been faithfully adhered to. If the correspondence had been given publication by me or my clients, it would certainly be a gross breach of faith and a violation of the signed agreement entered into.

"(Signed) W. K. PATTEN.

were published in the *Globe* newspaper under date of 8th February instant, containing divers statements affecting certain members of this House, and it is expedient that the House should have an opportunity of examining the same, it be ordered, that the said letters above recited be printed in the Votes and Proceedings for the use of members, together with certain other letters furnished by the hon. member for Lincoln and included therein.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the notice will be inserted in the Orders of the Day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there can be no objection on the part of any hon. gentleman that the Clerk of the House will be directed to arrange these in due sequence and chronological order.

Mr. BOWELL. Might I ask, are there additional papers put in?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot say. I just received a package a few minutes ago from the hon. member for Lincoln, who is absent from the House on important business. As far as I can judge, from glancing over them, they are much the same as he read yesterday. Whatever they may be I think we ought to allow them to be appended.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have given instructions to get the Order in Council copied for the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to alter my motion by adding the words "included therein" instead of "appended thereto."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

LOBSTER FACTORIES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I am anxious to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a return to an Order of the House made on the 8th February last year, and which was only received a few days ago. I do not see any reason why this return has been delayed so long, for I believe I had the right, and the House had the right, and the whole country had the right, to know the answer given to the

Order of the House by this return long ago. I may say, however, that it looks as if any consideration, even the smallest, is good enough for Prince Edward Island. That, however, is not the greatest complaint I have to make.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact, that he is debating a matter not before the House. The hon. gentleman can ask for an explanation, but he must not go beyond that. He cannot delay the proceedings of the House by raising a debate on a matter not before it.

Mr. PERRY. I contend that the return does not contain the information sought for, and I wish to call the attention of the Minister to that fact. The notice of motion asked for the number of lobster-packing factories around the coast of Prince Edward Island, but the Minister does not give that; he merely gives the names and the number of those who were fined, and those who paid those fines and those who did not. I say the answer in the return is not complete. As there seems to be a desire in the House to not allow me to fully go into this matter, I will take another course, and I will see the reason why the return has not been given as asked for.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not think there is any occasion for the hon. gentleman to take any other course at all. There is no disinclination on the part of myself to withhold the information he now asks, for I have not looked lately at the motion with reference to the information that was desired, but my recollection of the matter, both in connection with the discussion and conversation with the hon. gentleman, was that his motion was confined entirely to the information I brought down. That is to say, the names of the persons fined, and those who had paid, and those who had not paid the fines. It is a very easy thing to give the hon. gentleman the information he now seeks, and a supplementary return, if necessary, will be brought down.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McCarthy for second reading of the Bill (No. 10) to further amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter fifty, respecting the North-West Territories; the motion of Mr. Davin in amendment thereto, and the motion of Mr. Beausoleil in amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker: I realise, Sir, that the question under discussion is one likely to provoke angry feelings and race prejudices, and I shall endeavor to make the remarks that I have to make to-day in a conciliatory spirit. I shall of course feel bound to state my convictions, but I shall endeavor to do so courteously, and without, at all events, giving needless offence. I shall not agree with many of my fellow members of the House—with the majority of them probably—but, I shall ask of them that toleration that I accord to them in the discussion of this matter. It is, Sir, a disquietening question, and necessarily so. It is to be regretted that it is disquieting, but it cannot be helped. We might purchase quiet by

Mr. PERRY.

the avoidance of the question entirely. We might purchase quiet by allowing matters to go on in the course they have been going without any protest or without any attempt on the part of those who believe that danger is ahead to avert that danger. I do not consider, Sir, that that course is necessary or advisable. We are certainly capable of discussing this question in this high court of the nation, in a spirit of fairness stating our convictions; and after having heard the arguments that are to be presented on both sides, the House will decide the question as the majority of its members deem proper.

The speakers who have addressed the House on this subject in the earlier part of this debate have, as a rule, taken the ground that a community of language in a country is not essential; many of them, indeed, I infer from their remarks, entertain the opinion that it is not even desirable. We have had the example of states in ancient times, cited here in a sense which would lead one to suppose that the speakers thought the example of those states worthy to be copied by us. We have had allusion made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to the fact that of the federal unions now existing in the world two of them do not possess community of language; and I think, Sir, if we regard the history, the present position and the progress of those three federal unions, we shall find a very striking argument in favor of the doctrine I have advanced, that a community of language is desirable; for certainly neither the federal union of the cantons of Switzerland, nor that of the Provinces of Canada, bears any comparison with the federal union of the United States in point of development, population and power. The hon. member for Assiniboia treated us the other night to an exceedingly witty speech; I do not know that I can say that the spirit of the speech was quite in keeping with the magnitude and importance of the question he had under discussion. In the course of his speech he said that if you wished to make the French language permanent, you had but to attempt to restrict it. I do not know that the experience of the world would bear that assertion out. I do not know that the French language has been made permanent in the United States. Louisiana soon after was admitted into the American Union, the French language was not sanctioned as an official language; and the result of that prohibition or restriction, if the hon. member prefers the latter term, has not been to make the language permanent, but, on the contrary, to thoroughly diffuse and assimilate with the American element the French population near the mouth of the Mississippi; and I do not believe that any fair or proper attempt to secure the dominance of the English tongue in this country will have the result of making the French language predominant or increasing its use in the country.

My hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) gave us a very nice essay on ancient history. He went back to the days of Queen Esther, and told us how King Ahasuerus sent his letters in 127 different languages to 127 different provinces. Well, Sir, if the hon. gentleman had gone a little further back, which he might very properly have done, to the time of the Tower of Babel, he would have found a time when one language was in use;

in the 11th chapter of the Book of Genesis, he would have read :

“And the Lord said, behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do; and nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do.”

“Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language that they may not understand one another's speech.”

Evidently the Almighty recognised the power of a community of language, and frustrated the attempts that were being made by the people of that day : he scattered them over the face of the earth, and brought in more than a dual language among the peoples of the world. The hon. member for North York tells us that Greece had a community of language, and yet that out of that community rival states with their animosities and bickerings arose, and there was no such thing as a national feeling in Greece. The great trouble with Greece was that it wanted commercial union, and the day of commercial union had not yet come. If the Greeks had adopted that policy, the bickerings and animosities which existed among those states speaking the same language would gradually have disappeared. In Rome, the hon. gentleman tells us, there were the Greek, the Latin, and numerous other tongues ; they had no community of language in that great empire. Necessarily they had not. The Roman Empire was composed of conquered states ; it had spread from the city on the Tiber, until it had covered nearly the whole of the known world ; but does the hon. gentleman propose to tell us that the debates of the Roman senate, the Roman code, or the Roman statutes, were reproduced in all the languages spoken in that great empire ? I think not. I think there was nothing in the Roman Empire corresponding to the condition of things we have in Canada to-day. Latin was used in the proceedings of the Senate and was I venture to assert, the official language of the Roman Empire. Then the hon. gentleman came down to the days of modern history, and he gave us a long list of the nations having more than one language. He tells us that Spain, Italy, Sweden, the Netherlands, Russia, Austria, Turkey—

Mr. MULOCK. No ; I said nothing of Turkey.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, we will drop Turkey. Does the hon. gentleman propose to hold those nations up for us to copy ? Shall we copy the institutions of Spain, Russia or Austria ?

Mr. MULOCK. And Great Britain.

Mr. CHARLTON. We will come to Great Britain in a moment. Does the hon gentleman tell us that all the languages used in those countries were the official languages of their diets and assemblies, and that the laws were published in all those languages ? I think not ; and if they were, we do not want a model from them. Then, I come to England, as the hon. gentleman proposes. He tells us that in Great Britain we have not only English, but the Gaelic, the Welsh, the Irish, and the French in the Channel Islands. Well, are the debates in the Chamber at Westminster conducted in Gaelic, Irish, Welsh and French ? Are the resolutions put from the Chair of the House of Commons in all those languages ? Are those official languages ? By no means. English is the official language. The hon. gentleman tells us that the decrees of the English Parliament are read, I think he said from a high hill on the Isle of Man in the Manx language.

Well, if he wishes us to adopt that plan, there could be no objection I imagine, and we should then have all the decrees of this House read from the highest peak in the North-West, in French, in Icelandic, in Cree, in all the hundred and twenty-seven languages, more or less, that are spoken in that territory ; we need not quarrel with the hon. gentleman in regard to that. The hon. gentleman tells us that there is no need of resorting to repression. Well, Sir, we do not propose to resort to repression ; he is begging the question ; we do not propose to interfere with any rights that exist in Canada by virtue of the provisions of the British North America Act—not one of them ; but we do not want to extend certain features of our institutions to virgin soil ; we do not want to extend the confusion that necessarily exists from the use of two languages. While we do not want to interfere with a single vested right, which exists in this Confederation, by virtue of the Confederation Act of 1867, we deny that these are vested rights in the North-West Territories, a territory which has been acquired since Confederation, and we are not bound to have implanted in that soil the condition of things which we do not propose to interfere with, but the existence of which we lament in the older portions of the Dominion.

We next heard from our friend whose riding is Rouville (Mr. Gigault), a gentleman to whom I always listen with the greatest pleasure, a gentleman who is a logical speaker, and who represents his views temperately and forcibly. He accused my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) with being governed by American rather than by British precedent and example. No doubt the hon. gentleman from Simcoe thought that American example might be as good to follow as the examples of some of the Continental States of Europe ; and I do not know but that we might in many cases, with profit to ourselves, have paid more attention than we have to American example. For instance, if we had taken pains to examine American precedents with regard to the Franchise law ; if we had seized ourselves of the fact that the American Constitutional Convention of 1787, after full consideration of the question, had decided to have no national franchise but State franchises, and that this decision was carried into effect and had been in operation for a hundred years with the greatest success and to the greatest satisfaction of the people, we might have avoided the legislative bungle which is now upon our Statute-book—the Dominion Franchise Act—and have satisfied the public more thoroughly than we have succeeded in doing. We might, if we had copied American example more closely, have taken the position earlier in the day on Provincial rights which has since been taken ; and I do not know that the fact of being influenced to any extent by American example should be cast as a slur upon any public man in this House in discussing any public question. The hon. gentleman then will perhaps pardon me if, in dealing with this question of community of language, I refer him to American example bearing directly upon this question—the example to which I referred incidentally a few moments ago of the treatment of the language question in the vast territory of Louisiana, which was acquired by the American Government in 1803. Here was an old French colony with a large French population, containing

no Anglo-Saxon element of any consequence. It was necessary for the Government of the United States to give to the French citizens of Louisiana institutions and laws, and they made it a fundamental principle to be carried into effect at the earliest practicable moment, that the English language should be used through the territory as an official language, that the Legislature of Louisiana in its records of proceedings should use that tongue, and that the laws of Louisiana should be published in that tongue. Upon that basis the State of Louisiana was organised as speedily as possible, and upon that basis the French citizens of Louisiana became American citizens; and in course of time they have become so thoroughly assimilated that they are to-day American citizens in every sense of the word. Many eminent men come from this French element in Louisiana, such as General Beauregard, Pierre Soule, and scores of others, who figure in American history and have acquired prominence in American politics and literature. Any one going through New Orleans, as I did a short time ago, will see that there is one quarter of the city called the French quarter and another the English quarter. The old quarter which was occupied by the French is still called the French quarter, but you hear the English language everywhere, and you cannot discover any marked indication that you are among a people of foreign descent, so thoroughly Americanised have they become. That has been done in Louisiana, and the condition of things which exists there to-day is more desirable, certainly, to the American people than if they had a Quebec planted at the mouth of the Mississippi, just as we have one planted at the mouth of the St. Lawrence. Suppose the French language were extended over that vast territory comprising Louisiana and that great land west of the Mississippi, now comprising ten states and two territories, would that be a desirable state of things? Was not the wisdom of the American people shown in deciding that the French language should not be an official language either in the State of Louisiana as it exists at present or in any part of that vast territory west of the Mississippi extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the British line? Was not wisdom shown in excluding the French as an official language from that vast territory? Beyond question it was; and American example in that respect is an example we would do wisely to follow in dealing with the same question here.

There are other instances besides the one I have alluded to in the history of America. There is the example of the treatment of the Spaniards in Florida when that country was acquired by the Americans. The use of the vernacular language of the people was denied to them as an official language; the laws were not published in that language; the proceedings of the courts were not held in that language, but it was imperative that English should be used; and the consequence was that the Spanish population of Florida became speedily thoroughly assimilated with the Saxon population of the rest of the United States. We have another example. The United States, as a result of the war with Mexico, became possessed of the territory of California, which had a considerable Spanish population. Again the United States denied to that population the use of the Spanish tongue, as an official one, and made English the official language of the Legislature and the Courts. As a consequence

Mr. CHARLTON.

these people have been swallowed up by that great assimilating maelstrom, and now, in a second generation, you can scarcely detect a trace of the Spanish nationality in the population of California. The Spanish element have become thoroughly assimilated with the American element, and thoroughly Americanised, and that has been accomplished by virtue of this rule, which the American Government invariably enforces when incorporating foreign elements into its body politic. We have another case—that of Texas. Texas was conquered and wrested from Mexico by a movement of adventurers from the South and South-West, and an independent nationality was erected there after a fierce struggle, characterised by such events as that of San Antonio, where the Alamo, defended by one hundred and ninety-two men, was captured by 7,000 Mexican troops after 1,600 of the assaulting force were killed, and not a soul left in the garrison. The bravery of the garrison is commemorated by the inscription on the monument in the square of San Antonio: "Thermopylae sent its messengers of defeat; the Alamo sent none." The courageous spirit of these defenders resulted in wresting Texas from the control of Mexico, and they made English the official language; and Texas is to-day one of the most prosperous and thoroughly American of all the American States, and you can scarcely find a trace of the existence of a foreign element in the population of that country.

Then my hon. friend instances the case of Cape Colony, and points to the fact that the Dutch language is an official language in that colony. Well, the circumstances of Cape Colony are quite similar to our own. The Dutch were the original settlers of the country. It was conquered by England, and it was wise probably to give to the Holland element of Cape Colony the use of their language. But Cape Colony is extending its bounds; English influence has crossed the Kahlari Desert to the north, and, following Livingston's pathway in his early explorations, has reached the Zambesi. England has taken possession of Lake Nyassa, a lake larger than Lake Erie, has shut out Portugal from that region, is pushing her possessions on further north to Lake Bangweola, and has already acquired a vast empire in South Africa, with immense possibilities and resources, an empire that may be the home of scores of millions of people in the future—a salubrious, fertile region containing hundreds of thousands of square miles. Does my hon. friend suppose the Dutch tongue will be extended to that region and become the official language in the new Provinces to be erected in that vast country, the basin of the Zambesi? I am sure such will not be the case.

Then the hon. gentleman alleged that my hon. friend from North Simcoe said in his speech that the French shall not read French literature. I do not understand the hon. gentleman to have said any such thing. I do not understand that he proposes to debar Frenchmen from the use of their literature or their tongue wherever they live. The Bill under the consideration of the House merely provides for the discontinuance of the French language as an official language in the North-West Territories. It says nothing about the right of the French people to read their language, or use it as they do to-day. It says nothing about the right of a Frenchman to use his language in this House, or throughout this Dom-

inion. Wherever his rights exist under the Constitutional Act, he can preserve and cherish his language; he may refuse to allow his children to learn any other language if he chooses to do so. The hon. gentleman objects, also, to the preamble of this Bill. I think last year, my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, in the debate on the Jesuits' Estates Bill, said that the preamble had very little to do with the Bill, that the character of the measure was best shown by the provisions of the Bill itself. However, I see nothing objectionable in this preamble, which reads as follows :—

“Whereas it is expedient in the interest of the national comity of the Dominion that there should be a community of language amongst the people of Canada, and that the enactment in the North-West Territories Act allowing the use of the French should be expunged therefrom: Therefore Her Majesty, &c.”

That simply asserts that, in the interests of this Dominion, it would be well if we could have a community of language. I believe that statement, and I will support the Bill upon that assertion. The Bill itself asserts that the French language should not be used in the North-West as an official language. I believe that, and I shall vote that it shall not be used there. Those who think otherwise can vote the other way. Each of us is entitled to his own opinion, and probably each may entertain their opinion honestly. Then, the hon. gentleman says that the French Canadians want only fair play and justice. I should be ashamed to take the position that I intended to deny fair play and justice to the French Canadians; on the contrary, they should have the fullest justice and the utmost limit of fair play; but this is an English colony, we live under British laws and institutions, and there is a vast country in the North-West where all the institutions are plastic and unformed, and, because there are a few hundred or a few thousand children of French traders and French half-breeds in that territory, it is not necessary for the future welfare of this country that the dual language should be preserved there as official, with all the evils which we believe would flow from it to the general interests of the country. The North-West is likely to become the seat of power in this Dominion; it is likely to have the great majority of the people of this Dominion; it is likely to become the most productive part of the Dominion, and therefore it is of the utmost importance, at this time, that this change should be made, when it can be done without any great trouble. When that country is young and in a formative state, we should put it on the right track. The North-West ought not to be saddled with such a provision as the use of two official languages. I believe, in the interests of this country, that it should not be, and I shall so vote. My sense of duty impels me to do so. Then the hon. gentleman says, that Parliament is the proper place in which to deal with this. I thoroughly agree with him in that. The North-West Territories, have not yet Provincial institutions. This clause 110 emanated from us. With this Parliament rests the exclusive jurisdiction up to this moment, and, if this Parliament has taken a step which is not in the interest of the country, or has done any wrong, let us undo that wrong and retrace the step. I shall vote to retrace the step and undo the wrong. The hon. gentleman will vote that this provision shall not be repealed. He has a perfect right to do so,

and so have all his fellow-countrymen, but I shall vote that it be repealed, because I think it is not in the interest of the country.

Then we come to our friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson), who tells us there were French in the North-West before there were English. So there were, and so there were in Ontario, and they had stations in Detroit before there were any English there at all, and they had other stations in Michigan, Illinois and Wisconsin, and yet the French language has not been retained in those places. The English have acquired rights there by possession or purchase, and I believe that we may follow their example in the case of the Canadian North-West.

I come next to the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. I am bound to say that I considered that speech last night a bitter one. The hon. gentleman possesses tact and diplomatic ability, but last night he did not succeed in concealing the bitterness of his feeling on this topic, a feeling amounting almost to a sense of hatred of those who were opposed to him. He paraded before the House—as, of course, he had a right to do so—his devotion to his Church and his loyalty to French Canadian institutions. He is undoubtedly loyal to them. Referring to the French settlers of the North-West, he asked “when have these men spoken treason?” I have not accused them of speaking treason but it is not long since they were in rebellion; and whether they were more in fault for that than my hon. friend and his colleagues, I am not now to say; but as to their loyalty to this country and its institutions, I doubt if they are entitled to any degree of consideration on that score. As to this question of loyalty and of the use of treasonable expressions, I must be permitted, I think, to refer to some of the circumstances which are indicative of the feeling amongst our French fellow-citizens, and I do this with a feeling of reluctance. I did not propose to do so; and, perhaps, it is not necessary to do so; but, I think, the Minister of Public Works challenged this reference by the allusion which he made in the course of his speech last night. In the city of Quebec, not many months ago, there was a great public demonstration on the occasion of the unveiling of a couple of statues, and speeches were then made by French Canadians of eminence, who may be supposed to give utterance to the feeling in French Canada, which, I think, possess a great deal of significance. I think there may be some here now who were present on that occasion. I have understood that the Tri-color was there displayed abundantly, and that the Union Jack was not so abundantly displayed; that the outward appearances would not impress any one with the idea that it was a British Province. I find that I have here a couple of extracts from the speech of the Premier of that Province, in the course of which he said:

“He was ready to declare that the Government of which he was the head was ready to disappear if that would be the means of uniting the French Canadian people for the triumph of their sacred cause. (Great applause.) For the sake of their nationality, for the sake of their religion, they must be united. Religion and nationality formed a harmonious union in their midst. The strength of the French Canadian people lay in the union of the people with the clergy.”

A little later on, the hon. gentleman used the following language :—

"By coupling the name of the Jesuit hero, Brébeuf, with the immortal Jacques Cartier, they said to their insulters: 'It is useless to imagine that we will ever cease to be French and Catholic. This monument declares that after a century of separation from our ancient mother, we are still French. (Applause.) More than that, we will remain French and Catholic.' (Great and long continued cheering.) He said this, not as a provocation, but as a reply. But once more he would say that to render this reply effective they must cease their fratricidal strife and be united. That was his word of advice to them on this great occasion. Let them cherish it and act accordingly, and all the actions of the fanatics of Ontario would come to naught. (Long continued applause.)"

An hon. member of this House, Colonel Amyot of the 9th Battalion, in response to the toast of the Militia, said, among other things:

"That they did not know the moment the French Canadian Militia would be called upon to guard their interest and their laws."

A statement that was received with great applause. Now, a little later on, we had a celebration at Montreal, and we had the ex-mayor of that city using the following language in a speech made by him:—

"French Canadians were the sons of these colonisers"—

He had been referring to the early colonial history of Canada, and the valor of the French Canadians in resisting the Iroquois and the English:

"French Canadians were the sons of these colonisers and fighters, and if they were not so good at firing guns as their forefathers, they would not be found wanting, if occasion required it, and the Iroquois and savages of to-day would be treated in a similar manner to those of former days."

Well, Sir, if I am to be compared to an Indian, I would rather be compared to a Iroquois than to a Digger Indian; but I think this language is not calculated to promote harmony and good feeling, and I think the language was not called for. There was nothing in the events connected with the agitation in the House last Session, and the agitation that followed that affair in the country, that called for any such manifestation of feeling in French Canada. A portion of the people of this country took the view that a law had been passed that ought to have been disallowed; they took the view that the prerogative of the Crown had been insulted and infringed upon; they took the view that sectarian grants had been made and that money devoted to a special purpose had been unconstitutionally diverted from that purpose and used for another. There was amply room for differences of opinion on this point; but it was not a subject that warranted the exhibition of the kind of feeling that is evinced by the extracts I read a moment ago.

Mr. GIROUARD. Will the hon. gentleman tell me the name of the paper from which he has been quoting?

Mr. CHARLTON. The name of the paper is the *Toronto Mail*. It is the only paper, so far as I am aware, throughout Ontario, that had a reporter there to report the proceedings, or from which we can obtain any information with regard to the matter whatever. Now, the hon. Minister of Public Works, in his speech last night, dwelling upon the matter of the loyalty of the French Canadians, reminded us that it was owing to that spirit of loyalty that French Canada did not embark in the revolution with the thirteen colonies and become a part of the American Confederation. Well, I have great doubts, Sir, whether it was loyalty to British institutions, or whether it was the fear

on the part of the French Catholic Church that union with these thirteen Puritan colonies would be detrimental to her interests as a church; and I have very serious doubts whether it was unmixed loyalty that actuated the people of that Province in the choice they made in regard to that matter.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Keep those doubts to yourself.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have my doubts, and I have a perfect liberty to express them here to-day, and I think it is susceptible of demonstration that the choice in relation to that matter arose from the fear, on the part of that church, that acting in consonance with the thirteen colonies, would not redound to her interests in Canada. Of course, this is an opinion, and I suppose I have the liberty of expressing my opinions here with regard to this matter if I do it temperately and courteously, and I trust I have not exceeded the limits of courtesy in the way in which I have made the statement. Then the hon. gentleman asks: Is your birth better than ours, is your blood better than ours? Well, Sir, who had claimed that our birth or our blood was better than that of our French Canadian fellow-citizens? It is not a question as to which is the leading race, as to which has the best lineage, as to which has the best blood. We do not say to our French Canadian friends that we are better in any respect than they are, but in the position we take we are actuated by a desire to serve the interests of this whole country, and that with five millions of people in this country, the true interests of each one are the true interests of all; and if in our opinion a special line of policy is likely to be more conducive to the interests of Canada than another, we have a perfect right to advocate that line of policy; and the hon. gentleman had no right to make the taunt that he did, and to strive to raise, as he did strive to raise, in his speech, feelings of animosity and bitterness. Then he went on to say that persecution and fanaticism would not stand. Well, that is true, at least I believe and hope it is true. I do not believe that persecution or fanaticism ever benefited a cause yet, and I hope that the time will come when evangelists can hold religious services in the city of Hull without interruption, and when the Salvation Army can parade the streets of Quebec with the same facility and ease that they can the streets of Ottawa. I hope that persecution and fanaticism in that respect will not stand in the Province of Quebec; and if the time should ever come when some French Luther wants to nail ninety-five theses, more or less, to the door of any church in Canada, attacking tithes, fabrique assessments, canon law, and medieval institutions of any kind—I hope the time will come when any person, whether a clergyman or otherwise, will be at liberty to nail his placard to the door of the church and maintain that position, with free speech, and every right that pertains to free speech in Canada. Now, Sir, with regard to toleration, all that we want in this Dominion, all that we ask in this Equal Rights movement, is equal rights in religion, the right to worship God, the right to proclaim our belief, the right to carry on the usages of our religion in any part of this Dominion without molestation. That is all we claim. We have no desire to abridge the rights possessed by any man in this Dominion,

Mr. CHARLTON.

whatever may be his faith, and we only protest when a desire to abridge our rights is manifested by some other man against us. We have taken a position, of course, against sectarian grants; we take a position against union between Church and State, and any undue favors shown by the State to one church at the expense of another. If this is not sound ground, then I am much mistaken; if the position that we have taken on this matter is not unassailable, then I am laboring under a grievous error. I suppose, Mr. Speaker,—although the charge is not made directly against me; it was against my hon. friend from North Simcoe, and is likely to be made against me—I suppose that I shall be accused of fanaticism. Well, Sir, there may be some ground for it. My maternal ancestors were some of them Covenanters and were subjected to bitter persecution by the bloody Claverhouse. I can remember, as a boy, my own father being mobbed in the State of New York, because he was an abolitionist. And I rather fancy that fanaticism is constitutional with me; it may be, I will not deny it. But if it is fanaticism to stand up for what I believe to be in the best interests of this Dominion, if it is fanaticism to attempt to stem the tide that sets very strongly against me in this matter, to venture to take a position which alienates friends and embitters the hostility of foes, then I am a fanatic. But I stand up to-day to assert my belief that the use of the French language in the North-West as a dual language is unnecessary, that the use of the French language as an official language in the North-West should be prohibited, that it may easily be done, that no shock or agitation will result from doing it, and that it will be an act of supreme folly, when the matter is brought to our attention, to refuse to do it. The hon. gentleman said there are 1,500,000 French in Canada, and they are not to be driven from this country. Who asks to drive them from Canada? Who proposes to drive them from it? Who proposes to deprive them of any rights they possess to-day? They are welcome in Canada. We are glad to have them as citizens of this country, and we welcome them to share everything with us, and in any action we take to have in view the interests of the French as well as the Saxon inhabitants of this country. Then the hon. gentleman makes the plea of inherent rights to the use of the language in the North-West, because there are a few thousand French Canadians, more or less, in this country. The argument would apply to every portion of the Dominion where French Canadians are found. If there is an inherent right to the use of the French language wherever there are French Canadians, that right will apply to Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island; and if that argument is sound, you must not only retain the use of the dual language in the North-West, but also extend its use over the entire Dominion. Then the hon. gentleman tells us: "Oh, well, the expense is small, it is an exceedingly little thing to make such a row about." He said the cost up to this time had only been \$400 a year, and he added, "I will pay that amount out of my own pocket rather than have any trouble." Sir, it is not a matter of expense; that does not enter into the calculation. It is a matter of the future well-being of the North-

West; it is a matter involving the whole welfare of the future inhabitants of that great country, which may in fifty years have millions of inhabitants, instead of a few thousands; it is a question of laying the foundation on which the institutions of that country will rest, the moulding of the plastic elements which are to form the bed-rock of the future. It is not a question of a paltry few hundred dollars, which may have been spent hitherto in the cost of maintaining this system of a dual language in this country. Then the hon. gentleman told us, and he did so in a manner which amounted almost to a menace, that the French are united, the French in this House are united, they will stand by their rights, they will vote as one man, for there is no politics in this question. Well, the hon. gentleman felt, perhaps, as he has often felt before when he has had the entire French element at his back, that he was master of the situation—very likely he felt so. That is one of the troubles which exists in political matters, and a combination of that kind on race lines has often controlled most important legislation here. I cannot retort upon the hon. gentleman by telling him that the English are united, because they are not. They do not unite readily upon a matter of this kind. There are differences of opinion; they cannot be readily united for the purpose of maintaining race privileges and interests. There is too much magnanimity among them; they feel it would be an act of tyranny to unite on this matter, as the hon. gentleman claims the French of the country have done. But if that feeling is to govern the conduct of the French members of this House, if they are to unite together on race lines, in the manner which the hon. gentleman told us they have done on this occasion, the natural result may possibly be that it will lead to a union of the same kind of the other element; and this is certainly to be deprecated. Then he said: Why not treat the French as brothers and friends. Well, surely, why not? We have nothing, we seek nothing that we will not share with the French equally. What are our aspirations? Look at our annexations. We have acquired the North-West, we have acquired British Columbia, we have acquired Prince Edward Island, and we wish as soon as we can to acquire Newfoundland. We are determined to possess one-half of this continent. We have built a system of canals, not for our present wants only, but to meet the requirements of the future, and we have perfected a waterway from the ocean to the heart of the Continent. We have burdened ourselves with an enormous debt for the purpose of building a railway from ocean to ocean. We are making vast grants and subsidies for the purpose of extending the railway system of the Dominion. We are carefully and laboriously perfecting a code of laws which we believe have no equal in Christendom. We have in this Dominion one of the grandest educational systems that exists in the world. We have liberty; we aim to become a great nation. These are our aspirations, and there is not one of those blessings, privileges, immunities, that we do not propose to share equally and fully with every citizen of the Dominion whether Saxon or French. Yes, we are prepared to treat them as brothers, and we simply ask from them the same feeling and treatment towards us as we are freely prepared to extend to them. They are our brothers. We feel that to

be the case. The latchstring we have always hanging out and the warmest welcome is always ready. We do not wish to have animosities, bickerings and prejudices existing; but we want to make this an English nation, we wish to have English institutions from ocean to ocean, we wish the North-West with its future 30 or 40 million to be a Saxon North-West. We are honest in this wish, and we desire that every individual in this country should share the blessing that would be secured by this consummation. If we could only have on the part of the Minister of Public Works that degree of self-denial which would enable him to make British citizenship something more than a second or a third-rate consideration, if he could only make it prominent and superior to his devotion to French institutions, it would be a great thing for him, a fine thing for his race and a fine thing for this Dominion, and the same may be said of all who entertain the opinions he entertains.

I come next to the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne). I am bound to say that the spirit and the attitude of the French members of this House upon this question, and upon all questions for that matter, is above all praise. I say this truly; I say this fully. They have shown—there may be an exception or two, for there is an exception to every rule—fornearance and a desire to treat this question fairly; they have not evinced bitterness, they have not evinced bigotry, they have not evinced prejudice in an undue degree, and this is especially true with respect to the French Canadian Liberals of this House. The hon. gentleman to whose remarks I am referring, spoke last night in defence of Canadian rights, the rights that are guaranteed the French race under the constitution. I can agree with him. There is not a right guaranteed to the race under the constitution which I wish to see impaired; there is not a right the integrity of which I wish to see impaired in the slightest degree. This is not a question of the preservation of rights existing; it is a question as to the formation of new institutions and a polity that will be adopted with respect to the vast unoccupied territories of this Dominion.

Then we come to the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). The hon. gentleman treated us to a very learned dissertation, to a speech which, of its character, is perhaps the finest I ever listened to in this House. It was a most admirable contribution, and it was listened to, beyond doubt, with the greatest degree of pleasure by the hon. members of the House. I am afraid, however, it will be above the comprehension of the average elector and may not be read with effect by the millions in the country. I was struck with one point in the hon. gentleman's speech which I thought evinced a want of tact. He said that three millions people could not swallow two millions, that it was not a cod that swallowed Jonah but a whale. Now, the comparison of the French race in this country to Jonah was, I think, on the part of the hon. gentleman, somewhat unkind. We are not proposing to swallow this Jonah; we do not expect to undertake any such impossible task as to swallow two millions people—not by any means, but we do expect to get the institutions of the North-West fixed up in a right shape and we have no doubt in the world that we will succeed in that.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. LANDRY. You don't want to swallow it, but you want to throw it overboard.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, nor that either. We expect to allow our French Canadian friends to enjoy whatever privileges they ever have enjoyed, and we do not question their right to enjoy one of these privileges. If we can secure the gradual assimilation of the races, if we can secure gradual homogeneity, we will be glad, and if we cannot we will be sorry. The question of the two languages in the North-West is the question we have in hand to-day. We propose if possible to have that North-West an English country. I have not time this afternoon to attempt to follow the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in the various positions he has taken. However, he gave us an account of the attempt in the Netherlands to have community of language there, and said it was a failure. Well, we are not making that attempt in Canada, and it is not a parallel case, nor has it any bearing on the matter under discussion. We do not propose to make any attempt to force the English language upon the Canadians of Quebec, and therefore the comparison was far-fetched and entirely inapplicable. We merely propose that in a new country, where there are comparatively no inhabitants at all, that the English language shall be used as the official language in place of two languages. That is all there is about the question, from our standpoint. The hon. gentleman also said—and I cannot see what bearing it has on the case at all—that we had better commence with the aborigines by prohibiting the translation of books into their languages and by prohibiting the missionaries from learning their languages or from preaching the Gospel to them in their native tongue. It may be that this had a bearing on the case, but I cannot see it. There is no proposal to make the aboriginal languages in the North-West official languages, nor is such a thing dreamed of; there is no proposal to prohibit a man of the Cree or Sioux or Blackfoot tribes speaking in his native tongue, nor no proposal to prohibit the translation of the Bible into those tongues. Why the hon. gentleman should have brought up that argument I am unable to see.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sorry for that.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sorry; my obtuseness is to be lamented.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Everybody else in the House saw it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no doubt my hon. friend's perception is very keen.

Mr. DAVIN. I saw it clearly.

Mr. CHARLTON. I repeat, Sir, that I cannot see what this matter may have to do with the question before us, because there is no proposal to make the Cree or any other Indian language official. The proposal before the House is to make the English language official, but it does not prohibit any man from reading, speaking or transacting business in any other language in the world, the Chinese or otherwise. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) whose keen vision enables him to see a black rod in the dark may also enable him to see the bearing this has on the subject. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) proceeded to say that as there were several thousand French Canadians

in the North-West Territories it was necessary and more convenient to have the two languages; in fact he went so far as to say that because there were a few thousand French in the North-West it was a matter of absolute necessity to have the two languages. I wonder how they get along in Massachusetts without two official languages, where there are 75,000 French Canadians, or in New Hampshire where there are said to be about 40,000? It seems they get along quite conveniently with the English language there, and it seems that the French go there out of choice, and keep on going there and staying there, without feeling any hardship placed on them for the lack of their own language in these States. If the French can go to Massachusetts, Maine, Vermont and other New England States, why the same class of people cannot go to the North-West if there is no French language there, is more than I can understand. We are told further that we have no specific information or expressed request from the North-West for this change. We have all the information we want. We are dealing with this question on the basis of our own duty towards the North-West. We took it upon ourselves some years ago—it was done by the Senate—to insert a clause with reference to the use of the French language in the North-West, and when that Bill came back from the Senate to the House, the member of the Government responsible for the Bill, the Minister of the Interior at that time, assumed the responsibility for that clause in not insisting that it should be expunged from the Bill. No doubt this clause did not attract the attention it ought to have done then, and I do not suppose that the hon. the ex-Minister of Interior gave the matter any particular consideration. He was somewhat annoyed at the insertion of the clause, but as it was late in the Session he permitted it to pass. We have this matter now brought before the House, and we begin to realise that it is a question of some importance. The question is, shall we undo a certain piece of mischief that we did unwittingly a few years ago? I do not care what the North-West will think of this matter. I do not care a farthing whether we have specific information or expressed requests, or not; the question for me is, is it a provision that this House of Commons, as the original source of authority charged with the management of the affairs of the North-West, is entitled to insert in that Bill, in the interest of the North-West and of the country at large? If it is, let it stand there. If it is not, I maintain that, without any reference to expressed requests, or without consulting the wishes of the North-West, it is the duty of this Parliament to remove it. Then, the hon. gentleman says, let the people of the North-West legislate upon this when they become a Province. I say so, too, and I say further: let them be placed in a perfectly untrammelled position to do with the question as they think proper. And when the North-West in due time obtains Provincial Government, let them proceed *de novo* and determine whether they are to have French an official language or not. We will thus wash our hands of the question.

That is perhaps all I have time to say this afternoon in reference to the position taken by the learned and hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Sir, the discussion on this question has taken a wide range. It has covered the whole of the colonial history of the country, and I will ask the indulgence

of the House for a few moments while I refer to some of the more interesting features with regard to this struggle which is taking place on this continent for supremacy between the French and the English races. We have had colonial establishments in America for three hundred years. Three of the nations of Europe laid their plans for the foundations of empire here—Spain, France and England. Spain colonised Mexico and South America, but all her colonial possessions have dropped from her grasp except Cuba and some insignificant possessions in the West Indies. France colonised Canada, and the history of French enterprise, French courage, French genius, and French daring in connection with the exploration of the vast interior regions of America reads like a romance. We have in the careers of La Salle, Joliette, Marquette, Hennepin, Tonty, and Duquesne, a story of adventure which, I repeat, reads more like a romance than the veritable records of history. I have often thought, Mr. Speaker, when crossing over the prairies of Illinois, how magnificent was the conception of La Salle as to the foundation of an empire in that region; I have thought of his discovery of Illinois, of his voyage down the Mississippi to its mouth, of his knowledge of the vast resources of that great country, of the enterprise which led to the planting of military posts at Detroit, Mackinaw, and other favorable points in the west and north-west. The French of that day were singularly adventurous. The young Frenchmen preferred leaving his home on the St. Lawrence and going to the wilds of the west, taking a dusky bride of the forest rather than one of the marriageable daughters of his own people. In this spirit the French penetrated the far interior of the continent, and surrounded the thirteen colonies with a cordon of posts, and, in their magnificent conception, took possession of some of the finest portions of this continent. On the other hand, we had the thirteen colonies planted by the English, a more slow-going, methodical people, without that dash and spirit of adventure which characterised the French; but these Englishmen sat down and began the founding of states, the building up of institutions and the formation of constitutions; and the result of their labor in due time was embodied in the American Republic, with such men as Washington, Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, and other great fathers of the American Confederacy, standing sponsors of the work. But before this consummation had reached a close, the possessions of France in the north had passed away from her. In 1759, on the Plains of Abraham, the French power gave place to the English flag, and that event was one having a more important bearing on the destiny of this continent than any other event in the history of America. That event led unquestionably to the American Revolution. But for the conquest of Canada, the thirteen colonies would not have thought of revolting at the time they did. The capitulation of Quebec in 1759, and the French cession of Canada in 1762, were followed by the ceding of Louisiana to the United States in 1803. The great Napoleon, convinced that he would be unable to hold that possession or to prevent it falling into the hands of England, ceded it to the United States for the sum of \$15,000,000, and with this cession the last vestige of French possession and French power in America passed

away. Now the Anglo-Saxon was placed in the ascendancy; it was the decree of fate that this should be the case; and what does he proceed to do? Why he sets to work to carry into effect with all possible haste his purposes. He intends that this whole continent shall have freedom and free institutions; he intends that it shall have religious tolerance; he intends that the history of the race on this continent shall be marked by the most wonderful material development of this or any other age; he intends to build up a great power on this continent; and he has done it. Already the second power in the world is the Republic to the south of us; the greatest of Britain's colonies is the one in which we live; and the power of these two countries is increasing in a ratio which almost dazzles the imagination. The Anglo-Saxon may be somewhat aggressive, but his purpose is nevertheless a beneficent one, and he intends—it is his fixed determination—that assimilation and homogeneity shall be the characteristics of every part of the land over which he bears sway. That is his fixed intention, and whether he can accomplish it or not, I am unable to say; but that he expects to occupy this continent, from the Arctic Ocean to the Isthmus of Panama, there is no doubt. My hon. friend asks, what he will do with Mexico? He will do with Mexico just what he did with the French in Louisiana and the Spaniards in California. He will say to them: Here are the institutions and the rights of citizens—take them; you are welcome to them; become American citizens, and there is no right belonging to an American citizen that will be denied you; and he will assimilate them all. He will not take them in all at once, as the whale swallowed Jonah, but he will take them little by little, and will ultimately assimilate the whole mass. In the working out of this problem, he will find our French friends, genial, tractable, industrious, naturally law-abiding. I cannot tell how potent will be the influences that will be brought to bear on them, or how rapid the assimilation will be; but I do not believe that the position of isolation which the French race occupy now they will see fit to occupy forever. On the contrary, I believe they will ultimately see it to their interest to join this great tide, to share this great prosperity, to become a portion of this Anglo-Saxon race which occupies this continent—to submit, in fact, to the decree of fate. They may not do it in this or in the next generation, and we must leave natural causes and forces to work their natural fruit; we cannot bring about the change by violent measures; we cannot do it either by this measure or by any subsequent one we may introduce. It is a matter in regard to which our French friends must be left to exercise their free choice. So long as they wish to remain as they are, they must be free to do so. In the evolution of affairs, when they see that some change will be beneficial to them, it is for them to choose it or not; they will act according to their own wishes, and be governed by their own free choice, be the result what it may. That the French race in Canada is capable of reaching the highest stage of intelligence and development goes without saying. That they will play an important part in the history of this continent is certain, but they never will fulfil the destiny which ought to be theirs while they remain in a position of isolation, without community of interest or community

Mr. CHARLTON.

of feeling with the kindred races upon this continent.

Now, I repeat what I have said several times, as I wish to make this point clear, that we have no intention to meddle with vested rights. It would not be prudent to do so. My hon. friend says, the use of the French as an official language in the North-West is a vested right. I say it is not. It is not guaranteed by the Act of British North America, but it is a right which exists by means of the surreptitious interpolation of a clause in the statute. That matter we are considering now, and it is competent for us to repeal that statute. We are not dealing with the constitution of this country at all. It is not necessary to conceal what the sympathies of the English-speaking people of this country are. While we do not propose to meddle with vested rights or to make ourselves officious or offensive in any sense to our French Canadian citizens, we do not deny that we consider medievalism a little behind the age. We do not deny that we would like to see the French race rid themselves of it, not, as in France, in the flames and smoke of revolution, but by peaceful legislation. We do not deny that we would like to see them rid of their system of tithes, fabrique assessments and the other antiquated abuses under which they labor, but while they have our sympathy and while we bid them God-speed in any effort they may make to unburden themselves of this system, we do not propose to initiate any movement to that end. I shall feel sorry if the spirit of backwardness continues, and shall feel glad that something else should take its place. I feel free to make this statement, because it is my conviction that the condition of things in Quebec can be improved, and that the true Liberal, the true Reformer, will grapple with that condition of things.

The question may be asked: Why not take the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)? It may be said the North-West Territories are sure to remove the dual language, and that the result I aim at will then be reached any way. Why not, then, take the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia, and shift from our own shoulders the responsibility of dealing directly with this question? Well, I answer that I prefer, as the more manly and honest course, that we should undo the thing we have done. It is my belief that it is incumbent upon this House either to affirm that the principle embodied in the 110th clause is right or that it is wrong. We do not want to shift the responsibility to other shoulders. If the inhabitants of the North-West want the dual language, they can have it after they get this power. It will be competent for them then to adopt it, but let us leave them perfectly untrammelled in this matter. Let us declare whether it is our opinion that the 110th clause of the North-West Act is a proper or an improper clause. Let those who believe it is a proper clause, vote for its retention, and let those who believe it is not, vote for its repeal. I am free to say that I would not vote to grant a dual language to the North-West under any circumstances. I do not believe it is our business to do so. I repeat if they want it they can have it when they have Provincial institutions; but it is not our business to saddle it upon them. We have no business to make any enactment of that kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are not saddling it.

Mr. CHARLTON. We did saddle it, and we should unsaddle it. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) says that he believes in Provincial rights in this matter. Well, there is something rather curious in connection with the backdown of the Government upon this question of Provincial rights. It rather provokes my surprise. I can remember when the Rivers and Streams Bill was disallowed again and again; I can remember when the railway legislation of Manitoba was disallowed, and when the Government asserted—and they told the truth—that they had unquestionably an unlimited power in the matter of disallowance. There can be no question, it is a matter in the discretion of the Government, which is responsible only to the people for the proper exercise of that power, and yet the Government have become the advocate of Provincial rights. They have had a new revelation on this matter; they have had a new light as to their duty; they do not feel warranted now in meddling with Provincial rights at all since the Jesuit Estates' Bill; and the hon. member for Cardwell has no doubt whatever that in this difficulty Provincial rights should govern. I think the position of the Government is scarcely a creditable one; its abandonment of their position with regard to their right to exercise the veto power in the case of Provincial legislation does not reflect credit on them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot veto this clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, but we can repeal it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would not be the exercise of the veto power.

Mr. CHARLTON. But I am making some remarks on the position taken by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who believes this question should be referred to the Provincial Government of the North-West Territories, when organised, for the settlement of this question, because it is a matter pertinent to Provincial rights, and I say it is a matter which pertains to us. The authority emanates from us, the clause was adopted by us, the clause should be rescinded when invested with Provincial authority and powers by us, and then the Provinces of the North-West will be placed in the position to exercise Provincial rights, and say whether they will have this thing or not. Reference was made by some speaker, in the early part of the debate, to the petitions sent in by the North-West Council, and the insinuation was made that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) had bought the Council. I do not remember who made this charge. I do not think the hon. member for North Simcoe has the funds to buy that Council, and I would not deem it a very creditable thing on the part of any hon. member to cast that imputation upon him. Another assertion made was that his speech has captured it. That is an assertion more flattering to the hon. gentleman than the other, and I have no doubt his speech had very much weight and influence in the North-West; but the fact is the public is alive to the importance of this question, and that the sentiments of the North-West and Manitoba are against the retention of this dual language. That

was shown by the repudiation of the French language in Manitoba the other day by a vote of twenty-seven to six; and by a larger proportion than twenty-seven to six, the people of Manitoba and the North-West will sweep this language away whenever they are given this opportunity.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Leave it to them.

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly we will. We will sweep it away here, and leave it to them to deal with it there. We may adopt the politician's expedient of shifting the responsibility from our shoulders and dodging out of this thing, but I do not think that would be very honorable or creditable to this House. I appreciate fully the feelings of hon. members who will vote for the retention of the dual language clause. I appreciate the feeling of the French members of this House who believe in the extension of their language over the North-West. They act according to their convictions, and I shall respect their action if they vote accordingly; but I cannot agree with them, and will therefore vote the other way. I hope that the French members will forgive, if they deem it necessary to forgive, that feeling which they cannot endorse, but which English-speaking members of this House entertain—a feeling of pride in the history of the British Empire; that feeling which causes them to take pleasure in contemplating the result of the battle upon the Plains of Abraham; that feeling which leads them to rejoice in the results of the Battles of the Nile and Trafalgar, and in the results of the Battle of Waterloo; that feeling which makes them view with pride the progress of the British Empire, and inspire in them the belief that British institutions are the best calculated to conduce to the prosperity and welfare of mankind. I hope, Sir, they will forgive our purpose, our avowed purpose, to make this a Saxon state. The avowed purpose of the Anglo-Saxon is to make the Anglo-Saxon race the greatest race on the earth, and the hope of the Anglo-Saxon is that the day will come, and come before many decades have elapsed, when the English language will be the common means of intercommunication between all the races of the world, and the English race will be the dominant race of the world, so that the Anglo-Saxon will fulfil the destiny which God has evidently designed he shall fulfil in this world.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to trouble you with very many observations in regard to the speech we have just listened to, or, indeed, to address you at any great length at all. I may say at once, that if any one of the propositions now before the Chair had been thoroughly and entirely satisfactory to my mind, as to the mode in which this question should be dealt with, I should have contented myself with giving a silent vote. It does not happen that either of those propositions commends itself entirely to my mind, and I shall briefly state why that is so, and how, in my poor judgment, this matter should be disposed of. Referring to what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has said, his distinguished position for a great many years in this Parliament has led—I do not say at all unjustifiably—to his not infrequently, when announcing his own views on public questions, speaking in the plural. Not infrequently has he followed in the past the course which he pursued to-day, of speaking both

positively and affirmatively, and positively and negatively, in regard to the views and assertions, and policies and aspirations of others with whom he was for the time acting; but I am wholly unable to accept the declaration which the hon. member has made to-day in the plural at all. I accept it as far as he is himself concerned. As far as he himself professes that these are his views, his intentions, his opinions and his aspirations, I accept his statement fully and unfeignedly. But, when the hon. gentleman spoke of "we," of what "we" were intending, what "we" were proposing, what "we" were aiming at, and what "we" were not aiming at, and what "we" were not intending; when he spoke of what the English speaking people of this country intended and insisted upon, and so forth, then I say the hon. gentleman took up a position which, in face of what has been going on in this country for some months past, in face of the declarations of the hon. member who is primarily responsible for this agitation—the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)—in face of the language of this Bill itself, in face of all these things with which we have to deal, I cannot accept. If I could accept it, the question would receive an easy and rapid solution from me. I do not intend to enter into a criticism of the criticisms of the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). One or two words will suffice for that. The hon. gentleman said, but I hope and think he must have misread his history, that the decrees of ancient Rome, were published in all those portions of the world over which she had authority, only in the tongue of Rome herself. I think history shows us that nothing so inhuman and barbarous as that was done, even in what may be called inhuman and barbarous times. Turning to a more modern example, which he justifiably quotes, an example which is to be regarded by us with the highest attention, interest and respect, he refers to the neighboring Republic, to what has been aimed at and accomplished in that great community, in whose well-being the whole modern world has so deep an interest, of whose constitution the right hon. gentleman opposite has not seldom spoken in terms of deserved admiration as to the great work which was achieved by the men who framed that constitution. Speaking of that example, the hon. member for North Norfolk was unfortunate enough to quote, as an instance of a state where the French language had been stamped out and the great principle which he proclaimed, had been realised in the very initiation of its connection with the nation of which it forms a part, the State of Louisiana. Why, Sir, is not the hon. gentleman aware that, by the original constitution of the State of Louisiana, the French as well as the English language was permitted to be used in the debates of that State, and that that continued until the State of Louisiana by a subsequent determination of its own, under circumstances when the question had ceased to be a grievance, determined—as I believe, though I have no information upon this point—that it should be blotted out. The fact, however, is this, as stated in a book of authority, the "Cyclopædia of Political Science:"

"The diversity of interests of the French and American citizens, however, formed the more usual dividing line of politics in the State. The former were at least a strong minority, and a singular evidence of its strength was a provision in the Constitution which allowed mem-

Mr. BLAKE.

bers of the Legislature to debate either in French or in English."

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the statutes were printed in French?

Mr. BLAKE. I was not discussing whether the use of the French language was complete in all the technical details. What in the world has the publication of the statutes or the proceedings in the French language to do with the matter? What is involved in that except a paltry \$500 a year for the printing of certain things in the two languages? What is the harm if the people who have to obey the laws are enabled to read them printed in the language which they understand? That is a small question; the great question is included in the power of freely debating in the Legislature in the tongues of the peoples of whom the State is composed. All I care to know in regard to that is that the constitution gave the people of French origin the right to speak in their mother tongue in their own State Legislature. The hon. gentleman has said that this question is a very narrow one, and, as he puts it, it is a comparatively narrow one. He has spoken of the impropriety of what he calls dodging responsibility. He has told us of the want of manliness that would be involved in our placing upon other shoulders the responsibility which we ought to take ourselves, and I confess that I have considerable sympathy with that view. As far as our present information goes, the general principle upon which this question should be dealt with, and I am quite prepared now to state the time when I think it should be dealt with; but I thought a large part of the hon. gentleman's speech was but a poor commentary on the declaration as to dodging responsibility which he made and to which I have just referred, when he iterated and reiterated the statement that "we" have no intention of interfering with vested rights, that "we" have no intention of interfering with the rights of any minority which are secured under the British North America Act, that "we" have no desire to touch any privilege properly reserved, that "we" do not intend to touch it, and that "we" are not touching it now. It appeared to me that these statements were evasive of responsibility, were not merely inconsistent with the Bill which the hon. gentleman is supporting—including the preamble—but were fatally inconsistent with the attitude of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and with the general character of the agitation of which this Bill is merely the first fruits. A little later, the hon. gentleman declared that "we," the Anglo-Saxons of this continent—once again taking the plural pronoun, which the hon. gentleman used first when speaking of those with whom he was acting, then when speaking of the English-speaking people of this country, and finally when speaking of the Anglo-Saxon race from the Pole to the Isthmus—he declared their stern determination, by what means might be open to them, to make this country from the North Pole to the Isthmus an Anglo-Saxon community, and to create a homogeneity of race. Well, it is only a question of means and methods, times and circumstances, opportunities and occasions, by which this result is to be achieved; and the hon. gentleman will find, as I shall proceed to point out presently, that his leader does not propose to relegate the consideration of this question to other generations, to those natural and

gradual and insensible operations which furnish the only possible solution of such great questions as he has imported into the debate; but that it is other and more rapid, direct and stringent—I will say more violent methods, that are really proposed to us in this regard. Now, Sir, as I have said, there are underlying questions here, much broader questions than the simple questions dealt with by the enacting clause. And these underlying questions are historically old, no doubt, but they are old with reference to our own policy too; they were raised before the last general election, they were raised by the hon. member for North Simcoe himself in large part, they were raised by a newspaper which was, at that time, the most powerful supporter in the Province of Ontario of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they have since been persisted in, and have since been enlarged. This group of questions are fundamental questions. They embrace topics of creed as well as of race, and the Jesuit affair to which the hon. member referred, was not the cause, was not the origin. It was obviously, it has since been confessed to have been, a mere incident, a mere occasion, taken advantage of as a fit and opportune occasion to bring up one phase, and in various aspects, more than one phase, of this group; a good occasion to bring all up in a manner which would attract the favorable consideration of those to whom they who brought them up sought to address themselves. Now, Sir, I intend to refrain, as far as possible, from discussing this question in any party aspect whatever. It needs to be discussed in its party aspect, it must receive such a discussion at some time, but I do not think this time is the fitting time. I say I hope as far as possible to avoid any question of party in the course of this discussion. I am as anxious as the hon. gentleman is anxious, to say nothing, so far as truth will allow, except conciliatory words, and to deal with this matter in a manner becoming a public man; in such a way that, if my feeble words have any effect at all, they may tend to prevent the calamitous results of which the hon. gentleman this afternoon was complaining, though he, and those who act with him, from the best motives, I have no doubt, have been the prime cause of the realisation of these results to the extent to which they have been up to this time realized. I say, Sir, that if you could deal simply with the enacting clause in this Bill it would be a matter of minor consequence; if you could dissociate that clause from its preamble, from its surroundings, from its past and from its future. But you cannot dissociate it, either from its preamble or from its surroundings or from its past, and still less from its future. These difficulties are in part indicated by the preamble which, as you must expound it upon any fair principle of exposition, I maintain declares for action and principles of action which all good Canadians must disavow instead of assenting to. It is a far-reaching principle. It goes—and the hon. member for North Simcoe, whose legislative and professional ability we know—intended that it should go, wrote it in order that it should go, far beyond the intent of the enacting clause; and those who agree to that preamble, who give to it to-day their voices and their votes, must set their minds and their political forces to the accomplishment of the ends which we find there embedded. Doubtless our constitutional act may be amended, doubtless the

well-understood wishes of the Canadian people can accomplish the amendment of the constitution. The machinery may be cumbersome, and it may be that occasionally, as has happened in the past, upon inadequate representations, changes of no great consequence, but changes still, may be made; and it may be again that very strong representations may, for a time at least, be ineffectual in producing amendment. But in relation to any question the well understood wishes of the Canadian people, in time and place, after due consideration, thoroughly ascertained and forcibly presented must produce an amendment of the constitution; and into the agitations which are necessary in order to execute this preamble, as indicated by the hon. gentleman's own speech, we should be, it is intended that we should be, plunged if we agree to it. Now, what does it say? The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), thought that it was a very innocent thing. There was not much in it. He laid a great deal of stress upon the preamble of some other Bill which was passed in some other Legislature, and he thought that preamble was good cause for disallowance here. But now he says that the preamble of this Bill, which is given as the basis of our decision, the cause itself upon which we are called upon to vote, is of very little consequence. It is true, it is the reason for the enactment, it is the moving cause which is given to us, but it is not of much consequence, and is not of much harm.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I cited the words of the Minister of Justice, not my own words.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, well, I know. I do not care much for that mere throwing of verbal bombshells from one side to the another. We have got to do with the reason of the Bill. The hon. gentleman cited words which I thought he adopted. He agrees with me now that the preamble is of consequence, and that by it we understand what the Bill means. He says that he is prepared to agree with the preamble, and to vote for it. The preamble says:

"Whereas it is expedient, in the interest of the national comity in the Dominion, that there should be community of language among the people of Canada, and that the enactment in the North-West Territories Act allowing the use of the French language should be—"

Repealed? Oh, no.

"should be expunged therefrom: Therefore,"

And it proceeds to enact. Here, then, is the meaning in this preamble, of that community of language, which it is expedient should prevail among the whole people of Canada. The second paragraph of the preamble tells us that the community of language which is declared to be expedient amongst the whole people of Canada, is that community and harmony which prevails, according to the well known fable, between the lion and the lamb; the English is to swallow up the French and the French is to die, that the English may live and flourish upon it. That is the community which is to exist, the community of language which is expedient; the enactment allowing the use of French is to be expunged; therefore, it is the English language alone that is to be used. Now, Sir, when I read this preamble I confess myself to have been a little puzzled by the word "comity," whose use—

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is a mistake. I think in truth the word was "unity."

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I am very glad to hear it, because I was about to say that I did not perceive that the word "comity" had any reasonable application to this matter at all. We know what the meaning of that word is, and if ever an improper word could be chosen for the hon. gentleman's Bill, it certainly was the word "comity." But he now tells us, as I presumed, that what he intended by the phrase, was unity, and, therefore, it is in the interests of the national unity of the Dominion, that this result is to take place. Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to the advancement of our national unity, we must agree, if we adopt this preamble, that it is expedient, that we should take all possible steps which are open to us to procure by legal and constitutional means the disallowance of the use of the French language where now it is allowed. That is clear, that is plain, that is obvious, that is logical. Was ever such a lame and impotent conclusion deduced from such important premises, if this question is to cease with this little enacting clause with reference to the North-West Territories? If that which it is expedient for the unity of the Canadian Dominion to abrogate is to be suffered to go on in this chamber, is to be suffered to go on in Canada, is to be suffered to go on in the important Province of Quebec, while our national unity is to be preserved, forsooth, by dealing with a few thousands who now inhabit the North-West Territories? No. These gentlemen represent a very grave condition of affairs. That is not their intention. We all know it is not the intention; it has been admitted not to be the intention at all; we cannot stop here; that would indeed be much cry and little wool. Nor does the hon. gentleman so pretend. In the speech with which he moved the first reading of this Bill he entered into a number of considerations which would have been but remotely relevant to the simple clause of the Bill itself. True he pointed out plainly enough, what was perfectly obvious, that he was not at the moment proposing to do more than deal with the North-West Territories question. But, so far from making that further announcement, which he could not have honestly made, but which was made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to-day, he said simply this. After speaking of the past and the present, he said:

"I have endeavored at all events to make good my statements, that both from within and from without the general opinion prevails that this question has come to the point where it is likely to cause further differences, as it has already caused differences in the Dominion."

Then the hon. gentleman said:

"Come back now, Sir, to the North-West Territories. I am not attempting here, and hon. gentlemen know that at all events in this form of motion, I could not attempt in any way to interfere with any rights under the British North America Act which are guaranteed to the French Canadians of the Province of Quebec and to the French Canadians in this Parliament. I am treating, Sir, of what this Parliament is competent to deal with. I am treating of the question of the dual language of the North-West Territories."

It is a perfectly correct statement that this is all the legislation proposed by this clause; but the proposition to which we are asked to assent, as the ground work of the legislation proposed, obliges us to proceed by all lawful ways and means to secure, in the interests of the national unity of the Dominion, the application of that principle in those other places

Mr. BLAKE.

where certainly the contrary principle now prevails, is potent and effectual for good or for evil according to the diversities of opinions on this subject, potent and effectual to an infinitely greater extent than its application can be either now or for 50 years to come in the North-West Territories of Canada. But I say we are not confined to the hon. gentleman's preamble nor to his speech here. We find in a recent speech delivered in this city to what is called the Equal Rights Association statements which deal with this question, and which deal with it in a manner showing that he at all events does not shrink from the application of the motto which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), cited last night, the motto "Thorough." The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), said we are not talking of interfering or proposing to interfere with the use of the French language, with reading, writing or speaking it. Nothing of that kind, he said, is talked or thought of; it is simply this question of using it in the North-West Legislature, and, as the hon. gentleman repeated, this dreadful grievance of the statutes and ordinances being printed in the French language. But that is not the view of the hon. member for Simcoe. I find these statements in a speech delivered by him as late as 12th December last, within a few yards of this building. He said that Lord Durham had held first, and above all things, that the French language must be stamped out. And the hon. gentleman gave his own personal opinion that without a shadow of doubt Lord Durham was right. It is not, therefore, a question of an occasional French speech in Parliament which bores the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), or of their being troubled by the fact that copies of the Debates and of the statutes are printed in French, in a tongue with which they are not as familiar as with their mother tongue; but the language must be stamped out, says the hon. member for North Simcoe. The hon. gentleman proceeded:

"Is there a shadow of doubt that between these two races, of all races in the world, if they are ever to be united, it must be by obliteration of one of these languages and by the teaching in one of these tongues."

I should judge, I hope I am not mistaken, that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), does not mean that the English language should be obliterated; if so, it must be the French language. Then, the hon. member for North Simcoe drew upon his experience as a parliamentarian, and declared he had observed that more French was now spoken in the House than formerly, an observation, I must confess, entirely at variance with my experience, which is somewhat longer in this House than that of the hon. gentleman. I quite admit that the course which the hon. gentleman and others have pursued, will very naturally lead to a larger quantity of French speaking in this House than has prevailed hitherto, but I do say there is nothing more marked, than the change which has taken place since I first entered Parliament, with respect to this question of French speaking. Then, the hon. member for North Simcoe proceeded to point out that our constitution is amendable in regard to the use of the French language in Quebec and in Canada, and he gave the precedents which showed the truth of that statement, that the constitution is amendable. And

what did he go on to say ! He went on to say that the precedents in that sense are very useful and may be acted on in the year 1890 or '91 in this connection. What ! Are we going to relegate this matter to some distant age to be disposed of finally by the action of the French Canadians ; when the leader (Mr. McCarthy) tells us that in 1890 or '91 the precedents which prove the possibility of altering the British North America Act, so as to obliterate the use of the French language are useful and may become available forthwith ? Then the hon. gentleman stated that we ought not to remain in this position forever, and there should be sufficient patriotism in the Dominion to produce the change foreshadowed. Nor was his speech confined to the question of language, it touched creed as well ; for I find him asking the people whom he was addressing, and through them the people of the whole Dominion, to give him power to eliminate those parts of the constitution which were inimical to the public weal ; and he followed that statement by the question—indicating the parts of the constitution which he regarded as inimical to the public weal, and which he proposed that the people of the country should give him power to eliminate—

“ Are we to have Separate Schools in Upper Canada, the assessments in Lower Canada, dual language in the Dominion Parliament, and dual languages in Quebec, the North-West and Manitoba ? ”

And he again called for power to obliterate what he called those obnoxious clauses. I, therefore, expected that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would not adopt the line which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has adopted. I expected that, while he would perhaps leave rather in the background those other questions, he would say nothing which was inconsistent with his preceding utterances, nothing which would be likely to limit the effect of the preamble to which he asked the assent of the House ; nothing which would interfere with or check the triumphant march of his friends in pursuit of the great purpose which had been before developed, and which was further and fully developed in advance of the meeting of Parliament by the speech to which I have referred. This Bill, then, is only the opening of the campaign ; and it lays down in itself, so far as the question of language is concerned, which is all it deals with, lines quite broad enough for the contemplated movement ; and, I repeat, that its past and its present and its surroundings are all important elements ; they indicate its future ; and they entirely overshadow the little enacting clause. For those who, like the hon. gentlemen, have spoken in that sense in this House, who believe that these things are essentially in the interests of the Dominion of Canada, there is, and I am not in the slightest degree complaining of it, there is for them but one course to pursue, the course of agitation. It is their right, nay more, it is their bounden duty, if their conscientious convictions be, and I am far from saying they are not so, that the condition of things in this whole Dominion, is such that its future prosperity and progress will be served and advanced by such an agitation as is necessary for the attainment of such results as are indicated, to enter upon and pursue that path of agitation. We may as well settle what it is that we are called upon to meet ; what that condition of things is with which it is proposed

that we should deal. I say that that honesty of conviction which I freely accord to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), (and which I am bound to accord to him as to any public man), involves, as a necessary consequence, that he should prosecute the agitation upon the lines he laid down on the 12th of December last and at other times, as the line of policy essential to this Dominion. If it were otherwise, I can conceive no language strong enough for the denunciation of his conduct in the utterance of these sentiments. Now, Sir, for those of us who believe—I speak for myself only—but for myself and for any other person who happens to believe that in our existing conditions the objects aimed at are, by the means proposed, absolutely impossible of attainment ; for those who believe that the agitation does, as to the Province of Quebec, not merely not present any element whatever of success, but destroys the least prospect of reform from that source from which alone the reforms which these hon. gentlemen desire can be looked for, namely, from within, from the spontaneous action of the people themselves ? for those who believe that it not merely does not improve, but that it tends to imperil the conditions of certain minorities of race and certain minorities in creed in different parts of the Dominion ; that it excuses, if it does not absolutely justify, the combinations of populations on lines of race and creed which the hon. gentleman so earnestly deprecated this afternoon ; for those who believe that it tends to produce and to intensify the greatest political evils which it is possible to conceive for Canada, and that it imperils the best hopes which remain to Canada ; for me, Sir, who believe all these things, and for any others who may believe with me, there remains only the course of firm and uncompromising opposition from the start, to the course of the hon. gentleman. “ *Obsta principiis.* ” I decline to permit the thin end of the wedge to be inserted ; not with the guile which I might not unjustly attribute to the remarks of the hon. member for North Norfolk, nor yet with the hammer of the hon. member for North Simcoe, who has told us plainly the strokes he intends to give to that wedge and the vigor with which he intends with it to rift and cleave this Dominion. Now, Sir, I profess to be, and I hope I am a Reformer. I have never concealed my opinion ; I have always at those times and places, and under those circumstances in which I thought I might do good by it, announced the opinion that there are many things to be reformed in the different Provinces of this Dominion, and many things to be reformed in the Dominion as a whole. There are many things I should desire to see reformed in the Province of Quebec as well as in other Provinces. But I know full well,—such little knowledge of history as I have acquired, such knowledge of human nature as fifty-six years have given me, have taught me that impertinent interference ; still more that threats of coercive interference, and agitations to withdraw acquired and provincial rights are the very surest means to destroy the slightest vestige of hope of reform. They give to the resisting party incalculable advantages. They enlist the sentiment of nationality, the sentiment of provincial autonomy, the feeling of outraged dignity and of insulted authority in opposition to the intruders. And under cover of these defences, resistance is easy and

its success is certain; while where the opportunity occurs aggressive action is but too likely to ensue. That is the condition of things, Sir, which I believe will be accomplished by the efforts that are now being made. I regard the prospect of reforms which I myself should desire to see accomplished in the Province of Quebec, as removed—I will not say to an incalculable but to a very long distance—by this agitation even so far as it has gone. I regard that prospect as absolutely vanished, should this agitation receive the support and countenance to any considerable extent of this House and of the people of the Dominion at large. No, Sir, the fullest and the frankest recognition of the provincial and covenanted rights; the evidence which we shall give within the domain of our power in the various Provinces of Canada, of a generous and liberal consideration for those minorities which are under our control; combined with a sympathetic interest in the welfare of our neighbors give titles—just titles—to friendly suggestions to helpful advice, to legitimate influence. Nor have I despaired in the past; nor when this cloud passes away shall I despair in the future for the recognition of those titles. At any rate I am on the side of those who shall stand by those minorities who are, as I have pointed out, threatened and proposed to be coerced (by constitutional means I admit, but it is not the less threat and coercion, however constitutionally you may do it) by the policy the hon. member for North Simcoe has foreshadowed. I am on their side; and I believe that any other attitude is impotent for good, and powerful for evil to the state.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the South Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 68) to incorporate the West Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 69) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the St. Lawrence International Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Brandon and South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Scarth.)

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Summerside Bank.—(Mr. Davies.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Bankers' Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Confederation Life Association.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Calgary Water Power Company (Limited).—(Mr. Hickey.)

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the Elbow River Water Power Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House resumed debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McCarthy for second reading of Bill Mr. BLAKE.

(No. 10) respecting the North-West Territories and the amendments of Messrs. Davin and Beau-soleil thereto.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard something to-day—of what I fear we shall hear more of in Canada for some time—of a union of race and a union of creed. This question is not unfamiliar to my ears. In days long gone by I found myself, as my predecessor in the leadership of the Liberal party found himself, as my successor in that leadership, I dare say, may find himself, confronted with attempts to unite and consolidate in the ranks of one party those of one nationality, and to consolidate in the ranks of one party those of one creed. This question is not new in Canada. Those attempts I met by no private bargain or intrigue; I met them by frank statements in this House and on public platforms of my views on the questions of race and creed, and of the rights and interests of minorities; I met them by an effort to convince those most particularly concerned that there were no real grounds for those attempts—attempts which I deprecated then, as I deprecate them now, as public calamities—and by the assurance that my fellow countrymen of all creeds and all races might differ and agree, according to their opinions on political topics, with absolute confidence as to the safety of the rights peculiar to themselves on questions of race and creed. That assurance, I believe I could well give; that assurance I hope this debate will enable us in Canada still to give; but largely on the issues of this debate does the question of that assurance turn. Sir, at all times and in all countries minorities are inclined to be susceptible, jealous, apprehensive, exacting—such is the condition of human nature. Those who are in minorities feel it; and those who happen to be in majorities, though they may complain of it, ought to understand it too. Minorities are apt to believe that they must unite in order to protect themselves against aggression; and such union amongst themselves, and such consequent isolation from their fellow-countrymen, is, wherever it occurs, and just in proportion to the extent of its occurrence, a serious danger to the state. But this is oftentimes excusable, and sometimes even justifiable; and in the face of such attacks as those to which I referred this afternoon, I am not able in any strong language to condemn, although I do not intend to applaud, and although I still most earnestly deprecate, any such attempt at union. I am speaking this day mainly in the hope to avert, if by any feeble effort of mine I can avert, the continued existence of those apprehensions which might be a justification, or at any rate an excuse, for such union. Sir, in times of gloom and depression as to the future of my country—perhaps I am not an optimist, perhaps I have taken and may take now in many aspects a view too gloomy as to the condition and prospects of Canada, but in times in which I have felt gloom and depression as to the prospects and future of my country, as to its progress in several of the respects which are essential to the making of a nation, I have had in these latter years the consolation of believing that, in whatever other respects we might be stationary, perhaps, even, I am ashamed to say, retrograde, in the respect at any rate of tolerance and regard to the rights and privileges and susceptibilities of minorities, we were moving on—slowly, steadily moving on—to a higher plane.

And that consolation was, to my mind, a very great one. But although I did so believe, as I shall still venture to entertain that hope, I knew well that all this time there were great masses of prejudice and suspicion, of ancient hates and misconceptions, and bitter memories of former conflicts, lying ready to the hand of the incendiary, easy to be kindled, difficult to be extinguished; and that the proportions of the conflagration which they might excite were impossible to be calculated in advance. Sir, we have but just heard of an event we must all deeply deplore. The great institution, the crown and glory, I may be permitted to say, of the educational institutions of our country, is at this moment in flames; and we know not how small a spark may have kindled the great fire which is consuming that ornament to the whole community of Canada, the University of Toronto. That ornament, a great material ornament, and a still greater exhibition of the triumphs of the principles of toleration and of our advance in higher education, a university where we have gathered together the youth of all denominations, Protestant and Catholic, under the sanction even of the Catholic Church—a State institution on non-sectarian principles, where all were gathered together as fellow-subjects to acquire the highest training that the land afforded is now, so far as its material fabric goes, a ruin tottering to the ground. But great through the calamity, the material fabric may be replaced. Just as by that great calamity we may observe how small a spark may kindle a great fire, so let us take warning in this larger sphere, in the still greater matter upon which we are now engaged; and let those who are seeking to set the heather afire upon this question be careful before they proceed to precipitate a moral ruin which may be irreparable. Let them remember that it is utterly impossible to calculate the results of the issues and the passions they are raising. Sir, I knew not merely that there were questions of prejudice and of misconception, of passion and of bigotry, of ancient hate and ancient difficulties; but I knew more. I am not of those who take the optimistic view that in all respects our path is easier and smoother because of our peculiar conditions in Canada; I am not of those who believe that our path is made plainer and straighter by the circumstances of different nationalities and of different creeds. I have recognised the fact that our situation, such as it is, presents problems of very considerable difficulty—perhaps problems of very considerable danger—and that we might have, if Providence had so ordered our lot that we were a homogeneous people, all of one race, one tongue, and one creed, an easier path, a plainer road in which to travel. I have recognised those difficulties with which we may have to grapple some day; though I hope, if we are to succeed, at some other time and in some different spirit and on some other lines than are proposed to-day. I knew that those real difficulties added great force and strength to the baser elements which form the greater part, after all, of the troubles with which we were and are encompassed; I knew the risk and the loss which was to be encountered in the Province which I may call an English and Protestant Province—the province of Ontario—by acting for those whom we served on the path on which we were then travelling; and we encountered it deliberately at that time. Nor shall we, I hope shrink from it to-

day. The right will triumph in the end. There is an old proverb in the language which my hon. friend would proscribe: "*Tout casse, tout lasse, tout passe*;" and even this storm, this agitation, though its proportions may be as great as my hon. friend expects and perhaps justly expects, will pass away; with serious consequences may be to those who are engaged in the contest, but it will pass away in the end; and what is right and true will in the end prevail, though some of us may fall in the struggle. On what conditions, circumstanced as we are, can we live and thrive and grow in Canada? Certainly not on the lines which are being laid down by those engaged in this agitation. I would ask them to put themselves in the French Canadian's place. You may selfishly wish that he had agreed to be suppressed; you may have a profound conviction of the incomparable superiority of your tongue, your laws, your creed; you may earnestly desire for all men the inestimable boons of British birth, of English speech, of Protestant religion. But still, after all, cannot you put yourself in his place? And can you not, must you not, admire the courage, the fidelity, and the determination with which, at great odds, he fought in all fields—in the legislature, before the people, and in even sterner fields than these—for what to him was as dear as what you call your birthright is to you? Fought, aye, and conquered too! Cannot you recognise that his was after all a victory for humanity? And that if, as the case is, it has imposed greater difficulties and more arduous efforts and toils on those who are engaged in making a nation of Canada, it yet, by that very circumstance, gave the chance for more exalted triumphs, gave an opening for the exhibition of still higher and deeper and broader feelings of justice and liberality and tolerance than are permitted to a wholly homogeneous people? Can you not at least see—if that much you cannot see—that he has in fact conquered? Do you seriously hope to prevail to-day in a conflict in which, under infinitely greater disadvantages, he obtained the victory long ago? Surely if it were a conquest in which he was in the wrong, you have the right to struggle still; but his victory after all was for equal rights—rights equal with your own. That is all he asked; that is all he got. But you say: No; his language must be obliterated; it is inimical to the Constitution that it should continue; you must teach him your tongue; he must forget his own; he must not have what he regards—and, from his point of view, rightly regards—as equal rights with you, the Anglo-Saxon, of whom the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke so proudly this afternoon as destined by fate to swallow him up. Sir, I regard this larger question to which I have referred, and it is the real question we have to consider, as a settled question; and even were my views as to the settlement different from what they are, I would not consent, as a public man, to an attempt to reopen a controversy, long since closed, on grounds which do not give to my eye the least prospect of success, but which ensure ultimate defeat to the assailants, and meanwhile limitless disaster to the state. I say: No; a thousand times, no! Whether you differ or agree as to what might have been best for the country, in the situation of the country as it stands, I say: No, a thousand times, no; to the least effort or proposal to reopen that settled controversy; and I maintain that it is the duty of those

who truly regard the progress and the prosperity of Canada, who hope to see it advance in its path towards nationality, to defend the rights of the minorities in this regard, as by law and by convention and by national settlement established. I intend for my part to defend them just as warmly as if I were one of themselves; and I should regard myself as dishonored and disgraced if I were now to yield to the forces which press me to any other course. It is not difficult to drive most of us, perhaps—it is certainly not difficult to drive the humble individual who addresses you from his place in this Parliament; but I hope it is impossible to drive me, as long as I occupy that place, from the path of duty and of honor, which I believe to be the path which I have chalked out in the words I have now spoken. To this Bill, under these circumstances, I should record an unhesitating negative, if that were the question presented immediately to the House. I do not desire to enlarge upon the lessons of history, of which we have heard much in this debate; but I wish to call your attention to two very recent formal, and to my mind, solemn expressions of opinion, expressions of British opinion, of the opinions of the English Government upon questions closely allied to this. You remember the long and complicated and difficult controversy with reference to Schleswig-Holstein. In 1860, the English Government proposed to Denmark to allow Schleswig, one of the duchies, independently to decide upon the language to be used where the Danish people prevailed, where the Germans prevailed, and where the races were mixed. That was the character of the dispatch, that the community itself should decide, and that regard should be had to the various languages of the populations, thus giving a plain indication at that comparatively recent date, of the view of the British Government, under the Secretariat for foreign affairs of Lord John Russell, in regard to that question. Again in 1862 and 1863, unhappy, broken-down, disintegrated and enslaved Poland, regarded by the great powers as no longer possessing the capacities for an independent state, but as a people under the thrall of Russia, had broken out once again into insurrection, under the pressure of some fresh severities of its Russian masters; and three of the great powers of Europe agreed together to remonstrate with Russia as to its course towards the Poles—I can hardly say towards Poland, but towards the Poles. Who were they? Great Britain, France and Austria. They remonstrated with Russia. Russia asked them to formulate the points upon which they suggested her lines of policy towards Poland should proceed. Those three powers formulated, by conjoint action, six points, and one of the six points on which they recommended to Russia action towards Poland, circumscribed as Poland was, and so late as the year 1863, was the use of the Polish language in the public offices and in the law courts. That was the advice given by Great Britain, France and Austria to Russia, interfering with its course towards its own subjects, who had been handed over to it by a proceeding which no one can read without condemning, but handed over and having become, so to speak, its property long before. And, at that late date, the recommendation was that the step taken should be reversed, that the abrogation of the right to use their own

Mr. BLAKE.

language should be withdrawn, and that the Poles should have the right to use their own language in the courts and the public offices. I do not deny, as I have already said, our difficulties in this country. I repeat that those difficulties are serious; and I hope that those of us who now act on the lines which I have been suggesting will be recognised as having earned in proper time and proper place, the right to be listened to with favorable ears in case we do tender proper advice as to what we believe, in the true interests of minorities, and in the true interest of Canada, should be done in regard to these difficult and delicate questions. I hope also that our attitude may not be mistaken by either friend or foe, either by those we serve or those we oppose, by the minorities in whose cause we are prepared to stand up or by the majorities whom many of us represent, as being that of an unworthy truckling to either race or creed. I should like to ask what have the majority of the representatives of Ontario constituencies to gain by adopting the course which I have chalked out for myself? Let others speak for themselves. I know that the only gain I can have for myself is risk and loss. Nothing but that. We shall then claim our right to speak firmly and frankly on all fit occasions and on all burning questions, and we shall ask the consideration which we are now granting. Having said so much, I ask how should this Bill, brought forward in the frame which it has assumed, with the preamble by which it is prefaced, with the speech in which it was introduced, with the speeches by which out of doors it was heralded, having regard to the movement of which I have said it is the first fruits—how should this Bill be met? I am prepared to meet such a Bill, so introduced, so framed, so prefaced, with an uncompromising negative. But it has seemed to be the temper of the House to meet it with some substantive declaration. I shall not object to that; but for myself I am not fully satisfied with either of the declarations which have been proposed. I am of opinion that, if we do formulate a declaration, it should contain a distinct and unequivocal repudiation of the principle of the preamble of this Bill, and should vindicate the ground on which we stand, as to the question raised by the enacting clause. In these respects and also because I am not prepared for myself to affirm all the language contained in the second amendment,—for example the statement that the enactment would put in doubt the stability of our institutions—I think that amendment is not wholly applicable to the situation; nor do I think the first amendment is what we require either. I think there is apart from the suggestions of policy, no present grievance of any account. The money question is absolutely nothing. The amount is trifling, and this Parliament pays it; and the hon. gentleman who proposes the Bill (Mr. McCarthy) has cheerfully voted for and supported the payment of hundreds of thousands of dollars—I might say millions—of expenditure much less defensible than the \$400 or \$500 a year which are expended to convey to the French people of the North-West, few as they may be, a knowledge of the ordinances of the country in which they live. Now, Sir, what is the condition of our country with respect to the North-West? We have spent many scores of millions mainly in connection with the North-West. Our crying need there to-day is, and will for a long time be, settlement, the influx of hardy and frugal cultiva-

tors of the soil. The Province of Ontario is being bled to-day partly to meet that demand. Her farms have fallen in price; and that fall, very notably in the eastern section of the Province, is partly due to the altered conditions of supply and demand, partly also due, no doubt, to unfavorable seasons, partly due to low prices, due to a combination of circumstances, in which however, the North-West is a large factor. I say that fall would have been very much more marked than it is to-day, if it had not been for that influx of French Canadian settlers into the east, which this agitation seems almost designed to prevent, which certainly is regarded as no unmixed blessing by those who are engaged in the agitation, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned. For my own part, I take ground altogether different from those gentlemen on that subject; I heartily welcome our French fellow-countrymen who prefer Ontario to the States. I hope they will continue to prefer it; I hope that they will come in, just as many of them as have come in, and buy our farms from those who want to sell them, and who will not complain, however much other people may create grievances in another Province, if they get a better price than they otherwise might by reason of altered conditions in the law of supply and demand. I say that while Ontario is being bled at this moment and in this way, the Province of Quebec is being bled too, not so much by migration to the North-West; but she is being bled mainly to the entire loss of Canada, and to the profit of the neighboring Republic. I think the most important object to which we can practically address ourselves, is the diversion of that emigration to the States to migration to the North-West Territories. I do not hope myself for any substantial measure of success whatever from projects of repatriation. I believe that the French Canadian whom you let go to the States, and who settles there, you have practically lost forever. There may be cases of return, but, speaking in the large, such, I regret to say, is my belief of the result. Nor can I say that I entertain any very high or sanguine hopes, judging by experience, of Quebec migration on a large scale to the North-West. But still there is in that respect a hope, there ought to be a hope. If it is the case that we are unable to persuade our own people from the Province of Quebec, agriculturists, to move to those fertile plains of which my hon. friend from North Norfolk gave such a glowing description, if it is the case that we are unable to persuade them to move there, and that they still prefer the Eastern or the Western States to Canada, then how can we hope for any great immigration from abroad? I say that we ought to address ourselves to that problem to which I have referred, in an earnest, an active, an energetic manner. But I conceive that the temper and spirit displayed in this Parliament and displayed in the North-West itself in this matter, may be very important factors as to the success of any such effort. I decline to abandon the hope of considerable immigration. I believe that if the people of the North-West Territories will consider of the matter, if those few thousands of souls who are scattered, specks hardly discernible, through that vast territory, will but realise the fact that industrious, hardy, frugal, economical, cultivators of the soil are leaving old Canada, not for new Canada, but for the States, they will hold out their arms, they will welcome warmly those whom we might induce

to go out there. Are you going to induce them to do so by such proposals as this? I am for trying out the experiment; I am for continuing every inducement, the sentimental inducement if you please, as well as other inducements, until that experiment is fully and fairly tried out. In face of this agitation to which I have, all through what I have said, alluded, as the main and important, the overshadowing feature of this discussion, I should regard the immediate adoption of a proposal to expunge such little use of the French tongue as is now provided for, as fatal to whatever prospect there may be of an increasing or of a continuing French migration to the North-West. I say that the future will indicate to us the solution of this question, and that it should be reserved until the future speaks and gives us that indication. I agree with something that has been said by the hon. member for North Norfolk as to the people of the North-West. They are, so far as their rights, their constitutional rights are concerned, in a transition condition. They have not asked, they feel themselves that they are not yet in a position to claim the full measure of provincial rights. It would be entirely premature so to deal with these enormous areas of fertile territory in the present conditions of settlement and of occupation, and to turn them into Provinces. All sides are agreed on that. The people of the locality, but also the people of Canada, are deeply interested in the policy to be pursued in the North-West. Canada has, in truth, if you consider the enormous areas that she has to settle, the enormous expenditure she has made and is making—she has, in truth, the main interest, an interest far surpassing that of the few people who are now there. But fortunately for old Canada, and fortunately for those people, it is a common interest. There is not the slightest divergence of interest. There may be differences of opinion as to what are the best means of advancing that interest, but the interests are one and the same; the prosperity of the North-West is the one interest of both; and the proper step to take in order to advance that prosperity is the question submitted to both; and upon that question the Parliament of Canada, in the present condition of the North-West and of the people of that country, must speak; I will not say with a despotic voice, I will not at all say with a voice regardless of the opinion of the Territories, but still at this moment, having the responsibility, with a decisive and potential voice. Now, under these circumstances, I say, we should meet the question when it comes. The hon. gentleman has suggested that we have heard the opinion of the North-West. I should have great, though not absolutely decisive regard to that expression deliberately and constitutionally reached, but I deny that we have yet heard it. The North-West Assembly had no commission or authority from this Parliament, its creators, to deal with this question at all; and the electors to that assembly had not before them, when the assembly was elected, any proposition upon this subject. So, neither was there an authority in the body, nor was there a mandate from the constituency. It may be, it is quite possible, that even upon a full and calm consideration, after the interval of time which is to elapse between now and the next appeal to the people, it may be that there may be a very strong expression of opinion there, as to what is for their interests; but in the meantime it is not to be entirely forgotten

that the condition is only this, that the Parliament of Canada votes out of Canadian resources a trifling sum annually for the payment of the printing in the two languages of their ordinances; and that if they choose to elect a Frenchman to the assembly, that Frenchman has what, I am afraid, would be a very barren privilege, the right of expressing his sentiments in that assembly, in what, to the majority of them, I am afraid, would be something like an unknown tongue. There is the condition of things. No particular grievance, therefore, now exists, and the condition upon which you are to deal with the question is to be settled, as I have said, in the future. If, when you have tried the experiment, if when you have used all fair exertions, if when you have given all fair inducements, you still find that country is, even to the extent to which it now is proportionately, an English country, why the question will settle itself. If, what I would rejoice to see in the face of all that has been said in my Province and elsewhere, there should be a large immigration of Frenchmen to the North-West, and that settlement should be mixed, the condition might be practically the same. If that settlement were, what I would not prefer myself, isolated, it might create a condition of things demanding different treatment. Let us deal with it when the condition arises and as the condition exists; and when we do deal with it, let us deal with it, not associated with the efforts which have been made, the apprehensions which have been raised, the hostilities which have been excited by the proceedings of which this Bill is the first outcome, but entirely dissociated from all these, having meantime finally and altogether settled, as far as the opinion of the Parliament of Canada can settle, the other questions, the greater questions, the more important questions in regard to which this Bill seems to be but a sort of pilot balloon. Sir, I have endeavored to set forth in the draft of an amendment such a form of words as, without at all being wedded to that precise form, seems to me to indicate the most appropriate solution of this question, and, if the opportunity is offered to me in the course of this discussion, by any process, I shall take leave to submit that proposition to the chamber; and in order that hon. members may know what the proposition which I at all events would very respectfully submit for their consideration, I shall now, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, read it:

"This House cannot, having regard to the long continued use of the French language in old Canada, and to the covenants on that subject embodied in the British North America Act, agree to the declaration contained in the said Bill as the basis thereof, that it is expedient in the interest of the national unity of the Dominion that there should be community of language amongst the people of Canada.

"That, on the contrary, this House declares its inviolable adherence to the covenants in respect to the use of the French language in Quebec and Canada, and its determination to resist any attempt to impair those covenants.

"That as to such use of the French language in the North-West Territories, as is now provided by law, it is in the best interests of Canada at large and of the Territories in particular that inducements should be held out to the emigrating inhabitants of each of the Provinces to settle in the Territories, whose greatest want is population.

"That the expunging of the provisions allowing the use of the French language in the Territories is not required to remedy any practical grievance at this time, and would, under existing circumstances, lessen the chances of a French Canadian immigration.

"That it is expedient to leave those provisions undisturbed, and to defer any decision as to the ultimate solution of the question until time shall have further developed the conditions of North-West settlement."

On these lines, or on lines like these, I would invite this House to act; to these considerations, however feebly set forth, I would invite the earnest and dispassionate attention of my fellow-countrymen. This I feel is for Canada a turning point. I see but dimly; I may not see aright; but, if I at all discern the signs of the times, until Canadians on such lines agree, there will be for Canada neither progress, prosperity, nor peace.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, although the hon. gentleman has disapproved very strongly of the use of the plural pronoun, I will venture to make use of it in addressing him for a moment and in saying that we on this side of the House are delighted to see the hon. gentleman in his place once more and able so vigorously to take part in the discussions in this chamber. I will not for one moment dream of attempting to follow the hon. gentleman through the brilliant periods of the carefully prepared oration which he has delivered to this House. I would not dream of doing so in any case, besides I would leave the matter naturally to the hon. gentleman beside me (Mr. McCarthy). But, Sir, I will say that while the hon. gentleman was addressing us and while I admired those glowing periods in which he advocated a broad-minded and liberal policy in Canada, I could not help asking myself if it was possible the hon. gentleman was not aware that his own conduct was largely responsible for the agitation and for the fear in the Province of Ontario which had given rise to this agitation which he condemns. I could not help asking myself whether the hon. gentleman was not aware that the course which he had pursued in reference to the Riel agitation had warned the people of Ontario of the danger in which they stood and had led them to believe, rightly or wrongly, that the power of French Canada was so great that even Edward Blake had succumbed to its influence, had gone back on all the record of his past life, had forgotten his pledge, yet warm from his lips that he would not attempt to build up a political party on the scaffold of Regina, had forgotten the blood of his own fellow-countrymen on the plains of the North-West, and had joined hands with the Parti National. That party which without his support would have withered and died almost in the hour in which it was born, that party which is responsible to-day for all the trouble that is upon us at this moment. I could not help also asking myself if the hon. gentleman who had addressed us in such eloquent terms had also forgotten, or was it possible that the hon. gentleman who told us that this preamble of the Bill was the all-important part of the Bill, was the same gentleman who voted last Parliament that the preamble of a Bill had nothing whatever to do with it, or was it due to his approval of that preamble that he so voted. I do not wish to press this matter further, but I will say that these considerations presented themselves to my mind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. McNEILL. I am about to proceed. I do not wish to press that particular part of the matter any further, but I was going to turn to another matter. I hope I have not in any way annoyed hon. gentlemen opposite. I think I have the right to express my views as well as any of these hon. gentlemen. If

Mr. BLAKE.

we have not even the right of free discussion I do now know what Canada is coming to. I have been much struck during the course of this debate with one or two of its features. One of them is that there seems to be a very strong reluctance, I do not say on the part of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, but on the part of most of the hon. gentlemen who have opposed this Bill, to meet this issue squarely, and to say whether or not they desired to maintain a dual language in the North-West Territories, in the teeth of the almost unanimous wish of the representatives of the people there. Another feature of this debate which has struck me is this, that hon. gentlemen or some of those who have spoken at least, desire not so much to discuss this Bill as it is, or to discuss the provisions of the Bill, or whether or not the dual language should be maintained officially in the North-West, but rather to discuss some other question as to whether our French Canadian friends are to have the right to speak their own language at all in the North-West and throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. There is another feature of this debate which has impressed me a good deal, and that is, that there is a tendency, in some quarters, to impute narrow-mindedness and a want of liberality to those who think that to impose the dual language by statutory enactment upon the people of those vast regions, which we call the North-West, would not be to the benefit of Canada. The speech of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) struck me as somewhat of an illustration of the first two of these features of this debate. The hon. gentleman, if he will allow me to say so, made us a most able and a most interesting address; but I listened to that speech for considerably over an hour without being able to discover whether the hon. gentleman was or was not in favor of continuing the dual language officially in the North-West. The hon. gentleman certainly pitched into my hon. friend beside me (Mr. McCarthy) most unmercifully, as did several other gentlemen, and unless my hon. friend from Simcoe has the hide of a rhinoceros, or half a dozen of them, he must, by this time, one would think, be pretty sore. The hon. member for Bothwell told us that if one language only was to be the language of Canada, that could not be the English language, but that it must be a sort of hybrid between the English and the French. I thought when he made that statement that he was not complimentary to my friend, the Minister of Public Works, who had just been addressing us in very forcible English indeed. I thought he had not been complimentary to my hon. friend, the leader of his own party, whose charming English will, I venture to say, live in the literature of Canada. The hon. gentleman naturally overlooks these facts, because they are facts. He has also overlooked the fact that although Highlanders of Scotland speak the English language they speak pure English; he overlooked the fact that although almost all the rising generation of Wales speak English, they do not speak a hybrid between Welsh and English. He also overlooked the fact that although the people in the counties of Ireland, where there has been an admixture of race, speak English, that that English is not a mixture of Erse and English, but is pure English. The hon. gentleman overlooked these facts; but I do not suppose we need be much

surprised at that, for we all know that when my hon. friend gets on what I may call a burst of pure theoretical, political, philosophy, such ordinary common place things as mere matters of notorious fact are altogether beneath his notice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is depending on his imagination now.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman is simply stating facts which my hon. friend from Bothwell never can appreciate. I may say further that I thought the hon. gentleman paid rather a left-handed compliment to our French Canadian friends, when out of all the characters portrayed by Shakespeare he selected as the mouth-piece of the French Canadians on this occasion the rapacious, the extortionate, and the relentless Shylock. My hon. friend gave us a very interesting discourse upon the law of forces. He handled the subject admirably, and he told us that if a number of forces were acting upon a given body at a given time, that body would be impelled in the direction of the resultant of these forces. I see my hon. friend nods his head and agrees to that statement. He told us that that law applied to mental as well as to physical force, and he was happy enough to illustrate the fact himself, because he showed us that the forces then acting on his own mind impelled him to make a perfect circle round the subject under discussion and carefully to avoid touching it at all. In reference to the third feature of this discussion, namely, the tendency to impute illiberality to those who think that the dual official language should not be maintained in the North-West Territories. For my own part, I wish to state that I shall express my conscientious convictions on this question regardless of any such imputations. While in many things I do not agree with my hon. friend beside me (Mr. McCarthy) yet I agree with the proposition he lays down, when he says that a country inhabited by one homogeneous people, speaking one language, is stronger and more stable than the same country would be if it were inhabited by an equal population composed of the original races which together went to make up that homogeneous people; each one of them speaking its own separate language, maintaining its own laws and customs and preserving its own individuality. I venture to say that there are few people who will controvert that assertion. Let us take the Austrian Empire for example. What is the notorious cause of the weakness of the Austrian Empire? It is the fact that there is no distinctive nationality in Austria; it is the fact that Austria consists of a conglomeration, or rather I should say of a bundle of distinct peoples, each of them preserving their own nationality, their own manners and customs; and as Professor Freeman says held together only by the fact that certain marriages, and wars, and treaties, and so forth, have given them a common sovereign.

I have been astonished to hear the example of Austria held up as one which could be placed in opposition to the view of the hon. member for North Simcoe. What does M. Louis Leger say in his late work with regard to Austria, a work of which Prof. Freeman, in his preface, expresses the highest admiration? He says:

"These conflicting elements have not been welded together by time, as for example: Have the Celts, the Gallo-Romans, the Franks, and the Iberians in Modern

France? They have each preserved their language and their traditions; they live side by side without mingling. The life of an organic body consists in the equilibrium of the simple elements of which it is composed. If this equilibrium is destroyed, the body dies. In like fashion the life of the Austro-Hungarian State depends upon the unstable equilibrium of the various races which make up the empire."

Then, take the case of England. It is notorious that the Celts in the west did not fuse with the rest of the population of the island, and during several centuries that circumstance was a source of weakness, and embarrassment, and a clog upon England. If the Celts, and Anglo-Saxons, and Normans had not mingled in England and formed one race, but lived as separate races in England to-day, does anyone suppose that England would occupy the place among the nations of the world which she does occupy? Take the case of Scotland. Is it not notorious that the Highlanders of Scotland did not amalgamate with the Lowlanders, and is it not a fact that that was a source of weakness to that country? Sir Walter Scott, who knew the nature of Scotchmen as well as any man who ever lived, perfectly expresses the feelings of the Highlanders of Scotland when he puts into the mouth of a typical chieftain the words with which we are all familiar:

"The stranger came with iron hand,
And from our fathers reft the land."

And then, after giving a magnificent picture of the barren fastnesses into which they were driven, he goes on:

"Pent in this fortress of the North,
Thinkst thou we will not sally forth
To spoil the spoilers as we may,
And from the robber rend the prey?
Ay, by my soul! while on yon plain
The Saxon rears one shock of grain,
While of ten thousand herds there strays
But one along yon river maze,
The Gael of plain and river heir
Shall with strong hand redeem his share."

Sir, it is notorious, as I say, that those words represent the sentiment of the Highlanders of Scotland, as maintained for very many generations, and that it is only within comparatively recent days that that unfortunate feeling of distrust and dislike between these races has died away; and I venture to say that anyone who knows the circumstances of that country is prepared to endorse what I say when I assert that nothing has more contributed to that better and happier condition of things which now exists than the more general use of the English language in the Highlands of Scotland. Take the case of France. Will anyone say that if France to-day were not inhabited by the great and homogeneous people that she has, but were inhabited by the Celts and Gallo—Romans, Iberians, Franks and Norsemen—each preserving their own institutions, usages and individuality, and speaking their own language, she could be the great and powerful and stable nation she is to-day? And so I believe that here in Canada, if our races were amalgamated, we should be stronger than we are at the present moment. We all know that our French Canadian friends have many qualities characteristic of their race, great and good qualities, which are not characteristic of the race to which we belong; and I think we may say, on the other hand, that we have good qualities characteristic of our race which are not so highly developed

Mr. McNEILL.

in theirs; and I think we may fairly conclude that if there were a blending of the races, that blending would be beneficial to both; but in any case it cannot be doubted that it would add to the solidarity of the Dominion. Then, I think, there can be no question of the correctness of the assertion of my hon. friend, that this perpetuation of different languages has a tendency to keep races apart and to preserve and maintain race distinctions; and the other proposition, the reverse of that—though I cannot go so far as some of the quotations which my hon. friend read taken by themselves would seem to go—appears to me to be perfectly correct also, that the use of one language is a wonderful solvent of race distinctions. It further seems to me to be self-evident, that the enforcing by statutory enactment, so far as statutory enactment can enforce it, the use of distinct languages has a tendency to perpetuate a plurality of languages, and to prevent the advance throughout the population of any one of those languages which has a natural tendency to become dominant. Now, Sir, all these propositions I believe to be true and unassailable; but I hope no hon. gentleman in this House, whether he be amongst my French Canadian friends or amongst my English-speaking friends, will for one moment suppose that because I hold these propositions to be true, I also believe that the dual language should not have been permitted in Canada. I entertain no such opinion, Mr. Speaker. In dealing practically with this question, we have not to consider principles in the abstract, but facts as they are. A well known writer, speaking of the great Edmund Burke, said:

"All abstract speculation and theorising on the principles of government, without special reference to the particular circumstances of the country and the people to be governed, Mr. Burke held, from the beginning to the end of his life, in undisguised contempt."

And I venture to think that it would be well if that rooted conviction of the greatest political thinker Britain ever produced, was also the rooted conviction of some of our theoretical political philosophers of the nineteenth century. It no more follows that because we think it would be to the advantage of Canada that we should have one homogeneous race here, that because we think that our races would more speedily become homogeneous if one language only were used, we would be justified in attempting, even if we had the power, to stamp out one of these languages, than it follows that one of these races would be justified in exterminating the other. I would ask if there is any man in this Chamber who would say that when Canada passed under the aegis of liberty-loving England, the use of their mother tongue should have been denied to the gallant defenders of their soil. Is there any man who will say that on the day when Montcalm fell on the Plains of Abraham there should have passed away forever from his compatriots the right to the freest and fullest use of that tongue which they had learned at their mother's knee, which is interwoven with the very threads of life, which is inseparably connected with every joy and sorrow, with every emotion, with every thought, from infancy to the grave? I venture to say that no one will say so, and I venture to say that any such treatment of the vanquished would have been un-English and unjust, would have been tyrannical and cruel. I will go further and

say that it seems to me it would have been only a little less oppressive to have precluded our French Canadian friends, who were the overwhelming majority in their own Province, from the freest use of their own language in their courts of law and in the Legislative Assembly of their Province. In treating of this matter, we must not be so much impressed by considerations of abstract principles as by facts as they exist and by the lessons of history, and while it would have been well for England if the Celts of the west had amalgamated with the rest of the population as the Celts in Cornwall and Devonshire did, and while it would have been well for Scotland if the Celts in the North had amalgamated with the Saxons in the plains as the Celts in England have done, still we must remember that notwithstanding the fact that they did not amalgamate and have not amalgamated up to this day, England has grown to be great and prosperous as no country of a like area has ever grown before; and Queen Victoria to-day has not throughout her broad Empire more devoted and loyal subjects than are to be found in Wales. And while it is true that it would have added to the strength of Scotland if the Celts of the Highlands had joined hand in hand with their brethren on the plains, yet, notwithstanding the fact that they did not do so, Scotland for many a long century preserved her independence and held her own; and when at length the kingdoms were merged into one, that result came about, not as a consideration of abstract principles alone would have led us to believe it would have come about, by the conquest of the weaker country by the stronger, but it came about by the fact that the far weaker country gave a king to her great and powerful southern neighbor from her own royal House of Stuart; and to-day when any British general wishes to get a body of picked men for any service of special difficulty and danger, these very plaided warriors of the North, who were so often led by men like the typical Rhoderick Dhu against the Saxon, are amongst the most highly prized of all those most famous regiments whose splendid deeds of valor, and prowess, have shed a lustre on the British arms. Therefore, I say, that although we have two races living side by side here in Canada, I for one am not doubtful of the result. Let no man fear for the future of Canada. Mighty and glorious that future must be, notwithstanding that there may be perhaps a poor pitiful handful of traitors within, and that there are certainly swarms of jealous rivals without. For my part I wish we had no race distinctions, I wish we were all one united homogeneous people, I wish the terms French Canadian and British Canadian were only to be found in the pages of history, and that from the North to the South and from ocean to ocean, the simple word Canadian were the one and only term that could appropriately be applied to the citizen of this broad Dominion. But, Sir, such a result as that, if it is to be brought about at all, can only come about by the flux of time and by the cultivation of feelings of mutual respect, mutual forbearance, and mutual good-will. I wish to say this, however, that the forbearance must not be all on one side. We must remember that part of the trouble is this, that in the Province of Ontario, and, I believe, in other parts of Canada to-day, the impression is that the forbearance has been pretty

much all on one side. For my part I will say here in my place in Parliament what I said to my own constituents on the 12th July last, that the man who would for party purposes or for paltry personal motives endeavor to sow the seeds of dissension between our French Canadian friends and the British-speaking people of Canada is unworthy to represent any constituency in this Dominion, and that he might more properly, in the well known words of the poet Hood:—

“Sit for hell and represent the devil.”

Sir, we have our race distinctions, and it is our duty to make the best of them. Unfortunately the extraordinary movement which was inaugurated some time ago in the Province of Quebec, and which was promoted so largely by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and which culminated in the formation of a party whose *raison d'être* is only that it is the French as against the English party, has rendered the making the best of our race distinctions very much more difficult than it otherwise would have been. That is a proposition which perhaps may be taken exception to. But when the people of the Province of Ontario see the Premier of the Province of Quebec ostentatiously put himself at the head of this anti-British party in the Province of Quebec, they, I think, naturally come to the conclusion—whether it is right or not is another question—that this anti-British party represents the sentiments of the people of the Province of Quebec and that the sentiment of the people of the Province of Quebec is hostile to British interests. I do not myself believe that that is a fair view of the situation, because we know—those of us who are in this House know—or many of us believe—I may say we know that the Parti National does not represent united Quebec at all events. We know that our French Canadian friends sitting on this side of this House are opposed to the Parti National, and I believe—my hon. friend will contradict me if I am wrong—that the organ of the party of which he is the distinguished leader, *La Patrie*, denounces the Parti National. If, then, we have our friends on this side opposed to the Parti National and those hon. gentlemen opposite who represent the great Liberal Party of the Province, also opposed to it, I think the sentiment of the Province of Quebec cannot fairly be taken to be hostile to British interests, but the existence of that Parti National produces that impression in Ontario. I was very much pleased to hear the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), who occupies such a prominent position in that party—if I may be allowed to allude in passing to a previous debate—aver from his place in this House in the most solemn terms, in the most distinct and emphatic terms, that he and those acting with him were not actuated by any anti-British feeling whatever; that he and his compatriots recognised to the fullest extent the beneficence—that was the word he used—the beneficence of British rule in Canada. And I was glad to hear him aver that, without any reservation, they admitted that they were treated with fair play, with justice and with generosity. I was delighted when I heard the hon. member make that speech, and I was so moved by it that I was almost inclined to cross the floor of the House and renew to him my supplication that he would allow his name to be enrolled as a member of the Imperial Federation

League; but I thought I would wait till the conclusion of the debate, when I was satisfied, from what my hon. friend said, that I would capture the whole *Parti National en bloc*. But I warn my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, who is not here at present, but I warn him through the members of the Cabinet who are here, that when that day arrives and I get the silver-tongued member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) to become a member of the Federation League, my right hon. friend will have to keep a sharp eye on me lest I fall a victim to the magic of my hon. friend opposite. As I have said we must try to make the best of our race differences. The hon. gentleman said he had the fullest confidence in British fair play, British justice and British generosity, and I say he and his compatriots may have the fullest confidence in British fair play, justice and generosity. The British people in Canada and in the Mother Country are as ready to mete out fair play, justice and generosity to-day as they have been in the past, and they will be in the future as they are to-day. That is my conviction. Because for my part, I will never believe that our French Canadian friends can be prevailed upon either by agitator or demagogue so far to do violence to the generous and chivalrous impulses which are so characteristic of their race, as to endeavor to convert those privileges which have been so lavishly conferred upon them into a weapon to wound the hand that bestowed the boon. Therefore, I do not believe that any attempt will ever be made to interfere with those privileges. It is right that they should look with jealousy at any attempt to interfere with the constitutional privileges which have been conferred upon them, but, for my part—it may be my blindness—I cannot see how the proposal which is now before us will interfere with them. I am not speaking of the preamble of the Bill, I am speaking of the Bill itself. I take the position which was taken by the 188 last session, and I assume that the preamble is not an essential part of the Bill. I say the question with which we are now face to face is not one of interfering with the constitutional privileges of our French Canadian friends. It is rather a question whether we should continue to interfere with the natural privileges of the British people in the North-West Territories, who have, by the voice of their Legislative Assembly, asked us to relieve them of a burden which this House has imposed upon them. When they had no Legislative Assembly, this House, with the strong hand and in the exercise of its right, no doubt, if not of its wisdom, decreed that there should be dual language in the North-West Territories. At that time we had at least this excuse for what we did, that we had no authoritative information that what we did would be distasteful to the majority of the people there. Now we have the fact that the Legislative Assembly, which we felt bound to call into existence, has, by a practically unanimous vote, asked us to relieve them of the burden which we cast upon them. They say that they regard this as a burden, they say that they do not require dual language in the North-West Territories, they say that they regard it as burdensome and vexatious, and they ask us to remove the incubus which we have cast upon them. I do not see for my part how we can refuse to accede to their request. It is perfectly useless, to my mind, to

Mr. McNEILL.

place against the almost unanimous vote of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West petitions such as have been presented to this House, more especially when we know that the opinion expressed by the Legislative Assembly is endorsed by every organ of public opinion in the North-West. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Davin), who edits the *Regina Leader*, and who, I see, is not in his place, has not endorsed it. Well, I listened to my hon. friend reading a long article from the *Regina Leader* the other day, and the *Leader* did not venture to controvert in any way the statement that this was the opinion of the people there. It is quite true that if there were a large French population in the North-West Territories, the precedents which have been adduced by the hon. member for West Durham, might have some force. What were they? One was that it had been recommended by the British Parliament that the people of certain countries in Europe should be left to decide for themselves whether they should have a dual language, or a plurality of languages, or what language they should have as their official language. Well, the people of the North-West have told us their wishes; and if he does not give effect to their expressed opinion upon this subject, he is going back upon this precedent which he has brought before the House. And what was the other? It was with reference to Poland, and the question was whether the Poles should be allowed fuller use of their own language in their own country. What in the world has that got to do with this question? If the North-West was a French settlement, if there was an overwhelming majority of our French Canadian friends in the North-West, these two precedents which have been brought forward by the hon. gentleman would have some bearing. But I venture to say—and I hope that he will not think me impertinent in saying so; I suppose, insignificant as I am, I have a right to my opinion on the question—but in my opinion, at least, his precedents have no bearing upon the question at all, but are rather an argument in favor of the contention that the people of the North-West ought to decide this question, and that the opinion of the people of the North-West ought to be taken as conclusive on this question. Now, if there were a large number of our French Canadian friends in that country, even though they were not in a majority, I think it might be reasonable that we should stay our hands. But I want to ask, is there not some limit to this? Suppose there was only one French Canadian in the North-West, and a hundred thousand British people; should we be called upon to establish a dual language in the North-West Territories, or to maintain it there? Well, then, it is a question of degree. The question is, whether there is such a population of our French Canadian friends there as to require the use of this official dual language, such a population as would make it worth our while to go right in the teeth of the almost unanimously expressed wish of the representatives of the people. It is strange Liberal doctrine, at all events, I think. Now, Sir, if the people of the North-West were seeking to inflict any hardship upon our French Canadian friends the case would be different. But they are not asking anything of the kind. They are simply asking us not to impose upon them this dual official language, and when we remember that every single member of that Legislative Assembly is an English-speaking person, and that the

French language is to him a foreign tongue, it seems to me that the request is a very reasonable one. Mr. Speaker, I would be most unwilling in any way to do violence to the sentiments of my French Canadian friends; I would be as unwilling to do so as I am sure they would be unwilling to do violence to my sentiments. I would even be willing to go some length in deference to their prejudices, as I believe they would be willing to go some length to meet my prejudices. But though I am prepared to go a long way for peace and friendship, even for the attainment of such objects as these, I am not prepared to go as far as to betray the people of my own flesh and blood; I am not prepared to go so far as to say that I will ignore the voice of the Legislature which we ourselves have felt it our duty to establish there. I would consider that I was doing them a gross injustice, and I shall endeavor, for my part, to mete out to them the same measure of justice that I would hope to have meted out to myself.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think I would have attempted to address the House upon this question, had it not been for the remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. McNeill). I think it was a very inopportune time for the hon. member to make the attack he did on my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), just after the able, patriotic and broad-minded speech that he had made, showing that he was able to rise above party and express in a patriotic manner the views he held. I regret that the hon. gentleman should have taken this opportunity to make such a wild charge against the character of my hon. friend from West Durham, although he requires no defence at my hand, either in this House or in the country. Sir, the position that my hon. friend took upon the Reil question only entitled him, I think, to still greater credit before this House and the people of Canada. To my mind he had everything to lose from a political point of view, and nothing to gain, from the position he took on that question; and although I did not vote with him, although he was my leader, whom I respected and admired then as I do at the present time, I exercised my humble judgment according to the best of my ability, nor did that hon. gentleman ever complain of the position that I took at that time. I think, Sir, that it is to be regretted that this question has come before the House at all, considering the course the discussion has taken. The discussion has taken a wide range, and many matters have been referred to that are likely to raise bad feeling throughout the country, not only between people of different nationalities, but between those professing different religious creeds; and this has been attributed to the speeches made by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) on other occasions outside of the House, as well as to the remarks he made on the introduction of this Bill. I must also say, Mr. Speaker, that I think that the heated and passionate address of the Minister of Public Works last night is very much to be regretted. I do not think that hon. Minister was at all justified in making the remarks he did on this particular question. Had the hon. Minister any ground for the attack he made upon the people of the Province of Ontario that they were intolerant towards their fellow-countrymen in Quebec, and the French-speaking people of this country? The

hon. gentleman must have forgotten that at the present time in this House the most ultra-British and ultra-Protestant representatives in the chamber have chosen for their leader a French-speaking Catholic who, by his conduct in this House, and by his great ability, has endeared himself not only to the members on this side, who are proud of him as their leader, but I may say to every member on the other side of the House as well; a gentleman whose patriotism is well known, who has on several occasions taken a broad-minded and liberal view of questions, in opposition to what we know to be the sentiments, easily aroused, of his race in the Province of Quebec, which he represents here. That being the case, I think it is to be regretted that the Minister of Public Works should have made the passionate appeal he did and have attacked the people of Ontario, and have appealed to his French Canadian friends irrespective of party to stand by him on the present occasion. In my humble opinion he did not consider that the constitutional rights of the people of Quebec were being attacked at the present time, or that there was any danger whatever to him or to his party or his nationality or the creed of the people whom he represents. It is only fair, after the attack made by the hon. member who has taken his seat, giving as his reason why this agitation has been carried on throughout Ontario, that I should thus express my opinion. In my humble judgment, I may say to my French Canadian friends on both sides of the House, that I do not think there is any particular danger to their constitutional rights or their civil or religious liberties. If I were to express my true feelings on this matter I would say that, judging by the articles in the press which support the Dominion Government, judging by the resolutions passed at party meetings throughout Ontario, there is no particular fault found with the action of this House or with this Government, for the newspapers and the party with whom the hon. Minister works in harmony do not find fault with the leader of the Government and hold him and his colleagues responsible for this agitation, but all the blame is cast upon Mr. Mowat and the Ontario Government. Does not the Minister of Public Works know that the only charge brought forward in Ontario against the Government of that Province and the only charge brought by the Conservative party, with whom he works so well, is that Mr. Mowat is allowing French to be taught in the public schools in some parts of Ontario, and that he has been truckling to the Catholic Church? These are the charges made, and I am sure when the elections take place a few months hence that will be the last we will hear about this, which appears to be at present a very important and serious question, so far as many of the Conservatives in Ontario are concerned. No doubt my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works will find time, instead of offering, as he told us, prayers on sacred ground in Quebec for the souls of his forefathers, to send missionaries to stir up the French Canadians to vote against the Mowat Government, as he has done in the past. I am informed that only a few months ago he sent one of his missionaries to assist a in bye-election and to endeavor to stir up the feelings of the French and Irish Catholics against that Government. I have as much right, and a great deal more right, to offer this as a cause of the

agitation in Ontario, as had the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House to lay an unjustifiable charge against the hon. gentleman for West Durham (Mr. Blake). If those charges had not been made I would not have addressed the House on this question. Although I admire very much, and I am sure every member of this House and every true Canadian must admire the broad and patriotic speech of the member for West Durham, of whom I am a great admirer and follower, I cannot agree with him on the main question before the House at the present time. I believe, and it is my honest judgment, although I may be wrong, that, as in the North-West Territory there are so few French-speaking people, and still fewer, if the information I have received is correct, who read French, it would be better not to have a dual language in that country at the present time. While I differ from the hon. gentleman, I am sure he will give me credit for honesty of judgment in dealing with this subject. While not committing myself to vote for the Bill before the House I candidly express my view on this question and I believe also the view of my constituents. I may say to the Minister of Public Works, who has just entered the Chamber, that I do not think he was justified in making the attack he did upon us. It is not within my recollection that in the Province of Ontario any Catholic or any number of Catholics have been treated with intolerance or their worship interfered with in any respect whatever, with the one or two exceptions which are so frequently referred to, and in those cases there was no interference with worship. It is true that in Toronto, where feeling runs high, when there were large demonstrations on one, two or three occasions, rows have been stirred up and little conflicts have taken place; but at no place, and certainly not in the riding which I represent, where there is a very large Protestant majority, have the hon. gentleman's co-religionists failed to enjoy the greatest possible liberty to worship God in any way they pleased, and in my riding they have been assisted, as every Catholic throughout that section will bear witness, very materially by their Protestant neighbors. I repeat that the insinuations made in the speech of the Minister of Public Works were very unjustifiable, and his appeal to his fellow Canadians, irrespective of party, to stand by him on this occasion, was simply an attempt to pull wool over their eyes, for he knew that if there was any agitation in Ontario, if there was any intolerance in regard to this question, it was owing to the action of his own political friends for whom he had not a word of condemnation, although they are the party which is opposing the action of the Liberal Government in allowing French to be taught in the schools, and indeed the hon. gentleman seemed to be perfectly satisfied to receive the support of those who were carrying on this agitation in Ontario.

Mr. LAURIER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LAURIER moved :

That this debate be made the first Order of the Day on Monday next after private Bills.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Miscellaneous Expenses—Senate..... \$58,438

Mr. FOSTER. This is a decrease of over \$2,000.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). How is this decrease of \$2,200 ?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, don't find fault with a decrease.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). There must be something about it to require some explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the result of a general course of economy.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understood that last Session there was to be some investigation to see if the expenses could not be cut down. Are we to understand that this is the result of the operations of the enquiry last year ?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a forerunner of the result.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Well, we would like to see some afterrunners too.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before these items pass, I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance and of the House, to what I consider has been a gross misuse of the vote of this House in this connection last year. In the Auditor General's Report for 1888-1889 I find that this House, after consideration and consultation, voted a sum of \$5,338 for the stationery of the Senate. That amounted to about the same *per capita* as was voted for our stationery here. I find, however, that these gentlemen of the Senate instead of spending the sum we voted spent \$12,412.88. This is a matter which requires a good deal of explanation. It is perfectly useless for us to attempt to limit the expenditure, if we vote four or five thousand dollars for a particular department or branch of the Legislature, and if they spend ten or twelve thousand dollars. When I take up the details of that expenditure I find that they are not such as would commend them to our serious judgment. Among the items I find 99 thermometers, from which I would suppose that each gentleman in the Senate requires a thermometer to test the temperature of the chamber for himself.

Mr. FOSTER. To keep him warm.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No ; it would not even keep him warm. Then I find among the items several barometers, 12 tourists' cases at \$127 (I suppose some of them intended to make a journey in the summer), 22 writing cases, stationery cabinets, writing desks, deed boxes, despatch boxes, pocket diaries, letter cases, and a lot of other things which at first sight do not appear to be at all necessary. The principle which I wish to call attention to is the disregard paid to the control which this Chamber should exercise on the expenditure of public money. When we vote \$5,800 and they spend \$12,000 it is a flagrant disregard of the wishes of this Chamber, which is supposed to control the expenditure of the public money. I think the Minister should give some explanation of this extraordinary expenditure above the vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. While the Minister is looking for this information, I would call his attention

to an item of \$100.50 for a gown for the Speaker of the Senate. I would like to know why this House should be called upon to contribute \$100.50 for one gown for the Speaker of the Senate. It must be a very costly one, when we find that the gown of the Speaker of this House only cost \$60.

Mr. FOSTER. It must be of very much finer material.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think this is any matter to joke about, nor do I think that the people of this country at the present moment, considering our debt and financial embarrassment, are ready to give their assent to extravagance of this kind. It may be that the Speaker of the Senate has to be provided with a gown, but I think discretion should direct him not to resort to such extravagance. I do not consider it is in keeping with the dignity of a man who occupies the high position of the Speaker of the Senate, and who is irresponsible to the people, that he should act so extravagantly with the public money.

Mr. FOSTER. Unfortunately there is no representative of the Senate here. I could not by any manner of means divine what questions would be asked. All that I can do with reference to these matters is when the attention of the House has been called to them, make a note and bring down an explanation to the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I move that the item stand, and that the Speaker of the Senate appear before the Committee to give information.

Mr. BOWELL. You cannot do that. How are you going to get him into the House ?

Mr. LISTER. At all events there should be some person in this House able to give us the information. It is a monstrous thing that the Senate, irresponsible as it is to the people of this country, should exceed the appropriation made by Parliament. I find here amongst other items 432 pocket pencils. These are gold pencils, I should think, and probably each Senator takes one for himself and three or four for his friends. Then, again, we have 372 pocket knives for about 70 Senators. I may say, in connection with this item of stationery, that this year the members of this House have received a very inferior lot of stationery, much inferior to what has been given for several years before. I for one believe that the giving of these boxes of stationery should be entirely abolished. Every gentleman who attends this House and the Senate gets all the writing paper he wishes for at the Stationery Office up stairs; the boxes of stationery are taken home, and in three or four Sessions he has enough for his children and his grandchildren. If the collection were confined to stationery, there might be some excuse for it; but all sorts of articles are given, particularly to the members of the Senate. I understand that they receive dressing cases—which are entirely unnecessary and uncalled for. If the Government think there should be a provision for stationery for the members, it would be better to vote \$25 or \$30 additional to their sessional allowance; but the Senators have no right to overdraw the appropriation of this House for that purpose. We control the purse strings, and they have no right to spend a dollar more than we allow them. If they do, they should return it.

Mr. FOSTER. If hon. gentlemen will point out just what items they wish to have explanations upon, I shall be glad to get the explanations. These items are a recapitulation of the articles which go into the stationery boxes, and you will find a similar recapitulation of the articles that go into the stationery boxes of this House.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I see a charge for six deed boxes; what are they for?

Mr. FOSTER. I dare say they are to put documents in. Other documents than deeds might be put into deed boxes.

Mr. LISTER. There is evidently favoritism in this matter. I know some Senators who say that they have not received some of the things mentioned in this list. I see a charge for brief bags, and four Senators must have got writing desks, to the exclusion of the other 76; and various articles are charged for in insufficient numbers to go round the Senate, so that a few Senators must have been favored at the expense of the others.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not quite fair in his criticism. These items are for stationery used not only by the Senators themselves, but also by the officers of the Senate.

Mr. LISTER. Last year the total amount spent by the Senators for stationery was \$12,412, while we voted them only \$5,988, so that they spent more than 100 per cent. in excess of the amount voted by this House. This \$12,000 is really worth more than all the services the senators have rendered since 1867.

Mr. FISHER. The Finance Minister is no doubt right in saying that some of these articles are required by officers of the Senate, but I cannot conceive of any one connected with the Senate who has a right to order a brief bag, for instance, which is a part of the equipment of a legal gentleman. There would be some reasonable excuse if such articles were necessary for their public duties, and not for their private or professional use. The remarks of my hon. friend are important, from the fact that the Senators have expended more than double the amount voted; and I care not what the items are, no Department of the Government has a right to ask for a grant to be thus unblushingly overstepped. The same amount is asked this year, while we have no sort of guarantee that double as much will not be again spent; and, apparently if these things are necessary, it is very evident that instead of their asking for the same amount as was voted last year, the hon. Finance Minister ought to ask for double as much, because the Senate spent double last year. If this expenditure is not justifiable, and evidently in the Finance Minister's opinion it is not, because he does not propose to give them as much money as they spent, then we ought to know why they have increased the expenditure?

Mr. FOSTER. I will make enquiries about the item of stationery. It must be remembered that these are simply the details, while the general vote has not been very much over-expended. Some of the details can be exactly known, because they are salaries, and some cannot, because they are different from year to year; and it may be, and I think it very reasonable to suppose that it is, that some of the items that appear here are for articles that are in the nature of stock, which may run out from year to year, and which may be provided anew in

a particular year, when the whole amount is consequently greater than would be normally used in an ordinary year.

Mr. McMULLEN. Apart from this item, there are several points on which we should like information from the Senators. Now, in the first place, I understand there are about seventy-five or eighty Senators altogether. I see that there are 420 blotting pads at \$254; 1,992 lead pencils at \$110; 432 pocket pencils at \$300; 438 boxes of pens at \$373; 4,356 pen holders at \$126; 372 pocket knives at \$541; 312 pairs of scissors at \$314—over a dollar a pair; 268 pocket knives at \$99; 144 desk knives at \$34; 6 deed boxes at \$31; 96 pocket diaries at \$120; 120 letter cases at \$132; 240 pocket memos. at \$68; 120 wallets at \$160; 135 card cases at \$79; 720 pieces ribbon at \$398; 138 baskets at \$93; 8 hones—I do not know what those are, unless they are razor strops; it is a wonder they do not charge us for razors. If we pass over all those items, next year they will probably bring in at the tail of the bill a charge for barbers to shave them every morning, and possibly for grinding-stones to grind their razors. These charges are unreasonable, and we would not be discharging our duty if we were to allow an item of this kind to pass without bringing before the House and the country the extravagance of men who are removed beyond the reach of the people or the Government. Some distinct understanding should be come to by which each Senator would get a prescribed amount of stationery—a knife if necessary, a pair of scissors, but nothing more. The idea of having 320 pairs of scissors at \$360 for 78 Senators is absurd. We have the right to criticise severely this scandalous expenditure connected with the Senate, and we should not allow this item to pass before getting some explanation. What becomes of all this stuff? The Senators must be loaded down every time they go away from here. It is a disgrace that they should take the property of the people in this style and carry it away.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Without criticising the items, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to a fact which appears rather singular, namely, that the stationery for the Senate, composed of 70 to 80 members, should cost \$12,400, while the stationery for the House of Commons, composed of 215 members, does not cost so much. That is something that requires explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. That has been the case for a long series of years. That is due not so much to the great amount, as to the fact that the Senators are more careful in the selection of their stationery than the House of Commons.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Should that be allowed?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a pretty difficult matter to exercise control over. They have there their own Committee on Contingencies, and have a good deal to do in the management of their own affairs, and it is scarcely fair that my hon. friend, who has criticised so extensively these several items, should make the assertion that these hon. gentlemen carry away stationery in their pockets. I do not think these remarks were called for, and

Mr. FOSTER.

they were certainly not respectful to the other branch of this House.

Mr. McMULLEN. What do they do with it? We have a right to know what becomes of all this stuff.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will not consent to pass this item until I follow out to their ultimate destination all the articles, I am afraid the item will have to stand a long time.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman should get from the Senate an account of what becomes of all this stuff. We have put a lot of questions to the hon. gentleman, but he is not able to answer. I contend that the item should stand over, and that the hon. gentleman should ask the Senate to furnish him with the necessary information.

Mr. FISHER. I am sure the Senators themselves would be willing to take such steps as are necessary to give the Finance Minister all the information asked for. It stands to reason that the Senators themselves cannot possibly have carried off or used all the articles enumerated in the Auditor's Report. My own conclusion is that there must be great carelessness in the management of the Stationery Department, or very deliberate misapplication of the articles charged. I do not wish to make any charges against any of the officials, but it is in the interests, not only of the Senators themselves, but in the interests of the officials of the Senate, that a complete answer should be given to the questions put. It is absurd to suppose that the Senators, and officials who have access to these articles, could possibly have used them, and the only conclusion we can come to is that these articles were abstracted from the Stationery Department of the Senate and applied to purposes to which they ought not to be applied at the country's expense. It is, therefore, I believe, the duty of the Minister of Finance, as defending the reputation of the Senate, to give a complete answer to these questions, and I do not think it would be showing proper respect to the Senate to allow this item to pass until such explanation has been given.

Mr. FOSTER. Let it stand. I will give a detailed account of it.

House of Commons—Salaries as per
Clerk's Estimate..... \$70,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I should like to ask what number of sessional clerks are now employed. I find that an amount of \$10,102 is paid for sessional clerks. It was understood a year ago, or it came out in debate, that there were so many sessional clerks employed that there were sufficient almost to give one to every hon. member on the other side of the House to attend to his correspondence. Is that practice still continued?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not continued.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is responsible for the distribution of the rooms in connection with the House of Commons? Is it Mr. Speaker, or does it rest with some of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. gentleman locate his question, if I may use that term? Does he mean the distribution which

takes place previous to the sitting of the House or during the time the House is in session?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. While the House is sitting, who arranges who shall have the rooms which belong to the House of Commons? Is it the Treasury Department, or the Speaker, or the Minister of Public Works?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Prior to the meeting of Parliament the distribution is arranged by myself. Of course, that is always subject to the action of the House of Commons, or of Mr. Speaker, or of the Committee of Internal Economy; but previous to the sitting of the House the rooms are prepared, and if any change has been suggested during the recess or during the previous Session, the change is made in accordance with the wish which has been expressed. When Parliament meets, the distribution of rooms is, to a very great extent, under the control of the House of Commons, and it is the same in the Senate.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman inform the House how many rooms have been given to gentlemen on his own side of the House, and how many to members from this side of the House. There is a general complaint—I do not know whether it is justified or not—that almost every hon. member on that side of the House, or a very large number have had rooms assigned for their private use where they can meet together, whereas for the members on this side I believe only two rooms have been assigned—one for the leader of the Opposition, and one for the use of Mr. Mackenzie and Sir Richard Cartwright. That is hardly in proportion to the representation of parties in this House, and is hardly dealing out fair play to hon. members on both sides. We know, unfortunately, that there are more members on that side than on this, and we must expect, for the time being, that they will have more rooms than are given to the smaller number who are in the Opposition; but we have our rights, and we might expect that the Minister of Public Works, or the Speaker, would see that those rights are not neglected.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not aware that, except the large room next to the chamber which has been given to the Conservative members, who are in large numbers, any changes have been made in the rooms from what they were last Session.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is not the question. I want to know how many there are allotted, or were allotted last Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know, because this was not fixed by my Department, and members of the House of Commons took the rooms as they thought proper. Some members are in committee rooms and others are in other rooms; but, if I were to be called upon to state under oath which rooms or how many are used by one side or the other I could not state the number. During the Session of Parliament, members of both sides have used rooms which were not absolutely required by clerks of the House, or have been using committee rooms when they were not required for meetings of committees, but I cannot say how many are used on one side or the other. I am sure they have not been allotted by my Department.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Public Works has always such thorough control of his Department, and is always so ready to give a full, if not always a satisfactory, explanation when he is required, that I am surprised that he is not able to give the information which I asked for. Perhaps he will take the means to discover and to inform the committee what the disposition of these rooms is. I know there is considerable complaint made on this side of the House, and, although there may be no change from last year, that is no satisfaction to us, and no proof that the distribution last year was right.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There has been no assignment of rooms to any members of the House. The only room which has been assigned to the members on this side of the House is the large room to which I have referred, because they had no room before in which they could meet. They had only a little room, No. 8, where no meeting could be held. The other room allotted to hon. members opposite last year was No. 6, and that was renewed this year and those are the only two rooms that I am aware of that have been allotted to members. Any other rooms which are occupied by members on one side or the other, have been taken possession of by members of the House during the Session, but there has been no allotment by my Department. This is the first time I have heard of any complaint in regard to this matter; but, if any complaint had been made to me, I would have answered as I have, that during the Session these rooms are in the possession of the House of Commons and the members of the House of Commons, and that they occupy such rooms as they think best to occupy, provided they do not interfere with the work of the clerks or the sitting of the committees.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then I understand from the hon. gentleman that these rooms which are occupied by members on his side, are open to any members of this House if they choose to use them. The members on this side of the House have a right to use the room equally with those gentlemen who are in possession.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman remembers that he was in the Government at that time, and the Ministers occupied rooms. The rooms that we occupied last year have continued to be occupied this year. Besides the rooms occupied by the members of the Government, there is one that the late Premier (Mr. Mackenzie) used; I think it was No. 9. But that being required for the press room, another was allotted to him, so that he might enjoy the privacy of a room, having held the high position of Premier. Besides that, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) had a room three or four years ago. It was given to him when the changes took place, and I had great pleasure in offering it to him, because it was understood that he should have a room where he could receive his friends and consult with them. Besides these, I do not know of any room that is occupied by any members on one side or the other. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman is perfectly right in saying there are some, but they have not been allotted by my Department or by myself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there is about a dozen rooms that, by common habit of the House, are assigned for the use of members. Although it is quite fair and proper for hon. gentle-

men opposite, who are in a majority, to have a majority of the rooms, I think a due proportion should be observed, and that in proportion to the members on this side, rooms should be assigned, just as we do in forming our committees. The hon. gentleman has given, I think, a proportion of three to two, something like that, on all the committees. Of course, we know that the Ministers must have rooms—I do not exactly know how many the Ministers have.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Five or six. In some rooms there are three or four persons.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In our time, I think, the only one of us who had a room was my hon. friend, Mr. Mackenzie. I had a special room myself when Minister, but the reason for that was that we found it convenient to transact our business in our offices. But as a matter of fact, the Minister will find, if he makes enquiry, that the thing is pretty much as my hon. friend has stated, that about a dozen rooms are practically taken possession of by members of the House; and that a very much more than a proportionate share, so far, has fallen to the lot of the majority. Now, we recognise their right to a majority of the rooms, but only a proportionate majority. If the Minister of Public Works will make enquiries into the matter he can very easily satisfy the wishes of my hon. friend. By the courtesy of my old friend, Mr. Mackenzie, I have nothing to complain of, because he very kindly puts his room at my disposal, so that personally I have no interest in the matter. But I know that the fact is as I have stated, as regards the practical working out of it. I am not accusing the hon. Minister of having set them aside, but I am stating the facts. All we ask is that Mr. Speaker, if he chooses to assume this somewhat onerous task, will see that our friends do get a proportionate number of the rooms.

Mr. WRIGHT. The difficulties in this matter are considerable. Quite a portion of my political life has been spent in a little room that we had down stairs, inhabited by myself and by five or six gentlemen of the Opposition. But the Ministers, casting their eyes upon this little pleasant room, as the late lamented Ahab on Naboth's vineyard, drove us out and took possession according to the good old plan, that "they may take who have the power, and they may keep who can," and then we had to take possession of a pleasant little room at the far end of the corridor. There I find we occupy a nameless position. When I was out west I remember seeing certain little caves inhabited by gophers and rattlesnakes, and that kind of thing. Well, we are about the strangest congregation you can find anywhere. My hon. friend, the brilliant party of the left-centre, occupies that room, and then we have the millionaires, we have the Canadian Pacific Railway, and very many other important institutions. I think four or five gentlemen belong to the Opposition. At any rate, when I am there I am about the only representative of the Ministerial party. But I may say that our relations have been very friendly, and I hope the Minister will not drive us to extremity, because I think we desire very much to hold on to our room. I can assure the hon. gentleman that if he wants a position with us, if he wants a "sit," as they term it, in our little room, he is quite welcome.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the first important question we have to consider is, who has charge of the allocation of the rooms in this building. I understand that the Minister of Public Works repudiates responsibility. He says the building is under his control when Parliament is not in Session, but when Parliament is in Session it is under control of Mr. Speaker. That, I understand, is what the Minister of Public Works has informed us. Well, if that be the case, I think Mr. Speaker should hold the balance with something like an even hand, and that the members of the Opposition should have the fair proportion of these rooms. I do not know how many rooms are occupied by the Ministers, but I know that in our time there was no room at all held by anyone, except it might be by the First Minister, and he only while it was not required for other purposes. I suppose the first consideration in the use of rooms in this House is to see that the officers of the House should have proper accommodation. I do not know what Mr. Speaker has to say on this subject, whether there are a sufficient number of rooms or not assigned to the officers of the House for the discharge of the duties that pertain to them. Of course, I do not recognise the right of the Government, or of Mr. Speaker, to appoint all their friends in the Dominion, to bring them here and crowd us out altogether. I expect that the number of officers employed in the House will be a reasonable number, and that reasonable accommodation should be afforded them in the first instance. Those rooms that remain, after that, should be divided between the two sides of the House, something in proportion to our numbers. If the Ministers find that they are obliged to furnish some accommodation to their friends within the limit they have subscribed for themselves, I think they must submit to the inconvenience, and they should give us our share, because we have a great deal to do in the conduct of public business; if we do not have any other very serious duties to perform, we have to watch what has been proposed to us, and what is being done by the Government, and in that case we would be better prepared to attend to our duties than if we were compelled to come in here and attend to them at our desks. It seems to me that Mr. Speaker, or whoever has charge of this, and I assume that it is Mr. Speaker, for it ought to belong to him as the chief officer of the House during the session of Parliament, because the Government are as much interested in the Senate chamber as they are in this building, and so far as that matter is concerned the Speaker should have the same control over the rooms at his disposal in this part of the building as the Speaker of the Senate has in the other; and if that be the case, we see no reason why Mr. Speaker should not properly discharge his duties.

Mr. McMULLEN. Two weeks before Parliament met, I wrote to the Speaker of the House requesting him to allow myself, Dr. Landerkin and Dr. McDonald to occupy a room. Last year I found very great difficulty in conducting correspondence on account of the coldness of the chamber during certain hours of the day. It was also impossible to carry on correspondence in room No. 6. I received no reply to my letter. On reaching here I immediately called on Mr. Speaker, and asked him if he could accommodate me. He stated he would do the best he could, and since then I have

no word. I made my application in a courteous way. I received no reply; I got no room. If several members joined together in occupying a room the accommodation should be afforded them, as it might be done if the rooms were fairly distributed. Members on one side of the House should not obtain all the accommodation, and leave the others either to work in this chamber or in a crowded room where men are smoking or chatting, or work in his room at his hotel. There should be some change made in regard to this matter.

Mr. HESSON. I am about as hard and as faithful a worker in this House as the hon. gentleman, but although I have been here twelve years, I have not yet obtained a room. The hon. gentleman can utilise the room occupied by his political friends, and if that is not satisfactory he can work at his desk. It is impossible that 200 members can be provided with all the accommodation that they desire. It must be remembered that we come here to perform a public duty and must expect to submit to a little inconvenience. I do not think all the complaints should emanate from the Opposition side of the House, for there are scores of members on this side who occupy a similar position. I thank the Minister of Public Works for having provided an additional room this Session. When hon. gentlemen opposite come into power no doubt we will have to take very small corners in the building.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman chooses to be content without suitable accommodation, he has no right to dictate to me as to my action. The hon. gentleman has no right to find fault with me. I applied in the proper way at the proper time, and I have not received the accommodation asked. I congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite on the new room that has been provided for their use. We, however, ask that we should receive a little consideration at the hands of the Minister of Public Works and the Speaker of the House. We desire some little convenience to enable us to do our business comfortably, and it is impossible to sit in this chamber when the House is not in session, and it is also impossible to conduct correspondence in No. 6, where smoking and chatting are indulged in.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member appears to be under the impression that he has not been treated with that courtesy to which every member is entitled from the Speaker of the House. I hope he does not believe there has been any intention to be discourteous to him. As to the rooms in question, I am glad to-night to hear from the highest authority in the matter, that the Speaker is responsible for the distribution of the rooms during the Session. That right has been disputed, and as I was afraid of being squeezed between that higher authority and members of Parliament, I gave up the task in despair, and I have had nothing to do with the distribution of the rooms. This year I have received no application, except that from the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), which was made by letter, and one since the meeting of Parliament, and I told him I had no rooms at my disposal, but I would do what I could; at the same time I told him distinctly the difficulty in which I was placed: first, that I had no rooms to distribute; and, second, that, if I had, I was not aware that I had the power to dispose of them. I distinctly remember

that this question came up some time ago, and we were obliged to consult the Revised Statutes of Canada to ascertain in whom the authority rested, as to the control and distribution of these rooms. I think the question was submitted to the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the House; and as no satisfactory solution of the question was arrived at, it remained in the same position as before. But I am unwilling to shirk any responsibility, and if the Speaker has control of those rooms and the distribution of them, I am willing to accept the responsibility, and give to hon. members the accommodation placed at my disposal. But I may say that just now I am aware of not more than two rooms that could be placed at the disposal of members. The occupation of one has been accounted for by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright), and no one will hold that that distribution has been unjust, for the Ministerial party is represented by one member, the Independent party by one, and the Opposition by six members. The only other room available is No. 34, which is, I think, the British Columbia room. Those gentlemen from the far west, having that enterprise and spirit which distinguishes those who come from the western slope, have taken possession of it without asking anyone. I was only aware of it yesterday, when I was paid the compliment of being invited there. I am not aware of any other rooms that are available, except rooms occupied by committees, and while members might work there, they would be liable to be obliged to leave during the sittings of the committees. As to the rooms occupied by the Ministers, they are in a portion of the building where the jurisdiction is difficult to determine, namely, between the Senate and House of Commons. I have nothing to do with them. They have been assigned outside of the Session, and, lying as they do between the two buildings, I would not venture to claim any jurisdiction over them. I may say that we have not sufficient accommodation in this House, even for the employés to do their work. Very often we have heard of plans being in course of preparation for the enlargement of the House, or for additional accommodation. In my humble opinion it would be high time that we should make up our mind to have that increased accommodation, which, I believe, would be for the benefit of the country as well as for the members of this House. From the experience I have now had I think it would be well to begin to think of it and, if possible, to prepare plans to get that additional accommodation needed. I for one am perfectly of the same opinion as others that there is not enough comfort for the members of the House, and I think it would be only fair that the country should bear the expense of giving to their representatives a place where they would not be exposed to catch rheumatism and other diseases. It is not within my province, as I am a neutral power, but as it is a question which concerns both sides of the House I venture in all humility to give my opinion on the matter. I think the few thousand dollars that might be spent towards that end would not be lost to the country, but would, on the contrary, be a great gain.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). His honor the Speaker has observed that we have not sufficient room for the employés of the House, and I would suggest

that instead of increasing the accommodation we had better decrease the number of employés.

Mr. WRIGHT. This matter was thoroughly discussed some years ago, and the Minister of Public Works will remember that he then gave it full consideration, and led us to believe that long before this we would have this ample accommodation which his honor the Speaker suggested as necessary for the members of this House. If the hon. Minister will look over the plans, he will find, I think, that it was proposed we should have a gymnasium, a bowling alley, and various means of enjoying ourselves.

An hon. MEMBER. And a racquet court.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think we did not go so far as a racquet court, nor were we to have any hockey on Sunday. At all events we were to have pleasant surroundings in which the health of the members would be promoted, and in which they could attend to their duties with more comfort.

Contingencies—House of Commons. . . \$21,250

Mr. CAMPBELL. While I believe that the remarks made by hon. gentlemen in reference to the expenditure for contingencies in the Senate were right and proper, and that a great deal of that expenditure was necessary, yet at the same time I believe that it would not be well for us to pass silently over the amount asked for contingencies for the House of Commons. The question was asked, and I do not think it was properly answered, what had become of the enormous number of knives purchased for the Senate; but I find that for the House of Commons we have been dealing largely in pocket knives, too. There were no less than 839 knives purchased by the Government for the House of Commons last year, at a cost of \$1,153, and 720 pairs of scissors. I am only a young member of course, but I cannot see for the life of me what has become of all these knives. I think the same practice must have been going on here, as was attributed to the Senators, when it was said that some of them must be getting five or six knives. If any such work as this is going on it should be stopped.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member must have been asleep; we have heard that over and over again.

Mr. LISTER. That was in reference to the Senate.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the hon. member for East Grey chooses to pass over this without saying anything about it, I do not think this side of the House should. There was an appropriation of \$100.50 for a gown for the Speaker of the Senate, but I find that the Speaker of the House of Commons received \$60 for a gown, which, of course, was not quite so much as the Speaker of the Senate received, but then no doubt he does not require such an expensive gown. I find we are a little extravagant in other ways too. Last year \$75 was charged for attendance at Speaker's dinners. That is not right; but this year I find that \$102 is asked for the same purpose. If the Speaker wants to give dinners, and there must be some one to attend at the dinners, he ought to provide them himself and pay them out of his large salary. I am finding fault with the items, but I wish to call attention to the fact that we must see that our own hands are clean.

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

before we criticise too severely the expenditure of the other chamber. The expenditure in all these items is altogether too large, and I agree with the member for Lambton that it would be a good plan to wipe out these items altogether. I always understood that when we gave an officer of this House a salary, it was right and proper for him to provide for his own expenditure, and if he chooses to give dinners he should pay for them. I hardly think it is fair to tax the people of this country for these matters. Those who attend those dinners, if they think the Speaker cannot afford to pay for them, let them put their hands in their pocket and give a little themselves. I must condemn the system, as I do not think it is a proper thing to bring these items before the House. If they want dinners let them pay for them.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice here a charge of \$250 for a mahogany glass. Where was that put?

Mr. SPEAKER. It was put in the Speaker's reception room. With the exception of what was got last year, the furniture in that room has been in use since Parliament sat in Toronto; it was moved down to Quebec, and from Quebec it was brought here; and I suppose that room, to which everyone is welcome and is received, including strangers visiting Ottawa who come to the Speaker's rooms, ought to be at least as well furnished as a first-class house, though it is not so. As it is now, many men have rooms which are better furnished than that room. I thought, therefore, that nobody would grumble against this addition to its furniture, and I may say that the only thing I regret is that all the members do not come there more often.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not know where the article was; I just saw the item, and I made the enquiry. I have nothing to say against the furnishing of the Speaker's apartments; but in all these matters we should try to cultivate economy.

Mr. LOVITT. I see a charge of \$200 for the Speaker's travelling expenses. What about that?

Mr. SPEAKER. As to that, I may say, from my knowledge of the past, that it has been considered for many years a perquisite of the Speaker to have the use of a carriage for travelling or visits which are considered to come within the duties of his office; and last year, not being afraid of the members of Parliament, I had an account for about \$200. I cut it in two, to make it as small as possible; but I thought it due to my successor that I should not cut off this perquisite altogether. If the House decides, however, that there is to be in future no such perquisite for the office, I am of course willing to give it up; but I suppose it is only right that future Speakers should be granted the same privilege that our predecessors always enjoyed.

Mr. LISTER. I suppose nobody can take exception to an allowance to the Speaker for cab hire, seeing that the members of the Government have the same thing; but there is a charge here which must be a mistake, a charge for attendance on the Speaker's dinners. On the principle of charging for the attendance, the Speaker would have a right to charge for the food supplied to his guests.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the remark of the hon. gentleman is quite fair. It is understood

that the Speaker is to have rooms, and servants to attend on those rooms, and those servants are required to come on special occasions when large dinners are given. They are the ordinary servants whom I found there when I assumed the office. If I had found no servants there, I would not have looked for any, but would have brought my own. But I think it only fair that those things which have been done in the past should continue. Those servants are only for the service of the apartments, not for the service of my own family, because, with the exception of Madame Ouimet, my family are at home, and I suppose they do not want anything from the Government for their living expenses. If my hon. friend thinks that this charge should not continue to be made as in the past, and that the Speaker's perquisites should be diminished in the public interest, I am willing to submit; but I would not consider myself justified in cutting down the attributes of the position which I have enjoyed for the last three years, and which may be enjoyed by my successors.

Mr. LISTER. So far as these items are concerned, after the Speaker's explanations, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. LOVITT. I see another charge of \$56.82 for cab hire. That is not cut in two.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not charged to the Speaker. That is the general expenditure for cab hire for the officers of the House. When a messenger is sent a great distance for the dispatch of the business of the House, he is sometimes allowed a cab on the authority of either the clerk or the chief messenger. For instance, very often, at four or five o'clock in the morning, some corrections have to be made to the report of the proceedings; when the last proofs are revised, sometimes they have to be sent back in a hurry. In these and similar instances a cab is a necessity, and I suppose the clerk and the officers of the House have not been very extravagant in that respect.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not see any provision for a revision of the voters' list. Is there to be no revision this year?

Mr. FOSTER. That does not necessarily follow. Other estimates are to be brought down. When they come down you will find that out.

Salaries of Officers of the Library . . . \$16,265

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the cause of the decrease?

Mr. FOSTER. A re-arrangement of the officers of the library.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that one of the officers, Mr. Griffin, has been allowed \$500 travelling expenses last year. What was that for?

Mr. FOSTER. He went to Washington and to the old country, to London and Paris, to visit the libraries in those places, to examine into their methods of cataloguing and working in order to make some improvements in our system here.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I met Mr. Griffin in London, and I must say that he was busily engaged looking into the libraries, and has probably obtained information as to their working which he can use to advantage here.

Mr. DAVIN. There cannot be the least doubt that the librarian going over to London and searching in the book-stalls, and visiting the libraries there, would be able to save, by the knowledge he would receive of the facilities for getting books, more than the amount of money to the Government his trip would cost. Our library here is small and imperfect, and in order to be complete requires many more books, and I do not know of any way in which the \$500 could have been spent more profitably.

Mr. McMULLEN. I might make a remark with reference to the reading-room. It is constantly filled by strangers who read the newspapers, and thus prevent members from looking at them. The other evening I went in and found no less than ten people in the room busily reading, not one of whom was a member, and I could not get a sight of a paper I wanted until I applied to one of the men in charge, when he took it out of the hands of the man who was reading it and gave it to me. Members of Parliament should not be prevented reading the files by people from Ottawa or elsewhere.

Mr. DAVIN. The only way that inconvenience could be avoided, would be to get rid of the rule which allows members to introduce friends, and rigidly exclude all who are not members. Under the rule, it is difficult for a member to refuse the applications of people who ask the right of access to the reading-room.

Mr. FOSTER. If that is to be the rule, members of Parliament will have to forego their right of introducing outsiders to the reading room. Then there are the ubiquitous members of the fourth estate, whom I suppose it is impossible to keep out of the reading-room.

Mr. DAVIN. There is a compromise which I might suggest. During the sittings of the House it might be made a rigid rule that none but members of the House, or members of the press, should have access to the reading-room, but in the mornings the rule might not be so rigid. Of course, as the Minister of Finance suggests, the members of the press are licensed libertines, and we cannot do anything with them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps an arrangement might be made by which we might give a card to a visitor, which would entitle him to go to a Department and read some of the numerous newspapers there. It is possible that they might not find the best literature of the country in any Department, but still they would have reading matter before them.

Mr. ELLIS. There is an objection to the suggestion of the member for Assiniboia. People come here on delegations from different parts of the country. Delegates might be here from Toronto, who would desire to see the Toronto papers. Delegates might come from Regina who would want to see the *Regina Leader*, and these would naturally desire to have access to the reading-room.

Mr. MASSON. I think the compromise suggested by the hon. gentleman is worse than his original proposition. It is when the House is in Session that the friends of members might desire to be in the gallery, and it is at other times they desire to be in the reading-room.

Printing, printing paper and book-binding \$75,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is this in connection with the Printing Bureau?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is reported that the operations of the Printing Bureau have not been as satisfactory as the Government anticipated, and that work which it was expected the bureau would be able to perform has been distributed to various newspapers in the country.

Mr. FOSTER. The item for the Printing Bureau will come up elsewhere, and this matter can be then better discussed. This vote is only for printing the documents of the House.

Outlays towards the establishment and maintenance of Experimental Farms \$75,000

Mr. McMULLEN. This appears to be a very large expenditure. Last year about \$120,000 was expended on that farm, and I think the income was about \$2,500. I think the Minister of Agriculture should give some detailed statement as to the expenditure which was made last year, and should give us some information as to the amount he expects to save during the coming year. We cannot afford to continue this enormous outlay on the Experimental Farm. It is evident that it will be a losing game, and, while it is desirable to make it successful, now that the experiment has been entered into, we must hope that it will not be made a political sink in which a great amount of money will be lost.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I observe that a vote of \$70,000 was taken last year, and that there has been \$90,000 spent.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman is in error. It was in the previous year that \$90,000 was spent, and that was the vote for that year. The vote of last year of \$70,000 has not been exceeded.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I find that \$12,762 was spent for labor, and I should like to know how much of that was spent for regular annual expenditure, and how much on permanent improvements. If we are to have an experimental farm, we should have an exact account every year, showing the regular annual expenditure and the amount paid on permanent improvements; but we have never had that. Up to the present year, I find that \$39,000 have been spent on labor alone. We ought to have a statement showing the expenditure under those two heads.

Mr. CARLING. We have only had possession of the farm for two or three years, as my hon. friend knows, and a large amount of money has been expended in draining, and fencing, and levelling, and getting the whole farm into a good condition. I believe that the whole expenditure annually on all the farms will not be more than \$55,000 or \$56,000, and that means the farm here and the other four farms—one in the Maritime Provinces, one in Manitoba, one at Indian Head and one in British Columbia. I am convinced that the whole expenditure for keeping up these farms will be less than \$60,000 a year. We cannot tell what the receipts will be. Of course, this is an experimental farm, and we are distributing seeds to all parts of the country. I think my hon. friend is aware that

Mr. MASSON.

the distribution has been made in his county to anyone who applied for it. We have had a large expenditure in printing the bulletins, which are issued by the director of the farm. I understand from the director that we have distributed the grain raised on the farm to between three and four thousand farmers, and I think we have now between thirteen and fourteen thousand farmers to whom we are regularly sending bulletins. We will be glad if any hon. members will give us the names of prominent farmers in their counties, and they will be supplied regularly with these bulletins, and the seed will be sent to them in small quantities, either of wheat, barley or oats, free. These are sent free in small quantities of three pounds. We have now reports from all parts of the Dominion, as to the result of the test made in seed wheat and oats and barley. I am glad to say that samples of Ladoga wheat was sent last year and the winter of 1888, to the Peace River district, and the parties that it was sent to have pronounced it one of the finest samples of spring wheat they have received this year, weighing 64 pounds to the bushel. We find that the farmers all over the Dominion are taking great interest in these varieties of seed grains, and we have applications and correspondence every day in regard to them. We get reports from nearly every one to whom they have been sent. The very greatest care is taken as to the expenditure. There is no waste of money. Of course, in a large farm like the central farm, and the other farms, it takes money to put them into proper condition, but this year will finish all the work on these farms, on capital expenditure.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Does the Minister not think that we are discussing this item prematurely without the report from his Department?

Mr. CARLING. I should be very glad if the report could have been here, but it is not the fault of the Department. The report is ready and is in the hands of the printer. But the annual report from the Department of Agriculture is for the calendar and not the financial year. It is made up to the first of January last, and will, perhaps, be distributed in the course of two or three weeks. The expenditure, however, for the last financial year, is to be found in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has never been the practice to pass this vote so early in the Session, until the report of the Department is published. It must appear to the Committee utterly absurd for us to pass the Estimates under these circumstances, when it is impossible to make any intelligent criticisms. We must have the reports of the Department, otherwise we do not know what the Department has been doing.

Mr. CARLING. Every item of expenditure is in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Every item for the expenditure for the year 1889?

Mr. CARLING. Up to July last.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But the report of the Department, and the report of those who have charge of the stock farm, and the evidence which the hon. gentleman behind me just asked for as to the working of the farm, what amount has been expended on capital, what the returns have been, and what is the result of the experiment itself—all these things do not appear to this committee. I

would ask the Finance Minister if he thinks it is fair or right that we should be asked to vote items of this kind without any data? It has not been done heretofore. I do not take any part myself in discussions upon the Experimental Farm, because it is a subject that I do not know much about, but I remember that interesting speeches were delivered last year by hon. gentlemen on the subject of the Experimental Farm, and the data upon which those speeches were based were gathered from the report of the Department. That data we have not got this year.

Mr. HESSON. I think every gentleman in the House who represents an agricultural constituency, feels a responsibility in relation to this farm. Not only should the expenditure be investigated, but the results ought to be considered. There is not a gentleman in the House who has not some knowledge of the efforts that are being made to disseminate the information, and the advantages that were expected from the Experimental Farm. We do not expect a revenue from the farm, at least sufficiently great to pay all the expense; but we do believe, indirectly, that it is doing a most important work. To-day I received a communication from my own constituency, asking in what way they can possibly get the samples they have seen referred to in the press; asking in what way they can get the two-rowed barley that the Experimental Farm proposes to furnish, and asking for information generally. I presume that all the members of this House representing rural constituencies, probably have the very same class of questions put to themselves. I believe that knowledge is being disseminated among the farmers, and that some experiments are going on at the farm which will be advantageous to the country. Now, to ask the Department to give results which would prove that it was desirable to continue the expense in the direction they have begun, would be to ask too much, because we never expected that the farm would be directly remunerative and return dollar for dollar.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We do not want that.

Mr. HESSON. I can understand that hon. gentlemen will be honest enough to believe that the Department is trying to do the very best they can. The Department may not be in a position to get out the report for various reasons. It is probable that they have not full returns from the three or four thousand farmers who have been making experiments with grain that has been sent out. The report will be very valuable if it shows results from all those districts where the grain has been tested. One thing is clear. It would not be wise to cause the Department to fail in its purpose because of a lack of confidence in this House, when they are doing the very best that can be done. I think that every hon. gentleman who takes enough interest in the matter to visit the farm, will see that they are not trying to make a profit directly from the farm itself, so much as to disseminate knowledge and information throughout the country. I purpose to put something in the hands of the Government director of the farm, with reference to the distribution of barley that they propose to make. I wish they would go more extensively into it. The experiment, so far as I have been able to see, has been a great success, and I am sure that the farmers of this country are very glad to find that they are able

to produce a barley suitable to the British market. Every year discloses the fact that we are less able to obtain a remunerative price for the barley our farmers grow, and any movement in the direction indicated will more than repay any expenditure. I am only sorry the Government are not going far enough in the direction of securing sufficient seed to supply our farmers, and make it worthy of the attention of the dealers in barley to handle that particular variety altogether. I believe the experiments, judging from bulletin No. 6, have been of a very satisfactory character, and sufficient seed barley of this character should be placed in the hands of our intelligent farmers and not mix it with our four or six-rowed barley, which has been found for the last three years very unremunerative.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister will observe that we are not now giving attention to matters connected with the model farm, for it would be quite impossible to understand the working of the farm without the facts and details in the annual report. I think, therefore, when the annual report comes down we will have to go over a great many matters a second time. I observe an item: museum, and office for director, \$15,231. The Committee will naturally expect a detailed statement of what the museum is, what it is contemplated to be done to justify such a large expenditure. The farm is intended to demonstrate to the agriculturists of this country what can be cultivated profitably in an ordinary way. I observe an item: greenhouses, \$5,666, and a large amount also for a conservatory. Surely we do not require greenhouses and conservatories to demonstrate the benefit of an experimental farm, because while it is admitted that you can produce anything in a greenhouse and conservatory, the fact that certain flowers and fruits are raised there, is no proof to the ordinary farmer of the country that those flowers or fruits are suitable to the country at large. I presume the report will show the object had in view when this expenditure was incurred; therefore, I do not agree with my hon. friend who has taken exception to the items being proceeded with until the report of the Department has been brought down.

Mr. CARLING. The items passed through the Committee last year a month before the annual report was brought down.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Very improperly.

Mr. CARLING. So we are not asking anything that was not done last year. All the items of expenditure appear in the Auditor General's Report. The annual report of all the departments of the central farm, and the different farms, has been in the hands of the printers for some time, but weeks or months may elapse before we obtain it. It must be remembered, moreover, that this is not the final passage of the item.

Mr. SCARTH. I would like to say in regard to the Experimental Farm, not only the central one but those in Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia, that they are felt to be of very great assistance to the farmers there. They are appreciated throughout the whole of the North-West, and I am satisfied our farmers are going to learn from those Experimental Farms a great deal that, without them, they would not learn. But there is one point I should like to bring to the attention of the Minister, and it is this: that, so

far as I understand the matter, the bulletins, which constitute one of the most important parts of the work, are only printed in two languages, in the dual language, and that is felt to be a very great drawback. In Manitoba we have many Mennonites and Icelanders, who cannot read English or French; and I have no doubt in Assiniboia, which is represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Davin), where they have Swedes, Hungarians, Bohemians and Icelanders, they feel very greatly at a loss in this respect. In British Columbia they have Chinese, and I understand they are going into farming. At all events, I can speak for Manitoba, and I can say that the Mennonites and Icelanders form a large number of our population. It has been stated that the British Colonial Secretary has complained that in India certain Acts that were passed had not been printed in Hindoo and other languages. It is certainly important that in Manitoba, where we have Russians, Swedes, Icelanders and others, we should obtain the bulletins printed in more than in the dual language. I rise simply to draw the Minister's attention to that point.

Mr. McMULLEN. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) I may say they are altogether aside from the question. It has been suggested by the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), that the item should not be proceeded with until the annual report is distributed, and this is a fair request. The report of the Auditor General gives simply items of expenditure for seeds and other articles, but contains nothing as to whether those seeds have been successfully cultivated or not, and we have not the manager's report as to the success of the experiments. In all fairness the Committee should not be called upon to consider these items, and if at a later period the Minister finds he will be unable to present his report in time this Session, the House can then consider the propriety of passing these items in its absence.

Mr. CARLING. The expenditure in the Auditor General's Report is from the 1st July, 1888, to the 1st July, 1889. The report for the last six months of 1888 up to January, 1889, is in the hands of hon. members, so that there would be only six months of the expenditure in the report to come down.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) We had that report last year.

Mr. CARLING. Excuse me, we did not have that report last year until the item was approved.

Mr. SCARTH. I wish again to ask the hon. Minister in how many languages he is going to publish these bulletins, and whether this injustice is to be continued to my constituents in Manitoba?

Mr. WATSON. If the hon. gentleman is going to adopt these foreign languages, I would point out that we have the Cree and the Sioux which are not foreign to the North-West. We have the Indians who are making considerable progress in farming, and no doubt they are as much interested in these matters as the Chinese in British Columbia. I think the hon. Minister might publish them in the Cree and Sioux languages as well.

Mr. SCARTH. I have not the least objection to that, but we have to consider that the Cree and the Sioux Indians have instructors paid by the Government, who can translate for them the bulletins issued by the Minister of Agriculture, but the Mennonites have no instructor. They are well

Mr. SCARTH.

educated, but they do not speak English, and unless you intend to obliterate their language, you should have these bulletins published in the Mennonite tongue.

Mr. McMULLEN. If we acceded to all the demands of the North-West, we will sink the Ship of State before we get through. If we have to print all the bulletins issued by the model farm in the languages of all the people who may come to this country, the new Printing Bureau would not be equal to the task. I draw the Minister's attention to the fact, what while we have a report before us, yet we have nothing to show whether the experiments have been successful or not. The Minister's report will doubtless contain some reference to the seeds bought last year, and the success so far of the experiments. The hon. gentleman has got his manager beside him, and he can easily say whether this will be contained in this report or not.

Mr. BOWELL. I would suggest that the Committee might allow the item to pass (as there is very great uncertainty as to when the report of the Minister of Agriculture will be laid on the Table) with the distinct understanding that all the privileges granted for discussing items of this kind will be extended to members of the House when the items come up for concurrence. By that time the report will, in all probability, be before the House. I quite agree with the remarks made by the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) that, before the House is asked to pass a large item like this, the members should be placed in full possession of all that has been done on the farm, and the result of the experiments likely to follow from its establishment. I make the suggestion, hoping it will be adopted.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We remember a year or two ago, when Sir Charles Tupper was Finance Minister, that item after item was left for concurrence, and that we had only three hours for discussion in concurrence.

Mr. McMULLEN. They went through like sheaves through a threshing machine.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask information on this item for \$2,800 for law expenses. What trouble have we been in?

Mr. CARLING. We have no law expenses this year. This amount is for lawyers' fees and witnesses, and the expenses of arbitration when we bought the farm. The farm was bought from a number of proprietors, and as they wanted to try to get as much as they could, we submitted the matter to arbitration. This is a sum paid on that account last year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The remarks made by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) shows that we cannot go on with these items without having the report. That hon. gentleman announced that some \$90,000 had been expended and that an appropriation of some \$70,000 had been made.

Mr. CARLING. I explained that we were within the vote of last year. It was \$90,000 that was expended during the previous year.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The estimate given for 1887 was \$90,000, for 1888 \$70,000, and for last year \$70,000. I have taken these from the public documents. Now, there is \$90,000 in the Auditor

General's Report as having been spent on the different farms under a vote of \$70,000. It was in 1887 that the \$90,000 was given.

Mr. SCARTH. I think the question which I asked of the Minister some time ago is more important than the points raised by the hon. gentleman. If you are going to issue bulletins with the intention of farmers understanding them, they should be issued in languages which all the farmers in the country can understand. A very large number of our farmers do not speak neither English nor French, and what you publish is Greek to them. It will cost very little more to give the Mennonite population the information which you give to other farmers. I ask if the Department going to appoint instructors to teach the Mennonites, Swedes and Icelanders, or whether you will publish the bulletins in these languages? So long as you do not do so you are not doing justice to the Mennonites of Manitoba.

Mr. CARLING. Up to this time all departmental documents have been printed in English and French, but it has now been brought to my notice that we have Danes, Scandinavians and Icelanders, who have all of course come here to settle, and the subject is worthy of consideration. I can only say to my hon. friend that I will enquire into it, and if possible meet his wishes.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I must bring the Committee back to the matter to which I directed the attention of the Minister of Finance a few moments ago, because I think it involves an important principle. It is well known that two or three years ago a new system was introduced of asking the House to go into Committee of Supply before the Minister of Finance made his Budget statement. I think the understanding then was that statutory amounts, and amounts fairly open to debate and criticism on the information then before the House, should be considered; but one of the most important functions of the House of Commons is criticism of the expenditure of the Government, and that criticism can only be intelligent when the House has before it the information on which it can form a judgment. When we are asked to pass items for the Agriculture Department, or the Customs Department, before the reports of those Departments are brought down, it is manifest that no intelligent criticism can be made upon them, and the members of the House are only poking in the dark.

Mr. CARLING. Read the report.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman suggests that before I address the House I might read this report. I may not read a report that I am not specially interested in, but there are some reports that I do read, and there are some gentlemen who read this report, and evidently, from their speeches, read it very carefully. If this new system of passing items before we have the reports is introduced, the House of Commons will be abdicating one of its most important functions. Our financial leader is here, and I would like to hear his views on this subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think there can be any possible doubt about the point raised by my hon. friend. As a matter of course, all these items are expected to be considered after the reports of the several Ministers have been brought down. The reason of the case is obvious

—you cannot discuss items, especially those of magnitude or importance, until you hear from the Minister in charge. The only course to pursue is to take up those items belonging to Departments of which the reports have been brought down.

Mr. CARLING. We have the report in full to the 1st of January, 1889, and the report for 1889 is now in the hands of the printer, but it may be a month before it can be laid before the House. After that, if there are any items which hon. gentlemen wish to discuss, I will pledge myself, and I think I can also pledge the Government, that every opportunity will be given to discuss them on concurrence.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Let it stand until we can find out when the report is likely to be ready.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not at all dispute that the hon. Minister intends that the discussion should be full, but we have had such an experience of the utter impossibility of having these items discussed on concurrence, that members do not care to reserve their remarks to that time. Last Session, to the best of my recollection, the entire three or four hundred items contained in the Estimates, were put through the House in eight or ten hours.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt that the general contention of my hon. friend is quite right—that, as far as possible, all the reports of the Departments should be down before their estimates are passed. However, it may happen, and there are sometimes causes that make it almost unavoidable, that the business of the House would be very much delayed if we adopted the rule that we must have the report before we can pass the items. I think we should act on the suggestion made by my hon. friend opposite, that we should let the item stand until we can see whether the report will be down within a reasonable time, and if it should be found that it will be very late, I suppose the House would consent to pass the votes without it.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:20 a.m. (Saturday.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 17th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Alberta Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 84) to amend the Act to incorporate the Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

THE FISHERIES ACT.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 85) to amend "The Fisheries Act," chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The object of the Bill is to extend the provisions of the present Act in relation to the powers of fishery officers with reference to the distribution of the bounties. The fishery officers are now only

justices of the peace, *ex-officio* in connection with the Fisheries Act, and the first clause of this Bill gives them power to act as justices in connection with any Act relating to fisheries. The other clause of the Bill is in reference to the confiscation of appliances used in illegal fishing, and the last section is to increase the penalties in connection with the illegal catching of lobsters.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Mr. BOWELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the attention of the House to the motion made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in reference to certain correspondence published in the *Globe* a short time since, and contained in letters signed by an hon. member of this House. I think it is only fair to that hon. gentleman, as it is very important to those whose names have been mentioned in connection with this matter, that all of the documents which have been made public, together with the explanations which have been made in this House, should be entered in the Journals in the same manner as the letters which were published in the *Globe* newspaper. My object in making this motion is simply this—that while the charges, which were implied rather than stated in those letters, appear in the Journals, nothing follows them in the way of denial on the part of those gentlemen whose names are mentioned in connection with them, nor does the explanation given by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), and published in one of the city journals, appear therein. I, therefore, desire to move a resolution similar to that moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as follows:—

That whereas certain letters and documents, reading as follows (these are attached), were published in the *Citizen* newspaper, under date of the 11th of February instant, in explanation of certain letters published in the *Globe* newspaper, under date of the 8th of February instant, respecting the granting of a certain lease to cut timber to one John Adams, and it is expedient that the House should have an opportunity of examining the same, it is ordered that the said letters and documents above recited be printed in the Votes and Proceedings for the use of members, together with the statement made by the hon. member for Lincoln in the House of Commons on the 13th day of February instant, and the remarks made thereon by certain members of the House of Commons, as reported and printed in the Official Debates of the House of Commons on the 13th of February instant.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure everybody in this House will desire that everything connected with the matter brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from South Oxford should have publicity, so that the members should have the fullest possible information in order to arrive at a proper conclusion; but I am not quite sure that letters written at a subsequent date, in explanation of the charges referred to, should be printed in our proceedings. I am not quite sure that the proposition of my hon. friend is not liable to objection; but, as the matter is a delicate one, and as the House has not had an opportunity yet to see the new matter, I think my hon. friend would, perhaps, agree to defer his motion until to-morrow.

Mr. BOWELL. I have certainly no objection to accede to the request made by the hon. leader of the Opposition; but I tell him frankly that I am anxious that this very disagreeable corres-

Mr. TUPPER.

pondence, as I may term it, and the statement connected therewith, should be printed in consecutive order in the Journals of this House, so that persons hereafter reading the letters in the Journals should have also before them the explanations made by the hon. member for Lincoln, whatever they are worth, together with the statements made by myself and the Prime Minister.

Mr. LAURIER. I think there can be no objection whatever to the explanations made by the hon. Minister of Customs and the hon. Prime Minister going on the Journals of the House, but I am not quite sure that the letters recently written by the hon. member for Lincoln, which are referred to in the motion, should also go on the Journals.

Mr. BLAKE. Divide the motion, and move now for the statements made in this House, and let the other part stand.

Mr. BOWELL. That would not accomplish my object. I desire to have the denial made by the hon. member for Lincoln, in the letter published in the *Citizen*, also, put upon our records. I am proposing this in self-defence, and I think it would be scarcely fair, even if not strictly in accordance with parliamentary usage, to deny that to gentlemen whose honor has been impugned in that correspondence. If the hon. leader of the Opposition desires to have a postponement of the motion, I have no objection to let it remain until to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After the statement of my hon. friend, that he desires to have the whole thing printed in one return, so that everybody can read it from beginning to end, I hope my hon. friend opposite will not object.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think there is any reason for me to recede from the position I have taken. I am sure that everybody would agree that the statements made by the hon. Minister of Customs, and the hon. Prime Minister the other day, should go at once on the Journals; but it is the letters published in the *Citizen* to which I take exception. I do not say that I shall persist in my objection, but we have not yet read those letters.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, let it stand until to-morrow.

Mr. BOWELL. I will withdraw the motion, with the understanding that it will be made to-morrow.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 20) respecting the Goderich and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to "The Goderich and Wingham Railway Company."—(Mr. Porter.)

Bill (No. 21) to incorporate the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Barron.)

Bill (No. 22) to amend the Act to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Corby.)

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburgh and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

BEHRING'S SEA FISHERIES.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to detain the House for a moment, before the Orders of the Day are called. I notice that in the Queen's Speech delivered at the opening of Parliament, on the 11th instant, no reference is made to the Behring Sea difficulty, which is a matter of very great importance to us. It is also stated that the United States Government are making provision for more efficient police regulations with respect to seizures in that sea; and in view of our action some time ago, and the expression of our unbounded confidence in the Queen and loyalty to her, we naturally look to England for a little protection in this matter. I would ask the Premier if he has any information to give to the House on this subject?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only information I can give the hon. gentleman is that negotiations have commenced—that the British Ambassador and the Secretary of State for the United States are now discussing the preliminaries for negotiations on this subject.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McCarthy for second reading of Bill (No. 10) to further amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 50, respecting the North-West Territories; the motion of Mr. Davin in amendment thereto, and the motion of Mr. Beausoleil in amendment to the amendment.

Mr. LAURIER. If I, for one, could accept the declaration often made by the mover of this Bill, not only while introducing it, but on several occasions before, protesting that to the course which he had adopted for himself, and of which this is only the preliminary step, he was impelled by no other motive than a desire, a lofty desire, of securing the future of this country from dissension, and of ensuring peace and harmony by removing all causes of contention, I would be sorry that the hon. gentleman, harboring in his heart aims so high, should have endeavored to accomplish them by means so selfish, and so ungenerous, as those which underlie the measure which he has brought before the House. When, however, the hon. gentleman, in order to find a motive for the measure to which he called the attention of the House, invokes considerations of such far-reaching prudence, he is simply deluding himself. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, may persuade himself, but he will with difficulty convince those to whom he has been addressing himself, that his ultimate object in this matter is simply to secure the future peace and harmony of this country, while his present action must tend to endanger the peace and harmony which happily prevail. I can find nothing in this Bill, I must say, but the old, old spirit of domination and intolerance which, in this land, and in other lands, has always characterised the course of pure, unadulterated Toryism. This measure, taken by itself, disconnected from the motives which inspired it, would not be of very great importance—we are all agreed upon that—but it is of the greatest importance for this reason,

that it constitutes a declaration of war by the hon. gentleman and those with whom he is acting, against the French race. It is a declaration of war, I say, against the French race of this country, of which the hon. gentleman, in this House, spoke in no disrespectful terms, but of which, in other places in the Province of Ontario, he spoke—I am sorry that he is not now in his place to hear me—the hon. gentleman spoke in terms which he would not dare to repeat on the floor of this House; the hon. gentleman spoke of the French race in terms of opprobrium, which, I say again, he would not dare to repeat in this House, in presence of French Canadians, who, by law, are on a plane of equality with him in this House. He would not dare to apply here to my fellow-countrymen of French origin, the terms and epithets which he applied to them on former occasions in the Province of Ontario. He would not dare to say here what he said elsewhere; he would not dare call that race here as he did elsewhere—a “bastard nationality.” I have here his language, which he used not later than the 12th July last, at Stayner, Ont., where he said:

“In Barrie, last election, I pointed out, in a few simple words, that the great danger which overshadowed Canada was the French national cry, this bastard nationality, not a nationality which will take us in as we will take them in, but a nationality which begins and ends with the French race—which begins and ends with those who profess the Roman Catholic faith, and which now threatens the dismemberment of Canada.”

A “bastard nationality,” a “danger to Canada!” Why, Sir, the days are not five years distant when this “bastard nationality,” to use the choice words of the hon. gentleman, was unanimous in their support of the Conservative party to which the hon. gentleman, then as now, belonged; the days are not five years distant when the hon. gentleman might have counted on his fingers the members of that race in this House who did not belong to the Conservative party. And yet in those days, and as long as that race gave his party nearly the whole weight of their influence, we never heard of any danger to Canada from this French national cry. In those days the sensitiveness of the hon. gentleman, now so easily alarmed, did not seem to be in the least concerned. Nay, more, my fellow-countrymen of French origin, on the same side of the House to which he belongs, could appeal, and did appeal, to all the prejudices of my own race; but that was a legitimate warfare, because the national cry was made to do service in behalf of the Conservative party, to give them office, and to procure for them the direct and indirect profits of office. The speech delivered the other night by my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, and to which, I must say, legitimate objection was taken by my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), was simply, in condensed form, the food which, for the last twenty-five years, has been served up every day by the Conservative ministerial press of the Province of Quebec. Yet in those days not one word was ever heard as to any danger to Canada from this national cry. But matters are altered to-day. To-day the French Canadians are no longer a unit in their support of the Conservative party; and what was commendable, or at least unobjectionable, in those days, has now become a danger to Canada. A danger to Canada, Sir! I venture to say, judging of the future by the past, that if the French Canadians were again to unite and give the whole

weight of their influence to the party to which the hon. gentleman still belongs, not one word more would we hear about this danger to Canada from the French national cry; because, though the hon. gentleman affects now to be a free lance, still he belongs to the party commanded by the Prime Minister. He may not be a very disciplined soldier, he may be carrying on a guerilla warfare, according to his methods, but after all, he is working for the benefit of the Conservative party. He has told us himself on more than one occasion. Not fifteen days ago he said so in Collingwood, and he said so on the 12th July last, at Stayner. It is well known that it was on the 12th July last at Stayner, amongst his own constituents, that the hon. gentleman started on the war path. He then stated that he was furnishing his own weapons, and that when Parliament again met he was going to give assault to the French. His ardor was such that he deprecated the unfortunate condition of things which, under the Constitution, did not permit him to attack them wherever his ardor would impel him, but under the Constitution, he says he could attack the French language in the North-West Territories, and attack he would as soon as the occasion offered. But at the same time the hon. gentleman, addressing his constituents—all of them, probably, good Tories—was careful to tell them that he was still a Conservative, that he would remain a Conservative, and that a Conservative he hoped to die; and I have no doubt that that is true, because I do not think the hon. gentleman has the slightest particle of Liberalism in his composition. After this, some candid souls have asked if the hon. gentleman was in sympathy with the Prime Minister, or if he was starting a new movement of his own. A most useless question, for, whatever may be the aim of the hon. gentleman, it is quite certain that he means no harm to the Conservative party, still less to the leader of the party. Upon that occasion he spoke of his attachment to the party, and to the leader of the party, in terms of gushing effusiveness which, I must say, the hon. gentleman is not accustomed to use. I might quote several expressions of his, but here is one which is characteristic of the whole tenor of his speech:

“I will treat my old chieftain with all tenderness, for I am still a member of the party. I cannot be read out, although I do not know what is in store for me.”

The hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) is not here, but, if he were, I would tell him that he can keep his soul in peace. He need not fret or worry over what is in store for him, for I know the right hon. gentleman's astuteness too well—not to mention his nobler qualities—not to be aware that, if the hon. gentleman brings recruits to the party, he will be forgiven; and it is for recruits to the party that he is looking now. I regret that the hon. gentleman is not here, as I would rather speak in his presence than in his absence, but, in all sincerity, I say that I believe he is looking for recruits for the Conservative party, while, of course, not forgetting himself. The Conservative party have been in power for a long time; they have been in power nearly continuously for thirty years, and it is a matter of history that, during that time, they have been kept in power almost entirely by the French Catholic support of the Province of Quebec. That is a support upon which they can no longer rely, because the people of Quebec are now divided in their political allegiance; but it must be manifest

Mr. LAURIER.

to everybody that an English Protestant united Ontario would be just as effective for party purposes, and this seems to be the task which the hon. gentleman has set before him to accomplish. It is always an easy and a cheap task to arouse and inflame prejudices. Give me a meeting or assembly of men, whether it be small or large, and in that meeting I will find passions and prejudices, noble in themselves, but which can be easily excited into dangerous passions and prejudices. The hon. gentleman is now endeavoring to arouse prejudices which old quarrels, religious fervor, and pride of race, may have left in the breasts of his fellow-countrymen of English origin. He tells them that if the country is to be kept British all Canadians of British origin must unite; at the same time he states that he is a Conservative, that he will remain a Conservative, that he will not be separated from his leader. If the appeals which he has been making were to be successful, to whom would they profit and whom would they affect? They certainly would not affect the Conservatives, because the hon. gentleman states that he is still in allegiance with them, and that they belong to the same party. If they would affect anybody, they would affect the Liberals of Ontario, who, fearing perhaps for British connection, might be induced to follow the hon. gentleman into the Conservative party, for which he could frame a policy and of which then he would be dictator. Well, if this movement of the hon. gentleman were to be terminated here, if it were attempted merely to do service as a party device and to end there, it might not be viewed with much alarm. If this measure of the hon. gentleman were not to be followed by any other, if it were to remain as it appears here, a measure for the proscription of the French language confined to the North-West Territories alone, where the French population is small, I say at once that I would be inclined to say: Let the measure pass and let us return to those measures of practical usefulness which demand our attention. But this is not the last movement of the hon. gentleman. This is only a preliminary skirmish, soon to be followed by a general onslaught upon the whole French race in Canada. I have before me the words of the hon. gentleman, and he has more than once told us that his object is a hand-to-hand conflict with the French race of Canada. If he did not say so in so many words, there is no mistaking his meaning that his ultimate object is the annihilation of the French race as an individual people in this Dominion. In his speech at Stayner, he unfolded his whole mind, and, addressing himself to the English section of the people of the Dominion, he said:

“There is a great work cut out for us to do. Let us begin with that which seems most possible of accomplishment. Let us deal with the dual languages in the North-West. In the Local House let us deal with the teaching of French in the schools. When these two matters are settled, we will have accomplished something, and we may be able to do something better in future.”

These words are quite significant. This Bill, the introduction of this measure, is simply a preliminary step, and when that is accomplished it is to be followed by something better. And what is that something better which is to follow? The hon. gentleman has not left us in doubt as to that. Here are his words:

"We must buckle on our armor. * * * This is a British country, and the sooner we take up our French Canadians and make them British, the less trouble will we leave for posterity, for sooner or later must this matter be settled."

Nothing can be plainer than this language. The French Canadians are to be deprived of their language, not only in the North-West Territories, but wherever their language exists. They must be deprived of everything which constitutes their distinct individuality in this Dominion, and this must be done by legislation now; but, if not done now by legislation, in future it will be done by force and violence—by bullets and bayonets. The expression is not mine, but that of the hon. gentleman himself. It has been repeated, not once or twice, but several times in different parts of the Dominion. So this is the policy upon which the hon. gentleman is endeavoring to form a new party, or to re-organise an old party. This is the policy the hon. gentleman offers to his fellow-countrymen of English origin. I denounce this policy as anti-Canadian; I denounce it as anti-British; I denounce it as being at variance with all the traditions of British Government in this country; I denounce it as fatal to the hope we at one time entertained, and which I, for one, am not disposed to give up, of forming a nation on this Continent; I denounce it as a crime, the consequences of which are simply shocking to contemplate. The hon. gentleman may mean nothing more than a mere party device, but he is opening the flood-gates to passions which, once aroused, perhaps no human power may be able to restrain. He is appealing to national and religious passions, the most inflexible of all passions, and—whatever may be his motive, whatever his end, whatever his purpose—his movement cannot be characterised by any other language than that of a national crime. I do not know what are the motives which are actuating the hon. gentleman; I do not know them fully. I look only at the consequences. But, whatever may be the hon. gentleman's motives, he has more than once felt impelled to repudiate the statement that he is actuated by hatred of the French race. If he were here, I would tell him that I accept his statement absolutely and entirely. Hatred is so base a sentiment that I would not impute it to him, but, if he is not actuated by hatred, it is evident that he has a very strange misconception of the character of French Canadians, and must have a very low estimate of their moral standard. In the speech to which I have already alluded, the hon. gentleman did not hesitate to go considerably out of his way, in order to refer to the agitation which, a few years ago, passed over the Province of Quebec, consequent upon the rebellion in the North-West and the execution of the chief participant in the same. He did not hesitate then to attribute the storm of indignation which, at that time, convulsed a highly emotional race to the lowest sentiments which can actuate the human heart, and those expressions were, to a certain extent, reproduced in the House, the other day, by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), in the attempt he made to attack my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Blake) for the courageous stand which he took upon that question. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) did not hesitate to say, that, if the people

of Quebec took the stand they did at that time, it was from a most dishonest motive; that it was simply an attempt to stand between a criminal and justice, because the so-called criminal happened to be one of their own race.

"Those who have done me the honor to pay close attention to my political career, will remember that in the County of Haldimand two or three years ago I raised the warning note. I pointed out that the Province of Quebec had been worked up to madness against the Dominion authorities for daring to execute justice upon a Frenchman."

"For daring to execute justice upon a Frenchman." I repeat this sentiment in his own words. Well, I have simply this to say, that whoever declares that the position taken by the people of Quebec upon this question was not an honest one is guilty of slander, and makes a statement the truth of which he cannot prove. The hon. gentleman has not, however, the odium of having invented that charge. It has been a stock phrase of the Conservative ministerial press of Ontario for the last three or four years. So long as it was simply confined to some obscure scribblers it might be passed in silence, but when the hon. gentleman did not hesitate to give it the countenance of his name and reputation, and when, moreover, such sentiments are re-echoed in this House, I cannot allow the charge to pass unrebuked. I will meet the hon. gentlemen on his own grounds. I will not dispute his expression that the people of Quebec were driven to madness on this question, but as to the motives attributed by him I will state that the people of Quebec believe in their conscience, whether right or wrong, that the execution "of that Frenchman" (to use the words of the hon. gentleman) was an unjustifiable homicide. The hon. gentleman will not forget that twenty-three of his colleagues; twenty-three of those who supported that Administration like himself—most of them who, like himself, will not be read out of the party, but who will remain Conservatives—telegraphed to the Prime Minister that the execution would be a crime. This is not all; there is more than that. The hon. gentleman will not forget that the press of the civilised world decided upon that occasion that "mercy should rule and not severity." The opinion of the press of the whole world; the *London Lancet*, the *Christian World*, the *London Daily News*, the *London Echo*, the *Pall-Mall Gazette* in England, the *National*, the *Journal des Debats* and the *Le Télégraphe* in France, the *Harper's Weekly*, the *Times*, the *World*, the *Commercial Advertiser* of New York, and scores of other journals in the United States, gave it as their opinion that mercy should have been the rule upon that occasion. I tell the hon. gentleman who has interrupted me that if those great organs of public opinion came to the conclusion that mercy should have been the rule upon that occasion, how dare he now contest the honesty of the people of Quebec who came to the same conclusion? If those who were without the conflict, if those who looked from a calmer sphere came to this conclusion, is it to be wondered at that the people of Quebec came to the same conclusion, though it may be regretted that they expressed their opinion in such violent language. I say more. There is no one man of English origin, if he be true to the standard of that proud race which never tolerated injustice, and never submitted to tyranny, who, looking at the long tale of woe and misery

which resulted in the rebellion in the North-West, but must feel his heart indignant—not against the poor wretches who, goaded to madness and driven to despair by years of careless indifference, at last risked life and limb and freedom, risked the loss of everything dear to man, to get justice, and then alone obtained it—but against those who by their own supineness had brought about such a crime on the fair name of the country. There is more than that. If the history of that rebellion were told, it would unfold to the world a tragedy darker than Hamlet. There was a race of men on the border between savage and civilised life; advanced enough to understand the value of property, but not advanced enough to defend their property against those unfeeling speculators who everywhere precede civilisation. Among the whole race then in Canada there was not one who had received the smallest rudiment of education; but they had heard there was one of their number who had been more favored than they in this respect, and he was then an exile. If he were brought back to the Territories, might he not procure for them the act of simple justice which they themselves could not obtain? To him they appealed; but, misfortune greater than all their misfortune! the man to whom they thus appealed to be the eye to see for them, the mind to guide them, the arm to protect them, had been touched by the hand of God, and was the most helpless of them all. In the face of such facts, the judgment of my fellow-countrymen can be impugned, but their honesty cannot be assailed. It is a vile imputation to attack their honesty of purpose; and if I have thus alluded to these facts, it is not with a view of recrimination, it is not with a view of perpetuating the bitterness of these sad days. But since we are threatened with a war of races, since my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) is going to appeal to the people of Ontario to unite together, I want at least fair play in the contest. I cannot allow that such a statement as this made at Stayner, should go unrebuked, and I must do my share in the attempt to re-establish perverted truth. I cannot allow the fair name of my countrymen to be assailed by false statements, and that the expression should go abroad uncontradicted that the people of Quebec will follow no law but the law of their own selfishness. Since the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) has taken this attitude, since he has tried to introduce this new policy, which outlines the course he has taken recently, we might have hoped that he were impelled by motives of a higher and nobler consideration. I am not ignorant of the fact that, among the men who have adopted the same views as the hon. gentleman, there are many who have come to the conclusion which the hon. gentleman has given expression to, from the conviction that the existence of two separate nationalities in Canada is not compatible with the existence of the Dominion. This objection thus presented is one which I will not reject. On the contrary, I say this is a question which must engross the serious attention of all those who have at heart the future of the country, for no one can close his eyes to the fact that the existence of two distinct nationalities must produce sometimes, as it has produced already, causes of angry friction and, therefore, of danger. But, Sir, we must deal with facts as they are, and deal with them as we find

Mr. LAURIER.

them. Here are two different races geographically united under the same political allegiance, but separated by numerous ethnical features. With those conflicting elements, it is the object of the hon. gentleman apparently—it is my own object certainly, and it is the object of us all, I believe—to try to form a nation. This is the problem we have to solve; how shall we proceed to solve it? The hon. gentleman has given us his method, the Tory method, and he has once more demonstrated that Tory methods never proceed from the nobler, higher instincts of the human heart and the human intellect, but always from the dread, the diffidence, and the distrust which everywhere has made the Tory party, wherever it has had sway, suspicious and cruel. The hon. gentleman, looking around this broad Dominion, sees a population of one and a-half million inhabitants, nearly one-third of our whole population, who are of French origin, attached to their language, their laws, their institutions, and their religion—attached to everything which characterises their separate individuality. If the hon. gentleman had stated that this was a cause of possible friction, and that we should endeavor to find some means of alleviating that friction, I would agree with him; but the hon. gentleman did not take that view. On the contrary, he coldly asserts that the existence of two separate races here is not compatible with the existence of the Dominion, and, therefore, one must disappear; and I have quoted his words in which he appeals to his friends of English origin to buckle on their armor, and see to it that we have only one nationality on this continent. Sir, if this policy were to prevail, what would be the result? What is it the hon. gentleman has in view? It is simply this: that the French Canadians should feel the yoke on their shoulders, that they should be deprived by legislation, or by force if necessary, of everything which has been granted to them hitherto. If this doctrine were to prevail, on what foundation would this Confederation rest? The hon. gentleman, I am sure, would himself admit that pride of race, attachment to the memory of one's nation and ancestors, are noble sentiments; and yet the hon. gentleman coldly proposes that one and a-half million of Canadians—in order, as he says, that they should become good Canadians—should renounce their origin and the traditions of their race. He proposes that the humiliation of one whole race in this country should be the foundation of this Dominion. Woe to the party which can adopt such degrading doctrines as this. Who does not see that the humiliation of one race would be a far greater danger to Confederation than any we have ever yet known? I endorse the words spoken a short time ago by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), that we want to build up a nation on this continent; and we want to establish such a state of things that every citizen of this country, whatever his origin may be, whether he is English or French, shall feel in his heart a supreme pride to call himself a Canadian. But I would ask the hon. gentleman—I could not appeal perhaps to his heart, though I might to his logical mind—does he believe that to subject one whole section of our population to the humiliation of renouncing its origin, of turning its back upon its history, would make them proud of the country? Who does not perceive that if you

should force one section to hate the institutions under which they live, those institutions cannot live? Sir, the humiliation of one race, one class, one creed, or one man is not the foundation on which this Confederation can rest. There is but one foundation for it, that is, to give the fullest scope and the fullest sway to all those sentiments which could not be torn from the heart without causing a loss of pride. The hon. gentleman seems to think that all Canadians should be cast in the same mould. He is proud of his race, and he has every reason to be proud of it; but, Sir, it does not follow that we should all be English-speaking Canadians, that we should all be merged in the Anglo-Saxon element. Certainly no one can respect or admire more than I do the Anglo-Saxon race; I have never disguised my sentiments on that point; but we of French origin are satisfied to be what we are, and we claim no more. I claim this for the race in which I was born, that though it is not perhaps endowed with the same qualities as the Anglo-Saxon race, it is endowed with qualities as great; I claim for it that it is endowed with qualities unsurpassed in some respects; I claim for it that there is not to-day under the sun a more moral, more honest or more intellectual race; and if the hon. gentleman came to Lower Canada, it would be my pride to take him to one of those ancient parishes on the St. Lawrence or one of its tributaries, and show him a people to whom, prejudiced as he is, he could not but apply the words which the poet applied to those who at one time inhabited the Basin of Minas and the meadows of Grandpré:

"Men whose lives glided on like rivers that water
the woodland,
Darkened by shadows of earth, but reflecting an
image of Heaven."

Sir, I claim no more than this is fairly due to my countrymen, and I say let the two races stand together, each with its own characteristics; they will be all the more speedily united in the same aspirations towards a common object—British in allegiance and Canadian in sentiment. But, Sir, if you attempt to rend from one whatever is dear and sacred to it, instead of having peace and harmony, you will have ever increasing discord. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the other day told us that it was in the interest of the French Canadians to become a part of the Anglo-Saxon race; and proceeding to relate the achievements of that great race, both in war and peace, he almost asked permission from and apologised to the French Canadians for feeling proud of the British feats of arms on the Plains of Abraham, in the Bay of Trafalgar, on the field of Waterloo. Sir, my hon. friend needed not to apologise; his sentiments are quite natural to those who have the same blood as he has in his veins, and they cannot be offensive to anyone; but I, who belong to the race which was defeated in those battles, claim no permission to say that I lay no claim to that stoical heroism, if heroism it be, which can contemplate without a pang, even retrospectively, the defeat of one's own race, though my judgment is clear that in two, at least, of those battles—that on the Plains of Abraham and that on the field of Waterloo—the victory of England was a victory of liberty. I have, more than once in this House, told my fellow-countrymen of the Province of Quebec, that the day which had severed Canada from France had not

been an evil day for the descendants of France, because they had found under the British Crown greater liberty than they could have hoped for under the French régime, and after all liberty is the greatest boon of life. But, Sir, while I say that, I do not disguise to my fellow-countrymen of English origin, who will, I hope, understand me, that even at this day, holding the opinions which I hold, whenever I take up our history, as I follow the long, the persistent, the implacable duel between England and France for the possession of this continent; as I trace, page by page, the fatal climax, dim at first, but gradually taking shape and becoming inevitable; as I follow the brave army of Montcalm retreating before superior forces, retreating, even after victory, retreating into a circle made every day narrower and narrower; as I come to the last page and the last struggle where that truly great man, the gallant Montcalm, found death with his first defeat, I do not disguise from my fellow-countrymen of English origin that my heart is clenched and that my French blood runs colder in my veins. Talk to me not of your purely utilitarian theories! men are not mere automatons! It is not by trampling on the tenderest sentiments of the soul that you will ever accomplish your end if such an end you have in view. And yet it is in the name of British allegiance, it is with the apparent object of securing the future of this country, that this new policy is introduced—this so-called British policy which is at total variance with the policy ever followed by the British authorities on this continent. This country had but a few years before passed under the régime of the English Crown, when the great conflict arose between England and her colonies to the south, which ended in the separation of those colonies from the mother land. England at once realised that, if she was to retain a foothold upon this continent, it was necessary for her to win the affections of her new subjects, since she had lost the allegiance of those of her own kith and kin; and that unless she made just concessions she could not hope to do so. In a just and generous spirit she made the concessions necessary to gain this object. To her new subjects she gave their laws, their language, and their religion, although at the time that very religion was subjected to many disabilities in England. Does not the hon. gentleman who moved this Bill know, as everybody must know, that these timely concessions saved this colony to England? Does he not know that if the new subjects of England had joined the armies which Congress sent over to force Canadians into the movement of insurrection, the result would have been for Canada what it has been for the rebellious colonies—total separation. And the hon. gentleman might have known that, though the Marquis de Lafayette and the Count d'Estaing sent their emissaries to wave the old colors of France before the eyes of the old subjects of France, the latter still remained true and fought under the British flag around the walls of Quebec with the same courage which they had displayed against that flag but sixteen years before. Supposing the hon. gentleman had been living then and had had a voice in the council of the King, what advice would he have given? Would he have said: Do not allow these men to talk their own language; do not give them any privileges? If he had, and if his advice had been taken, this

country would not be British as it is to-day. I have stated, and I repeat the statement, that the French Canadians having claimed and received from England the privileges of British subjects, it would be the blackest ingratitude on their part if, to-day, they were to reject the obligations which British citizenship entails; but I also say to the hon. gentleman that it would be ungrateful, unmanly, and ungenerous to repeal at this moment, or to attempt to take from the French Canadians, the concessions made to them to win their affections and to secure their support in the day of England's danger. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated, a few evenings ago, that he had his doubts as to whether the loyalty of French Canadians upon that occasion had been altogether unmixed; he had his doubts as to whether, instead of being loyal, they did not only look to their language, their laws, their institutions and their church. I do not understand the doubts of the hon. gentleman. I do not doubt at all. I am quite sure these were the motives which impelled my countrymen to be loyal. They had to choose between the action of the British Crown and that of the Philadelphia Congress. The British Crown had just granted them the Act of 1774, which secured to them everything they held dear—their language, their laws and their religion—and they had to choose between that and the Act of the Philadelphia Congress, which will always remain a blot on a noble page of American history. The hon. gentleman shows that in the proclamation which the Congress of Philadelphia issued to the English people that very concession was declared to be one of the grievances of which the colonies had to complain. These were the motives that induced my countrymen to take the stand they did. Does the hon. gentleman find fault with them for being guided by motives? Do not men generally act on motives? As Mr. Lincoln said, in 1862, in the darkest period of the war: Negroes themselves will act upon motives. I would like to know what objection my hon. friend has to that? What are his views of loyalty? Does loyalty consist only in kissing the smiting hand? Is it meritorious when submissive and slavish? No; loyalty is meritorious when it proceeds from favors granted and from justice done. And this has been the invariable tradition of the race to which my hon. friend has the honor to belong, and of which he is justly proud. But there were before to-day men whose memory was short and whose sense of gratitude was limited. In the first Parliament, which sat in 1791 under the Constitution then granted, there were men like the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who wished to have the use of the French language abolished in the legislative hall. Their attempts were frustrated, chiefly by the efforts of one man, who, upon that subject, could speak with authority. That man was Joseph Papineau, the illustrious father of a still more illustrious son; and his whole life was the repudiation of the theory advanced here in the last four days. He was an example of the fact that a man can speak in the language of his ancestors, and still remain a true subject of the Crown of England. At the time when Arnold and Montgomery were invading Canada, despatches had been brought from Lord Howe, who commanded the British forces in the

Mr. LAURIER.

insurgent colonies, to Sir Guy Carleton, who commanded the English forces in Canada. The despatches reached Montreal. Sir Guy Carleton had been forced to retreat to Quebec before Montgomery's army, and was busily preparing that city against the invaders. The despatches could not be carried further than Montreal, except at the cost of great perils and hardships; but two young men undertook to carry them through. Joseph Papineau, then a young man, twenty-five years of age, was one of the two who volunteered for this service. The country was in the hands of the enemy; it was unsettled, and there were great rivers to be crossed, without bridges, and it was in the fall of the year. Mr. Papineau and his friend tramped the whole distance. They reached Quebec and delivered their despatches. Then, what did they do? They enlisted as volunteers and served in the defence of Quebec, until the enemy was repulsed from Canadian soil. Some few years afterwards, in 1791, Mr. Papineau had been elected member for Montreal, and when the attempt was made to banish the French language from the walls of the legislature of Quebec, Mr. Papineau could speak with some authority, and he asked:

"Is it simply because Canada forms part of the British Empire that Canadians, who speak not the language in use on the banks of the Thames, are to be deprived of their natural rights?"

Mr. Papineau's recent services, his fidelity to the cause in danger, were such as to convince the English members of the Legislature that his arguments were reasonable and generous; and I submit that his words should find an echo, even at this distant day, within the walls of this chamber. The hon. gentleman told us that, at a later date, Lord Durham, in his famous report, advised the suppression of the French language in the legislative halls of Canada. It is perfectly true, and his views were incorporated in the Imperial Act of 1840, but five years had not elapsed before the Canadian Legislature unanimously decided, all shades of opinion united, to petition the Imperial Parliament to remove the obnoxious clause, and it was so removed. The union of Upper and Lower Canada had just been consummated, and it was soon perceived, under the guidance of that master mind, Mr. Baldwin, that if the union was to be for the good of the whole people, every section of the people had to be protected in what was held dear by every one of them. This Act of the Legislature has, however, been criticised by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He found nothing in it great, generous or statesman like. On the contrary, he characterised it as a weak concession from politicians in order to capture French votes. I would not do justice to the hon. gentleman if I did not here quote his words. This is what he said:

"The Parliament of 1840 did all it could to repair the injury of 1774; but, gentlemen, it was not very long before our politicians undid it all."

Mark the supreme contempt in these words, "our politicians!" The hon. gentleman was on tender ground when he spoke of "politicians," he was at one time a politician, though he informed his audience that he was no longer of that class.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A statesman.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman was too modest to say that, but he left it to be inferred, that the great statesmen of the present day should

endeavor to undo the great wrong inflicted on this country, from such base motives, by such puny politicians as Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Lafontaine, Sir Allen MacNab and Mr. Morin. The hon. gentleman was proud, he said, to fortify his views with the views of Lord Durham, and he was proud to refer to Lord Durham as a Liberal of the Liberals. It is true that Lord Durham was a Liberal, but I will show that, while he was a friend of liberty, and was one of the most advanced statesmen of his day, he did not know the force of free institutions, and that, however large the range of his mind, he was not such a keen-sighted statesman, nor even true Liberal, as was our own Robert Baldwin. My hon. friend the other day recalled the famous words of Lord Durham, wherein, in graphic language, he depicted the state of Lower Canada in the summer of 1838. He had expected, he said, to find here a conflict between a Government and a people, but he had found two peoples warring in the bosom of the same state; he had found a struggle, not of principles, but of races. The language is perfectly true. It cannot be doubted at this day, that the movement which culminated in the rebellion of 1837-38 in Lower Canada, when it assumed that acute form, had degenerated into a war of races. My hon. friend did not tell us the cause which had brought about that war of races, but Lord Durham told us, and my hon. friend might have quoted his language. The cause was the contest between the Legislative Assembly and an irresponsible Government. For almost fifty years the Legislative Assembly passed laws which were deemed essential, absolutely essential, for the welfare of the country, and even for the very existence of the Legislative Assembly itself, as a body; and as often as those laws were passed, so often were they trampled upon by an irresponsible Government. The Assembly was altogether French; the Executive was almost entirely English, and its members were recruited by the Colonial Office among its creatures. As may be expected in any such case, the whole French population took part with the Assembly, and nearly the whole of the English population took part with the Executive. Very few, probably, thought much as to who was in the right or as to who was in the wrong; but, if you desire to know who was in the main right in that dispute, I cannot do better than to call in the testimony of Lord Durham himself, as it is couched in his report. And this is what he said:

"From the commencement, therefore, to the end of the disputes which marked the whole parliamentary history of Lower Canada, I look on the conduct of the Assembly as a constant warfare with the Executive, for the purpose of obtaining the powers inherent in a representative body by the very nature of representative government."

Thus you have the admission that, if there was a rebellion, it was forced upon the French Canadians of that day by the action of the Executive Government, which had refused to give to the Legislative Assembly the powers inherent to a legislative body. Yet, in face of that opinion, Lord Durham said that the loyalty of the French Canadians could not be trusted, and that henceforth Lower Canada would have to be governed by an English population, and the method he suggested was the union of the two Canadas, with a provision that the English population should have in the House a large majority in numbers. The reason he gives

for coming to that conclusion is given in very pithy terms. Here it is:

"Never again will the present generation of French Canadians yield a loyal submission to a British Government."

I have already stated that Lord Durham did not know the full force of free representative institutions, and that our own Baldwin was a greater statesman in that respect than Lord Durham. Lord Durham had not imagined, he had not thought, that, if the French Canadians were given all their privileges, they would at once become loyal subjects, that they would not have to be governed by the strong hand of an English majority, that division would not take place on the line of races but on the broader lines which impel men to move onwards or to cling to the past. Mr. Baldwin understood that, and he was the first to suggest that the French Canadians should have their language restored, and should be treated as the equals of their fellow-citizens of English origin. That was true statesmanship and that view was unanimously adopted by the Legislature; and I ask, in face of subsequent facts, who is the greater statesman, Lord Durham or Mr. Baldwin? Lord Durham stated that the then living generation of French Canadians would never yield submission to an English Government. At that very time, there was a young man who was an exile from his native country, because he had been a few months before a rebel in arms, and the British Government had set a price upon his head. There is no doubt that, if he had been captured, he would have met the fate of those who, on the scaffold, paid the penalty of having loved their country not wisely but too well. Under the policy introduced in 1845, this young man became a member of Parliament and leader of the Conservative party, and he died a baronet of the realm. Sir, this took place in face of the words Lord Durham wrote in 1838, when he said that never again would that generation of French Canadians yield a loyal submission to the British Government. Now, my hon. friend from Simcoe asks us to go back upon this policy. Are we to be told at this day, or is it to be believed by any one at this day, that the policy introduced by Mr. Baldwin has not made Canada what it is? Is there a man living in this land, especially if he is of the Liberal party, who would at this day go back upon the policy inaugurated by their leader forty years ago? Sir, there is not a man in this country to-day who must not feel proud of the wise and statesman-like policy which was introduced upon that occasion. I am not ignorant of, nor will I minimise, the danger which arises to Canada from the fact that we have here a duality of language and a duality of race. But the fact exists, and ostracism of any kind, instead of removing the danger, would simply intensify it, by forcing a section of our population to hate the institutions under which they live—intensify it, because it would bring a section of our population into conflict with the majority, which would thus abuse the brute power of numbers. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman must feel that the policy which he is now championing is weak and inferior. Any policy which appeals to a class, to a creed, to a race, or which does not appeal to the better instincts to be found in all classes, in all creeds, and in all races, is stamped with the stamp of inferiority. The French Canadian who appeals to his fellow-countrymen to stand by themselves,

aloof from the rest of this continent; the English Canadian who, like my hon. friend, appeals to his fellow-countrymen on grounds affecting them alone, may, perhaps, win the applause of those whom they may be addressing, but impartial history will pronounce their work as vicious in conception as it is mischievous and wicked in its tendency. We are here a nation, or we want to be a nation, composed of the most heterogeneous elements—Protestants and Catholics, English, French, German, Irish, Scotch, every one, let it be remembered, with his traditions, with his prejudices. In each of these conflicting antagonistic elements, however, there is a common spot of patriotism, and the only true policy is that which reaches that common patriotism and makes it vibrate in all, towards a common end and common aspirations. I may be asked: What, then, is to be the future of Canada? The future of Canada is this: that it must be British. I do not share the dreams or the delusions of those few of my fellow-countrymen of French origin, who talk to us of forming a French nation on the banks of the St. Lawrence; and I would say to my hon. friend from Simcoe, if he were here, that these dreams ought not to disturb his sleep. Those who share these delusions are very few; they might be counted upon the fingers of one hand, and I never knew but one newspaper which ever gave them utterance. Yet, while I say that this country is bound to be British, it does not follow at all that there must be but one language—the English language—to be spoken in this country. I claim that I am as loyal as the hon. gentleman to the institutions of this country, and I am the son of a French mother, and I declare that I cling to the language which I learned at her knee as I cling to the life which she gave me. And upon this ground I appeal to every man of British origin, to every man of that race in which the domestic affections are so strong; and I know that in the heart of every one the answer will be, that, situated as we are, they would do as we do. But the hon. gentleman will revert to the cold, dry arguments that, after all, a duality of race will produce friction, and that friction will produce danger. But where is the remedy? I tell the hon. gentleman that the remedy is not in ostracism, not in harsh methods nor in cruel methods. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill)—who, like many other good men, preaches better than he practices—gave us the other day the true remedy. The true remedy, he said, is mutual forbearance and respect. I altogether agree with my hon. friend from North Bruce. But he complained in his speech that the forbearance should not be all on one side. Sir, is it all on one side? What he complains of is a few expressions, I admit very imprudent, that have fallen from the lips of some men in the heat of the debate. Well, I am pretty sure that when those expressions are sifted and explained they readily fall away. The newspapers of Ontario, during the past year, have been full of citations of the words of my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), pronounced at the St. Jean Baptiste celebration last year; and when he took occasion, a few days ago, to explain those words, he explained them so thoroughly that my hon. friend from North Bruce immediately wanted to make him a member of the Imperial Federation League. If all the other expressions were so sifted I do not despair that my hon. friend from North

Mr. LAURIER.

Bruce would try to make Mr. Mercier himself a member of the Imperial Federation League. This is what he claims his fellow-countrymen and my fellow-countrymen of English origin have to bear. Well, I tell him that the French Canadians have also something to bear. I will tell him what we have to bear. What we object to is the meddling interference of certain men in Ontario in our domestic politics; what I object to is the whining pity bestowed by some over-zealous and over-good men in Ontario upon the poor, down-trodden, prostrate French Canadians. Only the other day my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) complained that the Province of Quebec was making no progress, and he instanced the fact that in that Province we still have the tithing system, and he said if there was in Quebec a true Liberal party, they would grapple with such an evil as that. There is in Quebec a Liberal party, not without fault, I admit, but a party which has fought as noble a battle as was ever fought by any party in any land. But before I tell him why the Liberal party in Quebec do not grapple with the tithing system, let me remind him that there is in England a Liberal party of which any man ought to be proud, a party led to-day by one of the greatest men that England has ever produced, or that any land has ever produced—Mr. Gladstone. Does my hon. friend also know that there is a tithing system in England just as there is a tithing system in Lower Canada—no, not just the same, because the tithing system in England is far more oppressive and unjust than the system in Lower Canada. The tithing system in Lower Canada only affects Roman Catholics and no one else, but in England the tithing system affects every man, whether he is a member of the Church of England or of another. And yet never to this day did the Liberal party grapple with that system or attempt to bring the English people to abolish that system. Why? Because the great majority of the English people would not part with it. And for the very same reason the Liberal party has never grappled with that system here, because the people of Quebec are satisfied with it. My hon. friend has read somewhere that the people are oppressed under the tithing system, that they are compelled to abandon their lands because the oppression is such that they cannot pay the tithes. The truth is the people of Quebec to-day give double the amount to the Church voluntarily than they give by law. I declare, in the name of the Liberal party of Quebec, of which I am an humble member, that so long as the conscience of Quebec is satisfied with the system, never will the Liberal party attack that system. I will say this to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that if we could make a compact between the English and the French, each to mind his own business and not meddle with the business of the other, we would get along tolerably well, not only tolerably well, but perfectly well. Yet the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) perhaps may say: If you are to bring the two races together, simply by relying upon moral influence and persuasion, the union may be far away. There is force in the objection, because there are in Quebec, as there are in Ontario, extreme men who will not be amenable either to reason or generous considerations. The extreme men of Quebec talk to-day of forming a French nation on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and the extremists of Ontario talk of driving away

the French with bayonets. When the very large body of the nation, composed of the two races, come closer together and know each other better, I have no doubt that friction of races here will be as rare as it is in Switzerland after hundreds of years of political union. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) if he were here, would say, perhaps: Is this system ever to remain? Is there never to be a day when we shall have here nothing but the English language? I would tell my hon. friend that I do not trouble myself with such considerations as to a dim and distant future. The only thing which troubles me at this moment is, to keep peace and harmony in this land, and not have peace and harmony endangered under the vain pretence of securing the future against feuds and contentions. I have great pleasure in telling the hon. gentleman—and I am sorry he is not present—that, in my judgment, the English language is to-day and must be for several generations, perhaps for several centuries, the commanding language of the world. So long as the centre of civilisation was on the basin of the Mediterranean, three languages in succession held sway: the Greek, the Latin and the French. At the end of the seventeenth century the French language was undoubtedly the dominating language of civilisation. It is still the language of diplomacy, the vehicle of communication for international exchange in the higher productions of the human mind, but it is no longer the language of the many. That position now belongs to the English language. That revolution has been accomplished by the wonderful development of the Anglo-Saxon race during the eighteenth and in the nineteenth centuries. That race have carried their language with them in their emigration around the world, and now it is the language of more than 100,000,000 of people scattered over Europe, Africa, America, Asia, and the islands and continents of the Pacific Ocean. Sir, the very fact that the English language is to-day the dominating language of this continent of America, makes it imperative on French Canadians, although they will retain their language, to learn and speak English. Nothing was more appropriate, more wise than the words that fell a few days ago from the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard). The French Canadian father who to-day does not give an English education to his son does not do justice to his child, because he compels him to stand back in the hard struggle for life. I would say more. It is imperative for us French Canadians to learn English, but—I have no right to give advice to any other man—if I were to give any advice to my Anglo-Canadian friends, it would be that they would do well to learn French too. The English are a proud race; but the Romans were a proud race also; and after they had conquered the world, a Roman acknowledged that the education of his son was not complete unless he was as familiar with Greek letters as he was with Latin letters. Perhaps, however, my hon. friend for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would not admit such an example for himself or the people of this country, because the object of my hon. friend is not simply to remove the use of the French language in the North-West Territories and from every legislative hall in Canada, but his object is to prevent the teaching of French in the schools of Ontario. There are to-day, in the back townships and new concessions in Ontario, schools where a few French settlers are

attempting to impart some knowledge to their children in the language of their ancestors. The eagle eye of my hon. friend has caught sight of that fact. The eye of the eagle can withstand the sun, but the eye of my hon. friend cannot withstand that little light. He spoke a few days ago in this city, the Capital of Canada, at a meeting which adopted the following resolution:—

“And this meeting avails itself of this opportunity of expressing the opinion that in our own Province the use of the French language as the language of instruction in the public schools should be abolished and for ever prohibited, and that no undecided measure for obtaining this end will be satisfactory to the people of Ontario.”

The hon. gentleman spoke to that resolution and endorsed every word of it. This is what he said:

“At the same time, as a citizen of Ontario—of the Dominion, I heartily endorse the sentiment which the meeting has given utterance to—that we ought, and ought at once and for all time, to put an end to the teaching of our children, either French, Canadian or English, in any other language than the language of the country in which we live.”

Is this really the measure of my hon. friend? We always knew him to be a restrictionist, but not to that extent, I am sure; we always knew him to be a restrictionist in trade, but he is a restrictionist even in knowledge. If the hon. gentleman, on that occasion, had said that the people of Ontario would insist that English should be taught in all their schools, I would raise both my hands in favor of it. But that is not enough; not only must English be taught, but he objects to any other language being taught in Ontario schools. Can it be that an hon. gentleman possessing the attainments, power and ability of my hon. friend should stoop to things so low? It is a thing low, and vile, and contemptible, to say that the people of Ontario, whatever be their creed or their origin, shall not have the right to teach a second language to their children if they choose. Men are not usually wantonly cruel; men do not, as a rule, purposely degrade their lives, and what is the reason, I want to know, which impels my hon. friend to use such language as that? Sir, the reason is, that Tories of the stamp of my hon. friend never can bring themselves up to the point of trusting the better instincts of the human heart; they never can divest themselves of the base notion that, if they treat their opponents with generosity or with justice, their opponents will abuse the privilege. They can never divest themselves of the base notion that, if the French Canadians are to be allowed their language and their characteristics as a race, they will turn traitors as a race. They want to make this country British in the same manner they have tried to make Ireland British. For the last seven hundred years, English statesmen have attempted to make Ireland British, not by justice, not by generosity, not by appealing to the better instincts of the generous hearts of that people, but by every form of violence and cruelty. They have proscribed her religion, they have killed her agriculture, they have destroyed her commerce, they have done everything to degrade the land and the people. And with what result? With the result of making Ireland a thorn in the side of England, with the result of filling the heart of the people of Ireland with bitterness against England. Sir, Mr. Gladstone has done more in five years to make Ireland British than English statesmen have done for seven hundred years before.

Will I show you the different results which can be wrought upon the feelings of a sensitive people by generous treatment? Let me quote a speech delivered by Mr. John Dillon, M. P. for Tipperary, last year. The occasion was a demonstration in favor of Mr. Dillon on his being released from jail, where he had served a term under the odious Coercion law. Now, I cite this speech because it may be a lesson to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and those who agree with him in this House. Mr. Dillon said :

"But it is impossible for me to be blind to the facts that are forced upon my notice as regard the mighty change which have come over the minds of the masses of the people of England, and remembering this, I think it is not wise to be impatient, because the liberty of Ireland is not to be accomplished in a day. I can see no cause for impatience, but cause rather for hope and even exultation. Coming now, as I do, from what was meant to be a degradation and an insult to me, and as I hope an honorable man, I can find in my heart not the slightest trace of bitterness against the people of England. I recollect the day when the power and when the name of Englishmen were hateful to my heart. It may be that I have been demoralised by the countless acts of kindness I have received at the hands of Englishmen; but the feeling has now changed, and I cannot find it in my heart to regret that it is fast passing away."

Those last words, I am sure, will fill with unbounded joy the friends of Ireland and the friends of England as well. But with what terrible meaning are not these words prefaced? It is known that Mr. Dillon is a man of noble and unstained character. No harsh words would be expected to cross the lips of such a man, yet he tells us there was a time when the very name of England was hateful to him. How terrible these words are? They are the expression of the bitterness accumulated through centuries and centuries of persecutions in succeeding generations of Irishmen. But, Sir, mark the change. Less than five years of a generous attempt by a great party to do justice to Ireland, to give her the liberty and justice to which she is entitled, has worked wonders and changed the disposition of the Irish people. These five years of generous attempts to do justice to Ireland have erased the sentiment of bitterness and replaced it by sentiments of affection to the land whose very name was hateful to Ireland only a few years ago. What a triumph this is for the cause of Ireland? What a triumph this is for those who, in this House, told the English people that if they were to treat the Irish people generously, they would have the same result in Ireland as in this country? What an evidence also this is that the only manner, after all, in which you can attach a people to their allegiance is to treat them with fairness and generosity; and what a rebuke it is to all those (my hon. friend from North Simcoe included) who believe that the only manner in which to make a people loyal is to trample under foot everything which they hold dear and sacred. Sir, I have just pronounced the name of Home Rule. Home Rule with us is local autonomy, and I hope that this principle of local autonomy will some day afford us some solution of the difficulty we have now to deal with. What is objectionable in this Bill is not, as has been often stated, the object of the Bill itself, (which is, after all, with some exceptions, a local question), but the tendency of the Bill and the principles which underlie it, for we know that this is only a preliminary step that is to be followed by many others. We are, to-day, in the

Mr. LAURIER.

fourth day of this debate, and I have to make the reproach that the Government have not yet told us what their policy is on the question. The Government, of late, do not discharge the duty they owe to this House. They can advise us on matters of details and matters of procedure, but when it comes to a question of principle they refuse to discharge the duties for which they are responsible to the House. We had a speech the other day from the hon. the Minister of Public Works. He simply told us he was against the Bill, but he affirmed no principle which we might apply to the situation. We have three propositions before us: the Bill itself, the amendment of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and the amendment of my hon. friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil). I am free to speak of them, but in what I say I declare that I express my own personal opinion. I do not speak here as the leader of a party—I express my own opinion, and nothing more. As to the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I have to say that, in my opinion, it is premature. It is endeavoring to give to the people of the Territories upon one question, plenary power, while they are still in a form of tutelage. We are not prepared to give to the people of the North-West full local autonomy. We cannot expect that a population which in 1885 numbered only something like 30,000 souls—the population of a small town, scattered over immense territories, out of which several empires can be carved—can be entrusted with the full power of responsible government. The amendment of my hon. friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) is, perhaps, more consistent with our true position. The amendment affirms the proposition that the present state of things ought to be permanent. With this, however, I cannot agree, and although I am prepared to vote for the amendment of my hon. friend from Berthier, I cannot do so without taking exception to his statements. It is impossible to admit, for instance, that the institutions of the North-West are permanent. On the contrary, they are exceptionally temporary; they deal with a state of things which is exceptional in itself; they were devised at a time when there was no population, and they must be modified from time to time as the necessities of the case require. But at this moment to say they are permanent, is a thing in which I cannot agree, except so far as they must be permanent in every particular, so long as we are not ready to give these people a more extended form of local authority. My hon. friend also says in this amendment, that since we passed this law and gave this incipient constitution to the North-West Territories, nothing has occurred to change our views. I cannot agree with that. Everything has occurred since that time, not to change our views, but to set us thinking about what we should do at a future time, not very far off, in regard to those Territories. What has occurred is this: a population has gone into those Territories; they have been given a Legislature; and that Legislature has demanded certain measures—not only on the question of language, but on that of the schools, and on the system of Government. Bearing these facts in mind, it seems to me that the proper time to deal with this question will be when we are prepared to give the Territories, perhaps not absolute, but a more extended form of local self-government; and when that time comes, we must be prepared

to deal with this question upon the broad principle of this Constitution, which has been devised for the safety of the majority and the protection of the minority, and in the light of the condition of things which may exist at that time in the Territories. But till then I believe it is better to defer the consideration of this question. There is this remarkable feature in the Bill we have before us: it is not founded on an expression of the will of the people of the Territories; it is founded simply on alleged principles applicable to the whole Dominion. This is what I object to in this Bill, and—though it is my own individual opinion only—I submit to all parties in this House, French or English, Liberals or Conservatives, that the best thing for us to do is to defer the consideration of this question to a future time when we shall be prepared to deal with all the questions now affecting the North-West Territories. In the meantime, however, we ought to remember this—French, English, Liberals, Conservatives—that no race in this country has absolute rights, only the rights which do not invade the rights of any other race. We ought to remember that the expression of race feelings and race sentiments should be well restrained to a point, beyond which, if pressed, though still kept within legitimate limits, they might hurt the feelings and sentiments of other races. But when the time comes for dealing with this question, I hope we shall all be prepared, without party differences, to deal with it on the broad principles that apply to this Constitution; that we shall not, French or English, hesitate to apply true principles under the fear that evil consequences may flow from them, because we must remember that true principles are only an emanation of Divine truth, and that there is above us an eternal Providence whose infinite wisdom knows better than man what is best for man, and who, even when all seems lost, still guides everything for the greatest good.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I go a great way with my hon. friend in his remarks concerning the principle of this Bill. I sympathise with his very natural feelings of indignation at much of the language that has been used in support of this measure now before the House. I have no accord with the desire expressed in some quarters that by any mode whatever there should be an attempt made to oppress the one language or to render it inferior to the other; I believe that would be impossible if it were tried, and it would be foolish and wicked if it were possible. The statement that has been made so often that this is a conquered country is *à propos de rien*. Whether it was conquered or ceded, we have a constitution now under which all British subjects are in a position of absolute equality, having equal rights of every kind—of language, of religion, of property and of person. There is no paramount race in this country; there is no conquered race in this country; we are all British subjects, and those who are not English are none the less British subjects on that account. But while I say so much, Mr. Speaker, I must regret that my hon. friend, perhaps yielding to the necessity of his position as a party leader, should have commenced his speech with some party attacks against the Tories. My hon. friend felt constrained, I suppose, to make those allusions which, in the cir-

cumstances of the case, I think were not altogether generous or altogether politic. The hon. gentleman spoke of the spirit of this Bill being that of Toryism, utter Toryism, oppressive Toryism. Why, Sir, if he looks at the history of England in modern days, I think he will find that most of the liberal measures passed there have been passed, if not by Tories, by Conservatives. I think also, if he will look at the history of Canada, he will find at all events, that liberality towards the French Canadian race was pretty much confined to the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman had to admit that while this Bill was, as he affirmed, an evidence of utter Toryism, the exclusion of the French language, the injury done to the French people, the insult offered to them, came from a Radical, the Earl of Durham. To be sure, my hon. friend said that Lord Durham was a Radical who did not understand all about liberty. That is quite evident; and so great a Radical was he that in order to get rid of him the English Government sent him to this country to show us his liberalism by attempting to deprive half the people of their right to use their own language. Ay, Mr. Speaker, and he succeeded in carrying out that effort; he succeeded in excluding the French language, and the measure was carried by a Liberal Government in England. That was in 1840. The first Government formed in Canada under that measure in 1841 was a confused Government, where Liberals, and Tories, and officials were mixed up together. But, Sir, in 1844, when there was a stand-up fight between Conservatives and Liberals, when the Conservatives rallied around Lord Metcalfe, and carried a majority; when the Parliament met in Montreal in that year, with a Conservative majority, the whole of the French Canadian race, with the exception, I think, of four, were in opposition to the Government. I was then elected for the first time, and I sat in that Parliament as a Tory, a supporter of Lord Metcalfe. In that Parliament the French Canadians were powerless; and yet, Mr. Speaker, what did that House do? Let me read to you a resolution that was passed, not by a Liberal or Radical Government, not by a Parliament having sympathy with the French Canadians exactly, but by a Conservative Parliament elected, as was then alleged, in opposition to the interests of the Province of Lower Canada; and yet passed, from a mere sense of justice, and without one single dissenting voice. Yes, from a mere sense of justice, the resolution was passed and the address was passed without one dissenting voice. I, as a member of the young Tory party, was proud then to have the opportunity of pronouncing on that question. The yeas and nays were not taken because we were unanimous, but I was proud of having had a part, as a member of a great party, in the resolve to relieve our French Canadian friends from the oppressive action of the Liberal Government in England, at the instigation of the Radical Earl Durham. What said that address? I shall not read the whole address which went home to Her Majesty, and of which the chief clause was repealed, but it went on to say:

"We do not question that the best intentions and designs influenced the minds of those who enacted the provision which declared: That all writs, proclamations, instruments for summoning and calling together the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of the Pro-

vince of Canada, and for proroguing and dissolving the same, and all writs of summons and election, and all writs and public instruments whatever relating to the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly, or either of them, and all returns to such writs and instruments, and all journals and entries, and written or printed proceedings of what nature soever of the said Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly, and of each of them respectively, and all written or printed proceedings and reports of Committees of the said Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly, respectively, shall be in the English language only."

That was the measure of justice offered to the French Canadians by a Liberal Parliament in England and a Radical Governor General and High Commissioner sent out by a Liberal Government. And what did the Tory Legislative Assembly of Canada say?

"That in the very first session of the Legislature, under that Act, it was indispensable to translate into French every public record and document. That the debates were not and could not, unless a portion of the representatives of the people were silenced, be carried out without its use; that in the courts and judicial proceedings it was found equally necessary as before the Union, and for every other practical purpose, it is as much used as it ever has been. That the only distinction which exists, then, is, that the French is not permitted to be the legal language of Parliamentary record, a distinction of little value, perhaps, in itself—one which cannot produce any beneficial results on the feelings or the habits of the people using it, while it gives rise to a feeling among them injurious to the best peace and tranquility of the Province, namely, that this limited proscription of their language conveys, however designedly, an imputation of an unfavorable distinction towards themselves.

"That desirous that the hearts of all men in this Province may be joined in unity, in their attachment to and support of Your Majesty's person and Government, we humbly pray Your Majesty to endeavor to remove this cause of discontent, and to recommend to the Imperial Parliament the repeal of that portion of the law which has given rise to it; assuring Your Majesty that such a course will be hailed by Your Majesty's loyal Canadian people as an additional mark of Your Majesty's solicitude for their welfare."

There is an instance of the oppressive Toryism which my hon. friend lamented. But my hon. friend ought to have looked at the history of old Canada after that period. My hon. friend says truly that a Conservative Government was kept in for years by the support of the Conservatives of Lower Canada. And why was that so? Because from the Conservative party the Lower Canadians got full and ample justice. What party was it that relieved the *habitants* of Lower Canada, the *gens de couleur* of Lower Canada, from the oppression of the seigniorial tenure? What was it that made them free men instead of being victims of antiquated feudalism? The seigniorial tenure oppressed them, and the people rose against it; and it was a Conservative Government, of which I had the honor to be a member, that relieved them of that burden. You might remember, Sir, that when the Hon. George Brown brought his immense force and ability and unsurpassed energy to lead the Reform party of old Upper Canada, his whole aim was oppression to the French. Every speech he made, every article that he wrote in the *Globe*, every resolution almost which he moved, was a denunciation of the French law, the French language, and the Catholic religion; and because we, the Conservatives, opposed him with all our might and all our vigor, we were in a minority in our Province. Again and again have the best and the strongest of our Conservatives been defeated at the polls simply because we would not do injustice to our French follow-countrymen.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Again and again have we been put in a minority because we declined to join in that crusade against the French Canadians, against the Catholic religion, and against French institutions. Again and again have I been misrepresented and called the slave of popery, and told that I had sold myself to the French of Lower Canada and was sacrificing my own race, my own religion, and my own people because, without a moment of hesitation, without swerving for an instant, I and those who followed me—for even when I was not the nominal leader, I greatly directed the course of the Conservative party—declined, from no personal motive or desire of popularity, the popular cry was raised against the French Canadians in Upper Canada then as it is in Ontario, to-day—to do an injustice to our French Canadian fellow-citizens; and it was not a fair taunt of the hon. gentleman to tell us that we owed our position to the support of the Conservatives of Lower Canada. Does the hon. gentleman not remember when the agitation was raised in Upper Canada on a very specious cry—the question of representation by population—that the population being equal in Upper Canada should have as many members as Lower Canada, which it had not at the time of the Union, because at that time Lower Canada had a larger population than Upper Canada—does the hon. gentleman not remember that the Conservative party opposed that cry, specious and popular as it was? And why did we oppose it? Because the avowed object was to crush and oppress our French Canadian subjects. The reason why I oppose the Bill of my hon. friend to-day is the same—because that Bill, a small Bill; I might almost call it an insignificant Bill in its enacting clause—is based on the purpose of doing away with the French language, of discarding the French language, at all events, and depriving the French Canadian people of the solace of the language they learned at the feet of their mothers. Why, Mr. Speaker, if there is one act of oppression more than another which would come home to a man's breast, it is that he should be deprived of the consolation of hearing and speaking and reading the language that his mother taught him. It is cruel. It is seething the kid in its mother's milk. The greatest, perhaps, of all the objections to this measure, is that it is a futile measure. It will not succeed. It cannot succeed. As my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said the other day, and as the hon. member from the West Riding of Durham (Mr. Blake) repeated, in order to carry out an oppressive measure we must have a Russian Government or we must have a Strafford here; we must put down the language with a strong hand; we must exclude it from the schools; we must exclude it from official life; no man in Canada who spoke French must be allowed to take office; the Frenchman must be made a Pariah, and his language must be made a mark of scorn; that is the only way to carry out the principle or the object of my hon. friend the Minister for North Simcoe.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Did I call my hon. friend the Minister from North Simcoe? That is giving him more than equal rights. But my hon. friend has commenced at the wrong end. He should attack the language where it is; he should

not attack it where it is not. He should have gone down to the Province of Quebec, and, by peaceable means—he says by peaceable means, though I heard some remarks about bayonets from my hon. friend opposite—and, by his skill and his eloquence, and by other means which, no doubt, he has presented to his own mind and will give to us by-and-bye, he should have shown the people there that it is for their good, that it is for the good of the party, and for the unity and good of the country, and should have convinced them that it was necessary for them to give up their language. His present proposal is like the sting of a gnat—a sort of irritation which can be of no use, and could not carry out the avowed object of my hon. friend. There is scarcely any French spoken in the North-West. There are a few French Canadians there, and a scattered population of French half-breeds, and the whole effect of this Bill would be to deprive these poor people of reading or knowing the laws to which they are subject. I say the hon. gentleman commenced at the wrong end. If the butcher goes to kill an ox, he goes to strike him on the head, and does not cut a little piece off the tail, which, after all, is the only effect of the measure of my hon. friend. But he is such an able man that one wonders—I wonder, with my limited apprehension—what he would accomplish by this measure.

Mr. MITCHELL. He got loaded up the wrong way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It cannot be from any desire to save the \$400 which my hon. friend is ready to pay. It cannot be for the purpose of spreading the English language more than it is spread there. It cannot have the effect of inducing the half-breeds who are hunting over the plains to change their language from French to English. Unless it be that my hon. friend has a dislike to the language—and I am not aware that he knows much about it—or has a dislike to the people who use the language, I cannot understand why he has pressed this Bill. It is on record that an English sailor, returning from France, was asked what kind of people the French were. "Oh," said the sailor with an expletive, "they are a bad lot." "What is the matter with them?" "Oh," he said, "they call a hat a *chapeau*; why the deuce could they not call it a hat at once, and be hanged to them?" And that is very much the spirit of my hon. friend. I did not intend to speak on this matter at all after having heard the exhaustive speeches which have been made on the other side, and I must say, with the little exception of the slight touch of partisanship in the speech of my hon. friend who spoke last (Mr. Laurier), the speeches of the gentlemen who have honored the House have been of such a kind that I agree with almost everything they say.

Mr. MITCHELL. Except the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The member for North Norfolk is not on that side.

Mr. MITCHELL. He is here beside me.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is an Ishmaelite. He has placed himself under the wing of the hon. the leader of the Fourth party.

Mr. MITCHELL. Don't misrepresent me—it is the Third party.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, he sits in very suspicious juxtaposition to the leader of that party. The objections to be taken to the resolution now before the House, moved by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), have been already given by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). Without entering into the general discussion of the resolution, it is in my mind sufficiently condemnatory of it to call upon the House to reject it, that, if it means anything, it means the continuation of the present state of things must be perpetual. It says that any alteration will cause a distrust, a suspicion, a doubt of the stability of our laws. If that is any reason against giving to the Legislature in the North-West now the power to deal with this matter, the same reason will exist twenty years hence, and it would keep the question permanently a source of disquiet and agitation and discomfort, not only in the North-West, but in Ontario and other Provinces, amongst all those who take a warm interest in this matter. I think also the resolution of which we had some information from the hon. member from the West Riding (Mr. Blake) is liable to almost a similar objection. It leaves the case undecided, and while these two resolutions have that effect, we must remember that this is a subject of great agitation in different parts of the Dominion. Lower Canada is agitated on account of this attack on their language; the North-West will be agitated if it is supposed that they are deprived of the right of judging on this subject; and we must take great care, Mr. Speaker, that while we are calming the agitation and soothing the agitated feelings of the people of Quebec, we are not arousing the feelings of the freemen of the North-West by passing a resolution which postpones for an indefinite time, it may be for a long period, a question in which we can see, from the resolution they have adopted, that they are greatly interested. I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the true solution of this question, a solution that will quiet the feelings of the East and that will be satisfactory to the people who roam over the plains of the North-West, will be the resolution in principle of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), in which he says: Let the representatives of the people up there judge for themselves, after having had a commission from the people to deal with the subject. I think if that were adopted it would satisfy the North-West, and the *amende honorable* that was made in this House by that resolution would quiet the insulted feelings of the people of the Province of Quebec, and we would have peace, through the benign influence of this resolution of my hon. friend from Assiniboia. I would ask my hon. friend opposite, my hon. friend from the West Riding of Durham (Mr. Blake), to take this matter into his consideration, and see whether there cannot be adopted very much of his resolution, with which I am most heartily in accord, and, in addition, to enquire whether, after the people had an opportunity of considering the question, after the next general election, and after they have read the discussion in this House, and after they have seen the general opinion of Parliament the great inquest of the nation, it would not be right and fair to trust to the representatives of the people in our far west to choose for themselves? They will act for their own country, for their own section, and their action will be only

temporary. That country is infinitely too large to be one Province; it is too large, in my opinion, to be four Provinces, and this is a matter for the future, and, therefore, a resolution of this kind, giving them the power to deal with the subject, after being commissioned by the people, will be quite safe. After the population comes in there, if there is a large German population—and I should be very glad to see it—who shall take possession of a large section of that area, why not give them the right to use the German language? They would insist upon it whenever their numbers were sufficient. If the French Canadian settlement, which was commenced under rather unfavorable auspices at Edmonton, should increase and grow so that they would become a French Canadian Province, they would insist upon having their own language. This is a measure of peace and a measure for only a time. Under all the circumstances, the fact that they are not yet a Province, is of very little consequence. Whether they are called a Province or a Territory, they have rights as British subjects. Whether the people occupy a Territory or occupy a Province, if they want to use the French language, they should be allowed to use it; and if they want to use the English language, they should be allowed to use it, and it should be left to themselves. If there should be anything else attached to a measure of this kind when transmitted from the North-West, if there is anything further than a mere statement respecting the language, if any improper legislation attached to this, there is a remedy. All that this House and that this Government has to do is to check any improper legislation exceeding their powers, as, for instance, constituting themselves a constituent Assembly instead of a Legislative body, as they are now. These are my sentiments, very crudely expressed, and I must ask my hon. friends opposite to weigh this question carefully to see whether some joint measure of peace should not be adopted, and then the whole question, in my opinion, would be ended forever.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the privilege of the House for one moment with reference to the remarks of the First Minister which were addressed to me personally before the recess. I wish to say that I have given the consideration which was due to everything the hon. gentleman has said, and that while my own judgment remains that the proper solution of this question is embodied in the suggestion which I submitted for the consideration of the House, I believe that the best interests of Canada are to be served by, if possible, a harmonious settlement of the question. For my part, I should not desire to adhere to any individual opinion, or to the terms of my suggestion, if there could be devised any reasonable modification of those terms which might meet the assent of the leading men of both sides and of both races within this chamber, and I have some hope that such a result may be reached before this debate is ended. I think it my duty to have made that statement to the House, because the great disaster which has happened to the University of which I am Chancellor, obliges me to leave to-night in connection with its interests; therefore, my own proposition

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

I must leave in the hands of the House at large. I know not whether it may be adopted or whether some modification of it may be adopted, but I do hope that the debate will be conducted and closed in the spirit which characterised the right hon. gentleman's closing remarks.

THE FISHERIES QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before going on with the debate, I wish to remark that I have seen an important statement in an evening paper, to which, I think, the attention of the House should be called. It is headed: "It hovered over us. The close shave we had of a war with the United States." The item reads thus:

"CINCINNATI, Ohio, Feb. 17.—In a speech at the dedication of the First Regiment Armory, Saturday night, Governor Foraker said he was asked by telegraph by the War Department in 1887, when the Canadian fishery situation was strained, how many armed men he could rush to the Canadian border in case of a sudden emergency. He said similar messages were sent to Governors of other States."

It is a very important statement, and I would like to know whether the Government have received any information of the truth of the statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; the Government did not receive at that time, and have not received at any time since, any intimation of anything of the kind at all approaching or in any way connected with it. I believe it is altogether a canard.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure of it.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House resumed debate on proposed motion of Mr. McCarthy, &c. &c.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am sure that every hon. member has been delighted to hear from the lips of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), the declaration just made that he desires that the present difficulty should be amicably settled, and I feel confident that in this House there is enough patriotism, enough religious and political toleration, and enough statesmanship to enable us to arrive at a solution which will be acceptable to all. Indeed, Sir, it has been to me, I may say, a source of grief to witness the acrimonious spirit in which this debate has been conducted, and to see old feuds, old enmities and religious animosities excited, which I am sure every one in this House must have felt had better have lain forever dormant until they had died their natural death. At the same time I do not see why the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) should have excited so much alarm. I speak of the Bill itself, for when I look at the preamble I must confess I cannot fathom it. It is the preamble which in its nature may tend, and has tended, to excite the strongest animosity and the strongest distrust on the part of our French members, and many have seen in it an attempt on the part of my hon. friend to deprive them of their political and religious liberties throughout the Dominion. I am sure, from the intercourse I have enjoyed for some years with the hon. gentleman, that such purposes are not in his heart. It may be that this preamble is a kind of indication of what was lurking in his

mind, and of that condition he would desire to see established throughout the length and breadth of the land—one language; but, at the same time, it is not in his heart, nor is it his intention, to adopt any legislation, or other such means, to endeavor to bring about such a result, as he must be conscious that such a mode of action would be utterly futile. I must express my sympathy with those French members who have been alarmed on the present occasion. I have spent a good part of my life in France, and my boyhood and early manhood are associated with the pleasures of that country, and I have seized every opportunity I have had since manhood to renew my acquaintance with France; and, therefore, I enter on a discussion of such a subject as this with no sympathy for any fanatics, but with a desire to arrive at some result which may be satisfactory to all parties, and which may be for the ultimate benefit of our common country. I regret that religious animosities should have been excited, for I can never forget that over three hundred years ago, it was the Catholic Lord Howard of Effingham who led the fleet of England against the Spanish Armada, and that he did so after having kissed the hand of the English Queen, whom he knew had been declared by the Sovereign Pontiff to be illegitimate, to be a heretic, and to have been excommunicated. I cannot help thinking that during the whole of this debate we have been moving on too high a plane, and have been led away by the preamble of the Bill, to which most of the efforts of opponents of the Bill have been directed. I might take the ground, following the decision of last year arrived at by the authorities on constitutional law, on both sides of this House, that the preamble has nothing to do with the Bill, that we must consider the Bill itself; that was the doctrine proclaimed last year, and it is one which may be applied on the present occasion. But, apart from the preamble, when you look at the Bill, what is it? It is a Bill founded simply on the petition of a number of gentlemen in the North-West Territories, called the Legislative Council. Those gentlemen, rightly or wrongly, wisely or unwisely, have been entrusted with the management of the affairs of the North-West Territories. They have the confidence, so far as we know, of the electors of these Territories, they are as duly qualified to vote as are the electors of Ontario or of Quebec, and they are there on the spot, and in a full House almost unanimously they have asked to be relieved of a disability which was imposed upon them, and which they never requested or expected would have been laid upon them. They tell us that circumstances have so changed that the system which has been in operation in the Territories is no longer satisfactory and that it is unwise to continue such a disability, and they beg to be relieved of it. I have examined the returns of the last census in 1885, and I find in the North-West Territories the whole population by nationalities was 48,362 souls, of whom there were savage Indians 20,170, leaving a population of 28,192; and of that number the French population amounted to 1,520; or only 5½ per cent. of the population of 28,000, or 3⅛ per cent. of the whole population.

MR. LARIVIÈRE. It is true that the French Canadian population is 1,500, but there is a large French half-breed population which the hon. gentleman forgets.

MR. COCKBURN. I will take up that point immediately. I am kindly reminded by my hon. friend, that there is another population in the North-West Territories, a half-breed French population. I am aware of the fact that that population numbers 3,387, but I understand on reliable authority that this is not a French-speaking population, but a population which speaks the Cree language, and I do not think I am entitled to rank them with the 1,520 French in the Territories. At all events, I cannot put them on the same footing. I will go further, and say, that since that census was taken I have no doubt in my own mind, and my conviction is strengthened by authentic information, that the increase of the English-speaking population and the German-speaking population and other nationalities has been so great, that, instead of the French population being 5 per cent. it is now probably less. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) spoke to us the other day of this being an attempt on the part of 3,000,000 people to swallow 2,000,000. There is no such attempt. He said this reminded him of the fact that it was a whale and not a cod that swallowed Jonah. I beg to remind the hon. gentleman, that if he is going to reverse the decision of the majority for 5 per cent. of the population, he is asking Jonah to swallow the whale. With respect to the population in the Province of Quebec, with which a comparison has been made, I find that there is a total population of 1,350,000, the French population numbering upwards of 1,000,000, the English-speaking numbering 268,000, or 19 per cent. of the population. I do not think we have a right to institute such comparisons, and I only mention them as they have been already made, because those rights of the people of the Province of Quebec, the rights of the minority in Quebec and of the minority in Ontario, and in every other Province in the Dominion, will, I trust, for ever remain undisturbed; and I will be no party, directly or indirectly, to do anything which, in my humble judgment, would amount to an attempt to break up one of the most sacred contracts into which any two people have ever entered. I mention this matter fully in order that my position may be clearly understood. The position of the North-West Territories has been presented to us as resembling very much the position occupied by Switzerland. We have been pointed to Switzerland as a guiding star for us. Even the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was so careful as to give all the exports and imports of that country, and he showed us how it was purely an agricultural country, and how it was particularly blessed in having a treble language. The analogy was a forced one; in fact, I know of no two countries so utterly dissimilar in every respect as the North-West Territories and Switzerland.

MR. DAVIN. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman, because I know he does not wish to misinterpret my remarks in proceeding with his lucid argument. I did not compare Switzerland to the North-West Territories. I said there was an analogy between Canada and Switzerland, although Canada stretches across an entire continent and Switzerland is in the heart of Europe.

MR. COCKBURN. I thank the hon. gentleman for the information. The argument was, however, made, and made several times. I desire to draw

attention to the fact that each of those Territories is only slightly less than the area of the whole of the United Kingdom, 121,000 square miles, while the whole area of Switzerland is only some 15,964 square miles, of which 34 per cent. is over four thousand feet above the level of the sea. There are some 4,521 square miles unproductive, and six per cent. of the whole country is covered with snow fields and glaciers. I do not think you can compare a country like that with what I might call the immense ocean land territory we have in the North-West. I have trudged through the whole of Switzerland, again and again, with my knapsack on my back; and, speaking generally, you could take the whole of it and duck it in Lake Superior, sink it to the bottom there, and were it not for its high mountains like Mount Rosa and others you would never know that it was at the bottom of the lake. I consider Switzerland in almost every respect dissimilar to Canada. In its whole history Switzerland is entirely different from Canada. In Switzerland we are not dealing with a virgin country as we are in Canada with the North-West, which was until lately the habitat of the wild beast and the home of the buffalo. We are not dealing with a country without a history; a country spread out before us waiting for emigrants to possess it. In Switzerland we have a country which, in one form or another, has had some form of Government for six hundred years. Switzerland saw the beginning of its Confederation in the year 1291, when Uri, Schwyz and Unterwalden united to check the encroachments of the House of Hapsburg. In 1332, Luzern joined; in 1351, Zurich joined; in 1353, Glarus and Zug and Berne city joined; in 1481, Freiburg city and Solothurn joined; in 1501, Basle and Schaffhausen joined; in 1513, Appenzell joined: and these 13 cantons remained the Confederation of Switzerland. In 1798, two centuries and a-half or more after this, the Helvetic Republic, under the protection of the French Directory, was established. When you look at this country which has been held out as a model to ours, what do you find? You find that its growth was from prehistoric times, unaccompanied by serious disturbing influences. Our growth in the North-West, and throughout the whole of this country, is very different. It has been made up of individual elements brought from all countries, amalgamated together from their own desire to satisfy their economic wants, whereas in Switzerland they were brought together by the external hostile influences around them. There were Austria, Italy, France and Germany crowding them altogether; we find, as soon as they were freed from this external pressure upon them, there was internecine warfare. This country held up to our admiration is a country which had no settled form of government until 1848, when the new constitution as adopted by a majority of cantons, though material changes in the form of necessary extension of the constitutional law were made in 1865, and finally in 1874. In the year 1832, we find that seven of the twenty-two cantons formed themselves together in a Liberal Sonderbund. We find in 1846 the Catholic cantons united in a separate Diet, and a separate Legislature and Senate, so to speak, a revival of the league of Sarnen. So strong is the feeling of a want of union among them that you find in 1832 a civil and religious war; and in 1846 these Catholic cantons raised 50,000 men while the Federation on its side

Mr. COCKBURN.

raised some 100,000 men and overcame those opposed to it. We find that in the twenty-two cantons in Switzerland, the official language is that spoken by the majority. The rule they have laid down for themselves is that the majority should decide what the official language should be in each canton. It is not a question of whether five or ten per cent. of the population should speak one language, and be correspondingly represented, but in every case it is decided that the official language shall be the language of the majority in the cantons. Now, in considering those cantons, we must never confound them with our Provinces, although constitutionally they possess greater rights than the Provinces themselves. In fact, they accepted the doctrine of extreme state rights as it existed before the great civil war in the United States. I have pointed to Switzerland as adopting the official language of the majority, and I should like to see the same thing carried out in our North-West Territories. Louisiana has also been brought forward. I find an Act of Congress on the 20th February, 1811, with reference to the incorporation of Louisiana, to the effect that they shall be allowed to come into the Union on condition that all its laws, all its records, and all its legislative proceedings were to be preserved in the English language. Austria-Hungary has also been referred to. In that country we have a population of 41,000,000. Of this we have 8,000,000 Germans, 6,000,000 Magyar, 7,000,000 Czechs, 3,000,000 Roumanians, 3,000,000 Poles, 3,000,000 Serbs and Croatsians, and 1,500,000 Turks, and other peoples speaking various tongues. There are 21 legislative assemblies and executive councils, and all of these transact their affairs in the distinct languages of the majority. If we look to Switzerland or to Austria-Hungary we shall find that the ruling there is the rule of the majority. Such a rule I would like to see introduced into this Dominion without any reference to religion or to the status of the language, and I am sure there would, in such a case, be very few found in this House who would contest the accuracy of such a proposition. The debate has proceeded as if the proposal were made to obliterate altogether the French language. We have been told that we shall have all to learn English; that the French language will be unknown in our country; that we shall have all our papers printed in English, and all our proceedings and private business conducted in English. I consider such argument a travesty on the question now before us. The question before us is simply and in reality the petition of the North-West Assembly. This Assembly, in the words of their petition, say:

"That whereas, by section one hundred and ten of 'The North-West Territories Act,' it is enacted that either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Legislative Assembly of the Territories and in the proceedings before the courts; and both these languages shall be used in the records and journals of the Assembly, and all ordinances made under this Act shall be printed in both these languages.

"And whereas this Assembly is of the opinion that the sentiment of the people of the North-West Territories is against the continuance of the section recited, on the grounds that the needs of the Territories do not demand the official recognition of a dual language in the North-West or the expenditure necessitated by the same.

"And whereas this Assembly is also of the opinion that sound public policy demands the discontinuance of two official languages in the North-West:

"Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray."

We have here the declaration, calmly and deliber-

ately expressed, of those men who are entrusted with the management of the affairs of the North-West Territories, and they ask us simply to rescind the resolution or law passed by this House binding them to the use of two languages in their courts and in the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly. Why, Sir, I understand that in the whole North-West Council there is not a single member to be found who speaks the French language; and why, in the name of common sense, should we refuse to grant to these men a simple request of this kind? They are the directors and managers of those Territories; they are the men most conversant with all its wants; and they come and tell us that it is a trouble to them to be compelled to use that language, that they wish to be free from it, that it is not wanted, that it is against the sentiment of the people, and that no sound public policy demands its continuance. We have, unfortunately, in the preamble of this Bill, a totally different question raised; but I trust that the House will divest itself of the feeling that has been aroused by this preamble, and will consider solely and exclusively the request made by this board of gentlemen to this House and will grant it. We have had various countries pointed out to us, among them Schleswig-Holstein, in which the policy of Great Britain was to give to the various sections of the population the use of their languages—to the Danes, the Danish language, and to the Germans, theirs; and we were told that the Russians in 1862 were advised by England and other countries on the continent of Europe to grant to the Poles the right to speak their own language. I quite agree with these recommendations; but surely it is not contended that the Poles for whom this petition was made, consisted of only 5 or 10 per cent. of the population of Poland, or that the Danes and Germans for whom a similar request was made numbered only 10 per cent. of the total population? Why, the arguments brought forward in reference to other countries have only tended to confirm and strengthen, in my mind, the right of those people in the Legislative Assembly of the North-West to be granted what they ask. Before I take my seat, I should like to read, with reference to Switzerland, one or two paragraphs from the Federal Government of Switzerland by Mr. Moses, published last year, in which he says:

"The conglomerate character of the Swiss population, composed of representatives of the German, French and Italian peoples, has made it difficult to bring all parts to co-operate towards a common national end. The fact that these representatives of different peoples have continued in separate groups, each within its own territory, and speaking its own language, has made the growth of a national sentiment slower than it might have been had all been thrown together into a common society and compelled in the course of time to use a common language. At present German is spoken in fourteen cantons and parts of others; while Italian is confined to the canton of Ticino and a part of Graubunden. To state the relations between these groups in another way, there are 1,352 German communes, 945 French and 291 Italian. Besides these there are 118 communes in Graubunden where the Romansch language is used. Only German, French and Italian, however, are regarded as official languages, and in these three all the federal laws"—

Not the cantonal or provincial laws—

—"are published, and they may all be used in the transaction of federal business, whether in the assemblies, in the council, or in the courts; moreover, all must be represented in the Federal Council. The Romansch language, on the other hand, is not an official language, and is seldom employed in the affairs of the Federal Government. Not only as it regards their language, but in a general way, also as it regards their manners and customs, have the several cantons maintained their individuality.

"While in Switzerland the representatives of the German, French and Italian peoples have preserved their peculiar characteristics, to a certain extent, by remaining territorially separated, in the United States there has been a mingling of peoples on the same territory, and there is already manifest a tendency to mould those of English, Scotch, Irish, German and Scandinavian stock into a new national product."

Well, Sir, I entertain those views with reference to the request of the North-West Assembly; but while I recognise its wisdom, I am not blind to the objections raised in this House or to the susceptibilities of our French kindred. I am, therefore, prepared to accept the proposal which has been made with reference to finding some means of dealing with this question, after showing every desire to conciliate those susceptibilities, by leaving the whole question to be determined by the electors themselves in the North-West Territories, and I can only hope that the brief delay in its settlement will not give occasion for idle strifes. In view of the fact that we desire to give our French friends, and all the electors, an opportunity to be fully represented after the matter has been fully discussed, and in view of the fact that our friends in the North-West will have before them the debates which have taken place in this House on the question, I think the wisest policy is to accept the suggestion thrown out by the hon. gentleman, and to join all our hands together, and see if we cannot settle this difficulty, which I regret has ever arisen, but which, I hope, will soon be finally solved.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to make a few and only a few observations on this important question. I think the subject from almost every standpoint has been dealt with ably, logically, and generally reasonably; but I consider it to be the duty of every public man, in cases of national emergency, when the national life is at stake, to, as far as possible, use conciliatory language, to allay the suspicions of some, and the excitement of others, and to have regard to the feelings of those classes, those religions and those nationalities which are always in opposition to each other. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) made use of much more eloquent language in a similar line the other night, and I thought it was to be regretted that that hon. gentleman, with his great ability, had not successfully carried out the principles which he was then endeavoring to inculcate throughout his previous history. I can only say that from my first entrance into political life to the present time, I have at various times recognised that he has been one of the very important factors in creating a strong feeling in the Province of Ontario against our French fellow-subjects in the Province of Quebec. I know that it was the case in 1871 and 1872, and I thought, when the hon. gentleman was addressing us so elegantly the other night, it was a great pity he had not adopted the same moderation when speaking in our local Legislative Assembly in Toronto, and referring to the murder of "Brother Scott," and when among the English-speaking people the feeling was almost at fever height, and the excitement so great that men could scarcely restrain themselves, and there was a strong hostility engendered against our French fellow-citizens, so much so that reason did not always hold her sway, and that very often excitement of sentiment and national prejudice took the place of reason. I think that those gentleman who have dealt with this question

have dealt with it very ably. They brought into service many very important lessons of history, and if we wish to learn anything with reference to national life there is no source from which we can glean greater knowledge. From history we can learn the causes of the rise, the growth, the progress and the decay of nations; from it we can learn those principles which tend to make nations great, powerful, and long-lived; and if the lessons of history teach anything, they teach us one important truth, that community of language is not essential to national unity, because some of the greatest nations have been cited in which national unity, to all intents and purposes, either for political or social life, exists without community of language, which the hon. member for North Simcoe professes to say is necessary for the well-being of a nation. If Switzerland has now endured for over seven hundred years and stands as an emblem of greatness in national life, as a federation of states based upon somewhat the same principles as our Confederation, and yet has three different languages recognised as state languages, does she not teach us the very important lesson that it is not essential to have community of language in order to have a great state? The hon. member for Bothwell laid down some very important rules to guide us in our choice among the resolutions proposed or to be proposed for the solution of this question. He said that the rule upon which the English authorities followed, in reference to what language or languages should be the official language of any new state or country when it was organised, was the rule of convenience. Well, we should apply the rule of convenience to this case, and if the hon. gentleman's logic went to prove anything, it went to prove that the solution of the present difficulty is the one proposed by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), because it cannot be inconvenient to that country to have but one language, seeing that there is not one member in the North-West Council who speaks French. If the rule of convenience should be the rule to guide us, when we have the unanimous voice of the North-West Council asking that only one language be official, surely there can be no injustice in granting their petition; and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) ought to support the resolution of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) if he has the strength of his convictions. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) intimated to this House the nature of the resolution that he would have proposed had he the opportunity; but I do think that with all his great eloquence and ability, his proposition fell far short of meeting the requirements of the mass of the people. What was his proposition? It was this: We will postpone the day of settlement in that country until, if I may so term it, vested rights grow up in reference to the French language there; until the question may be much more difficult to settle than it is now. He proposes that we should shunt off the responsibility from our shoulders to-day and relegate it to the future, and in the meantime, allow to be kept up a very dangerous agitation, that may ultimately result in the destruction of the state. I do not think it was statesmanlike on the part of that hon. gentleman to make that proposition. It is much more practical to solve the difficulty by

Mr. SPROULE.

giving the power into the hands of the people themselves, and thus do no injustice to our French fellow-citizens. Moreover, the hon. gentleman and his supporters have invariably held that the duty of the Federal Parliament was, as far as possible, to give power into the hands of the people to settle these provincial or territorial questions themselves. In harmony with that theory, he has always argued, during the last ten or twelve years, in which I have had the honor of a seat in this House, that in matters affecting provincial rights, the Provinces should be left to deal with them alone. Why not put that theory into practice on this occasion? To do so would be a much better solution of the difficulty than the hon. gentleman proposes. I can see practically no difference between the motion of the hon. gentleman and that proposed by an hon. French member (Mr. Beausoleil) a few evenings before. They are both in the same direction, and are attended with the difficulty that they postpone the settlement of this vexed and difficult question to the future, and merely tide over the present. One hon. member said that the reason we ought not to touch this question at present, and allow the French language to be spoken in that country, was because the Act has been so long in existence. For thirteen years it has been on the Statute-book, and previous to that time he said the French language was also spoken there; and if for no other reason, the right of priority would compel us to decide that the French language should be the language spoken in that country. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) answered that argument ably, when he said if it was the right of priority which should determine the question, the Cree language ought to be made the official language instead of the French, because the Cree was spoken in those Territories by the aborigines long before there was any English spoken there. Another hon. gentleman said that a large number of the French who were there almost compelled us to do justice to them by retaining this clause in the Act; but in Ontario to-day we have ten times the number of French Canadians that there are in the North-West, and no one contends that in the Legislative Hall of Ontario it would be wise or needful in the interests of that Province that the two languages should be official. If the reasoning of the hon. member for Bothwell were correct, that because French Canadians were there, and the right to use the dual language was given them a few years ago, we should continue it to them now, with much greater force should the French Canadians of Ontario ask us to make the dual language official in that Province. A great many strictures have been passed upon the hon. member for North Simcoe for having brought this question before the House. Stripping the question of all its surroundings, I do not think that the motion he has proposed or the amendment to that clause of the law, is in itself very extraordinary; but, unfortunately, when we came to consider the proposition, we found that in the preamble to his Bill the hon. gentleman fell into the mistake of imitating the Bill passed by Mr. Mercier in Quebec, and mixed up in the other questions, with the one at issue, that are not relevant to it. But, if we strike out all that irrelevant matter, the preamble is not so objectionable, and I do not think we would be doing great injustice if

we accepted the Bill as so amended. It is most unfortunate, that at this time, when there is a disturbing element abroad in the land, men with perhaps more enthusiasm than judgment, are creating a great deal of excitement both in Quebec and Ontario, and in the North-West Territories; and in view of this fact we should deal with this question very carefully, and extend as generously as we can all the concessions we can reasonably extend to our French compatriots. But, while doing that, we would be doing an injustice to ourselves if we were to allow any encroachments that, in our honest convictions, we believed would be contrary to the interests of the state or of our national life. I believe there is a disposition on the part of eminent men on both sides of this chamber, to, as far as possible, come together in a great emergency, and support the state rather than support their national sentiment. I think it is wise and well that they should do so, and we would fall far short of our duty if we were unable to join with them, in this important crisis of our history, in trying to stamp out anything which partook rather of sentiment than of statesmanship, of race rather than of national rights. We should stand by one another, and endeavor to reconcile those conflicting elements we so often find in this country of ours. I am far from believing that we have not a bright future before us. I do not believe that, because we may speak the French or the German or the Gaelic language, that is anything against the glorious future in store for our state; but we must endeavor to reconcile those conflicting elements and to bring together the people who are in a manner under our charge, and who are looking to us for advice in important times like this. I think we would meet the duty which devolves upon us by accepting the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), because, in that way we would be doing no great injustice to anyone; we would be following the lines of provincial rights; we would be giving into the hands of the people the right of saying what they should have now and what they should have in the future. At the same time, we would do our duty to the state; we would ally for the time one of those exciting questions which are becoming more and more annoying every day, and we would be doing our duty as members of this great country, which must in time become one of the most important in the history of the world.

Mr. WRIGHT. As a member who, for twenty-five years, has represented in this House a county in the Province of Quebec, a county in which a large majority are French Canadians, and as a Quebec member, I cannot allow this debate to pass without saying a few words. Sir, I regret exceedingly that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) should have brought this matter under the notice of the House. It appears to me to be one of the most disturbing questions which could have been brought under our consideration. Providence has placed us here in this magnificent northern home land of ours, men of divers races and creeds and languages, but I think animated by a common patriotic purpose, to develop our resources to the utmost, to live in peace and harmony together in the enjoyment of equal rights and privileges. I think, take it for all in all, we have the best and freest country that ever the sun shone on.

I think we have every material element of wealth within our midst, that we have a hardy, a bold, an energetic and a kindly population, and that we have the best country that can be found in the world. We have a form of government which is free to the fullest extent, and every man has the absolute right of freedom of conscience and worship. All that is wanted to build up this national edifice is a little common sense—a little sense of justice, a little of that spirit of compromise, which is of the very essence of the British system, and then the work may be said to be accomplished. I must confess that I have been very much astonished at the course which has been taken by the hon. member who introduced this Bill, and his friends who advocate Imperial Federation. They profess to endeavor to bring about the union of the British Empire; they profess to unite instead of dividing us, but what does this course of action mean? Instead of peace and harmony, they bring us the faggot and the sword; instead of that spirit of compromise, which, as I said, is of the essence of the British system, and gives it its magnificent power throughout the world, they bring us dissension and disorder. To my mind, their course—I regret to say it, for personally I have the greatest respect for those hon. gentlemen—leads me, though I cannot believe that they are animated by treasonable purposes, to think that they are not animated by patriotic purposes, and I regret exceedingly that they have chosen to adopt this course, which cannot but be disastrous to the interests of our common country. But I believe in the common sense of the great body of the people, and while, if certain fanatics in the Province of Quebec, and certain fanatics in the Province of Ontario had their way, the result would be most disastrous, still I have faith in the patriotism of the great body of that people, and I believe that when this storm has swept over us, the result will be beneficial and not disastrous. To my mind, the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has received at the hands of the three gentlemen who attacked his position with such singular force and power a summary and condign punishment. It appeared to me that his punishment was almost too great for him to bear. He bore it, however, with a bravery and a stoicism which was worthy of every admiration. Not the Jesuit Brébeuf at the stake, tortured to death by savages, not Rowland Taylor in the fires of Smithfield, passed the ordeal more gallantly than did the hon. gentleman. Sir, in a great story told by a great master of French literature, he gives us a description of the torture. In the "Notre Dame" of Victor Hugo, he gives us a graphic account of the death of the Gitana Esmeralda who was executed by the cruel code of a barbarous age. He tells us how her limbs were dislocated, her arms and legs were broken, and how then she was pressed to death dying with the name of her lover and her Saviour on her lips. When the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who was the first executioner, proceeded to perform this dreadful task, when he proceeded to inflict that punishment, the result could not be doubtful. When Eos or the Dawn comes in contact with Chaos or the Dark, no one can doubt what the result will be. In the great book of Sir Walter Scott, when Wilfrid of Ivanhoe charges down upon the Templar, who can doubt the result? And so, when the eagle from the west swooped from his eyrie upon the serpent of Simcoe—I use the term only in

a parliamentary sense—who could doubt what the result must be? Sir, he destroyed him with dithyrambics. His punishment was something almost too dreadful for him to bear. Mr. Davin poured out upon him all the vials of wrath of the English language. He pointed out the extraordinary temerity of a lawyer, and a *nisi prius* lawyer at that, engaging in this attempt. Why, it was the very apotheosis of six-and-eight-pence. In the older civilisation, if the firm of Quirk, Gammon & Snap had attempted to work a revolution, they would have been driven out of every European country. This is the man who is attempting to destroy a magnificent language and literature and to divert the course of an empire. Sir, he pointed out too, indirectly, that all the great traitors were not lawyers. He detested every deserter from his party. Someone had said that a gentleman never changed either his religion or his politics. He could not go so far, but he could not forget that, at the famous “Siege of Corinth,” the “First to fire the shot and wield the blade, was Alp the Adrian renegade.” He was in religion a Low Church radical; but in almost all other matters he was inclined to be High. Some concessions must be made to the sentiments of a democratic country like this. A sot must be occasionally thrown to the Cerberus. It was difficult to maintain the distinctions of caste. In “Guy Livingston,” the old Irish Colonel was unwilling even to die with an attorney; in this country it is still more difficult to live with them. They had an unpleasant fashion of interfering with the private affairs of a gentleman—which, to say the least, was inconvenient. Lucifer, Catiline, Iscariot, the Constable of Bourbon, Benedict Arnold and their congeners might have been indiscreet; but, however, they had never been indentured. In the older civilisations, in order to float a company, you must have the name of a lord in the prospectus. It was one of the prerogatives of those who charged with the conqueror at Senlac. There was a great English statesman, who in his career had not been cut short, by circumstances over which he had no control, would have solved this difficult problem. He understood the peculiar genius of the Anglo-Saxon race; he combined the practical with the poetical; the sensualistic with the idealistic philosophy. When John Locke will have been forgotten, when “Paradise Lost” will have paled before the lustre of Eos, or the Dawn, when Shakespeare will have been relegated to obscurity then the name of the lamented John Cade will be held in veneration and honor, as one who loved his fellowmen and understood the genius of his people; the object of his life was to increase the pleasures of his people, by adding to the size of the drinking pots, by increasing their number of hoops thereon, and to complete their happiness by hanging all the lawyers. If that system had been carried out, if that project had been realised, what a start would have been made in the direction of the millennial period! Then, Sir, the Vice-Chancellor took up the parable. It was said of Lord Bacon that he wrote of exhaustive science, like a Lord Chancellor; it may be said of the Vice-Chancellor that he attacked the hon. member for Simcoe, with singular force and power. He went back to past ages; he made an exhaustive review of the Egyptian, Assyrian and ancient civilisations. Then the hon. member for Bothwell deluged him

Mr. WRIGHT.

with authorities, the result was the complete discomfiture of the unhappy gentleman. The hon. member for West Assiniboia destroyed him as the Parthian horse destroyed the legions of Crassus. The member for York charged him as the Greek phalanx did the Persians at Arbela. While, like the Roman legion, the hon. member for Bothwell, destroyed his opponent. And so the doom was accomplished and *peni forte et dure* was inflicted upon the unhappy member for Simcoe. I regret, for one, and I am sure this House will regret, that such a course has been taken by an hon. gentleman for whom we all have so high an esteem. For my part I have been twenty-five years in this House, and, in my capacity as a soldier in the ranks, have done my best to build up this nation, and to keep together the various elements of our system of Confederation. Our difficulties have been very great, but now, after the edifice has been completed, after this splendid structure has been erected, I, for one, do not wish to live to see it destroyed, and if this motion of the hon. gentleman had carried, I state my honest conviction to this House when I say that I believe it would be followed by disastrous results. If we were, by this insidious attempt, to succeed in destroying the French language in the North-West, and then carry the policy still farther, as is the evident intention, to the Province of which I have the honor to be an inhabitant, I believe that the system of Confederation would be destroyed. Sir, contact has brought us into sympathy. We have constructed a magnificent system of railways, we have become acquainted with the Maritime Provinces and the North-West, and we have spanned this land from ocean to ocean, and from sea to sea. The people of this Dominion like each other. For my part, I have always had a profound and supreme admiration for the toilers of the sea in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I have always liked the people of British Columbia. I have even admired the splendid people of Ontario. We have always held them in our heart of hearts. And so with the men that come from that grand prairie Province, the wheat-field of the world, we hold them in special regard on account of their ability, their energy, their enterprise, and I do not wish to see the separation of those Provinces which send us such men. But, Sir, with all that, there is one place which I hold still dearer, it is my native Province, the Province of Quebec. Sir, that Province contains divers races. We have there the Englishman, the Irishman, the Scotchman, coming from bold and hardy races, who are able to hold their own against all comers. We have also the French Canadian people, and I who know them well, who was born in their midst, who have lived among them have learned to respect their zeal for their ancient faith, their kindly courtesy, and the chivalrous gallantry which they inherit from their Norman and Breton ancestors. I, for one, would be the first to protest against any interference with, or any outrage upon, the rights and privileges of my native Province. Sir, I do not believe that this House or this country would tolerate any such a thing. If we could eliminate the French language, would we do so? I ask every member of this House to answer this question honestly in his own mind. If we could eliminate the French Canadians, whom we know so well for their kindly

courtesy, for their generous hearts, for their marked ability, as we have seen those qualities exemplified in this House, would we do so? Would we strike out such an element as this from our population? I do not believe that there is a man throughout the Dominion who would say so. Sir, there can be no doubt that the hon. member for Simcoe has, with strange power, aroused a singular fanaticism in this land. Last summer I visited one of the greatest counties in the Province of Ontario, one of the greatest in the Dominion, a county of which any Province might well be proud. Sir, it was a land of which it might almost be said that it was literally flowing with milk and honey, with creameries and with cheese factories. It was a land of extraordinary fertility, a land of which any man might well boast. The pastures were covered with herds of the choicest cattle; forests alternated with cultivated fields; the sluggish rivers flowed with smooth serenity through rich meadows and fields of waving corn. Its people were bold and brave and manly, whose ancestors had held their country against the invaders; and the sons looked as though they would hold that land as bravely as their fathers had won it. A little graveyard was pointed out to me where the victors and vanquished slept quietly together awaiting the judgment day:

"These in the robings of glory;
Those in the gloom of defeat,
Both with the battle blood gory,
In the dusk of eternity meet;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day,
Under the laurel—the blue,
Under the willow—the grey."

It was literally an agricultural paradise, but the trail of the hon. member for Simcoe was over it all. A great anti-Jesuit meeting had been held. There the 188 were denounced in the fiercest terms. I remember reading in the local newspapers that one reverend gentleman had called us, I think, a "complicated comminuted community of cowardly cannibals." That was the term applied to the 188. On the other hand, the noble 13, gentlemen of whom we have always been very proud, were held up in the highest honor and esteem. When I went there the storm had passed over, and I only remained to receive its ground swell. As I have said, the county was a most magnificent one, and the people were a generous and brave people. But there was a gloom upon their countenances which struck me with surprise, considering that they had such a beautiful country, that their crops were splendid, that they had every element of material prosperity. They said to me: "What do you think of these Jesuits who have taken possession of the land? You come from the land of Loyola, you come from the land of these Jesuits, you come from this priest-ridden Province of Quebec." I said: "Yes; but it does appear to me that there are other Provinces which are priest-ridden as well as Quebec." "Well," they said, "what is going to become of those poor, miserable, oppressed Protestants of that Province?" I said: "Yes; we may be oppressed, but as you can see, they do not starve me, at any rate." "With regard to the English inhabitants of that Province, those poor slaves who are hunted by Mercier and his congeners, what about them?" I said: "I think they bear their punishment very patiently, at any rate they

get on very well with all their neighbors." Then they said: "What of the priesthood?" I said: "So far as the priests of the Province of Quebec are concerned, not alone the Catholic priests, but the Presbyterian clergy, the Methodist clergy, and the clergymen of all the denominations, they live in peace and harmony together, they like each other." I said: Father Brown of Chelsea told me the men who first came to assist him when his church was burning were the Orangemen of the district. I saw myself at the funeral of an excellent lady, the wife of the Presbyterian clergyman, the Catholic priest among the friends in the sad procession. Everywhere the same kindly feeling prevailed, and I said that among the priests of my district, some six or seven, there are not finer gentlemen, not better servants of Christ, or better servants of the Man who in the olden times gave us His laws under the palm trees of Judea, than the very Catholic priests of whom I have spoken. I said that if some of these men were animated by the feelings which appeared to animate a few of the clergymen of Ontario, we would have had a very sad time indeed; but they preached the gospel of peace, love, law and order. Under these circumstances, I said, we got on exceedingly well. But, they said: You have a lot of nuns. Yes, I said, we have, and most excellent and worthy ladies they are, ladies who by their truly Christian charity are calculated to convince one of the reality of the Christian religion. The Rev. Mr. Carson said that when some of his family were dying from diphtheria, that those who first came to his assistance were Catholic nuns, and I said in my own region they attend Protestant and Catholic alike. I said I felt it to be my duty to state this to you, because great misapprehension has arisen with respect to the feelings which prevail among those who reside in the Province of Quebec. When I was seated by the bedside of the dying Father Delliages, he said to me: Every night my dreams carry me back to dear old France, but my heart is with the people of the Gatineau region. So it is with most of the clergy in our midst. They get on admirably with the Protestant clergy there. The Methodist goes about most energetically to promote the interests of the Master; so does the Presbyterian clergyman; and so does the English clergyman, unless, unhappily, he is too poor to have a horse, and he then walks as did the Apostles of old. Then they proceeded to put me through a course of cross-questioning. They said: Tell us of the night; tell us of the future; what party will it be which will sweep away those rotten old parties, as the leaves are swept away by the autumn blast? I ventured to say a word on behalf of my friend of the Left Centre. I said: Here was an opportunity for the Left Centre, who is a chief of singular energy and intelligence, but without a party; and here is a splendid party, but without a head: still should the two join together, great results may be anticipated. I told them of his heroic struggles in favor of the Widow Murphy and her cow. I told them that in Sir Peter they had one who was always foremost in works of goodwill; I told them of his marvellous energy, ability and perseverance; I told them of his heroic struggles in favor of the helpless and the poor; I told them that when the widow's wail and the cry of orphan children came from the woods of New Brunswick, that he performed one of the most generous and gallant acts on record; I told them that he was

always foremost in works of good-will; I told them that to be poor and helpless and miserable was to commend them to his generous nature, and that if he were not ennobled by Downing Street, he was ennobled by right of an earlier creation and the imposition of a mightier Hand. What then they said of the superb old sorcerer who sits securely throned on a thousand wiles in his city of Ottawa? I told them that the "old sorcerer," as they called him, had apparently taken a new lease of life. He was sorcerer, magician and necromancer all in one—like Aaron's rod, his wand had swallowed up those of all the other magicians;—like Prospero, he had waved his wand, and a nation had sprung into existence;—by his magic power he had bound our Dominion together with a network of iron, and strewed it with cities, "like shells along the seashore";—he had clothed the dry bones with flesh, and breathed life into the northern part of this continent. Will the magician's wand be broken, his spells reversed, and this gorgeous edifice of Confederation disappear? Will the sorcerer say:

"Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits, and
Are melted into air, into thin air;
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit shall dissolve,
And like this unsubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a wreck behind?"

But that magician has laid the stones faithfully and well, and the edifice will not fade away. But they said, he was gone over to the scarlet woman who sits on the seven hills. I ventured to say that I was not aware of the state of the hon. gentleman's spiritual harem at the present time,

"Not age could change, nor custom stale,
His infinite variety."

I thought I knew that at an early period he was captured by Madame Calvin; then that he had certain coqueries with Madame Wesley; then he had a liaison with a certain beautiful Baptist lady; but I said, perhaps, inasmuch as he had an infinite versatility, the Italian beauty, the scarlet lady, had at last won his heart. But, I said, it is well known that he has had the best of everything in this world, and, if I am not mistaken, he will get the best in the next. They said, what about the members of the Cabinet? I said they were most admirable gentlemen, who were selected, as I have often said, not only on account of their singular ability and merits, but also because they represented certain historical events. I ventured to say that the Minister of Customs represents, or did represent, the battle of the Boyne; the Minister of Inland Revenue was supposed to represent the broken treaty of Limerick; the Minister of Finance represented the crystal globules of cold water; while the Minister of Agriculture represented that amber beverage which was dear to our Scandinavian forefathers. And, as regards the old Chieftain himself, we who deal so much in futures, who hold him in our heart of hearts, do not take for him the opprobrious term conferred by the savages, of "Old To-morrow," but, looking to the future, we call him the "Sweet By-and-Bye." Those people were very much agitated by the course adopted by my hon. friend for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy).

Mr. WRIGHT.

Then they said: "Is there any chance of the Left Centre joining the present administration?" I replied: "I notice certain little passage of sweetness and light confitures and compliments, and one can never tell what the result might be. We, who are lookers-on in Venice, sometimes thought that it was quite possible that the Third Party might take his place in the ranks of the present government, and we remember that passage in "Marmion":

"Let the wild falcon take her fling,
She'll stoop when she has tired her wing,"

And, perhaps, when the hour comes, when the cry goes forth, "the Philistines are upon thee Samson," when the morning breaks, he will be found fighting in the ranks of the Chieftain, as of yore. At all events, I know that so far as the leader of the Government is concerned his feeling is always in favor of one who is given to a little judicious bolting. My hon. friend to my left will bear testimony to that, and the horse which bolts, as the House will recollect, is always treated with a little more attention than the steady old hack that never kicks over the traces; and I am aware of the kindly feelings which always animate the right hon. Premier towards the leader of the Left Centre. Not to parody, but to speak with certain reverence I may, refer to a hymn which appears to be singularly appropriate, and which always impresses me with its strange power and pathos:

"There were ninety and nine that safely lay, in the
shelter of the fold,
But one was out on the hills away, far off from
the gates of gold.
Away on the mountain bleak and bare,
Away from the tender chieftain's care."

I left that pleasant country with a feeling that, take it for all in all, the difficulty was not insurmountable. They said to me: If the old parties are swept away, what of the new party which will be formed? I replied: I do not see what they can do unless the anti-Jesuits muster their battalions and move down on Quebec. Before they had reached Montreal they would be met by you, Mr. Speaker, and the gallant 65th. I can fancy what the feelings of the old guard would be when they met on the plains before the great commercial city of the Dominion. I can fancy the scene which was enacted on the plain. Colonel O'Brien—I beg pardon for using his name—would bow pleasantly to Mr. Speaker, and would say: "Gentlemen of the French guard, fire first," and the Speaker would say: "Gentlemen of the English guard, you fire first;" and then the soldiers would look upon each other, and realising they were brothers, march together to the city of Montreal, universally rejoicing and feeling they might have other enemies at some future time to fight against rather than amongst themselves. I beg pardon of the House, Sir, for treating a serious subject with such apparent irreverence. I sit opposite my hon. friend from Simcoe and I notice the equanimity with which he bears his punishment, and I have no doubt that when the time comes he will hit back with all that strength and power of which we all know he is capable. I would, however, ask that hon. gentleman and those who are with him on this question—some of whom I have ranked as my dearest friends in this House and in the country—to consider their course. We cannot afford to have our Confederation destroyed,

and the people of Canada will not permit a few fanatical men in Quebec or Ontario to bring about so undesirable a result. Somebody has stated that the French and the English dislike each other. I deny it. The two races on the contrary like each other, and I know that in my part of the country, we would not part with our French compatriots, even if we could. We all recollect what happened a few years ago, when a great rebellion took place in the North-West. We remember when feeling ran high throughout the whole length and breadth of the land. Was there any division between the French, English and Irish then? No; not one soldier faltered. Every Canadian, whether English, Irish or French, was ready to go forward to put down the rebellion and to protect the laws. Some histories tell us that at the battle of Marathon a light ran along the Grecian spears when the Greeks saw the enemy, and that at the battle of Salamis a light shone on the masts of the Grecian ships. So it was with the patriotic sentiments which animated our people then. A friend of mine, Major Joshua Wright, who travelled with the 65th Battalion, told me that braver soldiers and more patriotic men could not be found in the world. They vindicated the honor and glory of their country, and so it was with the people of every race throughout that awful time. And is there no word to be said for these few unhappy men, these hunters of the plains, who animated by their native gallantry and believing they were injured, deceived as they were by an ignorant man who preyed upon their feelings, went down into these rifle pits and faced death as calmly and as bravely as ever men did? Is there not one word for these hunters who were swept away by the bullet and the resistless charge of the Canadian volunteers? Sir, we have the elements of a great country. We have noble, generous and patriotic feelings animating the great body of our people, and there is no need for discontent. At any rate one can see by the votes which have been given in this House what the consensus of opinion of the great majority of the people of Canada is. They are determined that our Confederation shall be built up and shall not be destroyed. Sir, we have one thing on which we must rely. We must hold our faith towards each other. For one, I cannot consent, under any circumstances, to any step towards the destruction of that magnificent French language and literature. I believe that with me the great body of the people of Canada share that sentiment. We have one way of building up that country and one only way; it is the grand old English system of justice, fair play and equal rights; and, Sir, the angels of light which will build up our country and make us a great nation will be "justice, fair play, love, truth and faith in each other."

Mr. LANDRY. I join with a great deal of pleasure in the general expression which has been given this evening to the sentiment that there is great satisfaction in finding that the leaders on both sides of the House believe they can arrive at a settlement of this vexed and difficult question. In the meantime I desire the indulgence of the House for a short time to express what I, as an humble member of this House, believe to be the true position on this question. Before proceeding to do so I will call the attention of hon. members of

this House to an assertion made the other afternoon by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), when he was urging to this House how well it would be for this Dominion to follow the example of the United States and their mode of dealing with the languages of the people in the different territories they acquire. He told us that in the colonisation of Louisiana the United States of America had simply held out to that country to come with them and partake of the institutions of the United States as they existed, and that they would make no concessions to them as to their language. He told us the same applied to Florida, Texas, and I believe Mexico. I have looked at the constitution of Louisiana and what do I find? If the hon. gentleman is as incorrect in all his other assertions as he is in reference to Louisiana then I say that no credence can be attached to his statements, for I think that he did not take the trouble of looking up the facts before he made the statement to this House. I find that in the Revised Statutes of Louisiana down to 1856 a constitutional provision of the General Assembly, section 101, says:

"The Secretary of the Senate and House of Representatives shall be conversant with the French and English tongues, and members may address either House in the French or English language."

Now, if I read aright the constitution of our Dominion, they went farther in Louisiana, in relation to the French language, than we do in the Dominion; for not only do they give the privilege of using the two languages in Parliament, but they require that the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives should be conversant with both languages. Article 129 of the same constitution says:

"The constitution and the laws of the State shall be promulgated in the English and French languages."

And that continues down to 1856. I repeat that if the hon. gentleman is as incorrect in the other statements he made as he is with reference to Louisiana, he did not take the trouble to inform himself. We were told to-day, Sir, by some gentleman who addressed this House, that the true principle is to leave this question to the North-West Territories or to the Council. As an humble member of this House I am willing to make some sacrifice of my opinion in order to join the majority of this House for the purpose of securing peace and prosperity and establishing our unity on a solid basis, but I cannot conceal the fact that my opinion is in an entirely different direction from theirs. I believe we ought, in this Parliament, to retain the power invested in us and deal with this difficult question of education and languages. We have done so in regard to the other Provinces, and why should we not do so in the North-West Territories? The principles laid down by the constitution and laws of this Dominion since 1867 all point in the direction in which I speak, namely, that these difficult, delicate, disquieting questions the Parliament of Canada has retained the power to deal with. I do not believe it would be right to leave the Council of the North-West Territories a question so difficult of solution. If a majority of this Parliament believe that it is not in the interests of the North-West Territories to have the use of both languages, then I say that this Parliament ought to take the responsibility of saying so, and giving those Territories such laws as they think are favorable to the development and welfare of that

country. The legislation of this Parliament has not left that question to be dealt with by the other Provinces when there has been any legislation on it at all. We find that section 133 of the British North America Act of 1867 reads thus :

“ Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec, and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec.”

Now, Sir, if it was important to establish by this Act that the two languages should be used in the Province of Quebec, as well as in the courts of Canada, in the interest of the people of those Provinces, it is just as important that the Parliament of Canada to-day should decide the question for the North-West Territories. If it were left to the people of the North-West Territories to decide whether it would be in their interest or not to use both languages, what would be the result? The result would be that all the excitement consequent on the decision of a question of this kind would be transferred to the people of those Territories.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDRY. And a gentlemen with the ability of my hon. friend might go into the country there and make the speeches he is capable of making on one side, and a gentleman with the ability perhaps of the leader of the Government of the Province of Quebec might go and make speeches on the other side, and we should have in all probability a war of races among the people themselves in their attempts to settle this very disquieting question. The spirit of our laws has not been to leave such question to the settlement of the people either in the Province of Ontario or in the Province of Quebec. It has been to settle them in this Parliament. Then, why leave this question to the people of the North-West Territories? Let us suppose that their decision would be that they do not want the dual languages; then we should be bound to enact laws here in pursuance of that decision, and to carry out the will of the people as expressed by them at the polls, and if the time came, as it must come, when the North-West Territories will be divided into Provinces, should we not be bound by that decision, in framing the constitution of those Provinces, whether there were three or four or ten—because the territory is very large—to give to each one of those Provinces a constitution such as decided upon by the present population of the North-West? My impression is that we should be bound to act by the decision the people of the North-West should give on this question to-day, in framing the constitutions of all those future Provinces. If it were then thought in the interest of one Province that it should have the use of the dual languages, and in the interest of another Province that it should not, depending entirely on the number of French people who might be there, I do not think that is the proper course to follow now to leave that decision to the people of the North-West Territories. I say that the right policy is to retain in the hands of this Parliament the power of dealing with this question. When the Provinces come to be formed, we should look to the conditions then existing, to the number of people there, and give them

Mr. LANDRY.

a constitution in accordance with those conditions and the desire and best interests of the people. The British North America Act not only takes the subject of legislation with regard to languages out of the hands of this Parliament, but also a subject which is of perhaps as much, if not greater importance, namely, the subject of education. We find that section 93 provides :

“ In and for each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions :—

“ Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the Province at the Union :

“ All the powers, privileges and duties at the Union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the Separate Schools and school trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects, shall be and the same are hereby extended to the Dissident Schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic subjects in Quebec.”

Now, Sir, there was another question considered by the Fathers of Confederation as one of great difficulty, on which the people might divide with a great deal of animosity and feeling, and they took it entirely out of the power of the Provinces and placed it, not even in the hands of this Parliament—because this Act cannot be disturbed by a vote of this House. If it was considered so important with regard to these Provinces, why is it not of equal importance with regard to the North-West Territories? So jealous were the Fathers of Confederation of the rights of the minorities in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec that they went even a great deal further than I have yet pointed out. We find in section 80 of the same Act, this provision :

“ The Legislative Assembly of Quebec shall be composed of 65 members, to be elected to represent the 65 electoral divisions or districts of Lower Canada in this Act referred to, subject to alteration thereof by the Legislature of Quebec: Provided, that it shall not be lawful to present to the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec, for assent any Bill for altering the limits of any of the electoral divisions or districts mentioned in the second schedule to this Act, unless the second and third readings of such Bill have been passed in the Legislative Assembly with the concurrence of the majority of the members representing all those electoral divisions or districts, and the assent shall not be given to such Bill, unless an address has been presented by the Legislative Assembly to the Lieutenant Governor stating that it has been so passed.”

So jealous were the framers of this Act of the rights of the minority, that in the case of some twelve counties in the Province of Quebec which were considered Protestant counties, it was not left even in the hands of the Legislature of that Province to alter the limits of these counties at any time thereafter. And yet to-day it is said that we must relegate to the people of the North-West Territories the authority to legislate upon this question which is similar in fact to the question dealt with so judiciously in the British North America Act. At that time and previous to Confederation there were in what were then called Upper and Lower Canada questions similar to the one now being discussed, and these questions were debated with, perhaps, even greater animosity than is the present one, and the differences of opinion they excited had a great deal to do with bringing about Confederation; and I will take this opportunity of referring to the questions then at issue, not so much for the purpose of recalling the discussions thereon, as for the purpose of illustrating the position I take, that the questions which are raised to-day are similar to those which created excitement then, and

should be dealt with in the same manner. In 1851, and while the two Canadas were united, I find in the *Toronto Globe* of the 17th July of that year, the following language:—

“The Reform party are in power now—they have been so for four years. * * * These four years have been palmy days of priestcraft.”

The sectarian grants which should have been swept away, have been increased. * * * When the present party came into power, the common school system was free from sectarian elements—but they introduced the wedge which threatens to destroy the whole fabric.”

In 1853, two years afterwards, the same agitation was going on, and we find this language used in that same newspapers which was then one of the most, if not the most, influential newspaper then published in Ontario. The article is dated 6th September, 1853, and contains the following language:—

“When we have freed our schools from Popish control, when Protestants are eligible to office, and when the people are no longer taxed for the support of the Roman Catholic Church * * * it will then be time to cry out, should we go further and touch upon the just rights of Romanists, but not till then.”

In the same year we find in the *Globe*, the following remarks:—

“The *Quebec Journal* says ‘that Mr. Brown gave notice on the last day of the session, that he would on the first day of the next session introduce a Bill to abolish tithes and compulsory taxes for ecclesiastical purposes in this Province. It is a bold step, but it is made necessary by the circumstances of the time. It is desirable that as soon as possible, an issue may be raised upon which to try the great question of Catholic and Protestant, and we could not have a better test than this of Lower Canadian tithes.’”

I call attention to this state of things to show that the arguments then used were on a par and almost the same as those now used by the promoter of this Bill and by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). One could almost imagine, in listening to the speeches of these hon. gentlemen, that time had retraced its course, and we were back again in the old days when the Hon. George Brown led the Liberal party and the *Toronto Globe* trotted out the Protestant horse. To remedy the state of affairs which then existed and the intensity of which is shown by the *Globe*, Confederation was brought about, and these vexed questions were settled by the British North America Act, in the way I have pointed out. As I again repeat it, it was necessary then to put those vexed questions out of the arena of both local and Dominion politics, and it was considered that by the British North America Act they were laid at rest forever. To-day, however, a revival of the same discussions will bring about the same results that were brought about then. I would ask who received credit at the hands of the people of this country? Was it those who were engaged in the discussion of this question on the lines laid down by the *Toronto Globe*, or those who resisted the prejudices that were sought to be excited by the party whose views that organ represented? Those who received credit at the hands of the people were not those who raised the issues such as are being raised to-day by the hon. member for North Simcoe and the hon. member for North Norfolk, but they were those who resisted the prejudices and the appeals to passion which were then being exploited. Among those who were thus rewarded was the right hon. gentleman who leads this House. We find him in those times of great disquiet and most violent and bitter

discussions always resisting the party of prejudice; we find him, from 1851 down to Confederation, in the councils of his country, a member of the executive council when not a leader of his Government. We have found since Confederation down to the present time that he has been at the head of affairs for seventeen or eighteen years out of the twenty-three which have elapsed since then. This shows that the sound common sense of the people gave credit to him and the others who resisted these appeals to public passion and these appeals of the majority to crush the minority—appeals made on grounds similar to those taken to-day by the promoter of this Bill; and I venture to predict that, perhaps not for six months or a year—because these strong and loud appeals which are being made by gentlemen of the ability of those who are promoting the measure, to the prejudices of the people, must run a certain course—but I say in the long run those who will resist that wave of fanaticism and the appeals made to prejudice, are the ones who will represent the great body of the electorate just as those who resisted similar appeals in the past have represented them from 1851 down to the present time. I was sorry to hear the leader of the Opposition, in the beginning of his beautiful address this afternoon, try to make political capital out of this question, but history shows that the party who resisted these prejudices in the past and the party which resists them now is after all the Conservative party. To-day, however, different from the past, we must give credit to some members of the Liberal party who have joined with us in opposing this fanatical crusade; but the fact remains unchanged, that, in the past, it was the Conservatives who resisted these influences to a much larger extent than did the Liberal party. From Confederation down to the present, there has been relative peace in this country. And why? Because these disquieting questions were set at rest by the British North America Act, but unfortunately they were not settled, in so far as the North-West Territories are concerned, and, therefore, it is that they are being brought to the front again, and the attack is made on the only vulnerable and assailable part which is left. But I will call the attention of the House to this fact, that the British North America Act of 1871 provides that while we are at liberty to make laws and constitution for the North-West Territories, yet when once those laws are made by this Parliament, those laws have the same force as the British North America Act itself. I will read the section. Section 6 of the British North America Act, chapter 28, reads as follows:—

“Except as provided by the third section of this Act, it shall not be competent for the Parliament of Canada to alter the provisions of the last mentioned Act of the said Parliament in so far as it relates to the Province of Manitoba, or of any other Act hereafter establishing new Provinces in the said Dominion, subject always to the right of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba to alter from time to time the provision of any law respecting the qualification of electors and members of the Legislative Assembly and to make laws respecting elections in the said Province.”

This is the point I wish to make—that this Parliament has the power to make laws and a constitution for the North-West Territories and to divide the North-West Territories into Provinces. Down to this time it has not been thought advisable to divide the North-West Territories into Provinces, perhaps because the population has not been sufficiently numerous, but the time will come, and it may not be

far distant, when this Parliament will be called upon to exercise that power. This Parliament can wait, and it will be time enough, when it is asked to make a constitution and laws for the different Provinces which may be established there, to consider the circumstances of the Territories and the Provinces to be established, and to see then whether it is advisable that the two languages should be preserved, or to provide that only one language shall be used. At present, I ask what great harm is the dual language doing to the North-West Territories? Let all hon. gentlemen who have taken the other side of this question or have listened to the speeches of the promoter of the Bill, and the other hon. gentlemen made both in and outside of this House, let all those who may have felt excited because it was held out to them that a great wrong and injustice was being done to their fellow countrymen in this matter, consider this question. The other day my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said he was willing to go a long distance to meet the views of his French fellow-citizens, but he was not willing to sacrifice his own flesh and blood. What sacrifice of his own flesh and blood is he asked to make? I ask this House and the people of this country, who have studied this question and who may be somewhat excited in regard to it, what sacrifice of the hon. gentleman's flesh and blood is made by leaving the constitution of the North-West Territories such as it is, until this Parliament is called upon to divide those Territories into Provinces and make a constitution for each Province? It simply leaves them in those Territories the liberty, if they desire, to use the two languages. They are not forced to use the French language. The English speaking people there are not obliged by law to learn that language, or to use it in the Legislature or to study it. They may use the English language if they will. There is no compulsion. Then, what great harm is it to them? And, further, they are not even called upon to pay for the translation of the public documents into the French language. Then, where are they injured, where are their rights and privileges interfered with, because the law says that those who desire to do so may use the French language in the North-West Council, or that their public records shall be printed in both languages? Does that do any harm to them, or take away from them any right? If this matter is looked at calmly and in a proper spirit, it will be seen that this provision does no harm to anyone, takes away no privilege, imposes no hardship, and does not make the English speaking population do what they do not wish to do. If it should have the effect of diffusing more knowledge amongst some part of the population of the North-West Territories, would it not be of some benefit to them to have these documents printed in the French language. I repeat—and this is a point which I strongly feel—that this time is inopportune; that this discussion should not have been raised either in the country or in the House on the question, because the time has not arrived when Parliament is called upon to frame a constitution for the North-West Territories or for any Provinces which may be created there. If the leaders on both sides were to come together and adopt some common basis of amendment or motion which, although, perhaps, it might not be in entire accord with my views, would restore peace and accord in the Dominion, I do

Mr. LANDRY.

not say that I would not vote for such an amendment, even at the sacrifice of my views, but at present my views are that we should not interfere at all in the matter, and that we should not do so until the time is opportune, and we are called upon to legislate for those Provinces. For a few moments, I desire to reply to some of the assumptions which are to be deduced from the speeches of the hon. gentlemen from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). These hon. gentlemen are kind enough to say that they entertain no hatred to the French people of this Dominion, they are kind enough to say that they have even a great liking for the French people of this Dominion, they are kind enough to say that they wish them no harm; but I ask any unprejudiced man who has followed the speeches which have been made in this House, or who has read the speeches which have been made on the public hustings in the Province of Ontario, and one in the North-West, if he can arrive at any other conclusion than that these hon. gentlemen declare that at present the French people of this Dominion are not desirable subjects in this country? It may be said that is a strained conclusion on my part. I do not think it is. If it is necessary, in their opinion, to have the French population—I will not say annihilated—but gradually made other than they are to-day, that must be their opinion. If they are desirable subjects, why should they not be left as they are, and why should any attempt be made either by legislation or by speeches to change them from what they are? They are blamed by these hon. gentlemen because they cannot be delighted by the same literature which delights these hon. gentlemen, because they are not delighted by the same pages of history which delighted these hon. gentlemen, because they are not moved by the same noble aspirations which move these hon. gentlemen in their actions. No other deduction can be drawn from that than the deduction which I have stated. If you take the facts as they exist, what do you find? We, the French people of this Dominion, are accused by these hon. gentlemen—not by the majority of the English speaking people, but I believe by a small minority, as I am sure it would be found if it were tested, but by a sufficiently large number to create disquietude and some amount of excitement—of combining together as a nationality or people in order to obtain that which we have no right to obtain. That has been advanced upon the public hustings, and, in effect, on the floor of this House. The records show an entirely different state of things. These hon. gentlemen have not brought forward any proof in this House or in the country to justify that statement. I would ask on what particular question, since 1867, have the French people united on a matter of this kind? They have not united in any vote in this House or in any election in this Dominion. Look at the last general elections for the Dominion. There are some 45,000 French people in Nova Scotia, and there is not one representative of that nationality from that Province in this House. Is that any evidence of their uniting in order to get influence and power to use it to the detriment of the English speaking people of this country? In Prince Edward Island, the population is not so large as in Nova Scotia. I think the population is about 109,000 or 110,000,

and there are about 10,000 or 11,000 French there. It is true that they send a worthy representative of that nationality here, but have you found him advocating anything but what he believed to be in the true interests of the people of this Dominion any more than you have found his English speaking colleagues? In New Brunswick, there are 56,000 French people, but, where they could send three representatives of that nationality to represent three counties there, what do you find? Your humble servant is the only representative of the French race from the Province of New Brunswick. Does that show that the promoter of the Bill (Mr. McCarthy) and his friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) were right in trying to impress upon the people of Ontario that the object of the French people of this Dominion is to dominate and to combine together in order to get a dominant influence and use it to the detriment of English speaking people and to their own advantage? I say, when you look at the three Maritime Provinces in the elections I have mentioned, we do not see any such desire to form a combination; they have not acted in the spirit which is attributed to them. Then let us go a little further and look at the Province of Quebec in the last election, and what do we see? The facts show us that, instead of combining, the people divided. In that large Province, so exclusively French, if I may say so—although there are a large number of English speaking people—if the French Canadians had been actuated by the motives attributed to them by the hon. gentlemen, we would not have seen the result which actually took place. If my memory serves me well, I think that 26 French speaking members were returned from that Province to support the Opposition in this House, and 25 were returned to support the Government. Does that look as if there was no division among the French people? Does that look as if there was unanimity of feeling of a hostile character against the English people? Does that look as if they were isolating themselves from the rest of the community, and working in harmony for the purpose of obtaining things prejudicial to the English people and advantageous to themselves? The facts do not show that they were actuated by any such spirit; on the contrary, they were divided nearly half and half between the two great parties of this Dominion, and, Sir, have you observed in their votes in this House that feeling which is spoken of? I say you cannot point to a single vote upon the records of this House since 1867 that supports the assertion made by my hon. friend. If there ever was a question upon which the people of the Province of Quebec and the French speaking people of this Dominion could be united by national feelings, and, if you will, national prejudices, it was the Riel question, that came up in 1886. And what was the result of that vote? Speaking from memory again, I think there were twenty-four French members voting one way, and twenty-seven voting the other way. Does that show that there was a combination of the French people for any purpose hostile to the rest of the Dominion? Sir, you will appeal in vain to the records of any of the elections held in the Dominion of Canada since 1867, to find any proof whatever of the assertions made by my hon. friend who is promoting this Bill in this House, and who tried to promote the excitement that has been raised dur-

ing the last year in the Province of Ontario and in the other Provinces. It is true, the assertions are made, but no evidence is brought forward to prove them. These hon. gentlemen not only accuse us of combining in this House, but in their speeches they assert that we are endeavoring to combine the French people of the country together. I say those gentlemen do not study the effects of their speech, they do not consider the influence of the appeals that they make to their own people. They say it is wrong to have these combinations, it is wrong for the people of one race to combine against another, but if they would carefully study the effect of their own speeches, they will see that they are infinitely more calculated to bring together a certain portion of the people belonging to the majority in Canada in opposition to the French people. We need not go very far to find an example of this kind of appeal. I will quote from a speech made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, I think, on the 12th July last, in which, speaking to Orangemen, he said among other things:

“Set the mark of your mission as an order at a higher point than to keep a particular set of men in office, and when Mr. Bowell and Sir Hector Langevin lie down together, study the situation and be wary, for the net result will not be set down to the credit of the Orange Order.”

Sir, here is a strong appeal to the people to combine together in opposition to the French, because he takes the trouble to point out that the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Public Works, if they have sufficient community of feeling, and sufficient community of interest in this Dominion to work together politically for the interest of our common country, it is a fact which he asks the people to be aware, he tells them that it means evil to them, it means ill to the English people of this Dominion; it is a danger when French Canadians unite in the Government with English speaking Canadians. What other deductions can be drawn from his language? What other evil can he mean when he points to the fact of the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Public Works being in the same Cabinet? He goes on to say:

“The issue is important, our foe is sleepless, resolute and unscrupulous.”

Now, what does that mean? If we were to use such language to an assembly of French Canadians and tell them “the issue is important, our foe,” the English speaking people, “is resolute and unscrupulous,” would we not be accused of using language of an inflammatory character, and of trying to arouse the prejudices of our compatriots; would we not be accused of trying to rally together the people of our nationality for the purpose of resisting the people of another nationality? We would be so accused, I think, and very rightly. And if these gentlemen say that, do we go too far, if we accuse them of having similar motives, if we say that by their language they are trying to form a combination of the English speaking people against the French speaking people? Let me say that I do not, myself, approve of everything that I have read as having been said in the Province of Quebec by gentlemen calling themselves Nationalists; I do not myself approve of everything I have seen in some newspapers I have read in that Province, upon the subject of French nationality, when they go so far as to intimate a desire to see upon the banks of the St. Lawrence French na-

tionality, as contradistinguished from a British nationality. I do not approve of that; but I would point out to these hon. gentlemen who are promoting this Bill, and to the hon. member for North Norfolk who sympathises with them, that there is this difference between their speeches and the speeches of those public men I have referred to in the Province of Quebec. Those men who have spoken thus in the Province of Quebec, and those hon. gentlemen who have spoken on that subject in this House, have made these speeches, so far as I have read them, only in self defence. The purport of their speeches have been this: If the English people attack us we are prepared to resist them; if these people attack our nationality we are prepared to resist them; if these people attack our language we are prepared to resist them; if these people attack our school system we are prepared to resist them; if they attack our religion we are prepared to resist them. But they have never gone so far as to say: We must go to Ontario and pluck from the English speaking people the rights and privileges which they enjoy. Their speeches have always, so far as I have seen, been in answer to attacks made upon them by those gentlemen speaking in the Province of Ontario. But the speeches of these gentlemen promoting this Bill have not been on the defensive. The hon. member for North Simcoe and his friends, on the contrary, have spoken in an aggressive tone, as aggressive as the preamble of the Bill of my hon. friend is aggressive. It is not necessary that I should quote from the speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen, for they are fresh in the memory of the House. It is only necessary, in order to emphasise my view, that I should read from the preamble of the Bill, which is as follows:—

“Whereas it is expedient in the interest of the national comity of the Dominion that there should be community of language among the people of Canada, and that the enactment in “North-West Territories Act” allowing the use of the French language should be expunged therefrom.”

Is this not an attack upon those rights which have been secured to the French people of the Province of Quebec, primarily by treaty, and also by the Act of Confederation, and secured in such a way that not even the legislation of this House can interfere with them? When such an attack is made, and when it is embodied in violent speeches, it is not unnatural that the French members from Quebec should, in reply, say that if an attempt is made to interfere with the French language in the North-West Territories, we will resist it to the utmost of our power. There is not so much fault to be found with the attitude taken by the people there, irrespective of the points to which I have alluded. Some hon. gentlemen did not appear to wish to go so far, and they stated they had no intention of interfering with vested rights. That is not the attitude taken by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who introduced the Bill. He intends to interfere with vested rights; he intends to secure this entering wedge, and follow it up by attacking the Separate School system and the use of the French language in Quebec, if we have to attach any credence to the speeches delivered by the hon. gentleman outside this House and within its walls. Other members, however, say they do not intend to go so far. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)

Mr. LANDRY.

will not go so far, but where the French are weak, as in the North-West Territories, he intends to attack them there, and to accomplish the purpose he has in view. But he should remember that an injustice to one is a menace to all. If it is an injustice to 10 or 50 people, it is a menace to any number. Holding those views, I consider it is not expedient to-day to pronounce an opinion upon this question, and I hold that this is an inopportune time to bring it forward, and I am prepared, if no better resolution is submitted, to vote for the sub-amendment before the House, and vote squarely against the Bill. I do not think I am prepared to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), because it is not, to my view, the proper one. We should not revert to the people the power to deal with this subject, but we should keep it in our own hands, and when the proper times comes for legislation, we should, speaking for the whole Dominion, say what we believe to be right for the North-West and for the great Provinces to be established there, and we should consider the circumstances, the population, the different nationalities there, and we should legislate in the best interests of all. Believing that to be the proper policy, I am not disposed to vote either for the Bill or for the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). At this hour of the evening and in view of the great length of the discussion, I will speak very briefly and follow the most excellent example of moderation and of courtesy shown to-day by hon. gentlemen who have spoken, and most prominently by the leader of the Opposition. I have waited for four days in the hope that some English-speaking representative of the Provinces by the sea, older in parliamentary experience than I am, who could have spoken with more authority regarding the feeling of the eastern Provinces, would rise and take part in this debate. If such an hon. member addressed this House I would gladly resume my seat in silence. But, perhaps, in the course of remarks occupying a few moments, I may be able to contribute some points to this discussion which will enable us to arrive at a mutual understanding. The questions before the House are two: one, which seems to me to be relevant and a comparatively narrow question; the other, which seems to be irrelevant, is one which has taken a very broad range. In the very few remarks I offer, I will sharply distinguish between these two questions; one of which grows out of the enacting clause of the Bill of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and the other which grows out of the inconsequential and ill-constructed preamble of the Bill. The first is with respect to the simple and narrow question as to whether, all things considered, in this year of our Lord 1890, it is wise in this Parliament to strike out section 110 of the North-West Territories Act, which was inserted in that Act thirteen years ago. I do not propose to review the reasons given by those who are opposed to the policy of expunging this section. I understood the hon. leader of the Opposition to say that the Bill, coupled with such a preamble, and heralded with such a speech as was delivered by the introducer of the Bill in this House, and still more by speeches outside this House, was one they could not approve; but if that simple Bill had been introduced, without

the preamble, in a moderate speech by a member from the North-West, he would not have regarded it as one that was very objectionable. It is said that those who favor the preamble of the Bill are endorsing the action of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but those who endorse only the Bill itself occupy a different position. It has been said, and it was said by the hon. member for Assiniboia West (Mr. Davin), that it was unjust to the people of the western Provinces to strike out section 110. I come from a Province where, as the member for Kent (Mr. Landry) has said, there are a considerable number of French-speaking people. We come from a Province which has not the dual language, from a Province where we live on terms of good-will with each other; and no better evidence of the good-will of the English and French-speaking people in that Province can be furnished, than the fact that a great party in that Province, mainly an English-speaking party, some years ago, chose as their leader the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), whom we all respected and knew to be a capable administrator, and he held for some time a very important portfolio in the Government of that Province. The argument of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), that the continuation of section 110 would have the effect of attracting emigrants from the New England States and leading to emigration westward seems to me to be not well founded on fact. Thirteen years ago this House passed section 110 as a bid for emigrants for the North-West; but that section has not had the effect of drawing emigrants there, and any French Canadians who have emigrated have gone to the factories and farms of the New England States. Many of my French Canadian friends have said to me since this discussion began: Be reasonable and endeavor to understand the present situation; suppose a hundred years ago the French had obtained possession of the northern part of the continent, and you and yours were in the minority, how would you feel about this question? I said: I would hope that the French Government would deal as generously as the English have been disposed to deal with the French people in the Provinces; but I would say frankly that in the matter of carving out new Provinces, however much I might desire the English language to be retained, I must accept the facts of history and could not hope for the perpetuation of my own language as an official language. I have only this to say in favor of repealing section 110, and it is this: that I agree with every argument made in its favor. I thought a powerful argument was made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in the earlier part of his speech, in which he appeared to devote close attention to the precise question before the House; and I concur in the opinion that it is desirable, other things being equal, without breaking faith, to have but one language, that Government is easier and that friction is less among a people in a country which has a homogeneous people. This remark is made by one whose duty all his life has been to study history, and I venture to say there is not in Europe a single example of a nation, with two rival races jealously preserving their own nationality, and nearly equal in strength, whose power is at all commensurate with her resources and population as compared with a homogeneous nation. I will

not follow that out in detail, because it has been discussed fully by gentlemen on both sides of the House. In Switzerland, where there are three languages, the people live in good-will; but the force that holds Switzerland together is the iron band of pressure from the outside. If we had on the north and west of us, as we have on the south of us, jealous nations whom we felt were quite willing to eat us up at an hour's notice, I think we would have better feelings of brotherly love than we have now. The case of Austro-Hungary was different from that of Switzerland, but I have not time to enter at any great length into the question of why Austro-Hungary, since that great duel on the field of Sadowa, has not an influence consistent with her large population, her fertile soil, and her great resources. Germany on the north, with far less population, is, beyond all question, the more powerful nation; that is, the nation with a comparatively homogeneous race is stronger than the other, although nominally the smaller. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) made a very pertinent argument in the case of England, when he pointed out that when England was occupied by two rival races, the Saxons and the Normans, she made very little progress; but when these nations were fused together she went forward by leaps and bounds. The most pertinent of all the arguments advanced, to my thinking, is the argument based on facts with which we are all acquainted. We know something of the course of events in the great Republic to the south. Her success is something phenomenal in the history of nations; and what is the policy which that great, progressive and sensible people have pursued in this matter of founding a new colony? Have they not stood by the one language? Have they not stood by the public schools? Have they not stood by the common law of England, those just and clement laws, those institutions of government which guarantee personal liberty? Have they not held those out to the foreign nations, saying: "Come and share these laws with us, enjoy this liberty with us." And have not their most enlightened men, ever since they planted this policy in the land, discovered that these laws were a mighty force of assimilation and tended to make a people compact? To secure this homogeneity, it seems to me that, in this new commonwealth, it will be unwise to allure immigrants from France, from Denmark, from Germany, from Sweden, and from other foreign countries, by the hope that when they come into this Dominion, in our courts of justice, in our Legislatures, they will be entitled to the free use of their own language. I think, if we do so, we are holding out to them an illusive hope. I think it better to say to the Danes, Germans, Prussians, French and others who come here: we welcome you all; there are our fertile lands, occupy them; and there are our mighty English laws guarding your lives and property. There are schools in which your children may be taught; there are representative institutions of Government. If you wish, you can have equal rights with all of us; and then we may hope that in one or two generations the great difficulty of governing these western Provinces will be removed, and they will be united into one. In my judgment, there is no single force within the range of Government—I am not speaking of the almost unlimited force of religion, which is beyond the

range of Government in our happy country—there is no force so subtle, so insidious, so powerful to effect this unity of races as the force of language. It is like the primary forces of nature. It makes a people like each other who did not like each other before. I agree with so many French members that it is a pity we cannot all speak the French language. If we could I am sure we would like them better, and they would like us better, and if I were a younger man and could learn as fast as I could in my earlier days, I would learn to speak that beautiful language as I long ago learned to read it.

Mr. LANDRY. And then you would pass a law to prevent yourself using it.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Far from it. I will deal with that remark of my hon. friend later on. I do not wish to recall past memories. I do not wish to speak of the events of 1877, but I do feel, in all soberness, that he who threw the apple of discord was not the hon. member singled out for condemnation by my friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). It was that man who inserted in the Upper House, late in the Session of 1877, that ill-fated section of the North-West Territories Act, which provided for the official use of the two languages. It was he who planted the baleful cypress tree by the cradles of those young commonwealths between the Red River and the Rocky Mountains. A few words more and I have done. I will refer now to the somewhat irrelevant and larger question as to whether we should not consider that this Act is only a wedge by which its promoters commence to break up the institutions of the French Canadians, and that after they have succeeded in this, they are to go on and petition the Imperial Parliament to strike out section 133 of the British North America Act which guarantees the French language in this chamber, that they will go further and agitate for the repeal of the civil law in Quebec, and possibly endeavor to strike out that portion of the Act of Confederation which guarantees the freedom of the Roman Catholic religion in the Province of Quebec. Coming from the Lower Provinces as I do, and without any authority to speak for any but myself and the county which I represent, as one who has been in the habit of meeting the public men of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and studying the opinions of the press in that country, I desire to say, that, so far as I know, the one million people of the Lower Provinces sending forty-three members to this House are an absolute unit in believing that when we came into the Confederation there were agreements between the two Canadas and the Lower Provinces which should not be broken. The understanding was that our people were called in to keep the peace between those people on the St. Lawrence. We knew that a treaty in substance had been made. We knew that treaty has been crystallised and made lawful and binding upon us by the Parliament at Westminster. We know that that treaty guaranteed the perfect freedom of the Catholic religion in Quebec, the use of the French language, the perpetuity of the civil law of Rome included, and I desire to say that the people down there, who are mostly English, love the truth and keep their faith. Long ago our old King Alfred was called the "truth teller," and we English people boast that we are

Mr. WELDON (Albert).

truth tellers and boast that we keep our faith. It is a quality we are proud of. We are not faith breakers; we are faith keepers; and I think the one million people in the Provinces by the sea are one man in saying that it is our bounden duty, in good faith and honor, absolutely to preserve inviolate those provisions of the treaty, those guarantees of the constitution, which have been referred to by my hon. friend. That is the answer I give him when he asks me if I wish to strike out the French language. Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for its patience in indulging me thus far. As I sit down my attention has been called by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) to a constitutional point which, I think, might be very well stated at this juncture, namely, that whatever we desire to do in the North-West Territories in regard to the schools or the Assembly or the printing of papers or judicial proceedings, we have no power under the constitution to deal with the use of the French language in the courts; for section 133 of the British North America Act reads as follows:—

"Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person, or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the Courts of Quebec."

And if we turn to section 101, which gives to this Parliament the power to establish Canadian courts, we find that it reads as follows:—

"The Parliament of Canada may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, from time to time, provide for the constitution, maintenance and organisation of a general Court of Appeal for Canada, and for the establishment of any additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada."

Reading these two sections together, I think they are conclusive that the courts of the North-West Territories are courts of Canada, and whatever we wish to do we cannot touch them. Let me sit down by saying that it makes a young member proud of his country, and proud of his Parliament, and proud of the French race, to observe the dignity and order which have been maintained throughout this debate; and if the hon. member who leads the Opposition will forgive me for saying so, and not think it improper, I should like to express the delight I have, as a peace lover, to see the increased dignity of debate and the elevated tone of discussion in this chamber during the four years that I have been here, for which I think the unflinching urbanity of the hon. gentleman himself is largely to be credited.

Mr. DESSAINT. (Translation.) As a French Canadian, Mr. Speaker, representing a county most essentially French, I think that it is my duty, under the circumstances, to raise my voice in protest against the resolution which this House is asked to adopt. The North-West Territories were definitely organised by statute in 1877. The repeal of section 110 of chapter 50 of Revised Statutes of Canada is asked for, by which section it is enacted that:

"Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Council or Legislative Assembly of the Territories and in the proceedings before the courts; and both those languages shall be used in the records and journals of the said Council or Assembly; and all ordinances made under this Act shall be printed in both those languages."

The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) proposes by his Bill, now before the House, to repeal section 110 of "The North-West Territories Act." I will ask at once what can be the object which the hon. member has, and must necessarily have, in presenting such a resolution? If the Act which is now before the House, has but one particular object, namely, to have justice done to the people of the North-West Territories, I ask what is his mission, what is his mandate to thus take the part of these people? If there are any persons in the North-West Territories who find themselves injured, let them make their voices heard in this House through their authorised representatives. The object of the hon. member seems clear enough in the preamble of the Bill:

"Whereas it is expedient in the interest of the national comity of the Dominion that there should be community of language among the people of Canada, and that the enactment in 'The North-West Territories Act' allowing the use of the French language should be expunged therefrom: Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

"1. Section one hundred and ten of the Act of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled 'An Act respecting the North-West Territories,' is hereby repealed."

After reading this preamble, it is easily ascertainable that it is not merely to redress the grievances in the North-West that the hon. member has brought in this Bill. It has quite another object. It is not a piece of partial and local legislation which he undertakes to carry out, but general legislation attacking everything which is French Canadian in Canada. If the hon. member has local legislation in view, I ask what is his commission, what is his mission? I do not see that he has any, and I consider that he is meddling in what does not concern him, that he is meddling in the business of other people. It is said that many American citizens have made fortunes in minding their own business. This is the line of conduct which should be adopted by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). When the North-West Territories Act was passed in 1877, it will be remembered that the section which is sought to be repealed was adopted first by the Senate; this section was then submitted to the House of Commons. The Government of Mr. Mackenzie was then in power. The hon. member for North Simcoe was then in the House, and he consented with the others,—he had not then the mission which he has to-day,—he consented, as did the other members, to the adoption of this section, which passed unanimously. Later on, in 1880, this North-West Territories Act again came before the House, and this section is found imbedded in the Revised Statutes, and never did the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) think it proper to complain of it. Last year, he set out on the war path, and he was seen careering over Ontario and the North-West Territories. He thought himself charged with a special mission to regenerate the population, and to rub out from the map of Canada all that belonged to the French Canadians. I would not wish to insult the hon. member by comparing him to the celebrated knight who roamed over Spain and the other European countries in order to fight windmills. I certainly would not desire to compare him to this renowned knight of the sorrowful figure, who, in his moments of sanguinary instinct, disembowelled armies of sheep; because the comparison would not be fair. The

illustrious Don Quixote fought from pure gallantry, and he sought always to protect the feeble and the oppressed, whilst the hon. member for North Simcoe seeks to persecute them. This is the difference I make between the two personages. Now, Mr. Speaker, the intention shown by the hon. member is not only, as all the world is perfectly convinced, to abolish the French language in the North-West. If this were a Bill of limited effect which we are discussing at the present moment, one might perhaps consider for a moment the seasonableness of such a measure; but the Bill extends much farther. The aim of the hon. member—he has not concealed it in his speech, and all those who have followed him have preached the same doctrine,—is the destruction of the French language not only in the North-West Territories, but throughout the Dominion of Canada. Further he would like to abolish the separate schools; he would equally like, if it were possible, to abolish the Roman Catholic religion, which has been attacked in a furious manner for some time past. I think that the movement which has now been set going throughout the country is far from being a patriotic one, but I am certain that those who intend such a persecution will not succeed in their efforts. History gives lessons which must not be disregarded; lessons which we should make use of, and which we will certainly put into practice. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has told us that by the Act of Capitulation of Quebec and by the Act of Cession of 1763 the use of the French language was not guaranteed. If the Catholic religion has been preserved to us, if a guarantee for all our privileges has been given to us, if we possess to-day the French civil law, the Code Napoléon, which is the admiration of the whole world, a system of law which goes back as far as the *Coutume de Paris* and the old coutumes of France, we owe these to the guarantees given by the Treaty of Paris, and to our privileges granted by the Treaty of Capitulation. Well, when we have the right of exercising our religion as we understand it; when we have preserved for ourselves the coutumes, the laws in force in the country, by capitulation, are they going now to tell us that we have not the right of speaking our language? When they allowed us the use of our language before the courts, because they could not do otherwise, is this not a formal guarantee that we should have the enjoyment, along with our civil rights, of this beautiful French language, of which we are proud for more than one reason? The attempt made by the hon. member for Simcoe will not succeed, and I trust that he will not return again to the charge. At the time of the cession of Canada—as he has himself stated,—the population of Canada, which was entirely French at the time, was about 65,000 souls. A great number quitted the country to return to France, notably the nobles and officers, and the educated persons generally. They deserted the new country and we remained there in small numbers under the shield and guardianship of the priests, who were at that epoch the only people of education. Well, since 1763, until Confederation in 1867, and even up to the present time as is now proved, they have tried by every means in their power to prevent the French Canadians from speaking their language and practising their religion. This people which originally reckoned only 65,000 souls resisted the storm and presented a

bold front to all attacks. It has preserved its privileges, its language, its religion, and its rights. How can it be imagined to-day, Mr. Speaker, that with a population of one million and one-half of French Canadians, settled in the Province of Quebec and the other Provinces of Canada, and about one million in the United States, how can it be imagined, I say, that the hon. member for Simcoe and the companions who support him, can hope to be able to destroy the French race, and take away from it the right of using its language, when there exists to defend it a population of more than one million living in the Dominion of Canada? The persecutions which have with intent been carried on against the French Canadians have not been confined to the Province of Quebec, but before the cession of 1763, the English who at that time peopled the thirteen colonies which later on made up the United States, already carried on before the war for independence had been declared, a bloody war upon everything that was French, and they attacked the Acadians, who then dwelt in Nova Scotia. In order to show the dishonesty with which they acted towards these Frenchmen, it will be sufficient for me to cite an extract from a work by Mr. Jacques de Baudoucourt, at page 309 :

“The Acadians asked to be exempted from carrying arms against France in case of war (for it must always be remembered that war had not been declared). This mark of attachment was never forgiven and served as a pretext for the carrying out of a measure the most brutal among all that history has recorded. The English fleets surrounded Acadia and the most profound secrecy was maintained in order that no one might escape. The officers and the Protestant clergy had already exhausted, against the unfortunate Acadians, all their insults and annoyances. The supreme iniquity was about to be consummated. To take seven or eight thousand men by force was impracticable, recourse was had to a ruse. A general proclamation from Moncton, invited all the men under the severest penalties, above the age of ten years, to assemble in the church of their respective villages, in order there to listen to the orders of the Government. The day fixed was Friday the 5th day of September. In order to give an idea of what took place in the other Acadian villages, let us recount what passed in the village of Grand Pré, where 483 men, 337 women and 1,107 children were grouped. When they were shut up in the church, the approaches to which were guarded by the Bostonais, Col. Winslow having taken his place in the middle of the meeting, made this announcement, one worthy of Nero and Caligula : ‘You are gathered together here in order that I may make you acquainted with the final resolve of His Majesty, respecting the French population of this Province. Your lands, your cattle, and your provisions of all kinds, are confiscated for the benefit of the Crown, and as for yourselves you will be transported from the country. You owe to the goodness of His Majesty the right which I am going to allow you, namely, that of carrying off all your money and household stuff, provided always, that it will not encumber the vessels in which you are going to embark. From this moment I declare you to be prisoners of the King.’

“And the unhappy Acadians without arms, were escorted in six ranks, at the bayonet’s point, from the church to the ship where the men were to embark; they passed along groaning with grief in the midst of their wives and children, who were on their knees and calling down the blessings of heaven on the poor exiles from whom they were going to be separated. The Americans were pitiless, and took no pains to unite families; they had not even prepared a place for the reception of the exiles, the colonies were not forewarned. On the same day and hour all the other villages were treated in the same manner, and the seven thousand captured Acadians were embarked for an unknown destination.”

The greater part of these poor wretches were deceived in this manner and despoiled of their goods; this act of cruelty will be a shameful blot on the history of British North America. These poor Acadians were embarked forcibly on board

Mr. DESSAINT.

the vessels. They were scattered along the coasts of the United States; and they were deprived of all, in order to prevent their return to their country where they possessed fertile and well cultivated lands and a fair amount of property. In spite of this persecution, Mr. Speaker, the Canadians so loved their soil; they so loved their country, that it ended in their repatriating themselves, and at the present day this population of 7,000, which had thus been scattered to the four winds, has come together again and numbers at least 110,000 Acadians, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. All this proves that there are certain feelings which cannot be driven out of the heart of man. The Canadians may be expelled from the country, but no one can succeed in stifling their national sentiment. I shall not enter upon all the historical incidents which followed this gloomy period, between 1760 and 1837. I shall only remark that the Government, every time the occasion presented itself, being then hostile, took all the means possible to deprive the French Canadian nation of their privileges. They tried to prevent our speaking the language peculiar to it. Our fellow-countrymen had not the right to speak officially the French language in the Legislative Assemblies, nor even in the courts: they robbed them of their just rights. They had judges who understood not a word of French, and who were third-class men. They endeavored by this means to prevent their having access to the courts,—and our countrymen chose the oldest men among them to adjust their differences; it was certainly the best way to bear up as they have done. The hon. First Minister has spoken to us about a memorable epoch; he spoke to us about the year 1844, the year in which he entered public life for the first time. He told us that if the French Canadians were protected in that year it was by a Tory Government. I think that the hon. the First Minister makes a mistake in this connection, for the Government of the day was not wholly Tory; and the measure to which he alluded, that is to say the restoration of the French language in Canada, was not proposed by a Tory, but by the Hon. Mr. Papineau, who certainly was not a Tory, but a Reformer and an advanced Liberal. This measure was a protest against the Union Act of 1840; for it is known that in this Union Act a section had been interpolated by which the French language was completely forbidden in the legislative debates. In 1845 the Hon. Mr. Papineau, moved a resolution and based a Bill upon this resolution, re-establishing the use of the French language in the Legislative Chamber. This resolution was unanimously adopted by the members present. Consequently the Conservative party of to-day, or the Tory party, cannot claim to have given us the benefit of such a measure. But if the hon. the First Minister had gone a little further and had come down to 1849, he would, perhaps have been able to have made us see what were the intentions of the Tories of that day. We can remember that, in 1849, the Tory newspapers declared war to the death on everything in the shape of a French Canadian. We can recollect that at that time it was a Liberal Government which asked the House to vote a sum of money as an indemnity to those French Canadians who had suffered losses in the rebellion of 1837. The proposal of the Government was warmly debated, and the hon. the First Minister of the present moment,

who was then in the House, was one of those who made the most revolutionary speeches that can be found in the history of our country. The press also discussed the question. It is necessary, said the Tory organs, that the French race should disappear from Canada. The hon. the First Minister was a Tory then, as he is now, and he was at the head of those who waged war upon the French Canadian race. We remember the disorders which were caused by this law. The Governor was insulted; stones and rotten eggs were thrown at him. An organised body laid siege to the Parliament House; threw in a shower of stones even into the Council Chamber; they drove out the members; they broke the desks and chairs; they carried off the mace; one of their leaders seated in the Speaker's chair proclaimed in the name of the people the dissolution of the Parliament. At the same time the building became the prey of the flames, as did the house of the Hon. Mr. Lafontaine. And who were at the head of this revolutionary movement? They were the Tories of the day, and I venture to say the political ancestors of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). And who, setting aside Mr. Lafontaine, took up the defence of the French Canadians? It was a man whose name will live in the history of our country. It was the father of the Hon. Mr. Blake, who, in a most eloquent speech, demanded, as a good patriot, as a philosopher, their rights for the French Canadians. We have discovered in this House, within the last few days, that the son of this great patriot has followed the traditions of his father, and has adopted the same line of conduct by praising the French Canadians. He has placed himself above the considerations of party; he has taken the side of the persecuted, and the French Canadians will owe him an eternal acknowledgment, as they preserve a precious remembrance of his illustrious father. I am perfectly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) does not hope to obtain the result which he has in view, when proposing the measure which is now offered for our consideration. He knows that it is impossible to secure the abolition of the French language in the North West, and still less in the Province of Quebec; and I tell him frankly that he is dashing his head against stone walls by endeavoring to secure the adoption of this measure. Before abolishing the French language, and taking from us the privileges which we enjoy, he will find, if need be, thousands upon thousands of breasts presented as a defence for the liberties which we enjoy. Mr. Speaker, recriminations are indulged in against the hon. the First Minister of the Province of Quebec. I do not know why they are continually attacking a man who is not in this House to defend himself; it would appear that there is a mad rage against him; it would appear that he has excited the prejudices and the hatred of certain persons in the House. I am not commissioned to take up the defence of Mr. Mercier; but when they accuse him of fanaticism; when they state that the Government of Quebec desires to ostracise the English minority in that Province, I say that a statement is made which is not true. Let us examine the facts as they really are: There are in the Province of Quebec ten members speaking the English language out of sixty-five who form the total membership of the Legislature. There are

in the Ministry two English Protestant Ministers. Consequently these two English Ministers represent one-third of the membership. If Mr. Mercier had only granted to the Protestant minority the number of Ministers to which they were entitled with regard to the population and the body of representatives, he would have given them but one Protestant Minister. Now, let any one cite one single act,—I do not refer to a word spoken in a patriotic speech where one may go beyond the usual bounds of prudence,—let them cite one case where Mr. Mercier has not done justice to the Protestant minority, then I will admit that he has made himself blameworthy. Again, lately, during the session now in progress, he has shown his justice towards the Protestant minority. Mr. Hall presented a Bill to the Legislature asking for a privilege favoring the Protestant minority, in the matter of the admission to the study of law of the bearers of University degrees. The Hon. Mr. Mercier was the first to impress upon his followers his own personal ideas, and he in this way made the Bill of Mr. Hall to pass in triumph. This is what the Sherbrooke *Gazette* says on the subject:

"We are quite aware that we are going to give the Sherbrooke *Examiner* an opportunity of delivering himself once more of his stupid jests, but we must render justice to Mr. Mercier for the statesmanlike act he has done in taking up the defence of the rights of the English Universities, in causing their diplomas of B.A. to be accepted as evidence that the bearer of the degree has received a sufficiently liberal education to enable him to commence the study of the law. Prejudice—blind irrational prejudice—is so spread over Quebec and possesses the Legislature to such a degree, that the chief of such a party as the National Party must have a large portion of moral courage to rise above the narrow and paltry ideas of the party, and render justice to the minority."

This is what Mr. Mercier has done in the case before us. His support, his pleading and his eloquence have assured the passing of Mr. Hall's Bill, and his efforts ought to be acknowledged to his face.

"Honor to whom honor is due. Mr. Mercier deserves the gratitude of all true believers in equal rights."

This is what an English newspaper said, quite recently, on the position taken by the Hon. Mr. Mercier towards the Protestant minority. This is not all: during the past few days a question of privilege was raised before this House by making allusion to certain disorders which have taken place in Hull. One hon. member allowed himself to make a furious tirade, not only against Mr. Mercier, but against French Canadians in general; he took advantage of the occasion to hurl upon the French Canadians an insult which I will not repeat, but which we have felt keenly and which has wounded us in our most private feelings. He went so far as to recall the sad remembrances of the battle on the Plains of Abraham and the battle of Waterloo. He went so far as to tell us that the time would come when great Salvation Armies would march through the streets of Quebec. Why provoke in this manner the French Canadians, who only ask to live like brothers, hand in hand with their fellow-citizens of whatever race or origin? This brand of discord is hurled in order to create a programme, in order to pick up at the next elections a certain number of fanatics. I have nothing to say about the Salvation Army nor the battle of the Plains of Abraham. If the history of our fellow-citizens of English origin has some dates of honor and victory, I can say that we French Cana-

dians have some glorious pages in the history of our country. If we have suffered losses, if we have experienced checks, we can in any case march with head erect; we can look behind with pride and be proud of our ancestors. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is not generous; I say that it is despicable to make illusions like that to the ancestors of a nation which has a glorious past. Occasion has been found to speak of the Salvation Army. I ask what has the Salvation Army to do with this case? I frankly admit that I have no very great admiration for this army, which may have a cause for its existence from its own point of view; but is, in my opinion, only a gathering of parasites, which I find simply ridiculous. I might say more, but as there may be found among those people some well-intentioned individuals, I wish to give them the benefit of the doubt. Nevertheless, there is one thing very certain, which is, that the Salvation Army, like many other fanatical religious organisations, has no justification for its existence, and I say that the law does not permit scandalous and noisy processions in the streets. We live in a free country; I respect all religious denominations, and we desire that our religion should be respected; but the liberty of creed in a country does not authorise license. This is what the first section of the Act respecting recatories says on the subject:—

“The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, so as the same be not made an excuse for acts of licentiousness, or a justification of practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the Province, are by the constitution and laws of this Province allowed to all Her Majesty’s subjects within the same.”

Well, all creeds have free access to this country; all religions are respected; but this must not give an opening for license which may disturb the public peace. Will they say that the noisy demonstrations, of which we were witness on the streets of Quebec, are not of a kind to break the public peace? I say: yes, they are; and, further, I find in these processions a provocation which should be avoided by all legal methods. To show the goodwill of the Hon. Mr. Mercier, who is always working in the interest of peace and harmony in our country, I shall cite the answer which he made to the Hon. Mr. Taillon in reference to the troubles which have occurred lately in Hull. This is what he said:

“At the opening of the Session the Hon. Mr. Taillon drew the attention of the Government to the regrettable disorders which took place recently in Hull, and asked whether it was their intention to take steps to put an end to them.

“The Hon. Mr. Mercier said the question of the leader of the Opposition was in every way an opportune one, and in reply he would inform the House that the Government had determined to maintain peace and order, and to protect those who desired to speak, no matter on what subject, provided that while so doing they did not violate the laws of the country.”

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Mr. Mercier has in this instance only done his duty, and I trust that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and the other members who have spoken in the same strain as he has, will be satisfied with the attitude which he, Mr. Mercier, has taken on this occasion. Well, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the French language, they tell us that in this country it is impossible—if we wish to be a homogeneous people, a true nationality,—that it is impossible that there should exist different languages. The learned researches of several of my colleagues have shown

Mr. DESSAINT.

that the thing not only is not impossible, but that it is found to be practical and advantageous in several countries, notably in the United States, in the Island of Jersey, in Switzerland, and in several other countries. I will venture to remark to the hon. member for Simcoe that, if he expects by this means to make the English language spoken by all British subjects his breath will be a long time out of his body before this end is reached; because Canada is not the only country where another language is spoken: there are other British possessions where English is not spoken at all—thus, the East or English Indies, where the people speak different languages and have different customs. I should like to think that the hon. member for Simcoe does not entertain the hope that England can impose her language upon all the peoples who make up her empire:

“The races which compose the population of India are as diverse as the climates,” says Larousse, “the tribes, which are distinct as to language, creeds, and by their social organisation, are innumerable.”

I do not know whether the hon. member for Simcoe wishes to carry on his crusade in favor of the English language into these regions. Let us see now what goes on in the Island of Jersey. It has been stated here that the French language was spoken there. It has been an English possession for many ages. The population is 56,078, of which 2,000 are Frenchmen. Notwithstanding, what do we see? We see the French language there is held in high esteem; that it is spoken by the well-to-do people, and that it is the official language of the country. This does not prevent the inhabitants of Jersey from proving in many instances their deep attachment for their new nationality, that of Great Britain. One can recollect that several years ago, France being at war with England, the people of Jersey took up arms against their old mother country, and fought for the Crown of England. This did not prevent them from preserving their customs, their privileges and their language up to the present time. This shows that one can be a patriot and a good British subject though speaking a foreign tongue. Let us look again at the Island of Ste. Lucie. It is a small island, exclusively, I think, or in great part peopled by French. Nevertheless for a great number of years the only language spoken in this island has been the French one; it is the official language. Several years back, when the Hon. Judge Armstrong was Governor of this island, which possessed French laws, they adopted the greater portion of the Code of Lower Canada. This does not prevent their being loyal subjects of Her Majesty, and if need be they would take up arms to defend the British Crown. I will not recall the glorious deeds of arms in which the French Canadians took part. These facts have already been mentioned in the course of this debate, and it is sufficient to recall them to show the loyalty of the French Canadians under all circumstances and in all places. Now, in order to prove the qualities of the French language, which has been so violently attacked, and which it is desired to see disappear, I will venture to quote a page written by Mr. Oscar Dunn, who, I think, is of British origin. This is what he says:

“The French language is a diamond of inestimable value; it is a work of gold worked on for centuries, of a beauty like to none other. All the world admires her; she charms every body: although she reveals her secrets to but few, one must love her, love her much, and court her assi-

duously and long; she only yields to him who knows how to conquer by persevering labor and unshaken constancy; but what a treasure does she reveal to her favorites. Her exquisite delicacy ravishes the understanding; she is all love and all gaiety; full of nobility and enthusiasm; accessible to the sciences as to fancy; to all elevated ideas as to all worthy sentiments; she understands your heart and assists your wit. If you once gain possession of her, nothing will persuade you ever to give her up. You will keep her as your very best treasure.⁷

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has allowed himself, in the course of his remarks, to allude to the antipathy existing between the French Canadians and the Irish. He has received in this House the most solemn denial of this statement that he could obtain. We have seen the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) rising and speaking in French, in the name of the Irish of the Province of Quebec, bearing witness, in this way, to the sympathies which his fellow-countrymen have for us. This is the most ample vindication which we could adduce as to this matter. This sympathy, Mr. Speaker, exists not only between the Irish and the French Canadians; it exists and will exist in spite of the obstacles raised by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) between the French Canadians and the thinking Englishmen. We have had evidence of this in this House. They wish to respect our institutions, our laws, our customs and our religion. On the other hand, we return the reverence which they pay us, and we respect likewise their institutions and their religion, their language and their character. We are capable of living in peace in this country. We have but one only object—to form a stronger Dominion, a great nation. But to reach this end it is not necessary to cast a brand of discord among us, as has done the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). We wish to live in peace, we desire harmony, we desire to be calm and unexcited. But I affirm that the proposition of the hon. member for North Simcoe is an act of tyranny, which will show, if it is sanctioned, that they are not so patriotic as they would wish us to believe. Before closing, Mr. Speaker, let me be allowed to say that we look upon the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) with calmness and tranquility. We are strong in our rights, and we fear nothing, even if this Bill were a declaration of war. We are strong in our rights and we are proud, at the same time, of our ancestors, whose memory we know how to make respected. I shall say no more. I am convinced that the Bill which is now before you for consideration will obtain the fate it deserves, and I am certain that all true patriots in this House will join hand to hand in order to give a lesson to the author of this Bill.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that this debate be the first Order of the Day to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 18th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Central Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Corby.)

Bill (No. 87) respecting the Pontiac Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the North Canadian Atlantic Railway, Steamship Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 89) to amend the Act incorporating the River Detroit Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 90) to amend the Act incorporating the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Bill (No. 91) to grant certain powers to the Chambly Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

ADJOURNMENT FOR ASH WEDNESDAY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved :

That when the House adjourns this day, it stand adjourned until Thursday next, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved :

That Government business shall take precedence on every Thursday, on and after Thursday next, the 20th instant, during the present Session, after Questions put by Members.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his motion. I think we have not yet reached a period of the Session when the Government should take another day. We have not yet discussed one of the numerous public Bills set down on the Order paper, and if Thursday is taken away, the only time when those Bills can come up will be Wednesday evening. It is not likely that we could dispose of them, having so short a time, and besides, to-morrow is Ash Wednesday. I would, therefore, suggest that the hon. gentleman should not press this motion to-day, but should reserve it until we have discussed some of these public Bills.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I meant this to take effect after Thursday next.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman might renew his motion next Monday, but I think it is altogether premature for the Government to make the motion now.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Government have, for a number of Sessions, compelled me to take the very objection which the leader of the Opposition has now taken. I am glad to see that he is resisting this motion. There is great difficulty in getting any private legislation done, when the Government come in and practically take all the time of the House for their own business. I have always protested against this, and I renew the protest, and endorse the statement of the leader of

the Opposition, with the full support of the party I represent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will allow the motion to stand over until Friday, when the First Minister will be here.

PRIVILEGE—THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Mr. BOWELL. I propose now to make the motion which I brought under the notice of the House yesterday in reference to the further correspondence of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) and the statements made in this House by him and other members, the First Minister and myself being among the number. The objection was taken yesterday that it was inadvisable or improper to place upon the records letters which were written subsequently to those which had been published in the *Toronto Globe*. It must be remembered by the House that these letters were not public property until they were published in the newspaper, and this House was not made cognisant of the fact until the motion was made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and passed, and placed upon the records of Parliament. My desire is that the explanation made by the hon. member for Lincoln, and published with certain letters in the *Citizen* newspaper on the 11th of the month, together with speeches to which I have referred, should follow as consecutively as possible the other letters now on record. I, therefore, move :

That whereas certain letters and documents, reading as follows :

(*Daily Citizen, Tuesday, 11th February, 1890.*)

“MR. RYKERT AND THE GLOBE.

“A VINDICATION IN REPLY TO GROSS MISSTATEMENTS.—THE CYPRESS HILLS TIMBER LIMITS.

“Editor of THE CITIZEN.

“The garbled statements put before its readers by the *Globe* newspaper, if allowed to go without any explanation on my part, might very reasonably lead to the conclusion that I had unduly used my influence with the Government, in the first place, to procure a timber license for Mr. Adams, and afterwards to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to press its claim to the alternate sections contained in that license. It must have struck even the most prejudiced person that many letters were not published to which my letters were answers, and which, if published, would have fully explained the whole matter. By a reference to the letters it will be seen that the whole fight was between Mr. Sands and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that I was acting in his behalf, and did all that lay in my power to prevent an injustice being done to him. I am not at all surprised at the publication of this private and confidential correspondence, because I was threatened with the same during my election in 1887, unless I paid \$5,000 for it, an offer which I indignantly refused, at the same time telling the party that he was welcome to publish everything in connection with the Cypress Hills limit, and that nothing that could be said or done would redound to my discredit. As the *Globe* has seen fit, with its customary notion of fair play, to publish such letters as it thought would reflect discredit upon myself, I would crave your indulgence by asking you to publish a portion of a letter which I addressed to the electors of Lincoln in February, 1887, in answer to the malicious attack made upon me by my opponents, that I had violated the Independence of Parliament Act. It is as follows:—

“As I understand the law, a member of Parliament cannot be charged with a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act unless he does something in violation of it. He cannot be said to be guilty of a breach of trust as a representative of the people unless he violates some law which reposes that trust in him. Now, let me explain to you what the law which particularly affects timber

Mr. MITCHELL.

limits was at the time the application for the Cypress Hills limit was made, and I may at the same time be permitted to state who made that law.

“Section 50 of 35 Victoria, chapter 23, declared that :—
“The right of cutting timber on such limits shall be put up at a bonus per square mile, varying according to the situation and value of the limit, and sold to the highest bidder by competition, either by tender or at public auction.”

“This was the law when the Macdonald Government left office, but it was speedily amended after Mackenzie came into power, no doubt to enable him to satisfy many of his followers who had M. P. attached to their names, and nobly did he respond to their impetuous demands, as the public records show. By section 11 of 37 Victoria, chapter 19, the law was amended by adding the following proviso to section 51 of the Act of 1872 :

“Provided further, that in cases where application may be made for limits on which to cut timber in unsurveyed territory, the Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister of the Interior, authorise the same to be leased for such bonus as may be deemed fair and reasonable, such leases to be subject, nevertheless, to the foregoing conditions in this section, except as to that part of sub-section 1 which provides for the erection of mills, which provision, in respect to unsurveyed territories, may, if considered expedient by the Minister of the Interior, be dispensed with.”

“Under the Act of 1872, timber licenses had to be sold by public competition to the highest bidder. This wise provision was done away with by Mr. Mackenzie, as you will see, and, as a result of it, any person could have a license by applying to the Government for an Order in Council, without being subjected to public competition and the payment of, perhaps, a large bonus. Within a very brief period after Mr. Mackenzie changed the law, Orders in Council were passed by him, granting 605 square miles, or 387,200 acres, to friends of that Government, and for which they only paid \$6,160. Among the grantees of the licenses were many Grit M.P.'s. The law remained the same ever since that time, except that the Conservative Government changed the licenses from twenty-one years to one year. Now, under the law as it existed at the time, Mr. Mackenzie passed Orders in Council for his friends to the extent of 605 square miles. It was doubtful if any member of Parliament could take the benefit of the same, or be interested in any contract with the Government, with colonisation and other companies, but this doubt was removed by Mr. Mackenzie in 1878, after a number of Grit M.P.'s had violated the Independence of Parliament Act, by an Act passed, chap. 5, 41 Vict. The law, as I have pointed out, does not prevent a member of Parliament applying for a timber license, and therefore if I had applied for the Cypress Hills limit myself, it was quite open and legal for me to do so. You will recollect that Mr. H. H. Cook, M.P., in 1878, applied for a license while the House was actually in session and it was promised to him, but no Order in Council was passed until 7th October, 1878, three weeks after Mr. Mackenzie was defeated, and the day before he resigned. This Order in Council was for 200 square miles in sections of twenty miles each wherever he might select them, including the very Cypress Hills limit. With this, no fault was found by any Reformer, but when a Conservative happened to apply for a similar favor for his friends, it is a breach of trust and a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act.”

“Now, what are the facts? In 1881 Mr. John Adams asked me to apply for a limit in the North-West Territory, and 700 miles from Winnipeg or any railway. I told Mr. Adams he was crazy, and advised him not to go into it, more especially as he told me he had to pay one Muckle (\$5,000) for the information. I showed him that he would have to take the lumber 1,300 miles by river to Winnipeg, and then compete with the lumber from the disputed territory. He wanted me to go halves with him and advance part of the money, but I declined to invest money on any such hazardous enterprise.

“He then proposed that I should go into the venture with him, and look to the same for any expenses I might incur in assisting him in getting up a company, or in working the limit. This I also declined. I told him I would make his application for him, which I did on the 18th day of February, 1882. Mr. Adams then stated to me that he would make Mrs. Rykert a present of one-half of what he made out of the limit, after deducting all expenses, which fact he communicated to her, and after the limit was sold he honestly carried out his promise. An Order in Council was passed granting Mr. Adams the right to select a limit in the Cypress Hills. Before Mr. Adams left for home he agreed to pay me \$100 per day for every day I might be engaged in business in connection with this limit, either in Winnipeg or the North-West. Mr. Adams at once organised a surveying party at a very

heavy cost, and had the limit surveyed as the law required, and the license was finally issued to him in September, 1882, for 37½ square miles. Can you say that I did anything wrong in making the application for Mr. Adams when the law was open to anybody to apply? Is there a tittle of evidence that I in any way took advantage of my position as a member of Parliament in applying for a license, or in any way committed a breach of trust? If the law allowed Mr. Adams to apply individually, or through me, for this limit, and he in all respects complied with its provisions, then it made no difference whether he made \$100 or \$200,000. But my opponents say Mr. Adams ought to have paid a bonus for so valuable a limit. They chose to forget the fact that when he applied for this limit no person would have undertaken to comply with the terms of the law, viz., erect a mill in six months, and pay heavy dues on a limit which at that time was far remote from any settlement, and not within reach of any railroad. At the time this limit was granted to Mr. Adams the Canadian Pacific Railway was compelled by law to go by the Yellowhead Pass—a point distant 600 miles from the limit. In May, 1882, the company applied to Parliament for leave to change their route, if necessary; and subsequently located it, passing within 30 miles of the Cypress Hills. Had it not been for this sudden change, the limit to-day would have been utterly valueless. Why do they not complain that Mr. Cook, M.P., was granted a limit of 200 square miles, scattered in sections all over the North-West, and was allowed three years to comply with any of the conditions required by law? Mr. Adams was compelled to erect his mill in six months, and pay annually \$250, besides being obliged to perform other very onerous conditions. Would any of these purists have complained if Mr. Cook had made \$200,000, or even a million of dollars? They did not complain when their friend Macaulay received a license without paying a bonus, and sold the same immediately for \$300,000.

"Now as to the second charge. If my opponents do not abandon the first charge and claim that the limit was worth all that Mr. Sands paid for it, then that gentleman could have no ground for complaint; and, on the other hand, if the limit turned out to be worthless, then the country has lost nothing. Upon either one or the other horn of the dilemma must my slanderers stand. It will be admitted that I could not waylay the agent of Mr. Sands unless I was in that country, nor could I be a party to any conspiracy to defraud Mr. Sands unless I knew that he was about to become, or was in fact the purchaser, and intended to send his explorer to examine the limit. That I was not in Winnipeg at the time is best proven by the following correspondence, which shows clearly that not only was I in St. Catharines, but that I could not possibly have waylaid Mr. Sands' agent:

"LETTER FROM JOHN ADAMS TO J. C. RYKERT.

"WINNIPEG, 7th November, 1882.

"MY DEAR MR. RYKERT.—No word from Mercer yet. Met several parties that saw him near the limit. I saw a party to-day that came from there, and left Mercer there. I know this party well; he said it was a splendid limit, and that Mercer was stopping some parties from cutting. The party offered me \$150,000; I cannot do anything till after the 12th. I hope Mercer will be back in a day or two. Will telegraph you if I hear anything. Saw P. McCarthy to-day; he thought if I got \$75,000 I ought to be satisfied, and give Mr. Rykert \$50,000. I told him M. Rykert had nothing to do with it. I hope Hunter will succeed in getting up a company.

"Yours truly,

"(Signed) JOHN ADAMS."

"JOHN ADAMS TO J. C. RYKERT.

"WINNIPEG, 8th November, 1882.

"MY DEAR MR. RYKERT.—Mercer is here; he will give you all particulars; is writing you to-day. Mercer saw Dr. Jukes; he is looking well.

"Yours,

"(Signed) JOHN ADAMS."

"TELEGRAM MERCER ADAMS TO J. C. RYKERT

"WINNIPEG, 11th November, 1882.

"To J. C. RYKERT:

"Returned all right; wrote yesterday.

"(Signed) M. J. ADAMS."

"TELEGRAM JOHN ADAMS TO J. C. RYKERT.

"WINNIPEG, 14th November, 1882.

"To J. C. RYKERT:

"Explorer not back yet; will let you know when he comes.

"(Signed) JOHN ADAMS."

"TELEGRAM M. J. ADAMS TO J. C. RYKERT.

"WINNIPEG, 17th November, 1882.

"To J. C. RYKERT, M.P.:

"Explorer not time to fully report; myself and two others start Monday to get full report.

"(Signed) M. J. ADAMS."

"TELEGRAM JOHN ADAMS TO J. C. RYKERT.

"WINNIPEG, 18th November, 1882.

"To J. C. RYKERT, M.P.:

"Parties all here, to meet at 3 o'clock.

"(Signed) JOHN ADAMS."

"LETTER MERCER TO J. C. RYKERT.

"WINNIPEG, 6th December, 1882.

"J. C. RYKERT, M.P.:

"MY DEAR SIR.—I returned from the limit on Monday, and I think we made good time. The explorer did not go all over the limit; he did not think it necessary, but he saw enough to justify him in recommending the purchase of it. He has telegraphed to his employer to come at once, and I believe that as soon as he comes the thing will be settled."

"(Signed) M. J. ADAMS."

"LETTER JOHN ADAMS TO J. C. RYKERT.

"WINNIPEG, 11th December, 1882.

"MY DEAR RYKERT.—In dealing with Mr. Sands I took Mr. McCarthy's advice; the next thing to do was to go to our banker, and he telegraphed to Manistee, Mich., which you will find enclosed. Now Mr. Sands would not give Zimmerman a quarter in it for nothing, and said if Mr. Zimmerman put up the money on or before the 20th he would take his deposit money back. I don't think there is any danger. You advised me to take \$150,000; now I got \$175,000, and he binds himself not to cut more than 10,000,000 in first and second year. What about the transfer? Will it have to go to Ottawa? Sands has every confidence in me.

"(Signed) JOHN ADAMS."

"TELEGRAM ADAMS TO RYKERT.

"WINNIPEG, 9th January, 1883.

"To J. C. RYKERT:

"Come to Winnipeg; room at Queen's.

"(Signed) JOHN ADAMS."

"This correspondence ought to satisfy any unprejudiced mind that I had nothing to do with either Mr. Sands or his explorer. I never saw Mr. Sands until the 16th of January, 1883, when the agreement was finally executed, and the license, which up to that time was in Adams' name, was transferred to Mr. McCarthy and myself as trustees respectively for Mr. Sands and Mr. Adams. If any further proof of this is required, I have the answer of Mr. Sands in a letter written by him on 7th February, 1887. I asked him certain questions to which he replied:

"Question—Did you ever know or see me before you negotiated the purchase of the limit?"

"Answer—No.

"Question—Was not the agreement entered into between Mr. Adams and yourself before my arrival in Winnipeg in January, 1883?"

"Answer—No; the agreement was entered into between myself and R. H. Hunter, the agent, and a member of the pool.

"What evidence has Mr. Pattison presented of any conspiracy? There is no pretence whatever that I was in Winnipeg when Mr. Sands first entered into negotiations for the purchase of the limit, and is there a shadow of a pretext for ever saying that I saw this explorer whom Mr. Sands sent to examine the limits? Any unprejudiced man must admit that the second charge was and is a base slander, and ought never to have been made by any person pretending to possess any of the instincts of a gentleman.

"As to the third charge—that Mr. Sands never knew that the Canadian Pacific Railway claimed any portion of the limit, I have this to say: That Mr. Sands was the first to communicate to me the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway claimed every alternate section on the limit, in a letter written by him to me a short time after the purchase of the limit, and urged me very strongly to get the matter settled. I made enquiries at once at the Department at Ottawa, and ascertained that the company, through their agent, Mr. Hamton, had entered a protest against renewing the license for the section which it claimed came within their charter. I then made further enquiries, and found that the company had de-

flected or changed its line so as to bring the same within the 24-mile belt, and consequently entitle it to claim every alternate section. I made every possible remonstrance to the Government against permitting the Canadian Pacific Railway to claim any portion of the limit, which had been granted in unsurveyed territory, long before the company had power to change its line, but without avail. The company persisted in its claim, and Mr. Sands had to yield. I afterwards met Mr. Sands in Toronto, when he requested me to make every effort to get the company to withdraw any claim they pretended to have, and failing in that to negotiate with the company for a sale of the land for a sum per acre to be agreed upon, not exceeding \$3.00 or \$3.50 per acre. I was engaged the greater part of the year between St. Catharines, Ottawa and Montreal, endeavoring to have Mr. Sands' rights to the whole limit recognised, and, not succeeding in that, I finally induced the company to sell to Mr. Sands for \$2.25 per acre. The following correspondence will show how the Canadian Pacific Railway claimed the odd sections, and that Mr. Sands knew of their claims.

“ J. C. RYKERT, M.P.: “ MONTREAL, 18th Feb., 1884.

“ DEAR MR. RYKERT,—I have your letter of the 16th. I have to-day instructed Mr. Tavish fully of the basis of settlement of the Cypress Hills limit matter, and have told him that you will communicate with him direct when you are ready to make a selection, and close the thing up.

“ (Signed) C. DRINKWATER,
“ Secretary C.P.R.”

“ The following was the agreement referred to in the letter:

“ Five thousand acres within limit, 8 sections, whether covered by timber or not, no less than a full section to be selected; \$2.25 per acre to be paid by purchaser, and all claims, whether for timber taken or damages to the limit by the company, to be abandoned. Selection of land to be made within three months and communicated to the company.

“ (Signed) C. D.”

“ A copy of this agreement was sent to Mr. Sands.

“ The following telegrams were received by me from Sands:—

“ 16th February, 1884.

“ To J. C. RYKERT:

“ Green timber covers about six thousand acres; dead timber covers about the same, but scattered over the limit.

“ (Signed) L. SANDS.”

“ 25th June, 1883.

“ To J. C. RYKERT:

“ Cannot decide yet. My men are now looking the sections. I expect their report every day.

“ (Signed) LOUIS SANDS.”

“ The following letter was received by me:—

“ MANISTEE, MICH., 7th July, 1884.

“ MR. J. C. RYKERT:

“ DEAR SIR,—The following odd sections in the following towns and ranges in the Cypress Hills are those that my man has selected, are to be bought of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, namely (here he enumerates them). I have never heard what were the terms of payment. The terms must be made easy.

“ (Signed) L. SANDS.”

“ It appears by Mr. Sands' letter to me of the 1st of August, 1883, that he suspected there had been deception practised upon him as to the quantity of timber on the limit, for in a letter of that date he says:

“ In my opinion my man Udell has been paid money by Mr. Adams, or some one else, to report to me a larger amount of timber than there was on the ground, as there is no more than 16,200,000 by my own and another expert's evidence, and Udell and Adams' estimate calls for 100 more.

“ If his man Udell was bribed by Mr. Adams, or some one else, and he knew it, in August, 1882, why did he not expose the transaction then? If he had any suspicion that I had anything to do with this, why did he employ me to fight the Canadian Pacific Railway, and afterwards ask me to negotiate with them for the sections as stated above? If I were blamed by Mr. Sands, why did he write to me on 23rd September, 1883, and use this language in that letter:

“ Let me hear from you if anything turns up. Also if you can receive for me permission to locate a new limit,
MR. BOWELL.

as you spoke about. I and my family are well, and my business fairly prosperous and good here. Hoping you may have the same blessing.

“ I remain, yours very respectfully,

“ (Signed) L. SANDS.”

“ Surely this was rather familiar language from a man to a person who had robbed him! Why did he, as late as 7th July, 1884, as before shown, write me to select the railway sections for him? The statement is absurd on the very face of it, and no man knows it better than Mr. Pattison that the charge is utterly false and without any color of foundation. Mr. Pattison says that I assisted in robbing this innocent, wealthy Dutchman out of \$240,100. Well, let us see what is his position to-day. He purchased limits with his eyes wide open, after having sent his own confidential agent to examine the same.' He considered the limits worth the money as late as 5th June, 1883, for on that day he wrote to me as follows:

“ I trust, and I am in hopes still, that you will succeed in getting a license for the whole limit, in which case I will have lost nothing in the transaction.

“ Later on he had the misfortune to have a fire in the limits destroy a large quantity of valuable timber, as stated by him in a letter to me dated 28th September, 1883. At the time he purchased and for a considerable time thereafter lumber ranged from \$40 to \$50 per thousand, and then tumbled down to half that figure. Besides this, for various reasons, as you well know, settlers did not go into that territory as rapidly as was expected, and therefore the sales of lumber were not as anticipated by Mr. Sands. I have no doubt that Mr. Sands has been disappointed in his venture, but it is idle for anybody to say that the limit was not a very valuable one, and worth all he paid for it. Every report of the limit from every quarter, together with the detailed reports of the surveyors, all corroborate this. If Mr. Pattison had no evidence other than that which he ultimately produced in the Opera House upon which to base his charges, it must be evident that the only motive he could have had was to wilfully and maliciously slander me, for the sole and only purpose of injuring me in your estimation as a public man. He did not up to that time, nor has he since dared to challenge any of my public acts as your representative for the last twenty-eight years, for he knows well that you had passed judgment upon them favorably on nine different occasions, but he hopes that the charges so suddenly made, and of so aggravated a nature, could not be met by me before the day of polling.

“ But there are certain statements made in the published letters, which anyone will see are answers to letters written to me which require explanation, and which will be better understood by a brief statement of certain facts. Some time after the license was applied for it was discovered that Mr. Laidlaw had made application to select a limit out of an area of 800 square miles which overlapped that of Mr. Adams. At the request of the Deputy Minister an arrangement was subsequently arrived at between Mr. Adams and Mr. Laidlaw. Before the survey was completed, in the month of June, 1882, it was discovered by Adams that the C. P. R., through their timber agent, Mr. Muckle, who was interested in the Adams limit, was cutting timber off the limit for the Medicine Hat bridge. Mr. Adams informed me the C. P. R. wanted the limit, and suggested a sale to them, and I advised him to sell at the price he named in his letter to me, and to explain to the company that the limit was well worth the amount, as it was, in fact; and in answer to his enquiry about another limit, told him he could put in another application. Mr. Adams, in his letters and in conversation, repeatedly told me he had other and better limits in view which he would apply for if he could sell the Cypress Hills limit, and it was that to which I referred several times in my letters to him. When the survey was completed and license issued Mr. Adams telegraphed me to go to Winnipeg and stop the C. P. R. destroying the limit. I accordingly went to Winnipeg, and Mr. Adams having given me a statement of his claim for damages, which had been furnished to him by the C. P. R.'s agent, Muckle, I saw the directors of the road, who then and there agreed to pay the claim, if on enquiry it was found that they had cut the timber, and at the same time offered to take all the ties Mr. Adams could deliver at a fair price. Up to this time no claim was made by the company to the alternate sections. When I discovered that a claim was made I at once represented the matter to the Government and insisted upon the license being renewed. I also called upon Mr. McArthur to send his partners, Messrs. Tupper and Macdonald, to Ottawa, as they were the solicitors for Mr. Sands and had passed his title, to explain the matter fully to the Minister of Railways and the Premier, and urge that good faith should be kept with Mr. Adams in respect to his license. I appealed also to other members

of the Government to see that justice was done, and I am quite certain that, so far as they could consistently do so, urged the C.P.R. to abandon its claim on the limit. Finding that the C.P.R. would not abandon its claim, I then, with the approval of Mr. Sands and Mr. Adams, appealed to different members of the Government to ask the company to sell such sections as might be found to contain any timber, and after much negotiation the very satisfactory agreement referred to in my letter above was arrived at. I wish to say most distinctly that no offer or inducement was ever made, directly or indirectly, to any member of the Government, either to procure the license originally, or afterwards to induce the C.P.R. to yield its claim. A number of persons, referred to in one of my letters published in the *Globe*, had volunteered to get the claim of the C.P.R. released, among them Mr. Muckle and Mr. Kirby, and under the arrangement made with Mr. Adams at the Queen's Hotel, I was authorised to negotiate with them, but neither the solicitors for Mr. Sands in Winnipeg, nor any persons in any way connected with the Government, at any time received or demanded from me, or were promised, any compensation for services rendered by them in seeing that justice was done Mr. Adams. I would not have taken the trouble to make any explanation of the matter, knowing that after a full examination of all the facts, the electors of Lincoln expressed their confidence in my integrity by increasing my majority to 500! were it not that the *Globe* has, by the publication of part of the correspondence (which was of a purely confidential character), attempted to cast a reflection upon the conduct of the Government in connection with this license.

"I am prepared to have, and desire the most searching enquiry into the whole case, and am satisfied that nothing can be shown which will reflect discredit upon the Government or myself.

"Yours truly,

"J. C. RYKERT.

"10th February, 1890."

"(From Official Debates, House of Commons.)

"PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

"Mr. RYKERT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to make a personal explanation in regard to certain matters which have appeared in the public press during the last few days. In the *Globe* of last Saturday there appeared a large number of letters purporting to be written by myself in regard to a timber limit in the North-West Territories. And in the *Globe* of Tuesday last a reference is made to this correspondence, and the charge is also made that I, as a member of this House, have been guilty of a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act, and that I have used my position as a member of Parliament for my own personal and private gain. It is also alleged that connected with that transaction are certain Ministers of the Crown, who, it is alleged, took an active part in respect to this matter. So far as I myself am concerned, I care not what the public press may say about me. I have been in Parliament a great many years, and the result of all attacks has been that I am here a member of this House, and I have occupied the position as representative of my own constituency for upwards of a quarter of a century. This whole correspondence was published during the last election; it was talked about throughout the country, and as a result, my majority was increased from the normal one of about 100 to about 500. So you will see, Mr. Speaker, that so far as my constituents were concerned they took no stock whatever in this correspondence or in matters published throughout my constituency in regard to this matter. I would not, Sir, upon this occasion, take any objection to what has been said were it not that something has been said reflecting on members of the Government. I am able to defend myself on any public platform in this country, and I am prepared to do so on all occasions, but when it is said that Ministers of the Crown are connected with me in a matter which is alleged to be not of a proper character, it is my duty at the very outset to satisfy this House that they have nothing whatever to do with it. I entirely exonerate the Government from anything improper. It must have struck hon. gentlemen on reading this correspondence, that there is something very peculiar about it. In the first place, it is a private and confidential correspondence. It also appears that those letters were written in answer to other letters addressed to myself, and that some of the letters which have been suppressed are of a very important character. It must also have suggested itself to persons reading it that all this correspondence took place after these limits in the North-West Territories were granted to Mr. Adams, and that this has nothing whatever to do with

my position as a member of Parliament. I propose to-day to supply to the House and the country some letters which have not been published, which will go a long way to explain the reason why some of the correspondence was written by myself, and also give several explanations regarding that correspondence, without which it might appear somewhat strange. Let me say, in the first place, as regards my being guilty of a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act, and as having prostituted my position as a member of Parliament, that, according to the law of the land, a law placed upon the Statute-book by the late Government, the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, that any person had the right to make application to the Government for a timber limit in the North-West Territories without tenders being asked, the old law had been repealed by the late Government, that any person could apply to the Government for the purpose of obtaining a limit in the North-West Territories. It is well known that this was taken advantage of, but I will not enter upon this question on this occasion. But in accordance with the law as it then stood, and the law is on the Statute-book, any company, composed of members of Parliament or other persons, had a perfect right to go to the Government and ask for a timber limit in the North-West Territories. I will state the facts briefly. On behalf of Mr. John Adams I was applied to get a timber limit in the North-West Territories. The correspondence leading up to that has not been published, and I propose to supply that, although I will not trouble the House with reading the letters in full, but I will place them in the hands of the official reporters of the House. I submit them in order to set myself right before the country and the House, and also to explain several observations made in the letters which have been published in the *Globe*. Mr. Adams, knowing that he had a perfect right to apply for a timber limit, wrote to me on 15th December, 1882, asking me to procure for him a limit in the North-West Territories, and asking me what proceeding he should adopt in order that he could get that limit. I replied, on 22nd December, that I received his letter, that I did not know when I would go to Ottawa, and if I could be any aid to him when I got there I would be pleased to assist him. I asked him in reference to different matters up there which will appear in the correspondence. On 18th January Mr. Adams wrote to me. He said:

"I think I have a good thing up here, and I am told by a timber agent that if I only apply to the Government I can get hold of it. Now, I do not know how to apply, and want you to help me, as I know you can if you like. Perhaps you can better yourself by helping me, as I will pay you well for all you do for me. Can I get up a company up here and apply for limits? I can get good men to help me. I have made a good deal of money up here and hope to make more."

"On 11th January I wrote to him:

"I know nothing of the prospects of getting limits, nor do I know what are the rules of the Department about applying. If you send me particulars of what you want, I will see the Department or send to my agent at Ottawa and enquire."

"Then, on the 25th January, I wrote again:

"I am delighted to hear you are making money. Nothing would please me better than to see you here again with a fortune. As regards the matter you speak of, I shall be pleased to assist you and the company in any way I can, and, of course, I would be glad to better myself in any way which is fair and honorable. It seems to me you ought to organise a company with good men, as you suggest, and then apply to the Government. I expect to be in Ottawa in two weeks, when I can perhaps do you service. Keep me posted as to what you want."

"I may state here that when the application was sent to me there was no location defined, and knowing that the Government would not allow a person to roam all over the North-West Territories, I asked that some specific description be given, in order that the Department would know what territory would be looked over by Mr. Adams to get the limit. On 10th February, 1882, I wrote to Mr. Adams:

"I cannot make out from the memo. sent me where the timber limit is, or the boundaries of the same. I have made enquiries in the Department, and they tell me it is necessary to state, as nearly as possible, the boundaries in the application, within which you wish to select fifty square miles—you cannot have any more,—but they will not permit you to wander all over the country. Think they will let you select the limit out of a defined area of 400 miles. I am afraid you are going into a very uncertain speculation, and better make more enquiries."

"Again, on 19th February, I wrote as follows:—

"After talking the matter over with you yesterday, I put in your application, but I am afraid you will have to

be more definite in your description. They tell me in the office there is no timber within the area fixed by you. I will try to have application allowed soon as possible.

"On 20th March I wrote him again:
"Your application has been granted, but the Minister tells me that he thinks it will be worthless to you, as the limit is a good many hundred miles from any railway, and there is not likely to be any for years. They tell me you will have to take timber 1,300 miles by water to Winnipeg, and then compete with the disputed territory. This is your own business, and you must be contented with the right to select within an area of 400 square miles. The Government will not let you play Cook and Sutherland upon it."

"On the 25th of March Mr. Adams wrote to me:
"Why cannot you get a bigger piece to select from, as I do not know anything about the territory? It will cost a large amount for the survey. Don't you think you can take a share in it or get up a company in St. Catharines? I will be liberal to them."

"On 27th March I wrote:
"I cannot see any use in telling you a dozen times about the extent of territory that you can select from. You have now more than is usually granted. I am getting full instructions ready for the surveyor, and you can send him just as soon as I get the order. I would not invest any money in any such speculation, nor can I advise any of my friends to put money in a place of which I know nothing."

"On 8th April he writes:
"What keeps the instructions back; can't you hurry them up? I am sorry you did not get 800 square miles to pick from. I think the delay will make it very costly to have the survey made. I think I can get up a company in Winnipeg to pay \$30,000 or \$50,000; then you can apply for another for me."

"This, Mr. Speaker, you will see, will explain all the observations made in the letter which is published under my own hand on 8th April. I used the same expressions as Mr. Adams made in his letter to me. On 10th April reference is made to the same transaction, and on 11th April the *Globe* also refers to the same. On 16th April Mr. Adams says:

"What is keeping back the order for the surveyor? I am getting very uneasy. Just as soon as this is settled I can get up a company for \$30,000 or \$40,000, or put in the whole for \$70,000 cash. If I succeed I wish to go for something else I have on hand."

"After the order was sent up to Mr. Adams, and he sent a survey party to look over the timber and to locate his limits, word came to Ottawa that the Canadian Pacific Railway were cutting down this timber, and I told him to notify the manager of the company not to trespass further on this limit. On 2nd July I received a letter from Mr. Adams as follows:—

"I send you word to-day that the Canadian Pacific Railway was cutting my timber; and after getting answer, notified the company. They have cut a good deal of the timber; and I think they will have to pay for it. Muckle thinks I can get the Canadian Pacific Railway to purchase at \$60,000 or \$70,000, and I am trying to get them to bite at it, anyway."

"This expression is explained in one of my letters. The letter continues:

"Can they not get the balance of the timber in the 400 miles? I will tell them to see you in Ottawa. I would like to work the limit if the Canadian Pacific Railway will not buy. It will pay better than all the cash we can get."

"What appears in my letter of the 24th is already explained. Adams writes to me from Winnipeg on 18th July:

"Mercer is back from the limit, and he will write you fully to-day. It is a great limit; and I am now satisfied the limit is well worth \$150,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they must have the timber, as there is none nearer than Winnipeg. But they are a hard people to satisfy about the value, unless Muckle will tell them all about it. I will try to get them to feel the men in the office here. I will go to Ottawa as soon as you are ready."

"The letter of 25th July says that the surveyor has arrived and was preparing the documents to send down to Ottawa. On 3rd August, after the papers were sent Mr. Adams, he writes:

"I am so anxious about the affair that I will leave for Ottawa next week, and will meet you in Toronto on my way. I have got a regular bonanza. Don't let them beat me out of it after all my hard work and expense in paying thousands for surveys. I was talking to McCarthy about getting up a company; but Peter has not much faith in it. That is Mr. McCarthy of Winnipeg). I think I can sell

Mr. BOWELL.

for \$80,000 or \$90,000 cash, or I might get up a company and double that amount and take half in stock.

"Then I telegraphed to him that the field notes had arrived, but that the oath of the surveyor had not been attached to it, and he ought to have a new application sworn to. Later on an application was made to have this license issued, but in consequence of some opposition made to it in the Department which is not necessary for me to refer to, it was delayed for some length of time. I mention that fact, because, in one of the letters of 14th September it is stated that Mr. Bowell was helping. Now, the facts are briefly this, in explanation of what the hon. the Minister of Customs did. The application was sent here for a license, and the Minister being away at Rivière du Loup, I was compelled to ask some person in the Government to assist to have that put through as early as possible. I applied to Mr. Bowell and asked him if he would watch it, and when the opportunity arrived to speak of it. In no way did I ask his influence, for, on the contrary, the whole matter had gone beyond the range of influence altogether. The matter had passed out of the hands of the Department, and it was only necessary to have an order issued for the final issuing of the license. Therefore, I simply asked the Minister of Customs if he would look after the matter and see that the thing was satisfactorily arranged for me. That is all the correspondence which leads up to this matter. All the other correspondence referred to has reference entirely to what took place after the license had been issued, and after the Government had refused to renew the license, in consequence of the application made by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the alternate sections. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me here state to the House that when this application was made for this timber license there was no railway within 400 or 500 miles of it. At that time the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were expected to carry their line up to the Yellowhead Pass. During the Session of Parliament after this license was granted the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made application to this Parliament to change their location, and the result was that the location of the railway came within twenty or thirty miles of this limit, so that it was by pure accident that it became valuable. You will see by the correspondence that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company set to work cutting down timber on the limit, in consequence of Mr. Muckle, their timber agent, who was interested in this very limit with Mr. Adams, having induced them to cut down the timber in order to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to buy it. I make that statement, because it was referred to in the correspondence. But when I applied to Mr. Van Horne in Montreal, at the instance of Mr. Adams, who telegraphed instructing me to go there, Mr. Van Horne stated to me that if the timber was cut down he would make it good. Up to that time the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made no claim; but in January, 1883, after the limit was sold, then for the first time it was discovered that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had made up their mind to secure the limit if at all possible. They claimed the alternate sections. It then became my duty, as representing Mr. Adams, to see the sale of the property carried out. Mr. Sands, who had secured the limit, insisted that I should see that the transaction was completed. I came to the Government, went before the Department, and asked them to renew the license. They said that it could not be done, because the Canadian Pacific Railway claimed the property. I urged as strongly as I could that it was the duty of the Government, having given the license long before the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had located their line, to see that the licensee was protected. I was urged to do so by Mr. Sands, whose correspondence I have here, and who insisted on it being done by myself.

"He said, on 21st February, 1880:

"I trust you will be able to protect my interest in this land transaction, for which services I will be happy to pay on demand."

"On 10th April, 1883, he wrote:

"Should anyone interfere with my limit, I shall telegraph you to advise how to proceed."

"Again, on 4th May, 1883, he wrote:

"I trust you will continue to uphold and defend my rights and title to the whole limit on Cypress Hills, and that you will soon be able to obtain for me the necessary limit."

"On 5th June, 1883, he wrote:

"Hence, I trust, and am in hopes still that you will succeed in getting me a license for the whole limit, in which event I will have lost nothing. If, however, you fail to induce your Government to do this act of justice, you will undoubtedly get me a license for the even-sections as soon as possible."

"On 23rd September, 1883, he wrote:

"Trusting you will look after my interests and not let any opportunity slip that may tend to increase my claim or strengthen our side of the case.

"In consequence of this, I urged very strongly on the Government that it was their duty to protect this licensee, and not allow the railway company to go into the unsurveyed territory and take that property. I fortified myself with an opinion from a distinguished member of the firm of Blake, Kerr, Lash & Cassels, of Toronto, which confirmed my own opinion that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had no right, in consequence of the deflection of their line, to take away the license given to another party in the unsurveyed territory. The title was passed by the firm of McArthur & Tupper, of Washington, a firm composed of Mr. McArthur, Mr. Dexter, Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Tupper. The moment it was found that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were endeavoring to take this timber limit, or to destroy it, I telegraphed to Mr. Sands to send Mr. McArthur to Ottawa, in order to show what they had done, and in order to have the matter set right. That is the reference I made to Mr. Tupper and Mr. Macdonald coming here. Those young gentlemen came here and did their duty; in the matter and asked nothing for their services, and got nothing for them. They did what they were bound to do, according to the law, as the solicitors of Mr. Sands. I wish to refer here to one of the letters, a portion of which is printed as follows:—

"I have to go to Ottawa to-morrow night to fight the matter out, which I do not like. I mean to have all the harder part of it to do. I have Bowell working for me, and if we succeed in beating the railway, we will have to pay the amount we agreed to pay, as you recollect, when we two were at the Queen's Hotel."

"This letter is not printed properly; there should be a full stop after 'Bowell working for me.' I put the matter before the Government, and they thought that it was fair that the license should be renewed if at all possible, but they thought that the agreement made between Mr. Adams and myself at the Queen's Hotel in Toronto should be carried out, that if any person would cause the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to abandon their claim, they should be paid for it. There were several persons in this city—Mr. Muckle, Mr. Kirby and others—who offered their services, and claimed that they could have this difficulty removed by the payment of \$5,000 or \$6,000 each. After consideration, it was decided that it was better to buy out the Canadian Pacific Railway claim and pay these gentlemen the money they asked, but no member of the Government, directly or indirectly, ever insinuated that any money was to be paid for their services, or anything of the kind. It was the duty of the Government to see that the license was properly and satisfactorily carried out. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no use of my enlarging much longer on this question. I have explained the correspondence leading to this transaction. The limit was applied for when any person could apply for it, and what took place took place in consequence of the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who finally sold out their rights to Mr. Sands for \$2.25 per acre, after working the limit for upwards of a year. So, that you will see, so far as I was personally concerned, all I did was done in my capacity as Mr. Sand's solicitor and entirely in his behalf. In my position as a member of Parliament I acted in good faith, and in obtaining that license I did what any other member of Parliament had a right to do. I had no faith myself in the enterprise, not knowing where the property was and not thinking it worth anything, and the whole thing was carried out by me in good faith, and did not affect my position as member of Parliament. Of course, I am not responsible for the publication of this correspondence, which I had hoped we had heard the end of after the trouble we had in the county of Lincoln, and after all this correspondence had been hawked about the country, and after the attempts that were made to induce me to buy it, which I refused to do. I will read to the House a telegram which I receive to-day, voluntarily, from Mr. Patterson, of St. Catharines, who was my opponent in the last election, a gentleman who is distinguished in that city, and who acted as the solicitor for Mr. Adams in the suit between that gentleman and me, which suit, I may say, was settled amicably in court. The correspondence had nothing whatever to do with that settlement, but it was in consequence simply of a suggestion coming from Mr. Samuel Blake, who acted for one party, and Mr. Osler, who acted for the other, and it was agreed that the correspondence should be destroyed, and Mr. Patterson telegraphed me to-day, referring to the correspondence published in the *Globe* of Saturday last, as follows:—

"I beg to say I am more surprised than yourself at the publication of this correspondence. The suit was settled agreeably to my client, and one of the terms of the agree-

ment was that the correspondence should be copied and no use made of the copies, and this, speaking for myself and to the best of my belief, for my clients, has been faithfully adhered to. If the correspondence has been given publication by me or my client, it must certainly be a gross breach of faith and in violation of the signed agreement entered into."

"I hold the original agreement signed by the counsel for the parties in which the whole matter was discussed. Now it has been dragged to the light of day, and I care not for myself personally, so long as I entirely exonerate the Government from any blame in the matter. I am prepared to defend myself, and have done so successfully in the county of Lincoln, where I was returned by a majority of five hundred at the last elections."

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the right hon. the First Minister brought down, as he said he would, copies of the Orders in Council referred to in this agreement."

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman asked me for it, and I consented to bring down the papers, but I did not know he wanted them for this discussion."

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will leave it on the Table, that will do."

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly."

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to make a motion, I do not propose to go into a discussion, and lose time by so doing, but merely beg to move:—

"That whereas certain matters and documents reading as follows:—

"I presume the House will permit me to consider these as read."

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes."

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand from the right hon. the First Minister that the House will consider them as read."

"— certain matters and documents reading as follows:— * * * as published in the *Globe* newspaper of 8th February, containing divers statements affecting certain members of this House, and if it is expedient that the House should have an opportunity of examining the same, it is ordered, that the said letters above cited be printed in the *Votes and Proceedings* for the use of members."

"The House is now in possession of the hon. member for Lincoln's explanations. I desire that the House should have the other documents which piece out the documents the hon. gentleman has referred to; and when the House is fully seized of them, we will be in a position to deal with this matter. I should be very glad, therefore, if the House will permit me, to include in that motion:—

"And any other papers or correspondence that the hon. member for Lincoln desires to have included."

"My wish being that the House should be seized of everything."

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have asked the hon. gentleman, as it is a matter which affects him so considerably, if he requires a notice, and he only brings the condition, which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is willing to grant, that besides the papers that hon. gentleman has moved for, the hon. member for Lincoln will be at liberty to put in the *Votes and Proceedings* any other papers in connection with the matter."

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose all the hon. gentleman's papers are dated?"

"Mr. RYKERT. They are all in regular order. I have never put anything irregular before the House."

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would make it more convenient for the use of hon. gentlemen if the letters the hon. gentleman wishes to interpolate were placed in order, as some of them are letters in reply to those contained in the document I have handed in."

"Mr. RYKERT. I have a hundred more, if the hon. gentleman would like to have them."

"Mr. SPEAKER. As this motion must go into the *Votes and Proceedings*, what papers are required should be described."

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Lincoln will put in within twenty-four hours all the papers, and we will have the whole story."

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection in the world to that."

"Mr. SPEAKER. The correspondence should be defined, so that we may know what papers are to be printed in the *Votes and Proceedings*."

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would suggest that, in order that the hon. member for Lincoln may put in all his papers, the hon. member will postpone his motion until to-morrow, and all the papers can be put in to-morrow."

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection

to that. It is perfectly fair that the hon. member for Lincoln should put his side of the question as fully as he pleases.

"Motion withdrawn.

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for Lincoln, I suppose, will send me within a reasonable time a list of the papers he wants inserted, so that I can add them to this motion, as suggested by the First Minister.

"Mr. RYKERT. I will hand them to *Hansard*, but will not copy them for the hon. gentleman.

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not require the hon. gentleman to copy them. No doubt the *Hansard* will copy them, and he can get them back from *Hansard*. All I want is to be enabled to make this motion in the form suggested by the First Minister.

"Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand the hon. member for Lincoln to say that he has handed in to *Hansard* all the papers he proposes to include. If that be the case, is there any object in delaying the motion, or does the hon. gentleman wish to hand the papers to the hon. member for South Oxford, so that they may be included?

"Mr. RYKERT. I propose that they shall go to *Hansard* at once, and they can be got back from *Hansard* and handed to the hon. gentleman.

"Mr. BOWELL. Before this question is closed, I desire to say one or two words in connection with the use of my name in this correspondence. The explanation given by the hon. gentleman of the conversation he had with me while the right hon. the First Minister, who, I think, was then Minister of the Interior, was absent at Rivière du Loup, is substantially correct; but I think he might have added that he had represented to me that the Canadian Pacific Railway had diverted their line some distance to the south in order to enable them to take possession of this timber limit for which he had obtained a license. If my recollection serves me right, I replied that in such case I thought his interests ought to be protected, and that I should bring the matter before my colleagues at the earliest possible moment. If that be a crime, I am sure it is one I have committed a great many times since I have been a member of the Government. There is scarcely a member of the House who has had any business with the Customs Department—and they are not a few—to whom I have not given precisely the same answer. To that portion of the correspondence I have no objection, but when I find the letter of 20th January couched in language of this kind, I think it must either be a misprint, or that the hon. gentleman was singularly unfortunate in selecting language to convey his ideas of what he was doing in Ottawa in connection with the extension of the lease or the re-issue of the lease to him. I find in the letter of 28th January the following language:—

"I have to go to Ottawa to-morrow night to fight the matter out, which I do not like. I mean to have all the hardest part of it to do. I have Bowell working for me. And if we succeed in beating the railway, we will have to pay the amount we agreed to pay, as you recollect, when we two were at the Queen's Hotel. I have not slept any for a week on account of this. We must keep perfectly quiet."

"A little further on he says:

"I am engaging all I can to assist me at Ottawa, and we will have to pay 'hem well for it, as we cannot afford to lose this."

"This language has to be taken in connection with the language of 12th February, in which he says, writing to Mr. Adams:

"I have not yet succeeded in doing anything, but I am pulling wires in every direction. John A.'s son from Winnipeg, McArthur's partner, is here, and I intend employing him to go for his father. I think if you had young Tupper here, and paid him pretty well, he would help us materially. The Canadian Pacific Railway has a great hold on the Government, and we must counteract this in some way."

"I may say, to avoid any charge of misquotation, that I am omitting certain portions of these letters. He goes on:

"I am completely sick of it, as it is something I had no right to expect, and which I should not be called upon to undertake. If it costs all we spoke of, we had better do it than let it go."

"In another letter, dated 5th March, 1883, he says: "I have not yet succeeded in getting anything done in the limit matter. I have brought Macdonald and Tupper from Winnipeg, and hope they will be able to induce their fathers to act properly in the matter."

"Mr. RYKERT. It should be 'promptly.'

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is evident that what the hon. gentleman intended was that what was done promptly was done properly.

Mr. BOWELL.

"Mr. BOWELL. I think, if the dates are looked at, the hon. gentleman will find that it was not done promptly. The writer goes on:

"I am almost discouraged at the delay. Sands is writing me daily about it. He knows all about it. Some persons sent him the papers containing the statements. Will make any effort this week, and must do something, if we have to let a note apiece go"—

"Whatever that may mean. Then, on the 8th March he writes:

"I find difficulties surrounding us in every way in reference to the limit, and I find that the Canadian Pacific Railway have certain Ministers working for them. I am afraid it will cost us each six or seven thousand dollars to get this made all right. I have five or six at work for me, and have agreed to pay them well if they succeed. Muckle was here and told me the limit was all within the belt. I am afraid they will do their very utmost to defeat me. I want to be satisfied that you are sure I am doing what is right, and also that you will back me out in all that I do in the way of payment."

"On the 28th March, 1883, I find the following:—

"I am having a hard time with the limit matter. It will cost us each at least \$5,500 to get this through. I have laid my ropes so that I expect to have it settled in a few days. I have a dozen at work for us. You must be prepared to pay the amount of your share at any time, as it will have to be all cash. I had Tupper and Macdonald brought from Winnipeg, and they have been working hard for me."

"In regard to this correspondence, I have simply to say, that while I admit the interview to which the hon. gentleman refers—and every Minister has to grant an interview to any and every gentleman who has business with the Department—I cannot reconcile the language in the subsequent letters which I have read with the explanation which the hon. gentleman has made. If the statements in those letters mean anything, they mean that the Canadian Pacific Railway had six members of the Government working for them, in order to deprive the hon. gentleman of a right which he had obtained for his client in these limits; that the balance of the members of the Cabinet were working for him, and that, if they succeed in obtaining what he wanted, they were to be well paid. The hon. gentleman denies that. I cannot possibly imagine that he intended to convey that meaning, but I repeat what I have already said, that, either he has been singularly unfortunate in the use of the English language to convey his meaning and his ideas, or he meant to convey to the men for whom he was working that he had purchased the balance of the Cabinet for the insignificant sum of \$5,500. I should be glad to hear from the hon. gentleman before this discussion closes an explanation of this point. I do not think it is necessary for any member of the Cabinet to make a distinct and positive, or even an indirect, denial of the statements made in those letters, if my interpretation of the language used is correct; but I again repeat, and with a good deal of emphasis, that I can put no other construction upon that language. I hope to hear from the hon. gentleman that he did not intend to convey that construction. If he did, I desire to give it, in the most emphatic language, the most positive denial.

An hon. MEMBER. A lie.

"Mr. BOWELL. I might in such a case, as suggested by an hon. gentleman opposite, designate it by stronger language. In justice to Mr. Hugh John Macdonald and Mr. Tupper, I am bound to read a telegram from the former gentleman. In these letters it is stated that Messrs. Macdonald and Tupper were brought to Ottawa in order to operate upon, or compel, or induce their fathers to do what the hon. gentleman thought was right. In the last letter I read he says:

"I had Tupper and Macdonald brought from Winnipeg, and they have been working hard for me."

On the 11th February, Mr. Macdonald telegraphs as follows:—

"Our firm acted as solicitors for purchasers of Rykert limit and charged ordinary fees. Neither Stewart—

"That is Mr. Tupper—

"—nor I had any interest in the limit or acted for or received any money from Rykert, and never went to Ottawa about the matter. Am writing,

"HUGH J. MACDONALD."
"It is only justice to those gentlemen that I should read this to the House, in reply to the statement that they were brought here to operate upon their parents in this matter. That is a question which I leave to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) to settle with Messrs. Macdonald and Tupper. I deem it justice to myself and to this firm to have made the statement, and having done so, I leave the matter with the House to form their own

opinion as to the character of this correspondence, and those who are assailed in it.

"Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman certainly could not have understood my explanations with reference to the payments of moneys. I distinctly stated that it was agreed at the Queen's Hotel, in Toronto, that certain moneys should be paid to parties who had volunteered their services to get the Canadian Pacific Railway claim removed. One of those gentlemen said he could get it removed for \$5,000, another said he could get it removed for \$3,000, and they made certain propositions. I stated distinctly that no member of the Government, either directly or indirectly, ever took anything or asked for anything. I put that as strong as I could. As regards the telegram received, all I can say is this: that I wrote to Mr. McArthur, the senior member of the firm, asking him to send those gentlemen to Ottawa. Mr. Sands also saw Mr. McArthur, other persons saw them, Mr. Abbott saw them also, asking him to send those gentlemen down to explain the matter and see what the position was. I saw these gentlemen in Ottawa and spoke in reference to that matter. I urged them to see what the facts were. That is as clear as noonday. I am quite satisfied that these gentlemen, when they come here, will recollect distinctly the conversation, for I asked them to go and see what could be done. Sir Charles Tupper distinctly stated to me that the line having been deflected by the railway company they were bound to protect the licensee. He said he would take the bull by the horns and see that the matter was properly attended to, if at all possible.

"Mr. McCARTHY. I find that my name is mentioned in this correspondence, and certainly, under other circumstances, I should not have thought it of sufficient importance to bring it before the House; but as the matter is now mentioned here upon the floor of the House, I think it well to state what my connection with the transaction was. In the month of January, 1882, at the request of two constituents of mine, of the name of Shortreed & Laidlaw, a lumbering firm, I forwarded to the Minister an application for a certain limit which they described, and of which, I think, they sent a plan. In response to that I received a reply that the limit would not be sold at that time, which reply I communicated to my constituents, Messrs. Shortreed & Laidlaw. I have not any recollection, though at this time I would not say it was impossible, that I ever interfered in the matter further until the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), as is stated in this letter, told me that the Government had arranged, or the Department had arranged, that this limit should be sold, but that as Messrs. Shortreed & Laidlaw's application was first, some arrangement would have to be made with them. A brother of Mr. Laidlaw, Mr. William Laidlaw, was acting, as I have learned, as solicitor for the firm of Messrs. Shortreed & Laidlaw. I communicated with him, and from that time out the arrangement was made by Mr. William Laidlaw and the hon. member for Lincoln. The arrangement was, as I remember it, that the limit that had been applied for by Messrs. Shortreed & Laidlaw should be granted to them if it turned out that the timber was upon that part; and if there was any timber to be found there, at their joint expense a surveyor should be sent up; and if timber was not upon the portion for which they applied, then the limit was to go to the gentleman for whom the member for Lincoln was acting. I heard nothing more of the matter until some time, I think late in August, when I was again appealed to by these gentlemen, who said that they had learned that something was being done which they did not think was fair or right by their claim. They begged of me to come down to Ottawa and see about it. I put them off; I said it was useless to go, the Ministers were away; but I promised to write, and I did write to the Department, claiming that nothing should be done until I had an opportunity of coming to the Capital. When I came here afterwards, in the month of September, I found the limit was granted to the applicant, Mr. Adams, for whom the member for Lincoln was acting. I reported that to my constituents, or, rather, to their solicitor, Mr. William Laidlaw, and my connection in the matter practically then ceased. They were very much dissatisfied. I need not go into that now, because I had no connection with that. They were very much dissatisfied indeed, and I think they appealed subsequently to the Department with reference to it; but, practically, from that time out I had nothing more to do with it. I had no interest, direct or indirect, with Messrs. Shortreed & Laidlaw; my whole concern was in forwarding the application of my constituents, this lumbering firm that I have spoken of.

"Mr. MITCHELL. I think, before we depart from this very interesting subject, it is desirable to say something more about it. I feel it to be due to the Minister of

Customs to say that, whatever other people may think of his conduct in this matter, his explanation entirely removes any doubt that might have existed in the minds of any person in relation to that correspondence. I am sure that there is no person in this House who read that correspondence but will pronounce it an infamous correspondence, so far as it relates to the Minister of Customs. Therefore I think the House should feel that he has given a full and ample explanation, and has quite removed from himself and his reputation any suspicion that he ever received any money, or acted in any way improperly. There are other members of the Cabinet here who were in that Cabinet at that time. I must say that having been myself a member of a Cabinet for a long time, and having sat with some of those gentlemen, particularly my right hon. friend, I feel sure that not one of those gentlemen ever received, or would receive, any such means to promote an object such as referred to in that correspondence. I think it is due to those hon. gentlemen themselves, it is due to their position, it is due to the honor and the credit of Canada, that they should severally disavow, as the Minister of Customs has done, any connection with that transaction, and repudiate the idea that men occupying the high position of advisers of Her Majesty would sully their position, or tamper with their reputation and character, by being guilty of anything such as imputed in that correspondence. I do not believe that one of them would do it, and I should be happy to hear a statement of that kind from them.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not the slightest objection to make such a statement. I thought that I had done so the other day, when the matter was first brought up. In the beginning of this transaction I was Minister of the Interior, but before it was all finished, I think, Sir David Macpherson was Minister of the Interior. I am sure neither myself nor my successor in anyway received any consideration of any kind, pecuniary or otherwise, for any of the transactions concerning this license. I almost think that the House would not even require this statement from me. The hon. member himself (Mr. Rykert) disavows any such intention, although I quite agree with the Minister of Customs that the language is singularly unfortunate—it is singularly unfortunate. As regards the solicitors who were employed by Mr. Adams, I think they were my son and the son of Sir Charles Tupper. Those are both young men, fighting their way as solicitors. I cannot speak about the wealth of my son's partner, but as far as my son is concerned, he had to fight his own battle. I gave him his education, and that is all. He is fighting his own way, and I believe he is doing it honestly and uprightly. Whatever may be his faults, I am quite sure that want of honor or honesty is not one of them. There is a remarkable discrepancy between a statement in the telegram that the Minister of Customs has read from my son and the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln. He says that these two gentlemen were here; this telegram says they were not here. The letter which will be here, I suppose, this week, will most likely throw some light upon this discrepancy. As for myself, I can throw no light upon it, because I do not remember the presence of either of these two gentlemen. I dare say that most probably they have written—at least Mr. McArthur, who was then their partner, was looking after this matter; and whether he carried on the correspondence on behalf of the clients of those two gentlemen, I cannot say. The correspondence in the Department will, however, show who carried on the correspondence on behalf of Mr. Sands, who bought from Mr. Adams. It will be shown whether Mr. McArthur or Mr. Tupper, or the firm as a whole, carried on the correspondence. I will lay this correspondence before the House.

"Copy of a Report of a Committee of the Honorable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the 17th April, 1882.

"On a Memorandum, dated 10th April, 1882, from the Minister of the Interior, recommending that Mr. John Adams be granted a yearly license to cut timber on a berth of fifty square miles, to be surveyed within six months, at his expense, and within the following described locality, namely: Commencing at a point which is distant five miles, measured due west, from a post which is planted between Sections twenty-five and thirty-six, in Township seven, Range one, west of the Fourth Principal Meridian, in the North-West Territories, thence due north twenty miles; thence due west twenty miles; thence due south twenty miles; thence due east to place of beginning.

"That the lease be on the terms and under the conditions as to survey of berth, erection of mills and payment

of dues that are provided by the Regulations established by Order in Council of the 11th of November, 1881.

"The Committee submit the above recommendation for Your Excellency's approval.

"Certified,

"(Sgd.) JOHN J. MCGEE,
"Asst. Clerk, P. C.

"The Honorable

"The Minister of the Interior."

"CERTIFIED COPY of a Report of a Committee of the Honorable the Privy Council, approved by His Honor the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the 19th September, 1882.

"On a Report, dated 16th September, 1882, from the Minister of the Interior, representing that, with reference to an Order in Council dated 17th April last, granting a timber license to Mr. John Adams, the required survey has now been made, and the returns thereof examined and approved by the Dominion Lands Office within the prescribed period.

"The Minister accordingly recommends that a yearly license, under the Regulations approved by the Governor in Council, 11th November, 1881, be granted to the said John Adams for a timber berth containing thirty-seven and a half square miles, more or less, shown on a plan dated 15th August, 1882, herewith attached, made by Dominion Land Surveyor J. W. Vaughan, and duly filed in the Dominion Lands Office of the Department of the Interior.

"The Committee advises that the license be granted to Mr. John Adams, as recommended.

"(Signed) JOHN J. MCGEE.

"The Honorable

"The Minister of the Interior."

"CERTIFIED COPY of a Report of a Committee of the Honorable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the 3rd of March, 1884.

"On a memorandum, dated 28th February, 1884, from the Minister of the Interior, submitting that, by an Order in Council dated 17th April, 1882, authority was granted to the Minister of the Interior to issue to Mr. John Adams, lumberman, of Winnipeg, a yearly license to cut timber on the terms and conditions provided by the Regulations, and that on the 19th September following, the limit in the meantime having been surveyed, another Order in Council was passed, granting to Mr. Adams a yearly license to cut timber on a berth of 37½ square miles, more or less, as shown on a plan attached to the said last-mentioned Order in Council.

"The Minister observes that in the month of January, 1883, it was discovered that the land covered by the license came within the Canadian Pacific Railway Belt, and that, therefore, the odd-numbered sections fell to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

"The Minister represents that on a renewal of the license being applied for, Mr. Adams' solicitor was informed that such renewal could be granted only for the even-numbered sections, these being all that belonged to the Dominion, and that the representatives of Mr. Adams (he being deceased) now apply for a license for the even-numbered sections only in the tract covered by the license originally granted to Mr. Adams. The licensees have paid the rent and incurred a large expenditure in fulfilling the conditions of the license.

"The Minister recommends that he be authorised to grant to the representatives of the late Mr. Adams a yearly license to cut timber on the even-numbered sections and fractions of even-numbered sections within the tract applied for, as shown upon the plan hereto attached, and colored pink, upon the usual terms and conditions.

"The Committee advise that a license be granted accordingly.

"(Signed) JOHN J. MCGEE,
"Clerk Privy Council.

"To the Honorable

"The Minister of the Interior."
Mr. BOWELL.

were published in the *Citizen* newspaper under date of 11th February instant, in explanation of certain letters published in the *Globe* newspaper under date of the 8th February instant, respecting the granting of a certain lease to cut timber to one John Adams, and it is expedient that the House should have an opportunity of examining the same, it is ordered, that the said letters and documents above recited be printed in the Votes and Proceedings for the use of members, together with the statement made by the hon. member for Lincoln in the House of Commons on the 13th day of February instant, and the remarks made thereon by certain members of the House of Commons as reported and printed in the official report of the debates of the House of Commons on the 13th February instant, and including copies of Orders in Council laid on the Table on the 17th instant.

Mr. LAURIER. I fully appreciate the motives, and I am sure everybody in this House appreciates the motives, which led the hon. gentleman to endeavor to lay before this House and to put upon the Journals all the information which he gave on a former occasion. To this there cannot be the slightest objection. But the hon. gentleman also couples with this, a desire to insert on the Journals of this House a certain newspaper article, a letter written by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), in the *Citizen*. I am not quite sure that it would be proper to put upon the Journals of this House such a communication as that, a simple newspaper article, but as the newspaper article is intermingled with certain letters which were exchanged at one time between the member for Lincoln and different parties, and which are, in substance, part of the charge and part of the information which is already before this House, I think, on the whole, we might allow the whole matter to be printed. I am not sure, however, that it should be considered a precedent, but as the object of the House is that all the information connected with this matter should be laid before the members, I would, for my part, agree to the motion of the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to raise any objections to anything being put on the Journals which tend to seize the House clearly of all the facts; but it does appear to me that it is a dangerous precedent to take any letters of this kind—published after the member has had the opportunity of stating every material fact that he thought necessary to bring before the House. I will just call the attention of the First Minister to one point: You are about to publish here a communication from the hon. member for Lincoln which appeared in the *Citizen*. If my memory serves me—it is some days since I read that—the hon. member for Lincoln made some reflections, or something which may be construed as reflections, on another member of this House now present. Suppose that hon. member chooses to publish another letter, and asks it to go on the Journals. It strikes me we might find our Journals inconveniently loaded, and of this kind of thing there might be no end. I am not going to oppose the motion, but I desire to call the attention of the House, and, in particular, of the First Minister, who has had a long experience, to what appears to me to be certain obvious inconveniences that may flow from this particular precedent. I do not exactly see,

primâ facie, that they could be very well avoided, if my hon. friend to whom I alluded should see fit to demand that his further explanation be put on record.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that it is without precedent ; I think it will be found in England that newspaper articles have been made a portion of the Journals on particular occasions. However, there is no fear of this being made a precedent, I hope. The House has got control of its own Journals, and can always prevent anything being inserted upon them that it would be inexpedient to have there. We have got control of the Journals, and the precedent on a former occasion of a newspaper article being made part of the Journals would be of very little importance. But I would point out to the hon. gentleman that, I think my hon. friend asks that this letter should be interpreted as a portion of the whole of these proceedings, not on account of the member for Lincoln, but on account of the fact that his name has been improperly used.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I say, I do not propose to interfere ; but it appeared to me that it was quite sufficient to place on the Journals what had already been agreed to. However, I will raise no further objection, but I will make this suggestion : The First Minister has been good enough to lay on the Table of the House three copies of reports of a Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council ; it would be a convenience to have those printed and add them to the hon. gentleman's motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would move to add :

Copies of the Order in Council having reference to this timber limit.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It does appear to me that this is rather an unusual proceeding, to publish, along with the other papers, the letter which the hon. member for Lincoln addressed to a newspaper in defence of the course which he had taken. Now, that does not necessarily form any part of the proceedings. The letters which were embraced in that communication, and which I understand were then given to the public for the first time, were included in the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford. The member for Lincoln rose in his place in this House and made a full explanation ; he gave an explanation which altogether superseded any explanation or defence which he may have made to the newspaper. Then I understood that the hon. Minister of Customs entered into a discussion of the use of his name by the member for Lincoln, not speaking on account of anything that appeared in that communication to the *Citizen* newspaper, but on account of the way in which his name was used in the correspondence that had taken place at a very much earlier period, that is, the correspondence relating to this particular transaction. It does seem to me that the House has all the information necessary before it, and upon which the Minister of Customs may base any action which he may choose to take, without publishing in the Journals of the House the communication which the member for Lincoln addressed to the newspaper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope my hon. friend will not press his objection. My hon. friend beside me thinks it is important that it should appear in the Votes and Proceedings. I think, however, if it is a precedent it is a bad one.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not pressing the matter ; I am just calling attention to what seems to me to be the obvious view of the case.

Mr. COOK. I object to this motion because the statement made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) is false, and I object to a false statement going into the records of this House. The hon. member has made a statement, and in that statement he has declared a falsehood, and I am prepared to prove the falsehood that is declared in that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. COOK. The member is not in his seat, and I therefore object to the statement going upon the records of this House.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

THE *MODUS VIVENDI*.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to point out to the First Minister that the time will soon be at hand when our people interested in the fisheries along the coast will be making their preparations, and they will be very glad to know, if the hon. gentleman is in a position to inform the House, whether any negotiations have been undertaken or are in progress looking to the restoration of the *modus vivendi* for the approaching season. Of course, I only desire such information as the hon. gentleman may be prepared to give, and I shall be glad to know if he can communicate to the House any probabilities regarding that question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will say, in answer to my hon. friend, that the whole of the questions which are considered to be open between Canada and the United States are now the subject of communication between Her Majesty's Minister and the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Blaine—the whole of them ; but the question that more especially now engages the attention of the negotiating parties is the Behring Sea question. The whole of the questions connected with the fisheries, as well as the Behring Sea question, are, however, the subject of discussion. As regards the *modus vivendi*, I would ask the hon. gentleman not to press that question just now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to state what I have heard about this matter, and I have heard it with deep regret. I have been informed since I spoke yesterday that the subject is being dealt with directly by the American Minister at the Court of St. James' and the Foreign Office in London, and that, practically, the matter is settled, and settled to the disadvantage of Canada. It is reported that, practically, the American contention has been conceded, and I am informed, and I believe correctly informed, that almost a settlement has been arrived at, and, so far as we know, this has been done without Canada having had anything to say about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say to my hon. friend that his information is altogether

inaccurate; that the matter has been relegated by Her Majesty's Government to be treated at Washington, and at Washington exclusively. Now we are really at the threshold of these discussions and negotiations.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to hear that the question is not settled, as I supposed it was.

ALLEGED CAPTURE OF A WHITE GIRL BY INDIANS.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior whether his Department has any information as to the white girl held captive by the Blackfeet Indians? An hon. member laughs. This is a matter which may be of small importance to him, but there are people who will consider it a matter of very great importance. I call the attention of the Minister to an article in the *MacLeod Gazette*, which reads as follows:—

"Last week the *Gazette* referred to the fact that a white girl was a captive among the Blackfeet Indians. We mentioned the age of the girl as being about five or six years. We have since learned that she is quite nine years old. Some doubt has been expressed in several quarters as to the truth of the story told in the *Gazette* last week. There is not the slightest doubt that it is true in every particular. Winnipeg Jack, whose captive the girl is, is an Indian. He can speak English, and since Lord Stanley's visit to the reserve he has been made an interpreter. The story, as told by the Indians, is that the child was captured in a raid made by the Indians on the other side of the line, in which her father, an American officer, was killed. Now that the Government are aware of the facts, for if they are not they should be, it will be their sacred duty to take immediate and prompt action to rescue this girl, even if it brings every Indian in the North-West Territories about their ears. There is no time to be lost. The girl is said to be nine years old, and if she is to be saved from the horrible fate that is surely in store for her, should she remain where she is, there must be no delay, but prompt action. There should be no parleying."

I think this may be information which is not in the possession of the Government, and now that it is made public, prompt action should be taken by the head of the Department in regard to this matter. I feel it to be my duty to ask the hon. gentleman whether his Department has any information in regard to it, and, if it has not, I desire to bring it to his attention?

Mr. DEWDNEY. If the hon. gentleman had given me notice that he proposed to make this enquiry to-day, I would have brought the papers in connection with the subject. It was during last summer that the matter was first brought to the attention of the Government. An enquiry was made, and we hold the correspondence in the Department, which correspondence I shall be happy to bring down, or show to the hon. gentleman if he should be inclined to see it. Upon enquiry made, and from information obtained from the Indians on the reserve where the white child is supposed to be, it appears that the child is the daughter of the woman with whom she is now living. When the matter was brought to my attention, I remembered that I had seen the child myself, and while she appears to have white blood in her veins, it never struck me that she was a white child. The woman has another child, about three years of age, who is as light in color as the girl who is supposed to be the daughter of the American officer. I do not believe she is a white child, but we are making full enquiries, and we propose to follow them up in order to ascertain whether the assertion I have heard made is correct or not. I think it is not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McCarthy for second reading of Bill (No. 10) to further amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 50, respecting the North-West Territories; the motion of Mr. Davin in amendment thereto, and the motion of Mr. Beausoleil in amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the sentiment will be re-echoed by many of us, when I say that it was not without a deep feeling of anxiety that I heard the beginning of this debate. I am still surer to respond to the feelings of all in expressing the sincere hope that, after all, it will be for the better that the debate had taken place, as it will dispel every suspicion and prevent any misunderstanding; and in that respect I cannot refrain from thanking the hon. gentlemen opposite, for their moderation, their sincerity and their patriotic stand, in discussing this delicate, this dangerous question. Let us hope that the debate will continue in the same spirit. The sensation-mongers who expected to see the parliamentary arena transformed into a regular battle-field will be disappointed, but the good name of the Canadian representatives, the good credit of the country will gain in value all that our detractors will lose in their expectations. It was thought, nay, it was predicted, that the inflammable materials which enter into the composition of all societies would be set on fire, and that our fine Dominion would soon be all in a blaze; let us hope—and it looks so, fortunately—let us hope that those inflammable elements, suspicion, prejudice and rivalry, will all be consumed and nothing will be left but the fine, solid, sterling gold frame of our young Confederation, more solid and brighter than ever, inviting the admiration of the world as it invites the covetous eye of our powerful neighbor. Were it not for that hope, were it not for the happy turn that the discussion has taken, I would say that it is with a sense of deep regret that I have seen the Bill placed before the House by the hon. member for North Simcoe. I thought, and I had hoped the day had gone by when we would be called upon to discuss questions conducive to no public good, irritating in their nature and unjust in their object. It was to be expected that in the latter end of the nineteenth century, ideas which savor of what are considered by many as dark ages, would not be advocated in a British Canadian Parliament, advocated by one of the most eminent members of a profession where forbearance, liberality and good fellowship are so universally practised. The hon. member for Simcoe has argued very strongly against the propriety of enacting the right to dual language in the North-West from the fact that, at the time of the cession of Canada, no such clause was inserted in the Articles of Capitulation, in the Treaty of Paris, in the Quebec Act of 1774, and in the Act of 1791. Discouragingly blind in the perception of historical facts, in the appreciation of significant events, the hon. member has not seen that the law of nations secured that right to a people who had against them the fate of war, but who were not conquered, in the strict sense of the word, since the last regular engagement of that war, the battle at Ste. Foye; was a brilliant victory for the French;

and if the hon. member had only taken some of the first official documents under the military regime which followed the Cession, he would have found that the British generals, still smarting under the irritation of a long and obstinate struggle, were more generous to their foes of yesterday than is my hon. friend for the inoffensive descendants of the discoverers and first settlers of the Hudson's Bay and Rupert's Land. It is a fact worthy of consideration, a fact which should not be overlooked, that, acting according to his instructions, or applying simply the general laws which govern the relations between the conquerors and the vanquished, General Murray, the first Governor of Quebec, used the French language in all his dealings with the King's new subjects. I hold in my hand his proclamation, dated 1764, which enacts in what manner his future proclamations shall be published, and it is in French. General Carleton, afterwards Lord Dorchester, issued a proclamation in 1770, before the "Quebec Act," in which he states that proclamations shall be made in English and in French. All the ordinances of the *Quebec Gazette*, which is made up chiefly of official documents, are printed in English and in French, from the date of its first issue in 1764. Have I not reason to wonder, Mr. Speaker, that over one century ago we can find such liberal ideas prevailing, in comparison with those of self-styled high-toned and high-minded gentlemen of this enlightened age? Taking at a glance a general view of the policy of the British Government in this country, I am glad to say that I find that it has always been most intelligent, most liberal, except for some period when the home Government was inspired by the misrepresentations of some of their friends in Canada. I regret also that the hon. member should have thought fit to bring in this Bill—which, according to the plan of campaign expounded in the press and in the public meetings of the Equal Righters, is the first practical step in the hostile movement directed against a people whose loyalty to the Crown and British institutions is above suspicion. I say that this is the first step, because we all know that what is asked for in this Bill is only a small portion of what is desired. Judging from the utterances of the hon. member, outside of Parliament, we must expect blows to be directed at the Catholic minority of Ontario, of Manitoba, of the North-West Territories; it is hoped for that the day will soon come when the Catholics and the French, if they wish to have schools of their own, will have to support them and also the public schools of those portions of the country. This Bill, therefore, is the initial step in a direction leading to all sorts of strife, is the first step in the reversal of a generous policy which all classes of the population of Canada have approved of for upwards of fifty years. This enlightened policy has given us prosperity, good feeling among the different races, good fellowship among public men. We have been taught to esteem each other, in working together for the common good of the country, sinking down all race and creed prejudices, agreeing to disagree on several subjects, but all agreeing to push the country forward in the path of material prosperity. We are asked to-day, to reverse that policy, to go back to the days of strife, of bitter feeling, out of which no good can come. It behooves all men

that value the peace and prosperity of the country, to stamp out this dangerous agitation, to discourage it at the outset and let well alone. Many right-meaning men do not see the ultimate result of this first move, because if they understood it I am sure it would receive condemnation at their hands. The legislation which we are asked to place in our statutes, not only savors of persecution, but is also retrograde. I take it for granted that the quality of British citizenship is not incompatible with a foreign origin, that a British subject may be of French origin and a Roman Catholic. If you admit of this double proposition, which I claim to be a fair and just one, which I have never heard contested, I do not see how any one can countenance the Bill now before this House. If you admit my proposition, if we of the Province of Quebec are British subjects enjoying all the privileges and rights which this quality confers, I cannot understand how the member for North Simcoe can ask the House to accept his Bill, in the light of what has been done in the Province of Quebec to satisfy the claims, the just claims of the Protestant minority. This extraordinary war, declared on the minority of the western part of the country cannot be looked upon otherwise than as cruel and uncalled-for by every inhabitant of the Province of Quebec. The different sections of the population have managed to work in harmony, presenting the pleasing spectacle of a people divided by nationalities and religion, but united for all other purposes. Does the promoter of the Bill now before the House know how the minority there have been treated? Does he know that when Confederation took place, it was agreed between the leaders of Quebec that the limits of twelve counties of Quebec Province, in which the English element predominated at that time, would never be changed without the consent of the representatives of those counties? Does the hon. gentleman ignore that the Protestant minority have practically a Council of public instruction of their own, which has complete control of educational matters? Does he know that in the smallest municipalities of the Province of Quebec this control exists? Surely he must be aware that every request of the minority in Quebec has always been granted by the majority? A few years ago it was suggested that a separate gaol be set apart for the Protestants, and this suggestion was acted upon and has now become a fact. Later on it was likewise suggested that a special lunatic asylum should be constructed for Protestant patients, and the scheme is now being carried out. The Protestants of Quebec are satisfied; but, strange to say, they are taken to task by men like the promoter of the coercive legislation now proposed to this House, and are blamed for their being satisfied. People have been speaking of the power of the Catholic Church. Power from whom? My English Protestant friends, I suppose, do not pretend that the Roman Catholic Church extends its power over them; what, then, their grievances are, I am at a loss to know. But I would read here the opinion of a man who has been living all his lifetime in the Province of Quebec, of a man whose literary merit is only equalled by the keen perception of an unprejudiced and thoroughly informed observer as set forth in an article published in one of the periodicals of Toronto, which must have

attracted considerable public attention. It is an article written by Mr. S. E. Dawson, of Montreal, and I will quote a few sentences from it just to show what is the true feeling of the Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec in regard to those pretended grievances :

"The English Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec ought to be very unhappy, if for no other reason, because so many estimable people in the sister Provinces and in the United States seem to be distressed on their account. It is not pleasant to be the object of so much solicitude. Besides, it is too late. The doctrine of 'States' rights' has been so persistently maintained by the other Provinces, especially by New Brunswick and Ontario, that it is impossible to deny to the French in Quebec those powers which the English majorities in the other Provinces have successfully asserted. What assistance, then, the other Provinces can afford to the minority of Quebec does not clearly appear, even if that minority shared generally in the gloomy apprehensions felt elsewhere on their account.

"The English minority ought also to be unhappy because of the civil and religious disadvantages which it would appear from outside sources that they are obliged to endure. And, then, if perchance any one of the minority faintly suggests that he cannot perceive anything unusually hard in his lot—anything beyond what falls to minorities elsewhere—he is chidden by 'superior persons' for not realising his abject condition. So that he becomes discouraged because he is not unhappy enough to please his neighbors.

"For, after all, in real deed, the most of us who have long resided in this Province do not find it in the least disagreeable. Unless the Anglo-Saxon mind is at an early age familiarised with other races and religions, it is apt to form fixed ideas. And so it often happens that the French Roman Catholic, as imagined by our outside friends, is different from the person we come in daily contact with. An Englishman may dwell a life-time in peace in the heart of French Canada. Nobody will leave tracts at his door or give them to his children. He may be on excellent terms, and even exchange hospitalities, with the *curé*; but if that reverend gentleman should feel any doubts about his host's future state, he will never be disagreeable enough to express them."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is, unfortunately, the position of affairs in the Province of Quebec since the beginning of this agitation. Nobody knows where the evil is. The evil does not exist; but our Protestant friends in the Province of Quebec, who have not complained, are taken to task and are lectured because they do not understand that they are unhappy, even if they do not see it or feel it. Mr. Speaker, what is the principle, or rather the negation of principle, at the bottom of the Bill presented by my hon. friend from Simcoe? It is coercion in a matter where coercion cannot exist. Coercion has been tried in several countries in matters of language and religion, and everywhere it has been tried the result has been contrary not only to expectations, but in a large measure contrary to the wish of those who have employed such means. Now, it is a very sad thing to see how the lessons of history are lost for our Equal Rights people, and how much, by neglecting this part of their education, they are drifting into a channel of narrow ideas. During the early part of the British regime in Canada, compulsion and coercion was tried with a view of welding together the different elements of population, so as to form a homogeneous nation, and it was always found that this coercion had a result quite contrary to what was expected. The most enlightened of our governors have declared time and again that the only way to strengthen British rule in Canada was to conciliate the King's new subjects. Such was the opinion of General Murray, of Lord Dorchester, of Sir J. Prevost, and of many others, including and foremost amongst them, Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Lord Elgin. The Equal Righters, who are also, most of them, Imperial Federationists, think differently; but I may tell them that if their aim is to perpetuate British institutions in America by sowing the seed of dissatisfaction, they are wide of the mark. There is one consideration which naturally springs from what I have just said. It is this: That they appear to have lost sight of the broad policy inaugurated by the English Government years ago, but they should not overlook the fact that if they can boast to-day of the title of British citizens, which they profess to value so much, they owe it to the ancestors of the very people they seem to hate and despise. What would have become of the British rule in the wars of Independence and of 1812, if French Canada,—instead, I do not say of fighting, but of being loyal,—had simply remained neutral. None but stone-blind men would say that this Canada of ours would still be a British country. It is a matter of history that the Governors of Canada in olden times would arrive here imbued with prejudices against the "Canadians," and that, after studying the country, these prejudices would make way for sounder notions leading to a change of policy. Immediately after the conquest, General Murray wrote to the Home Government in praise of the King's new subjects. Lieutenant-General Carleton, who, during the war of Independence, was saved from falling into the hands of American soldiers in his flight from Montreal to Quebec by a Canadian officer—General Carleton was a fast friend of the people he was expected by some newly-landed emigrant to crush out of existence. I could lengthen this list until your patience would be exhausted; but I must turn to things of the day, and say, that I am amazed to see men, very few I hope, brought up in contact with us, having for years professed the greatest friendship, accepted the hand extended to them, suddenly turn around on the Government to persecute and hound down the men they were so friendly to some months ago. I am amazed to find men of the day, aspiring to be the leaders of the people, reversing the policy inaugurated by men whose position placed them above the passions of the moment. When I see that the first Governors under the British rule, before the Quebec Act of 1874, and even during the military rule, condescended to publish the laws and the ordinances in French, I have a right to express my surprise that this meagre measure of justice appears in the eyes of certain gentlemen to be too large for the French population of the western Territories. French was used, more than a century ago, to bring the ordinances before the people, and that, after a terrible war, when vanquished and conquerors were face to face; and now, after a union of over one century, this simple act of justice, of international courtesy, which costs the country the enormous sum of five hundred dollars a year, is considered out of place and too generous. If you expect to make a great country with such ideas you are sadly mistaken. Sir Henry Summer Maine and Sir Alfred Lyell have claimed as one of the brightest titles of Great Britain to the admiration of the civilised world that, following the example of Rome, which left the conquered people their customs and institutions, England, in its acquisitions of territory, granted to the Crown's new subjects their former laws and customs. If we look at the British Empire we find it carrying into effect this generous

principle of international law. The Equal Righters seem to think that the use of the French language is a monstrous privilege, something unheard of in other countries. They would not have to travel out of the British Empire to find out that we are not a privileged class, and that in many British colonies several other languages are spoken besides the idiom of Shakespeare. In the Windward Islands they will find the French laws and the French language accepted and used. In Mauritius French is spoken in the Legislative Council, and last year a proposition was made to introduce it in the law courts, and no one opposed it. I may here quote a remark which was made in that Assembly, and which will receive its application in the North-West, if the Equal Righters have their own way. One of the speakers in the Mauritius Assembly said that a man coming out of court had remarked: "I have been accused and condemned, and I do not know what for." Coming back to the British colonies I find also that French was introduced in the Seychelles Islands. Let us come nearer England. The Education Commission of 1886-7-8, in their final report, say, in regard to the demands from Wales, that the Welsh language should be used in the schools of Wales:

"It is felt that they should be allowed to take up Welsh as a specific subject recognised in the code; to adopt an optional scheme for English as a class subject suitable to the special needs of Welsh districts, such scheme being founded on the principle of substituting a graduated system of translation from Welsh to English for the present requirements in English grammar; to teach Welsh along with English as a class subject; and to include Welsh among the languages in which candidates for Queen's scholarships and for certificates of merit may be examined."

With reference to Scotland, the same Commissioners say:

"In districts where Gaelic is spoken the intelligence of the children examined under any paragraph of this article may be tested by requiring them to explain in Gaelic the meaning of any passages read or recited."

In India, according to the Progress Report, India, 1882-3, the native laws and language are recognised as follows:—

"1. *Law*.—The natives of India, Hindu, Mohammedan or other, are amenable, so far as regards succession, inheritance, marriage, caste, or religious usages, each class to their own law, except when modified by express enactment." (Progress Rep. (India) 1882-3, p. 40.)

"2. *Language in the Courts*.—In the Punjab, Urdu and Hindustani are the official languages of the courts. (Progress Rep., 1882-3, p. 322.)

"In the native minor courts the native languages are spoken.

"3. *Schools*.—In the Government schools of the Punjab, Urdu and Hindustani are the languages in which the instruction is given.

"4. *Literature*.—In 1886 the register of publications for British India showed 8,877 books and magazines published within the year; of these more than nine-tenths were in vernacular languages."

In Heligoland education is compulsory. The children, mostly of Frisian origin and speaking their own language, are taught English and German in addition to the English. In Malta Italian is the official language of courts and documents. In the Cape of Good Hope, in the Session of 1888, it was resolved that the notices of motion and orders of the day and all bills submitted to the Council be printed in the Dutch as well as the English language, and this resolution was carried by twelve to seven, and the Finance Committee asked to have a sum of money placed in the Estimates for this purpose, which was done. And in 1884 an Act

was passed under which judges may, and other judicial officers shall, allow the use of either the Dutch or the English language in courts of justice, and divisional councils of a certain number of voters could ask to have summonses and notices issued in Dutch. I shall have occasion to put before the House, in a moment, the opinion of a gentleman who visited Canada not long ago, one of the most prominent men of England, and a well-known writer, who drew a comparison then between the Cape of Good Hope and Canada, which he concluded by saying that the people of these two colonies are the last and best specimens of British conservatism which still exists, and that these colonies were kept true to England by the generous and liberal treatment which they received at the hands of the Imperial Government. I refer to Sir Charles Dilke. The debate on this subject has considerably widened. My hon. friend who proposed this measure, and those who support it, felt themselves compelled to seek other reasons beyond the practical question to which they would like to reduce it; and in their search for reasons they went to foreign countries. But in their search they were equally unfortunate. For what do we find? Take Austro-Hungary, we find that Louis Leger, in his history of Austro-Hungary, says:

"The Universities of Vienna, Gratz Innsbruck and Gernovic teach in German. The Chekh Universities teach in Cheokh. The Cracow University teaches in Polish. The Universities of Livov in Polish and Ruthenian. The Universities of Buda-Pesth and Rolosovar teach in Magyar. The University of Zagreb teaches in Croatian.

"The University of Prague, which was first Latin and then German, has recently been divided into two universities, one teaching in German, the other in Chekh, the Hungarian tongue."

Article 19 of the Fundamental Law promulgated in 1867 under the authority of Count Beust, is as follows:—

"All the races of the Empire are on a footing of equality and each one of the nations generally has a right that the inviolability of its nationality and its language shall be secured. The equality of all languages used in the Empire for the purposes of administration for schools, and for public life, is recognised by the State."

Vaubery, in his History of Austria, says:

"In 1859 a most important concession was made by the Imperial Government to the spirit of nationality. By a ministerial order, the language used in the higher schools was, for the future, to be regulated according to the circumstances of nationality, the predominance of German being thereby abolished. In the same year was issued what was known as the Protestant Patent, which granted to the communes the free administration of their own educational and religious matters."

These examples show that the countries which have been wisely guided by the necessities of the different nationalities comprising them are those whose vitality is the most pronounced. If, in order to make a nation great, its people should speak but the one language, could it not be argued that there should be in the whole world but one language in order to make it perfect. If there is to be assimilation, let there be assimilation all over the world; let there be but one language all over the world. If that is necessary for one nation, it is equally necessary for the whole world. That is the view held by Socialists. They say there should be no differences, no classes, that every citizen in the world should be treated as his neighbor is, and that Christian fraternity should be put in practice, in politics and in the administration of the material and moral affairs of the

people. They hold that all men should be equal in rank, in privileges, in right, and in every possible way. This is communism, radicalism and demagogism. (I must say that in its logical consequences the Bill we discuss has that tendency.) The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has argued against the propriety of allowing the French language to be used in the North-West, on the ground that at the time of the cession of Canada no such law was inserted in the articles of capitulation, that it was not inserted in the Treaty of 1763, and that it was not in the Quebec Act of 1774, or in the Act giving constitutional government to Canada in 1791. I say that is no argument. If it was not then enacted, the reason is this: there was a tacit understanding that the right of the people to their language should be respected. But my hon. friend has gone further, and has said: Oh, in a new country, where people are beginning to colonise and settle, it is wrong in principle and it is a wrong policy to permit differences of language. But there is no difference between the two cases. In the one case, you find the people in a conquered country attached to their own language, and you all allow them to speak it; in the other case, you are asking people to come from all parts of the world to settle in your country; is it not a wise policy to assure them that when they arrive here, they will find the laws of the country promulgated at least in a language they can understand. This has been the wise policy followed in England. It is true, however, the Equal Righters in this country have had ancestors in England. The Solicitor General in England, in the debate on the Act of 1774, speaks of a Canadian Grand Jury who some years before had returned an indictment against all the Roman Catholics of the country. But Sir, I repeat, it here: the British statesmen have framed a generous and liberal policy for the early government of this country, a policy which has saved this colony for England instead of sending it over to the "Stars and Stripes," or of creating a sort of Ireland here in America. In presence of the noble conduct of these statesmen I say that the policy to foster religious strife or race animosities, whether coming from a Quebec "Nationalist" or a Toronto "Equal Righter" is the greatest enemy of British rule in Canada. More than one hundred years ago, when the English Parliament was meting out its first measure of justice to the French Canadians, in 1774, an English statesman, defending the Quebec Act, said that no address or eloquence:

"Will succeed in inducing a polished assembly of men to adopt the barbarous principle that the moment a conquest is obtained, it consists with humanity, it consists with wisdom, it consists with common honesty to take away all the laws of the conquered country, and more especially that portion of the laws which regulated the proceedings of the inhabitants in civil matters. Speaking of the rights of conquest, Grotius has these words: *Cum omne imperium victis erigitur relinquere illis possunt circa res privatas et publicas, eum leges, usque mores et magistratus.* Since all authority is snatched from the conquered, leave to them their own laws, their own customs and magistrates which are of advantage regarding private and public matters."

These are the moderated ideas of conquest. Such has been the practice of nations between one another. Is it not extraordinary that, after one hundred years, that celebrated debate can be quoted in a Canadian Assembly in a most appropriate manner. Prejudices from past ages still linger in this Mr. CHAPLEAU.

free land of America, but I hope that the vast majority of the citizens of Canada will stamp them out, will prefer peace and prosperity to religious and race strife, will leave to time the settlement of passing difficulties. I confess that the fate of the French language is in your hands; you can crush it out of official life, but I am sure that if the people of Canada rise, through their representatives, in their power and strength, it will be to assert, after the British Parliament, that right stands in their estimation far above might. How differently inspired was Lord Dufferin when he had occasion to mention the French Canadian race and its language. Speaking, at the time of his administration in Canada, at the Canadian Club in London, in 1875, that distinguished Governor General said:

"I may be permitted to remark on the extraordinary ability and intelligence with which the French portion of Her Majesty's subjects in Canada join with their British fellow-countrymen in working and developing the constitutional privileges with which (thanks to the initiative they were the first to take) their country has been endowed. Our French fellow-countrymen are, in fact, more parliamentary than the English themselves, and in the various fortunes of the colony, there have never been wanting French statesmen of eminence to claim an equal share with their British colleagues in shaping the history of the Dominion. Whatever may be the case elsewhere, in Canada, at all events, the French race has learned the golden rule and the necessity of arriving at practical results by the occasional sacrifice of logical symmetry and to the settlement of disputes, in the spirit of a generous compromise. The spectacle of two peoples, formed from nationalities so diverse, putting forth all their strength, in generous rivalry of each other, to prove their loyalty to their Queen and to the Government, and laboring with concerted action and in perfect harmony for the weal of their common country, will remain one of the most remarkable and pleasing facts in the history of the world, while also it will testify to the political wisdom and the magnanimous sentiments which pervade all the members of the great Canadian family."

And in Montreal in 1872, at the inauguration of the Queen's statue, on Victoria Square, Lord Dufferin, speaking of the minority in this Dominion, said:

"Brave and noble race, which was the first to afford Europe the means of bringing civilisation to the Continent of America, race valorous and hardy, whose pioneers, in the interior of this continent, gave scope to the industry of Europe to take root not only on the banks of the St. Lawrence, but also in the fertile valleys of the Ohio and of the Mississippi."

I could continue these quotations, but I will not take up the time of the House further by reading them. Sir, I ask myself, what credit, what glory does the hon. gentleman think he will get in erasing from the pages of the Statute three inoffensive lines which, when erased, will not add an iota to the power, the success, the supremacy of his race in the North-West, whilst, as he well knows, it will be considered as an unprovoked insult, as an attempt at oppression by those against whom his action is directed. No, Sir, the great legislators of the world—and my hon. and learned friend is well gifted enough to justify his ambition to be one of them—the great legislators of the world have not gained their fame by such narrow legislation. They have added to the code of humanity enactments in the sense of protection for the weak, of peaceful progress, of enlarged civilisation—in a word, they have added to the true "unity and comity" of nations.

"A wise prince," says Burke, "should study the genius of the nation he is called to rule; he must not contradict them in their customs nor take away their privileges, but

he must act according to the circumstances in which he finds the existing Government. It is less by terror than by love and confidence, says Montesquieu, that men are governed, and if absolute perfection in matter of Government is a myth, it is a fact that the best is the Government which adapts itself most closely to the climate, to the character, the usages, the habits, the prejudices even of the country."

The indisputable evidence of past history has long demonstrated the truth of those old but wise aphorisms. An hon. member—I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)—has quoted the example of Rome, but, if we go back to ancient history, what do we see? We see two great powers—according to the books of the colleges, which I suppose every one of you has read and translated—two great nations warring one against the other for the supremacy of the world—Carthage and Rome. If we look at the policy of those two great cities which founded two great nations, we find that the ruin of Carthage was brought about in great measure by the hostility which it developed to the nations it had subdued by its armies. In Sicily, where important Greek settlements had fallen into its power, a regular persecution was organised against the language, the customs, the opinions of the conquered. It succeeded in making of them irreconcilable enemies who rose against it at the hour of danger. Rome, on the contrary, courted the sympathies of the Greeks whom she had conquered. She encouraged the study of their language; she preserved their laws, respected their customs, their religion, their schools. The result of the two policies is written in history. Carthage was destroyed, when everything seemed to promise her success and domination. Rome gave to her citizens the freedom of the world and to her name an everlasting glory. What Carthage did, the Normans attempted in England after the conquest. There again the persecution saw the victims victorious in the long struggle, and England was founded, to continue the traditions, the success and the glory of the Roman Empire. If the proud and magic "Civis Sum Romanus" has had a rival in the talismanic "I am a British subject," it is due, in a great measure, to the liberal and generous policy of England, more than to the fear of her military power. The founder of the German Empire, Frederick the Great, understood the advantages which the conservative principles of the Catholic religion could give him in the Catholic provinces which he had subdued. He protected his new subjects in spite of the narrow-minded advisers who predicted that the court of Vienna would be served, in its intrigues, by the protection given to the Catholics of Silesia. The great emperor took no heed of those short-sighted counsels. In one of his letters I read these memorable words: "Emperor Joseph continues his work of secularisation without interruption. Here everybody remains as he was. I respect the rights of possession, upon which society is founded." And his Catholic provinces of Silesia remained faithful to him. Examples of the same kind are to be found in the history of all the great nations of Europe, where union began under the warm and beneficial influence of generosity and forbearance, leaving to the action of time the work of blending together nationalities and languages in the direction of perfect homogeneity. The great masters

in political science, the founders of vast and permanent empires, were above the prejudices of class, creed or race. Their wisdom enacted the great *Jus Gentium*, which is so, as Montesquieu observes, that "victory leaves to the conquered nations, besides life, those great things, liberty, laws, property, and religion always, when one is not blind, voluntarily." I might quote again, if I did not fear to weary the patience of the House, the same authority that I quoted a moment ago, to confirm my assertion, that Great Britain acted wisely in granting those liberties and privileges to Canada, and that Canadians merited such a liberal treatment at the hands of the mother country. Lord Dufferin, in his reception at Windsor, Ontario, on the 19th August, 1874, spoke as follows:—

"But it is not merely on this ground that we are under obligation to the French Canadian race. It must not be forgotten that it is to its loftiness of spirit, to its love of liberty, and to its just appreciation of the civil rights contained in germ in the constitution originally granted by England to Canada, that we owe the development of this parliamentary autonomy of which the nation is so justly proud; and I can assure you that, in the eyes of an Englishman, there are few things more delightful to observe than the dignity, the moderation, and the political capability, with which the French statesmen of Canada aid their English colleagues in applying and in putting into active operation these grand principles of law and of constitutional practice, which are the foundation of the free government of this country."

After such high tributes given to our nationality I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, and I was shocked when I heard the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) using the following language:—

"As to the loyalty of the Canadian bishops in refusing the offer of the Americans to join in the insurrection against England, I have my doubts about it; I am disposed to believe that they then obeyed the dictations of their own interests, to the interests of their church, more than to the true impulse of patriotism and loyalty."

The member for Norfolk will allow me to tell him he must have read in very strange books the history of our country, or he must have drunk at empoisoned sources his inspirations, with regard to the great factors of our nationality, to have been guilty of such a cruel anachronism. Why, Mr. Speaker, leaving the largest possible margin for the shortcomings, nay, the faults of a part of our clergy—and I am ready to admit that such a margin can be made use of—I affirm, without fear of contradiction, that no more admirable and uninterrupted succession and tradition of loyalty and devotion to the British Crown can be traced than to the history of the Roman Catholic Episcopacy of Lower Canada. I say, hoping that my words are not unparliamentary, that no more undeserved, no more unwarranted slander was ever written than the page of our *Hansard* where those unfortunate utterances of the hon. member for Norfolk are recorded. Disloyal and selfish, the bishops of Quebec! Who refused and repudiated the tempting offers, not of the Americans alone, but of the French generals whom the Catholic King of France had sent to assist the thirteen colonies in their rebellion against England? Was he disloyal, Mr. Speaker, the eminent Metropolitan of Quebec, who ordered a Thanksgiving day to be observed, a solemn *Te Deum* to be sung in honor of the victory of Trafalgar, won by Nelson over the French forces, and who, in his pastoral letter, speaking of the reverse of the French arms, said this:

"What calamities would have happened to us if they (the Frenchmen) had seized His Majesty's possessions

abroad, ruined his commerce, shut the gates to his wealth, and so diminished the means to check their rapacity and their spirit of domination."

Was he disloyal when he ordered his priests to teach their parishioners gratitude and fidelity to the Crown. Was he disloyal and selfish the noble priest who preached the sermon on the Thanksgiving Day appointed by the bishop, and who chose for his text the significant words "*Dextera tua Domine percussit inimicum.*" "It is thy hand, O Lord, that struck the enemy." Adding these words :

"Does it not seem to you a cruel thing to call 'an enemy' a country to which this colony owes its origin, a nation which was so long united to us by the strong ties of race, of friendship, of language, of religion; a country that has given us fathers, protectors, pastors, models of all virtues, beloved sovereigns, whose wise and moderate government made us happy, whilst they deserved our affection and gratitude."

Who, after mentioning the generosity of the King, of England adds :

"What return must you give for so many favors? A deep feeling of thankfulness towards Great Britain, a sincere desire to remain under that protection, a full conviction that our interests are dependent of the mother country, and that our happiness is interwoven with that of the Empire."

Are these the words of disloyal men? And can a man in his senses find an excuse for saying that those loyal appeals were not sincere? That noble priest, Mr. Speaker, became, very soon after, a prelate of our church, Bishop Plessis, one of the most eloquent, one of the most illustrious, one of the most loyal bishops of the Province of Quebec, who fought for the rights and liberties of his countrymen, and who was afterwards favored with the friendship of the first statesman in England, and who received from the British Crown an acknowledgment of the services that he had rendered, both to his fellow-countrymen and to the British Empire. Wrongly informed by the books he read, the hon. member for North Simcoe said that the insurrection in 1837 was a war of races and not the result of misgovernment. I am at a loss to know in what book the hon. gentleman has read the history of Canada. First, he forgets that the insurrection was not limited to Lower Canada, that Upper Canada had its share of it; then, that several prominent Englishmen of the Province of Quebec took part in the Rebellion. Does he not know also that the principles upon which the constitutional battle was fought from 1791 to 1837 were those for which the English had been fighting for more than a century—in fact, for the articles of the Magna Charta—for the pure, prompt and impartial administration of justice, for the control by the people of the expenditure of public money, for the redress of abuses and shocking favoritism from the personal and tyrannical chief of the Executive. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and his friends—for, after all, we must take them together, because they have a plan of campaign, they have entered upon an agitation which has been carried throughout the country—these gentlemen submit three reasons in support of the Bill now before the House. These are: First, that the North-West has been rapidly filled by Anglo-Saxon immigration, and that the number of people speaking the French language is so small in the Territories that the expenditure involved in the use of a second language in official proceedings is a waste of money. Second, a dual language is a source of contention and division, and should never be allowed in the

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

framing of the constitution of a new country. Third, the use of the French language was not allowed to the first inhabitants of the country after it fell into British hands; that it has always been a source of division and discord in this country, that it is inconsistent with true British loyalty; and that the sooner it disappears the better. I have endeavored to give answers to the two last reasons. But let us face squarely the argument with regard to the Territories themselves. What is the reason given for objecting to the dual language in the North-West Territories? The hon. gentleman has said that the Act amending the first North-West Territories Act was passed at a time when there were no people in the Territories to assent or consent to it. But the hon. gentleman should remember that there was a population there at that time; and they were people who, with their ancestors, had occupied the country for nearly a century. The North Saskatchewan, Lac à la Fourche, Prince Albert, Edmonton and Battleford were settled. The Territories had a population in 1877, although it was not a teeming population. And why was it that the French language was allowed to those people? It was because at that time the great majority of the people of those Territories was French. Time has passed, and the country has been conquered peacefully by another race. Do hon. gentlemen imagine that we French Canadians of another Province find fault with that result? No; I speak here the sentiments of my fellow-countrymen when I say that the greater the Anglo-Saxon immigration is into those Territories the better for the Territories and for the country at large. They have put their money and their energies into that country. They have shown themselves good settlers, and they are now a large majority in these Territories. I am not sorry of it. I speak of it without any feeling or without any prejudice. As I have stated on many occasions, I have invited English to be spoken in my home, and the peace of that home has not been disturbed by the difference of language in our prayers to the Almighty. I do not envy my neighbor because he succeeds in the path of life, with another language, another creed than mine. The sun shines for all, and I leave him his right as I want him to leave me mine. We find from the census returns, which no one will controvert, that the French and French half-breed population in the Territories is in the proportion of 13 per cent.—that is to say, that one-seventh, or a little more, of the population, is French, as to the language, in the North-West Territories. Now, in the Province of Quebec about one-sixth of the population is English, but nobody has ever dreamed of denying them the use of their language. My hon. friend may say you could not take from them the use of their language, because the constitution of the Province of Quebec would prevent you; nor could you do it, in view of the importance of the Anglo-Saxon race, their industry, their energy and the capital they have in the Province of Quebec. I will admit all that, but I say, and I speak for my countrymen when I say so, that, leaving those reasons aside, and considering only the paramount right of minorities, if a measure were proposed in the Province of Quebec to abolish the use of the English language, I would be the first to denounce it and I am sure the immense majority of my fellow-countrymen would

do the same. My conservative instincts would prevent me from endorsing a proposition, which would be, in my estimation, unfair, unjust, demagogic in its tendencies as is the measure advocated by my hon. friend.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a question of order. An expression was used by the hon. Minister, for which my hon. friend on my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) was ruled out of order on a former occasion. I do not know if it is proper that it should be allowed to be used on one side of the House and not on the other.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am ready to withdraw it for the hon. gentleman, although I must say I was not thinking of him at the time.

Mr. McCARTHY. He was addressing it with regard to me, and I prefer that the word should not be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I was referring to the member for North Simcoe when the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) called me to order, and I was calling this measure of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) a revolutionary measure, a demagogic measure and I do not think the expression unparliamentary. I say, that if such a measure were proposed in the Province of Quebec, even though the English race occupied only the same position with regard to the French as the French do with regard to the English in the North-West Territories, I would say "no" to such a proposition. I would declare that no offensive predominance should be given to the majority in a country where both races should be united. I ask myself what is the object to be gained by the measure proposed by my hon. friend? Is it to make the members of the Legislature of the North-West speak English? That cannot be the object, because they all speak English now, and I understand there is not a single elected man who is French. Is it his object to prevent the votes and deliberations of the North-West Assembly being printed in French? That cannot be, for I believe they are, in fact, only printed in the English language now, for the obvious reason that the members are all English.

Mr. DAVIN. They never have been printed in French.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend tells me, as a matter of fact, they never have been printed in French, and there is, therefore, no reason to make a law that they shall not be printed in that language. In the Privy Council at Ottawa our proceedings are all in English, and there is no necessity for having them printed in French, not by law, but for the mere convenience of the case, and nobody complains. So it would be in the North-West Assembly. But, as regards the promulgation of the laws, I appeal to the hon. member for Simcoe if it is not necessary that a large portion of that population, who understands only the French language, are entitled to know what laws they should obey and to have them printed in their own language? The French Canadians can lay claim to the title of being the first settlers of that country, and there is some value in that title. That title has been acknowledged to the

Indians, even by the American Government, at a time when their policy towards the Indians was—I will not say barbarous—but most severe, and in the North-West the first settlers were French, and the Hudson Bay Company respected their language and their customs. Why should we not treat them as well as they were treated when there was no regular government in those Territories? I say that if the measure of my hon. friend became law, a large portion of the population would be without knowledge of the laws they are supposed to obey. And as the Legislature has in its hands the whole of the municipal government of the country, the injustice would be more cruel. If he had only said: it is useless that the Legislature of the North-West should have French in their proceedings, the answer would be the sentimental one that they have, as an important minority composed of the first settlers of the land, a right to speak French in that Legislature. But against that I would have said: Wait for the sub-division of the country, when there will likely be three or four French-speaking members elected to that body; then we would not have to pass Draconian laws here to prevent them having French, because they would have it. The English-speaking people of the North-West would be as courteous to them as the French-speaking majority in the Province of Quebec have been to the English-speaking minority in that Province; and we know very well that if there were French members in the North-West Council it would be allowed to them to speak French. There will soon be a very large German immigration into that country—and I hope there will be, the Germans make very good settlers—and suppose three or four members elected for the Legislature were German; if they wanted to speak German, they would have a right to do so. Sir, if you do not respect the covenants which have been entered into between the two important races in the Dominion, to the extent of permitting the laws of the land to be published in the language of the minority, you are committing a cruel injustice, and retarding the progress of the country. Why, Sir, we spend thousands of dollars every year to publish pamphlets for distribution in France, Switzerland, Alsace-Lorraine and elsewhere—for what purpose? To bring French immigration to Canada, to say to those people that when they arrive here they will find the ordinances of the country and many of those ordinances refer mainly to local interests and objects—and its laws printed in their own language. To deprive them of this privilege would be a gross injustice. But my hon. friend knew this very well; he knew that if he could prevent the promulgation and publication of the laws and ordinances of the North-West in French, he would prevent French immigration into that country. He knew it, and he did it with that object in view; he had the courage to acknowledge it. I am sorry to say that the Equal Righters who are acting with the hon. member for North Simcoe are to blame if a war of races is the result of their agitation; but I hope I am not mistaken in believing that many hon. gentlemen, whose names have been connected with those of the hon. member for North Simcoe and the hon. member for North Norfolk, do not carry their feelings to that extent. I know that amongst them there are men who do not wish anything of that kind to happen. It is very

easy to set fire to this very inflammable piece of timber, a race agitation, and take that agitation as a means to achieve success; but I must say that if there is a glow for the ambition of a public man, it should not be a glow coming from the fires of prejudice and passion which he himself has kindled. The hon. gentleman has taken charge of a measure which the people of the North-West would have confided to any of the members representing them here if a real grievance had existed. Who has moved him to introduce this Bill? Has he done it of his own motion or had he a mandate for doing it? He went up to the North-West on a mission, and he has accomplished it; but I hope and believe that he will accomplish nothing by his measure. This question should have been settled quietly among the people of the North-West as a local question, to be determined between them and the Federal Government, from whom the legislative power of the territories emanates. But the promoters of this measure do not think of making it a local question. Leave the question to the people to settle, and you may be sure that probably in two years hence there will be nothing left of the little fire which has been raised by the hon. member for North Simcoe. Has not the North-West disinterested members enough in this House to take charge of such a measure? Is it not an insult to them that a member from an eastern Province should take upon himself to put it forward and advocate it? It shall not pass here, because on every side of the House people are alarmed, if not disgusted, by the way in which it has been taken up and agitated. We might very well agree among ourselves to leave to the North-West Legislature the settlement of this question. We would say to them: You have not been elected in the North-West to settle that question; it relates to one of the organic articles of the constitution of those Territories, which only the Parliament of Canada has a right to change; but we will be a paternal Parliament to you, and we will say to you, consult the people, and let the people of the North-West say whether there is any use of your speaking French when you sit around the table of the Legislature. The elections would come, and after those elections they may come back and say: If we are to have a useful representation in that assembly, if we are to have a population in those Territories, who will live harmoniously with their neighbors, we must not repeat the mistake of hurting the feelings of those with whom we are in partnership for the building up of this country. I say that to try to prevent those people publishing their laws in the language of the population, either in the French language or the English, would be an atrocity, a cruel measure, and a measure which would not induce immigrants or settlers to go into that country. There is one thing which I feel bound to say to correct a wrong impression, unjust to the hon. gentleman. My hon. friend from North Simcoe has been taken to task as being a Tory. I do not attach much importance to that little digression of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition. That is an eye-catching color which he puts in his political paintings when before an election audience; the "Tory" is always brought into the back ground so as to bring out in greater contrast the great display of the Liberal principles which it is the hon. gentleman's wont to picture to his hearers. But in the subject under discussion there should be no question of party politics. The

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

right hon. the leader of the Government answered my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), by showing that the Tories have been at times the best protectors of our French Canadian nationality in this country. But in calling this Bill a Tory measure, my hon. friend wanted to make out that it was an arbitrary, a retrograde measure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was inflammatory.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, it was that "or-a-tory" of my hon. friend that brought it out. My hon. friend wished to give a political meaning to this discussion. It has none, and I think it is but just to those who, on other occasions, have voted with the hon. member for North Simcoe, to say that the hon. gentleman himself had the courage—and it is not courage he wants—to say that on this occasion he had separated himself entirely from the Conservative party. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, calls all the Conservatives Tories; and I know that whatever denial we may give to the expression, he is bound to call us Tories. If he enjoys in calling us by that name, let him be happy. The hon. member for North Simcoe has in this question completely disassociated himself from his party; he has declared that on this question he is not in harmony with his party, but he declared, and had a right to do so, that upon other questions he would follow those whom he had always followed, and would continue to vote as a conservative on such matters as, for instance, the National Policy. It would not be right to close the Conservative party against the hon. member for North Simcoe and those who hold his views. This Bill which he has introduced has nothing to do with that party; it is a Bill of his own, and I hope, before the debate is over, he will see that it is greatly restricted in his following. The hon. member for West Durham argued that the Federal Government should keep, in a certain measure at least, a portion of the power over the Territories. True, we have granted to the Territories a constitution; we have given them legislative power to some extent; but as we still have the administration of the Territories in our hands and to protect those whom we are inviting to come and settle there, this Government should keep a certain control over these Territories. We are bound to do that, as we are bound to give to the French population a free and easy access to the judicial tribunals we have established there. I do not believe that there are many in this House disposed to say that they are at heart in favor of the measure proposed. Its preamble is a provocation and a just cause of irritation to a large section of our people, and the principle of the Bill and its practical effect, if carried into a conclusion, would work injustice and bad feeling in the old Provinces as well as in the North-West Territories. There are amongst those who support the measure of the hon. member for North Simcoe men who, if they do not call themselves Equal Rights advocates, are Imperial Federalists. Many of them pose as the advocates of what they deem to be the grand and the loyal policy of Imperial Federation. Let me ask them how they expect to help on their cause by this unfair, unseemly, this persecuting agitation. The British Empire is composed of a greater variety of nations and creeds than was the Roman Empire. Do the Imperial Federalists think they are going to help.

on their scheme by prosecuting a minority, even in such a remote territory as the North-West? We are not in the same condition of things in which we were some years ago. Modern science has given new wings to political thought; every incident that occurs in Canada, of any importance, is known to-morrow as far as Cape Colony and in the remote regions of India; and I appeal to Imperial Federalists, who might be tempted to support the Bill before the House, not to injure their own cause, and to remember that all men interested and responsible for the future of the Queen's dominion will condemn them for entering into an agitation which would tend to destroy the loyalty of a portion of Her Majesty's subjects. These gentlemen pose as the representatives of Ontario and pretend to speak the voice of Ontario in protest against the use of the French language in Canada. I venture to tell them that they do not represent Ontario in this matter, that they do not speak the voice of Ontario in this agitation. The true voice of Ontario may still be heard in the echoes of that splendid demonstration made in December, 1884, in Toronto, in honor of Sir John A. Macdonald. It was my good fortune to be present at that grand and imposing reunion of the forces of the great Conservative party. I shall never forget the ovation given to the Old Chief when he entered the hall where five thousand voices acclaimed him with enthusiastic cheers. I shall never forget the warm, the cordial reception given to my hon. friends the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Militia, and to myself. It was my first visit to Toronto and the impression I received, an impression which will never be effaced from my memory, was that the bond of friendship, nay, the bond of affection, that linked together the two great races of this Confederation, would resist any attack which interest, jealousy or prejudice might direct against it. It was, it is true, a political demonstration, but it had a great character beyond that, which proved that different races, and different creeds, and different nationalities, might unite and work together in the best manner for the progress of our common country. This was the voice of Ontario, and I think it would be the voice of Ontario still. I say to the supporters, if there are any in Ontario, of the measure of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that I believe the voice of Ontario would be still the same if the right hon. the leader of the House would appeal, on the same generous principles, to the same fair-minded population of Ontario to-day. Sir, I protest against that agitation, I protest against that plan of campaign as suggested in the speeches of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and indicated here and outside by the speeches of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I do not quote their expressions here. They are too ugly for me to quote them or, at all events, they are too provoking. It is not for us here to talk about opening a free road through the St. Lawrence for the Anglo-Saxon to pass to the conquest of the world. If that course is to be persisted in, Sir, I cannot qualify it in any other words, that if it is a political game it is a dangerous mistake, and if it is a determined and premeditated movement to be earnestly carried on, it is a criminal attack against the "peace, order and good government of the country." Sir, I hope that the hon. gentlemen will

pause before venturing any further in the dark and dangerous path they have entered into. They will look in the past and around them, and they will see written on the walls the fate which awaits them. All public men who have tried to build up a political platform of such materials as prejudices and fanaticism have found out that the beams and rafters of their building did not long resist the action of time and the pressure of common sense; they went down with the wreck, helpless and crippled, giving to the world a cruel lesson as to the inevitable fate of those who would attempt to imitate their example. Sir, I appeal to the higher instincts, to the nobler feelings of those who sincerely wish the consolidation of these British possessions, and whom the chances of politics do not affect. I ask them to think calmly of all this. They must know how dangerous are the elements which are brought into contact in the agitation which is carried on. They may be in earnest in believing that the strong currents thus put in motion will produce great and good results. Let them not forget that in dealing with these questions of race, nationality and religion they are dealing with the great electric currents of national life. Guide and govern these currents wisely, and you may draw from their united influences power and light and all the beneficent effects of the natural forces with which Providence has provided you. Misguide and misgovern them—use them with ignorance, recklessness, or malice,—and you may draw down on your heads unknown and uncounted disasters, ruin to individuals, confusion to communities, and disaster to the State. Sir, I agree with the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), I am not ready to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), although I am in accord with the principles of it, but I cannot find too strong language to express my repudiation of the principles, the form, the surroundings of the measure submitted. The Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe is opposed to his own political record, principles and career. He supported with intelligence and vigor the policy of unity of action and harmony of thought of the different races which form this Dominion, irrespective of creed or language. He was present when the Acts giving a constitution to the North-West Territories were initiated, revised and passed, and he gave his acquiescence to that legislation. The Bill is opposed to the policy that has prevailed in Canada, of protecting the rights of minorities in the schools, in the Legislatures, in the Senate. It is opposed to the law of the land, which was approved by two Administrations and three Parliaments. It is opposed to the spirit of British legislation, which, in the case of Manitoba, provided a perpetual guarantee to the minority in regard to schools and language, and, in the case of any new Province hereafter created in the Territories, provided a guarantee of stability to the constitution given to it at the time of its creation. It is opposed to the general policy of the modern British Empire, which, in India, in Manitoba, in Cape Colony, respects the right of the people of different origin to have the legal and legislative use of their own language. It is opposed to the plainest facts of science, which prove that race is stronger than language, as may be seen in the case of the Irish and the Scotch, the German-

speaking Russians, the French, German and Italian-speaking Swiss, the Jews, the Spanish-speaking Mexicans, the German-speaking Alsacians. It is opposed to the true spirit of loyalty to the Crown, because no man, who is truly loyal to the Crown, would endeavor to stir up strife among the Queen's subjects by attempting to repeal, for the avowed purpose of persecution and extinction, laws which have had the sanction of the Crown in one form or another ever since the Cession of Canada. I wish to make one more remark as to the political record of the hon. member for North Simcoe. Let me refer to that great demonstration in Toronto, which showed so well the fraternity of the two races, and I wish that fraternity was more widely practised. I think that the public men of each Province ought to visit the other Provinces, and try to develop that good feeling which is so easily developed when we are better acquainted with one another. In that great demonstration in Toronto what do we find? An address was presented to Sir John A. Macdonald by the Liberal Conservative party of Ontario. My hon. friend from Simcoe knows something of that address. On that occasion the chairman, was appointed on the motion of Mr. Dalton McCarthy, and when the meeting was organised the chairman read an elaborate, an eloquent address to Sir John Macdonald, two or three paragraphs of which I will read to this House, with as full an assurance of their being accepted here as they were accepted there:

"The happy results of British rule in North America begun when the policy of Pitt was accomplished by the valor of Wolfe, would have been imperfect, if not frustrated, but for the cordial relations which you have for nearly half a century maintained, in spite of unjust and unpatriotic criticism, with the great men who have been the chiefs of the loyal Canadians of Quebec; and on this occasion we would mingle with our felicitations to yourself a tribute of grateful remembrance of Cartier, whose statue rises in another city to bear witness to his public deeds and to keep his memory green. * * * In a Confederation in which the people are divided by a very earnest and sincere difference of opinion in race, religion and political sentiment, unity of action and harmony of thought have been maintained with striking success by the wisdom, tact and true liberality with which you have made alike the Cabinet, the Provincial Executives, the Bench, the Bar, and the Public Service, bear witness to your forethought and care for the interests of races, creeds and opinions, as part of the forces by which nations are governed, and by the wise conduct of which they grow strong, united and prosperous."

No better inspired, no better worded sentiments of true patriotism were ever recorded, and the hon. member for North Simcoe will derive more glory for the part he took in that demonstration than he will in the unchristian crusade he is now leading.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Before this House rose at six o'clock I had been showing that it would be an injustice to the population of the North-West Territories, who were the first settlers there, and who, surely, deserve our consideration, if we were to deprive them of the privilege of having the laws published in a language that they understand. What has been the cause of the large influx of Anglo-Saxon settlers into the North-West? It is the millions of money that the old Provinces have voted to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. We all agreed to that; we all applauded the enterprise
Mr. CHAPLEAU.

and the energy of those who built that road. What, again, has brought that immigration into the Territory? It was the great, the richly subsidised colonisation societies which brought thousands of immigrants from Great Britain to take possession of the soil, and the railway companies who acquired large tracts of land as railway subsidies and have invested their capital there. All these newcomers were characterised by that spirit of enterprise which belongs to the English immigrants, and which leads them to take possession of the world wherever the world and its resources presents itself to them. We welcome those desirable immigrants, we help them in the full measure of a dutiful Government. But must we, for all that, despise and forget the first settlers of those remote regions, those who revealed to us the treasure we had there? Sir, will not my hon. friend from North Simcoe give to these old settlers of the North-West, at least, time to learn English? It has taken me a long time to learn to speak it, badly as I do. I think he ought to give them, at least, a few years to learn how to read the laws which will be enacted in those Territories. But there is something more. These people who live there, who are the owners of the soil, have disputes amongst themselves. The law must be obeyed, must be administered, and is he going to deny them the right of having justice administered to them in a language which they understand? He does deny them of that right; we must not be unjust as he wants us to be. I think that if this House comes to the conclusion that a certain measure of liberty to settle that question of language ought to be given to the Legislature of the North-West, we must in justice reserve to the old settlers, to that population which is now in the minority, the right to speak their language, to be heard in their language, as witnesses, jurors, and pleaders before the courts. I desire, in closing my remarks, to quote some observations from a powerful writer and a keen observer, who has visited this country, Sir Charles Dilke. How does he speak of the population, of whom the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke, I will not say with contempt, but with suspicion as to their loyalty and with fear as to the future of the country so far as they were concerned. Sir Charles Dilke referred to one of the most prominent statesmen who represented the French Canadians, Sir George Cartier. Speaking of Sir George Cartier, who was very often accused by his opponents in politics, of being too much of a Britisher in Canada, Sir Charles said this:

"Sir George Cartier, the Conservative statesman who led the French Canadians at the time of Confederation, had himself as a young man taken part in Papineau's rebellion, but there was never a stronger supporter of a United Empire than my host at Ottawa in the year of the passing of the Bill."

Drawing a comparison between the French in Lower Canada and the South African Dutch, the author said:

"In both cases we found the alien people in the land had dispossessed the mother country of the province. In each case they have clung to their language and institutions, and in each country the language of the non-English Calvinists may now be made use of in the legislature. Both races are filled with intense Conservatism, and the French of Canada and the Dutch of South Africa are now in fact the only surviving true Conservatives living under free institutions."

This may not please the leader of the Opposition, but it could not but please an old Tory, like the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Speaking of the loyalty of the French Canadians at the time of the American Revolution, Sir Charles Dilke said :

"Curiously enough, the only moments at which we were ever popular in Lower Canada, until we gave her free institutions, were the moments when the Americans were trying to expel us."

These few lines must be significant to those who believe that because we speak a foreign language we cannot be loyal to the Crown and true supporters of the British nation. I will not say, true as it may be, that Canada would have been American except for the assistance given by the French Canadians at the time of the American Rebellion, but as a loyal Britisher, I would say, with Sir Charles Dilke: we have been able to preserve our supremacy in North America with the approval and assistance of the French Canadians, and "curiously enough the only moment at which we were ever popular in Lower Canada, until we gave her free institutions, were the moments when the Americans were trying to expel us." Mr. Speaker, I claim for our people, as I read it in the opuscles of a late friend, Oscar Dunn, that "the first man who spoke of responsible government in this country was a French Canadian, Pierre Bedard, and the one who contributed the most to establish it was another French Canadian, Lafontaine. Our nationality had the honor to furnish the statesman who introduced British liberties into this country. It was the only revenge we drew from our conquerors." I do not speak here as a French Canadian; I speak as a Canadian. The hon. member for North Simcoe has said, that, in order to judge of the nationality of a man, you must ascertain the language he speaks; that a German subject speaking another language can hardly be a full German; that a man who speaks French as his mother tongue, even if he knew and could speak English, cannot be really and truly a British subject. But we claim to be Canadians, and although we may speak in French or English we are really not English or French, but we are truly Canadians, and we intend to remain such. I heartily endorse the sentiments of that eloquent and fervent apostle of Canadian nationality, Principal Grant, when, speaking before St. Andrew's Society, in Montreal, he said :

"The Scotch are but one nationality in Canada, and not the first. That place belongs to the French Canadians; a sacred obligation is imposed upon the Canadian race as upon ours. We ought to be, the one more than Scotch, and the other more than French, we ought to be Canadians. There can be but one Canadian nation, and all the races which have chosen the sky of Canada as their own ought to contribute to the building up and the consolidating of this nation. Every other dream is but a folly and every effort to realise it is but treason. And against treason all Canadians must unite, to combat and chastise it."

Sir, if the hon. gentleman intends to carry out his purpose, interpreted as it must be by the preamble of this Bill and by the speech which accompanied its first reading, if the hon. gentleman wants to go to the end of his programme, if he really intends to do as he has stated in this House and outside this House he intends to do, I can only tell him this, that if he wants to destroy and efface the French language from the Dominion

27½

of Canada he should begin higher up and remove its use from the highest order of chivalry in England; he should efface it from the arms of England; if he thinks in speaking French we are disloyal to our beloved Sovereign, Her Majesty the Queen, he must have forgotten the words "*Honni soit qui mal y pense.*" If he wants to destroy French I answer him, in company with all my fellow-countrymen and all true British subjects in this Dominion: Sir, you shall not touch that language; you cannot efface it. We keep it with our religion, as a gift we owe to Divine Providence and to the kind liberality of Our beloved Sovereign. And whenever it is attempted to deprive us of that sacred deposit, we shall not despair as long as we read on the Royal Arms of England: "*Dieu et mon Droit.*"

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would say to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that I interfere with him with very considerable reluctance, but it is necessary for me for certain reasons to speak to-night. I will speak briefly, but, as he must of necessity speak at very considerable length, I hope, therefore, that he will not consider that I am treating him with discourtesy. I will take care that it does not interfere with his prerogative in any respect.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we all must agree that this debate, even so far as it has already gone, has been one of a very remarkable character. It is a debate which is calculated to shed considerable light on divers dark places in our political firmament. It has at any rate one notable feature. The present debate, coupled with a debate which took place on another subject, within this chamber about a year ago, constitutes a very important new departure on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite—a very important new departure, indeed. It is perfectly wonderful to see the zeal which is now expressed by so many of these hon. gentlemen for provincial rights, and to remember that these same hon. gentlemen—not even the hon. member for North Simcoe excepted—only a little more than thirteen months ago, certainly within a period of two years, did not see their way to stand side by side with us in defending the clearest and best established rights of his and my native Province. We find now that the sacredness of provincial rights is clearly held by a great majority in this House, we find that it is becoming a fundamental article of faith, and by none more (although his conversion was very late in the day) than by the venerable and pious Premier, may I say, who gave such excellent advice to us last year, as well as on the present occasion, on the subject of provincial rights. I am an old enough member of Parliament to remember when the First Minister of this Dominion had very little faith indeed in Confederation; when he began by doubting and disbelieving the possibility of a federal union, and when in point of fact, as I remember and as the record shows, he only accepted the situation when he saw that it was his last chance of safety from political shipwreck. From that time, although I will not say that he has plotted steadily and persistently to undermine this same Confederation, I will say that for twenty years, to

all outward seeming, at any rate, the policy of that right hon. gentleman has been to belittle, in every possible way, the rights of the several Provinces, of which to-day he has blossomed out so strong and stout a champion. In the case of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), we can all remember that last year that hon. gentleman was not apparently disposed to pay any very great respect to the provincial rights of one of the oldest and most important Provinces of this Dominion, although now he is suddenly smitten with the most extraordinary regard for the declarations—not of a Provincial Assembly in the proper sense of the term—but of the representative council of a fledgling territory of this Dominion. For my part, I much suspect the fervent zeal which new born converts evince on these occasions. I may say to this House, without respect to parties, that while we are here bound by every obligation to see that the rights of the Provinces are maintained, it may be as well for us to recollect that we are also here as Dominion representatives, and that the Dominion of Canada has its rights in this and other matters as well as the Provinces. This debate, as I have said, is one of a remarkable character, but I must add that I, for one, think that every true friend of Canada must regret that this subject has been forced upon us at this time. I say that no good has come of this Bill; I say that no good can come of it, and I am sorry to have to add that, in my judgment, speaking without prejudice or malice, I cannot but believe that no good was intended to come out of the proposal which we are now discussing. Whatever may be the motives which have caused the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) to assume the grave responsibility of throwing on the floor of this House what he well knew must be an apple of discord, calculated to set friend against friend, race against race, and religion against religion, I admit that this question having been raised, and the judgment of this House having been challenged, we are, in my opinion, bound to pass upon the question. Of all the faults and of all the follies which this House could commit in dealing with this question the worst, in my opinion, would be to leave it as a festering and ever-open sore. We are asked to decide on this question, and we should decide. In that I agree with the hon. gentleman and some of his friends. This House is called upon to pass judgment, and this House should pass such judgment as will set this question finally at rest, if such a thing can be. At all events, it should be set at rest so far as this branch of it is concerned. I believe that by this motion and by the agitation which has taken place throughout the length and breadth of the chief Provinces of Canada on the issues raised by the hon. gentleman and his friends, very considerable harm has been done. I do not think we can wholly undo that harm by anything we may accomplish here, at best I believe that all it is possible for us to do is to minimise the mischief which reckless hands have wrought. I will venture to suggest, before I sit down, certain considerations which occur to me as best calculated to bring about that end. I shall now consider in rotation the several propositions at present before the House. First of all, I must take the Bill which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) asks shall be read for the second time. I am sorry

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

to have to say that I cannot but regret the language of the preamble of that Bill as being decidedly offensive, as being calculated to do grave harm in this community and as being calculated as I have said to set members of this House of different creeds and nationalities at issue to no good purpose. More than that, Sir, I take objection in the strongest possible manner with the preceding lines of this preamble:

"Whereas it is expedient in the interest of the national unity of the Dominion that there should be community of language among the people of Canada, and that the enactment in 'The North-West Territories Act' allowing the use of the French language should be expunged therefrom."

Sir, that preamble is in no way necessary to the Bill, it should never have been there, and was intended to affront and offend my friends of the French nationality; and small blame to them if they felt affronted and offended when asked to consider a Bill introduced by a preamble like that. But I have a more important objection to make to that preamble: I say that on the plainest grounds of common sense and common prudence, the assertion contained in it that the best way to produce unity among us is to do what is known to be affronting to one-third or one-fourth of the people of this Dominion is entirely false and incorrect. That is not the way to produce national unity among Canadians; it is not the way to build up a nation here. The way to make Canadians proud of their country is to say, clearly and distinctly, to every race in Canada, that they may expect fair play and honest dealings at the hands of their fellow-countrymen, whether they are English, French, Scotch, Irish, Canadian or any other nationality. Looking at this matter, Sir, as a practical man, as one who hopes to end his life in Canada, I say that the hon. gentleman, be his motives or intentions what they may, is attempting a downright impossibility, if he hopes by legislative enactment to wipe away the French language and to induce a million or a million and a-quarter of our people to abandon their mother tongue, solemnly guaranteed to them by treaty and in every possible way that a government or a nation can guarantee, that it shall be left undisturbed in their native Province or in the Dominion of Canada. I say it is absurd. It might have come to pass—though I do not know but the hon. gentleman and his friends have now rendered it impossible—not to-day or to-morrow, but in the course of a generation or two, that mutual convenience in communicating and dealing with each other in the prevailing tongue of North America might have induced the people of Quebec to adopt that language, as has been done in Ireland, where, in many places, a number of years ago, the bulk of the population spoke Irish and Irish alone, but where now the English tongue has practically superseded the Irish language. But I tell the hon. member for North Simcoe and other hon. gentlemen who think with him that there is no case in history, and I cannot conceive of a case, where such result has been brought about by legislative enactment. Persecute a religion, a race, or a language, and you enlist every worthy, manly and self-respecting sentiment in the minds of the men who profess that religion, belong to that race, or speak that language in maintaining it against all odds; and I do not think so meanly of my French fellow-countrymen as to wish or believe that they

will be dragooned out of rights which have been solemnly guaranteed to them. Sir, I do not know what visions of victory or what aspirations may float through the minds of the hon. member for Simcoe and his followers. Peradventure, as has been suggested, it has entered into the mind of the hon. member to play the part of an Ontario Parnell, and to return to this House with twenty or thirty stout Protestant Home Rulers like the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), to hold the balance of power and to dictate terms—I was going to say to his adversary, but as I suppose I should say, his beloved chieftain who sits opposite to me.

An hon. MEMBER. Who said so?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why, the hon. member for Simcoe himself, and he ought to know. But if, as I have said, the language of the preamble of this unfortunate Act was needlessly affronting and offensive to gentlemen of French nationality, what must I say of the speech in which, without provocation, in cold blood, the hon. member for Simcoe thought fit to introduce it? Sir, I regretted exceedingly to hear that speech, and most of all for this reason: I knew—my parliamentary experience taught me, as the parliamentary experience of any hon. gentleman who has sat for a few sessions in this House would teach him—that one such mischievous and injudicious speech was sure to be the parent of others equally mischievous and injudicious, which would go far to widen the breach and render the task of moderate and reasonable men in composing our differences more difficult than ever; and I am sorry to say that one member of the Government at least—I mean the hon. Minister of Public Works—was betrayed into following the evil example of the hon. member for Simcoe, and into delivering a speech which the hon. member for Simcoe must have listened to with delight, but which I am sure no considerate man on either side of the House could have regarded as other than injudicious and ill-timed. I am very sorry that an old parliamentary veteran like the hon. Minister of Public Works should have deliberately played the game of the hon. member for Simcoe, as he most undoubtedly did, when he delivered that speech, which will prove an arsenal from which the hon. member for Simcoe and those associated with him could saw barbed and poisoned arrows to disturb the sentiments and feelings of a great number of worthy people throughout this community. Sir, I wish I could confine my regret in that respect entirely to the hon. Minister of Public Works. I would have thought that the trap laid by the hon. member for Simcoe was perfectly transparent. I would have thought that any hon. member in this House who listened to his speech, who read his preamble, who considered what his whole course has been, must have seen that the object that hon. gentleman was driving at, the thing he wanted to bring about, was, if possible, to array in a solid mass, if that were possible, the members of the French nationality on the one side, and the members of the English nationality on the other side; or, what is worse still, to array the members of one religious persuasion on one side, and the members of other religious persuasions on the other side. I regret exceedingly that a gentleman for whom I entertain such high regard as I do for the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beauso-

leil) should have walked deliberately into such a trap, and should have brought forward a resolution which looks—though I acquit the hon. gentleman of any such intention—as if it were designed to play into the hands of the hon. member for Simcoe. I am very sorry for it. I admit that there were extenuating circumstances in the case of the hon. member for Berthier. I am sometimes myself accused, most unjustly, of having hasty blood in my veins, and I dare say I would have felt angry at the language used by the hon. member for Simcoe; but however angry I might have felt, I do not think I would have walked into the trap he set and supplied him with material for future mischievous operations. Now, as far as I am concerned, my own course in this matter is clear enough. Last year—and I ask my French compatriots to recollect the circumstance—last year, in common with the great mass of the Liberal party and the Conservative party in the Province of Ontario, I and they voted upon a certain question in a way which offended the prejudices of many of our constituents. I laid down then, as I am disposed to lay down to-night, the principle that in affairs of this kind, as in all affairs which properly belong to them, the Provincial Legislatures should have the sole right to legislate. The principle which I applied in favor of the Province of Quebec last year I am disposed to apply on the present occasion in favor of the North-West Territories. I ask now the same rights for our fellow-countrymen of the North-West Territories that I asked for our fellow-countrymen in the Province of Quebec last year. I am prepared to recognise their right, but I require that that right be properly asserted and clearly stated, and that I should be well assured, when I interfere in a matter of this kind, that I, in my place, and as far as I can, am giving assent to the deliberately expressed opinion and conviction of the people of those Territories. It may be asked why will I not acknowledge that the North-West Council, as at present constituted, do really represent the views and the wishes of the people of those territories? I am bound to recall to the attention of hon. members this plain fact. No doubt, to a certain extent, these gentlemen may be said to represent the people of the North-West Territories, although they are not their only representatives; but they have not all the powers, and they were not elected to discharge all the duties of a Provincial Parliament or Assembly. I say, without any desire to belittle their important functions, that they are somewhat of a hybrid between a municipal council and a Provincial Parliament, and I cannot admit that they are entitled to speak with perfect authority on a question which was notoriously not before the people when the North-West Council were elected. More than that: I have another reason why I decline to accept what may, for ought I know, have been a hasty resolution passed by the North-West Council. So far as I am advised, there is every reason to believe that it was in no way the spontaneous declaration of the Council of the North-West, but was a suggestion from outside. Probably the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) knows best whence it came. It did not deal, in an yproper sense of the term, with a real substantial grievance under which those people groaned, and in voicing which the Council merely voiced

the true sentiments of their constituents. I am quite prepared, on proper opportunity being given me, to advocate provincial rights to the fullest extent; I am quite prepared to lay down the principle that the people of the North-West, when this matter has been fairly submitted to them, when they have passed upon it—if in two or three years hence they continue in the same mind—should be sustained by this Parliament; but beyond that I must decline to go. I admit that it was best for all parties that a decision should be come to on this subject; it will serve no good purpose that I can see to allow this matter to be kept open for debate and to continue to be made a cause of agitation between the conflicting races. I cannot however quite agree with the doctrine laid down by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) that a sort of vested right has been established by the mere fact of the concession which was made some ten or twelve years ago. I am prepared, as fully as any man, to maintain treaty rights formerly granted to our French brethren in the Province of Quebec, but I think that in all reason we ought to stop there. If the French settlers should become numerous in any Province of this Dominion, either near us or in the far West, and if they persuaded the Legislature, or the Legislature saw fit, for mutual convenience, for good fellowship or courtesy, to decree that the French language should be used in such Province, so let it be. No one on this side, I believe, would raise his voice or give his vote to prevent that extension of privileges; but, I say, in all conscience, that ought to be enough. I have no possible ground or pretence to dictate to my friends from Ontario what they should do in this matter. It is a matter in which they must judge for themselves, and no doubt they will be able to do that. But if they will allow me to make a suggestion to them, it will be this: I think they ought to oppose to the uttermost the passage of the Act introduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Mc Carthy)—and on these grounds: that the Act itself is mischievous, the language is offensive, and it deals with no real substantial grievance. Why, I am told that the whole cost of the evil which the hon. member for North Simcoe designs to remedy amounted in thirteen years to something like \$20,000, about one-tenth or about one-twentieth of the cost which the blundering attempt to usurp the property and the rights of the Province of Ontario, made partly under the hon. gentleman's auspices, has already cost this country. Looking at this matter from a practical point of view, I think after the hon. gentleman's exhibition, after the speech he made, which showed his animus, which showed his design to make mischief, my hon. friends from Ontario need have no fear that any but a few bigots will condemn them for refusing to vote against this Bill. I may tell them they have lost those bigots' votes already. While that is true, it is equally true—and my hon. friends will pardon me for reminding them of it—that, besides the bigots who would dare to join so wicked an agitation for it is wicked (to stir up an anti-French crusade, considering the circumstances under which the hon. gentleman desires to initiate it) besides those there are, I must confess, men known to all of you, moderate and reasonable men, who, while they are well content to accept the grounds on which we voted last year, who, while they

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

admit we did right, and, in fact, had no option but to vote as we did, would hold us to a strict account if we should now go back on our own record, and having a year ago voted to defend the rights of the Province of Quebec should now appear unwilling, on proper terms and conditions, to maintain the rights of our fellow-countrymen in the North-West. To my friends of the French nationality I speak with great diffidence; I admit that I think their anger very natural, I sympathise with their feelings, and I do not think they had any right to be addressed as they were on the floor of this House. But is that a reason—and I speak now, not merely to my political friends on this side, but to my French compatriots on the other side—that they should deliberately allow themselves to be goaded and driven into playing the game of the hon. member for North Simcoe? I repeat there can be no possible step they will take that would serve the ends of that hon. gentleman better than if they would display here, what I would regret to see displayed, the spectacle of a solid French minority voting against a solid English majority. It would be a grave political mistake which would injure themselves, and—I was going to say for once in my life, but I think I have had occasion to do it once or twice before—I am disposed to agree in substance with the advice tendered to the House by the hon. the leader of this Government. I am bound to admit—and I make him a present of the fact—that, if he had not spoken as he did, and cut me out, I would probably have made a similar suggestion myself, and my hon. friends beside me know right well what my feelings have been on this subject since it was broached. What I would advise—speaking entirely from a non-party point—my French friends to do would be to drop this motion of my hon. friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), or, if it cannot be dropped, not to vote for it, but to consent to an amendment on the lines suggested by the hon. gentleman. That is to say, disclaiming, as we ought to disclaim, all intention or desire to interfere with the rights guaranteed to our French friends in Quebec, and in the Dominion, and we should disclaim that, and should disavow all complicity or agreement with the anti-French crusade which the hon. gentleman has been preaching; but, at the same time, and on the same ground as we defended the rights of Quebec last year, we must now feel it our duty to record our conviction that, when this matter has been put fairly and clearly before the people of the North-West, they in the last resort, must be the judges of it. I believe that nine-tenths or nineteen-twentieths of this House, if they were free on both sides to vote as they think, would accept the suggestion I have made, and which was made before by the right hon. the First Minister, and I hope they will not allow themselves to be bulldozed into acting contrary to their convictions by a few fanatics in the House or outside of it. One word more, because, as I said, I am anxious not to delay the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. McCarthy). I believe myself that, if time is given, if two years are allowed to elapse, if the right is conceded which the people of the North-West demand to regulate their own affairs, it is extremely probable that those people would be content with the knowledge that they had that right conceded, and would not force that right to its extreme conclusion. For

myself, I would be glad if they could see their way to do that until such time as we saw whether or not there was going to be such a large immigration into that country as might affect the decision of this difficult and vexed question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is not unreasonable that, at this hour, I should claim the indulgence of the House. The debate has lasted over five days, or nearly so, and during that time I have been subjected to as much abuse certainly as the rules of Parliament permit, and perhaps a little more than the rules would warrant. I look at my friends who are opposite to me and I find no sympathetic glances, and I have no reason to expect them. I look to the band of Nationalists who think I am assailing their race and nationality and language, and I do not find any and I do not expect any. And even when I look amongst those on this side who were once my friends and allies, I find, perhaps, more hostile glances than I do elsewhere. I am standing here alone, or almost alone, doing what I believe to be my duty, and, notwithstanding the sneers, and the taunts, and the insinuations that have been made, I propose to do my duty to the end, if I stand alone, or almost alone, on the floor of this House in the vote which is shortly to be taken. The hon. gentleman who has last spoken (Sir Richard Cartwright) has made no disguise of his feelings or his principles. He speaks not from the principle of statesmanship but from a purely partisan or party point of view. He argues with his friends behind him and his friends before him on that ground, and he appeals to them not to fall into the trap which I am accused of having laid and which some of those friends, he thinks, have already fallen into, but to reject the Bill which I have had the honor to introduce. He makes this appeal without one word of argument upon the merits of the Bill, without a word as to whether it is right or wrong in the interests of the people of the North-West, for whom we are here to judge and to legislate upon this question, but simply with a view to the effect it may have on the votes of the people whom he thinks he leads from the Province of Ontario. He warns them as to the results. He knows well enough that they have gone away from him never to return, but he tells them that they will have lost all if they support such a measure as this and had better return to their allegiance. I looked for better things from that hon. gentleman, but have looked in vain. His speech was a purely partisan speech, without one redeeming feature, without one thing to raise it above the level of the mere party machine. I welcome his statement even from a party point of view if from no other, because it leaves that hon. gentleman without a shred of reputation as a statesman, which he once pretended to be. But I have to address myself not only to the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have to speak of the attack which has been made upon the measure from other sources, and to endeavor to clear up, if I can, the accusations which have been made. The hon. members who have supported me are small in number, though they are as true as steel. They have been overborne in this debate by the power of numbers—not of argument; and I will endeavor to show that, amid the tissue of mis-

representation which has been poured out upon our devoted heads, hon. members will find that there has been no warrant for any part of it. I am accused of having got up this agitation, of having originated it not only on matters of race, but on matters of religion, and I am accused of doing that for selfish purposes and ends. I would like to know what end I had to serve in severing myself from the gentleman I have hitherto supported, and from those hon. gentlemen behind me, who, I have reason to believe, would not have been unwilling to see me advanced in the ranks of my party. What could have led me to take this course as it has been untruly represented to the House, and through the House to the country? My whole course in regard to this matter did not originate last July in my address to my constituents. But on the floor of this chamber, in the presence of hon. members who hear me now, I stated that I had discovered—as, I am ashamed to say, I discovered for the first time—that the dual language clause was in the North-West Act. We then talked it over, and I appeal to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) if we did not call him across the floor and ask him how it was, as our attention had been called to the subject by a speech having been delivered by a Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, for the first time, in French, in the preceding session. That is what aroused our attention to this fact, and, if I am not misinformed, that is what first drew attention to the fact in the North-West—that a French Governor who was sent up there to govern what was practically an English speaking people—true, Sir, to the policy of his race, true to the object which my hon. friends from Quebec have had in view from the very first day that this country was ceded to Great Britain, namely, to perpetuate their race; and they know full well, if other hon. members choose to disregard it, that the perpetuation of that race can only be by the perpetuation of their language—I say, knowing that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West delivered there his speech in French and English, and imported into that Territory a secretary, in order that the laws might be translated into French and published in that language. This, Sir, it was, if I am not grossly misinformed, which raised the indignation of the members of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West so much that they threatened, if that occurred again, they would withdraw in a body. Well, Sir, whether that be so or not, so far as I am concerned it was as I have stated. I consulted some of the hon. gentlemen who are sitting about me and we agreed—some of these hon. gentlemen have been true to their pledges, but the voices of some others have been stifled because they feared to hurt their party—we then and there pledged ourselves that we would, at the earliest opportunity, bring to the notice of this House the iniquitous legislation which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had fathered, which he pretended he had acquiesced in reluctantly, but, as it now appears, he had deliberately connived at its introduction into the Act of the North-West Territories in the year 1878. That was the beginning of it, and I notified my leader at an early day that I would take this course. I had nothing to do with the agitation in connection with it. The agitation which has been spoken of with regard to the Equal Rights Association got

no strength from my connection with it. I had never even attended the convention which assembled at Toronto; all I had to do with it was to send a telegram of regret that I was unable to attend, being otherwise engaged in professional duties, and that I sympathised with the motives and the objects which had brought together the great band of people from all parts of Ontario to take such measures that for the future, at all events, their voice should be heard on the floor of this Parliament. When it became my duty to visit my constituents, as I did upon the 12th July—the first time, I may state, that I ever addressed a body of my constituents on that day, or made any political utterance on the 12th July—I then announced publicly, that I would take the earliest opportunity of asking this Parliament to undo what, according to the records—I will not use the word “surreptitiously”—but what, according to the records, had been stolen through in the dying hours of the Session of 1878, under the charge of the hon. member for Bothwell. Was that an agitation of which any man need be ashamed? Was that pandering to the already aroused passions? What followed? It is said that I have undertaken to act for the people of the North-West Territories; that no mission has been given me so to act for them, and that I am an intruder. Sir, when it became known that I purposed to take my holidays in the North-West, I was invited to address meetings throughout the Province of Manitoba. I had to decline to do so, except at one place, which, ultimately, was fixed for me, at Portage la Prairie.

Mr. WATSON. A Conservative centre.

Mr. McCARTHY. When I got to Portage la Prairie, and was on my way up to the North-West, it was not that I was seeking to intrude myself upon the domain of the North-West, but my difficulty was to deny myself to those who desired that I should address them and in the end I merely addressed one meeting, and that was at Calgary. I refused to make addresses in British Columbia, only to find on the next morning that the newspapers abused me for passing them by. I refused to address a meeting at Winnipeg, only to find that I was subject to castigation for passing by the important centre of that Province. The hon. member says I spoke at a Conservative centre. He knows pretty well, I think, he will be honest enough to admit, that the choice of place for holding the meeting, which happened to be at Portage la Prairie, was not my choice; but when I stated, as I did state, that I would only deliver one address in the North-West, and those who invited me fixed on Portage la Prairie as the place of the meeting, and I had no choice in the matter, one way or the other. I know the charge was made that it was chosen, because it was in a constituency represented by the hon. member who has just made the interruption, but I think that hon. member will do me the justice to say that, at all events, that charge was not founded so far as I am concerned. The charge has also been made that I was playing the game of the First Minister, that I was a mere tool in his hands, that I was going through this country without being sincere in my pledges, that in what I stated I was carrying on an agitation in collusion with him. Sir, I do not think that charge was

Mr. McCARTHY.

even worthy of contradiction, as it ought to be denounced, but it is a charge which I now take the opportunity, in the presence of the First Minister, to say, as every hon. member on the floor of this House must realise, was certainly wanting in a tittle of foundation. I did what I thought was honorable and fair by this hon. gentleman whom I have hitherto followed. I have been careful to hold no intercourse with my former leader, my still leader in all questions affecting the general policy of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; I am not ashamed to announce this fact. There is no reason why I should cross the floor of this House, for there is, in my judgment, on that side an inability and an unwillingness to grapple with the questions which are looming up, and which call for settlement, and I find a bigotry still more profound upon the other side, a still greater truckling to that which, as every man from the Province of Ontario knows, I propose to devote the rest of my political life to denounce, and, if possible, to overturn. Therefore, why should I cross the floor of the House and follow the banner of hon. gentlemen opposite? I took an opportunity long ago of stating exactly where I stood; I spoke in the Opera House in this city—I do not know whether the First Minister took the trouble of reading it, but it was there for him to read—I stated then exactly where I stood. I stated that when these questions came up, if my party differed from the view which ought to be taken, I must stand alone, and I must follow these questions to their end. On other questions I stated there, as I have stated elsewhere, that as I was elected a supporter of the general policy of the Government, I was still a supporter of, and still a believer in that policy. If my connection with the party that I have hitherto supported is an injury to that party, as I think perhaps it is, if the gentlemen who sit behind me do not want me here, I am willing to go here or there, I care not where. I think I can find a seat in this House, and I can still voice the opinions of my own constituency, and a large proportion of the people of Ontario, whether I am turned out of this party or not, and whether I am accepted in that party or not. Such has been my course, and I am not ashamed of it. I denounce that man as a traitor to his country, I care not who he may be, who endeavors to arouse political passions and race passions by misrepresenting my views; he is the man who is doing the wrong, he is the man who is endeavoring in this Parliament and in this country to set race against race and religion against religion, because if my views are fairly looked at, if my statements are fairly examined, if my speeches are fairly read, I think no taint of bitterness will be found, because no taint of bitterness exists, towards my French Canadian fellow-citizens.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman may laugh, but he must know that I have a perfect right to the opinion which I entertain, that the best interests of this country are to be subserved by a unity of language, that the future of this great Dominion, with which this Parliament is charged, will be best worked out by the people of this country coming together and speaking the

language of the majority, the tongue that ultimately must be spoken on all this continent of North America. And, if I am right in that, I do no injustice to my Canadian fellow-subjects; I do only what is my right and my duty, if among those hon. gentlemen and their constituents I endeavor to propagate my views and to support those views by arguments. I frankly admit, I do not deny it, that to many of these hon. gentlemen these are unpalatable views; but is that any good reason why, if I do think, and there are many who think with me, I should hesitate upon the floor of Parliament in temperate language, and my language was temperate, to express these views.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. My language, I re-assert, was temperate, and I will refer to it to support these views. My language was temperate wherever I spoke, and it was more especially temperate on the floor of Parliament, as an hon. gentleman's language ought to be temperate here. No such words escaped my lips as those which the Secretary of State used towards me here to-day; no language of that kind has ever escaped my lips in this debate, and I trust, notwithstanding the provocation of the Minister of Public Works, notwithstanding the provocation I received from the Secretary of State, who denounced me in language not fit for this Assembly, I trust no word will escape my lips which will resemble those used in the course they have pursued towards me. My arguments may tend to a certain conclusion, but my tone was temperate, and I venture to say that my argument was fairly drawn. Now, what was it? I ventured, in the first place, to give a short account of the history of this legislation. I ventured, in the second place, to demonstrate, what I am glad to know I did succeed in demonstrating beyond the region of contradiction, that the French language was not, according to any treaty rights, to be given, if you choose to call it so, to be made a part of the system in the North-West Territory. For that purpose it was necessary that I should trace the history of the cession. I was sorry I introduced even the word conquest, if it was offensive to any hon. gentleman, and I am quite willing to put the fact in any words, although most men will admit that the words make very little difference when the history is known to us all. I said, tracing that history step by step from the cession of 1763 to the passage of the British North America Act in 1867, that no word was to be found in all that history to show why that Act was passed, for which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is responsible, which was represented in that day to the House, but which I am sorry to say was not fairly or correctly represented to the House at that time, by the hon. gentleman, as a piece of legislation warranted upon a ground of that kind. My next argument, and I think it was a not unreasonable one, was this.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman was himself a member of the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not at all unaware of that fact. What I repeat is, that the matter was misrepresented to this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In what way?

Mr. McCARTHY. By the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I deny it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will tell the hon. gentleman in what way. That legislation was introduced into the Senate upon the suggestion of Mr. Girard, the Senator for Manitoba, but it was placed there by the member of the Government leading the Senate, Hon. Mr. Scott.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not believe it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have better information than the hon. gentleman, and, therefore, I shall not withdraw my statement. I speak by the book; I speak on the authority of a gentleman who was present; I speak in a way I can prove. I can prove that Senator Girard merely asked that some provision should be made by which the French half-breeds would have the right to speak in their own language in the courts; and the matter was taken into consideration by Hon. Mr. Scott.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is not the only thing that was asked.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct according to my information, and it is probably quite as good as that possessed by the Secretary of State.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have sat for five days in this House listening to this debate. I have been abused by almost every hon. gentleman who has spoken, but I have made no interruption. It is strange that if with ten to one against me they cannot give me even free speech.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. You stated as a fact that which was not correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Whether correct or not, the hon. gentleman knows the rules of debate. Sir, I am speaking by the book of what I know from information on the very highest authority. The leader of the Senate then stated that during the recess he would consult his colleagues, and after recess he came down and put the clause, which is now clause 110, into the hands of Mr. Girard, who moved it, and it was carried in the Senate. If that be so—and we had no clear explanation about it, although I threw out the challenge in my opening remarks—then the responsibility for this trouble rests not upon my shoulders but upon the shoulders of the hon. member for Bothwell and his friends in the Government at that time. Those are the men who are responsible for the trouble, and it became my duty to bring it forward. I do not say I have not failed in my duty heretofore; I failed in my duty probably in not being present when that was done, but I do not suppose that a young member, for I was then only in my second year of my parliamentary life, would have ventured to interpose at that stage of the Session. That I have failed in my duty since I do not pretend to deny, but when I did ascertain the facts I would have been wanting in my duty, feeling and believing as I do feel and believe with respect to this matter, if I had not brought it to the attention of the country in the first place, and, in the second place, to the attention of this House. With respect to other matters on which I desire to speak before I deal with the question itself: It is true I addressed a meeting in Montreal; it is true I addressed a meeting in this city of Ottawa, but those who know the facts must know that those meetings which I have had the honor to address were not of my seeking. I have a list of places and a bundle of papers which would satisfy hon. gentlemen that

I, at all events, was not seeking to force myself upon the public, but my attendance was demanded by the great city of Montreal and by the city of Ottawa, and it was only in answer to repeated calls that I went to those different cities. So much with respect to what has been said in regard to this agitation. If hon. gentlemen will deal with the matter fairly, they will see that there was no other course open to me, feeling as I feel, and realising my responsibility as a member of this House, but to take the action I have pursued. But exception has been taken to some of my language. I had the misfortune to miss the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I have not yet had time, having only received *Hansard* this evening, to peruse his speech throughout; but I am told the hon. gentleman assailed my speech on the ground that I had used harsh expressions with regard to his nationality. If the hon. gentleman understood my remarks were with respect to his nationality and his race, then I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman's indignation. If the hon. gentleman supposes that I was capable of speaking of any people of this Dominion, or any section of the people of this Dominion in these terms, he was perfectly within his duty in calling attention to the language and denouncing it in the most vigorous terms. But that was not the meaning of my words, and I think my hon. friend, a master as he is of our own tongue, perfectly well realised that was not the meaning. I spoke of the national cry and the national party that he among others has been establishing and fomenting in one of the Provinces of this Dominion, and I denounced that nationality, or rather that pretending nationality as a bastard nationality. I again denounce it here on the floor of Parliament as such. I say that the legitimate nationality, and there is but one, is the nationality common to us all, the nationality that spreads from ocean to ocean and embraces all races and peoples within this great Dominion. I say that if any one in any portion or corner of this Dominion gathers a party together, whether English, Irish, Scotch or French, and endeavors to rise a cry on the nationality of that particular race, there is no word that describes it other than the word that I used, and to which the hon. gentleman called attention. Although the hon. gentleman thought I dare not, I have no hesitation of repeating that statement on the floor of this House, and there is no hon. member understanding the sense in which I stated it before, and in which I repeat it now, who can deny that the expression used was applicable.

Mr. LAURIER. The expression was unfortunate.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman may say so, but I do not know how else he could put it. In justice to him I will say that he quoted my words fairly, or otherwise I would have quoted them myself. There is but one nationality that I, at all events, am willing to recognise in this country. I do not speak of our loyalty to the Throne; I do not speak of our allegiance to the mother country; I speak of that higher nationality of Canadians to Canada. I speak not of one nationality, not of one race, but of all Canada and all Canadians joined together as we should be joined and proud to acknowledge our allegiance. I regret that so much time has been taken up by a somewhat per-

Mr. McCARTHY.

sonal explanation, but, perhaps, if I was to do the subject justice with which I propose to deal, it was necessary that I should clear away from the discussion those extraneous matters which those opposed to me have thought well to introduce. We perfectly well understand the arts of the politician. We do not always spread it so exactly or plainly to the public as the innocent member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); we do not always exactly announce that we are giving party instructions when we speak on the floor of Parliament as that hon. gentleman has thought fit to do, but it has been perfectly plain and perfectly clear to the vision of the most uninitiated among us that the object here has been not to discuss this matter on its merits, not to deal with this question, as it ought to be dealt with, as to whether it should or not become law, but by abusing the plaintiff's attorney—the unfortunate promoter of the Bill—and by raising clouds of race prejudices and religious prejudices as well, to have this Bill rejected because of matters which ought not to have been mentioned in connection with it. What is the proposition we are dealing with here? It is a simple one. It is said that it is the entering of the thin end of the wedge; it is said that I have commenced a crusade, and that this is the first thing I have attempted and that my success in this will mean success later on in other matters. Even if that were so, and if the continuance of the present condition of things is an injury to the people of the North-West—if this is calculated to do that great portion of our Dominion an injustice, are the people of the North-West to suffer under this grievance because of the unfortunate language—if it be unfortunate—because of the unfortunate terms—if they be unfortunate—in which the Bill was presented to the House of Commons. I do not think the practical people of this country will accept any such excuse. I will just add as a rider to the advice of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright): “Do not I beseech you hon. members who sit behind him allow yourselves to be carried away with such ill advice as that.” This Bill and this only must be dealt with on its merits. It is not for the speech of the member who introduced it you are going to vote, it is not for his speech in the Opera House at Ottawa you are going to vote, but you must vote “yea” or “nay” upon the Bill itself which is now before you. If that Bill is one which in the interests of our common country should be passed, I do not think that excuses such as are presented here will save hon. gentlemen from the just indignation of their constituents. Again, there has been a very great misrepresentation of what I stated in my speech. My argument upon the question of language is to be found in these words:

“Now I venture to think I have to advance some explanation of the proposition which I am dealing with—that is, that language is of great importance, that it is of vital consequence to the nation, that the language spoken by its people should be common to them all, and that they should not at all events be encouraged and trained in speaking different languages.”

Is there anything revolutionary in that? Is this the language of the incendiary? Is there anything here that ought not to have been uttered on the floor of Parliament. You can look throughout the speech and you will find nothing more radical than that. I gave my reasons and I cited what my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was

good enough to sneer at as my "authorities." We are not all, like the hon. member for Assiniboia, versed in literature, history, philology, ethnology and in all the other subjects he is so well acquainted with, nor is the country so learned as that hon. gentleman; and I thought in justice to my position that I should quote my authorities. This subject is a comparatively new one to most of us, and I do not repent of it in the slightest degree that in the introduction of this Bill I stated my reasons and gave my authorities, which have been open to the criticisms of hon. members who did me the honor to listen to my address or who read my observations. After all the impassioned language we have heard, after all the abuse that has been heaped upon my devoted head, I ask: Do not those words of mine stand unrefuted and incapable of refutation? The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock)—the loyal embryo knight from that constituency—have first set up a man of straw and then attacked him. The hon. member for Bothwell contended that I had not gone far enough—that I ought to have struck at the language here in this chamber and in the Province of Quebec—that I ought to have prevented its use in the pulpit, on the platform, in the schools, and so on. Why, Sir, we have nothing to do with these matters; we have no call to meddle with them; but I am glad to be able to inform the hon. gentleman that the North-West Legislative Assembly are themselves dealing with this matter of the schools, which is, perhaps, the most important of all. They, discovering as they did lately, just as we have discovered lately, what was going on in the so-called Separate schools in the French settlements, have already, in advance of the Province of Ontario, put an end to that, and the teaching is now in the English tongue. What I have sought for here is that which is in our power. We have this enormous territory yet to be peopled by millions, and do we want to have repeated there the spectacle which is presented on the floor of this House, or the spectacle, still more deplorable from a patriotic point of view, which is depicted in the Legislative Chamber of the Province of Quebec? Do you want that, Sir? It would be better that we all spoke French than that half of us should speak French and half of us English.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," and he is quite right. I do not pretend to know the glories of the French language, but I do know enough from what I have been told to believe that it is a beautiful tongue. But that is not the question we are dealing with. We know that the French language is not and never can be the language of British North America and we ought to realise—more especially ought the French Canadians of this country to realise—that their true interest, as our true interest, is at as early a day as possible to have but the one language spoken in this country. Well, of course, I do not expect, and it would be hardly reasonable to expect, that those hon. gentlemen who agree with me that we should all be better speaking French will go the other step with me and agree that we should be all the better speaking English, though the hon. leader of the Opposition I am told—for I had not the honor of hearing him—rather leaned to that

view. Now, I am not going to follow the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in their excursions into Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Cape Colony, Mauritius, and other places which have been brought to our notice. I have stated before, and I repeat, that these cases are not the rule, but the exception; and while I quite admit that the Province of Quebec is also an exceptional case, the legislation proposed here has no reference to that Province; it has no reference even to this Parliament; it is with regard to the great territories of the North-West, which have always belonged to the Crown of England, which never belonged to the French in any sense, notwithstanding the statement of the bishop which is in our Votes and Proceedings. History tells us that north of the Height of Land and from there to the Pacific Ocean the Frenchman, although he went there, went there as a trespasser, and was expelled as a trespasser. I see a smile on the face of the philosopher from Bothwell, who endeavored to prove that the French territory extended as far as the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So it did.

Mr. McCARTHY. But that was settled by the boundary decision. Those who represented the Province of Ontario in that dispute, before the Privy Council, put forward that pretension, and the hon. gentleman sat there with his wig on his head ready to argue, if he were only allowed, in favor of it, but it was better argued by his seniors. But the Privy Council rejected his contention, and the boundary was placed where we now have it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all; it was on the ground of acquiescence that they decided.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is, of course, wiser than the rest of us. As the Privy Council gave no reason for their judgment, but simply reported to Her Majesty where the boundary was, I do not know where he got that information.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). During the argument.

Mr. McCARTHY. There was not one word during the argument, which I took part in, which would lead to that conclusion. At all events, the observation of a judge during an argument is not a decision.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The observation of Lord Selborne—

Mr. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman will keep his soul in patience we shall get on more easily with this debate. That being so, on what pretense, I want to know, did that hon. gentleman's Government introduce this clause into the North-West Territories Act? I am not now discussing the Province of Manitoba; but with regard to the North-West Territories, is there a shadow of reason for this provision? If so, it has not yet been given to show why the dual language should be imposed on the people of the North-West Territories. If there be no answer, as no answer there can be, then I want to know what is the duty of this Parliament? Is the duty of this Parliament to leave it there? In that respect I understand that the politician of the party, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) differs from the hon. member for West Durham, and he is wise to differ with him and withdraw himself from his protection. The proposition of the hon. member

for West Durham, the most monstrous ever submitted to any assembly, is to keep the language as an encouragement to the French to emigrate to the North-West, and to settle this question, by-and-bye, after they get there. If they go in masses, says the hon. member, I shall much regret it; but if they do go there in masses—and we perfectly well know that they do not go in any other way—then, he said, something will have to be done. If I might appeal to the reason of the House without prejudice, I would say, let us look at the position of the North-West to-day. We are told, and the census confirms it, that in 1885 there were but 1,500 French Canadians in the North-West. If you add the number of the half-breeds of French descent, the number will still be less than 5,000. I have got the exact figures here. We know that at the time to which I refer, there were in the three districts 23,285 English-speaking people; I am leaving the Indians out of consideration. The ratio is therefore 83 to 17 per cent., and if our records are correct that disproportion has been vastly increased, and it is not too much to say that there are not to-day in the North-West one-tenth of the people who speak the French language to the nine-tenths who speak the English language. And moreover, when we look at the record we find that these French are scattered.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then they are not in the mass?

Mr. McCARTHY. "Then they are not in the mass" is the very erudite observation made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). They are here, there and everywhere, in small bands and surrounded by a large population of English-speaking people. That being so, can there be any better time for settling this question than the present? Should there be an immigration in the North-West, in the near future, of the French Canadians, should they go in there induced by the speech of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), or should this House be insane enough to adopt the proposed resolution of that hon. gentleman, I do not know, in common justice, how it would be possible to say, by-and-bye, to those who had immigrated upon the faith of such resolution, that this dual language should be done away with. Therefore, this is the time to deal with the question, and I venture to say that this is the place. The hon. member for South Oxford threw another insinuation, and it certainly would be more satisfactory, if instead of insinuating, he would make his statements so clear that they could be understood. He said that the North-West Council had been moved to present the petition I spoke of by some outside influence, about which he indicated I knew something. What did the hon. gentleman mean? Has the hon. gentleman ever been in the North-West? Has he ever seen the members of the Council or of the Assembly? Does he know the character of the men there? My whole connection with the North-West Assembly commenced with stopping over at Calgary and then passing on; and I had only one communication with one of the members of that Council after this matter was dealt with by the Council, and that was with reference to the form in which the petition ought to be presented to this House. But to suppose that the North-West Council, composed of 22 members, representing three districts, which are in a much less degree

Mr. McCARTHY.

represented in this House, were not competent to deal with this question; to suppose that their opinion is to have no weight with us, but it is to be set at naught; to suppose that the great doctrine of provincial rights in the case of the North-West Council is not to have even the support of hon. gentlemen opposite, is a very extraordinary conclusion to arrive at. Now, what is the position? The North-West Council, by a petition which is practically unanimous—carried by 20 to 2—and which has been laid on the Table, asks for the passage of a measure such as the one I have introduced. Hearing that petitions were being presented here from certain settlements, there was at once—and without the slightest communication, so far as I know, with any member of this House; without any communication at all events with me—a burst of indignation at what appeared to these men to be the imposition which was being practised upon this House. The petitions which the hon. members presented, and which aroused this indignation, were couched as follows:—

"The petition of the undersigned humbly expose that at a public meeting of the ratepayers of Lethbridge, District of Alberta, N. W. T., held this second day of January, A. D. 1890, they have been respectively appointed chairman and secretary, and that the following resolution has been unanimously adopted:

"Whereas, the French language is, under the constitution and the laws, one of the two official languages of the Dominion; and

"Whereas, under the 'North-West Territories Act' the French is, equally with the English, an official language, the suppression of its use, as such, in the North-West Territories, would be a flagrant injustice towards the settlers of French origin, who were the pioneers of this country, and towards those of the same race, who, upon the faith of the constitution and existing laws, came and established themselves in the North-West, and have contributed, with other citizens of other nationalities, to the development of the resources of the country;

"Be it resolved:
"That a petition containing the resolution that has just been passed be signed by the chairman and the secretary of this meeting, and be addressed to the House of Commons, asking that no law be passed affecting the rights of the population with regard to the official use of the French language, as guaranteed by the constitution and the 'North-West Territories Act.'"

No sooner did the news reach the North-West than petitions such as this were being circulated; than an indignation meeting was called at Lethbridge. What was the result of that meeting? I have a telegram which was sent to me, and which reads as follows:—

"At a meeting of the Board of Trade of Lethbridge, thirty-five members present, the following resolution was passed:—

"Moved by J. D. Higginbotham, seconded by C. C. McCaul, that whereas it appears from reports in the public press that a petition purporting to be from the ratepayers of Lethbridge, against the proposal to abolish the dual language system, has been presented to Parliament, this Board of Trade emphatically protest against such petition being accepted as the views of the ratepayers or inhabitants of Lethbridge, because no such public meeting was ever held in Lethbridge, and the said petition was secretly prepared and forwarded, and the ratepayers of Lethbridge never had any opportunity of voting thereon, and that a copy of this resolution be telegraphed to Mr. Dalton McCarthy, and a copy forwarded by mail to the public press. Please let D. W. Davis, M.P., have copy of this telegram.

"W. A. GALLIHER,
"Secretary Board of Trade."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. And the Privy Council has a communication which shows what the meeting was and the number of people present, and which exposes the falsity of that telegram.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman did not think fit to lay it upon the Table.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is before the Privy Council, and the names can be given and the papers produced at any time my hon. friend wants them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think any statement of that kind would convince me, and I will tell the hon. gentleman the reason why. I have a letter from a gentleman, who has given me the liberty to read it—a gentleman well known to the right hon. the First Minister, and who is as incapable of telling an untruth as is the hon. the Provincial Secretary himself.

"February 5th, 1890.

"DEAR MR. McCARTHY,—The *Empire* publishes certain resolutions in regard to the dual language question, purporting to have been passed at a public meeting of ratepayers at Lethbridge. The 'public meeting' must have been very privately called, as none of the ratepayers to the public school ever heard of it. It was in fact a meeting of the Roman Catholic supporters of the separate school, a very small minority—and they were very careful not to let the general public get any inkling of their proceedings.

"You can rely on it that the general feeling of Lethbridge and this district, is entirely in favor of your motion.

"Yours faithfully,
C. C. McCAUL.

"You are at liberty to make any use of this letter that you see fit."

That is not the only communication I got. I got a letter from Banff from a gentleman perfectly well known to the right hon. the First Minister, Mr. Frederick J. Boswell:

"MY DEAR McCARTHY,—I noticed in the *Toronto Globe* the announcement that Davis, M. P. for Alberta, has presented to the House of Commons from Banff, Anthracite Canmore, &c., a resolution asking the Parliament not to do away with the French language in the Territories;" that the said resolutions were passed at public meeting held in the above named places; I can most positively assure you that no such meetings were held either at Banff, Anthracite or Canmore, the only meetings that have been held were two, in reference to the regulations and leases in the townsite of Banff.

"I think it right to let you know this, as I am with you *in re* your dual language Bill and am at work getting a petition signed by all inhabitants of this place backing you up. Dr. Brett, our member of the Legislative Assembly, is strongly in your favor, and you may depend that if it is referred to the Assembly he will do his utmost to carry it.

"I think it very unjust of Davis to misrepresent us.

"Wishing you and your Bill every success.

"I remain,
Yours very sincerely,
FRED J. BOSWELL."

I have also a telegram, which I believe was also sent to the hon. member who represents Alberta in this House (Mr. Davis), in these words:

"At a mass meeting in Calgary to-night, Mayor Lafferty, chairman, the following resolutions passed by 250 to 7:—

"No. 1. That the use of a dual language in official proceedings in the North-West Territories is unnecessary, expensive and calculated to prevent the complete union of the several nationalities who reside in the Territories, and that to bring about a united Canadian people in this part of the Dominion, the English language alone should be legalised in the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, the courts, and all other official bodies.

"No. 2. That this meeting heartily endorses the action of the Legislative Assembly at Regina, in reference to the dual language, and requests that the petition presented to the Dominion Government in pursuance of such action be granted.

"No. 3. That a copy of the above resolutions be forwarded to D. W. Davis, M.P.; D'Alton McCarthy, M.P., the Hon. James Loughheed, and the Dominion Parliament, and that D. W. Davis, M.P., be requested to forward in

every way the movement for the abolition of French as an official language in the Territories."

Now, let us see where we stand in regard to this question, considered as a local one. The members of the North-West Council were elected two years ago, if my memory serves me, since the members of this House who sit for that district were elected. They are twenty-two in number. They are spread, of course, and come much more in contact with the people of their respective territories than do the members who sit here, whose districts are so much larger. They have unanimously, or with practical unanimity, petitioned this House to abolish this clause in the North-West Territories Act. On the motion being made here, and the matter being brought before Parliament, and it appearing that certain cut-and-dried petitions were presented here from certain places in that Territory, the people there at once set about getting up counter-petitions which I have had the honor to present to the House. They are not petitions purporting to be signed by the chairmen and secretaries of public meetings, which may conceal the fact that no such meetings were held, but they are signed by the leading men in the places from which they come. For instance, in Calgary, the petition was signed by the mayor at the head, by two ex-mayors and over 500 others; and, in another place, the petition is signed by a French Catholic gentleman, who, I think must be the gentleman who grows coffee, to whom the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) referred to the other night, though of that I am not quite sure. Then we have a public meeting at which a vote of 250 to 7 was recorded in favor of this change; and yet we are told that we do not know what the feelings of the people of the North-West are in regard to this question, and that we ought to give them time for consideration, and to allow the members of the Assembly there another opportunity of appealing to their constituents. There are many other questions which come before this House with which, if that argument is to prevail, we would find it difficult to deal at all. But I do not conceal the fact that I do not look upon this matter as a local question. When I addressed the people of Calgary, and they were good enough to say that they understood I was to take a part in the movement to abolish the separate school system and the dual language in the North-West, I said, as to the dual language I shall move in Parliament, whether you petition or not; I look upon that question as a matter of national importance, as a matter affecting the whole Dominion, as a matter which is proper to be dealt with in Parliament and not by a Local Legislature. I found at the same time, in the organ of the hon. gentleman which is published in the city of Toronto, a statement that if the people in the North-West signified their desire to abolish the use of that language officially, effect would be given to their wish. When the Assembly met, almost their earliest act—and I think not their least important act—was to adopt this petition, which placed on two grounds their desire to abolish the use of that language: one, that it was not required in the interest of the country; and the other, that it was contrary to sound public policy that two languages should prevail. Follow that up by the petitions I have had the honor to present, and by the report which I have read from my place in Parliament, and then, if the House is not seized of

the opinions of the North-West in regard to this matter, I fail to see how we will ever be able to obtain the views of that people on the subject. Do not let us exaggerate, I have no desire at all to exaggerate the importance of this question of language. I admit as freely as it can be admitted that there are cases—and the case of Switzerland is one—where, under peculiar circumstances, people speaking different languages, those languages being officially there three instead of two, have enjoyed a certain amount of prosperity, or very great prosperity if you like. But do hon. gentlemen see any analogy between Switzerland and Canada? The cantons of Switzerland came together as independent bodies under bargains and terms and conditions to which every one of them had to agree, and that possesses nothing of an analogy to the case of our own North-West. But, if we look at the history of the Swiss Confederation, what do we find? I hardly expected from the historian of the House, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that so much stress would be laid upon the case of Switzerland. Let us look at this case of Switzerland for a few moments, while I give a short statement of its history. It is quite true that Switzerland is composed of 22 cantons, it is quite true that there are three official languages there, it is equally true that there is a fourth language which is not recognised. But the history of the Swiss constitution may briefly be summarised thus: Between 1291 and 1874, the confederation has passed through no less than seven phases, of which, since 1798, there have been four—one in 1798, one in 1803, another in 1815, another 1848, and a revision in 1874. Is that the evidence of a stable constitution? Is that the kind of constitution that the hon. member would like to have fastened upon the people of his beloved North-West? Just let us see:

“The third phase lasted till 1798”—

I am reading from the best work, I believe, on the subject, the work of Sir F. O. Adams—

—“without modification, and was marked by internal discord, religious wars, and revolts of peasants.”

That is the first beautiful picture we have of the Confederation of Switzerland. This phase lasted from 1815 to 1848:

“Then came an epoch of agitation and of discord.

“The Confederation suffered from a fundamental vice, *i. e.*, the powerlessness of the central authority. The Cantons had become too independent, and gave to their deputies instructions differing widely from each other.”

Now, here is what we find happening in 1847:

“On the 4th November, 1847, after the deputies of the Sonderbund had left the Diet, this league was declared to be dissolved, and hostilities broke out between the two contending parties. A short and decisive campaign of twenty-five days ensued: Freiburg was taken by the Federal troops under General Dufour, later Luzern opened its gates, the small cantons and the Valais capitulated, and the strife came to an end.”

Now, let me give you a comment upon this from a paper which, perhaps, will not command the attention of the members of this House, the *Edinburgh Review*, which, so late, as the month of January last, spoke of the Swiss Executive in these words:

“It (the Swiss Executive) guides the policy of a state eternally menaced by foreign complications; it preserves harmony throughout a confederacy made up of twenty-two cantons, each jealous of one another and sympathising only in common jealousy of the Federal power.”

Mr. McCARTHY.

I do not think that any of us would like to plant in the virgin soil of the North-West, a constitution such as the Swiss constitution, with the results which have attended its use, and, therefore, the illustration is very far fetched. Take another illustration which we have had, take Cape Colony; I dare say some hon. gentleman know more about Cape Colony than I do, possibly some members of this House may have visited it; but is it not a fact that the Dutch Boers, as they are called, have rebelled and have left the English colony and have formed an independent republic on its borders? Have not, within recent times, the British arms suffered a defeat at their hands, and to-day is there not very great trouble between the Dutch who remain in the English colony? Certainly, it is the last example I would expect to be given by any persons, cognisant with the facts in support of a duality of language in any country. But need we go so far afield? Let me give one more instance, wearisome as these instances may be. I cannot forbear quoting to the House the striking example of Bohemia. Bohemia, we all know, is inhabited by two nationalities, the Germans, and the Zechs, speaking each their language. We know an attempt was made, not long ago, to put down one of these languages, and how has a settlement been arrived at? What has been the only possible solution? Under the influence of the Emperor Francis Joseph, who is beloved by his subjects, and who has great influence among them, they have resolved to settle the difficulty in this extraordinary fashion: the Diet is informally divided into two *Curie*, one German and the other Zech, which sit and debate together, although each possesses the full power of a separate and co-ordinate House. That is the only solution for a duality of language which could be found in Bohemia, and it was found necessary to resort to that in order to prevent these people from flying at one another's throats, it was found necessary to resort to that to prevent the Germans from deserting to Bismark. Now, what is the position here?—because, it is useless for us to go further than our own country. If this language is not designedly perpetuated with the view of keeping up the French nationality—which the hon. leader of the Opposition has been the only French Canadian on the floor of Parliament to denounce, or to say that he does not sympathise with it.

Mr. LAURIER. What?

Mr. McCARTHY. A French nationality.

Mr. LAURIER. What did you say?

Mr. McCARTHY. I say you denounced it; I say that the leader of the Opposition is the only gentleman of that nationality who denounced it.

Mr. LAURIER. Denounce what, my nationality?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, not your nationality; but the formation of a French nation upon this continent.

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask, what is the ultimate result of the system that is being pursued in regard to the French language throughout this Dominion? Is there any other result, except the one which is pointed out to us in newspapers in the Province of Quebec? Is that not the logical outcome of the views which were enunciated so freely by *La Vérité* which I read to this House

when I had the honor to introduce this Bill? I know no other. But I deny the right of any gentleman in this House to repudiate the language of the mountebank, as the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) calls him, the "mountebank Premier" of the Province of Quebec. The language is not mine. I differ from Mr. Mercier as much as it is possible to differ from any public man, but yet I have too great a respect for my French Canadian fellow-subjects to speak of their First Minister in the language which was used by the champion of their cause on the floor of this Parliament; for I recognise in him, whatever his other faults may be, one of the greatest men which his nationality has produced in Canada. We know that although it may suit the purposes of the leader of the Opposition to say that he does not sympathise with these aspirations, his words are not uttered in the Province of Quebec. We know that the hon. gentleman is going hand in hand with the Premier of the Province of Quebec in all his local contests, in all his endeavors to fasten what he calls the Nationalist Party upon that Province, and in which, up to this time, he has been successful. We know, Sir, that the hon. gentleman was present at a great public meeting at which the Premier of Quebec announced the aspirations of the French Canadian people to be the formation of a great French nationality, not under the glorious Union Jack, of which we hear so much in this House from some hon. gentlemen who do not say so much about it in the Province of Quebec, but under the Tricolor, and he advised the members of both parties to join under the Tricolor of France, the flag of France, not that they wished to unite with France; I quite agree that is not their aspiration; the Republic of France does not suit the French Canadians of that view in the Province of Quebec; but that they did announce that their nationality was typified by the French flag, the Tricolor of France. That that language was uttered at a great meeting of their fellow-countrymen, that that language was uttered by the Premier of Quebec in the presence of the leader of the Opposition in this House, without demur, without contradiction, without remonstrance, and without reproach, goes without saying.

Mr. LAURIER. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to interrupt him? On the occasion to which he alludes I spoke after Mr. Mercier, and I spoke afterwards in Toronto, quoting word for word the language I had used in Quebec.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right, and yet my statement remains uncontradicted. The hon. gentleman did speak in honeyed words, first of his love for his own nationality, and secondly of his love for the other nationalities of the Dominion. What I am complaining of is this: if that was not the view of the hon. gentleman, then and there, before the thousands who were assembled, before the great body of his fellow-countrymen, was the time for prompt repudiation and not here. But no repudiation came. Is it possible under these conditions for us to stand still? Have we no other evidence of the aspirations of the hon. gentleman's party, because he is reaping the benefit of that party, that party which is his strength in the Province of Quebec? It is only a few days ago, certainly only a few weeks ago, since the hon. gentleman wrote an

open letter calling upon his people, notwithstanding the rebellion of the old Liberal Party of which he was at one time a member, when they rebelled against this new proposed national cry of the Premier of the Province of Quebec; the hon. gentleman instead of joining with his own confrères, wrote to the constituency or a prominent member in it, urging their support to the new party formed by the Premier of Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. Against the Tories.

Mr. McCARTHY. He had been a Tory or a Bleu, and he became a convert to the Nationalist cry and went over to the Nationalist Party against the remonstrances of the old Liberal Party of the Province. The hon. gentleman thought fit to interpose and interfere. Is that all? When the hon. gentleman joined in the agitation with respect to Riel, I wonder did he ever think that he would be denouncing a member of this House for incendiarism? I wonder did he ever think he would be denouncing a brother member for raising a cry and appealing to the passions of the people? Does the hon. gentleman remember his course upon that occasion? Sir, does he remember that when Riel, after a fair trial, after being ably defended and impartially tried, was justly executed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. Justly executed—yes. At a meeting in Montreal, led by the lieutenant of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) who sits here for western Ontario—influenced by purely patriotic considerations for the good of the country—this extraordinary language was used by the present leader of the Opposition at that excited time, when a statesman would have naturally used a language tending to quiet and subdue the disturbed passions of the multitude. And what were the words?

"If he (Laurier) had been on the banks of the Saskatchewan when the rebellion broke out, he would have taken up arms against the Government."

He further said:

"It must be well understood by all that this was not a war of races, but rather a vindication of the rights of one race that claimed for the French that which is granted to all other nationalities. The crime of Regina would still be avenged, not only by the French, but by all other races. They were asking for no favor, but they only wanted common justice pure and simple. They were as jealous of the liberties of others as of their own; and if injustice was done one class, injustice might be done to others."

He further said:

"They cannot bring Riel back to life, but by patriotically uniting together they can drive from power the wretches who had so pitilessly put him to death."

"Sir John had not had the courage of dealing leniently by a man who represented a cause which he had not treated fairly and justly."

"This was a free country and not even the Government had the right of committing judicial murder."

This was the language of the hon. gentleman, who has had the hardihood to speak of my moderate terms as being calculated to arouse angry passions, race difficulties and troubles. Does the hon. gentleman repent of those words? No. His benches are filled by his fellow-countrymen by reason of those words, and although some of them sit there to-day not following or supporting him, it is simply by reason of the accident that he did not secure a majority. The hon. gentleman profits by that language, and he has no reason to regret it. We recognize that by means of this cry the then

Government of the Province of Quebec, the best Government the Province has had since Confederation was ejected from office. Why? Because they declined to vote censure upon the Administration at Ottawa. Mr. Mercier, taking advantage of the excited feeling of the Province, gathered together the Nationalist Party, nationalist in the narrow sense to which I have referred, and, joining hands with the hon. gentleman here, brought about a result which deprived this House of many supporters from the French Province for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and brought strength to hon. gentlemen opposite. People might not consider the words of politicians of such serious moment, but we cannot disregard what we see going on before our eyes. The other day a young lady, Miss Maybee, was sent down to the Post Office Department in Quebec. She had the misfortune to speak English and to come from Ontario; and will it be believed, and yet we know it perfectly well to be the case, that those supporting the hon. gentleman opposite at once denounced the Government and the Postmaster General for making the appointment.

Mr. LAURIER. And the Ministerial papers, too.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I am astounded at it. I did not think that matters had gone to that length; I have not seen the references, and I will be delighted if the hon. gentleman will furnish them to me. So it now happens, if the hon. gentleman's statement is correct, and he would not make a statement if it was not correct, that both French parties in Quebec object to an English speaking lady.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The hon. gentleman admits it. I repeat that they object to an English lady being sent down there. I have the words in some of the newspapers if the hon. gentleman wishes them. The howl was raised, and it was successful. I am sorry to say. I am sorry to know that the old politeness of the French race seems to have departed, for I thought a young lady would have been favorably received; but objection was made by *L'Electeur* and another paper. Here are the words:

"*L'Événement* joins us in protesting against the nomination of Miss Maybee to the Post Office Inspector's Office. The rumor going round, according to what *l'Événement* says, is that we are going to give employment in the Civil Service at Quebec to a lady of Ontario. As the occupation of this lady would simply be to run a typewriter in the post office, we don't see why we should go so far to get a typewriter that we could find so easily at home.

"It is not in our knowledge, and it is not in the knowledge of any person, that they would think for a moment of bringing a French Canadian girl from Quebec or Montreal to occupy a position of any kind of employment in Ontario. Are we supposed to be more generous, more agreeable, than our neighbors, especially when we have persons who are qualified to do the work in question?"

I can assure the hon. gentleman that if a young lady is sent to Ontario or Toronto she will not be denounced in the public press, but she will be received with kindness, courtesy and consideration. Another article follows, which I need not trouble the House by reading. That is another result of these race troubles and race difficulties. But it is not the most serious in my humble judgment that we have to deal with. I find in a French publication of recent date, M. Tardivel, under the heading "Anglicism—Behold the Enemy," writes:

Mr. MCCARTHY.

"Reflecting a little upon the situation I saw a great danger for the future of the French Canadian race. Language is the soul of a nation. If the Basques have been able so long to preserve intact their ancient institutions amidst the revolutions and the wars which have convulsed France and Spain; if the Bretons and the Welsh have remained distinct from the races which surround them, they have their language to thank for it. If Ireland struggles in vain to regain her independence, it is because she no longer speaks the language of her old kings. Do you wish to cause a people to disappear? Destroy its language. It is because they comprehend this truth that Russia shows herself so inexorable towards the Polish language, and that Germany seeks to proscribe the French language of Alsace-Lorraine. It is then important for a people, especially a conquered people, to preserve its language."

The same writer again says:

"I stop here. I make no claim to have exhausted the subject, far from it. I have simply desired to utter this note of alarm; 'Fight the anglicification of the French language,' and at the same time to give some proofs that this enemy is really to be feared. Let others with more authority than I possess continue the combat; and if one day those who love the French language decide to make a grand assault, all along the line, be assured that I shall not fail to respond to the appeal."

Mr. LAURIER. What paper is that from?

Mr. MCCARTHY. It is not a paper at all.

Mr. GIROUARD. Surely we are entitled to know what the hon. gentleman is reading from.

Mr. Fiset. May I ask the hon. gentleman from what journal he is reading? I do not understand that he has told us from what paper he is quoting.

Mr. MCCARTHY. It is a pamphlet by Tardivel. Then another writer, Mr. Manseau, in a book published in 1881, writes:

"The dictionary gives the technical definition of *Anglicism*. Here follows, in our opinion, a definition from the heart. It is a spot of blood that shows us through what place the claws of the British lion have passed, and these claws (who is there that knows it not) torture and flag our language until they kill it."

I will not trouble the House with more extracts of this description, but I will draw the attention of my hon. friends on both sides to the instruction given in the French schools, and if there is then an hon. member who thinks that children so taught or instructed with regard to this history of our country can grow up as British citizens, or British subjects, or as loyal except to their own French Canadian nationality, or that anything can be expected from them except the language of *La Vérité* and the language of the Premier of the Province of Quebec; then I think that hon. gentlemen will be incapable of reasoning. In this history I find the following:

"1774. England, fearful of losing Canada, in view of the menacing attitude of the United States, made haste to grant a new constitution more favorable to the Catholics."

Mr. AMYOT. Hear, hear.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear." There is not a shadow of doubt that this is the teachings in the schools. Every concession that has been obtained is always pictured to the people of the Province of Quebec as having been wrung from tyrants and despots and not granted by the free-will of the people.

Mr. AMYOT. You are a tyrant to us.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I quote also another selection from one of these histories:

"The material forces of New France had to succumb in the end, but the providential forces still do their work in

the colony, which is probably destined to play on this continent the part which old France has played on the Continent of Europe."

I think I have read of similar language in *La Vérité*. If this is the teaching of the schools, if these are the writings of the different writers, if this is the language of the Premier of the Province, if these are the utterances at the great public meetings held in that Province (and no man is bold enough to assert a single word of dissent to them) what possible outcome can there be except the natural outcome which is here announced on the floor of Parliament. If my ears did not deceive me I think I heard the Minister of Public Works speak of the autonomy of his race, and state that his nation would live in spite of all that might be done against it. We must remember that this has been a British colony for over a century and a quarter, and that within a very short period after the cession—I was nearly using the unfortunate word conquest—a distinguished French traveller passing through here was able to announce that the French Canadians were better treated under the English than they were under their own Kings. We must remember that from that time to this they have enjoyed a liberty which they could not possibly have enjoyed under the Crown of France yet; notwithstanding this, they are endeavoring to perpetuate this race and nation cry mainly by their language, which is the soul of the nation, as this writer says. If the language was permitted to die out, as it would naturally do, all this ambition, which must end in delusion, which can never end in anything but delusion and which can never lead to any accomplished fact, would soon disappear. We have no jealousy of the Germans, we have no jealousy of any other nationality, because we know that while they speak in their own tongue, and for years after they come here are not able to speak any other tongue, yet they do not propose to divide the people of this country by their race cries and race feelings. Now these are the problems we have to deal with. There is no use our going to Switzerland or to Austro-Hungary for examples. We have to deal with the question we have here at home; and the practical question is, whether, under these circumstances, we should permit this kind of thing to go on. Whatever I might do bye-and-by, no man is responsible for my acts. The gentlemen who vote with me now, and the gentlemen who disagree with me, are not responsible for what I may do bye-and-by. I may state—as these hon. gentlemen who have done me the honor of following my utterances with so much care know well—that I have never pretended to believe or to say that it was possible to deal with the dual language in the Province of Quebec. I realise that that is beyond the hope of being dealt with by any possible legislation. I realise that that has been allowed to grow into such monstrous proportions that we can never hope to cope with it, except by natural ways and by natural causes which possibly may work a cure. Not in our day, but within perhaps a time that one can imagine, it may work out its own cure. I look forward to the assimilation that is going on by reason of the travelling backwards and forwards between the French Canadians of Quebec and the Eastern States of the Union. Do what you will, the people do go and will go to the Eastern States. Do what you will, they will more or less imbibe the language

of that great country and disseminate it amongst those whom they have left behind. From this side we are taking care that the Province of Ontario will maintain its character as an English speaking Province. This process is going on, I have great hope, and it is a hope which does no injustice to my French Canadian fellow citizens, that bye-and-by the difficulty even in the Province of Quebec may vanish. So that I have never had the ambition, I have never dreamed of interfering. I do not say, Sir, that the time may not come when it will be proper to move—though in that I do not find much sympathy in this House—to do away with the dual language in this Chamber. The time has not come yet, that is quite certain. What we are dealing with now is this question in the North-West, and do not let us mix up questions that have nothing at all to do with it. One hon. gentleman said I had introduced even a religious cry. Why, Sir, is freedom of speech so gone in this country that I cannot express my dissent from the system of separate schools which exists in my own Province without being told that I am raising a religious cry? Is that a question of religion? Is not that a question of great state policy as to how our children shall be educated? And I do hope that before very long the delegation from the Province of Ontario will call on this House for its aid to blot out the Separate School clause from the British North America Act, which limits and fetters the people of that Province. That clause was carried by a majority of French Canadians, and was imposed upon the people of Ontario against their will; and I am sorry to differ from my hon. leader on that question. He tells us—and I never feel more humiliated than when I hear him speak on that subject—that he participated in imposing that Separate School system upon us. But is it possible that the free people of Ontario are not to be placed in the same position as the people by the sea on both sides of them, in the Maritime Provinces and in British Columbia? If they could not ask this Parliament to aid in freeing them from the restrictions imposed upon them I would despair of the freedom of this country. But that has nothing to do with this question. All these are aside from it, and will be properly dealt with when they come up and not before. What we are dealing with now is the question whether this Bill for the repeal of the dual language in the North-West should or should not become law; that and that only is the question before us. I am sorry, Sir, that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has been compelled by the unfortunate event to which he alluded to absent himself from this discussion. It is not pleasant to speak of an hon. gentleman behind his back, for I cannot quite accept the theory put forward by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook), that that gives one a better privilege to abuse a man; but, perhaps, I may be allowed to say a few words about that hon. gentleman's proposition. You will remember, Sir, that he read us a lecture: he told us how we were not to disturb the harmony that at present existed; how we were to be careful of raising race cries; how he recognised that there was a mass of ignorance, prejudice and bigotry which only required the hand of an incendiary to inflame it, and he rather intimated that the hand of the incendiary had already been laid to that mass; and then he wound up with a fervent appeal that we should

never interfere with the covenant, as he called it, made at the time of Confederation. I felt that if that hon. gentleman had not already surrendered to French influences of the Province of Quebec he made his capitulation the other night. But his most extraordinary statement was that we were not informed of the opinion of the people of the North-West, that their representatives had no mandate from them to take up and deal with this question. Did that hon. gentleman remember that when in the Province of Ontario he agitated the country from end to end with regard to the murder of poor Thomas Scott, he sat in the Legislature of Ontario, where he had no mandate to deal with that question? Did the hon. gentleman remember that on one occasion he himself brought into this House a resolution which was offensive to a great many of us with regard to the Irish question, in order that he might secure the Irish section of our population and draw them to his standard, although he had no mandate, and although this House had no authority to speak with regard to Imperial concerns? Did that hon. gentleman remember that on another occasion he voted for, if he did not move, a resolution on the subject of the disestablishment of the Irish Church? And yet he undertook to assert that the Legislature of the North-West had no right to petition this Parliament. We had a right to pass offensive resolutions and send them home to England, notwithstanding the rebuff we met with from the Imperial authorities; but the hon. gentleman ventured to assert that the representatives of the North-West had no right to petition or to express their wishes that this clause should be stricken out of the North-West Territories Act. I will say no more in the absence of that hon. gentleman. I now desire, before closing, to say a word or two on the merits of the various motions before the Chair. The amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) has received but little favor from any of the English-speaking members. It is one, I think, impossible of acceptance. It announces that if we repeal a clause in the North-West Act, put in under the extraordinary circumstances to which reference has been made, and allowed to remain because attention has not been drawn to it, we shall be shaking the stability of our institutions and destroying the peace and progress of the North-West. The mere recital of that resolution carries its condemnation with it. The other amendment with which we have to deal, and which seems to find a good deal of favor, is the amendment of my hon. friend the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin); and before I deal with that I have somewhat of an apology to make to that hon. gentleman and to this House. I am accused of interfering with the prerogatives of the members from the North-West. Surely, said the hon. Minister of Public Works, echoed by the hon. Secretary of State, there were members in this House representing the North-West whose duty it was to bring this question to the attention of this chamber, and there was rather an insinuation thrown out by the hon. member for Assiniboia himself in his very opening words that my action was an intrusion on his domain; and, if you will pardon me saying so, the bitterness—but that is too strong a word, for he could not be bitter if he tried, but the appearance of bitterness—which characterised his observation I thought had its

Mr. McCARTHY.

origin somewhat in pique, that anyone except that hon. gentleman himself should venture to deal with questions affecting the people of the North-West. He and he alone is the guardian of their interests, the only member who has a right to speak on their behalf, and any one else who attempts to do so must expect to meet with the castigation administered to me in the opening of this debate.

Mr. DAVIN. I said you had a right.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; but the very observation rather suggested an apology from me. This is my excuse, and the only excuse I give—I am reading from the *Qu'Appelle Progress* of 7th February inst. :—

“Dalton McCarthy introduced into the Dominion Parliament his Bill to abolish the official use of the French language in the North-West. He delivered a very temperate and dispassionate speech, full of facts and arguments.”

That is not the way my feeble efforts were characterised in this House; but that seems to be the opinion of the outside world, at all events.

“The second reading is to take place on Wednesday next, when it is expected there will be a big fight. We are informed on good authority that all the North-West representatives will vote against it. If they do so, their constituents should call upon them to resign forthwith. We are also informed that Mr. N. F. Davin will speak against it. West Assiniboia is about the best mis-represented constituency in the North-West. This country is almost unanimous in favor of Mr. McCarthy's Bill, but its representatives all belong to the party machine and must represent the machine in preference to the country.”

That, Mr. Speaker, is my apology for venturing to introduce this point to the notice of the House. Now, with regard to the amendment of that hon. gentleman: what is it? My motion is that the Bill be read the second time. Great fault is found with the preamble. The preamble is worse than the enacting clause; the enacting clause is harmless and the preamble is something fearful. Well, to the laymen of the House, perhaps, explanations are necessary about the preamble. To the lawyers of the House an explanation is not called for. It is quite certain, as every lawyer in this House knows, that the preamble neither adds to nor takes from the effect of the enacting clause. The preamble, in this case, I quite admit, was unnecessary. While I do not at all withdraw from the sentiment contained in that preamble, yet as an effective piece of legislation I am free to admit the Bill would be perfectly as good without as with the preamble. Now, if the hon. gentlemen in this House are sincere, and I am bound to believe in their sincerity; if they desire that this dual clause should be expunged or repealed—the hon. member for West Durham thought “expunge” was a very improper word to use; one has to be very careful of his language and must not use words, no matter how plain they may be, except with the greatest care—well, I will call it repeal, or anything you will. But, I say, if hon. gentlemen are sincere in their desire to repeal this clause, the way to do that is to pass the Bill to the second reading, and those who are opposed to the preamble can then have it struck out. The preamble of a private Bill is the all-essential portion; if the preamble be not carried, the Bill does not pass. The preamble of a public Bill is wholly unessential; its only possible use can be to make an ambiguous portion of the enacting clause plain, if ambiguity there be; and I say here that while I do not withdraw from that

preamble, while I think the statement in it is perfectly true, namely :

“Whereas it is expedient in the interest of the national unity of the Dominion that there should be community of language among the people of Canada.”

Who will say nay to that? It may not be absolutely essential; that is not the proposition. I say, it is expedient, and every gentleman who has spoken on this question has admitted its expediency. Even the hon. member for West Durham said that if we were all of one race and one nationality, speaking one tongue, the task before us would be simpler and easier, and, therefore, the proposition before us is not incorrect and unfounded. But to any hon. gentleman who objects to it, all I can say is, when the Bill goes to Committee, should it pass the second reading, let him object to the preamble, and I shall be the first to withdraw it. I want the body of the Bill, and do not care for the preamble, and if there be a member of this House who desires the Bill and objects to the preamble, there shall be no opposition, as far as I am concerned, to this preamble being obliterated, or expunged, to use any term you please. I will say more. I did not in the least dream that the words should be taken up in an offensive sense, and I can only most heartily express my regret that any of my French Canadian friends should be offended by this clause in the Bill, or that I should have hurt the sentiments of French speaking members of this House, or the French Canadians throughout the country—for such was far from my intention. But what was the proposition of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)? It was that the Bill be not now read a second time. That is, he does not want the dual language expunged, nor does he want to give the power to the North-West Territories to expunge it.

Mr. DAVIN. I do.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then the hon. gentleman has not taken the proper course. If he wanted that, his proper course was to let the Bill be read a second time, and to move into Committee that clause I be struck out and the words of his amendment inserted in its stead :

“That the said Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved,—That it is expedient that the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories be authorised to deal with the subject-matter of this Bill by Ordinance or enactment after the next general election for the said Territories.”

But the effect of the hon. gentleman's amendment is to kill the Bill. Make no mistake about it. If the Bill is not read a second time, there it stops. Then what takes place? Hon. gentlemen say they want to repeal the dual language clause, but they want to do that with as much gentleness and consideration for the feelings and susceptibilities of the French-speaking people as possible. Then, the way to do that is to pass the Bill, rejecting the preamble, and inserting the clause of the hon. member for West Assiniboia as the substantial part of the Bill. But if you say that the Bill do not pass, but that it be resolved, &c., and make that resolution as long as you please, what follows? Who is to move? The Government cannot move, for they are at sixes and sevens on this subject. There is the resolution. I certainly would not move it, as I do not approve of it. The hon. member for Assiniboia would not move it, because he would offend the powers that be.

Mr. DAVIN. I would move it if necessary.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman doubt the necessity?

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then I think the hon. gentleman would have to move, and instead of being the admired of all his surroundings, he will occupy the position I do. He will be belated and berated, and will fall from the highest stage or pinnacle of greatness which he has occupied for the last few days. Do not now rush in where angels fear to tread; and I do not think the hon. gentleman will make any such mistake. Why, let us not deal with this subject in a simple way. Punish me if you will; expel me if you please; because I venture to put in this preamble, and to speak at the Opera House, and because I ventured to claim that the English language should rule in this country, but pass the Bill. The way to pass the Bill is to go to a second reading and then to expunge what is in the preamble. Do not pass the Bill, if it suits your pleasure, but vote the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier. That is honest and straightforward, and that, at all events, we can understand. We can understand the views and the policy of the hon. gentlemen who are absolutely opposed to any change. But hon. gentlemen who wish to get rid of this question by a side issue, who try to do and not to do it, will not, although they may deceive this country. That they may depend upon. I listened to the argument of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), and I listened to the argument of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault), and no more straightforward or honorable statement of the case was given on that side of the House. It contrasted greatly with the statement from the Treasury benches of its compatriots from Quebec; it was arguments, not abuse. It was a reason for us to pause in our course, and was not simply denunciation of those who differ from the views which those hon. gentlemen both take. But I say their view is the correct view. It is this Parliament, and it is this Parliament alone, which has the power to deal with this question. It is this Parliament which put that clause in, uninvited. It is this Parliament which has the authority to take that clause out. Why should we abnegate our duties or our functions on the ground of expediency or to get rid of a temporary difficulty? Will we, in the interest of our country, be doing a service? Will we not be keeping open that running sore of which the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) spoke? We put the trouble on the people of the North-West, but, although we should denude ourselves of our authority and endeavor to get rid of this question for the moment, it will remain a burning question in old Canada and in the new Provinces, more especially, if you postpone the decision of this question until after the next general elections. I am commissioned to read the opinion of a senator who once occupied a seat in this House, and whose voice is now unable to be heard here.

Mr. DAVIN. Name.

Mr. McCARTHY. Senator Perley. His observations ought to have weight. Writing to me on the 12th February, he says :

“MY DEAR SIR,—Stand firm for your resolution *re* dual language in the North-West Territories. The North-West

is with you. I get letters by every mail strongly urging me to help you in this matter. Davin's amendment if carried might lead to serious results in some of the constituencies, only paralleled by the Hull affair of last night. Particularity might this be the case in those constituencies where it was stated by Mr. Bits, member of the Legislative Assembly, that so few of the people could read in any language and their prejudices so easily excited. I contend it is wrong to submit a question of such a character to the vote of the people. Discussion and electioneering talk on such an issue would tend to disturb the harmony and good-feeling that is fast being obtained between the people of different nationalities and creeds in the North-West Territories. I write this advisedly and with the full knowledge of the responsibility of a representative of the people in the North-West Territories from end to end.

"Yours, &c.,
"W. D. PERLEY."

Is not that reasonable? Is it reasonable, when we have this matter before us now—a matter which has excited, we are told, a great deal of feeling in this chamber, a matter which has excited a good deal of feeling out of doors, having opinions formed one way or the other about it, having a means of knowledge denied to the representatives of the North-West Territories, we, who have this great duty thrown upon us here, should refuse to discharge it and ask the unfortunate people of the North-West to have this bone of contention thrown upon them. That may be right from a party point of view; I venture to say it is not right from a statesman's point of view. This Bill may be wrong, it may be that the Bill ought to be rejected, but there can be no justification for sending it to the people of the North-West to be dealt with. I deny that I have gone back upon any views that I have advocated in regard to provincial rights. If the people of the North-West did not wish to have this measure passed, we might postpone it at the present time, but the people have shown that they are in favor of it, and every newspaper in the North-West—excepting always the *Regina Leader*—has spoken in favor of the abolition of the dual language. I cannot look upon the *Regina Leader* as an authoritative representative of public opinion in the North-West. We know that the *Regina Leader* occupies a peculiar position in regard to the existing state of affairs in the North-West. I am told—I may be wrong—I do not connect it with any hon. member of this House, but I am told that it was owing to the fact that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West insisted upon giving to the *Regina Leader* the printing of that Government at a higher rate than it could be done for elsewhere, that the deadlock was brought about in the North-West Council, that the Lieutenant Governor's advisers refused to agree to that, and then resigned. Of course, the longer the dual language is preserved, the better it is for the publisher of the *Regina Leader*, and, therefore, I do not think that the *Regina Leader* is to be quoted as an authority on this question. Putting the *Regina Leader* aside, we have the unanimous opinion of the press of the North-West, as we have the opinion of the people of the North-West, that they do not want the dual language. Why should we pause? Why should we hesitate? I have done. I have endeavored to make my case as plain as I possibly can. I have endeavored to show why this question should be dealt with at the earliest possible moment. I have endeavored to show that it ought to be dealt with here. I have endeavored to show that, if this resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for West

Mr. McCARTHY.

Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is passed, that is the end of the Bill, but the end is not accomplished. I have stated that I am prepared, if any hon. gentleman objects to the recital in this Bill, that it shall be stricken out, and every hon. gentleman in this House knows that, when the Bill reaches committee, it can then be debated whether it is for us here or for the North-West to deal with this question; but, if the amendment of the hon. gentleman is carried, it is a way to do this little Bill to death, instead of its becoming the law of the land, which is the desire of the people in the North-West who have taken an interest in this matter, and I am sure is the desire of the great majority of the people of the country. The sooner this question is set at rest, the better. It is a question which is calculated to disturb us on a question of race cleavage. That alone should be a reason for dealing with the matter now. Does the House suppose that, if the Bill is defeated, whether upon the amendment of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) or upon the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), that would in any way end the question? Can any one imagine that, if I stand alone with my seconder in voting for this Bill, the same difficulties and troubles which certain hon. gentlemen profess to lament will not be brought up again? Is it not in the interest of the harmony and the good-will of the people of different nationalities that we should deal with this question here, this question which is now before us, and do they not suppose that we can deal with it in such a manner as to be as satisfactory to the people as if it were dealt with by the Council of the North-West? For myself, I may say that my political extinction has been prophesied by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. If that be my fate, in doing what I consider to be my duty, I shall cheerfully submit to it. I am acting simply according to my convictions, and not only as one hon. gentleman has suggested, because of the debate of the Jesuits' Estates Act. I wonder that that hon. gentleman should not have had better judgment than to introduce that question into this debate. I have nothing to be ashamed of, I have nothing to lament in regard to the vote which I gave on the Jesuits' Estates Act. I did not prosecute any agitation on that subject afterwards, because I realised that the vote of this House in regard to it was conclusive; but it is not conducive to harmony in the party to which I did belong and to which, to a certain extent, I still belong, that an hon. gentleman should taunt me for the fiasco which he says was the end of that matter. I have been taunted with the statement that I objected to the preamble of the Jesuits' Estates Act, and yet I was making nothing of the preamble to this Bill. There again the two matters are wholly and absolutely separate. In the Jesuits' Estates Act we had to take the Bill as it was, we had no power of amendment. It came to this House and it had either to be vetoed as it was, or allowed to go into operation as it was; whereas a Bill introduced into this House has to undergo the gauntlet of the first, second and third readings, of a consideration in committee, to be amended and improved to suit the opinions of the majority of the House. Therefore, there is nothing in common between the two cases. But, as I said before, those who voted with me on that question had nothing to regret, and I

can only say that if a similar occasion arose again, I should not hesitate to repeat my vote.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to trouble the House for a few minutes, while I make one or two remarks; called for, I think, by the speech of my hon. and learned friend.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. DAVIN. I have not spoken on this amendment. Now, Sir, the hon. and learned gentleman read to us the authority of Senator Perley.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has spoken already on this question, and I ask the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can speak upon the amendment.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad my hon. friend from North Norfolk, whom I have met on other fields, is so anxious to observe the rules of the House and the decencies of debate. The hon. and learned gentleman, for he is entitled to be called the hon. and learned gentleman, has read to us a letter from Senator Perley. The hon. Senator has been a member of this Parliament; I have known him a long time; some of you have known him, and I need not say that I recognise him, as you do, as a great authority, this "guide, philosopher and friend" of the hon. and learned member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). He appears in a character eminently suitable to himself, to his own views of what his duty to the public is, and I think he is eminently suitable as a guide to the hon. member from Simcoe. Sir, Senator Perley and the hon. member for Simcoe; the hon. member for Simcoe and Senator Perley. You will remember the line of Pope:

"And dunce the second follows dunce the first."

Now, I did not know the cause of the conversion of my hon. and learned friend from Simcoe. I had read a speech delivered by the hon. and learned member at Collingwood; I have it before me; it is reported in the *Empire*, and in this speech he declares to the people of Collingwood that he did not want this Parliament to deal with this question, but he wanted the people of the North-West to deal with it, the very thing that he denounces to-night. I will read to you his words:

"I want it understood that our great North-West Territories shall be left free to deal with certain matters which will affect them for all time to come."

He is speaking of the dual language.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the hon. member pardon me? I am sure he does not wish to misrepresent me.

Mr. DAVIN. Certainly not. Here is the paper.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The paper is perfectly correct, so far as it goes. My reference was to the question of separate schools in the North-West. I had already spoken about the dual language and my action in this House, and I was inviting the confidence of my constituents. I was then referring to the question of separate schools, which I understand they petitioned should not be dealt with here, but should be remitted to them to be dealt with. That is what I alluded to in the language my hon. friend is now reading.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, separate schools are a matter that can be left to the North-West, but the

dual language cannot be left to the North-West; so I suppose he thinks the dual language is a matter of more importance than the separate schools. Now, I want to point out the want of logic of my hon. friend. He comes here and tells us that we ought to pass his Bill. Why? Because he has heard from the North-West. Why has he heard from the North-West? Because an assembly has been elected on an extended suffrage, and that assembly has passed a resolution in a given direction. Why is that resolution of the least validity? Simply because these people represent the people of the North-West, and yet, forsooth, he tells us that the proposal to go to the source of power, to the source of authority, is a proposal that we ought not to entertain. He is just as illogical as the hon. and learned gentleman from West Durham (Mr. Blake) in his remarks the other night. I was delighted, of course, to hear his voice again in this House. I know very well of what importance it is to this House, and of what importance it is to the country at large, that we should have his great experience, his legal knowledge and his great parliamentary power; but when I heard a man who is president of a university, talk what—I say it without the least offence—was fallacious trash, I was perfectly amazed. Let me point out to you what the hon. and learned gentleman said. He said that he could not listen to the representation that was made—I am now making a point for the hon. and learned gentleman for Simcoe—that no message whatever had come from the people of the North-West. Why? Because this assembly had not got any authority from its creator to deal with this question. By dealing with this question he must mean to legislate on it; so he says that we cannot receive any representation from them because they had no power to legislate on it; but if they had any power to legislate on it, they would not require to make any representation at all. The point was taken up very properly by my hon. and learned friend that it was only three short years before that we heard the hon. and learned member for West Durham propose in this House a resolution with regard to Home Rule of which we were not in any wise seized; yet he asked us to pass a resolution, and showed that he thought our representation ought to have some effect, or might have some effect, on an assembly so closely connected with us as the assembly in the North-West. Now, I want to refer to a personal matter. I saw a criticism—I do not know whether it was correct or not—on a few remarks that I happened to make in reply to the speech of the hon. and learned member for Simcoe; and the critic said—I do not know whether that is correct or not, but I hope it was correct—he said that the weapons I used against the hon. and learned gentleman were the weapons of a gentleman. The hon. and learned gentleman comes here with an innuendo that is absolutely false, for which there is not a tittle of foundation. He has listened—I do not know where, I am sure—probably in the vestibule of an hotel, to the gospel of some *gobe mouche*, and he comes here and makes a statement about a matter which has no truth whatever in it. Now he says that a paper called the *Leader* never advocated the abolition of the dual language. Why, I read the other night how the hon. and learned gentleman made a statement that that paper never referred to it. I then read an article

rom that paper advocating the doing away with it, but without bitterness; it deprecated bitterness, it deprecated language that was calculated to inflame passions, and said, let us go and discuss this question calmly and practically. I may tell the hon. and learned member, who threw out the sneer, that it was a very good thing for newspapers, and the more French published the better, that most of the ordinances which were printed in French were not printed in the North-West, and that the company which publishes the *Leader* had no advantage from most of them. A few were printed there, but the great bulk were printed somewhere else. So the hon. and learned member, who occupies a high position in his profession, a profession to which gentlemen of the highest honor have been proud to belong, comes here and at the close of his speech throws out a sneer without the slightest foundation, and it was a vulgar sneer, even if there had been any foundation for it. I do not intend to make any reply to the hon. gentleman's speech, and I merely rose in regard to these matters to which I have alluded, but I want to point out that in the speech to which we have listened the hon. gentleman has not touched the case I made against him; he has not touched a single point of it and it remains there unshaken. I showed that the hon. and learned gentleman had cited authorities that proved the very reverse of that which he said those authorities would prove, and I also showed that he came before the House and laid down two propositions that were utterly false. Switzerland has been referred to by one hon. gentleman after another. Hon. gentlemen do not seem to have seen the point of my reference to Switzerland. My sole object was to show that the two propositions which the hon. and learned gentleman was disseminating throughout the country were without any foundation, namely, that a single language necessarily made a nation, and that with diversity of languages you could not have a nation; for, of course, if these two propositions were true, then we never could have a nation here in Canada. I showed those propositions were untrue. I showed that his authorities instead of supporting his case proved the contrary, and the statements I made in that little speech remain unshaken, and the hon. gentleman has not attempted to reply to them. The only thing he did in the way of attempting to reply to my speech was to descend to sneers without foundation, to innuendoes that in an Assembly far inferior to this would be held to be unworthy, and he fell back on a flippant reference what was without any cogency whatever. The hon. and learned gentleman told us, and I heard it with some astonishment, that he had no desire to create bitterness, that he had no ill-feeling to the French race. This reminds me of what Thackeray said of an Englishman: that if an Englishman sees a stranger come into the country he looks at him as who should say: "Damn you, who are you?" Yet that Englishman might no doubt feel an universal benevolence. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) talks here as if he felt universal benevolence towards every citizen of this country, whether he talks French or not; but you have to observe the general tenor of his conduct and of this agitation, and the face may be Jacob's but the hands are the hands of Esau. The statement made in that letter of Senator

Mr. DAVIN.

Perley, that there would be a disturbance in case this question were referred to the constituencies, is absolutely without the least foundation. There will be no disturbance whatever. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis), if he is here, will tell you that the reference can be made without the least disturbance. Everything will go on as quietly as possible, and once the question has been referred to the people, and they have elected a new House, you can then feel you have given it to a tribunal to deal with that has authority from the real source of power.

House divided on amendment to amendment (Mr. Beausoleil):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Audet,
Bain (Soulanges),
Beausoleil,
Béchar, d,
Bergeron,
Bernier,
Boisvert,
Bourassa,
Brien,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Cimon,
Cook,
Costigan,
Coulombe,
Couture,
Curran,
Daoust,
Dawson,
De St. Georges,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Dessaint,
Doyon,
Dupont,
Fiset,
Flynn,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gigault,
Girouard,

Godbout,
Grandbois,
Guay,
Holton,
Ives,
Joncas,
Labrosse,
Landry,
Langelier (Montmorency),
Langevin (Sir Hector),
La Rivière,
Laurier,
Lépine,
McGreevy,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Massue,
Meigs,
Mitchell,
Montplaisir,
Neveu,
Perry,
Préfontaine,
Rinfret,
Riopel,
Robillard,
Ste. Marie,
Thérien,
Turcot,
Vanasse,
Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wright.—63.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Barnard,
Barron,
Bell,
Bergin,
Borden,
Bowell,
Bowman,
Boyle,
Brown,
Bryson,
Burdett,
Campbell,
Cargill,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Chapleau,
Charlton,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Colby,
Corby,
Coughlin,
Daly,
Davies,
Davin,
Davis,
Denison,
Dewdney,
Dickinson,
Earle,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,

Macdonald (Huron),
Macdowall,
McCarthy,
McCulla,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Picton),
McIntyre,
McKay,
McKeen,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Moffat,
Moneriff,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Perley,
Platt,
Prior,
Putnam,
Robertson,
Roome,
Ross,
Rowand,
Seriver,
Semple,
Shanley,
Skinner,

Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Small,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Smith (Ontario),
Ferguson (Welland),	Somerville,
Fisher,	Sproule,
Foster,	Sutherland,
Gillmor,	Taylor,
Gordon,	Temple,
Guillet,	Thompson (Sir John),
Haggart,	Trow,
Hale,	Tupper,
Hesson,	Tyrwhitt,
Hickey,	Wallace,
Hudspeth,	Ward,
Innes,	Watson,
Jamieson,	Weldon (Albert),
Jones (Digby),	Weldon (St. John),
Jones (Halifax),	Welsh,
Kirk,	White (Cardwell),
Kirkpatrick,	White (Renfrew),
Landerkin,	Wilmot,
Lang,	Wilson (Elgin),
Lister,	Wilson (Lennox),
Livingston,	Wood (Brockville),
Lovitt,	Wood (Westmoreland).—117.
Maedonald (Sir John),	

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Inverness has not voted.

Mr. CAMERON. I have paired with the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Freeman). I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. COOK. The hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald A. Smith) has not voted.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. I was recorded as having been paired by the whip. I would have voted for the amendment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON and Mr. MITCHELL rose.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will give way to the Minister, because he has always treated me in a pretty decent sort of way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am very much obliged to the hon. member for Northumberland, and I will endeavor to return the courtesy by making my observations so short as to leave ample opportunity for him to speak before the House is wearied of the debate to-night. Notwithstanding the great attention the House has given to this question, the fact that its discussion has occupied five days, and that we have already reached midnight of the day preceding a statutory holiday, are reasons why, apart from the courtesy extended to me by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), I should detain the House for only a short while in offering the proposition which I am about to make in reference to the question under consideration. Before stating the view which I wish to present to the House as the decision which ought to be arrived at on this question, I may be permitted to make some observations with regard to certain arguments which have been put forward in defence of the preamble of this Bill. Some members have stated in the course of this debate that a different doctrine was laid down last Session in reference to another measure, from that which has been pronounced by those who have declared that the preamble of the Bill now before us is offensive to the good taste of the House and menaces the permanency of institutions established by law. They have stated that that doctrine is inconsistent with the doctrine laid down last Session, which my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), by mistake, asserted to be a statement that the preamble was no part of the Act and had nothing to do with it. No statement of that kind, as a general

proposition, was put before the House last Session. When I had the honor to address the House in regard to the Bill, then under discussion, I was speaking on a set of facts which were then before the House. I was speaking not of preambles in general, but of the preamble to a statute which was under our consideration; I was calling the attention of the House to the fact that the part of that preamble to which most exception had been taken was merely the recital of a correspondence which had taken place, and had no immediate connection with the enacting part of the Bill. More than that, when we come to consider the position in which we are now placed with regard to the preamble of the present Bill with the position which the House occupied last Session, voting yea or nay, on a motion to disallow the Act of another Legislature, because there was something in the recital offensive to the good taste of the House, there is this fundamental difference that, in voting for this Bill, we are not merely criticising the action of another Legislature, we are not criticising a preamble which might or might not have influenced the adoption of a statute in another Parliament, but we are now called on to vote, yea or nay, on this preamble which has been offered to us by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I submit, therefore, that the comments made by some members, in regard to our action of last Session are not founded on reasons which apply to the present case, and that the objection taken to this preamble is not inconsistent with the observations made last Session by myself, or by any other person, who then took the view I had the honor to express. In hurrying forward so as to detain the House only for as short a time as possible let me call attention to a subject from which attention has somewhat wandered in the course of this heated debate. Let me ask the calm consideration of the House to the very few points which are involved in the section of the North-West Territories Act which it is proposed to repeal. Section 110 provides, in relation to four subjects. First of all as to the debates of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories, and the provision in respect of these debates is that either the French or English language may be used. In the second place the provision relates to the records and Journals in that Assembly, and it is that the French and English languages must both be used in the records and Journals. We have first of all the provision that the use of either of the two languages is optional as regards the debates and compulsory as regards the printing and recording in the Journals of that Assembly. But we have in the next branch of this subject two other questions, both of which were touched upon by the Secretary of State this afternoon, and both of which, in my humble opinion—and I shall ask the opinion of the House upon it—are of far greater importance, as regards this question of language than the mere question of what language shall be used in the debates of the Assembly or the records or Journals of that body. As my hon. friend the Secretary of State says, it is a matter of little consequence what rule is applied as to the mode in which the debates shall be conducted in the Assembly. If the population in the North-West Territories of French origin and French speech is sufficiently numerous to send to that body intelligent and active men, capable of taking part

in the proceedings of that body they will assert their rights to speak their own language, which will be recognised, at least in courtesy, as it is recognised in every other Province of Canada where it is claimed upon the ground that a representative should speak in the tongue which suits him best. I have seen that right conceded frequently in the legislature of my own Province where there is no legislative guarantee on the subject, and the man who would object to an Acadian in Nova Scotia speaking his own tongue in the Legislature of his own Province would be laughed to scorn, as unworthy to sit in that Assembly. We can safely leave that subject to the Assembly, which I am sure, will be guided by as patriotic a feeling as actuates the other legislative bodies in Canada. I shall ask the House, in the proposition I am about to make, to give to the Assembly, in due time, the power to regulate its own debates, and to say in what manner, in what tongue, or in what mode its records and its Journals may be published from time to time. There are two subjects which remain and which, as I have already mentioned, stand upon a somewhat different footing. When we undertake to say that we shall expunge from the Statute-book a provision that justice shall be administered, or may be administered, in either of the two languages used in the North-West Territories, we are touching a subject far more important than the mere language of debate, and the mere language of the publication of the Journals of a legislative body. These, Sir, are our courts; these are the courts of the Dominion of Canada. In respect of the Provinces, power is given to the Provincial Legislatures, by the British North America Act, to establish the courts, and to regulate their organisation, their maintenance, and the extent of their jurisdiction. That power which rests on them, as regards the Provincial courts, rests directly on this Parliament as regards the courts of the North-West Territories. We have imposed upon us the duty, not only of creating those courts, but of breathing into them the breath of life by giving them the jurisdiction they exercise and the procedure by which that jurisdiction is to be carried on. Nay, more, it is our duty, just as it is the duty of a Provincial Assembly, to see that they are properly equipped to exercise their jurisdiction, in every detail, whether relating to mere procedure or to substantive enactment, so as to carry justice to every section of the people, in their homes in the wide territories where we have established them; and the proposal that this Parliament should on such short notice, without enquiry—for it is only within twelve months that we have heard of this agitation, or that the hon. member for North Simcoe discovered that such a provision existed on the Statute-book—expunge the provision that either language may be used in the courts of the country, seems to me to carry with it consequences more alarming than this House is prepared to risk. It is not mere fancy, but I am repeating what has been said to me, that in some distant sections of that country, if that provision be obliterated, we may have the misfortune of seeing men brought to the bar of justice in our own courts, tried before our own judges, convicted, condemned and sentenced in a language not one word of which they understand, and unable to offer a plea for justice or for mercy. Surely, Sir, it is unreasonable to say, in respect

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

of property or civil rights, that the administration of justice must be carried on in one language only, or that we shall permit ourselves to say hastily that it shall be expunged from the Statute-book, and that the courts of the country shall be left without any provision at all for the case of people who cannot understand the English language, if that should be the language prescribed. If that would be the case with respect to new comers, aware that they were going to a country where English law and language alone prevail, the case is made ten times stronger when applied, as my hon. friend the Secretary of State said this evening, to those who were the first settlers in the country; and where the new comers, who have established the new laws and the new language, should surely be willing to incur the obligation of permitting the old inhabitants of the country to use, for a time at least, their own language in their own defense and in the assertion of their rights before our courts of justice. The remaining subject which is touched upon in this provision is the printing of the ordinances of the North-West Assembly in both languages. This is a matter on which we are not required to hear the Legislative Assembly; it is a duty which we have ourselves to discharge. True, the enactment makes necessary the printing in both languages; but it is a duty which this House has charged itself with from year to year. The ordinances have been printed in both languages not merely because section 110 of the North-West Territories Act so provides, but more especially because at our table the money has been voted at every session since that Act was passed, and probably long before, for that purpose. That matter may safely be left in the hands of this Parliament, where it has always been dealt with down to this moment; and if this Parliament should think fit from year to year to order that the ordinances of the North-West Territories should be printed in any language in which it should be necessary to print them, in order to make them fully known to the people of the North-West Territories who are to be affected by them, I should like to ask what interests in this country would be injured thereby, or why any legislator or any person in the North-West Territories should say that it is distasteful to him that any of the ordinances should be printed in any but his own tongue? Therefore, Sir, in regard to that question, as well as in regard to the use of the language in the courts, I shall ask this House to come to the decision that these two provisions of the Act should be maintained; but with respect to the records, the Journals, and the debates of the North-West Assembly, we may yield them the deference and the confidence of permitting them to regulate their own affairs to the fullest extent. As to the time when this shall be done, I propose that it shall be done after the next election to the Assembly of the North-West Territories, and for the obvious reason that until then there can be nobody in the Territories capable of representing to this Parliament the sentiments and wishes of the people of those Territories in a constitutional manner, and nobody in the Territories, as the hon. member for West Durham said, having the mandate of the people to deal with that subject. It is well known, Sir, that the constitution of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West is limited

in many other particulars as well as in that; and in that particular, to say nothing of the others, the members of the Legislative Assembly were quite aware when they held their elections and passed the resolution which has been to some extent made the basis of this measure, that they were holding an election for a legislative body bound by the provisions of section 110 of the North-West Territories Act; and it will be fair that the electors of that territory should have an opportunity of instructing the representatives who will go to the future assembly as to their wishes in this regard. I cannot imagine any weaker reason against ascertaining in that way what the wishes of the people of the Territories are, than the letter which was read to influence the judgment of the House on this question to-night. I cannot imagine it being gravely asserted to this Legislature in one breath that the French people of the North-West Territories are numerically so insignificant that it is not worth while to use the French language in the Territories at all, and that its abolition is a matter of absolute certainty, and in the next breath that the French there are so strong and feel so keenly on this question that there will be bloodshed if they should be allowed to go to the polls upon it. I cannot understand how it can be urged that in a free country, or in a territory to which we have given the right of self-government to any extent, we shall have a legislative assembly there, give a free and liberal franchise to the people, and then say to them, we are afraid we cannot trust you to go to the polls, and, therefore, we must govern you without hearing your voice on your own affairs. By all means let the constitutional rights of the people be respected; let the people speak through their representatives; let them vote, and let us see that the votes shall be counted, in order that we may ascertain which of the many conflicting statements made to this chamber as to the comparative numbers of the population of the Territories is the safer one to adopt. I have always been under the impression that we had equal rights in this country, but I should begin to doubt it if we were to say, with regard to any section of the country: we are afraid there will be riots if you go to the polls, and we will close the polls against you and legislate for you against your will. Therefore, I will propose to the House the amendment I am about to read. I shall make but one other observation, which I had forgotten to make in its proper place, as regards the preamble, because it is touched upon in the amendment I am about to move. The mover of the Bill cannot fail to admit that, while it is true the preamble may be eliminated from the Bill, in proposing the second reading he puts the preamble forward as the basis of the Bill, and the reason which is assigned on the face of the Bill as the reason why this House should pass it is that community of language is necessary to the unity of a country.

Mr. McCARTHY. Expedient—not necessary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The amendment which I propose is as follows, and it is seconded by the hon. Secretary of State:—

That all the words after "resolved" be expunged and the following substituted:—

"That this House, having regard to the long continued use of the French language in old Canada, and to the cove-

nants on that subject embodied in the British North America Act, cannot agree to the declaration contained in the said Bill as the basis thereof, namely, that it is expedient in the interest of the national unity of the Dominion that there should be community of language amongst the people of Canada. That, on the contrary, this House declares its adherence to the said covenants, and its determination to resist any attempt to impair the same. That, at the same time, this House deems it expedient and proper, and not inconsistent with those covenants, that the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories should receive from the Parliament of Canada power to regulate, after the next general elections of the Assembly, the proceedings of the Assembly and the manner of recording and publishing such proceedings."

I need not hardly say to the House before closing—and it is the only other remark I have to make—that a portion of that resolution is taken from the one which was suggested by the hon. member for West Durham in his speech the other evening. The opinions he expressed with regard to the avowal this House ought to make, with regard to its adherence to those covenants and its future action upon questions of this kind, in so far as they touch the constitution of the country as established by the British North America Act I endorse almost entirely.

Mr. MITCHELL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MACDOWALL. The hon. the Minister of Justice said, before he moved his amendment, that the whole North-West should have fair representation in the Legislative Assembly before that question was dealt with by that assembly. I should like to ask him does the Government contemplate a re-distribution of seats in the North-West Assembly? because otherwise the population of the North-West will not have the fair representation they are entitled to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a matter which will have to be dealt with by Parliament, as the subject-matter of this resolution will be should it be adopted. The Government will consider that subject before bringing down a Bill.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I understand there will be a re-distribution of seats for the North-West Territories, and the French population will be given a representation before this question has to be dealt with.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will understand that if it is shown to the Government that there is not a fair representation in the present system of distribution this Parliament will beyond doubt remedy the evil.

Mr. MITCHELL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the motion for the adjournment of the debate withdrawn?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before the question is put, I should like to express my deep regret that I was away from the House when the motion of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) was voted upon. I do not like to sail under false colors, and if I had been here I should have voted for that motion. I was told that no vote would be taken to-night. I do not wish at all to blame the persons from whom I got that information, but I thought no vote would be taken to-night. Of course, it was my duty to be here, to be in my seat, but if I had been here, without going into any discussion of the question which has been occupying the attention

of the House for several days, I say I should have voted for the motion of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil.)

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think the request I have made is an unreasonable one. This is a very important subject, and I think it should not be hurried on at this late hour of the night.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no seconder to the motion for adjournment.

Mr. COOK. I second the motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Call in the members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, under the circumstances, and seeing the perseverance of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), we must come down.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must make my acknowledgments for the courtesy of the right hon. gentleman in having gracefully come down.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that this question be made the first Order of the day on Thursday next.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.35 a. m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 20th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

STATIONERY AND CONTINGENCIES OF SENATE.

Mr. RYKERT moved:

That a Message be sent to the Senate, requesting that their Honors will be pleased to grant leave to the officers in charge of the Stationery and Contingencies of the Senate, to attend before the Select Standing Committee of this House on Public Accounts, at their next meeting, to give information respecting the distribution of such stationery and the expenditure for contingencies, as set out on pages D-17 and 18 of the Report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts for the year ended 30th June, 1889;—and to bring with them all records relating to such items.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Ontario Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Bell.)

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 94) to incorporate the Thousand Islands Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Bell.)

DRILL HALL IN MONTREAL.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) (Translation) asked, Whether the Minister of Militia has given instructions to repair the recently damaged heating apparatus in the Montreal drill hall? If not, is it his intention to do so?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

(Translation.) In answer to my hon. friend, I must say that I have given instructions to repair the heating apparatus in the Montreal drill hall.

FLOODS IN LAPRAIRIE.

Mr. DOYON (Translation) asked, Whether it is within the knowledge of the Government that each year, and often twice each year, the village and the parish of Laprairie are inundated by the rising of the waters of the St. Lawrence, and suffer considerable damage? Whether it is the intention of the Government to take measures for the construction of works which may be judged necessary for the prevention of the destruction caused by these inundations?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) It is within the knowledge of the Government that floods happen in Laprairie, and the Government is now considering the matter.

HARBOR OF MONTREAL.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL (Translation) asked, Whether the plans adopted by the city of Montreal for the improvement of the harbor of Montreal were submitted to the Government before their adoption, or since? Have they received the approval and the sanction of the Government? Does the Government propose to contribute towards the construction of the projected works during the coming season? And, if so, to what extent? Does the Government intend to lay before the House the correspondence and the documents respecting the said project and its execution?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) The plans adopted by the council of the city of Montreal and the Board of Harbour Commissioners of Montreal were submitted to the Government before their adoption; they have not received the approval or the sanction of the Government. The Government is now considering the matter. As to whether the Government intend to contribute towards the carrying out of the proposed works during the coming season, I am not in a position to answer that question. The Government does not intend to lay before the House the correspondence and documents respecting the said scheme and its carrying out until the whole matter has been considered and the Government has reached a decision for or against, or any decision.

EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, What amount of export duty has been received for logs exported during the calendar year ending 31st July, 1889, from Ontario? What amount on logs exported from Quebec? and what amount on logs exported from New Brunswick?

Mr. BOWELL. The amount of duty collected on logs during the year ending the 31st December, 1889, was as follows:—From Ontario, \$56,737.18; from Quebec, \$16,043.79; from New Brunswick, \$1,017.55; making a total of \$73,798.52.

DAM AT VALLEYFIELD.

Mr. BERGERON. The question I intend to put is not the same in the French paper as it is in the English paper. I will read it from the latter,

which should have been the same in the French version. I beg to ask, Whether it is the intention of the Government to allow the public to use the dam connecting the mainland with Grand Ile, at Valleyfield, as sanctioned by custom since the first existence of the said dam, which is the only highway available for traffic; and in view, also, of the intention to build an iron bridge thereon, which expense would not be justifiable unless the Government would promise that such use would be continued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There does not appear to be any objection to allow the dam connecting the mainland with Grand Ile at Valleyfield to be used as a roadway, if the municipality binds itself that such use would be continued.

WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether the Government has yet received a report from Mr. Wood, who has been investigating certain matters connected with the Welland Canal? If it has been received, will it be at once laid before the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A report has been received from Mr. Wood in reference to the Welland Canal, and, if it is moved for, it will be brought down.

Mr. EDGAR. Will the hon. gentleman allow this to go as a motion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to that. Put in the motion.

NORTH-WEST REGISTRY OFFICES.

Mr. DAVIN asked, What have been the receipts from the North-West Territories Registry Offices during 1889? and what have been the expenses during the same period?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The receipts from the Registration Offices of the North-West Territories during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1889, amounted to \$8,179.41. The expenses for the same period were \$14,367.08.

LOBSTER FISHING REGULATIONS.

Mr. KIRK asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to revise the regulations so as to permit fishing for and canning lobsters in the autumn of this year on the southern and eastern coast of Nova Scotia?

Mr. TUPPER. It is not the intention.

NOVA SCOTIA SUPREME COURT.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) asked, Whether any appointment has been made to the Bench of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Mr. Justice Smith? If not, when will such appointment be made?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No such appointment has been made, but it will be made at an early day.

MAHONE BAY, N.S., LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. EISENHAUER asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to replace the lighthouse at Mahone Bay, in the County of Lunenburg, which was destroyed by fire?

Mr. TUPPER. It is not the intention of the Government to replace the lighthouse that was destroyed in 1887 by fire, it being considered that a floating house sufficiently answers the requirements of the place.

MEMBERS OF THE IMPERIAL FEDERATION ASSOCIATION.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency) asked, Whether the Government are aware that a number of their employés are members of the Branch of the Imperial Federation Association at Ottawa? If so, is it their intention to allow them to take part in that political movement?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have no official information that their employés, or any of them, are members of the Branch of the Imperial Federation Association at Ottawa; but if they are, I do not think that they are doing any harm to anybody.

HELMETS FOR THE MILITIA.

Mr. SUTHERLAND asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to furnish helmets to the non-commissioned officers and men of the Active Canadian Militia?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The subject-matter of this question is now under the consideration of the Government.

BEHRING'S SEA FISHERIES.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House to a reply given by the right hon. gentleman the leader of the Government a few days ago, to the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), when he stated that the matter of the Behring Sea fishery negotiations was then under consideration at Washington. On a subsequent occasion, in reply to an enquiry of my own respecting the *modus vivendi*, the hon. gentleman stated that both the Behring Sea fishery question and the question of the fisheries generally, were under consideration at Washington between the British Minister and the United States Government. Now, this is a question in which the people of the Dominion naturally feel a very great interest, and, therefore, I would ask the right hon. gentleman whether, in view of the negotiations which he has announced are proceeding at Washington, it is the purpose of the Government to have a representative of Canada at Washington to look after Canadian interests, as on previous occasions? I think the people of Canada would naturally expect, in a matter of so much interest to this country, that the views of the Government and the people of Canada should be represented there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give due notice of his question.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McCarthy for second reading of Bill (No. 10) further to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 50, respecting the North-West Territories; the motion of Mr. Davin in amendment thereto, and the motion of

Sir John Thompson in amendment to the amendment

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I feel that on an occasion like this even an old Politician like myself might rise with a good deal of hesitation to address this House, and through this House, the country, upon, perhaps, one of the most important questions we have had before us since 1867. It is no ordinary matter that has been brought before our attention in this country, in which the population is composed of various races, and especially of two leading races, the French and the English, comprising, also, a population of different religious convictions, and having various interests in respect to education and language, and in respect to other matters which many large sections of the population consider of the most vital importance. Under these circumstances, it is natural that a member getting up to address this House should feel under considerable reserve and restraint in the expression of his opinions. Sir, I have felt that during the course of this debate a good deal of unnecessarily strong language has been used, and I will take this opportunity of saying in the beginning—as my remarks will not be long on this occasion—that I think a good deal of unnecessary severity has been shown in regard both to the motives and the language of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I do not sympathise with those who find fault with that hon. gentleman, if he has acted on his convictions, in taking the course he has done; and while I dissent from the Bill which he has introduced, and shall vote against it if an opportunity is offered, I am not one of those who would blame that hon. gentleman for taking the course that his convictions impel him to pursue; I am not one of those who would find fault with his having the courage of his convictions and bringing this matter before the House. Sir, if there is one thing that recommends the conduct of a statesman to myself it is when he has the courage of his convictions, no matter whether it results in his unpopularity, no matter whether it results, as has been the case with that hon. gentleman, in his having had to sit under the most scathing denunciations and the most brilliant sarcasm, such as have been directed against the hon. gentleman from both sides of the House for the five days that this debate has lasted. I must say that I admire the courage and pluck which he displayed, and I admire the ability which he showed in fighting the matter out to the bitter end. I entirely dissent from the spirit and intention of this Bill, and, while I agree with those who believe that its introduction at the present time is calculated to do harm in the country and raise strife, I can find no fault with the hon. gentleman—if he believes, as he has stated to this House he does believe, that this course should be adopted and this Bill introduced—in regard to the course he has followed, for it was his duty to bring the matter before Parliament in order that the question might be discussed and decided. Some of the hon. members of this House have a peculiar responsibility in regard to this matter; I refer to those who took part in forming the Constitution of the country. The right hon. gentleman opposite (Sir John A. Macdonald), and the hon. gentleman who sits at his left (Sir Hector Langevin), with myself and one or two others not now in this House, met with

Mr. JONES (Halifax.)

considerable difficulty many years ago, in dealing with the questions of language and schools. One of the great difficulties we experienced in London, when we were preparing the Constitution of this Dominion to submit to the British Parliament for its approval and enactment—and the right hon. leader of the Government will agree that I do not exaggerate the facts when I say that these questions almost broke up the conference—and those difficulties arose out of these questions of language and schools. We felt the importance of conciliation and concession, the importance of conceding to the minority certain rights which they should enjoy, and the difficulty connected with this subject very nearly, as I have stated, broke up the conference in London. I realised then, that the people of Canada were composed mainly of two races, and, I admit, that I was not so liberal-minded then as now, and did not realise the difficulties as strongly as I do to-day. With respect to the amendment submitted by the Minister of Justice, I have come to the conclusion, that, while I do not entirely concur with it, I am prepared to adopt a similar course to that which I followed in 1867 in England—to accept it as probably the best solution presented of the question under consideration. I have, myself, given this matter some little consideration, and several days ago I prepared a resolution which I thought would meet the wishes of the House. I may state, that I should prefer this resolution to be adopted rather than that of the Minister of Justice, but I do not see any chance of this being done, and, therefore, I am prepared to give my approval to the motion of the hon. Minister of Justice, not as affording a perfect solution, but as one affording a temporary solution of these difficulties which now stare us in the face in this Canada of ours. If the amendment of the hon. Minister should fail, and I should have an opportunity to submit my resolution to the House, I will do so. It is in the following terms:—

That all after the word "Resolved" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

That at present it is inexpedient to further amend the Act relating to the North-West Territories, but the question should be left until Parliament is prepared to grant to the said Territories a full measure of Provincial Government such as is enjoyed by the existing Provinces of the Dominion.

I do not suppose I will obtain an opportunity to present my motion, for I believe there is sufficient good sense in this House and sufficient desire to promote harmony and community of feeling throughout this country, to induce hon. members to accept, as a compromise, the amendment moved by the Minister of Justice. What I am prepared to do is, to throw the responsibility of dealing with this matter on the Administration. They have chosen that amendment, after five days discussion, as a means of solving this difficulty, and upon them I would place the responsibility. I would have preferred not to vote for this amendment, if I could see any other way out of the difficulty, but I do not; and therefore I am prepared to accept it, not as a perfect measure, but as a solution—and it is a temporary solution only—of the difficulty that presents itself. Some views have been expressed during this debate with which I am not in accord. The question of schools has come up. It has been contended by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that a community of language

should prevail throughout the Dominion. I quite agree with my hon. friend that, if it were possible to have a community of language from one end of the country to the other, it is most desirable; but it is impossible. Not only in the North-West and in the Province of Quebec, do racial difficulties exist. In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, there is a large French Canadian and Acadian population, a population which I regret to say is not in as affluent circumstances as many of the Anglo-Saxon people there, a population which has not had the same facilities for educating their children and themselves as are possessed by many of us in the more advanced and older communities. If the hon. gentleman's community of language were to be applied in those schools, the result would be, first, teachers could not be found to educate the pupils in English; and second, the scholars themselves would be unable to understand anything except French. The effect would be that the poor children would remain ignorant and would have to go without an education. For that reason, I do not believe the proposition of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), would work satisfactorily throughout the country. Again, the hon. gentleman has referred to alleged difficulties which would arise respecting Provincial rights. I fail to perceive that any difficulty would occur regarding Provincial rights in the North-West Territories. That country will receive its charter from this Parliament. It will come in on an entirely different footing from the original Provinces of the Dominion. They came in as independent Provinces with laws and rights recognised by the British North America Act, which were in existence at that time, and which were to remain in existence until altered. The North-West Territories, however, were purchased by the Dominion, and when they receive their Provincial constitution the Canadian Parliament will decide the terms upon which it will be given. No question of Provincial rights can come into this issue. When this Parliament creates a Province or a number of Provinces in the North-West, Parliament will define and particularise in the constitution of those Provinces the powers they will exercise. I differ with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as to what rights can be accorded to those Provinces, the hon. member for Bothwell taking the ground that we cannot give less or more extensive powers to the new Provinces we create than are possessed by the old Provinces under the British North America Act. With all due deference to the hon. gentleman's view, I do not agree with it; but I admit that it is a question open to discussion. But I will say this, that if the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who introduced the Bill now under discussion, had allowed the matter to remain in abeyance for ten years and had not introduced this Bill, the question would have settled itself. Either the French population in the country, which is now admittedly very small, would have increased sufficiently to have enabled them to have demanded the exercise and use of their language, or if the Anglo-Saxon population or a foreign population had increased, the French population there never would have demanded it, and the consequence is that the language would have been eliminated by the operation of time and by the natural course of events.

That is the view I take of this part of the question. While I quite recognise the power of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and his right to bring this question before Parliament, I regret that he should have raised it at this time, because I believe that if he had not raised it, not five years—certainly not more than ten years—would have elapsed before, by the natural operation of events, the question would have settled itself. Now, Sir, after the very elaborate speeches which have been made on this question, and almost every branch of the question having been exhausted by the different very able speakers, I think it will be unnecessary for me to take up the time of the House longer. What I rose to do, was not to make a speech, but to give utterance to the views which I entertain on the matter, in order to justify the vote I gave the other day, and to explain the vote which I will give on the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice. I would say that I have lived among the French people for very many years and I can vouch that they are, as an almost universal rule, good citizens, living peaceably amongst themselves and in friendship with the people of other races, and most friendly in their relations with their English-speaking fellow countrymen. Where they are in power, as they are in the Province of Quebec by a large majority, they deal with the English-speaking people with a liberality which does credit to them. In that Province the Protestants have their separate schools and their separate eleemosynary and benevolent institutions, such as insane asylums, which receive Government aid in proportion to that given to the French and Catholic institutions. The English minority has all these privileges freely accorded by a Legislature in which there is only a fragment of English-speaking representatives. If where the English-speaking people have the power, as they have in the North-West Territories and in this Parliament, we deal less liberally with the French minority than they do with the English minority, what kind of position will we place ourselves in? One thing is certain: that in the interest of peace and harmony in this country, and in a mixed community such as ours, there must be compromise. If there are not concessions on both sides, it can only end in the disruption of the Dominion, and the breaking up of what, when we laid its foundation, we believed would be a great nation. I again repeat that while voting for the amendment of the Minister of Justice, although I do not entirely approve of it, I throw the responsibility for the measure on the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After the remarks which I made on a previous occasion during this debate, and the suggestion which I then offered across the floor to hon. gentlemen opposite, I think it right that I should at once address this House on the resolution presented by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. I should have then moved this resolution myself, but it was late at night and I was fatigued, and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has moved it at my special request. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), in the calm and wise speech he has delivered just now, has made the statement that he threw the responsibility for action on this question upon the Government. Mr. Speaker, the Government accepts that responsibility.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government think that the resolution moved by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice is a measure of peace, and a means of getting over this unfortunate feeling of irritation which has grown up between the two great races that make the strength and power of Canada. This resolution is for the purpose of getting rid of the temporary feeling—because it will only be temporary—which threatens for the moment to disturb the quiet of Canada, and thereby to hurt its prestige and its credit and to hamper its development. This resolution of the Minister of Justice is, as I have said, a measure of peace, and I implore and urge all my hon. friends on both sides of the House who look with anxiety for the future peace of Canada to accept it as such. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), in his speech, and in the resolution which he suggested, stated that the time had not arrived for the solution of this question and that it ought to be postponed. In my short reply I stated that while I accepted the greater part of his resolution, yet I thought that while the first portion of it would quiet the irritated feelings of the people in the eastern part of Canada, the postponement of this question for an unspecified time would, perhaps, arouse feelings of irritation in the western portion of this Dominion. I suggested across the floor that for the sake of peace we ought, after the people of the North-West had an opportunity of expressing their opinion, throw the responsibility upon them. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), casting aside all partisan desire of triumph, accepted—although, perhaps, against his own opinion—the proposition that I then made. If we examine and compare the resolution which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has moved with the suggested motion of my hon. friend for West Durham (Mr. Blake) it will be seen that the first portion of it is in his exact language, a little condensed, and it concludes with the proposition which I made and which that hon. gentleman accepted. It was a compromise, and in a question of this kind involving racial feelings, and prejudices, and arousing a sense of pride of race and nationality, such a course is wise and patriotic. I hold that this resolution is one which meets the case, and I implore the House that it may be accepted. Some of my hon. friends think that the power to deal with this subject should be at once given to the Assembly of the North-West Territories. Now there are great political considerations against that course, and, looking to the future, I think it would be a mistake. As my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) says, the present Legislature of the North-West Territories had no commission from the people to pronounce upon this subject of the two languages; they had no means of knowing what the opinion of the people was upon that point, and therefore, they did not speak with the authority of representatives in regard to the wishes and opinions of the people of the North-West. Those who look at history will see that the great and grave errors committed in France at the time when the people arose against the despotism of the Bourbons, and from which most of the evils following the revolution of 1798 arose, were due to the fact that the representatives of the people

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

who were elected for the purpose of reform under the laws of that day resolved themselves again and again into constituent assemblies, assuming for themselves the power of altering the constitution under which they were elected, instead of trying to effect reforms under the constitution as it existed, and with the powers which had been conferred upon them by the people. Now, there is no power conferred upon the Legislative Assembly of the North-West to alter their constitution. The members of that body are all, I believe, respectable men; they are all men having the interest of the North-West at heart; but not one of them had ever before sat in a Legislative Assembly or knew the limits of their powers. If you look at their various ordinances, you will find that they attack ever limit conferred upon them by the Act of 1888. They assumed that having been once elected they could do as they pleased; and in some of the resolutions passed at that time, they have asserted rights and powers which we do not exercise or venture to exercise in this Assembly. Therefore, it is of the very greatest importance that we should draw a distinction between a constituent assembly and a Legislative Assembly. The North-West Assembly is a Legislative Assembly with certain powers conferred upon it by the Act which brought it into being; but it has no right to represent the people on questions which were not before the people at the time it was elected as a Legislative Assembly with limited powers. It is of the very greatest importance that we should observe that distinction, and, therefore, I quite agree with all those hon. gentlemen on both sides who have said that any action taken in this matter should be deferred until the people of the North-West have an opportunity of saying to their representatives what they want. There is a difference of opinion on that point. Some hon. gentlemen who have come from that part of the country say that they believe that after the next general election the abolition of the dual language will not be pressed. I do not know how that may be; but we can afford to wait until the people of the North-West have seen and read the discussions which have taken place in this House, and have seen in the press of Canada how much this question has excited the attention of the people of the Dominion; they will then go to the polls fully charged with this question, having made up their minds what they will instruct their representatives to carry out. Then, Sir, not before, ought we to act upon the representations of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West. Now, Sir, an objection will be taken, I have no doubt, to the fact that this resolution of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice does not allude at all to the printing of the ordinances of the North-West. Sir, it ought not in any way to allude to that, or to bring that subject into the consideration of this question; and why? Because the printing of the ordinances of the North-West Assembly is no matter of concern to that assembly. It has no more authority with respect to the printing of those ordinances than this House of Commons of Canada has with respect to the printing of the statutes which we, in conjunction with the Senate, pass. The resolution which my hon. friend proposes says:

“That at the same time this House deems it expedient and proper, and not inconsistent with those covenants, that the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Terri-

tories should receive from the Parliament of Canada power to regulate, after the next general election of the Assembly, the proceedings of the Assembly, and the manner of recording and publishing such proceedings."

That gives them the whole control, the sole regulation of every proceeding and every paper with which they have anything to do, from the time they meet until the time they present the Bills which they have passed to the Governor for his sanction. The Journals, the Votes and Proceedings, the motions and resolutions, the Bills, the first, second and third readings, can, under the resolution of my hon. friend, be limited, if they so choose to limit them, to the English language. This resolution, if passed, gives them the whole authority to decide whether those things shall be printed in English, in French, in both English and French, in German, or in any other language. But, Sir, as here, so there; from the moment the Bills are passed, and presented to the Governor for his sanction, from that moment all their authority over them ceases. Here we pass Bills, we send them to the Senate, and then, so far as we are concerned, our power is ended. We know we could have them, if it were not for the clause in the British North America Act, printed in any language we like; but after they are sent up to the Senate and the Senate passes them, they are then handed over to the representative of the Sovereign, and from that moment they cease to be the property of the Legislature, and become the laws of the land, to be published by the Governor. Our statutes, when they are published, are published not by virtue of the authority of this House or both Houses together; they are published by the representative of the Sovereign, who, after having given his sanction to them, publishes them under constitutional rule. So in the North-West. We will suppose that under the authority given by this resolution the Acts of the North-West Assembly are presented to the Lieutenant-Governor in English, and in English alone; he gives his assent, and then, and not before, do they become ordinances, and the moment they become ordinances, it is the Crown that publishes them, and the Legislative body, which initiated the legislation, has nothing more to do with it. The consequence is that, so far as that Legislature is concerned, it can carry out its wishes by printing its measures in one or in both languages. Let them adopt their ordinances under the present system, and the Lieutenant-Governor, being a Dominion officer, will see that they are published certainly in the language in which they are presented. The Assembly, however, will have nothing to say as to whether they may not, by instructions from the Government here or the Dominion Parliament, be published in half-a-dozen languages. This resolution, Sir, is a measure of peace. This House will, by a large majority, I believe, reject the measure, presented as it has been, the harsh measure of my hon. friend from North Simcoe. Then, if this resolution be adopted, the matter will stand over for the opinion of the people of the North-West. If they declare that all the proceedings of their Legislature are to be in English, so let it be, and so it will be if this House adopt this resolution. But, after they have exercised their full right of limiting their documents, their resolutions, their Bills, their Journals, and their Votes and Proceedings, to the one tongue, it

will be left to the Lieutenant-Governor to order, under instruction from the Dominion Government—and that Dominion Government acting under instructions from the representatives of the people here—them to be printed in any other language as well as in English. Should, however, this House choose to say that any portion of the people of the North-West are to be deprived of the means of reading their laws in their own language, they will have to submit; but, in the meantime, we will have conferred full power and authority on the North-West Council to act on this unfortunate question just as they please, after having received an amended warrant from the people. Now, I must again say that it is of the very greatest importance that we should bury this question as soon as possible. It is quite true, as the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake) said, that a small spark may kindle a great conflagration, and we will be wilfully, on a question of sentiment—on a question of feeling, which does not deserve to be dignified by the name of sentiment—hazarding the future of the country, arousing the feelings of race against race, which I hoped had been forever buried in 1867, and ruining the credit of Canada in foreign countries. Aye, and in the mother country too. For, what credit can we, financially or otherwise, hope to obtain if it is known in England, if it is known especially on the Stock Exchange—the most fearful and timorous of all bodies—that the two races which inhabit Canada are drawn up against each other, on matters of sentiment, feeling and prejudice, which are more important and less easy to be soothed than mere material questions. It will stop the development of this country. It will prevent its future progress, and if this country should fall from the proud position it now holds in the eyes of the world, it will be because by our own insensate conduct we have destroyed our credit, destroyed our prestige, and ruined our future. In the few remarks I made the other night I intended to have called the intention of my hon. friends from the Province of Ontario to what was the action of the Province of Upper Canada in 1793, but I was tired, and held it over for another opportunity. I will call attention to it now, to show what was the feeling of the people of Upper Canada a century ago. By a very unwise measure, although introduced by a very great man, Mr. Pitt, in 1790, the old Province of Quebec was divided into two—Upper and Lower Canada. It was thought that matters would be simplified by keeping the French in one corner of this vast country, and the English in another, and they divided the Province of Quebec into two provinces. From that unwise measure came most of our troubles. The Legislature met in 1791 at Newark, afterwards Niagara, and was composed of Englishmen. They were severed from the French, but they had a colony of French on the western frontier of the Province of Canada, what is now the County of Essex. These Frenchmen were few in number, but their rights were protected at the second meeting of the Legislature of Upper Canada. The Province was a small one and poor, and could not afford even to print the proceedings of its Legislature; but its people regarded the feelings of their fellow-countrymen. Let me read the resolution, which is still in manuscript. The original volume will be found in our Library. This is the order of June 3, 1793:

"Ordered, that such acts as have already passed, or may hereafter pass the Legislature of this Province, be translated into the French language for the benefit of the inhabitants of the western district of this Province and other French settlers who may come to reside within this Province, and that A. Macdonald, Esq., of this House, member for Glengarry, be likewise employed as a French translator for this or other purposes."

Are we, one hundred years later, going to be less liberal to our French Canadian fellow-subjects than the few Englishmen, United Empire Loyalists, who settled Ontario? No, Sir. This resolution would cast shame on men who tried to deprive our French friends in the Province of Ontario of the privilege given them a hundred years ago by a body of men altogether speaking the English language. There may have been among them one member from that western district, of French origin—perhaps Monsieur Baby, who for years was the sole representative in the Province of Upper Canada of that portion of the French race who were living in Upper Canada. Are we going to be less liberal? Forbid it, Mr. Speaker. In the name of humanity, in the name of civilisation, in the name of the progress of this great country, I appeal to all our friends in this House, without reference to party, to forget what may be an inconvenience when they go back to their constituents on both sides, to forget that for a moment, and to merge everything in the great desire to make Canada, French and English, one people, without any hostile feeling, without any difference of opinion, further than that which arises from the different literatures and the different strains of mind that run always in different races, and which sever the Scotchman and the Irishman from the Englishman as much as it severs the Frenchman from the Englishman. Let us forget this cry, and we shall have our reward in seeing this unfortunate fire, which has been kindled from so small a spark, extinguished for ever, and we shall go on, as we have been going on since 1867, as one people, with one object, looking to one future, and expecting to lay the foundation of one great country.

Mr. EDGAR. I think it is a fortunate thing that this debate has taken so wide a range. If there is one thing more than another which should make a man feel proud of being a member of this Assembly, it is to have listened to a great debate like this. The questions which are before us for discussion are those which underlie our national existence, and upon the peaceful settlement of these questions depends our hope for the future of Canada. The speakers in this debate have, for the most part, been equal to the occasion, and they have displayed the courage to grapple with the real issues, they have shown a breadth of statesmanship to look at the lesson which history has taught us, and I do not think I am going too far in saying that they have dealt with the whole subject with an eloquence which could be found in few deliberative assemblies in the world. I think it is well that this debate has taken so wide a range for another reason. It has gone to the country. Day after day the opinions of the wisest statesmen of Canada, the most experienced of our public men, have been sent abroad by the press to educate the people on this subject before it shall have got into the hands of the uninformed and irresponsible platform orators who might use it to inflame the passions of race and of creed. Why has this debate, commencing

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

from so very small a Bill, and so very small a matter on its face, taken so wide a range as it has? There are several reasons for it. One is to be found in that unfortunate preamble. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has told us that he was surprised to find that the preamble was the occasion of so great an explosion of alarm and wrath in this House. I dare say he was surprised, because he says so, but it seems to me that he is making the same excuse as the boy made, in whose hands the fire-arm exploded, when he said that he did not know it was loaded. But the hon. gentleman not simply knew that that preamble was loaded, but he loaded it himself, and, therefore, he has no such excuse to make. The next reason that I find for the wide range of this debate was the speech by which it was introduced in this House by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). My judgment might be wrong, if I only depended on it to tell me that the hon. gentleman's introductory speech was sufficient to cause this widely extended debate. I do not depend upon my judgment alone, but upon that of an experienced parliamentary hand, the leader of the House and the leader of the Government. It is not the custom of the leader of the Government to introduce an unpleasant subject into this House when he can avoid it, but I can show that the speech of the First Minister, made a few minutes after the introductory speech of the hon. gentleman, was ample ground for the range the debate has taken. On that occasion, referring to the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe on the first reading of the Bill, the First Minister said:

"The line of argument my hon. friend has taken raises questions of such a nature, his whole line of argument is of such a kind, as to involve most serious and grave questions—so grave that I think we must take full time to consider what his arguments are, what they tend to, in what direction they lead, and what consequences may follow if the measure is persisted in."

I will say no more in reference to the hon. gentleman's speech in this House after that quotation, but, when a public man of the prominence of the hon. member for North Simcoe brings forward a measure in this House, it is impossible for any of us or for the country not to have regard to the discussions which the hon. gentleman has taken part in before the people of the country, at a recent date. If we had had no preamble to this Bill, but the simple terms of the Bill itself, if we had had no speech from the hon. gentleman in introducing it of such a character as the First Minister has described, we still had a cause for alarm. Our French friends in this House and in the country had cause for alarm when they had read—as I fancy all the members of this House had read—the speech which the hon. gentleman delivered almost under the shadow of this building, in Ottawa, on the 12th December, 1889. I am not going back to any 12th July speeches of the hon. gentleman. On that exciting occasion, I suppose, he ought to be allowed a little latitude, but I was glad to find that my leader on this side of the House compelled the hon. gentleman to withdraw or to explain away some of the language he used in one of those 12th July speeches made before the assembled brethren. However, we will not go into that. Let us see what the hon. gentleman promised the people of Ottawa he would do in the way of legislation; let us see

what he stated our grievances were. In this speech, he quoted with approval the report of Lord Durham in reference to the French language. Now, whether this report was written by Lord Durham himself, or by Mr. Charles Buller, or by Mr. Turton, whose reputation was very unsavory in his own country, or by Mr. Gibbon Wakefield, who was also in the *entourage* of Lord Durham, and whose reputation was even more unsavory than that of Mr. Turton, it is certain that this report was never accepted by the French people as a policy which was likely to reconcile the different people of this land. However, my hon. friend thinks that he will disinter Lord Durham's report and make it do service again in this country. Again we read in his December speech :

"Lord Durham realised that so long as the use of the French language was permitted, so long as they were permitted to be educated in their schools in the French language, to be instructed in the literature of France, instead of the literature of England, they would remain French in feeling."

Then he says :

"Is there any shadow of doubt that Lord Durham was right?"

The hon. member goes on, and says in the next sentence :

"There must be the obliteration of one of these languages."

Now, this was not applied to the North-West, this was not applied to Manitoba, it was applied to what Lord Durham applied it to, the Province of Quebec, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman, in that public place, advocated—and I am sure he is not the man to shirk responsibility on the floor of this House for what he advocates outside; at any rate, we do not expect it of him—he advocated the obliteration of one of these languages, and I do not think he meant the English language. Again, he says in that speech, speaking about the material progress of the country :

"While we were advancing at this sufficiently rapid pace of prosperity, we were forgetting the one thing needful to the consolidation of the Dominion; but all this time we were forgetting that this great trouble—"

That is to say, the use of the French language.

"—which was an enormous difficulty in 1837—"

That was certainly not in the North-West Territories, that was in the old Province of Quebec.

"—had quadrupled itself in 1867, and that we were leaving for our children to settle that, respecting which I used the expression, you will remember—I did not say in our generation—but I said that in the next generation the bayonet would do it, if we did not settle it by the ballot in this."

Now, Mr. Speaker, he has laid out for us a programme for the next generation, which, I hope, we will never see carried out. I am sure that I do not want to see any of my children in the next generation have to shoulder their muskets in a war of races in Canada; but that is the programme, unless—what, Mr. Speaker? Unless we settle it by the ballot in this. What does he mean by the ballot in this? Does he not mean by legislation, by the votes of the people acting upon the legislators in this Parliament; and does he not mean by the act of this, or of a future Parliament, under the direction of the ballot? That is what he promises, that is what he threatens in that speech—legislation or war. No wonder our French friends were a little alarmed at it. Then he says :

"This trouble was already lifting up its hideous head while we were fighting over matters of comparative unimportance,"

"Lifting up its hideous head." The beautiful French language is described in that way. Why, Mr. Speaker, when the occupant of that chair, every alternate day in this Chamber, before the doors are opened, lifts up his voice in the French language, in supplication to the God of both the French and the English, I suppose the hon. member for Simcoe feels that this language is then lifting up its "hideous head." He goes on and says that the Legislature of 1844

"Undid the good work which Lord Durham's wisdom had given us in the year 1840 or 1841."

But, Sir, he goes beyond that. He does not postpone this thing for the next generation, he does not even postpone it till there is another general election, when the ballot can be brought into force; but he proposes to do it in this very Parliament, if the words of the English language mean anything. What does he say?

"I will point out to you that this may be a very useful precedent—"

That is, the action of the Legislature at Kingston in 1844, when they introduced the French language unanimously again :

"That if, in 1844 or 1845 the Parliament of United Canada petition for the repeal of a clause of the Union Act, I do not know whether in 1890 or 1891, if the necessity arises, the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, cannot petition for an amendment to the British North America Act also."

Therefore, he promises that even in this Parliament, in the year 1890 or 1891, an Address may be presented to the Crown in England asking the Imperial Parliament to alter the British North America Act. Now, remember that course is not necessary, in order to affect the language in the North-West; it is only necessary to attack, what he thinks so terrible, the French language in Quebec, and the French language in this House, and, perhaps, the French language in Manitoba. He knows perfectly well that if he has the courage of his convictions he can put a notice on the paper to-day for an address from this House to the Queen, asking her to introduce legislation to amend the Imperial Act in this particular. Sir, when this solemn threat was read, no wonder the members of Parliament felt alarmed. Why this speech of 12th December last, which I hold in my hand, was sent to me, unless as a member of Parliament, I cannot say. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman sent copies to all his fellow members, in order to give them full notice of what he was doing; but if he did not, some of his friends did, who were anxious that the whole Parliament and country should know what the hon. member for Simcoe was so ostentatiously proposing to do. His programme is a large one, larger, he admits, even than the programme of the Equal Rights Association which he was addressing, because he says this :

"Are We to have Separate Schools in Upper Canada, tith assessments in Lower Canada, dual language in the Dominion Parliament, and dual languages in Quebec, the North-West and Manitoba?"

His programme is an extensive one. No wonder the French speaking people thought that this was but the entering of the small end of a very large wedge, to be driven home by the hammer of the eloquence of the hon.

member for North Simcoe. Now, however, a change has certainly come over the hon. gentleman; and I congratulate him upon it. His first speech in this House was not quite as brave as the speech he had delivered in the opera house here; and his last speech in the House was not nearly so aggressive as the first one he delivered here. He has been convinced by something during the course of this debate. I do not know whether it was his opponents who convinced him, or his own friends; I think he must have heard enough from his own friends and supporters to convince him that whatever they might think or say about the merits of this question of language in the North-West, they had no sympathy whatever with the larger crusade which the hon. gentleman pointed out to them on former occasions. Now, I listened to most of the debate, and I looked over the *Hansard*, and I find that, on this subject, the hon. member from West Toronto (Mr. Denison), who seconded the introduction of this Bill, does not hold out much encouragement to his leader. For he says he is talking of the case of Switzerland, the hon. gentleman says:

"I am not referring to Quebec; it is out of the question to speak of Quebec."

Then another, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) also fired a hot shot at that unfortunate preamble; and he went still further, and disclaimed any idea of interfering with the French language in the Province of Quebec or in the Dominion. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), who spoke, as he said, for one million of his fellow-subjects down by the sea, advocated the substance of the hon. gentleman's Bill, the one clause which it contains; but he also took occasion to say that the people in the Maritime Provinces, the million of people for whom he spoke, were truth-loving and treaty-keeping people, and they would never be a party to breaking a treaty under which the French language was established in Quebec and the Dominion. Another of the hon. gentleman's followers, the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), also repudiated the preamble—and he not only repudiated the preamble, but he poured a torrent of his turgid invective upon the head of his hon. friend, and denounced any clause abolishing the French language as "unjust, un-English, tyrannical and cruel." The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who also sympathises with the one clause of the Bill, spoke as follows with respect to the treaty rights of the French:

"We do not propose—"

I do not know who the "we" means; it certainly does not include the hon. member for Simcoe,—

"—to interfere with any rights that exist in Canada by the virtue of the provisions of the British North America Act; not with one of them."

Then, the hon. gentleman said further:

"There is not a right guaranteed to the race under the constitution which I wish to see impaired; there is not a right the integrity of which I wish to see impaired in the slightest degree."

Yet, the programme of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), was—I do not think it is so now—but a short time ago it was, to do what the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) says, is "out of the question;" what the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said

Mr. EDGAR.

would be "tyrannical and cruel, un-English and unjust," and to destroy rights which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says he does not wish to impair in the slightest degree. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) now says he will strike out the preamble. That is all very well, if the Bill ever reaches the House in Committee; but it is too late now to back down in that fashion, and it is a rare sight to see in this Parliament or in the courts of Ontario one of the brilliant leaders of the bar, which the hon. gentleman is, back down from any position he has boldly taken; yet the hon. gentleman backs down and says he is willing to withdraw the preamble of this Bill. It is too late to say that now; he should have thought of that before; he has sown the whirlwind and must reap the storm. I am glad to have heard so much from the other side of the House in favor of Provincial rights. It is proverbial that fresh converts are always a little over-zealous, and I think we have seen a display in this debate of a good deal of zeal a little misdirected on that subject. The question, of course, I know is a new one to those hon. gentlemen, and we can scarcely expect that they should understand it very well. They appear to have forgotten that there are two kinds of Provincial rights. There are the rights of the majority of the Legislature in the Province to pass such laws as come within the scope of the British North America Act. Those are the Provincial rights of the majority. But there are rights, also, belonging to the minority, guaranteed by the British North America Act, which are just as sacred as the rights of the majorities to govern themselves. Such rights would prevent the French majority in Quebec from taking away Protestant schools from the minority, for example. That is a question of the Provincial rights of the minority, which hon. gentlemen opposite, who are now advocating Provincial rights, have forgotten in their definition of that term. I think when the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) better understands this country and its citizens, he will know that Confederation, as was pointed out by the First Minister and by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), is a compromise. Confederation is a compromise in itself, and without Confederation what is Canada, where is it, or where would it be? Canada, therefore, is a compromise, and I believe if Confederation were broken up into its original fragments on a financial question, for example, it is just possible that the scattered members of the old Confederacy might remain in some sense connected with Great Britain and in some sense united to one another; but if this Confederation were torn to pieces by a war of races, there would be no hope of any harmony among its scattered members, there would be no hope of continuing the connection, which so many people desire, with Britain; and there would be no chance, which I feel to be an even more important thing, to build up a great Canadian nation. The hon. gentleman repudiates the idea of being an annexationist. He says, and I do not deny he thinks so too, that he is not working for annexation; but I tell him that if his speeches were not answered on this floor, if his sentiments were not repudiated by the great majority of this House, if this Bill were not voted down, he would make tens of thousands of annexationists in the Province of

Quebec. If the hon. gentleman will read the history of Canada, even for the last thirty years, he will learn that this very point, which is the object of his attack, formed one of the compromises agreed upon, in which the rights of the minorities were established. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will not acknowledge the authority of the late George Brown on that question, but I think that name will be acknowledged as a high authority in the Province of Ontario, and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will acknowledge it too. What did George Brown say on that point during the Confederation debates? He put the matter in a nutshell:

"The framers of this scheme had immense special difficulties to overcome. We had the prejudices of race and language and religion to deal with. To assert, then, that our scheme is without fault would be folly. It was necessarily the work of concession."

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) expresses the hope that in some mysterious way or other our French Canadian citizens will become Anglo-Saxon. Now, I do not know whether he means Anglo-Saxons of America or Anglo-Saxons of England. A great many attempts have been used, by promises and threats, and even by force, to make the French Canadians Yankees, but they have all failed, and I do not think that by legislation my hon. friend can hope to make the French Canadians English either. What is, I think, more important to us, is, that by proper and fair treatment we can keep the French people of this country true and loyal Canadians, loyal to the only form of Government which we have in Canada, the Government of Canada by Canadians, under the name of the Sovereign Lady, around whose throne the free people of England also govern themselves. There is no country under the sun in which fanaticism in politics or bigotry in religion is more dangerous than in Canada. Our materials are most inflammable, and it is not only culpable, but it is indeed a political crime for any public man to set the spark to that inflammable material. We must frown down fanaticism, whether it be shown on the floor of this House or on the streets of Hull, for if it be allowed to take its course, this country would not only be an impossible one to govern, but an unfit one to live in. In view of the present position of affairs, in view of the feeling which has been aroused in this House—necessarily aroused, as I have shown—and in view of the fact that there was no real pressing grievance to be remedied by this legislation, that there was no outcry from the North-West, that there was no unnecessary tax put upon the people of the North-West for printing the proceedings in French; this question could have well been left in abeyance. I will not say that the whole thing originated with my hon. friend, for he says it did not, but I know that if the hon. gentleman did not cause the petition to be sent from the North-West Council, it was, at all events, not sent until after he visited the North-West Territories. I think the origin of the trouble may be very naturally traced to the same source as the origin of the trouble we are now dealing with in this House. The grievance in the North-West Territories was a small one, an infinitesimal one, and I think it might have been borne with a little longer rather than that bitter feelings should have been aroused. I think we could have waited

until the question of a new Constitution for the North-West came up in its natural course before this Parliament by a proposition for creating one or more Provinces in the North-West. If this delay were allowed, I do not see that either the people of the North-West or the Canadian Constitution would have suffered. I believe that there is no necessity for this Bill at present, and holding this view, had I been within sound of the division bell the other evening, I should have voted for the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil).

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDGAR. Yes; I would unquestionably have so voted. I would have moved the six months' hoist, or anything else which would have postponed this Bill, not altogether because of the character of the Bill itself, but because of its preamble and surroundings, and chiefly of the speeches made by the hon. gentleman, and because the question would settle itself at no distant day. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," and appears to be surprised that I should make that announcement, but I again repeat that I am sorry I was not here to vote for that amendment. In taking this course, I cannot be accused of trying to gain French votes in my constituency, because, so far as I know, these is not one French Canadian in it. The fine constituency which I represent is largely English and Protestant, but at the same time it is largely liberal, and I shall be very much disappointed if the broad and liberal sentiments which I am trying to express here, will not meet with the approval of the liberal English-speaking Protestants of my riding, which is in the heart of the great Province of Ontario. I do not hope to catch votes, nor am I afraid of losing votes by the course which I take. While I may not have any claim or right to do so, I will venture to make an appeal to my French fellow members in this House. I do hope that they will receive a proposition of a conciliatory character, such as that contained in the amendment of the Minister of Justice, without alarm. Although they may not like everything that is in that proposition, they have no ground for alarm, in my opinion, when they hear the sentiments expressed towards them by the majority on both sides of this House. I shall also take the liberty of counselling them not to ask for anything unreasonable, or for anything which will give their enemies an excuse for open and continued hostility towards them.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). At this stage of the debate, and after the many lucid and able arguments that have been advanced on both sides, I cannot hope to add anything to the information of the House, or to interest it on this question to any degree. Nor, Sir, would I have ventured to have said a word were it not that I do not wish to record a silent vote upon the question now before the House. In the debate that has taken place during the last five or six days, I have been struck with the great unanimity with which hon. members who opposed the proposition of my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) have opposed, not the Bill itself, but the preamble with which that Bill has been introduced. It has been stated by many hon. gentlemen who have spoken upon this question, that the Bill itself was an innocent measure, but that its preamble is one calculated to excite the feelings of

the community, and, therefore, that the Bill ought on that account to be opposed. I have also been struck with the fact that the hon. gentlemen who have opposed the proposition of my hon. friend for North Simcoe, have criticised, not so much the speeches which he has delivered on the floor of Parliament in reference to this measure, as the speeches he has delivered outside of this House. I may say, Sir, frankly, that with many of the aspirations of my hon. friend for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) I have no sympathy whatever. There were many things said by that hon. gentleman during the recess which, perhaps, might as well have been left unsaid, and with which I do not at all concur; but I think every hon. member in this House must admit that the hon. member for North Simcoe has presented his case on the floor of this Parliament with a degree of moderation that ought to commend itself to the House, and which is in marked contrast to many of the speeches that have been delivered in opposition to his measure. Sir, the few words I have to say on this question—and they will be very few indeed—will have particular reference to the proposition now before the Chair, namely, the amendment moved by the hon. Minister of Justice. I have just stated that the greatest objection offered to this Bill refers to the preamble; that was one of the objections urged by the Minister of Justice in the speech he delivered here the other night. Well, Sir, we had before us last year the consideration of a Bill, the preamble of which was obnoxious to a very large portion of the people of this country—a preamble calculated to arouse the prejudices, if I may so express it, of a very large number of people, of whom I myself was one. I listened to the hon. Minister of Justice on that occasion taking the ground that the preamble of a Bill was no essential part of the Bill at all. During the recess following the last Session of Parliament, many of us were called to account by our constituents for the position we had taken on the question I have just referred to; and I undertook to justify the position I took on that question because I believed that the Government were right and did what they ought to do in the interest of the country. In doing so, I took the ground that the hon. Minister of Justice had taken, that the preamble formed no essential part of the Bill, and ought not to be considered in reference thereto. But we find the hon. Minister of Justice now laying down a new principle and taking the opposite view; he says he has a very strong objection to this Bill because of its preamble. Well, Sir, the hon. member for North Simcoe has stated distinctly that if this Bill passes a second reading, he has no objection to changing the preamble—that the House can amend it in any direction they please, or they can strike it out if they please. The whole question presented to this House, divested of all sentiment, and of all appeals to the Province of Quebec or to any other section of the country, is whether it is desirable that that particular clause of the North-West Territories Act should be continued on the Statute-book or not. I have no sympathy with those hon. gentlemen who say that the hon. member for North Simcoe ought not to have moved in this matter, but that it ought to have been left to the members representing North-West constituencies. If the hon. member for North

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

Simcoe believed, as he evidently does believe, that this clause of the North-West Territories Act should be expunged from the Statute-book, it was his bounden duty to bring the question before Parliament, whether he represented a constituency in Ontario, in the North-West Territories, or in any other portion of the Dominion. Now, let me say that with the first part of the proposition submitted by the hon. Minister of Justice I concur to a very great extent:

“That this House, having regard to the long continued use of the French language in old Canada, and to the covenants on that subject embodied in the British North America Act, cannot agree to the declaration contained in the said Bill as the basis thereof, that it is expedient in the interest of the national unity of the Dominion that there should be community of language amongst the people of Canada. That, on the contrary, this House declares its adherence to the said covenants and its determination to resist any attempt to impair the same.”

Why should we make that declaration, Mr. Speaker? We are not called on to deal with that question at the present time. My hon. friend from North Simcoe, with all his ardor in the direction he is moving, declared in the speech he made the other night, that it was not his intention to interfere in the slightest degree with the rights conferred on the minorities in the different Provinces by the Act of Confederation. The recognition of those rights is, to a very great extent, the basis of Confederation; it was because of the concession of them to the minorities in the different Provinces that Confederation was made a possibility; and, therefore, I would be one of the last to interfere with them in the slightest degree, whether in the Province of Quebec, the Province of Ontario, or any other Province in this Dominion. But I take it that we are not called upon, on the present occasion, to deal with that question at all. No proposition has been submitted to this House to interfere in the slightest degree with the rights of the minorities conferred upon them by the Act of Confederation, and, therefore, in my judgment at any rate, the recital in this resolution is entirely unnecessary. Then, I come to the other part of the question. The hon. Minister of Justice has laid down the proposition here that certain matters should be left to the final decision of the North-West Legislature, after the next general election. Well, Sir, if he had enlarged the scope of his proposition I do not say I would not agree with him; but he has confined it to two points. The first, refers to the use of the French language in the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories; but, in the speech he delivered here the other night, the hon. Minister stated, that if a number of French gentlemen were elected to represent portions of the North-West Territories in the Legislature, they would be permitted to use their language on the floor of that Legislature, as a matter of courtesy if not as a matter of right, so that it seems to me that the concession proposed to be made by this resolution is no concession at all. The second point refers to the printing of the proceedings of the North-West Legislature in the French language. Why, Sir, we have the authority of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who ought to know, perhaps, better than any other man in Canada—almost as well even as the Regina *Leader* itself—what is the practice in that section of the

country; and he stated as a fact that the proceedings of the North-West Legislature were not printed in the French language at all. So that it seems to me the proposition submitted to the House by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice will confer on the North-West Legislature practically no benefit whatever; and, therefore, while they have been asking this House for bread, we shall, if we pass this resolution, be giving them a stone. What does the hon. Minister say with regard to the use of the French language in the courts? He says that it would be a manifest injustice to the people of that country if they were precluded from using the French language in the courts. What argument did the hon. Minister use in respect to that contention—leaving aside altogether the constitutional argument, with which I do not propose to deal, but to speak of the injustice which he declared would be perpetrated upon the 1,500 French people and upon the 3,000 odd French half-breeds, a large proportion of whom, it has been stated in this debate, are incapable of speaking the French language at all, and only understand their mother tongue, the Indian? I say there would be no greater injustice in not allowing them to have the use of French in their courts than there is in not allowing the use of the French or the German language in the courts of the Province of Ontario, where there are over 200,000 Germans, and upwards of 100,000 French people. Can it be argued for a moment that any greater injustice will be perpetrated on the people of the North-West Territories by preventing the use of the French language in the records and proceedings before the courts, than is perpetrated upon the French or Germans in the Province of Ontario by not using the languages of these people in that Province? I have yet to learn that any miscarriage of justice has occurred, or that there has been any complaint of any miscarriage of justice because of the non-use of the French or of any other foreign language in the courts in that Province. It seems to me, therefore, that the argument of the Minister of Justice in that respect has very little force. I would have been pleased, I frankly admit, because I have the greatest respect for the opinion of my leader, if I could have agreed to the proposition which the Minister of Justice proposed to this House; but holding the views I do on this question, and believing, as I do, that the opinion of the people of the North-West Territories, as shown by their petitions to this Parliament, ought to have some force and effect, I find myself incapable of voting for that resolution.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BARRON. When, before recess, I had the pleasure of hearing my hon. friend the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) rise in his seat and say that he, an old parliamentarian, an old member of this House, rose to speak on this serious and important question with a good deal of diffidence, I confess to having then experienced some feeling of regret that I, a young member, had made up my mind to speak on this burning question; but I hope the hon. members of this House will see that, in rising to speak, notwithstanding my youth, I

do so solely under a keen sense of duty to my constituents, who expect me in this matter to give my decided views one way or the other. I do not think any hon. member of this House feels more conscious than I, of the great necessity we are under to say nothing to-night, or hereafter during this debate, which may in any way continue the ill-feeling that, perhaps, has been engendered during this debate. I am conscious of this necessity, not only out of respect for the high official position which you, Sir, so worthily occupy, not only out of respect for our own individual selves, and not only out of respect for the French members from the Province of Quebec, representing a great and free electorate, but because, Sir, I know full well that a harsh or hasty word spoken to-night, however true its text may be, is more calculated to repel than to induce a calm and dispassionate judgment; and so I hope, when I shall have resumed my seat, that I shall be able, on looking back over what I have said, to conclude that I have spoken calmly and dispassionately, although already words have been spoken which have grated somewhat harshly on the ears of hon. gentlemen who may think as I do, and who may vote as I intend to vote on this important question. But if I do give offence to any creed or to any person, I hope hon. gentlemen will see it is because I am now in the years of enthusiasm, because I believe in the assertion of free speech and free thought, knowing, as I do, that in past history these two elements have led to the highest kind of legislation—legislation tending to peace on earth and goodwill towards men. I have said that words have been spoken during this debate which fell unpleasantly on the ears of hon. gentlemen in this House. Need I say to whose language I refer? Need I say that the hon. the Minister of Public Works, more than any hon. gentleman in this House, has, during this debate, made use of language calculated to do serious harm throughout the country at large. I say, Sir, that his language was most fanatical, most inflammatory, and not justified at all by that of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy); but, assuming for a moment, which I do not now admit, that the hon. member for North Simcoe did say what, perhaps, in his calmer judgment, he would not have said, two wrongs do not make a right; and, therefore, the hon. the Minister of Public Works ought not to have used the language he did, and, coming from a gentleman in his exalted position, it was most dangerous to the peace and the welfare of the community at large. Bad enough would that language have been had it come from an ordinary member; bad enough would it have been had it come from a member of the Government, sitting behind the hon. gentleman, but, infinitely mischievous was it coming from the Minister of Public Works, who is second in command to the right hon. gentleman who leads this House. The hon. the Minister of Public Works spoke of the loyalty of the French Canadians. I admit, and I rejoice in the fact, that there are no more loyal men in the community than the French Canadians, but I do not propose to admit, as worthy of our admiration—if I may be allowed to speak for a moment in their behalf—the example set us by the hon. the Minister of Public Works in the gentleman to whom he referred, for British Canadians cannot see much loyalty to admire or respect in a gentleman, who one moment re-

joined in the tricolor of France, and the next gave three cheers for the British Crown. The loyalty I admire is that of such a man as Montcalm, who fought to the bitter end. The loyalty I admire is that of the French Canadians, who, when tempted by the Americans, refused to yield to temptation and remained loyal to the British Crown. Then, I cannot but recall the remarks made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) when he undertook to criticise the remarks of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). He devoted half an hour to abuse and vituperation against the hon. member for West Durham—against the very gentleman whom the right hon. the First Minister asked to come to his assistance in this serious and important matter. What must have been the feelings of the hon. member for East Grey when, after abusing that hon. gentleman, he heard, a day or two later, his leader ask him to come to his assistance, in order to bridge over this difficulty? When I heard the hon. member for East Grey presuming to criticise the course of the hon. member for West Durham, and when I saw the dignified, stately form of the hon. member for West Durham, and contrasted his bearing with that of the hon. member for East Grey, I could not help thinking of the cartoon in which a sinned cat was depicted as hissing and spitting at a great Bengal tiger. But, much as I respect and admire the hon. member for West Durham, exalted as is his ability, I regret to have to say that, in some particulars, I cannot follow him in the speech he addressed to this House a few nights ago. It is not my fault, but my misfortune, and no one regrets it more than I, that the constituency which I have the honor to represent did not send a gentleman of greater ability and of more astute mind to follow the hon. member for West Durham in the vote he proposes to give, and in the language he addressed to this House. But I shall refer to his remarks a few minutes later, when I come to that portion of my speech. For the present I wish to refer to the remarks addressed to this House last night by the hon. the Minister of Justice. It is with pride and pleasure that I see that hon. gentleman rise to address this House. It is with delight that I look forward to a literary treat when I see he intends to speak; and it was with pleasure that I saw him rise to move, as he did move, the amendment which is now before the House. But I confess to a feeling of great disappointment when he sat down; I confess that my idol was struck to the ground, because we found that the Minister of Justice had actually swallowed himself; that he, who within one year since declared that the preamble to an Act was of no moment, now declared that it was of the greatest possible importance. In the debate on the Jesuits' Estates Act, he said:

"Now, let me again, before I leave the subject of the Act, call the attention of the House to the fact that all the argument which has been made with regard to the necessity for disallowance is based on objections to the preamble of the Act. In the history of disallowance in this country, in the history of the disallowance of our own statutes in the mother country—and we know that scores of them were disallowed—the records will be searched in vain to find one which was disallowed because the preamble was not agreeable to anybody. I do not pretend to dispute the statement of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that the preamble is a part of the Act. So is the title a part of the Act, and so are the head-notes of sections; but has anyone ever heard of a Government being asked to disallow an Act because they did not like the

Mr. BARRON.

wording of the title or of the head-notes. The preamble is understood to be a part of the Act for the purpose of interpreting the Act, but there is nothing in this Act for which interpretation is needed, and I distinguish, in referring to this, the most trivial and technical objection which could be taken to a statute, between those parts of the preamble which assert that certain correspondence has passed, such as this between the Premier and the Cardinal at Rome, and those preambles which recite certain agreements which the statute validates."

Then, further on, he says:

"I assert, without fear of contradiction among people who will consider this matter in a calm and businesslike way, that that part of the preamble which is the only part relevant to the purposes of the Act itself, is utterly harmless, entirely businesslike, free from the slightest suspicion of derogating from any right of Her Majesty, and from the slightest suspicion of infringement of the constitution."

These were the words spoken a short year ago by the hon. the Minister of the Justice, when it appeared to be his purpose to minimise the importance of a preamble to an Act. But it will be in the recollection of hon. members that, on that occasion, the preamble was made, by a special enacting clause, part and parcel of the Act itself; and, therefore, it was that some hon. gentlemen opposed, as I did, the Act, because the preamble which was made a part of it was most offensive. What lawyer in this House will assume that the preamble is of any importance so long as the Act itself is clear and beyond doubt? First, however, let me draw attention to the fact that the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), having heard the objections made to the preamble, said at once, in effect, I do not consider it offensive, but, if any hon. gentleman does so, I will consent to have it struck out in Committee. The Minister of Justice, the other night, did not take a particle of notice of the concession or offer made by the hon. member for North Simcoe. It appeared to me that he refused to take notice of that offer or to comment upon it. It appeared to me that he was anxious that this apparently offensive preamble should continue in the Bill, so that he might have some argument and grievance on which to build an argument in this House. I say that there was nothing in the preamble to this Act. I mean by that, that no matter how offensive it might be—and I am not going to argue that just now—this House has no right to consider the preamble so long as the enacting clause is beyond any doubt, and I think there are very few lawyers in this House who will deny the truth of that proposition. I will not venture, young as I am, to address a legal argument to this House coming from myself, and I prefer to read authorities proving my contentions. I shall read from Maxwell on Statutes, an authority which, I think, will be acknowledged as sufficient. On page 56, Maxwell says:

"But the preamble cannot either restrict or extend the enacting part when the language of the latter is plain, and not open to doubt either as to its meaning or its scope."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON: The hon. member for Bothwell interrupts me by saying "hear, hear"—meaning, I suppose, that the language of the enacting clause is not plain. The hon. gentleman can read English and so can I, and neither he nor anyone else can contend that the enacting clause of this Bill is not so plain that any child can understand it. What

is the Bill? Simply that the 110th section of the North-West Territories Act shall be repealed, so there can be no ambiguity about the enacting clause, and therefore the preamble is a matter of no possible moment. The authority I have quoted goes on to say:

"It is not unusual to find that the enacting part is not exactly co-extensive with the preamble. In many Acts of Parliament, although a particular mischief is recited, the legislative provisions extend beyond it. The preamble is often no more than the recital of some of the inconveniences, and does not exclude any others for which a remedy is given by the statute. The evil recited is but the motive for legislation; the remedy may both consistently and wisely be extended beyond the cure of that evil; and if on a review of the whole Act a wider intention than that expressed in the preamble appears to be the real one, effect is to be given to it, notwithstanding the less extensive import of the preamble."

But it may be said that in this case the preamble is more extensive than the enacting clause, and, if I stop there, it would be said that I had not answered the question as to the importance of the preamble. But, on page 62, I find:

"Where the preamble is found more extensive than the enacting part, it is equally inefficacious to control the effect of the latter, when otherwise free from doubt." Then on page 64, this work proceeds:

"It has been sometimes said that the preamble may extend but cannot restrain the enacting part of a statute. But it would seem difficult to support this proposition. *** In a word, then, it is to be taken as a fundamental principle, standing, as it were, at the threshold of the whole subject of interpretation, that the intention of the Legislature is invariably to be accepted and carried into effect, whatever may be the opinion of the judicial interpreter of its wisdom or justice. If the language admits of no doubt or secondary meaning, it is simply to be obeyed, without more ado. If it admits of more than one construction, the true meaning is to be sought, not on the wide sea of surmise and speculation, but 'from such conjectures as are drawn from the words alone or something contained in them;' that is, from the context viewed by such light as its history may throw upon it, and construed with the help of certain general principles, and under the influence of certain presumptions as to what the Legislature does or does not generally intend."

Great as my respect is for the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), great as is my admiration for the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), much as I respect and admire the hon. the Minister of Justice, I prefer to take the views of Maxwell as to the meaning of the preamble to an Act. Let me give the House an instance where the preamble to an Act proved entirely inefficacious. There was a statute under which the question was raised as to the legality of the Orange Association in England, in or about the year 1832. The preamble to the Act recited that it was "directed against secret or oath-bound societies," and the argument was made that by reason of that statute, 29 George III, and by reason of that preamble, the Orange society was illegal. But it was found that the enacting clause did not go to the extent of the preamble, and the opinion was given by such gentlemen as Sergeant Lewis, Sir Wm. Howe, Sir Robert Gifford, Mr. Gurney, Mr. Gasalee and Mr. Adolphus, men, some of whom afterwards adorned the bench, and reached high positions in the service of their country; all of them gave the opinion that by reason of the enacting clause not going to the extent of the preamble, therefore the society itself was not illegal. Now, the hon. Minister of Justice proposes an amendment, and I must say that it struck me that that amendment was as inconsistent and as incongruous as the far-famed autumn leaves of Vallambrosa; but after all, what does it amount to? It admits the principle of the

hon. member for North Simcoe as advanced by his Bill; it admits that the time may come when dual language must be abolished in the North-West; it says in effect that we will not do to-day what we shall do to-morrow; therefore I say that when the Minister of Justice brings in his amendment proposing to do this a few days, months or years hence—perhaps not by this House, but to give others the power to do it—why, Sir, he practically gives away the case to the member from North Simcoe. What is that amendment?

"That all the words after 'Resolved' be expunged, and the following substituted:

"That this House, having regard for the long continued use of the French language in old Canada and to the covenants on that subject embodied in the British North America Act, cannot agree to the declarations contained in the said Bill as a basis thereof, namely, that it is expedient in the interest of the national unity of the Dominion that there should be unity of language amongst the people of Canada. That, on the contrary, this House declares its adhesion to the said covenants and its determination to resist any attempt to impair the same."

Now, it seems to me that the hon. member for North Simcoe has never disputed these premises. So far as I am concerned, I here declare that if the member for North Simcoe attempted in any way to interfere with the rights of our fellow-countrymen in the Province of Quebec, so far as the use of the French language is concerned, I would resist that attempt to the utmost. But we have heard it here declared by the member for North Simcoe, time and time again, both in his speech in introducing this Bill and in his speech the other night, that that was not his intention, and, therefore, it seems to me that we may agree with these premises. The amendment of the Minister of Justice then goes on:

"That at the same time this House deems it expedient and proper, and not inconsistent with those covenants that the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories should receive from the Parliament of Canada power to regulate, after the next general election of the Assembly, the proceedings of the Assembly and the manner of recording and publishing such proceedings."

Sir, I was prepared to take the objection that that amendment did not go far enough, that it did not include the ordinances, it did not include the statutes, it did not include the proceedings in the courts; but this objection, on my part, was anticipated by the First Minister when he spoke to-night, and explained that it was no matter, that the reason they were not included in this amendment was that the ordinances were published by this Parliament, or were under the control of this Parliament, and, therefore, this amendment went far enough. I confess that that answer of the First Minister is a complete answer to the objection I would have raised to this amendment not including the ordinances and the statutes. But the Bill of the hon. member for Simcoe may be passed, and still the ordinances and statutes will be published in both languages. Why? Because, what the Bill of the member for North Simcoe proposes is simply to repeal the 110th section of the North-West Territories Act, which has nothing whatever to do with the publication of the ordinances and the statutes which, as the First Minister stated this afternoon, were under the control of this Parliament, and therefore would be published in both languages. Now, if the Bill of the member from North Simcoe were to become law the statutes and the ordinances relating to the North-West Territories would still

be published in both languages for the reason I have stated. Now, I stated in the opening of my remarks that I would be compelled to refer briefly to the remarks of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and in doing so let me state that no one has any idea of the reluctance with which I do so, because I have such an unbounded respect and high admiration for that hon. gentleman, and I am always ready and willing, so far as I can, to bend my will to the will of the hon. member for West Durham, so long as my conscience and my better judgment allow me to do so. But upon this occasion I am unable to do so, and I want to refer to one or two matters upon which he has spoken, and upon which, to my mind, he appeared to me to take up a wrong position. He said that the North-West Council had no right to speak upon this important matter, and he used this language :

"The North-West Assembly had no permission or authority from this Parliament, its creators, to deal with this question at all, and the electors to that Assembly had not before them, when the Assembly was elected, any proposition upon that subject. So, neither was there an authority in the body, nor was there the provision in the constitution."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there can be no possible doubt of the truth of that proposition, nobody ever denied it ; but at the same time, to say that the North-West Territories had no right to speak out upon this matter, is setting forth a proposition which cannot possibly be accepted. Why, Sir, if it is correct that the North-West Council had no right to speak out upon the subject-matter of this Bill, then how much more are we stultifying ourselves in this House in the action we have taken, when, during my short period in Parliament, we have already spoken out upon matters relating to the entire Empire, more especially the subject of Home Rule. Sir, if the hon. member is right in his contention, then we never had the right to do that ; still we did it, and if we did that, with still greater reason may the representatives of the North-West Assembly speak out upon that question which peculiarly affects themselves. But in addition to the fact that the North-West Council have, by the resolution forwarded to the member for North Simcoe and placed upon the Table of this House, spoken out in very strong and plain language upon this subject, we have also other means of information whereby we know that it is the almost unanimous wish of the people of the North-West Territories to abolish the dual language. The hon. member from North Simcoe read, I believe, some telegrams the other night which were questioned by the hurried interruption of the Secretary of State. He read one, I believe, signed by a gentleman named McCaul. I happen to have the pleasure of knowing that gentleman, and I am quite confident, from my knowledge of him, he being a son of the late Dr. McCaul, President of the University of Toronto, that he is utterly incapable of sending such a telegram as was read by the member from North Simcoe, unless the statements contained in it were accurate in every particular. Let me read from the *Calgary Herald*, February 7, in regard to the dual language in the North-West :

"Here is a system which none of us ever asked for, which was imposed upon the North-West without its pre-knowledge or consent ; a system which we have no need of, which we most decidedly object to as useless and costly ; and the opportunity being offered of assisting a movement to rid the North-West of the system, our duty is plain."

Mr. BARRON.

Then I have a quotation from the *Calgary Herald* of 13th February, sent by a gentleman whose position ought not to be disputed, because he is one of the Queen's Counsel lately appointed by the Minister of Justice himself. I refer to Mr. James Bruce Smith, of Calgary. He has sent me the *Calgary Herald* of the 13th February, containing certain resolutions passed at a public meeting at Calgary on the evening before, which I shall read to the House :

"Resolved, That the use of a dual language in official proceedings in the North-West Territories is unnecessary, expensive, and calculated to prevent the complete union of the several nationalities who reside in the Territories, and that to bring about a united Canadian people in this part of the Dominion, the English language alone should be legalised for use in the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, the courts, and all other official bodies.

"Resolved, That this meeting heartily endorses the action of the Legislative Assembly at Regina, in reference to the dual language, and requests that the petition presented to the Dominion Government in pursuance of such action be granted.

"Resolved, That a copy of the above resolutions be forwarded to D. W. Davis, M.P., Dalton McCarthy, M.P., the Hon. James A. Lougheed, and the Dominion Government, and that D. W. Davis, M.P., be requested to forward in every way the movement for the abolition of French as an official language in the Territories."

I may, perhaps, be allowed by way of interjection, to read a statement prepared by Mr. Cayley, a gentleman well known to the First Minister, who, speaking of the cost of publishing the ordinances, resolutions, proceedings, and so forth, in the French language, says :

"The estimated population of the Territories is 100,000, of whom French and Half-breeds form one-fifth. The cost of French printing in 1883 was \$350 ; in 1887 it had risen to \$1,000 for printing and \$1,000 for translation. The latter cost \$3,000 for three years. Of 500 copies of the Territorial ordinances printed, 126 were distributed ; the balance lay on the shelves at Regina, and a large proportion of the 126 went to persons (official and others) who could speak English."

So I think we have sufficiently heard from the North-West Territories as to their views regarding this important matter. But I have heard it said that there have been counter-petitions presented by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis), petitions purporting to be very numerous signed, asking for the retention of the dual language. I do not doubt that if any one takes the trouble to examine these petitions he will be very much impressed with some of them. There is a great similarity of writing between the signatures to those petitions, and I think we all know that about the easiest thing in the world is to get up a petition. I recollect perfectly well that petitions were sent here very numerous signed against the Franchise Act, that iniquitous measure to which the First Minister is so strongly pledged, and upon an examination of the petitions it appeared that among the names of those asking for the repeal of the Franchise Act was the name of the First Minister himself. The celebrated Chartist petitions contained the signatures of Her Majesty the Queen, Prince Albert, the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell. We find also that upon an investigation into the question of petitions addressed to the House of Commons in England, it was found that numerous signed petitions contained only two or three different forms of handwriting. I read somewhere that a petition was addressed to ex-President Cleveland, when he was Sheriff in the State of New York, purporting

to have been signed by the friends and relatives of the ex-President himself, asking Mr. Cleveland as Sheriff that instead of hanging a criminal he would hang himself. So, I think, we see that very little importance is to be attached to any petitions, no matter how they are prepared, but especially petitions coming from the North-West Territories, containing prayers against the wishes of the representatives of the people there. I think all hon. members must have been greatly impressed with the speech of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I certainly was so impressed. I read it with a great deal of pleasure and care, because, as a literary effort, it could hardly be excelled; but I think that his whole speech from the beginning to the end was based on a wrong assumption. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman started with wrong premises entirely on which he built his argument; that his contention from the beginning to the end of his speech was that it was the intention of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to entirely eradicate the French language.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So he says.

Mr. BARRON. And upon these premises the hon. gentleman built his argument. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says, so the hon. member for North Simcoe says. If he says so, I have not heard it; and if he says so now, I will take my seat and not support his Bill, because I say it would be criminal, indeed, to endeavor to shut the mouths entirely of the French people, and eradicate the French language. What did the hon. member for Bothwell say?

"The hon. gentleman proposes to act towards the French population of this country in much the same way that the brother of Robert, Duke of Normandy, acted towards him. He proposes to put out their eyes. He says: 'Forget your mother tongue, forget the orators and statesmen, the novelists and historians, the poets and philosophers of France, and then you will begin to qualify yourselves for becoming good British subjects. If you understand the language, if you appreciate its beauties, if you admire its expression or its wisdom, or its elasticity, then it is impossible that you can be a loyal subject, it is impossible that you can be devoted to the maintenance of the Federal union.' This is the position that the hon. gentleman has taken."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. member for Bothwell says "hear, hear." All I can say is this, that I do not understand that to be the position of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy); but, on the contrary, if language means anything, if the English language can be comprehended, I understood him to say the direct opposite—that he has no desire to eradicate the French language or destroy it, but that, simply for purposes of convenience, he desires that in the North-West Territories, as his Bill says, section 110 of the North-West Territories Act, providing that the proceedings be printed in both languages, should be repealed.

An hon. MEMBER. Ask him.

Mr. BARRON. We have asked him; we have his speech.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) not argue that there could be no such thing as national unity without one language, and did he not quote Freeman and Max Müller for the purpose of establishing that proposition?

Mr. McCARTHY. I disclaim having argued any such ridiculous proposition. I argued that community of language tended to unity, not that it was necessary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That it was necessary.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. BARRON. But the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says it is the same thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say it was the same thing. I stated he said so.

Mr. BARRON. Well, he argues, as I understand, that the proposition of the member for North Simcoe is the same thing almost as if he proposed to reject the French language entirely. That contention reminds me of a story in a little book called "Alice in Wonderland," which all hon. gentlemen who may be happy enough to have families, no doubt, have read. Little Alice was seated at the head of the table, and there were present a hatter, a March hare, and a dormouse. An argument announced by little Alice did not seem quite to suit the hatter, and so the hatter said: "You might just as well say, little Alice, that because 'I see what I eat,' that it is the same thing as 'I eat what I see;'" and the March hare also rejoined: "You might just as well say that because 'I like what I get,' it is the same thing as that 'I get what I like;'" and the dormouse said: "Because, little Alice, I breathe when I sleep, you might say it is the same thing as that I sleep when I breathe;" and the hatter, summing up the propositions, said that little Alice must expect such inconsistent propositions as these, if she was to stand by the argument she advanced a few moments ago. I think if the hatter in the story were in this House he would have addressed the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) regarding his argument in much the same way as he admonished little Alice on the particular occasion I have spoken of. It is impossible for me, not being a historian, to follow the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in his historical crusades throughout the universe. He travelled up and down longitudes and back and forward over latitudes to find authorities to show that it is in the interests of the unity of the Empire and of the country that dual language should be retained. The hon. member introduced us to the Jews, to the Gentiles, and to the Greeks; he then took us among the Parthians, the Medes, the Alamites; then he brought us to dwell in Mesopotamia and Judea, and back again to the reign of Ahasuerus; then he asked us to travel with him mentally among the Italians of Malta, and then jumped across the Atlantic to take us among the French of Quebec. Then he introduced us among the Dutch of the Cape, took us to Calcutta among the Hindoos, and then among the Chinese of Hong Kong. He talked of the Helots of Sparta, and travelled in and out among the Ionian Islands. He took us back to the Roman Empire, and then with one stupendous bound brought us among the Algonquin tribes of the North-West. All this for the purpose of showing us that dual language is not harmful, but that it is, in fact, rather desirable to have a variety of languages, and thereby the unity of the Empire is perpetuated and secured. But, Sir, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), from the Alpha to the Omega of his speech, never said one word about that great exam-

ple shown us by the country to the south of us—I refer to the United States. Although the hon. gentleman referred to almost every country of the universe, he never once said a solitary word about the example shown us by the United States. There is not a doubt that in that great country their stupendous advance in civilisation and their immense advance in national strength and power, have been to a very great extent secured by the fact that they have one common school system, and one language from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Gulf of Mexico to the boundaries which separate them from Canada. I do not propose to follow the different members of this House who have given us the examples of Germany, Poland, Finland, Russia and other countries. I prefer to take the statement of the hon. gentleman from Albert (Mr. Weldon), a gentleman whom this House recognises as a great student of history and as one more able to speak on this important matter than gentlemen who within the last three or four months have refreshed their memories and secured new information with the object of addressing the House on this question. The member for Albert says :

“ I concur in the opinion that it is desirable, other things being equal, without breaking faith, that government is easier and that friction is less among a people in a country which has a homogeneous people. This remark is made by one whose duty all his life has been to study history, and I venture to say there is not in Europe a single example of a nation with two rival races jealously preserving their own nationality, and nearly equal in strength which is at all commensurate with her resources and population as compared with a homogeneous nation.”

I listened to the remark of the hon. the Premier himself when he replied to the leader of the Opposition—a leader for whom we all have more than ordinary respect and towards whom we entertain feelings akin to love and affection. This makes it all the harder for me to speak on this occasion, for I know that in saying what I do say and in feeling as I do feel, I am not in accord with the views of the Liberal leader ; but, on the contrary, I am doing that, and I am saying that, and I shall vote that way which is contrary to his wishes, and perhaps shall hurt his feelings in a way I would not like. I think that the hon. the leader of the Opposition was right when he said that at all times in the history of Canada the rights of the minority were disregarded by the Conservative party. We have only to go back to the times of the “ Family Compact.” We have only to go back to the seigniorial tenures—the abolition of which the right hon. gentleman took credit for the Conservative party, to prove this. Why, Sir, everything in the way of reform which has been done by the Conservative party (if my reading of history is correct) has been brought about by the bayonet of argument addressed by the Reform party to the Conservative party of this country. The Conservatives have been forced time and time again to do that which they say now they did willingly, but which they only did willingly because it was done for the purpose of preserving themselves in power. We find now that the Conservative party in this House are actually, partially acceding to the proposition of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). If the hon. the First Minister regards the rights of the minority, why did he not support the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) ? No ; on the

Mr. BARRON.

contrary, to please a certain portion of the community, he goes against that which he has spoken for this afternoon, and brings in a clear amendment in favor of abolishing the dual language. The only difference between the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice and the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe is that the hon. Minister refuses to do to-day that which the hon. member for North Simcoe wants done to-day, but he says he will do it to-morrow, which after all, becomes, except in point of time, practically the same thing. The hon. Minister appeals to this House, not to be possessed of animus, not to create racial or creed animosity. We know that the right hon. First Minister is the general-in-chief of Mr. Meredith, who is carrying on a crusade against Mr. Mowat in respect to Separate Schools and the alleged use of French in the schools in Ontario ; and if the right hon. gentleman is consistent, after the language he used this afternoon, he will write to Mr. Meredith and tell him to stop this crusade ; and not only so, but he will support Mr. Mowat in his efforts to do what is right and just to the French minority in that Province.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Follow the example of the Opposition here.

Mr. BARRON. Yes ; he has had to appeal to the hon. leader of the Opposition here, and to the hon. member for West Durham, and they, being possessed of patriotic feeling, desire to help the Premier in this great difficulty ; but the right hon. the Prime Minister cannot be consistent so long as he assists and upholds Mr. Meredith in Ontario in his present crusade, and addresses the House as he did this afternoon. I was surprised, Sir, to hear the right hon. gentleman stigmatise the resolution of the hon. member for North Simcoe as the sting of a gnat. I do not know whether he meant that the resolution itself was a gnat, or that the hon. member for North Simcoe was a gnat ; if he referred to the hon. member, he made a very unhappy reference. Let me tell the House, what the gnat really is—I suppose he meant the common gnat, because that is the animal that does the stinging :

“ The usual special representative of the family is the common gnat, whose blood-sucking propensities have rendered it too well known. It pierces the skin with the needle-like lancets of its rostrum, which are barbed at the tips, and gradually inserts the whole of these organs, at the same time liquifying the blood by some fluid secretion, which apparently adds to the subsequent irritation.”

And the hon. First Minister spoke of the irritation caused by the sting of the gnat. But here is the peculiar part of it. If the hon. member for North Simcoe is a common gnat, he must be a female gnat, because it is only the female gnat that inserts this irritating fluid which is spoken of :

“ The female alone attacks man, and in default of her favorite food will feed on the honey of flowers.”

But there is danger in calling my hon. friend from North Simcoe a gnat, because the gnat has a very numerous family and it increases very rapidly, and if there are very many of them produced, it will be a very serious matter for the Government :

“ One little gnat will produce millions of its kind in a single summer. So short a time is occupied by the entire series of metamorphoses that many generations are perfected in a single season. Their spontaneity and ease in their evolutions is such that they will fly untouched in a shower of rain.”

But here is some little comfort for the hon. First Minister. I think it is the poet Spencer who states that when gnats collect numerous around steeples firemen have been called out, only to discover that the alarm was not for a real fire, but only for the appearance of smoke; so that I may offer this consolation to the First Minister, that, perhaps, all the efforts of the hon. member for North Simcoe will only end in smoke.

Mr. LISTER. You should have left that part out.

Mr. BARRON. I do not say that, but I want to give the First Minister some little comfort under the circumstances. Now, I want to refer to a point made by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), for whom, as a constitutional lawyer, we must have the greatest possible respect, and I refer to it more particularly because the point was also raised by the hon. Minister of Justice. The hon. member in his speech said:

"As I sit down my attention has been called by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) to a constitutional point which, I think, might be very well stated at this juncture, namely, that whatever we desire to do in the North-West Territories in regard to the schools or the Assembly or the printing of papers or judicial proceedings, we have no power under the constitution to deal with the use of the French language in the courts; for section 133 of the British North America Act reads as follows:—

"Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person, or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this Act."

The hon. Minister of Justice advanced the argument that the Bill would not be effectual in destroying the use of the French language in the courts of the North-West Territories, because those courts were courts of Canada established under this Act. I deny that proposition. I say the courts in the North-West Territories are simply local courts. It is true, they were created by the Parliament of Canada; but they are not the courts to which this section refers. It refers to the Supreme Court and the Exchequer Court in the city of Ottawa; but, you might as well say that the different courts in the Province of Ontario were courts of Canada under this section, as to claim that the courts of the North-West Territories are courts of Canada established under this Act. Now, Sir, I desire to thank the House for the patient hearing they have given me speaking on this question, which has been discussed for four or five days, and which must be more or less threshed out at all points. But I may be permitted in closing to read from a little work on the Upper Houses published by the late Senator Trudel in 1880, an extract which I think justifies me in coming to the conclusion that it would be well indeed, in the North-West Territories, not to perpetuate the social, the religious, and the national feelings which Mr. Trudel says must be perpetuated in the Province of Quebec. What I am about to read is my own translation, and, therefore, I read it subject to correction. At page 6 Senator Trudel says:

"And if the Federal idea prevailed, it was owing to the Province of Quebec, which at no price would have accepted 'Legislative Union.'"

"In the case of Quebec, there was a host of social, religious and national distinct interests, which she could not dream, for an instant, of entrusting to a majority of race, creeds, and customs essentially differ-

ent from those of the greater part of her population, however well disposed this majority might be towards us."

"That she would not have desired, on any consideration, to accept such a union, our Province has evidenced by contending, with all the energy of men fighting to the death, against representation based on population."

"The Federal system might have been organised by concentrating, under the general Government, all matters of pre-eminent importance, or of superior social and economic interest, leaving to the control of the Local Legislatures matters of inferior moment, in such a way as to leave them only large municipal councils."

"But then Quebec would have refused to enter the Union, because this federation would have been equivalent, so far as she was concerned, to a Legislative Union, and then, good-bye to Confederation!"

"Because it was not in matters of lower importance, and of merely municipal interest, that our Province wished to have under its sole control. What Quebec desired, was to see placed under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature, and consequently under its exclusive protection, all its interests the most dear in a social, religious and national point of view, that is to say, the greater portion of interests of importance, which it is of consequence that a people should preserve inviolate."

The sentiments and the views expressed in that article I think are such we ought not to desire to perpetuate in the North-West Territories; and I—therefore, say, in conclusion, that I am glad to be able to support the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe, believing that if there is anything offensive in it, it will be amended in Committee, so as to make it satisfactory to the keenest sensibilities of any hon. gentleman in this House.

Mr. COOK. Some days ago, when the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), was making an arrangement with the right hon. the First Minister to set apart a day for the discussion of this question, I stated that I would not be able to be present on account of an engagement which I had, and would, therefore, be prevented, if the question then came to a vote, giving expression to my opinions before this House; and I took occasion to state, in view of this possibility, that I intended to vote against the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe. Fortunately, however, I was present last night to give my first vote on this question. I may add that as the hon. member for North Simcoe was engaged in a matter pertaining to his profession in which I happened to be on the side opposite to him, and which was postponed by arrangement, he is here, I may say, at my will. But the hon. gentleman stated, when I declared my intention of voting against his Bill, that I had made up my mind to vote without hearing the discussion. Well, the hon. gentleman forgot that he had made a speech in this House, and several speeches in the country, foreshadowing his measure, and he forgot also that I had read the Bill and the preamble, and was, therefore, in a position to come to a decision. The Bill of itself, without the preamble, was sufficient ground for me, without hearing any further discussion—without hearing any of the speeches made—to determine to vote against the Bill; because I am opposed to the extermination of the French language in any part of the Dominion. I must confess that I was somewhat surprised when I first heard of the hon. gentleman's intention to move in this direction. This discussion has taken a very wide range. It has travelled from one end of the world almost to the other, and references have been made during it to questions affecting many other countries, somewhat similarly situated to ours. I do not propose, even if I deemed myself sufficiently versed

in historical knowledge to do so, to follow hon. gentlemen who have so ably discussed this question from a historical point of view, but shall confine myself more particularly to our own country and to the antecedents of my hon. friend from North Simcoe. I have said that I was considerably surprised to see my hon. friend moving in this direction; for I well remember the time when he was bowing the knee to the French people of his constituency, and professed to be as true and loyal a supporter of theirs as any man in this House or out of it. I well remember the time when that hon. gentleman, instead of being in line with this crusade against race and religion, which has been mapped out by the *Mail* newspaper, and is supported by a few of his friends throughout the country, took the opposite course; for I well remember when that hon. gentleman, one Saturday night in his constituency, when he found he could not reach Toronto the next day, Sunday, engaged a special train to go to that city, and arrived there in the morning, in order to interview Archbishop Lynch on Sunday, to obtain His Grace's support in that county. I well remember then how loyal the hon. gentleman was to a paternal ancestor of his of a more remote date than his immediate paternal ancestor, who supported a different religion from the one the hon. member for North Simcoe does, or the one his father did. The hon. gentleman was then holding out his hand to a certain class; or it might be said that he was bowing the knee to Rome, and at the same time, on the other hand, bowing the knee to Ulster. In each case he was true to his blood. In the one he was true to his paternal ancestor of a more remote date, and in the other to his father. Therefore he could, with some show of fairness, say that he was true to both of his paternal ancestors. I do not know how far the hon. gentleman went himself in both directions; but I know that in the contests in which I had the honor of being his opponent in North Simcoe, my hon. friend did receive the support of a large number of the Roman Catholics and of the French people in that riding. But the gerrymander has removed a certain portion of these people from his riding, and he is not now quite so dependent on them as he was on that occasion.

An hon. MEMBER. Not so dependent.

Mr. COOK. Not so dependent. I believe they were all gerrymandered out. I have no doubt hon. members will recollect the Act that was passed by the First Minister, by which he placed my hon. friend in a safe Tory constituency, but I warn my hon. friend from North Simcoe to look out for his political hide at the next election. Formerly he had the support, as I have said, of the French, the Catholics and the Orangemen, and so well did he carry on this warfare, and so ingeniously did he proceed, that he had a member of his family leading the singing in a Roman Catholic church at mass every Sunday. Then we have the hon. gentleman's exemplification of the way in which he did things. You all remember the way in which he acted in reference to the dismissal of Mr. Letellier from the Lieutenant Governorship of the Province of Quebec. At that time the hon. gentleman's heart was still "true to Poll." He stood by his friends, he stood by the Ultramontanes, and assisted to dislodge the Lieutenant Governor of that Province. Now, what is the meaning of this crusade? There are a great

Mr. Cook.

many opinions given by a great many different people. Some say that the hon. gentleman is in league with the First Minister. Some say it is a Tory dodge, that he is appealing to the Ontario portion of the electors and that some other parties are appealing to the Quebec portion of the electors of this Dominion so as to prepare a jumble for the next election. I do not pretend to say which opinion is the correct one. It is stated that a certain newspaper would like to have some assistance from places in high quarters, the newspaper which, within a few years, has been feeding pretty liberally at the Tory crib, since the hon. gentlemen have been in power, even since they have pretended to abandon it, the *Mail* newspaper, and have built up the *Empire*, in order to show that they had the two organs. Now, they have the two organs. The hon. the leader of the Government is backed up by the *Empire*; the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has the *Mail* at his back; and it is said that the *Mail* demands that a new party should be formed to force matters upon the attention of the Government; that is, that they should have the balance of power in this House. We know what use would be made of it by some gentlemen in this House. I am sure my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Barron) would not be a party to that, though he criticised very freely the speeches of some of the members in this House. They were principally on the Liberal side, because he did not find anything in the speeches on the other side worth criticising, and he wanted to make a speech. Then there is another theory. The *Mail* newspaper had an agent at Washington not long since, and it appears that he was giving some extraordinary views and statements to the Congressional Commission who were sitting there at that time. This gentleman, who is the editor of the *Mail* newspaper, declared that there was a strong annexation feeling in this country, and even went so far as to say that it would be found in this House. When the loyal motion of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) was voted upon and unanimously adopted here, I think that Commission would come to the conclusion that the statements of that man were fallacious. I must say that I would have preferred if that loyal resolution had contained a clause showing that we were to be more loyal to Canada. I think some hon. gentlemen need a little training on the score of loyalty to Canada. I think a little advice on that subject would not hurt the leader of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would like to have the advice.

Mr. COOK. I think the right hon. gentleman who supported that resolution, would do better to show a little more of that loyalty to his own country which he expressed in his speech. I regret exceedingly that I have to refer to one matter which I dislike very much to refer to. I have to refer to my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), a gentleman who, I admit, stands high in this country, a man of great intellectual ability, a man who made a very strong and well reasoned speech from his point of view. It was not such an inflammatory speech as that made by my hon. friend the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in introducing his Bill. That was a speech which was intended to set the people by

the ears, to set the Protestant element against the Roman Catholic element, to throw a torch into the magazine, a speech which showed that the man who wanted to get his Bill through the House had no other object than that. I cannot believe that any man of common sense—and we know that the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has a great deal of common sense—would have introduced the Bill in the way in which he did introduce it without such a motive. But my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred to the French Half-breeds and held them responsible for the rebellion. I remember when that hon. gentleman stood up in this House, and made a charge against the Government in that respect, and exonerated the Half-breeds from the charge of bringing about the rebellion. The hon. gentleman should not attempt to remove so important a matter from the shoulders of a Government who are distinctly responsible for that, and to place it on the shoulders of the Half-breeds who had been suffering for seven long years without obtaining redress.

Mr. CHARLTON. I referred to the Half-breeds of the North-West as having been in rebellion, and I said the question to be settled was whether they were more to be blamed or the hon. gentlemen who sat upon the Treasury benches.

Mr. COOK. I read the hon. gentleman's speech, and thought I was correct, but of course I accept his statement. I regret also to have to refer to the speech of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. I have been supporting the cause which he supports. I believe it is the proper and just course to take in this House; but I am afraid that, notwithstanding the usual calmness of the hon. gentleman, he was too inflammatory on that occasion. It was not the words so much as the manner, and the manner was very bad. The hon. gentleman should be a little more cautious, and if he had only read carefully and pondered over the speech made by the Governor General at Quebec, when he received the committee of Equal Righters there, and told them to be tolerant and go home and be good boys and not to do it again—if he had only used a little tolerance in his language, I think it would have been better for his cause in this House. I am very sorry to say that I believe that it was the means of diverting from the cause he has at heart some members on both sides of this House—although I will not say so, because, probably, I am not entitled to say much on that point. Sir, I would just refer, while we are upon this French question, to the fact that a great many members in this House and people throughout the country who read the *Mail* newspaper, speak of the French in very slighting terms—I will not say the members of this House, but I know that many people in this country speak of the French in such terms. Now, I have been associated with the French more or less all my life, and it is not necessary for me to vindicate their habits and course of life, or anything of that sort, or their motives. But there is one thing that we owe to the French people of this country, and it is a debt of gratitude, after passing the loyal resolution to Her Majesty that we had the privilege of doing here a short time ago. If it had not been for the United Empire loyalists, of which I am a lineal descendant, and the French

people, we would not have any Canada to-day, we would have been annexed to the United States, and we would not have had the privilege of passing that loyal resolution. Sir, nothing good can come from the attacks upon the French, nothing but bad blood, rebellion and civil war. As the Premier said to-night, supposing anything of that sort should arise, where would we be? Why, Sir, we would be nowhere; we would be nowhere as Canadians, as a British dependency; we would be in the hands and in the arms of the United States in a very short time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh; hear, hear.

Mr. COOK. The very hon. gentlemen who are now screaming out at the top of their voices, the very men who claim to be patriots in this country to-day, are the men who would drive Canada to annexation. I do not say they would do it intentionally, but they would do it in ignorance of the facts of the case. We do not want a repetition in this country of the difficulties that have beset Ireland for the last few centuries; we do not want any of their fire-brands in this country, we do not want any of those agitators coming over here to ruin our country. The Secretary of State has passed an Act to prohibit the Chinese; perhaps he had better include gentlemen of this class, gentlemen who are agitators; but my hon. friend, when he was imported, was so small that we could not have told whether he was an agitator or not. Now, Sir, it has been said that the Premier of this country is very desirous that the Local Government of Ontario should not be sustained. It has been stated that "Mowat must go." That is an old saying, an old by-word, but as yet he has not gone. Now, some people are wicked enough to say that even Mr. Meredith is included in this controversy. We know he made a speech on this very line in the city of London; but, if he takes that ground, I will guarantee that he will not be successful at the next general election. Sir, it has been stated by some of our friends—and I differ with the greater number of my friends in that respect—that we, as a party, are provincial rights men. We go for provincial rights, but, Sir, I draw the line at this race question; most of my friends do not. I say that if this House passes that Bill, and difficulties arise in the North-West, the minority in Lower Canada may be in jeopardy some time, and not very far off, because we know the intention of the hon. gentleman. However he may disclaim his intention to the House, we know from his organs, and from his speeches all along the line, that unless his words belie his meaning, he proposes to exterminate the French language throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. Now, suppose that provincial rights were extended to cover this question of race. In Lower Canada the English language might be expunged, and what would be the result? The result would be that the English people of Ontario would not submit to that, and civil war would be sure to take place, and the result would be disastrous. Why, Sir, this is a wicked thing, when you come to look at it. When you come to look at it in all its phases, when you see that the hon. gentleman intends to set race against race, and religion against religion, and when all men will have hold of each other's throats, you see that it is a wicked thing. Now, I do not like the motion

of the Minister of Justice, because this question is only to be left until the next election in the North-West, and then a decision is to be given, and I believe hon. gentlemen know pretty well what that decision is going to be. They want to put off the evil day, and I believe that it would have been better to have met the thing boldly and moved the six months' hoist, and so do away with the matter altogether. I believe that is the best way to put down these fanatics. I was somewhat amused at the hon. leader of the Government this afternoon. He was a very bold man this afternoon, he was very courageous, and he held the sword over his head and defied those gentlemen who are opposing him in reference to this matter. But he was quite mild the other day. When he made his two speeches before, they were just as tame and mild as a sucking dove's speech. But the hon. gentleman was quite bold to-day, for, after making arrangements, by which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would help him through the difficulty, he gets up in his place and he declares here: "We will stand or fall by this, we are going to make this question"—well, he did not say a Government question, but he meant that. His speech reminded me very much of an Irishman that came to this country when it was first being settled. One day there came a bear into the house while the Irishman and his wife were there. He ran up stairs and cried out "Biddy, kill the bear." So Biddy killed the bear, and he came down very courageous, and when the neighbors came in he says: "Look what Biddy and I did: we killed the bear." Now, the Irishman had a good deal more—I will not say honor, but he had a good deal more generosity; for, although he took credit to himself, he gave Biddy a share of the credit. But the hon. gentleman took all the credit to himself; he did not even give my hon. friends on this side of the House any share of it whatever, and I hope before this debate is through the hon. gentleman will announce, so it may go to the country, that he did not do this thing all alone. I am a great admirer of the hon. member for North Simcoe, and always have been so. I know he is a great lawyer and an astute politician; it is claimed that he is a man of undoubted pluck and determination. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said the hon. member for North Simcoe was full of pluck and determination, and although he had been castigated by almost all the members of the House, he had never yielded. The hon. member has not shown so much pluck in the past as the member for Northumberland imagines. If we refer to the past we find that on one occasion he introduced into this House a Bill to prevent people being injured on railways. He was not successful, and he did not introduce it the next year. Determination is shown by a man keeping introducing the same measure year after year, if it is a good one until he succeeds. Next, the hon. gentleman introduced a Bill for the appointment of a railway commission. He was sat upon by the Premier, and he finally withdrew it. Then he had some litigation for a gentleman in the matter of patents, and he thought it would be a good thing to regulate the Patent Office. He introduced a Bill for that purpose, but the late Minister of Railways sat on him, and that was the last of the Bill. I do not know how often the hon. gentleman has been sat upon in this House.

Mr. Cook.

It is also said by people outside that the hon. gentleman endeavored, in his legal profession, to make people believe that he ran the late Minister of Justice, and that he had a great deal of influence with him; but since the present Minister came into office his influence has vanished, and that is one of the reasons why he is not now in happy accord with the Government. It has been stated by the Minister of Public Works—I have great confidence in the Minister of Public Works, although he sometimes gets a little excited; I have great confidence in his integrity, and I do not believe he would wilfully make an untruthful statement to the House; the hon. gentleman stated that all the French printing for the North-West Territories had cost only \$400 a year, and he was so magnanimous as to say that if any one objected to the amount, he would put his hand into his pocket and pay it every year. That was a generous proposition from the hon. Minister, and no doubt he is sincere and will do it. Let me refer, for a moment, to the St. Catharines Milling Company. They obtained, from this Government, a license to cut timber in a territory where they had no right, and the result was they had considerable litigation, and the Government stood sponsors to the company for their costs. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was selected solicitor for the company, and he received a total sum of \$33,500 for legal expenses. The hon. gentleman is afraid that this country will be ruined because of the enormous expenditure going on; but I will give the hon. gentleman this assurance, that at the rate the hon. Minister of Public Works stated as the cost, the French printing in the North-West could be maintained for 84 years for the costs in that suit. The hon. gentleman wants to do something as a patriot, and I have no doubt he is sincere in his wish. I was a little impressed, however, with the story, which is going round, that there is collusion between the hon. the First Minister and the hon. gentleman, because the hon. the First Minister never said an unkind word to him, or even had a look of scorn; in fact, he was as pleasant with the hon. gentleman as if they were both sailing in the same boat. It looked very much as if the report was true; still, one may be deceived by the very fact that hon. gentlemen opposite look so pleasantly confident, especially when they have got into a tight place. I have known some of the antecedents of the hon. member for North Simcoe. We had four contests in North Simcoe, and probably we would have had another, except for the fact that the hon. the First Minister gerrymandered the constituency. I am very sorry he did so, because I would have liked to have beaten the hon. gentleman just once more. In almost every address made to the electors by the hon. gentleman during the time I was an opposing candidate he always strongly advocated the cause of temperance. Although he was a great temperance advocate, almost the first thing he did on coming into this House was to introduce an intemperate Bill, which he had no right to introduce, and which cost the country a quarter of a million of dollars. In order to be able to estimate the value of an hon. gentleman's promises and pledges you must know the man, and judge what he will do by his past conduct. Some people also say that the hon. gentle-

man has not been received as kindly in court as formerly. It is also well known that in those four contests large sums were expended, and the hon. gentleman thought he should be reimbursed in some way. He was once president of the Pacific Junction Railway, but he abandoned that position and is president no longer. He received only \$3,000 a year salary; but it is stated that three or four gentlemen friends of his divided somewhere in the neighborhood of \$700,000 or \$800,000 between them. That should satisfy almost any individual, particularly one who, like the hon. gentleman, is in favor of economy. The hon. gentleman has stated that there is a *parti national* in Quebec, led by Mr. Mercier, and he is supported by the leader of the Opposition in this House. But what is the hon. gentleman himself endeavoring to do? He is trying to raise a *parti national* in Ontario. Is that not the true object of the hon. gentleman? We desire a great national party in Canada, but the hon. gentleman is not going to obtain it in that way. We all desire to have a great national party in this country and one great Canadian nation, and I hope the time will come when we will untie the apron strings and go out on our own account, but at present it is best to maintain our present relations. The hon. gentleman is not going to work in the right way. As he wishes to be leader of a great national party, he should not collect around him a small circle of Protestants of Ontario and a few Conservatives and endeavor to draw them away from his leader. That is not the correct course, and the hon. gentleman should be actuated by higher motives in such matters. He should endeavor to earn a reputation as a great constitutional lawyer and legislator. His name should be handed down to posterity, but I am afraid he is sailing in a boat that will carry him down there degraded. Much has been said about the different creeds in this country, about Protestants, Orangemen and Roman Catholics. But I say this, that in Quebec the English speaking people are one-tenth of the entire population, and yet they have ten English speaking members in their House. I think that is a very liberal provision on the part of the French Canadian people towards the minority. In Ontario, where we have a large Protestant majority, one-sixth of the population are Roman Catholics, and yet there are only six Roman Catholics in the Ontario Legislature. It appears to me that there is a good deal more liberality among the Roman Catholic Frenchmen of Lower Canada than there is among the Protestant English speaking population in Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. COOK. That is my view of the matter, and I am glad to know that the hon. leader of the Government endorses what I say, because when I have got such a distinguished backer as he is I need not be afraid of any man who may oppose me in my constituency. If that right hon. gentleman would only support me in Simcoe next election I will guarantee that I will double my majority, but I suppose I can hardly hope for that. I see the right hon. gentleman rubs the palm of his hands as if he intimated something about money. Well, I will tell the right hon. gentleman a little secret. There is a Tory living in East Simcoe who told a certain gentleman that he knew of \$20,000 which came to that constituency, and he was pretty

certain it came from Ottawa. There was in addition \$5,000 given by the Dodge lumber firm and \$1,500 raised by local subscriptions, so that his friends had \$26,500 against me in the last election. The right hon. gentleman knows so well how these things are done that he cannot afford to impute motives to others. Of course we will say openly and fairly that when we meet a man of that sort we do not intend to give him many advantages over us. If he endeavors to fight us with such weapons we are ready to meet him with the same.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. COOK. I don't wish to be understood as using this in the plural, and, therefore, I must not say "we." At all events I trust that there will be sufficient patriotism among the members of this House, to squelch these attempts of the member for North Simcoe for all time to come.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Mr. Speaker, whilst I strongly object to the Bill which is now before the House, yet, like most of the gentlemen who have already addressed you, I have still stronger objections to its preamble. Although the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), in the second speech he delivered in this debate, has told us that he would assent to have that preamble set aside if it did not suit the House, and in order as he said not to offend the susceptibility of the French members, yet the fact remains that the Bill would be voted, on account of the principle laid down in the preamble, and invoked by the hon. member and propounded in his speeches. It has been already said, and correctly said, by several hon. gentlemen, that if you couple the preamble of that Bill with the speeches the hon. gentleman has delivered in this House, and outside of this House, you are forcibly led to the conclusion that this Bill must be regarded as only the first step in a crusade against the French Canadian race. Any man who reads that preamble, and the speeches of the hon. gentleman in connection with the Bill, can come to no other conclusion than that the hon. member does not intend to confine his present course to the North-West Territories. By the enacting clause of this Bill he proposes to suppress the French language in these Territories, but by the spirit he has evinced, and by the speeches he has delivered, he gives notice, as I understand it, that it is his intention to continue the same warfare against the French language wherever it is spoken in this Dominion. In his second speech in this House, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) complains that he has been misunderstood, that his speeches have not been fairly read, and that his intentions have been misinterpreted. The hon. gentleman, however, has repudiated nothing of what he had previously said, and told us that whilst he admitted that the time might come when the French language should be suppressed in the Parliament of Canada, yet he would not interfere with vested rights which are guaranteed to the people of Quebec by the British North America Act. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten so soon the bearing of the speech which he pronounced in introducing this Bill? Has he forgotten the meaning of the speeches he has delivered on this question outside this House, and notably his speech at Stayner, in which he is reported to have said:

"That the present generation would have to settle this question by the ballot-box, or, otherwise, that the next generation would settle it at the point of the bayonet."

Did not this language mean that if the French Canadians succeeded during the present generation in preventing by the ballot-box their language from being suppressed in Canada, the admirers of the hon. gentleman in the next generation, if they fulfil their duties, would have to take up arms to subdue, to drive into the sea, or to exterminate these odious French Canadians? Let the hon. member and his principal follower in the House, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), succeed in their present attempt to suppress the French language in the Territories, and I venture to say that before long you will see them, assuming the presumptuous attitude of conquerors inflated by victory, incite an agitation in the country for the suppression of the French language in the Parliament of Canada, and at the same time preparing their arms to carry the war into the Province of Quebec, for the purpose of abolishing the French language in the Legislature of that Province, in its courts of law, in its schools, and wherever it is taught or spoken in Canada. Sir, during last summer, in a speech which I addressed to a number of my constituents, I uttered a few words which I will take the liberty of repeating here as an answer to the threats against the French Canadians, contained in the speeches of the hon. member for North Simcoe. After having given some explanations with regard to the Jesuit question, which had been debated in this House last Session, I referred to the threats uttered by the hon. member for North Simcoe in his Stayner speech, and also to newspaper articles containing the most violent, abusive, injurious, offensive, provoking and threatening language against my French Canadian countrymen; and I told them: My friends, notwithstanding those threats, I strongly believe that we have nothing to fear from that quarter. The enjoyment of our rights and our peculiar institutions is guaranteed to us by the constitution of this country, and by what I consider to be a greater power—the good sense and love of liberty and fair play of the vast majority of our English speaking fellow-countrymen. They will never permit the peace of this country to be disturbed and its prosperity jeopardised by any fanatical action. But, I added, after all, we do not know what may happen in the life of a people, and history teaches us that sometimes damogues have succeeded by appeals to passion and popular prejudice in throwing their country into revolutionary convulsion and causing a great deal of evil. If such should be our misfortune, if this country should be thrown into a civil war, we should be placed in the cruel alternative, either of submitting cowardly to the annihilation of our race, and all the institutions that are dear to our hearts, or of standing up like men in their defence; we should have to appeal to our courage and to the protection of the British flag. But if chance should turn against us, if the British flag should be found to be powerless to offer us adequate protection, then, my friends, there would be no other alternative offered to us than to turn our eyes towards the stars and stripes, which would, I believe, offer to us full protection against the rage of our enemies. Sir, for having uttered these words I was denounced by part of the public press of this country as an annexationist; but I hold that there is nothing in the language I used to justify the charge. An

MR. BECHARD.

annexationist I am not, although I am one of those who believe that this country is not destined to remain forever in the clothes of childhood. Sir, I do not hesitate to say that it would be my pride to see my country taking rank among the nations of the globe. But the annexationists, those who push towards annexation, are to be found among those turbulent men who, being never satisfied with the actual state of the country, would not hesitate, for the satisfaction of a mere prejudice, to throw their country into a civil war, which could end in nothing less than the breaking down of Confederation and the dismemberment of this country. Now, Sir, the hon. member for North Simcoe finds fault with the French Canadians because they endeavor to perpetuate their language and their literature, while he says they should understand that the best interests of the country require that they should abandon their own language and speak the English language. Sir, does he suppose that the French Canadians, just to suit his fancy, will become renegades to their language, to their literature and to their peculiar institutions? Indeed, Sir, they cultivate their own language, but at the same time they do their best to acquire a knowledge of the English language, knowing, as they do, that any man to-day, who wants to do some business, must know that language; and you have a good evidence of this fact in this Chamber, where the French representatives speak the English language tolerably well. No young man in the Province of Quebec considers that his education is sufficiently complete until he can speak, read and write the English language. But the hon. member considers that the French language in this country is a danger to the state, and that so long as the French Canadians are allowed to cultivate their language they cannot be assimilated to the Anglo-Saxon element of our community. On this point the hon. gentleman has been well answered by several hon. members who mentioned different countries where two or three official languages exist, and which, notwithstanding that fact, are inhabited by a homogeneous people living together in a perfect political union. But the hon. gentleman seemed to cherish particularly the policy suggested by Lord Durham in his celebrated report on the cause of the troubles in 1837. It is said in that report that the cause of those troubles was not misgovernment, but a feeling of hostility existing between the two races; and Lord Durham suggested as a remedy that the French language should be suppressed as an official language in Lower Canada. How long did that policy last? The right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government informed the House the other night that it lasted but during the short period of three or four years, and that it was set aside at the request or the prayer of those who were most interested in the question, the Parliament of Canada, under the Union, in which there were as many English as French members. Now, supposing such a policy were adopted to-day, how long do you think, Sir, it would last? No one could tell, but every one can see the disastrous consequences which would follow its adoption. Sir, the policy suggested by Lord Durham proved to be an unsound policy, and the wisdom of his advice was as disputable as the accuracy of some of the facts related in his report. To say that the cause of

the trouble in 1837 was an existing feeling of hostility between the two races is a misconception of the case. If such had been the cause of the troubles then, would we have seen among the leaders of the popular movement which then took place such good Englishmen as Wilfred Nelson, Robert Nelson, O'Callaghan, D. S. Brown, and others? No; the real cause of the trouble was well stated by the hon. the Minister of Public Works and by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. The Governor General surrounded by a clique of evil advisers—office holders—attempted to dictate to the Legislative Assembly in that Province. He went so far as to spend the public money without the assent of that Assembly, and in that unconstitutional course he was supported by the then Legislative Council, whose members, on account of their unpatriotic conduct, were branded by the appellation, which then became so popular, of "*vieillards malfaisants*," which may be translated by the term "mischievous old men." The report of Lord Durham, it is well known, was never considered in Lower Canada as an impartial document with regard to the French Canadians. The hon. member for North Simcoe has made an assertion from which I entirely dissent. He has said that the French Canadians are not a sympathetic people, that they are exclusive in their affections, that they do not sympathise with their English-speaking countrymen; and, in support of that proposition, he has quoted, from I do not know what obscure authority, an extract stating that the Irish Catholic and the French Canadian, although they profess the same religious faith—a circumstance which ought to create a bond of union and of mutual sympathy between them—are the bitterest enemies? If there was a time when a feeling of hostility existed between these two elements of our people it was when they were first brought face to face, and before they knew each other. But those days have long since gone by, and from the moment that those people began to know each other better, and to appreciate each other better, they have lived on terms of the best friendship, and, wherever they are seen living today in the same settlements, at least in the Province of Quebec, their relations are of the most cordial character. It is well known that their sons and daughters frequently intermarry. But, while I am on this point, let me indulge for a moment in reminiscences of the past, by referring to a solemn period of our history, when the French Canadians displayed towards their Irish brethren the feelings of the most devoted sympathy and benevolence. Men of my age, and older than I, in this House, can well remember that during the summer of 1847 we had an Irish immigration into the Province of Quebec. These immigrants were landed on our shores in the most destitute condition, the one-half of them suffering from that very contagious disease, typhoid fever. When they were landed in our harbors, a feeling of stupefaction overcame the sympathies of our people for a moment. What were they to do? Were they to send back to the ocean that importation of death into their midst? Did not the supreme law of self-preservation seem to demand that? But suddenly the voice of those men who for nearly nineteen centuries have been repeating the words of the Gospel and preaching the divine teachings of charity was heard. Those immigrants are our brethren, ex-

claimed the French Canadian pastors; they must be received and they must be assisted. Immediately people of all classes rushed to the assistance of the poor destitute immigrants, and many of them were themselves stricken down by the dire contagion. Priests, Sisters of Charity, physicians, the mayor of a great city, and a number of other people fell victims to their devotedness, but the poor immigrants received the assistance which their destitute condition demanded. A large number were preserved to life, and those who died received in their last moments all the consolation that can be given by Christian benevolence. And those numerous children who, by the deaths of their parents, became orphans, what became of them? They were adopted by our citizens, who raised them as the members of their own families. It has been my good fortune to be acquainted with some of them, who, thanks to the education given them by their protectors, occupy to-day distinguished positions in our social life. Ah, the French Canadians are a sympathetic people, endowed with generous hearts and instincts, and magnanimous qualities. I regret the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) does not know them, for if he did know them as they are he would change his present attitude towards them, as he would soon find his own heart kindle with feelings of the warmest admiration for that noble people. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), in the two speeches he has delivered in this House since the beginning of the debate has referred each time to Mr. Mercier, and he seems to look upon Mr. Mercier as the founder in the near future of a French Canadian nation on the shores of the St. Lawrence. In order to justify his apprehensions in this regard he reports a few words which were stated to have fallen from the lips of Mr. Mercier in a speech which he pronounced at a banquet in the city of Quebec on the celebration of St. John's Day, the 24th June last. Mr. Mercier is reported to have appealed on that occasion to his countrymen, to have endeavored to induce them to give up the old party flags of rouge and bleu and to rally under the tricolor, which would lead this country to the brilliant destiny which it would reach in the future, or some words to that effect. To draw from these words an inference that Mr. Mercier intends that an independent French Canadian nation can be founded in the Province of Quebec is to give to these words a greater significance and a greater importance than they have. No serious man in the Province of Quebec would think of the realisation of such an idea, which he would consider as nothing but Utopian; and Mr. Mercier himself is too intelligent and too clever a man to have meant in pronouncing those words that a nation could be established in the Province of Quebec independent of the other Provinces of this Dominion, and independent of England. But we know that all men, on the occasion of the celebration of great festivals, are apt, more or less, in the course of a speech delivered at a dinner in answer to toasts, to give expression to some sentiment with no other purpose than to provoke applause, and I do not believe that the words which flowed from the lips of Mr. Mercier on that occasion have any other importance. The hon. member has spoken of the National party, and, in his second speech, looking at the French members sitting on this side of the

House, whom he called the band of Nationalists, he stated that he did not expect and did not want any sympathy from them. Well, that is a matter of mere personal inclination, and surely no man would be guilty of such folly as to expect from his fellow men more sympathy than he feels disposed to grant in return, and thereby inspire. But the hon. member seemed to think that this National party has been formed in opposition to the English speaking population of the Dominion. There is nothing of the kind. It is well known that Mr. Mercier, when in Opposition, led the Liberal party in the Quebec Legislature, and that, a short time before the elections of 1886, he made an alliance with a certain portion of the old Conservatives, who had repudiated their former leaders; but, as these gentlemen would not call themselves Liberals, they took the name of National Conservatives. Since Mr. Mercier has taken possession of power, as he had one wing of his party composed of Liberals and another wing composed of those who called themselves National Conservatives, they agreed to call the party in Quebec the National party. But that has no other significance or bearing. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) must not think that the old Liberal party in the Province of Quebec is dead. Our leader, our illustrious leader in this House, still calls himself a Liberal. I see my colleagues sitting around me, representing the Province of Quebec, who still call themselves Liberals. I see my old friend from the county of Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), who has been in Parliament for about twenty-five years, who has been a Minister of the Crown, and who still continues to call himself a Liberal and not a Nationalist. Here is my venerable friend the member for St. Johns (Mr. Bourassa), who has passed thirty-six years in Parliament. What does he call himself? A Liberal. He was born a Liberal, he has lived a Liberal, and, depend upon it, he will die a Liberal. Your humble servant, after twenty-two years passed in this House, still continues, and intends to continue in the future, to call himself a Liberal. The old Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, as represented in this House, still exists, and you may be sure that it will not disappear from the sphere of action. Before I sit down I want to refer to a regret expressed by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in his first speech on this question. He said he regretted, or it was to be regretted, that England, after the cession, had adopted so liberal a policy towards the French Canadians; and, if another policy had been adopted, we would not have in this country the evils which he thought were created by the existence of two official languages. On this question he was well answered by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who told him that if a different policy had been adopted this country would not have long remained a British colony. Sir, the liberal policy of England on that occasion conquered the hearts of the French Canadians, and in her days of trial they stood by her and remained faithful to their allegiance. Less than twenty years afterwards they resisted the seducing appeals of the American patriots and of General La Fayette to join in the great revolutionary movement for liberty and independence. In 1812 the same temptation was again held out to them, and again they resisted those allurements; they did more, they gallantly shed their blood on battle-fields for

Mr. BÉCHARD.

the honor of the British flag, and they clung to England with more than filial affection. Now, Sir, I ask, after these great deeds, what more could be done, what remains to be accomplished by French Canadians, to prove their loyalty, when I find that it is still suspected by such men as my hon. friend from North Norfolk? Mr. Speaker, let me say in conclusion, that, notwithstanding this passing storm, I do not despair of the future of my country. I have faith, I have confidence in the good sense, in the practical common sense, of the great majority of my English speaking fellow-countrymen. I have no doubt that when an opportunity is given they will rally together to defeat the nefarious designs of those who do not hesitate to swing the torch of discord in this country. Sir, since the different Provinces of this country have been brought into a federal union we have accomplished great things, upon which we look with a just feeling of pride. We will continue to work together, English Canadians as well as French Canadians, to promote the prosperity of our country, the welfare of our countrymen, endeavoring to deserve, at the same time, by our considerate action, the moderation of our views, and, if I may say so, the wisdom of our conduct, the blessings and gratitude of future generations.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I should not have attempted to rise at this late period of the debate did I not feel that, on account of my long experience in the Territories, and occupying, as I did, two of the most responsible positions in those Territories for some years, I might speak with some authority in reference to some portions of the matter which is now before this honorable House. As you are aware, I went to the North-West Territories in 1879 as Indian Commissioner. During that year I travelled through the length and breadth of the land, for the purpose of visiting the Indians who were under my special charge. When I arrived in the North-West Territories the Hon. Mr. Laird was then Governor of that country. At that time the North-West Council was composed of the stipendiary magistrates of the Territories, with one or two unofficial members who were appointed by the Governor. The meetings of Council in those days were held in the Government House at Battleford; the proceedings were of a very limited character. The Council sat for a few weeks, passed a few short ordinances, and then adjourned. For two or three years this continued, and year after year, as opportunity offered, the Government had the ordinances printed in French. In 1881, when I became Lieutenant Governor of that Province, the headquarters of the Government were removed to Regina. When I took charge of the administration of affairs the Council which met me was composed of the gentlemen I have just mentioned. Settlers were coming into the country, which was settling up from one end to the other, and although up to that time the population had been principally French, or people of French extraction, when I took charge the majority was already English, and I was able, almost at once, in accordance with the power which I had under the North-West Territory Act, to form electoral districts and to bring representative members into that Council. Up to 1885 the ordinances passed by the North-West Council had been printed by myself, and also by my predecessor, in French and

English. But, as you know, the moneys voted for the North-West government were voted in a lump sum, and as the country settled up it was necessary that public works should be constructed, and it was found necessary to use all the available money we could possibly get on the public works. Up to 1885, although the ordinances had been printed in French, there were virtually very few applications made to me or to my officers for copies of the French ordinances. In that or the subsequent year, on account of the demand made upon me for moneys for public works, I neglected to have those ordinances printed in French, but in 1887, when I found a demand was being made for those ordinances, and finding that I had not the money with which to have them printed, I came down to this honorable House and asked for a vote for the purpose of having them printed in French. This House voted the sum of \$3,000 for that purpose. Let me here call the attention of the House to a remark which was made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron), where he stated that he was informed by Mr. Cayley, one of the members of the North-West Council, which is now the North-West Assembly, that while in 1883, I think he said, the cost of printing the North-West ordinances was only some \$300, in 1887 it cost \$1,000 for printing in French and \$1,000 for translation. Well, Sir, Mr. Cayley was a member of my Council before it became a Legislative Assembly, and he ought to have known that the reason of the large expenditure of 1887 was that the money was voted in this House to print the ordinances which I neglected to have printed in 1885 and in 1886. I had in my hands a day or two ago a statement of the cost of printing those ordinances, and it corresponded with the statement made by the Minister of Public Works that since 1881 the average expense was \$400 or \$500 a year.

Mr. McCARTHY. Could the hon. gentleman give the figures for the different years?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not that statement now with me. If I had it here, I could show the hon. member for North Simcoe that the large expenditure for translation and printing of the French ordinances from 1887 to 1889 was on account of my neglecting to publish them in 1884-85. Not only did I publish the ordinances of those two years and those of the year in which the sum was voted, but I also thought it advisable to have the Journals of the House, which had never before been published in French, published from the first year of Mr. Laird's appointment as Lieutenant Governor up to the time I left the Territories. I believe they will prove interesting in the future, in the same way as the old Journals of Ontario and Quebec are interesting to me whenever I look over them. So when I left the Territories the whole of the ordinances up to that time were printed in French, and also the Journals of the House. I think I may claim to be able to speak with authority with respect to the sentiments of the people of that country in respect to this matter. During the ten years I lived in the North-West Territories I never, on one single occasion that I recollect, heard any objection to the printing of the ordinances in French, except an occasional remark that it would be as well if we spent the money on public works instead of on printing French ordinances, as

the demand for those ordinances was very small. These observations were made at the time when farmers coming in from the north and south of the railway were often obliged to unload part of their loads, and go back for the part so left, before they could reach the railway. Every one, however, knows the difficulties experienced in a new country; but those were the only remarks I heard mentioned in regard to the printing of the French ordinances. I have also, since the gentlemen who constitute the present Legislative Assembly were returned, run an election myself. I have also travelled through the country, and as late as last year I travelled through it from one end to the other. I followed in the wake of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and I must say that from one end to the other there was no indication of any excitement on this question. Perhaps the House will permit me to give my opinion with respect to the population in the North-West to-day. One-third of the people in the Territories comprise Ontario farmers and Ontario settlers; the balance is made up of English or old country settlers, French, German and other nationalities. I think very likely among the Ontario settlers there may be some who fought this battle over before in their younger days, and have strong feelings on the subject; but I do not believe that feeling exists to any great extent among that class. The old country settlers rank next in number to those from Ontario, and I believe not seventy-five per cent. of them ever heard of the British North America Act, or of the Manitoba Act, and the bulk of them do not know of the clause in the North-West Territories Act providing that the ordinances and proceedings shall be printed in the two languages. But I can understand that interested parties, those who within the last few weeks have taken a great interest in this question and are engaged in getting up the petitions to send down to this House stating their views should go to those ignorant people, ignorant so far as this matter is concerned, and obtain their signatures to petitions asking that money should not be wasted on the printing of French ordinances, but should be spent on useful work in other directions. But, I believe, if I know what British fair play is and how Englishmen feel on such matters, that these same men, if they had heard the speech of my hon. colleague on Tuesday night, would say: "This is a small matter; let the French have the records printed in their own language." With regard to the other nationalities, I may say there are a large number of Germans. On my visit last summer to Whitewood I was invited to meet a lot of settlers who had established themselves 16 miles north of that place. Many came out to meet me, and I found in two townships, Nos. 18 and 19 on Ranges 1, 2 and 3, the people were representatives of nine nationalities—Bohemians, Norwegians, Danes, Slavonians, Polish, Swedes, French and English. My opinion is that when we invite foreigners to come to our country we should endeavor to allow them, whether English, French, Germans or other nationalities, to have the laws under which they live printed in their own language, especially the school ordinances and laws of that character. I should like to say a word or two in regard to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I can echo the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr.

Mitchell) in regard to that hon. gentleman. I believe he has taken up the work which he has now on hand from purely conscientious motives. I believe myself that he has done so on his own responsibility, and I, for one, think, as the hon. member for North Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) thought, that any man who occupies the position he did when he took this stand is a man of whom his country should be proud. I do not agree with everything that hon. gentleman has said, I do not agree with the Bill he has introduced, but I believe he has taken this course from purely conscientious motives. If that hon. gentleman had the same ground to go over again I believe he would very likely have introduced his Bill without this preamble, which appears to have been unfortunate, and not in sympathy with the opinions of the majority of the members of this House. I believe also that if he had again to make the speech which he delivered in introducing this Bill he would be more moderate in his tone. But I do not believe that the hon. gentleman, as he stated himself, intended to hurt the feelings of any member of this House. I do think that the hon. gentleman spoke rather intemperately in his first speech, but no one can complain of the manner in which he responded to the venomous attacks made on him during the last five days of this debate. There are one or two remarks in the speech of the hon. member to which I would like to refer. He stated that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories in opening the session of the Legislative Assembly the year before last, made a mistake in that he read his speech in French, which had never been done before. If any one can give a reason why that speech was not previously read in French I am in a position to do it. As Lieutenant Governor I opened the Assembly for the seven years previous to that, and I can give him the reason why I did not read the speech in French. Unfortunately I was not able to read the French language sufficiently well to warrant me in doing so. If I had undertaken that task I have no doubt that my audience would not know whether I was speaking in Blackfoot, Cree, or French, and I thought it better to leave it alone. In my opinion where the Lieutenant Governor made a mistake was, when last year he met his council and did not read his speech in French. The reason given by the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) for this was that it had been reported that if the Lieutenant Governor attempted to read his speech in French members of the Assembly would have left the building. If I had been Lieutenant Governor at that time I would have read that speech in French if I had to read it to my clerk and to empty chairs. It was his duty to do so and a man should never neglect that. I know every one of the representatives of the North-West Assembly personally, and I can hardly believe there could be any foundation for that report. If the Lieutenant Governor had read his speech I do not believe there would have been any excitement, and if any members of the House left their seats for that reason they would not be fit to represent the people who sent them to the Legislature. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) also spoke of the Lieutenant Governor getting a translator to translate the ordinances which he states created some dissatisfaction. When I was Lieutenant Governor the clerk of my council was a French

Mr. DEWDNEY.

lawyer and he was able to do the translating himself, but when the present Government took office this gentleman was transferred to the Indian Department, and the present clerk, not being a very good French scholar, is unable to do the translation. Any gentleman who knows anything of the translation of French in connection with legal work knows that a man must have a legal mind and legal experience before he can make a fair translation of such documents. Therefore the Governor had to take up some man to do the translation for him. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) when he addressed the House the other evening referred to the spark which is liable to break out into a great blaze. The hon. gentleman might have gone a little further in his comparison. If he had lived in a wooden, mossy country as I have, he would have seen that on many occasions when it was thought the fire was out a small spark still remained working gradually and surely under the surface and when fanned by a slight breeze breaks out again and creates a conflagration greater than the original one. What I want to see done in the present instance is some measure taken by this House which will extinguish the spark forever. I believe that the amendment proposed by my hon. colleague the Minister of Justice will effect that object and will be satisfactory to the people of the North-West. I am quite certain that what the people up there require is peace and prosperity. If they can raise their 25 bushels of wheat, their 70 bushels of oats and their 300 or 400 bushels of potatoes to the acre, they will be contented and happy. If this House can settle the question in the manner proposed by my hon. colleague I believe it will be satisfactory to the people of the North-West.

Mr. MASSON. At this late hour in the evening, and at this late stage of the debate, I would not take up the time of the House in speaking on this subject were it not that I consider it a question of very great importance, and were it not also for the fact that it has taken such a very wide and varied range. I consider it important, as a subject likely to affect the peace and the prosperity, yea, even the existence of this Dominion. It is true that the Act before the House is a very brief one, but it is also one that has a very wide scope. Especially is this Bill important when we consider it in connection with the preamble by which it is prefaced, and interpret that preamble by the speeches, made not only in this House but in different parts of the country during recess, by the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill. He says that the preamble does not mean what some hon. gentlemen say it does—a declaration that the French language should be obliterated, and that we should have only one language throughout the whole Dominion, in this House, and in all the Provinces of this Dominion; but if it does not mean that, I would ask, what does it mean? If it does not mean that, is it ambiguous? If it is ambiguous, read it in the light of the speeches made by the hon. gentleman during the recess, and we can find no ambiguity about it. The hon. gentleman in one of his speeches stated in emphatic words that he would not rest until the French language was stamped out. He admitted that he had a great work in hand, but he said: "Let us begin with that which seems

most possible of accomplishment—let us deal with the dual languages in the North-West." With that declaration from the hon. gentleman, it is impossible for any person to put but one interpretation on the clause in the preamble regarding unity of language, namely, that it is expedient and his desire that it should be so, not only in the Territories of the North-West, but in the Dominion of Canada and in all the Provinces thereof. We might ask, if that is not the meaning of the preamble, why was it placed there? It has been whispered in the corridors that the hon. gentleman has stated that it was only introduced for the purpose of filling out the Bill and making it a little larger, as it looked too small without it. But I can hardly think that was the hon. gentleman's intention. If he wanted to extend the Bill and make it larger, he had many facts which he could have used in the preamble for the purpose. He could have stated that the North-West Territories Act had passed the House without the clause in question in it, and without any request to place it there; he might have stated that that clause was placed in the Bill by the Senate, and that when the Bill came back from the Senate, the Minister of the Interior, who had charge of the Bill, expressed regret that it was there; he might have quoted from the *Hansard* of that time the whole speech of the hon. Minister of the Interior; if he wished still further to swell his preamble, he might have placed in it the resolution of the North-West Council and the petition founded on that resolution. These would have been matters of fact, and fair material to put in the preamble. They would have had the effect of strengthening the hon. gentleman's hands and of assisting him in passing his Bill, instead of the effect which the preamble he has placed there is likely to have, namely, that of preventing its passing. The hon. gentleman says he is willing to abandon the preamble, after he has made a speech saying that he would not abandon the cause until he had attained his object. He said he would abandon it, after having made a speech introducing his Bill based entirely on that preamble. It is too late, however, for him now to say that he will abandon it. He says he will abandon it, not now, but after the Bill passes its second reading. He wishes the House to put itself in the false position of passing the preamble, which he said would amount to nothing, although I think it is generally admitted that passing the measure is endorsing its principle. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) referred to the expressions used by the hon. Minister of Justice in the debate on the Jesuit Estates Act last Session, in which he contended the hon. Minister had held an entirely different view with regard to the importance of a preamble. The views of the hon. member for North Simcoe and the hon. member for North Victoria were certainly very different last Session from what they are this Session. They then laid great stress on the preamble, while they make little of it to-day; but it is impossible for those hon. gentlemen to suppose that this House will not take account of the great difference in the two cases. It may be very interesting to place on record the legal argument of the hon. member for North Victoria, that in a decision on the interpretation of a statute, the preamble has no weight or effect; but it is equally true that a preamble is often refer-

red to in explanation of a statute. But I can see, and I think every hon. gentleman in this House can see, a very great distinction between those two cases. In the one case the Government were asked to disallow a Bill because it had an offensive preamble, and the answer to that was that the Administration, in reviewing the Bill, had to consider its meaning and its consequences, and not statements contained in the preamble. In this case we are asked to enact a Bill containing a preamble, and in enacting that Bill we are enacting the principles set forth in that preamble. The preamble of that Bill is as much a resolution of this House as the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice or any other resolution formally put before us. Therefore, when this House is asked to pass that Bill to a second reading, we are asked to vote for the resolution contained in the preamble. That is an entirely different thing from the Administration dealing with a Bill which had been passed by a Local Legislature. I am not going to follow that part of the discussion any further, because I wish to be brief, and I am willing to admit at the outset what I think is admitted by a majority of this House, that it would have been better if the clause in question had not been inserted in the North-West Territories Act; but it was inserted, and a gift, a privilege, a right was given to the people of the North-West Territories by that enactment. Now, a gift once given, I hold, cannot be ruthlessly taken away; a gift once given remains in the donee until he chooses to relinquish it; and, therefore, those people, being granted this privilege, whether rightly or wrongly, wisely or unwisely, should be allowed to retain it until they voluntarily abandon it. Now, it has been said by some that this Parliament, having given the power, has certainly the right to take it away. That can only be done by treating the Parliament as paternal to the North-West Territories, and in that view I suppose, they would say that a father might take from his child the gift he had given him. He might give his child a toy, and then, when he found that child making too much noise with it, he might take it away from him. That right may be granted, but the gift, even such a one as that, is never taken back without a pang; and I do not think it would be wise, even if lawful, for us to take back a privilege of that kind which has been given. There are certain distinctions though which must be drawn. There may be things which should be taken back, and there may be things that we ought properly not to have given. The people in this case have been granted a privilege, and these people, I submit, should be consulted before this privilege is taken away. It is said, however, that they have already expressed themselves on this subject. Well, I think the remarks of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) are conclusive on that point. I think that every legal mind must agree that his reasoning in that case was perfectly correct, that these members, not having been elected to deal with this subject, are not, as regards it, the constitutional mouthpiece of the people of the North-West. When they were elected there was no such cry before the people, and no such question at issue. They had received no such instruction whatever from the people on that subject, and, therefore, it cannot be contended that theirs was a proper representation of the people. But

one hon. gentleman says it would be dangerous to refer a question of this kind to the people, that it would be dangerous to go among them and freely discuss whether they should abandon the printing of their Journals and their debates in French; yet, in the same breath, that hon. gentleman has told us he was willing to refer to them the question of separate schools. He holds that it would be quite safe to discuss before the people the question of taking away their separate schools, but that it would be dangerous to go among them and discuss a question as simple as this. It is argued by some that this is a question affecting the rights of minorities, and that, therefore, this House should deal with it. Well, I think that a very great distinction lies as to what are the rights of minorities and what are not. Minorities have rights, it is true, but they must be limited, because if they are to be co-extensive with the majority, then the minorities would in all cases rule. The rights of a minority must be those important rights which belong to civilised people and are recognised by the laws of nations. They are the rights relating to civil and religious liberties, and the protection of life, liberty and property. These are matters in which the rights of a minority should be protected, and which this Parliament should keep under control. It is in accord with that principle that the amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Justice proposes that this Parliament should continue to maintain power over the printing of the ordinances and over the courts of the country. But as to the other question of what language the debates should be conducted, the Journals of the House printed in, that is a question of pure expense and convenience which should be left, as the amendment proposes, to the people of the North-West Territories for decision so soon as they shall be heard from. I do not think that either the hon. member for North Simcoe or the hon. member for South Victoria, who are both lawyers, would object to a court of which the judge was either French or acquainted with the French, the jury French, and only acquainted with the French language, or some of them only acquainted with it, and the prisoner and witnesses only acquainted with that tongue, having its proceedings conducted in French. It would be highly inconvenient, and, perhaps, effect a miscarriage of justice if they were not. Therefore, I do not believe that any of the hon. gentlemen who support the measure of the hon. member for North Simcoe, looking at the question in that light, would say that there should be no French used in the courts in the North-West. Why, Sir, you might have all the parties from the judge to the prisoner, the jurymen, the witnesses and the prosecutor, acquainted only with French, or a portion of them not conversant with any other language. How could such a court be conducted solely in the English tongue? Could the prisoner in that case be sure that he was getting justice, since he could understand nothing that was being said? Could the evidence be thoroughly sifted and the witnesses thoroughly cross-examined, if the lawyers did not understand the language the witnesses spoke? The hon. member for North Victoria spoke of ordinances and statutes of the North-West Council. I understand there are no statutes, properly so called, in the North-West Territories, and I must suppose he referred to the statutes of Canada.

Mr. MASSON.

Would any hon. gentleman contend that our statutes, which are circulated among our people for the purpose of educating the people as to what the law is, should be placed in the hands of magistrates and officers throughout the country printed only in the English language, which to many of them is an unknown tongue? How could these magistrates, how could the people learn them if published only in a language they did not understand? As to this question of the rights of the minority, I would say that in these matters, such as appertain to a court, where a man's life and property may be brought in question, it is right that this House should retain its protectorate, and in the other matters, such as the internal economy of the council it is only just that the council should deal with them just as soon as the people are consulted in the matter. But the hon. member for North Victoria said that this amendment amounted to a put off, that it was a promise to do to-morrow what we would not do to-day, and that when that to-morrow came it would not be carried out, or he insinuated as much by saying we knew what would be done. If I interpret the language of the resolution rightly, it implies nothing of the kind. It says in plain language that this House admits it to be expedient and proper, and not inconsistent with the covenants, that the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories should receive from the Parliament of Canada—not to-morrow, but now—the power to regulate,—to regulate when?—after the next general elections of the North-West Assembly, the proceedings of the Assembly and the manner of recording and publishing such proceedings. But the declaration is that they should not have that right after the next general elections, but now. I believe the objection taken by the hon. member for North Victoria is perfectly met by the language of the amendment. But the hon. member for North Simcoe claims for his measure that it is one which will promote national greatness. He says that the nation should be greater, and that he does not see how a nation could become great in which there were several official languages. He said that he had not stated that a nation could not be great under those circumstances, but that a nation would become greater and more united if all the people spoke the one language. It does not follow, and the hon. gentleman admitted to-day that it did not follow, that a nation might not become united and loyal to their constitution and government because they used more than one language, and history does not assist him in setting forth that a nation would become greater if it spoke only one language. We have only to cast a rapid glance back on the nations of the past to find that they attained greatness where they spoke many languages, and that they attained their highest point of greatness while speaking many languages. It never happened that any great nation has lasted long enough to be reduced to one language only. Therefore history virtually rebuts the proposition that a nation may not become greater while speaking more than one language, because those nations of the past became great while speaking many languages, and it was only when, in some cases, in their greatness, they exerted paternal treatment of the conquered or annexed countries, these very forces became a weakness to the state and caused them to crumble and fall away. We

are told by the hon. the leader of the Opposition that there were those in the Province of Quebec who had a dream of establishing a French nationality on the banks of the St. Lawrence, but the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) informed the House—as is well-known—that in the Province of Ontario there are those who have a dream of a greater nation, a nation speaking the Anglo-Saxon tongue, not confined to the banks of the St. Lawrence or to any one country, but extending over the whole world. Such is no doubt the dream of many in the Province of Ontario, and elsewhere, that there may be a nation with a community of language extending from pole to pole. Such dreams may be indulged in without doing any particular harm to anybody. They may please the dreamer without hurting his neighbors. Such questions, however, I think are not for us to discuss here. Such questions should be left to Him who moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform, and who, for His own wise purposes, has created different nations and given us different languages and taught us different creeds. In His hands I think we can leave the future which is certainly so far away, but for the present, let us each and all do what we can to maintain the patriotic sentiment of our people and to establish unity among the different classes of this Dominion, the different races and the different creeds, to establish peace, harmony and good fellowship; let us become a nation great, glorious and united—united not only by interest but by love; and then, Mr. Speaker, as long as the old St. Lawrence rolls his course unto the sea, so long shall Canada remain great, glorious and free.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Had the resolution submitted by the Minister of Justice and introduced, as I understand, as the expression of the Government's views on this question, proposed what I considered to be a fair, and just, and final settlement of this question, it would have received my support and it would have received that support in silence; but, inasmuch as that resolution does not, in my opinion, offer to this House a fairly just and final settlement, I feel myself obliged to state in a few words wherein I differ from it, and the course I deem it proper to pursue. We have had a very lengthened debate and I am sure, after five days' debating, it is not to be expected or desired that any hon. gentleman should make a long speech. We have had the question viewed from an historical aspect, and from I do not know how many other aspects, but to my mind the importance of the question has not been minimised by the manner in which it has been treated on both sides of the House. At first it did not appear to be a matter of such wonderful importance, but it has been magnified by the press outside, and by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, until now, no doubt, it has assumed a position of national importance. I must frankly say that the House need not be ashamed of the debate. It has been maintained, on both sides of the House, at a higher standard than any debate I have listened to for many years in this Parliament. As to the historical aspect of this question, I will make only one remark. We have had learned gentlemen referring us to precedents in Europe in days gone by, and even in the present—to precedents in Austro-Hungary, in Switzerland, in Italy, in Spain,

and in I do not know how many other countries. No doubt there are lessons to be derived from each and all of these countries, but I think it must have struck many hon. members of this House that there is very little application of the case of an old country such as Switzerland, made up of different nationalities, inheriting traditions of centuries—traditions of hatred, traditions of loyalty, traditions of language and traditions of religion—to a great lone land such as we have here unpeopled, and for which we have to legislate. It seems to me therefore that, although you may deduce certain lessons from the historical references that have been made to these countries, we are starting out as it were on a new plane altogether, and must determine this question which is before us on practical data which we can gather for ourselves from the circumstances and condition of the North-West Territories. We had from the hon. and learned gentleman who sits beside me—Mr. Mills (Bothwell)—the other night a speech replete with information, a speech in which he argued the question in a very calm and logical manner, enforced with a world and a wealth of illustration which was remarkable, a speech which was very concise and lucid, and which, I think, maintained the hon. gentleman in the high position which he has in this House as one of its most profound thinkers and most able debaters. But what was the conclusion which he drew? I think the conclusion was based on common sense, and it was that whether we should or should not have in this country one language or two or three languages was simply a matter of convenience. That was the practical conclusion which he drew, and I think it is a very fair and just conclusion. If that is admitted, the next question is, who is to determine the question of convenience? That is the stage which we have now reached. Is it to be the Parliament of Canada, composed of men from the Maritime Provinces, from the Province of Quebec and from British Columbia, more than half of whom, I venture to say, have never set foot in the North-West Territories at all, who know nothing of the wants and desires of the people there, or is it to be the people of the North-West themselves? I think any practical man would give an answer to that question in a very short time. The answer which I give to that question is the one which leads me to the conclusion to which I have come, and which I will support with my vote. In the first place, we have before us the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), which has been so much discussed. But I will say this frankly and fully, that divorced from its preamble, disassociated from the speeches of its introducer, both in this House and outside the House, disassociated, if you can disassociate it, from the crusade which he is charged with carrying on, that Bill would offer a solution of the question not very unfair. But it has two defects in my mind, and they are fatal defects. One is that no man, in my humble opinion, who has followed the course of events in this country for the past five or six months, who knows the promises and the pledges that that hon. gentleman gave to the public, who knows the circumstances under which he gave those promises and pledges, and who witnessed the introduction of that Bill, and heard the speech with which it was introduced—no man, I say, can disassociate the enacting part of that Bill from its preamble or from the inter-

pretation of that preamble which was given in the speech with which it was introduced. The Bill and the preamble must stand or fall together; and it is all nonsense for the hon. gentleman to come into this Chamber after five days of debate have taken place, after passions of creed and passions of race have been aroused, not only in this House but through the country, by his Bill and by his speech—for him to come into the House now and say: "I find I have made a mistake, and I am willing to withdraw the preamble if you will allow the Bill to go into the Committee and carry it." I venture to say that style of action will not commend itself to the common sense of the House. The hon. gentleman attempted to make the House believe that the meaning of that preamble had been magnified, that the preamble did not mean that which a man of common sense would imply from its language. Well, Sir, I can put but one meaning upon it, and that is the meaning which, if I did not derive it from the Bill, I would certainly derive from the preamble when read in the light of the speech with which the hon. gentleman introduced his Bill. What does the preamble say?

"Whereas it is expedient in the interest of the national unity of the Dominion that there should be community of language among the people of Canada."

Well, Sir, does the hon. gentleman think this House is a debating club? Are we to put in our Bills mere abstract propositions? The hon. gentleman is too old a parliamentarian not to know that when a proposition of that kind is placed in the preamble of a Bill it is placed there for the purpose of taking legislative action upon it, and when he places it there he places it as the key to the enacting part which is to follow; and to say that he asks Parliament to carry a mere abstract proposition on which legislation is not to be based, is merely to turn this House into a debating club. But, Sir, that was not the object of the hon. gentleman. His speech was plain, and although the closing speech which he delivered to this House has been commended so much, those who followed the hon. gentleman clearly could see that he pledged himself that the crusade which he had taken up, which was now beginning, was to take up the rest of his political life. He is now upon the threshold of the work which he is engaged in, and he is not going to stop by repealing section 110 of the Revised Statutes of Canada relating to the North-West Territories, but he is going to carry out that principle which he has enunciated in the preamble of his Bill, and, therefore, those who vote for his Bill to-night, who prefer that solution of the question, cannot divorce the preamble from it, and they cannot vote for the Bill divorced from the preamble and the speech made by the hon. gentleman who introduced it. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman talked as if in this House—and that language is re-echoed in very many parts of this country to the discredit of those who use it—he talks as if, in this House, hon. gentlemen are divided by race and creed distinctions; indeed, one would suppose that in the House of Commons of Canada, to listen to some hon. gentlemen here, and to listen to their organs in the public press, this House is divided by a broad line, French gentlemen on one side trying to carry out their opinions, and the English-speaking members being on the other endeavoring to enforce their opinions. Sir, I believe, in relation to this question of languages, that the

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

social forces, the commercial forces, and the political forces which are at work in this Dominion, are slowly but surely—and none the less surely because slowly—working out to one end, so far as language is concerned, to make the English language in the future, the vehicle of communication in Parliament and outside Parliament. It is not by legislative enactments, it is not by preambles declaratory of intentions such as are expressed here, but by the impulse of natural forces, by necessity and convenience, that this great result will be achieved. What did we hear in the House the other day? We heard from the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard) a confession, which was re-echoed from this side of the House, that every French gentleman in the country—such are the forces at work in this community—is convinced that he would not be doing justice to his children if he brought them up in ignorance of the English language and English literature. The fact is, as he told us, that the French boys of the present age are being educated in both languages, so that when they grow up they will be able to take their place, not only in the parliamentary arena, but in the commercial circles of the great commercial centres. Is there discord between races and creeds in this House? What sight do we behold in this Parliament to-night? We see one of the historical parties of Canada led by whom? Led by a French gentleman who was elected as leader of the great Liberal party—because he was a French Canadian? No; but because his ability and his experience, his tact and his urbanity, fitted him for that high position; and I will venture the assertion that the choice made by that party two or three years ago has been more than justified by the experience we have had of his leadership in the House. Sir, I will venture to say, although he is a French Canadian, that he enjoys the confidence of his followers to as large an extent as his distinguished predecessors did. We have every confidence in him, we know his breadth of view, we know that he is not animated by racial or creed antipathies, but that he desires to build up a nation in this country upon broad and generous grounds. Sir, I venture this further remark that, after two or three years' experience of his leadership, he not only enjoys the thorough confidence of those who follow him, but he has earned, and has deservedly earned, the respect of his political opponents. Well, we heard that hon. gentleman charged here the other night by the hon. member who introduced the Bill—and I know why he charged it, he charged it from the basest of motives—that that hon. gentleman was a party to certain treasonable language which was used down on the banks of the St. Lawrence, or language alleged to be treasonable, by the Premier of Quebec; and he charged that the leader of the Liberal party had sanctioned by his presence and by his silence, the use of that language. Sir, that was ignorance on the part of the hon. member, and it was unjust, also, because he knew, he could not help but know, that the hon. gentleman who leads the Liberal party had not only taken occasion at the very time to rebuke the language, or to dissent from the language, or from some of the extreme expressions which were made use of on that occasion; but, afterwards, in the great city of Toronto, before an English speaking audience, he had read his disclaimer from the paper which printed it at

the time, and had then declared himself as true and as thoroughly a British Canadian as any man in Canada. Sir, I have this further to say, and I hope before this debate is closed that it will be proved conclusively that the language which it is alleged Mr. Mercier used on that occasion, has been foully and falsely misrepresented. I was shown to-night by an hon. gentleman who sits near me a correct transcript of that language, and I do not think it is right that an hon. gentleman holding the high position of Premier of one of the greater Provinces, should be held up to public scorn and contumely for having used language which he never used, and for having preached treason which he never preached, but when as a matter of fact the sentiments he uttered were not stronger than those embodied in the preamble of the resolution which the leader of the Government asks this House to endorse. The language which Mr. Mercier used on that occasion was as follows:—

“Whilst protesting our respect and our friendship, too, for the representatives of other races and other creeds, whilst declaring ourselves ever ready to grant to them their rights everywhere and at all times, on all occasions and in everything; whilst offering to divide with them as between brethren the immense territory and the enormous wealth which Providence has laid before us; whilst willing to live with them in perfect harmony under the shadow of the flag of England and the sceptre of a Queen loved of all, we solemnly declare that never shall we renounce the rights guaranteed to us by treaties, by laws and by the constitution.

“Treaties, law and constitution secure to us the right of remaining Catholic and French, and Catholic and French we will remain.

“Let us proclaim it ahigh and aloud, so that among our opponents there be no false hopes, so that in our own ranks there be no weakness; the persecution of the first years of English domination succeeded not in crushing our fathers; no more shall the persecutions, which now threatens, succeed in crushing us, their descendants.

“We are now two millions and a half of French Canadians in America, proud of the past, strong in the present and confident of the future; we scorn and laugh at the threats of our enemies.”

I see nothing in that language to condemn, there is no treason in it; there is nothing about building up a French nationality on the banks of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. RYKERT. What is the date of the speech?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is Mr. Mercier's speech, delivered before St. Jean Baptiste Society on 24th of June.

Mr. AMYOT. 24th of May, I was there.

Mr. McNEILL. Where did the hon. gentleman get that report?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am told it was not an extempore but a carefully written speech, and one which was read from the manuscript. It is a copy from the manuscript I have read, and the hon. gentleman who sits behind me was present on the occasion, and so far as his memory serves those were the words used.

Mr. AMYOT. I was there myself, and it was the same speech.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Let me pass from that point. None of the resolutions and amendments proposed commend themselves to my judgment so much as that submitted by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). It is short, and while it might perhaps be improved and made a little more definite in some of its phrases, it proceeds upon the correct lines. It proposes that

this whole question should be relegated to the people of the North-West Territories, that they, at the next general election, should instruct their representatives how they should vote and act, and that the representatives of the people after being instructed by the people at the polls should decide for themselves what languages should be used in the House, in debate, in the votes and proceedings, in the ordinances and in the courts. That resolution proceeds upon broad, liberal lines. It commends itself to my mind, because it shows faith in the people, a desire to leave that which concerns those people, more immediately than our people, to the people of the North-West themselves, to the people who are the best judges. What do the people of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick know of this matter? I have never set my foot in the North-West, and I am not as competent as are gentlemen living there, to judge as to whether one, two, or three languages should be used. It is a question which they should determine; to them it should be relegated, and I never found yet, if you put full and ample trust in the people, that the people will fail you. The Liberal party have proclaimed time and again their belief in Provincial rights. But it is said there are no Provincial rights mixed up in this matter because there are no Provinces. That is a mere quibble. The basis underlying Provincial rights is the same whether the people belong to a Territory or belong to a Province. What is that basis? It is, that upon all matters of purely local concern the people more immediately affected should determine how the matters should be decided. It is the same principle either applied to a Province with full political rights or to the North-West Territories with partial political rights; the underlying principle is the same in both cases. It is said that the people have spoken, and that the North-West Council has already told this House what is the opinion of the people of the North-West. But that argument has been sufficiently answered. The North-West representatives were not elected to do more than legislate within the bounds of the constitution under which they were elected; they were not elected to change that constitution or to express to this Parliament the voice of the people with respect to any such change. The question never came before the people at the last election, and if I am correctly informed, not two, three or four, but six or seven representatives, when the question came before them, expressed a desire that the question should be relegated to the people, and that they should receive instructions from their constituents. This Dominion has had enough of forcing a change of constitution on Provinces by the action of the Legislature, irrespective of the people. It was done in Nova Scotia and you have an open sore there to this day. You have had a partially discontented Province, and why? Simply because the people, when their constitution was proposed to be taken away, had not an opportunity of declaring whether they wished that course to be followed or not. We should not try to repeat that experiment, even on a small scale. I desire to follow on the lines of the Liberal party, laid down here years and years ago; in all local matters to refer the questions to the people more immediately interested. I have never found that solution of the difficulty to fail; it has always proved equal to

the occasion. Provinces have been driven almost to revolt; there has been discontent in Ontario and in Quebec; but when you apply the principle of Provincial rights, when you allow the people to deal with their own local affairs as they please, the question is settled always in the way the people desire it to be settled. So it should be in the North-West Territories. They have an equal right to speak with the people of the older Provinces, and I, for one, will not be a party to taking away that right, which, if my own Province was interested, I would expect to have given to it. I believe if we apply the principles of provincial rights we are treading upon safe ground, upon ground we have travelled before, upon a well tried and beaten path which has always led us out of difficulties; but, if you abandon that, and take up some other ground and say that Parliament should deal with this subject, whether competent or not, or whether it possesses the requisite information or not, you are entering a sea of difficulties, from which I, at least, see no safe haven. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), who made an able and brilliant speech the other night, did not deal in many historical arguments, but he gave us two from modern history: the one with respect to the question of the use of the dual languages in Schleswig-Holstein, and the other with respect to their use in Poland, and he asked us to pay great respect to the recommendations of the English statesmen in those two cases. I have no doubt that any recommendation by English statesmen, experienced in matters of this kind, would carry great weight. Upon what lines did they go? Just on the lines that we are asking you shall go now: to leave it to the people to decide how many languages they shall have, or if they shall have but one. That was the proposition which the English Secretary of State made in his despatch with reference to the Schleswig-Holstein question and that was the same proposition which the great powers of Europe made with reference to the settlement of the language question in Poland. Therefore, if these great English precedents are to have any weight, if hon. gentlemen opposite, some of whom I have in my eye now who pay very great respect to the opinions and recommendations of English statesmen, will pay weight to these opinions I have referred to, they will vote for the resolution of the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and leave this matter to the people, who are best qualified to judge of it themselves. I wish to say a few words with reference to the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Justice. I am opposed to that amendment, as I stated in my opening remarks, upon the ground that it is a half-and-half measure, for it gives with one hand what it withholds with the other. By it you declare that you have a half belief in the right of the people to decide this question, but that you have not full confidence in them. It seems to me to be a hesitating, half-hearted Tory proposition. You say: "We will give them the power to determine whether their proceedings and speeches shall be in one or two languages, but, oh, we cannot trust the people to decide as to whether their ordinances shall be published in one or two languages." That is all nonsense. Why withdraw from the people of the Territories the right to determine whether one, two or three languages shall be used? It may be that the Germans will go to

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

those Territories in sufficient numbers to justify the Legislature of that country in determining that the ordinances shall be published in German. Should any objection be offered? Certainly not. I object to this amendment, because it leaves this question which has given rise to so much trouble, so much heartburning and so much turmoil in the same position as it is now, namely, on the Table of this House. If this amendment of the Minister of Justice is adopted the question will come up next year. You will have the same debate, and you will have more bitterness imported into it than now. We have had on this occasion the restraining influence which comes from the fact that the great leaders occupying the front benches on both sides of the House have united to give us wise counsel, to commend us to be prudent, to be cautious, to refrain from exciting language, and to remember that underlying this question there are others which may result in the disruption of the whole Dominion. The debate, so far, has been conducted with an abstinence from exciting language which is certainly commendable, but if you keep this question open, what guarantee have you that this commendable abstinence from violent language is going to be repeated next year? The hon. member for North Simcoe will doubtless bring up this question again next year, for he would be inconsistent in his course if he did not do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will move next year that the right which was given to the people of the North-West with reference to their votes and proceedings, shall also be extended to their ordinances, and on what ground could you withhold it? I, for one, can see no logical or just reason for going half way in this matter. If we are going to trust the people let us trust them fully, and let us show them that we have confidence in them. The hon. Premier cited an instance from Ontario nearly one hundred years old, to show that the people of Ontario, United Empire Loyalists as they were, were not unworthy then to be trusted with the disposition of a matter similar to the one now before us. Did these people a hundred years ago act harshly or tyrannically? No. The First Minister showed that they acted in a broad and generous spirit, and that they published their ordinances and their debates in the languages which were understood by the two races of the people. Are their descendants to-day, who have gone to the North-West, less broad or less generous than their forefathers were a hundred years ago? Not at all, Sir. The precedent which the hon. gentleman has cited is directly against this half-hearted resolution, and if it is good for anything it is good to prove that the people of the North-West are as qualified to-day—nay, if we judge from the spread of education; if we can judge from the increase of toleration which has been going on among the people of North America for the last hundred years—they are more qualified to deal with this question in a broad, generous and free spirit than were their forefathers. I see nothing but procrastination, delay and danger, in this amendment of the Minister of Justice, and I oppose it upon the ground that I do not believe it will give satisfaction to the people more immediately interested, or will work effectively or justly if carried into law.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Montmorency.) (Translation). I do not desire to detain the House very long, Mr. Speaker; nor have I the pretention that I have anything very new in the shape of argument to offer upon the important question which concerns us at the present moment. Nevertheless, the speeches delivered by the member for North Simcoe contain assertions so unjust, so destitute of foundation, that I wish to arraign some of them. What is the object of the Bill of the member for Simcoe? Is it the interest of the public which urges him on? Is it really a sincere desire to consolidate the Canadian nationality in the Dominion? I answer emphatically, no. His sole object is to continue to excite the various races which inhabit this country, the one against the other; his sole end is to enflame religious prejudice, and to build for himself a small political party on the ruins which he shall have made, to the injury of political peace and religious tolerance in Canada. His Bill, I say, is an outrageous provocation to the French of this country. Last year, it was the Catholic sensibility which the member for North Simcoe wished to wound with the Jesuit question; this time it is the French nationality which he attacks, wounding in this way the two strongest and most sensitive feelings which exist in any nation proud and courageous. For months and months the member for North Simcoe and the press at his command have not ceased to insult and vilify us. Have you seen any agitation in the Province of Quebec? No. Have you seen any tumultuous meetings gathered together in order to protest again these insults? No. Have you seen brought into this House any petitions asking for the rejection of this Bill? None whatever. Why so? It is because, in spite of what they think in certain quarters, we understand constitutional rule. We have remained calm,—confiding in the justice of this House; and this justice will be meted out to us. In a few moments this anti-French Bill of the member for North Simcoe will be crushed by the same humiliating majority which crushed out his motion against the Jesuits. In face of this display of narrow fanaticism, I ask whether we of French origin have done anything to justify it? I think not. Our history is there, to show on the contrary our spirit of tolerance, our spirit of friendliness. I asked a moment ago: Have we provoked our fellow citizens of English origin? No. I shall quote to this House an eloquent witness to our spirit of tolerance,—and this evidence has fallen from the lips of a qualified man, from the lips of an English Conservative who played a no mean part in this country and who died a baronet in England; I mean Sir John Rose. What did this politician say, during the debates on Confederation? I shall allow him to speak for himself:

“It is a very grave and anxious question for us to consider—especially the minorities in Lower Canada—how far our mutual rights and interests are respected and guarded, the one in the General and the other in the Local Legislature. With reference to this subject, I think that I, and those with whom I have acted—the English-speaking members from Lower Canada—may in some degree congratulate ourselves at having brought about a state of feeling between the two races in this section of the Province which has produced some good effect. There has been ever since the time of the union, I am happy to say—and every body knows it who has any experience in Lower Canada—a cordial understanding and friendly feeling between the two nationalities, which has produced the happiest results. Belonging to different races and professing a different faith,

we live near each other; we do not trench upon the rights of each other; we have not had those party and religious differences which two races, speaking different languages and holding different religious beliefs might be supposed to have had; and it is a matter of sincere gratification to us, I say, that this state of things has existed and is now found among us. But if, instead of this mutual confidence; if, instead of the English-speaking minority placing trust in the French majority in the Local Legislature, and the French minority placing the same trust in the English majority in the General Legislature, no such feeling existed, how could this scheme of Confederation be made to work successfully? I think that it cannot be denied that there is the utmost confidence on both sides; I feel assured that our confidence in the majority in the Local Government will not be misplaced, and I earnestly trust that the confidence they repose in us in the General Legislature will not be abused. I hope that this mutual yielding of confidence will make us both act in a high-minded and sensitive manner when the rights of either side are called in question—if ever they should be called in question—in the respective Legislatures. This is an era in the history of both races—the earnest plighting of each other's faith as they embrace this scheme. It is remarkable that both should place such entire confidence in one another; and in future ages our posterity on both sides will be able to point with pride to the period when the two races had such reliance, the one on the other, as that each was willing to trust its safety and interest to the honor of the other. This mutual confidence has not been brought about by any ephemeral or spasmodic desire for change on the part of either; it is the result of the knowledge each race possesses of the character of the other. It is because we have learned to respect each other's motives and have been made to feel by experience that neither must be aggressive, and that the interests of the one are safe in the keeping of the other. * * * A feeling of distrust between the French and English races in the community would have rendered even the fair consideration of the scheme of union impracticable. Would the French have, in that case, been now ready to trust themselves in the General Legislature, or the English in the Local Legislature, of Lower Canada? No; and I pray God that this mutual confidence between the two races which have so high and noble a work to do on this continent, who are menaced by a common danger, and actuated by a common interest, may continue for all time to come; I pray that it may not be interrupted or destroyed by any act of either party; and I trust that each may continue to feel assured that if at any time hereafter circumstances should arise, calculated to infringe upon the rights of either, it will be sufficient to say, in order to prevent any aggression of this kind: “We trusted each other when we entered this union; we felt then that our rights would be sacred with you; and our honor and good faith and integrity are involved in and pledged to the maintenance of them.” I believe this is an era in our history in which in after ages our children may appeal with pride, and that if there should be any intention on either side to aggress upon the other, the recollection that each trusted to the honor of the other will prevent that intention from being carried out. Feeling as I do thus strongly that our French fellow-subjects are placing entire confidence in us, in our honor and our good faith, we the English-speaking population of Lower Canada, ought not to be behind hand in placing confidence in them. I feel that we have no reason as a minority to fear aggressions on the part of the majority. We feel that in the past we have an earnest of what we may reasonably expect the future relations between the two races to be. But although this feeling of mutual confidence may be strong enough in our breasts at this time, I am glad to see that my hon. friend the Attorney General East, as representing the French majority in Lower Canada, and the Minister of Finance as representing the English-speaking minority, have each carefully and prudently endeavored to place as fundamental conditions in this basis of union such safeguards and protection as the two races may respectively rely upon.”

On the same occasion the hon. gentleman said further:

“We the English Protestant minority of Lower Canada cannot forget that whatever right of separate education we have was accorded to us in the most unrestricted way before the union of the Provinces, when we were in the minority and entirely in the hands of the French population. We cannot forget that in no way was there any attempt to prevent us educating our children in the manner we saw fit and deemed best; and I would be untrue to what is just if I forgot to state that the dis-

tribution of State funds for educational purposes was made in such a way as to cause no complaint on the part of the minority. I believe we have always had our fair share of the public grants in so far as the French element could control them, and not only the liberty, but every facility for the establishment of separate dissentient schools wherever they were deemed desirable. A single person has the right, under the law, of establishing a dissentient school and obtaining a fair share of the educational grant, if he can gather together fifteen children who desire instruction in it. Now we cannot forget that in the past this liberality has been shown to us, and that whatever we desired of the French majority in respect to education they were, if it was at all reasonable, willing to concede. We have thus in this, also, the guarantee of the past that nothing will be done in the future unduly to interfere with our rights and interests as regards education, and I believe that everything that we desire will be as freely given by the Local Legislature as it was before the union of the Canadas."

This is the handsome eulogium of the tolerance of the French Canadians, made by an Englishman who had passed his life in their midst. And today as a reward for our justice towards the English minority, behold an Englishman, a distinguished member of this House, comes and asks us to deprive of their language the French minority in the Territories of the North-West. I appeal on its behalf to the sentiment of justice in this House whose most noble prerogative is the protection of the weak. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to answer some of the assertions made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in the last speech he has made in support of the Bill. This hon. member looks as if he believed that the Protestants are frightfully maltreated in the Province of Quebec—that we render their existence very bitter. Let us settle at once this point. There are in our Province 188,309 Protestants and 1,170,718 Roman Catholics according to the census of 1881. The Protestants, therefore, only represent 13 per cent., or one-seventh of the total population of our Province. They are only in the majority in the Counties of Compton, Stanstead, Brome, Missisquoi, Huntingdon and Argenteuil. Nevertheless, they have ten representatives. In these six counties the Protestants have only a majority of 2,136 and are in the minority in Sherbrooke, Montreal West, Pontiac and Megantic, so that they would have a right only to six members instead of ten, if they were excluded from representation in those counties where they are in the minority. I may also add that, since Confederation, several counties, whose population is wholly Catholic, have elected English Protestant members. I can mention the following names: Mr. Clarence Hamilton was elected in the County of Bonaventure; Mr. W. Price, for Chicoutimi and Saguenay; the Hon. Mr. Joly for Lotbinière; Mr. Hemming and Mr. Watts, for Drummond and Arthabaska; the Hon. Mr. Church for the County of Ottawa; the Hon. Mr. Wurtele for the County of Yamaska; the Hon. D. A. Ross for the County of Quebec; and Mr. Pozer for Beauce. This shows that the French-Canadians are not prejudiced in the matter of their representatives. It is the same thing in the Legislative Council, which is composed of 24 members. According to population, the Protestants, only forming one-seventh of the Province, would only have a right to but three Legislative Councillors out of the twenty-four, but notwithstanding, they have five, that is to say, one-fifth. But there is more to say. In the five divisions represented by Protestants the majority is Roman Catholic. The Protestants are only as 34 to 100 of the

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency).

population. In 1878, we had, in the person of Mr. Joly, a Protestant, as First Minister. The Hon. Mr. Joly is a man among the Protestants who occupies the best position in the Province of Quebec. Was there ever complaint made that a Protestant was at the head of affairs in the Province of Quebec? No, Mr. Speaker; but the English Tories endeavored to excite the national prejudices of the French Canadians, by throwing into their teeth the sneer that they had a Protestant at the head of the Government. Now, turning to the school question, let us see in what manner Protestants are treated in the Province of Quebec. I will not give my own opinion, but I am going to quote an opinion which will not be gainsaid by any one. It is that of the Rev. Mr. Rexford, the secretary of the Protestant section of the Council of Public Instruction in the Province of Quebec. In the course of last summer in the Province of Ontario they carried on an anti-French and an anti-Catholic campaign. At this juncture, they represented the Government of the Province of Quebec as a Government which wished to drive out all the Englishmen from the country. The leader of the Government addressed a letter to the Rev. Mr. Rexford, in which he asked him for certain information respecting Protestant public education in the Province of Quebec. Mr. Rexford answered by the following letter dated the 4th of July, 1889:—

“DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.

“QUEBEC, 4th July, 1889.

“To the Honorable the First Minister of the Province of Quebec:

“MY DEAR SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th June last, containing questions respecting the Protestant schools of the Province of Quebec, and I take the liberty of submitting the following declarations to serve as answers to these questions:—

“First question—What is the condition of the Protestant separate schools in the Province of Quebec?

“Answer—The Protestant schools of the Province of Quebec, are either schools controlled by the majority of the ratepayers of the municipality in which they are situated, under the control of five school commissioners; or they are dissentient schools belonging to the minority of a municipality, under the control of three school trustees. There are in the Province 916 of these elementary schools, thirty-eight model schools, and nineteen academies, forming a total of nearly 1,000 schools attended by 34,440 scholars. These schools, in a number of cases, suffer somewhat from the density of the dissentient element on which their support depends; but they enjoy all the rights and privileges of the schools belonging to the majority of the inhabitants of the Province as regards school regulations, class books, the course of studies, and the capacity of the teachers; in the last connection they are perhaps slightly more favored than some of the schools belonging to the majority of the people of the Province. It is a fact that the Protestant Committee, having a smaller number of schools under its control, is in a condition to take, when matters make it necessary, measures to improve the condition of the Protestant schools, before similar measures can be adopted with regard to the Roman Catholic schools of the Province.”

“Second question—Please give me an abbreviated statement of the law bearing on this subject, and upon the rights given to the Protestants to support separate schools in our Province.

“Answer—For school purposes, the Province is divided into sections, called school municipalities. The schools of these municipalities are under the direction of five commissioners elected by the ratepayers. If the majority of the inhabitants of the municipality are Protestant, the schools of the municipality are conducted conformably to the regulations issued by the Protestant Committee, respecting the course of study, class-books, teachers, &c. When the Protestants form the minority in the municipality, and they are not satisfied with the government of the schools, they have the right to record their dissent, and to notify the school commissioners that they are either in whole or in part dissentients. They then elect three trustees, devoted to the govern-

ment of their dissentient schools. These dissentient schools enjoy all the rights and privileges of the schools of the majority of the inhabitants of the municipality, save in this one point, that the dissentient trustees cannot levy school taxes upon duly incorporated companies. This power belongs to the school commissioners of each municipality, who are bound to place in the hands of the trustees a portion of the taxes levied on the companies legally constituted as corporations, in proportion to the number of scholars attending their respective schools. In other respects, the dissentient trustees have the same powers as the school commissioners in all that respects the schools placed under their control. If the dissentients of a municipality are too weak in numbers to support a school they can unite with a neighboring municipality of their own religious belief, with the object of supporting these schools. Every head of a family residing in a municipality not provided with a dissentient school, may, (1) if he belongs to the minority, (2) if he has children of an age to attend school and (3) if he lives within three miles of a school of his own religious faith situated in another municipality, pay his taxes towards the support of this school, and send his children there.

"Any person belonging to the religious minority may, at any time whatsoever, become a dissentient by giving the prescribed notices, but he is subject to the payment of the ordinary taxes imposed by the school commissioners for the current year, and having reference to the existing debts of the school corporation. In every case, on the formation of a new municipality, if the notice of the dissentients is given within the month following the erection of the municipality, the dissentients are not subject to the taxes imposed by the school commissioners.

"When, in the municipality, the minority is a dissentient one it has a right to a portion of the property of the school corporation from which it is dissentient. This portion is determined *pro rata* according to the value of the taxable property represented by the dissentients. The Protestant schools, dissentient or under the control of school commissioners, are placed under the superintendence of the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction, at the present time composed of ten members appointed by the Government, of five members appointed by the committee, and of one member elected by the Provincial Association of Protestant School Teachers. This committee has the power of making regulations respecting Protestant schools, normal schools, boards of examiners, school inspectors, class-books, as well as all matters respecting the organisation, the government and the discipline of Protestant schools, and the classification of schools and teachers. The McGill normal school educates, under the control of regulations made by this committee, the teachers for the non-Catholic portion of the Province.

"The central board of Protestant examiners, acting in accordance with the regulations of the committee, has alone the power of issuing certificates to act as teacher in the Protestant schools. Five regular inspectors and three special inspectors, appointed on a recommendation of the Protestant committee, perform the duty of inspection as regards the Protestant schools of the Province.

"Third question.—Please tell me the number of Protestant separate schools that there are in this Province and the sum of money which they receive from the Government?

"Answer:—1st. There are about one thousand separate Protestant schools in the Province; 2nd. The subsidy granted by the Government for elementary instruction is \$360,000. This sum is distributed among the school municipalities of the Province, in proportion to their total population, as ascertained at the last census. In each municipality where there are dissentient schools in charge of trustees the portion of the grant coming to the municipality is divided between the school commissioners and dissentient trustees in proportion to the number of children attending their respective schools. As this grant is, in the first place, divided according to the total population, and then, where there exist dissentient schools, on account of the variable assistance given to the school, it is impossible to state the exact amount of the grant received by the Protestant schools. Nevertheless, it is evident that approximately these schools receive in proportion to the population, say about one-seventh of the whole grant.

"Fourth question.—Can you give me the number of the Protestant English-speaking population of the Province?

"Answer.—I have not the means of ascertaining the number of the Protestant English-speaking population of the Province,—distinguishing it from the Protestant population speaking other languages. According to the last census there were in the Province:

Roman Catholics.....	1,170,718
Protestants.....	183,900
No religion.....	4,319

Total..... 1,358,937

"I have the honor to be, dear Sir,

Your obedient servant,

"ELSON I. REXFORD,

"Secretary of the Department of Public Instruction."

Well, you see with what liberality the Protestant minority is treated in the Province of Quebec. It is of little consequence whether it be English or Protestant it is treated with the liberality and justice which are due to minorities. There is another question which we know agitates the hon. member for North Simcoe. It is the question respecting the Jesuit Estates. This question has come again to be threshed out before this House. Complaint is made of the famous preamble of the Bill respecting which so much noise was made last year. I shall not quote, in reply to what has been said, any other authority than that of a Protestant who occupies one of the highest positions in our Province, and who is looked upon with the greatest respect by the Protestants of the Province of Quebec. I mean the Hon. Mr. Joly. This is what he said on this matter in a letter addressed to the Montreal *Witness* on the 7th of January last:

"The Jesuit Estates Act has become the signal for a strong agitation throughout the Dominion. Men who for so many years lived together in confidence and friendship, in spite of the differences of origin and creed, have now become suspicious the one of the other and are gradually separating more and more. * * * Every effort ought to be brought to bear in order to preserve this time-honored sentiment of confidence and mutual tolerance, which has allowed us, Canadians as we are, English and French, Roman Catholics and Protestants, to live happily and in peace, side by side, in days when there is but little peace in the world. Such efforts deserve to be supported by all men endued with good will. * * * If I had been a member of the Legislature at the time, and the name of the Pope and his consent might have been omitted, I would have insisted in placing them in the Bill before allowing it to be adopted.

"* * * At first sight, a great portion of the preamble of the Bill appears to be out of place and subject to objections or superfluous; but after re-examination the attentive reader, especially if he is possessed of some legal knowledge, will be struck with the display of minute precautions which have been taken to obtain, on behalf of the Province, a final and non-appealable judgment."

This is how, Mr. Speaker, a Protestant holding the position which Mr. Joly does, appreciates the preamble of the Bill respecting the Jesuit Estates, which has been so severely criticised in this House. Another assertion on the part of the hon. member which has astonished me, is that which he has made when alleging that *La Vérité* is the organ of the Quebec Government. He appears to me to be a close reader of this journal, because he constantly quotes it in his speeches. Probably because he takes delight in it and reads it on Sunday in order to keep holy the Sabbath day. I protest, Mr. Speaker, against the statement of the hon. member. One must be a complete stranger to what is going on in the Province of Quebec to make such an assertion. *La Vérité* is not the organ of any political party; not more the organ of the Conservative party; not more the organ of the hon. Ministers who are sitting on the Treasury benches, than the organ of the Quebec Government. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not desire any other proof of this than an article in this journal published on the 26th October, 1889. This is what *La Vérité* said:

"We have never abandoned the Conservative leaders, for the excellent reason that we never marched under

their banner; for the same reason that we do not follow Mr. Mercier to-day. From the first day of its publication, *La Vérité* has always been, what it is now, and what it will be so long as we have the control of it, a journal absolutely independent of party politics."

We see by this article how very unjust was the statement of the hon. member in wishing to excite prejudices in the Province of Quebec, by making it believed that this newspaper reflected the opinion of the great majority of a population of the Province of Quebec, and that it reflected, above all, the opinion of the Government of Quebec. And, finally, *La Minerve*, addressing itself to *La Vérité* asked it several questions with regard to the Government of Quebec. And what did Mr. Tardivel answer in his journal? He said that he accepted Mr. Mercier as the lesser evil. He paid us the compliment of saying that we were worth more than our adversaries,—which is, by the way, but a poor compliment. I can cite, Mr. Speaker, a more recent example of the liberality of Mr. Mercier towards the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec. No further back than fifteen days, a representative in the Legislature of Quebec, Mr. Hall, presented a Bill on the subject of university degrees. This Bill could only have passed the Assembly and the Council through the grace and influence of the head of the Executive of Quebec. I shall quote touching the estimation in which the Hon. Mr. Mercier is held, a newspaper which I am convinced the hon. member for North Simcoe should read as attentively as *La Vérité*, and whose statements he cannot doubt. This is what the *Mail* said three or four days ago:

"The *Mail* is not often able to commend Mr. Mercier's political acts, but it would be doing him an injustice if it failed to congratulate him upon the course which he has taken with regard to Mr. Hall's B. A. Bill, which has now passed both Houses of the Quebec Legislature. He made a vigorous speech in support of it in the Assembly, and exercised his great powers in the Council in order to secure its passage there. He deserves credit, therefore, for thus assisting in the removal of one of the disabilities under which the Protestant minority in Quebec has long been laboring. * * It is not difficult to understand the intense satisfaction with which the friends of Protestant education in Quebec regard the removal of a disability which has weighed heavily upon them for many years."

I am now going to cite, with regard to this Bill, what *La Vérité*, so often quoted by the hon. member from North Simcoe, has said. These are the reproaches which that newspaper cast upon the leader of the Government in connection with the adoption of this measure, of date the 8th instant:

"And at the time of the third reading had it not been for the scandalous intervention of the First Minister in favor of the Bill, the majority of the members would have rejected this exceptional legislation. We say scandalous intervention."

"In fact, contrary to all parliamentary usage, Mr. Mercier quitted his seat, while the members were entering the House in order to vote, and ran about the hall of meeting, openly bringing to bear the weight of his influence, as leader of the party, upon certain Liberals well known on account of their hostility to the Bill. This was an unseemly act which the Speaker of the House did not prevent, as he might have done and ought to have done."

This is the manner in which the newspaper, which the hon. member of North Simcoe says represents the opinions of the Government of Quebec, treats the leader of this Government. I trust that in the future the hon. member will give himself the trouble to read other newspapers in the Province of Quebec, in order the better to inform himself about what is passing there. For a long time past this hon. member, and those other members of his own kidney, have taken a consi-

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency).

derable interest in our affairs. The proper mode of making himself well informed in all that respects us would be to read trustworthy journals, like the *Electeur* for example, which is perfectly up to the mark in the affairs of the Province, and *La Justice*, in whose columns my hon. friend the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) often writes. He would obtain through these newspapers all the information possible respecting our affairs. Another of our crimes, Mr. Speaker, is the case of Miss Maybee. It would seem that, eminently respectable as this young woman is, she has made herself latterly much talked about. It has been sought to make it believed that the objections against the appointment of Miss Maybee, to the post office at Quebec, were owing to the fact that she came from the Province of Ontario and that she was a Protestant. I say that this is entirely false. In this connection I will quote what has been said by a Conservative newspaper in Quebec, the *Evenement*. This is how this journal looks upon this appointment:

"As the business of this lady will be merely to work a small calligraphic machine, in the post office, we do not see why they go so far to look for an employé when they could easily have found one in our own city. It is not to our knowledge, and not to the knowledge of any one, that in any public office in the Province of Ontario did they dream of bringing from Quebec or Montreal a French Canadian woman to fill any employment whatsoever. Are we bound to be more generous, more complaisant than our neighbors, especially when we possess already persons who are fitted to do the work required in the present case?"

Well, I must say this to the hon. member: The gallantry of Frenchmen is proverbial; and certainly there is nobody among us who would not have been delighted to keep within our walls this Miss Maybee, who, by the way, they say is very pretty, as are, moreover, all English ladies. If my hon. friend, the member for North Simcoe, would visit our Province he would discover that the English and the French Canadians live on the best possible terms; he would see that in many cases Englishmen marry French Canadian women and that French Canadian men marry English women. If one may judge by the fruit of their affections, it is certain that they make good matches, for it does not appear that, either on the one side or the other, they are disposed to break the bonds of union. In order to conceal somewhat the sentiment which overrules him—and this sentiment is nothing else but fanaticism—the member for North Simcoe tells us that it is necessary that the nation should speak but one language, if it wishes to become homogeneous. He has quoted, to this effect, several extracts from newspapers in Ontario and elsewhere. I will quote for him a work which, I think, possesses fully as much authority as these newspapers. This is what on this point the great dictionary, of Larousse says at the word "nationality":

"NATIONALITY: And in the first place what is a nationality? What is it which gives it its character? What is it that makes a nation? Is it the community of origin and race? By no means, for there is no people which has not been more or less mixed during the course of ages with foreign elements, and there is no race which is not sub-divided into several nationalities. Is it unity of language? Community of language is one of the greatest characteristics of a nation; but it is not alone sufficient to stamp it, because a nation perfectly united and homogeneous may include populations speaking different languages. Can it be said, for example, that Brittany, Provence and Alsace at the present time separated from us, do not belong to the French nationality, because they speak in those countries languages which are not those of

Touraine and the Isle de France? If this point of view is taken it must be affirmed that Alsace ought not to be French but German."

But the hon. member will perhaps say: You quote in this connection French authorities, but in my eyes these authorities have hardly any value. Well, I will quote for him other authorities, which have much more weight than the newspapers which he has read to this House. I will read to him the words of a Governor who has left behind him a very great popularity among us, and who has gone to gather in the Indies, and wherever the English Crown may send him, new laurels. I refer to Lord Dufferin. This is what he said about the French Canadians:

"At this moment the French Canadian race, to which you belong, is engaged in a generous rivalry with your fellow-subjects of English origin, the end of which is to see which of the two will contribute most to the moral, material, and political advancement, as well as to the prosperity of the country. There is not one student, man of business or of science, politician, or writer, of either origin, who does not feel himself inspired by this noble emulation. The issue of this conflict depends on the success of your efforts, on the efficiency of your discipline and of your education upon the character of the moral, and intellectual atmosphere which you create in this region." These words were spoken in reply to any address, which was presented to him by Laval University in Quebec. On another occasion the same noble Lord expressed himself as follows:—

"I think that Canada should esteem itself happy in owing its prosperity to the mixture of several races. The action and the reaction of several national idiosyncrasies, the one upon the other, give to our society a freshness, a coloring, an elasticity, a vigor, which without them would be wanting to it. The statesman who would seek to obliterate these distinctive characteristics would be truly badly advised.

"Whatever it may be elsewhere, the French race in Canada has learned to appreciate the advantages of moderation, this golden rule of societies, and the necessity of arriving at practical results by sacrificing the demands of a too inexorable logic, and by settling grave difficulties by generous compromises."

There is something more yet. If we go further back still in the political history of our country, we find that those who made the Constitution, which governs us since we have been under British rule, have always taken scrupulous care not to wound the prejudices, or the national or religious susceptibilities of the various peoples who inhabit Canada. I have taken the pains to read the debates which took place in England when they gave us the Constitution of 1774. Immediately after this Constitution was given us, a Constitution by which they took away the trial by jury and the writ of *habeas corpus*; a petition was signed at Quebec, addressed to Her Majesty, asking for the restitution to the citizens of Canada, of the trial by jury and the writ of *habeas corpus*. Very interesting debates took place in the English House of Commons, at this period, and we find in the Parliamentary History, in volume 18, what follows. It is Sir Robert Smith, a member of the House of Commons, who is speaking:

"Whoever reflects upon the excellencies of the British laws, whoever considers them in theory, or sees the daily advantages of them in practice, whoever justly admires them for their peculiar lenity, moderation, equity, and impartiality, would wish to see them extended over the whole face of the British Empire; but if there are local and circumstantial reasons, arising from the national character of the people, their language, customs, usages, institutions, and I will even add, their prejudices, which in this case ought to be consulted, and not only consulted but, in some measure, indulged; but if there are reasons arising from these various circumstances, that make it impossible for the English laws to be adopted in their

original purity, I will venture to affirm, that a legislator is not only justified but that it is an essential part of his duty, so to alter and modify these laws as may best adapt them to the peculiar genius and temper of the people, so as to become the best rule of civil conduct possible, and the best calculated to promote their general happiness. It was ever the maxim of the greatest legislators of antiquity, to consult the manners and dispositions of the people, and the degrees of improvement they had then received, and to frame such a system of laws as was best suited to their then immediate situation."

Such were, at this epoch, the precautions taken in order not to wound the religious sentiments and the national sentiments of the various races which then peopled Canada. When the English Parliament itself gives such an example of conciliation and moderation, I think that it is in very bad part for the hon. member for North Simcoe to wish today to bring to an end the old traditional British fair play, and to oppress the minority, as he desires to do by this Bill. I may say also that it was not because the English population was fairly large that so much care was taken of Canada at this time; nor was it because she was very influential. I am going to quote what was said then before a committee of the House which, before passing the Act to amend the Quebec Bill, summoned before it General Murray and General Carleton, and heard them respecting Canadian affairs. This committee sat on the 2nd June, 1774. A question was put to General Carleton and this is how he answered:

"The Protestants in Canada are under 400, about 360; but the French inhabitants who are all Catholics amount to 150,000.

"Lord NORTH. Are those 360 men of substance?"

"Gen. CARLETON. Much the greatest part of them are not. There are some that have purchased seigniories, some in trade and some reduced soldiers; but the majority are men of small substances."

"Mr. JENKINSON. Is there much intercourse or communication between those 360 and the rest of the Province?"

"Gen. CARLETON. Very little.

"Lord NORTH. Are these people, upon the whole, proper and eligible for an Assembly to be chosen from them?"

"Gen. CARLETON. I should apprehend, by no means."

Well, Mr. Speaker, as we see when those precautions were taken, about which I spoke a few moments ago, it was not merely in order to protect the English minority, because Gen. Carleton answers that the English population which dwelt in Canada at that period was far from being influential and important. But if at that time there were men of elevated views, practical men, who asked that the people of the Province of Quebec might be placed on a footing of equality with the other British subjects; there were also at that time, men of narrow minds, men wishing to excite prejudices, as there exist such at the present day. I discovered while making the researches, which I have given to the House, a remarkable incident which I must relate. There happened to live, at the time in question, a certain Richard Whitworth, who was probably one of the political ancestors of the hon. member for North Simcoe, if one may judge from his remarks. The House of Commons had returned from the House of Lords, where they had attended to hear the sanction of the Bills. These are the words, which I again borrow from the history of England:

"SIR,—I have often wished that some member would take notice of the language in which the King's assent is given. We are just returned from the House of Lords, and I think this a very proper time to move, that by an

address, or Bill, whichever may be thought most proper. His Majesty be desired to give his assent in his own language. I hate a dishonest language. *Le Roi le veut*. Let the royal assent, sir, be given in the language of truth. We have, sir, even in our proceedings, *Die Martis, Die Lunae*. I could wish they were abolished. The ceremony of the King's assent being given in French, is the remains of Norman slavery; a disgrace to the British Parliament, and which I hope will induce some member to move that either an address or Bill be forwarded to obtain the royal assent for the future, to be given in good honest English. I am fully satisfied it would make the people much happier. (The House was in a continual laugh.)

"The speaker replied very gravely that, as the matter was of a very weighty nature, he thought it would be proper that the House should take time to consider of it. This occasioned a second flow of good humor. The House, however, was adjourned immediately."

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe is going to meet with the same fate as the proposition made by this Mr. Whitworth in the House of Commons of England. It was in 1774, that this destroyer of French made his speech in the English House of Commons. In the speech delivered by the hon. member for North Simcoe, when introducing the measure now under consideration, he quoted a portion of Lord Durham's report on the affairs of Canada; he has only quoted that portion which applied to Lower Canada. He spoke of the troubles and difficulties which existed in Quebec in 1837 and in 1838. We know that at this period the people of the Province fought in order to obtain those liberties of which we are so proud to-day. Several of them ascended the scaffold; others were exiled, and the constitutional liberties acquired with the price of the blood of our ancestors, are to-day shared in by the English who live in Canada. After listening to the speech of the hon. member, one would be led to believe that difficulties existed only in Lower Canada. Nevertheless, we find in Lord Durham's report that difficulties existed also in Upper Canada. This is what he says:

"The Irish Roman Catholics complain loudly and with reason about the existence of Orangism in this Colony. They are justly indignant that, in a Province, which their loyalty and their bravery has effectually aided in preserving, their feelings are outraged by the processions and the banners of this association. The leaders probably hope to make use of this sort of standing conspiracy, of this illegal organisation in order to win for them political power; it is an Irish-Tory institution, having rather a political complexion than a religious one. The organisation of this body allows its leaders to exercise a powerful influence on the populace. And it is stated that at the last elections the Tories carried several seats by means of the violent acts committed by the rabble thus placed at their disposal. But it must not be a matter of surprise, if the existence of such an institution, wounding one class by its scornful hostility to its religion, and another class by its violent opposition to its policy, should excite among the two classes a profound indignation, and should seriously contribute to the want of confidence with which the Government is regarded."

It is seen, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. member had desired to be impartial he would have quoted that portion of the report which concerns Upper Canada. But no, he has taken good care not to do that; he has limited himself to quoting what may be stated to the discredit of the Province of Quebec. He has designedly omitted the other side of the question, because a man possessing his vast knowledge could not but be aware of all that is contained in Lord Durham's report, but he has only read the passages which might be of use to him in the battle which he is now carrying on in Ontario. But, Mr. Speaker, Lord Durham is not the only person who mentioned these difficulties, Lord Metcalfe himself in letters which he sent to Mr. L'ANGELIER (Montmorency).

England, while he was living in Canada, found occasion to relate the manner in which this political contest was carried on. This is what he said:

"The strife of parties is much keener in Upper Canada than in Lower, because in the latter the French party is so overwhelming, that no popular movement in favor of their enemies could be incited; but, in Upper Canada, the strength of the Conservative and the Reform parties being more evenly balanced the contest is more lively and occasionally gives an opportunity for disorders. It is under conditions such as these, that the Orange lodges do much mischief. Organised at first, I think, as political associations, rather than as religious combinations, they nevertheless tend to excite religious dissensions. If an unscrupulous Conservative desires to carry an election or to get the mastery in a public meeting, he gathers a party of Orangemen or he collects a party of Orangemen, or Irish Protestants, armed with clubs, Orangemen being always on the Conservative side, although many Conservatives are not Orangemen. Lately a cross was planted here to point out the place where a Roman Catholic church was shortly to be erected; during the night the cross was cut down, and there was substituted for it a placard declaring that no Roman Catholic church should ever be built there."

Well, if we admit that we are not absolutely perfect in the Province of Quebec, people will acknowledge that they are not altogether angels who live in the Province of Ontario. Respecting the right of minorities, I desire to quote, to this House, the words uttered by the Hon. Mr. Mercier in a speech which he delivered in Montreal on the 6th of November last; and in which he has traced with a master hand, like a great politician as he is, the rights of minorities:

"Some people with evil intent have desired to profit by the settlement of the question respecting the Jesuit Estates, to excite prejudices against the majority in this Province, by accusing them of being unjust towards the Protestant minority; and it is alleged very falsely that this minority was ill-treated, and that it had not the complete exercise of its rights. The rights of a minority may be looked upon from four points of view: 1. From the religious point of view; 2. From the civil point of view; 3. From the educational point of view; 4. From the political point of view. Surely it will not be alleged that the Protestant minority does not exercise, and does not claim with success, all its rights in our Province, from the religious, political, and civil points of view. Nobody will dare to say that Roman Catholics prevent Protestants from practising their religion in as free a manner as they practise it themselves. There are Protestant churches everywhere, even in centres which I might call exclusively Roman Catholic; and we have it yet to learn of the smallest insult having been offered to Protestant congregations, when they judge fit to assemble together. As to political and civil rights, they are recorded in our codes and our constitution; and it has never entered the mind of anyone to say that the Protestants had any reason to complain, in this respect. As to the rights respecting education, it is but right to state exactly what they are, in order to make to disappear any ambiguity which might exist in this respect. But, before doing this, let us state plainly that the law declares the two languages—French and English—to be official; that in practice all our public documents are printed in these two languages; that in the Legislature both are spoken; and very often we French Canadians answer in English the speeches made in English by our colleagues of another origin; and that we take special pains to render to them, in this connection, all possible assistance, in order to remove any pretext for complaint. The same thing is done in our courts of justice, where, very often, French Canadian advocates plead in English, out of courtesy to their brethren of foreign origin; and, although we are not bound to do so, each time when in our public departments we have to write to a person speaking the English language, we do it in his own tongue. This is an invariable rule, which I believe has no exception, or at least if there are exceptions they are so rare that it would not be reasonable to take any notice of them."

"As to the education question, I do not think that there is a minority better treated, in this respect, than that of the Province of Quebec; and, as I do not desire to have my own evidence accepted, I have taken care to summon that of the Rev. Mr. Rexford, the Protestant Secretary of the Council of Public Instruction. Let

them know, once for all, that the Protestant minority is well treated in this Province; it is treated generously, liberally, and there is no country in the world in which the majority has less of religious and national prejudice than in the Province of Quebec. The letter of the Rev. Mr. Rexford makes us acquainted with the situation; let us hope that it will produce salutary effect in the other Provinces, where they seem disposed to forget the rules of justice by threatening the minority with the loss of those rights which they possess here. * * * In conclusion, let me beg of you, numerous as you are, not to forget that we have formed the national party with your consent, with your support, with the consent and support of all Liberals in the Province of Quebec; that this party is the outcome of an honorable alliance and has enabled me to form the present Government which in its inception was called national, has remained national since, and will remain national so long as I am at its head.

"That is to say, we have broken from old party lines, we have given up certain traditions, looked upon as dangerous, and certain ideas condemned by respected authorities, in order to publish a new programme, sufficiently liberal to assure the public prosperity, but also sufficiently conservative not to disturb good citizens. This programme will be respected, this Government will be maintained, and this party will live under these conditions, and not otherwise. I reckon upon having all honest people on my side to enable me to keep this promise and to make this decision respected."

These are the terms in which the Hon. Mr. Mercier established the principles on which the national party in the Province of Quebec is based. These are the few remarks which I desired to make. I have endeavored to make them with all possible moderation, and I trust that I have not wounded any feeling which deserves respect. Before concluding, let me be permitted to thank the English members in this House for having taken up the defence of this beautiful French language, which we all love so much. One of them, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), has delivered, in this connection, an admirable speech. At the risk of losing his own personal popularity he has not been afraid to lift up his voice in maintaining the defence of the French minority in the North-West Territories, and in proclaiming at the same time the imprescriptible rights of the French language. We have in this courageous proceeding a new proof of his grand character, which enables him to rise above all narrow prejudices in order to render to every one what is due to him, without regard to consequences. Besides such noble conduct is not without precedent; we always will remember that it was his illustrious father who, in the old Parliament, raised his voice and asked for an indemnity in favor of the victims of the troubles in 1837 and 1838. For this reason, the names of both are written in ineffaceable characters on the ever grateful hearts of the citizens of the Province of Quebec. The abolition of the French language is asked for. Why? Is it because it was the first to awaken the echoes of the virgin forests of this country? Is it because French discoverers opened up to civilisation these vast Territories at the present time peopled by the English? Is it because French missionaries went and poured out their blood, in order to teach the Indians, who dwelt in these places, the first rudiments of christianity and civilisation? The country represented by the member for North Simcoe is situate on the shores of the same great lake which formerly heard the moans of the French martyrs, whom the Indians put to death with most horrible tortures. These were cries of Frenchmen, and at this time there were not there any Englishmen to protest against the use of the French language. These unfortunate Jesuits, who in this way shed

their generous blood, were far from suspecting that later on a member representing a county bearing the name of this great Lake would rise in this House to insult the French language. They were far from dreaming that this soil which they had watered with their blood would yield so bitter a harvest; they little thought that their great work would be in this way so quickly sent into oblivion by those very people, who, this very day, reap the fruit of their labors, as well as of their heroic courage. If the member for North Simcoe wishes to abolish the French language let him commence by tearing off from the coat of arms of the English monarchy these extremely French words: "Dieu et mon droit,"—"Honi soit qui mal y pense." These extremely French mottoes blaze above the heads of the judges on their bench. What does the member for North Simcoe mean by not having asked for the disappearance of the remainder of this barbarous old custom? How does it happen that he has not yet protested against the use of the French language in sanctioning the Bills in this country, as well as in England? You can never abolish the French language; for if, unfortunately, there are to be found men who desire its abolition, there are also men with honest hearts who know how to respect stipulations made in the past, and to place themselves above prejudices of race and religion, to whom is visible nothing but holy and immutable justice. Evil be to those who come forward in this way to light up the fire of discord and to appeal to the most dangerous prejudices. History will hold them severely accountable for their want of wisdom and patriotism. One of our poets, Fréchette, who has won so much honor for the French language in Canada, has, in some admirable verses, given advice which I recommend to the serious consideration of the member for North Simcoe:

"He whose glance governs the universe, in His wisdom gave this fruitful soil to the various nations, as a father's free gift. Christian feeling should maintain the equilibrium of peace among all the children in this common cradle. Their peaceful occupation has lasted for fifty years—the twig has become a great tree and spreads itself afar over the plain. Evil be to those serpents whose baleful breath spreads throughout its branches, pestiferous breathings of hatreds, conflicts and rivalries,"

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the sixth day of this debate, and, certainly, I think my hon. friend opposite will agree with me it is time it should be finished. I should like to ask my hon. friend whether he thinks we cannot have the division to-night.

Mr. LAURIER. I am quite sure, that unless we sit until 6 o'clock in the morning, we cannot have the division at this sitting. I will, however, do my very best, without committing myself at all, to bring the debate to a close to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is usual that there should be some understanding of this kind across the floor, and if I had some assurance from my hon. friend that we could close the debate to-morrow, I would not object to an adjournment.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will understand that this is a debate in regard to which it is more difficult than usual to have an understanding across the floor. However, I will say this: I

have every reason to hope that we shall close the debate to-morrow, and I will do my very best to bring it to a close then.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Under these circumstances, I will not oppose the motion of my hon. friend for the adjournment of the debate, and I will move that it be made the first Order of the day to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1 a. m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 21st February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 95) respecting Agricultural Fertilisers (from the Senate).—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McCarthy for second reading of Bill (No. 10) to further amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 50, respecting the North-West Territories; the motion of Mr. Davin in amendment thereto, and the motion of Sir John Thompson in amendment to the amendment.

Mr. AMYOT. Owing to the fact that this House consented, on my motion last night, to adjourn the debate, and owing also to the fact that a great many members desire to leave to-night, I will shorten my remarks as much as possible. Before entering into the merits of the amendment, which we have to discuss and upon which we are called upon to vote, I will say a few words in answer to the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). That hon. gentleman persists in saying that the treaties never insured to the French Canadians, or to those speaking the French language in this country, the use of that language. He has repeatedly said that the language is the essence of a people's existence, so it must be the first privilege of a people. I will call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the Articles of Capitulation of Quebec, dated 18th September, 1759, where we find the following as having been demanded and granted:—

“That the inhabitants shall be preserved in the possession of their houses, goods, effects and privileges—”

The word “privileges” is there. What privilege is greater than the language of the people?

—“granted upon their laying down their arms.”

They laid down their arms, to take them up again for the defence of the British flag. They knew only one language then, but, with their old gun and their old French language, they succeeded in keeping this country in the possession of the British Crown. Now, if the hon. gentleman looks

Mr. LAURIER.

at the capitulation of Montreal, signed in French and English, he will find that it is stipulated that

“The French Canadians shall continue, as subjects of the King, to be governed according to the custom of Paris, and the laws and usages established for this country.”

If that does not include in the first place the language, I do not know what it includes. Then I will refer the hon. gentleman to the Treaty of Paris, which was written only in French. It was signed on the 10th February, 1763. I have had the first article translated, because we do not find it in English. This is what it says:

“There will be an universal, and perpetual, Christian-like peace, as well over land as over sea, and a sincere and immovable friendship will be established between their Britannic Majesties * * * and between their heirs and successors, Kingdoms, States, provinces, countries, subjects and vassals of whatsoever kind and condition they may be, making no exception for rank or fortune; so that the High Contracting parties will bestow the very greatest attention upon the maintenance between themselves and said States and subjects of this friendship and intercourse, without permitting from henceforth, on one side or the other, the commission of any acts of hostility, either by land or sea, on any pretext whatever; and they will carefully avoid all that which might tend to impair for the future the union so happily established, endeavoring, on the contrary, to secure for each other in turn on all occasions, all which may contribute to their mutual glory, interests and advantages. * * * There will be a general forgetfulness of all that may have been done or committed before or since the beginning of the war now put an end to.”

You must not lose sight of the events of that time. There had been a fight; both armies had behaved most gloriously; we had about 12,000 men against 60,000 on the other side, and sometimes the fortune was for us and sometimes against us. The last battle, which was fought on the field of St. Foye, was in favor of our arms. But then the Governor de Vaudreuil, one of the most miserable creatures that ever came to this country, gave us up. After that our troops went to Montreal; our brave generals were discouraged at seeing such cowardice and such treason on the part of the Governor. But the Governor went up to Montreal and there again capitulated. Then our troops went back to France, and afterwards there was signed in France, a treaty between England, France and Portugal, which was a treaty of peace. The different countries that had been the subject of dispute were divided between these kingdoms, and it was a cession of peace and nothing else. That is the reason why, the other day, when the hon. gentleman spoke of the conquest, I said it was a cession, and not a conquest. I will now draw the special attention of the hon. member to chapter 18 of 14 George III, 1774, which is “An Act to make more effectual provisions for the Government of the Province of Quebec in North America.” The preamble says:

“Whereas His Majesty, by His Royal proclamation bearing date 7th October in the third year of his reign, thought fit to declare the provisions which had been made in respect to certain countries, territories and isles in America, ceded to His Majesty by the Definitive Treaty of Peace concluded on the 10th of February, 1773.”

I will not take up the time of the House in reading the Act; but I will quote, for the satisfaction of the hon. member for North Simcoe, sections 4 and 8 of that statute. In those times the use of the French language was looked upon as so important that in 1790 an ordinance was passed “for the better preservation and due distribution of the ancient French records.” In the face of that I

wonder how the hon. member can pretend that the use of the French language is not fully recognised by the treaties and the ancient laws. I will not take up the time of the House in reading any of these statutes, but I will remark that the British North America Act virtually makes the English and French languages official in this country. Then we have the Act which erects the North-West Territories and which establishes the use of the French language. Now, my hon. friend says that the perpetuation of a race is only possible by means of one language. I admit that there is a great deal in that, though I will not admit it fully. But in his mind the language is the essence of a nation. The second proposal is this: "We have the right to destroy you French, and we will do it." Well, I wonder where he gets that right. Is it in Divine law, or human law, or in the *ius gentium*? Perhaps he gets it out of some wicked hearts, as I do not know where else he could get it. I do not find any source or trace for such a right. He says: "Why do you get excited when I say that? I am calm," he says, "I am moderate, but you get excited." Mr. Speaker, a big man may come to you and calmly say, "Please give me your money." He may take a man by the throat and say, "Keep quiet and I will choke you;" and he will be calm, but he will not be just or right. It is perfectly astounding to hear the representatives of three or four millions say to the representatives of one million and a half, "We are going to make you disappear, we are calm, be calm." Well, a man who makes such proposals deserves simply to be laughed at, and that is the only answer I will give the hon. member on that point. Now, he says that we only want one language. Why? Is it for the good of the country? I presume that when there are two or three, or four races in a country, it stimulates them to good objects. Every one wants to do as well or better than his neighbor, and it is for the good of the nation. Is it for the peace of the country? Sir, we have had the two languages here since 1760, and have we had any trouble, have we had any fighting? In the United States they have only one language, it is true, but within a century they have had a war that cost more lives and more money than any other war the world has seen during the last 400 years. I do not see that any good reason has been given for the use of one language only. At all events, if it is necessary, it is now too late to say so. Confederation has gone into effect, and if one language only was necessary we should have been warned of it before we entered Confederation. It is too late now to tell us that we want only one language, one nation. If we want to change the terms and condition of the charter, we shall have to begin over again. If we are not willing to stand by the treaty that has been made, if we desire to change the conditions, then we shall have to begin at the beginning; because in law the consent of the parties is given upon certain facts, and when those facts are erroneous the convention is null and void. My hon. friend is too good a lawyer not to know that. Every time the hon. gentleman has a chance he brings up the Riel affair. I wish the hon. gentleman was in his seat; at all events, I will say what I intended, and he will be able to read it in the *Hanard*. What is the Riel affair? He does not seem to have understood it since it occurred, although it is a very simple matter. I shall

not undertake to discuss the merits of that affair, but I want to state how, as a matter of fact, it occurred, and how it presented itself to the country. Riel had had his trial and had been recommended to mercy. For my part, I had always looked upon Riel as having been a madman, working for a noble cause, if you will, but still a madman, who, when he spoke of religion or politics, became perfectly insane, so much so that he wanted to go to Rome and be made a pope. He wanted to rule over the whole world. After his condemnation and the recommendation to mercy, it was stated that the man was mad, and the Government became anxious about it, and sent doctors up to examine him, and we know what report they made. Under the circumstances, petitions were signed to obtain his pardon, and his pardon was promised us. Then, Mr. Speaker, there is this point to which I wish to draw the attention of my hon. friend: when the Government was ready to grant the pardon, or to confine the man in an asylum for the rest of his days, what occurred? Petitions were presented signed by those whom the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) represents. The question then rested between those petitions and the promises of the Government and the Province of Quebec. It had been promised by the Ministers, that if we prayed for Riel's release it would be granted. The Government preferred to accede to those people who signed those petitions, and that was the origin of the trouble to-day. The Government preferred to grant the request of those petitioners, and we felt insulted. That is the whole case in a nutshell. If my learned friend cannot understand it, I am sorry; but these facts cannot be changed. Immediately afterwards the ministerial papers and many others joined hands to form a new party, and, as we had to give it a name, we called it the National party. There is no more harm in calling it by that name than there is in calling our fiscal policy the National Policy. We had a right to use the word National as other men in other countries use it. We chose that name, and since then that party has existed in the Province of Quebec. It commands a majority in the Province, even although my hon. friend opposite (Mr. McCarthy) calls it a bastard party. I do not know anything regarding his domestic habits; but I may tell him that, in our Province, if a man used such an expression, we would say that he had been very badly brought up; and if he were to say that in a private house, he would be put out. I will not give the hon. gentleman any other reply, except the emphatic statement that our party is not bastard. It has for its parents, love of country and self-respect; but we would prefer that it should be bastard rather than it should have a father like the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It was under those circumstances that we broke away from our allegiance to our old chiefs. It pained me to leave the ranks of those with whom I had been fighting for twenty years; it was hard to give up all my old friends; but my conscience dictated my action, and I accepted the consequences. That party exists; and I must say to the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) that, if he does not know it, he reminds me of the old Frenchmen who are still working for Napoleon I.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I did not say this party did not exist. I said it did exist; but that the old Liberals still existed too.

Mr. AMYOT. There may be a few—there were not enough, at all events, to get power. But please remember it is a political party, whatever there may be in a name. I trust that certain parties will cease presenting the position of that party under false colors. I presume we have the right to form a party, and if it should not please us we have the liberty to give it up and form another. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) attacked our schools; I wonder if the hon. gentleman has ever read any of the books which are given to our scholars; I wonder if he knows what is taught in our schools! He seems to ignore the fact that in the Province of Quebec we have Protestant schools which are conducted on the same lines as ours, except that the Protestants teach Protestant doctrines and the Catholics teach Catholic doctrines; but as regards the rest they are the same. If the hon. gentleman wishes to visit our schools we will admit him with French politeness, with which we are trying to equalise British politeness; and if the hon. gentleman sees what is taught there, he will see that we teach our children to obey the laws of God and man, to be faithful to the Crown and to the laws which ensure the welfare of man and of a country. It is a singular habit on the part of that sect—I do not see there is any other name I could give it—to be always making an attack. We never attack. In the Riel matter we were on the defensive. The members of that sect undertake to attack our schools, but we never attack the schools of Ontario. Why do they not leave our schools alone, when we let their schools alone? let everybody mind his own business. Next, the hon. gentleman attacked Mr. Mercier. The politics of Mr. Mercier are discussed in the Legislature three months, and every day of the year in the press, and some persons hold that he is very good, while others say that he is very bad. The hon. member for North Simcoe, however, imagines that in two words he will condemn that hon. gentleman in the face of the universe. I only wish he would meet Mr. Mercier on the stump, and then the hon. member for North Simcoe would find that, in spite of his talents, it would be very hard work to convince his audience that Mr. Mercier is guilty of half the sins with which he is charged. Mr. Mercier has done more for the good of his country since he has been in power than the hon. gentleman will ever be able to do harm. I now come to the Bill which is at present under the consideration of the House. I desire to say a word or two in regard to the preamble. There is a great difference between the preamble of this Bill as compared with the preamble of the Jesuit Bill. The preamble of the Jesuit Bill was a recital of facts and nothing else, and we had either to accept the Bill as a whole or to reject it entirely. The preamble of the hon. gentleman's Bill, however, is a preamble for which this House will be responsible, and contains a declaration of principle. As the Bill is unacceptable to the House, an amendment has been proposed. The hon. member for North Simcoe wants to take away the whole of the French language in the North-West; but the amendment

Mr. AMYOT.

says: no; we will take only part away. It occurs to me that we are legislating to take away from the half-breeds rights secured by statute, without even allowing them to be heard or without consulting them, and without their being represented in any way; and this is done at a time when no one expected that any such legislation would be proposed. The amendment seems to be unjust to the people of the Province of Quebec. If we diminish the strength of the French language in any part of the Confederation, we reduce the strength of the language as a whole. That is unjust, because when we entered into Confederation it was promised that we would receive full justice and never lose any of our rights. Since that time we have been asked to contribute millions to open up the North-West and to build up magnificent railroads. Yet that is the way we are recompensed now. I think it is both unjust and unfair. I believe, further, that the passing of this Bill would establish a bad precedent, for if we once declare that we will change either the Imperial or Federal charters, the door will be opened for all kinds of trouble and confusion. Every year we will have petitions sent to England, or forwarded here, asking for repeals and changes, and there will never be peace in the Confederation. We should lay down the rule that our constitutional charters shall never be changed except by the unanimous consent of the parties concerned. The first change in those charters is to do injustice to these four or five thousand Canadians of French origin who live on the prairies of the North-West, and who have no representative in this Parliament. By the Bill proposed we do not confer any favors on them; we take away from them important rights without any reason whatever. I warn my friends from other Provinces who are in favor of the Federal system, that this first change may lead to other changes and that the end will result in legislative union. There is a germ of legislative union in the Bill of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It is an insult to nearly half the population of Canada; it contains false principles; and, unfortunately, the Government, to a certain extent, yield to it. The Bill is unjust to the half-breeds, because it takes away from them vested rights granted to them by this Parliament in the Act of 1877. If you give a man a hundred dollars, you have no right to take twenty dollars back from him; and yet this is exactly the way in which Parliament proposes to treat the people of the North-West. This Bill, if adopted, would be unfair to the half-breeds, to whom we owe much, because through them we have been enabled to make treaties with the Indians and to enter peaceably into the North-West. I have documents here, which, if I could detain the House by reading, would show that our possession of that territory is due in a great measure to the half-breeds. For all these benefits we have received, the recompense proposed by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is that we should take away their language and their rights. For years we have ill-treated this people. We sent a legion of surveyors amongst them to change the form of their lands, against their wishes, and when they complained we laughed at them. We pushed them to rebellion. When they held indignation meetings to protest against the conduct of the Government, we took that for a declaration of war and we sent our Mounted Police to fire upon them. Then we

sent four thousand troops against them, and at a cost of a hundred lives and six million dollars we managed to destroy their property and to kill many of them. There were the claims of Indians and half-breeds. To the Indians we gave land which was not transferable, but to the half-breeds we offered land or scrip. These children of the prairie naturally preferred this scrip, and besides the men who gave the scrip were the speculators with money and whiskey, who cheated them out of their property. This I know from my own knowledge, because I have seen it done. I shall not at the present time refer to the letter of Monseigneur Grandin, but we all know his complaints. It is our duty as a nation, having some respect for itself, that we should cease to inflict evils on the people of these Territories, and that we should not inflict another one on them by depriving them of their language. In the prayer you have just read, Mr. Speaker, we prayed God to have peace and harmony, and we should remember that peace and harmony are as desirable for these poor people as for us in this House. If we want to be just, if we want to be proud of being Canadians, we must see that this injustice shall cease. I do not say that it is altogether the fault of the Government, for probably they are not acquainted with the fact that this injustice is inflicted, but they should ascertain it, and I believe that if they did know the facts they would see that justice should be dealt out to these weak people. There is also another grievance to the effect that when the country was divided for election purposes, the division was such that the French people could not elect a representative. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) states that there is unanimity in the Council on this question. That is a very poor argument, when it is remembered that we began by preventing the half-breeds from electing the representatives they were entitled to. Such an argument will, I am sure, have very little weight with an intelligent body of men, such as compose this House. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that there is a national danger in abolishing the French language, as is proposed by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)? Do not you think the French language is the best safeguard against annexation? If the people of this country were all English-speaking, annexation would come in a very short time. What will prevent annexation is the determination of the Province of Quebec to maintain its own language. The people there are not willing to give up the present state of affairs and risk going elsewhere. If we were not a loyal people, if we were not devoted to the Queen, if we were not loyal to the Confederation, does it not strike you, Mr. Speaker, that we might apply to our neighbors in the United States, and to our million of French Canadians there, for help? The United States never took any country by force, but at the same time they never refused a country which wished to be annexed to them. We do not want annexation, however. We want to remain Canadians. We want to form a grand nationality composed of the different races. We want Canada to remain a great country, and we want to form a part of it; but do not abuse that sentiment. You who believe in divorce, do not suppose that we are disposed to endure constant insults such as those thrown at us by certain por-

tions of the English press, especially when they are repeated on the floor of this House by a party, led by a man of talent who stands at the head of the bar of Ontario. We are loyal, and we want to remain loyal. I repeat the words I quoted the other day, that the last gun which will be fired in defence of the British flag on this continent, will be discharged by a French Canadian; but there is another sentence which we must not forget, uttered by a traveller, who said that the first gun that would be fired for the independence of Canada, would be discharged by a French Canadian from the States. There is no danger with us. We are frank and loyal and just—just to the minority and just to every one; we never attack; we only want to keep what we have. Under the eyes of God, we want to grow and prosper with our neighbors and friends in this country, peaceably and harmoniously, and I implore that faction to stop their attacks, and to leave us to the peaceable enjoyment of our rights. What harm is done to them if our farmers speak French in their homes? When we come here as representatives of the people, do you find anything wrong with us—any dishonesty, any tricks, any complots against you? Are we not loyal subjects? Then, why not let us alone? What harm will it do you if the ordinances of the North-West Council are printed in French, so that the priests may read them to the loyal subjects who only understand French? What need is there to save a few paltry dollars, if, thereby, you throw the country into an immense danger? The responsibility of that faction is very great, but I know that the good sense of the country will soon put an end to their agitation. I am not threatening; I am only exposing the facts. If we want to form a large and compact country, let us not constantly be putting in the hands of one part of the population weapons which must be opposed by another part. Now, Sir, the hon. Premier through the hon. Minister of Justice, for whom I have the greatest personal respect, proposed the compromise amendment which has been offered to us. That compromise, I believe, is dictated by sincere and patriotic views. Whether I accept it or not, I am happy to see that both parties can forget their differences and join hands, in order to try to put a stop to this harmful agitation. It is true, the amendment itself attacks one of the roots of the tree of Confederation; but I am happy to see that the chiefs of both parties can agree to this compromise, without saying whether I can sanction it by my vote or not. In concluding my remarks, which I abridge so as to accommodate my hon. colleagues, I will repeat, that if we want the Confederation to go on, if we want harmony and prosperity in this country, we must cease to attack each other, we must respect the rights of each other, we must leave each one to the enjoyment of his aspirations, his religion and his language; we must give full liberty to everyone, so that all will be free to work for the common good of the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes, while I refer to some matters which I deem it proper to refer to before this debate closes. I can endorse, most heartily, the sentiment given utterance to by the speaker who has just preceded me, as to our regard to the mutual rights of the inhabitants of

the various Provinces. If we should treat each other in a spirit of disregard for those rights, it would be a misfortune, a calamity, to the country. I am not able to understand, however, that the rights of the French-speaking community of the North-West, with regard to language, are vested rights. They certainly are not vested rights in the sense of the rights conferred by the British North America Act on the French inhabitants of the Province of Quebec. These rights were granted by the North-West Territories Act in 1877, and, in my belief, it is quite competent for the Legislature which granted those rights to repeal the enactment by which they were granted. Now, I have noticed, in the treatment of this by almost all the speakers opposed to the Bill under consideration, a disposition to magnify the evils which are likely to result from this discussion, and to place on false grounds the object sought by the Bill, and the consequences likely to result from its passage. It is asserted that the Bill is conceived in a spirit of enmity to the French race, and that the effect of its passage would be to set the two races at each other's throats and to disturb all the good relations existing between them—that, in short, it is a public calamity, that the subject of the retention of the dual languages in the North-West should be mooted at all. If this is the case, we are unable to approach this subject in any sense without the consequences to which I have alluded. The real subject before us is not a design to assault the inhabitants of a great Province in this Dominion, to abridge their rights or to attack their language or their institutions, or to interfere with vested rights that exist in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act. That is not the design of this Bill. The hon. gentleman who brings this Bill before the House expressly disavows any such designs. The design of the Bill is to retrace the false step which, in the estimate of some members of this House, has been taken in forming the institutions of a new land, by repealing clause 110 of the North-West Territories Act and leaving to the people of those Territories the full and free exercise of Provincial rights in establishing their own institutions, without being handicapped by us by any legislation here, and thus replace them in the position of doing, as they should have had the right to do in the beginning, what they please in this matter.

Now, there are three plans before this House: There is the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy); there is the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin); and there is the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir John Thompson). The first of these plans is a direct one, and the one which I prefer. It proposes to settle this question at once, so far as this Parliament is concerned. The second is in some respect of the same character as the first. It proposes to recognise the assertion as true that the existing state of things in the North-West Territories shall not be insisted on as permanent by this House; but it proposes to remove from our shoulders the responsibility of dealing with this question and to relegate it to the Assembly of the North-West Territories after the next elections, when that assembly shall have power to deal with the whole question. Plan number three is not only indirect but partial. It proposes, in the same indirect way, to shift the responsibility from our

Mr. CHARLTON.

shoulders of dealing with this question and to place it upon the shoulders of the North-West Assembly, but it proposes to deal with only one feature of the case, namely, the use of the French language in the Legislative Assembly, leaving untouched the use of that language in the courts of the North-West and in the printing of the ordinances. In my opinion, the plan proposed by the hon. Minister of Justice is the least worthy of our consideration and support; and I must say that, after listening attentively to all the arguments advanced during the long debate on this question—which I do not consider a question that ought to create that degree of bitterness of feeling which exists—I am persuaded that we ought to settle this difficulty promptly and peremptorily in our capacity as the sovereign source of power in this matter, by retracing the steps we took in the year 1877. I cannot understand that the use of the French language in the courts, provided for by the 133rd clause of the British North America Act, contemplates the use of that language in courts such as these established in the North-West. The language of that section is as follows:—

“Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the House or the Parliament of Canada and of the House of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person, or in any pleading or process in, or issuing from, any court of Canada established under this Act, and in, or from, all or any of the courts of Quebec.”

Now, here is a remarkable difference in the language used regarding the courts of Quebec and the courts of Canada. Either language is to be used in any and all of the courts of Quebec, but they are both to be used in any court of Canada established under this Act only. What is a court of Canada established under this Act? The 101st section explains that:

“The Parliament of Canada may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, from time to time, provide for the constitution, maintenance and organisation of a general Court of Appeal for Canada, and for the establishment of any additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada.”

So that reference is had in this 133rd clause to such courts as may be established in virtue of the authority conferred under section 101—such as the Court of Appeals, the Exchequer Court, or any court established as a court of Canada for the settlement of questions pertaining to the Dominion of Canada in which our French subjects and English subjects will meet for the purpose of trying cases from all the Provinces. But this clause does not, in my opinion, interfere with or apply to the courts of any Province in this Dominion, except the specially named courts of the Province of Quebec.

We have had a great deal of talk about Provincial rights in connection with this matter. In my opinion, any action but that proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe would be a violation of the fundamental principle of Provincial rights. The hon. member for North Simcoe proposes to repeal clause 110. He proposes to give the inhabitants of the North-West Territories the right to form their own institutions when they become a Province; he proposes to leave them in the full and unrestricted possession of Provincial rights. But the amendment of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and the amendment

of the hon. Minister of Justice do not propose to do this; they only propose to make the condition, that we shall retain this authority and power which we have exercised and this law on the Statute-book until we have consulted the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories. The amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice proposes further, that we shall absolutely retain a portion of the abuse complained of, and only remove it in so far as it may apply to the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories; and neither amendment meets so fully the principle of Provincial rights as the proposition of the hon. member for North Simcoe, the essence of which is that we shall withdraw our interference, and allow the people of the North-West to deal with this matter themselves. That is the proper and the direct way to deal with this question. I see no reason to change the opinion I have formed, or to withdraw my support from the Bill, which I announced I intended to support. The use of the dual language and Separate Schools are local institutions, which we have no right, as a Parliament, to impose upon any section of this country. They are institutions which should be established, which should be arranged for, which should be legislated upon, by the Provincial authorities of the Province in which they may exist. I do not say that I would not consider that the Governor in Council has not the power to veto a Bill of this kind on the ground of general advantage or in the general interests of the Dominion; but I do say that, in my belief, the Government has no right to establish local institutions in any portion of the territories of Canada. For that reason, I believe that this clause 110 should be repealed. We must remember that Canada was formerly a military colony; we must remember that divergencies existed between the old French colonies and the English colonies in America; and these differences of opinion, these differences of institutions, and these differences of instincts, have, to a certain extent, come down to the present day. Canada was a military colony; it had feudal institutions; and the thirteen colonies were quite different from Canada. The Saxon colonies are quite different in many respects from the colony of Quebec; it is natural, therefore, that friction should arise between these two systems, and it is in the last degree unwise to extend the area of that friction. It would be much better to restrict it to the Province where the question under debate was first at issue, as we would do by repealing this clause and leaving the people of the North-West to settle the matter by themselves, than to set ourselves by the ears, from one end of the Dominion to the other, as we have been doing.

The hon. the leader of the Opposition has made a speech, which, I can say most sincerely, was, in my estimation, a most able speech, one which I admired exceedingly both for its spirit and tone, and for the tact displayed in it by that hon. gentleman in dealing with that question; and one which I admired also for the sentiments it breathed in defence of his race and native tongue, in respect of which I could almost respond to the sentiments he uttered; but I think he was mistaken in saying that this Bill necessarily provokes enmity between the two races, that it necessarily sets them against each other in a spirit of hostility. I do not think it is necessary to take that view. I

do not think the scope of the question extensive enough or the issues involved great enough to warrant the two great races setting themselves by the ears in this matter. It is a local question, a question affecting a certain locality in this Dominion, it is in one sense a small question at this moment, affecting only a few thousand people. It may be a great question as to the future, but at present it is a small question comparatively, and it is a question we may as well settle at once and take out of the way.

In the course of the speeches which have been made, I have been severely criticised in some respects. My hon. friend the member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry) took up an extract from a speech made by me at Essex (Centre) on the 12th July, in which I rather facetiously alluded to the alliance between my hon. friend the Minister of Customs and my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works as being rather incongruous, and said that, when they were lying in the same bed, the representative of the French nationality and the grand master of the Orange Order, that the friendship was rather a peculiar and suspicious one; and that I thought they could not both be acting according to their principles, and that I thought my hon. friend the Minister of Customs would be the one who would be sold. I do not know that that remark should be considered as offensive. We have seen other incongruous spectacles; for instance, during this debate, Pilate and Herod have been made friends together for we have seen the leaders of the two political parties, no doubt from patriotic motives, acting in concert; and that is a very unusual thing to see. They have been endeavoring to arrange this matter in certain ways, whereas I think the simplest way would be to repeal the clause to which I have referred.

My hon. friend the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), in the course of his very able speech, advanced the argument that it was necessary to keep up the French language in the North-West for the purpose of encouraging immigration; and the First Minister said he would be willing to have German made an official language there also, in order to encourage immigration. No doubt, he would be willing to go further and adopt the Gaelic or any other language for that purpose. The question is: is the retention of that language or any other necessary to encourage immigration into that country? In the year 1871, the hierarchy of your own Province, Mr. Speaker, issued a joint letter warning the French Canadians against emigrating to the New England States, which, it was said, would imperil their spiritual interests, which would prove very dangerous to themselves, and which was something they ought not to do. At the same time, the hierarchy requested the people of that Province who might desire to emigrate to migrate to the Canadian North-West. What was the effect of that letter; what was the effect of that warning and of those arguments; what was the effect of these mandates, in the name of the Church, upon the Canadian French of the Province of Quebec? Did they quit going to Massachusetts and flock in large bodies to the North-West? Did the existence of the dual language in the North-West draw thousands of the French Canadian people there, or did the fact that there was no dual language in Massachusetts and Vermont

prevent them from going to those States? On the contrary, there are to be found in the New England States more French Canadians than there are inhabitants in Manitoba, the North-West and British Columbia together, with a score or more thousand added to that number. They have gone to New England in spite of that mandate; they have gone to a country where English is the only language spoken; they have refused to listen to their own hierarchy; they have done what they were entreated not to do, and they have not done what they were entreated to do. I think that is a fair argument to show that the retention of the French language in the North-West is unnecessary to promote immigration to that country. The Germans go there, and the Icelanders go there, though their languages are not official there, and I do not think that the absence of their language as an official one is the slightest bar to their immigration to that country.

In connection with this question of the anxiety of our French friends for the continuance of their rights—and it is a most natural anxiety on their part—it is, perhaps, a little significant that, one after another, the municipalities of the Province of Quebec are abolishing the use of the English tongue. I am informed that the great majority of those municipalities have already abandoned it. Wherever a municipal council petitions for power to abolish the use of English in its proceedings it is very soon obtained; an order is issued in the *Official Gazette*, and the use of English ceases. In view of this fact, I think our friends should not raise so much trouble in reference to the abolition of the use of French in a country which probably has no more population than an ordinary municipality in the Province of Quebec.

The hon. First Minister warned us of the terrible consequences of drawing up two races against each other. He said this was a question which could afford to wait, and a moment afterwards he said: For Heaven's sake, bury this and get it out of sight. It is certainly lamentable that two races should be drawn up against one another; but, if one race is drawn up, if that race is acting and aiming at a common purpose, it may become necessary to have some organisation in the other race, and our French friends have never, in my recollection, or, so far as I know, in the history of Canada, failed to press their own claims and to stand by their own interests. It may be necessary to watch the opposite party, because their devotion to their language, their religion and their race—which may be perfectly proper in their case and from their standpoint—may lead to demands, which, in the view of an impartial observer, ought not to be granted. In that case, the exhortation of the First Minister to beware of arraying one race against another, is out of place, because the English-speaking population in this country have always acted in a spirit of generosity and a spirit of magnanimity; and if the English-speaking people think it necessary to take some precautions for the future, it is not in a spirit of enmity to the French population, but, looking at the great North-West with all its resources, regarding it as the foundation of a great empire, we are justified in doing so if we have arrived at the conclusion that it is better at the outset to have the institutions there formed on the proper basis, when it can be done without any great con-

Mr. CHARLTON.

tion, and to say that we will start with the English language and go on there with that language as the official one. I do not think it can be properly said by the First Minister that those who are in favor of that obviously common-sense arrangement are arraying one race against another.

Some of our speakers on this side appear to me to lack judiciousness. My hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), for instance, warned the French to beware of their enemies. Who are their enemies? I deny that they have an enemy in this House, or in this country, or that any demand is made in this Bill which indicates enmity to the French race in this Dominion. The hon. member from Iberville (Mr. Béchard), last night, in his temperate speech, spoke of the demagogues, whose designs were to provoke dissension and disaster. Was the hon. gentleman warranted in classing as demagogues those who seek for abolition of the dual language in the North-West? Is there anything like the spirit of the demagogue in this proposition to undo what we sincerely believe to have been a wrong step, and to place upon a proper basis the institutions for the future of a great country? If there is an act which is worthy of being characterised as an act of statesmanship which has come under my observation in this Parliament of Canada, it is an act of that character. Then the hon. gentleman read an extract from a speech delivered to his constituents last summer in which he proposed, as a remedy for all these unendurable evils which the French race was suffering at the hands of those who asked for equal rights—he proposes as a remedy annexation to the United States. Well, Sir, how much better off would his race be in that position? Would there be any less pressure that would tend towards unification of race and language? Would the influence brought to bear upon them be of a less aggravating character, if they wished to retain their isolation? Would the United States treat with a greater degree of forbearance than the Saxon population of this country does, the peculiar institutions of Quebec? Why, there would be danger of their being denied admission to the Union as is the case with Utah until they had adopted a Republican form of government and had rid themselves of medieval institutions.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior says: "Oh, this is a small matter; what is the use of making this row over a cost amounting to \$1,000 a year, or so? Let the whole thing go. Do not make the trouble you are making about this question." As I said before, it is not a matter of the cost; it is not a matter of the pressing importance of the question at this moment in any respect whatever. We are looking to the future, we are looking to the consequences in the future, and it is, because it is a comparatively small and trifling matter in itself, that we can now deal with it with so much greater facility and ease than we can by-and-by when it becomes a great matter, involving great issues in the North-West. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) tells us that the preamble is a matter of no great account. I agree with him. He says: Let the people decide. I agree with him most fully. The only fault I have to find with him is, that he will not act upon his assertion. He says: Let the people decide the question; and then he proposes to refuse to allow the people to decide the question. I say, let the people decide the question. Repeal the 110th clause, leaving

them perfectly untrammelled; let them start *de novo* and decide whether they will have the dual language or not; leave them perfectly free to deal with their local institutions, without interference or meddling with them on our part.

My hon. friend, the Secretary of State, who, I see, is in his seat, had some strictures to make on my remarks, and I will ask the attention of the House for a moment while I refer to one or two of them. The hon. gentleman told us that the Protestants of Quebec did not complain. Well, I do not know that the Protestants of Quebec have any great reason to complain; it would be, however, only natural, as they are in a very small minority in that Province, that they should be cautious about making complaints, because the evincing of a spirit of captiousness, or what is termed such by the majority, might lead to their having greater reasons for complaint. But I have heard complaints from the Province of Quebec. For instance, I heard complaints last year about the degradation of the degrees of Protestant universities.

Mr. LAURIER. That has been remedied.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, these complaints led to the remedy of that evil. A Bill has been passed to remedy the evil, and the passage of that Bill is equivalent to a confession that the Protestants had, in this matter, just cause of complaint.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). They have no other cause of complaint.

Mr. CHARLTON. I believe that all the grievances and the difficulties between the two races might be settled in the same spirit. Then we have the question of the division of the school funds. I do not know if that has been settled or not, but there have been some complaints about that—

Mr. LAURIER. That is before the Council of Education.

Mr. CHARLTON—taking the school funds paid by corporations, such as the Bank of Montreal, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, of whom the great majority of the stock holders are Protestants, and dividing the taxes paid by these corporations between Protestants and Catholics in relative proportion to the population, whereas they ought to be divided in proportion to the religion of those who paid the taxes.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Is that done in Ontario?

Mr. CHARLTON. Not now, but I understood that it was the case once. Complaint was made, and I think the evil has been remedied, although I speak under correction with regard to that matter. Then, the hon. gentleman makes an allusion to something which I have said in one of the speeches I made in the country, and which he thinks was of the most insulting character to the French population—something, I think, with regard to cutting a road to the St. Lawrence with the sword. Well, Mr. Speaker, upon one occasion, I forget where, when we were somewhat warm over these declarations in Quebec—and, by-the-bye, let me state that I am happy to learn that the language attributed to Mr. Mercier has been very much modified by a more authentic report of his remarks—but when we were somewhat roused by the talk about a French nationality, and French national institutions, and the building up of a French state at the mouth of

the St. Lawrence, I did say, I think once, in one of my speeches, that if the French inhabitants of Quebec attempted to create a separate nationality, planting themselves upon the St. Lawrence and denying the western Provinces access to the sea, in that case it would lead to an attempt to cut a road to the sea with the sword. I have nothing to retract upon that score. If that attempt were made, such a result would unquestionably follow.

Now, Sir, a few words with regard to my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) and the criticisms made by that hon. gentleman upon the remarks I had made just before he spoke. I may say that I spoke without due preparation; I had only the time between ten o'clock in the morning, and three in the afternoon to prepare my brief, and in the haste of preparation I probably did fall into some inaccuracy, and amongst these inaccuracies was one, technical rather in its character, with regard to the course adopted by the United States Government when Louisiana was purchased in 1803. I stated that the United States Government, from the inception, had sought by every means to secure a single language, and had abolished the use of the French. But I find that for the first few years that policy was not so rigorously enforced as later on, and the use of French was permitted, to a limited extent, and in that sense my hon. friend had me at a disadvantage; for I had gone upon the assumption that the well understood general policy of the Government had been more vigorously enforced than probably was the case at the outset. But so far as the policy of the United States Government was concerned, with the new states along the Mississippi where French settlements were established, and in all these settlements outside of Louisiana proper, the French language was never used officially at all.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Civil Code of Louisiana was printed in French in 1825.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am referring to the territories away to the north along the Mississippi and the Missouri. But I am free to admit that in this criticism upon the policy of the United States with regard to Louisiana, I fell into a technical error, although the position I took in regard to the general policy of the United States with regard to Louisiana and to all other portions of the country originally settled by foreign nations and incorporated with the United States, was perfectly correct. Then the hon. gentleman indulged in some criticism about the use of the pronoun "we"; he seemed to be under an apprehension that I would convey the impression that he acted with me, or believed with me, in this matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, I always desire to avoid giving ground for the charge of egotism, and, consequently, avoid, as far as possible, the use of the pronoun "I." I do not like to see a large "I" used too freely. But, on this occasion, I find that the hon. gentleman himself used the word "we" in his speech, and used it on several occasions. In speaking upon this occasion when I used the word "we," I used it, not as including those who disagree with me, but referring to those, be their numbers great or small, who agree with me in this matter. Perhaps, if it suits the hon. gentleman, I may use the personal pronoun "I" and ignore the "we"—ignore all who are associated with me in this or other matters. But, in my opinion, this part of the hon. gentleman's

criticism was a very "wee" matter indeed, and the spirit in which it was made was not one I admire very highly.

In the course of the speeches made by different members of the House, the motives of those who engaged in the Equal Rights movement during last summer have been very severely criticised. We have been termed fanatics and demagogues, and there is scarcely a term of disrespect in the political vocabulary that has not been applied to those gentlemen who saw fit to associate themselves in this movement in this House and in the country during last summer. I feel bound, under the circumstances, as the question has been raised, to say a few words in regard to this matter. What, probably, were the motives, I would ask, that actuated these thirteen men who stood up in this House and voted against the 188 members? What were, probably, the motives which actuated those men in the course they took after the prorogation of Parliament? Do you think, Sir, they were seeking after popularity? Was it with any desire to gain political advantage that those men united and embittered their foes and made foes of their friends? You, Sir, sat in this House on the night that vote was taken. Do you think any one of the thirteen stood up under flattering and encouraging circumstances or because there was a great advantage to be gained? No; no one will suppose that such was the case; and whatever may have been the motives which actuated those men, you can scarcely, under the circumstances, attribute that action to base, mercenary or dishonest motives. We felt that having taken that stand, it was perfectly proper to defend our position in the country. We felt that we were standing on principles that were just, and it was as proper to vindicate them upon the platform as upon the floor of the House of Commons. We thought we were resisting the investing of a dangerous order with special advantages and privileges. We may have been mistaken, but we believed that was the case, and, acting on that view, we submitted to the country similar arguments to those we had presented on the floor of this House. We believed we were resisting an unconstitutional reference to a foreign potentate. I believe it now, and believing it we felt bound to act on that belief. We believed we were resisting sectarian endowment from public funds. We believed this, and we held that it was establishing a precedent of the most dangerous character, and believing that we acted honestly before the country in denouncing it. We believed we were resisting a dangerous encroachment by clerical power. Believing this we denounced it. We did not propose, no man who has taken part in this agitation ever proposed, to deprive any subject in this country of any rights he possessed. No man has ever proposed to ask for himself what he was not prepared to give to every citizen in this country. We ask no special privileges; we merely resist the granting of special privileges. We ask equal rights for all, special privileges to none, a guarantee of the fundamental principle of liberty to the subjects of this country. I understand the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said he did not sympathise with the movement made by the Equal Rights party in discussing this question on the platforms of the country. I believe it was a proper way to influence public sentiment, and that it was necessary.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me for a moment to say that I do not think I said that; I did not mean to do so. I said I took no part, because I realised that no object would be gained.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understood the reason why the hon. gentleman refrained from doing so was because he disapproved of it, and I am happy to receive his explanation. This movement, which is decried and condemned in this House, has, I believe, accomplished something; and, I believe, what this movement has accomplished is of the most salutary character. It has certainly awakened public attention to the existence of a great public danger. I believe it is due to this movement that the agitation exists in Manitoba with respect to the dual language and the Separate Schools; and the abolition of both of those evils, as I deem them to be, may be justly attributed to the agitation that commenced with the vote taken in this House on 29th March last. I believe this agitation has succeeded in arousing public sentiment in the North-West with respect to the dual language, and the fact that we are discussing to-day a Bill with respect to the abolition of the French language in the North-West, and that we have in the North-West a sentiment so pronounced as to have demanded the introduction of this Bill, is due to the agitation of the question of equal rights up and down throughout the country since the prorogation of the House last Session. The harvest is satisfactory; the results so far are abundantly satisfactory, if nothing else is accomplished; and if this Bill passes, or if the North-West is relieved of the burden of the dual language, there is nothing else to ask for, because the Constitution grants the rest.

Mr. LAURIER. What about the agitation in Quebec?

Mr. CHARLTON. We do not expect to have any. I do not say there has been such an agitation. I say there has been an agitation in Manitoba against the dual language and separate schools, and there has been an agitation in the North-West Territories, and it is a foregone conclusion that in some way or other the dual language will be removed there. On broad principles we are dealing with this question, and our sincere desire is to secure homogeneity and assimilation. We desire it, we do not expect to force it, or that it will come immediately; we hope it will come some time by the force of circumstances, and we hope, when the day comes, that solution will be reached by a consensus of opinion among the people of the Dominion. We hope for this, and anything that will exert influence in this direction without trampling on the rights of others is something we may properly make use of. The North-West is virgin soil, and any seed that is undesirable should not be planted by us there. Our first Act with respect to this question was wrong; I believe we cannot do better than change that Act, and in doing so we will act strictly in consonance with the principle of Provincial rights. With respect to vested rights in the Province of Quebec, I repeat that, so far as I am concerned and my influence extends, I have no idea, thought, desire or purpose to deal with the Provincial rights of Quebec in any sense whatever. I may entertain my opinion as to whether

it is desirable for Quebec to have different institutions, and I may, in a proper way and on a proper occasion, express that opinion, I trust; but so far as regard dealing in any manner with the vested rights of Quebec, I would not be a party to such an attempt or countenance it in any way whatever. The proposal to divide the continent between the two races is unreasonable. I consider this country is under British institutions, and although the French language prevailed when the country was ceded to the British, and although the French language has been recognised and certain vested rights have been granted, yet the proposal to divide this great country between the two races and the two languages is unreasonable and unsatisfactory and not calculated to promote the future good of the country. The issue I think we all recognise is inevitable; no matter in what way we may deal with this question the dual language in the North-West is doomed. It is doomed, whether this Bill passes or not, whether the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), or even the motion of the hon. the Minister of Justice passes; in either of these cases it is useless to propose that the French language in the great North-West will be retained for any length of time, and to remove a source of irritation we may as well meet the inevitable to-day, and exchange clause 110 from the North-West Territories Act, and leave those Territories in a position so that when they frame Provincial institutions they may deal with the question as they may choose on the basis of Provincial rights.

Mr. HOLTON. I wish in a very few words to emphasise the position which I have so far taken, and in which I propose continuing, with respect to the measure now under the consideration of this House. And at the outset I would say that I fully agree with the majority of the speakers who have preceded me, in regarding its introduction under existing circumstances as a grave public calamity. The principle involved in this measure is, of course, a fairly debatable one. Yet after listening very attentively to the discussion of the past week, and more particularly to the speeches of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I am unable, in my own mind, to separate the Bill now submitted to us from those speeches, or from the utterances of himself and friends upon the public platforms during the past twelve months. In fact, Sir, the hon. member's advocacy of the proposed enactment is but the fulfilment of the promise or threat repeatedly made by him on the occasions referred to—the first step in his utopian scheme for welding and cementing the inhabitants of this whole country into one harmonious English-speaking people. I do not wish to impute motives to the gentlemen of the Equal Rights Association? Many of them are personal friends of my own: and, whatever I may think of their movement, I very cheerfully credit them with all the sincerity of purpose in which they claim for themselves, or to which they are entitled. Still, Sir, we cannot blind our eyes to the fact that, as a most lamentable result of the agitation which they have promoted and so persistently maintained throughout the country, the prejudices and animosities of the different elements of our population have been unduly aroused, so that to-day we find the public mind inflamed to a

degree that has probably not been equalled since the unhappy period of half a century ago. And, Sir, with the public mind thus excited and disturbed, this measure is forced upon the attention of the House, and in no sense as oil is poured upon the troubled waters; under such circumstances, the cool, calm deliberation to which a question of this importance is entitled cannot possibly be had. In this fact alone, I find good and sufficient reason for supporting any proposition having for its purpose the postponement of the consideration of the measure. There is one matter to which I now feel it my duty—as it certainly is my pleasure—to make brief allusion; that is, the gross misconception which unfortunately obtains in many quarters outside the Province of Quebec, as to the true relations existing between the two races in it—a misconception for which I believe the present agitation is very largely responsible. I may possibly be told outside of this House, if not in it, that I am neither qualified nor authorised to speak here, for the minority of that Province. Still, Sir, I am one of that minority; I have lived all my days in that Province; my acquaintance with its people is pretty extended. And, I do think, and believe, that I fully represent the great majority of my co-religionists there, when I say that on the whole we have not very much to complain of. I, Sir, am as staunch and pronounced a Protestant, as loyal to my faith, as true to my race, as jealous of my rights, and as fully determined to defend them at all hazards, as any man sitting in this House. But, Sir, I have never yet had reason or occasion to imagine for a moment that my civil or religious liberty—my life, property, or any of the sacred rights which are mine, as a free-born subject of Her Majesty—ever have been, or are ever likely to be, in one whit in greater jeopardy in my native Province, than if I were a resident of any other portion of the Dominion. Of course, Sir, (and more particularly in those parts of the Province where we of the minority are numerically weak) we do labor under certain disadvantages; the inevitable incidents, I presume, of being in a minority. Yet, aside from the inconveniences flowing from that source, and aside from the friction engendered by such movements as the present one, our troubles are but few, and it may be truthfully said that the two races do dwell harmoniously together.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HOLTON. Further, Sir, I feel it is but due to my neighbors and fellow-citizens of French origin to declare here on their behalf, that they are not, as a people, the intolerant bigots and fanatics that too many people in certain quarters are inclined to suppose them to be, judging them, as they unfairly and improperly do, from the unwise utterances of excited politicians, the intemperate writings of obscure newspaper people, or the occasional unlawful acts of an ignorant mob. These things are truly and sincerely deplored and deprecated by the vast majority of French Canadians, and in no sense or degree reflect their real sentiments towards their English and Protestant fellow-citizens. The French people are devoted to their church, loyal to the traditions of race and family, and attached to their country in a manner and to a degree which we would do well to emulate. And in these things they are entitled to our

deepest respect. Moreover, they are as peaceable, law-abiding, moral and kindly-disposed citizens as are to be found in any section of the Dominion; and I find that in the same measure that we respect their rights, feelings, opinions, and prejudices even, will they be found to respect ours. And just here, Sir, I would say that the true friends of the minority in the Province of Quebec are not those who, for any reason, seek to stir up religious or racial prejudices on the one side or the other, and that about the most dangerous foes we of that minority have to dread are those, from without the Province, who busy themselves discovering grievances which we do not feel to be such—or, perhaps, of which we know nothing,—and for which they are ever ready to prescribe heroic treatment. I would warn such to leave us to ourselves, for we are quite capable of protecting our own interests. And, for one, I have confidence enough in their sense of fair play and justice, to believe that, if left to the free exercise of their own impulses, the French Canadian majority will do all that in them lies — by legislation or otherwise — to render our position still more pleasant and secure. The French Canadians are, as a rule, quite as tolerant as their neighbors; and, at times, I am forced to the conclusion that in some things they are, perhaps, even a little more so. In illustration of this I would like to refer briefly to my own personal experience with them in public life; and my statement may, perhaps, prove a revelation to many to whom the idea of French domination is such a terrible bogey. Notwithstanding that about two-thirds of the electors of the County of Chateauguay are French Roman Catholics, that constituency has been represented in the Parliament of Canada for 30 years by English Protestants, my late father and myself. In my own three elections, my opponents were Roman Catholics; yet, in no instance was there any attempt on the part of residents of the county to raise the race or religion cry against me, and I have yet to learn of the first vote in any of these contests that was influenced by such considerations. I am naturally very proud of this record of my electors; but I must go still further, and say that, since I have enjoyed the honor of a seat in this House, no French Canadian priest or layman has ever intimated to me, directly or indirectly, the faintest whisper of a suggestion as to the course it might be wished I should pursue on any public question whatsoever. Having repeatedly sent me here as their representative, without exacting pledge or promise, they have left me absolutely to the exercise of my own discretion and best judgment. I am, of course, aware that my remarks have been a little aside the question actually before the House—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. HOLTON—but the debate has taken a very wide range, including the matters to which I have reference, and I wished, before its close, to say at least this much as a simple matter of justice to my French Canadian friends.

Mr. LARIVIERE. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. LARIVIERE. That is just what I am going to talk on—the question. After this long debate, I rely on the indulgence of the House to allow me to make just a few remarks. Coming from the west as I do, I hope I am entitled to a certain consideration,

Mr. HOLTON.

because I am very well acquainted with the people whose cause is now to be dealt with. I need not make any reference to the short Bill which has been offered to this House, because we have heard so much about it that I believe it is not now in existence; at least, after all the remarks that have fallen from the lips of the hon. members of this House, I do not believe that we shall ever be called upon to decide upon its merits. The cause of all this, Mr. Speaker, is undoubtedly the agitation which has been aroused since last year. When the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), the other evening, denied that he should be styled an agitator, I believe he did not say exactly what was correct, for anyone who peruses the speeches that hon. gentleman has made on different occasions must see that the expressions he used in those speeches are proof that he is the principal promoter of this agitation. I have in my hand a copy of a speech delivered by him in the city of Ottawa before the Equal Rights Association, from which I take the following extracts:—

“We have a record for eight months, Mr. Chairman—I mean the Equal Rights Association—which no political party could boast of in a decade of years, and if there are men among us now who want to go back to their old political alliance, I say, shame on them! They ought to be satisfied with what we have accomplished in so short a time. (Loud cheers.) What have we accomplished? Go to the Province of Manitoba, and what do we see there? Why, that Government is going to deal, not only with the dual language question and the iniquitous Act which would fasten it upon them, but with Separate Schools. I had the honor to stand upon the same platform at Portage la Prairie with the Attorney General of the Province.”— This is an honor that I do not envy the hon. gentleman—

—“when he announced his intention, in anticipation of the action of his Government, that he would cease to sign the official cheque for the publication of the statutes in the dual language, or cease to be Attorney General. (Cheers.) Do you tell me that the Equal Rights Association had nothing to do with that?”

Nor Mr. McCarthy, I presume—

“Of course, the feeling was there; the grievance existed. People's minds had only to be directed to it, and the moment attention was drawn to it the Province of Manitoba rose to a man and said, ‘We want no dual language, and away with Separate Schools as well.’ (Applause.) Let me prove what I say is correct. There ought to be no sympathy between Attorney General Martin and myself, according to old political doctrines. He is a Reformer and I a Conservative; therefore we should be sworn foes.”

But I believe both can be put in the same sack. The hon. gentleman came to Manitoba, and he made a speech in the constituency represented by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson). I did not see him in my own constituency, because the reception might have been pretty cold there. Hear what he said then:

“He was glad to notice that at last the Protestant minority in Quebec had waked up, and at an early date he hoped to have the pleasure of addressing them in Montreal on the question. They all had their hands full. In Ontario they would have to contend with the question of French teaching in the schools. In Manitoba they had the dual language to deal with, and in the North-West they had the same question.”

This is the key:

“As soon as the work had been accomplished, they would then be in the position to master the same difficulties in the Province of Quebec.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, if, after uttering such speeches, the hon. gentleman cannot be called an agitator, I really do not know what an agitator is. This question of the language as well as that of other privileges, which certain classes of the community

enjoy under the Constitution, is a very old question; and we have had, in the course of that debate, the history of all those privileges; but on account of the similarity of the case, I will refer to an Address which was passed by the Legislature of Canada, in 1844, to the Queen, asking that the French language be restored to the country. This Address was moved by the Hon. Mr. Papineau, and seconded by the Hon. Mr. Moffatt, on 20th December, 1844, and reads as follows:—

“That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, renewing the expression of the faithful attachment of this House to Her Majesty’s person and Government.

“Setting forth, that sensible of the advantages we enjoy from Her Majesty’s care and protection, which this House trusts may long be continued to us under Her Majesty’s parental sway, it is, at all times, the duty of this House to submit for Her Majesty’s most gracious consideration, such matters as may have a tendency, with any class of Her Majesty’s subjects, to diminish that contentment, which this House is well assured, Her Majesty desires should exist in every portion of Her domains.

“Representing, that the French is the native language of a very large class of Her Majesty’s subjects in this Province; of this class the great mass indeed speak no other language. In it the largest portion of their laws and the books on the system of jurisprudence are written; their daily intercourse with each other is conducted; it is the language in which alone they can invoke the blessings of Heaven on themselves and all that are dear to them. A language indispensable to so many of Her Majesty’s faithful people, cannot, they will believe, be viewed by their Sovereign as foreign, when used by them.

“Stating, that Her Majesty’s royal predecessors placed the languages spoken by the two great classes of Her Majesty’s subjects in this Province on the same footing, affording, in this respect, equal justice and equal facility to all.

“Pointing out, that this principle was never departed from until the Act re-uniting these Provinces was passed; that this House do not question that the best intentions and designs influenced the minds of those who enacted the provision which declared:—

“That all writs, proclamations, instruments for summoning and calling together the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly for the Province of Canada, and for proroguing and dissolving the same; and all writs of summons and elections; and all writs and public instruments whatever, relating to the said Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly, or either of them, and all returns to such writs and instruments; and all journals and entries; and written and printed proceedings, of what nature soever, of the said Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly, and of each of them respectively; and all written or printed proceedings and reports of Committees of the said Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly, respectively, shall be in the English language, only.”

“Stating, that in the very first session of the Legislature, under that Act, it was indispensable to translate into French every public record and document; that the debates were not and could not, unless a portion of the representatives of the people were silenced, be carried on without its use; that in courts and judicial proceedings, it was found equally necessary as before the Union, and for every other practical purpose, it is as much used as it ever has been.

“Urging, that the only distinction which exists, then, is, that the French is not permitted to be the legal language of Parliamentary records; a distinction of little value perhaps in itself,—one that cannot produce any beneficial result on the feelings or habits of the people using it; while it gives rise to a feeling among them injurious to the peace and tranquillity of the Province, namely, that this limited proscription of their language conveys, however undesignedly, an imputation of unfavorable distinction towards themselves.

“Representing, that desirous that the hearts of all men in this Province may be joined in unity, in attachment to, and support of Her Majesty’s person and Government, this House humbly petition Her Majesty to endeavor to remove this cause of discontent, and to recommend to Her Imperial Parliament, the repeal of that portion of the law which has given rise to it; assuring Her Majesty that such a course will be hailed, by Her Majesty’s loyal Canadian people, as an additional mark of her solicitude for their welfare.”

This was the position at the time when the French language had been abolished, and, acting upon the request of the Legislature, that language was reinstated upon the Statute-books. I have here the translation of a despatch of Lord Elgin on the same subject, in which he said:

“I am very anxious to hear that you have taken measures to abrogate this part of the Union Act that impose restrictions against the use of the French language.

“The delay happening in the execution of the promise made, I believe, by Mr. Gladstone upon this subject, is one of the points urged by Mr. Papineau to promote this agitation.

“Again I must avow that I am profoundly convinced of the impolitic character of all intentions of this kind to denationalise the French. In general it produces the opposite effect to that we have in view, and inflames national prejudices and animosities.

“But supposing it revives, what will be the consequences? You may be able to Americanise them, but believe me, with the same means you can never make Englishmen of the French population of the Province.

“On the other hand, they feel that their religion, their customs, their sympathies, and their prejudices, if you will, are taken more into consideration and more respected here than in any other part of this vast continent. Who would dare to say that the last arm that will raise the English flag on the American soil will not be that of a French Canadian?”

These are the words of Lord Elgin when it was asked that the French language, which had been taken away, should be restored. What is the position to-day? We have in the North-West a small population, it is true, but a population with the same rights as if they were much larger. These people have addressed this House in petitions which have been received here, and which, I must say, in spite of what has been said to the contrary, convey the expression of opinion of a large number of the people. I will read one of them, which is as follows:—

“Whereas, under the ‘North-West Territories Act’ the French is, equally with the English, an official language, the suppression of its use, as such, in the North-West, would be a flagrant injustice towards the settlers of French origin, who were the pioneers of this country, and towards those of the same race who, upon the faith of the Constitution and existing laws, came and established themselves in the North-West, and have contributed, with other citizens of other nationalities, to the development of the resources of the country.

“Be it resolved, &c., &c.”

I say, therefore, there is a similarity in the two cases, and I hope there will be a similarity in the results. The hon. member for North Norfolk has told us this afternoon that this measure of the hon. member for North Simcoe is not an attack on the rights of any section of our community, nor on the constitution, because, he says, the French have no vested rights in the North-West. Well, Sir, that is a question which may be subject to a certain amount of discussion; but there is no doubt, in my mind, that there are vested rights for the population of the North-West, as well as there are for the French population of the Province of Quebec and other parts of Canada. It is admitted that the British North America Act has restrictive clauses whereby the minority are protected in their rights, and these rights are acknowledged in the letter of the Constitution. They are of divers kinds. For instance, as has been stated by an hon. gentleman in this debate, in the British North America Act there is a provision whereby a certain number of counties in the Province of Quebec, which are supposed to be populated by English inhabitants, will retain their present limits until the representatives

of those counties decide otherwise. This was a sort of protection for the minority. Then we have protection for the minority in the Province of Quebec, in regard to the Protestants, and in regard to their schools, and in regard to their language, and we have protection in the Province of Ontario for the minority in regard to their schools. All through the Dominion of Canada we have protection in regard to Federal legislation, for the French language, and, in Manitoba, which was created by a subsequent enactment, protection is given to the minorities in regard to schools and in regard to language. But, astonishing to say, when the Province of Manitoba was organised, it was not the Catholic or the French minority that was protected by the enactment, because at that time the Catholics and the French were in the majority. Therefore, the laws which were passed in order to give a constitution to the Province of Manitoba, were passed with the view to protect the Protestant and English minority. To-day the reverse exists. The Protestant and English-speaking population has increased, so that now the minority is on the other side. What do we see now? During the existence of the former state of things, did we ever see the majority attempt to take advantage of their position to take away the rights of the minority? No; but to-day we see that the majority, acting on the views which have been enunciated by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), are passing enactments to abolish the French language in Manitoba; and we are also threatened with an Act to abolish the Separate School system there. I may quote from a letter which was recently written by His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface on the subject of the Separate Schools, and also on the question of the dual language. It is dated the 22nd September, 1889, and in this letter the history of the negotiations which took place at that time between the delegates of the North-West Territories and the Canadian Government here is given in full:

"I may be permitted to review certain portions of our history perhaps not too well known. In 1868 two delegates of the Canadian Government, Sir George Cartier and the Hon. Wm. Macdougall, were sent to England to negotiate with the Imperial Government and the Hudson's Bay Co. for the acquisition of Rupert's Land and the North-West Territories. After long deliberations, the conditions of the transfer were agreed to by the interested parties.

"Meanwhile Earl Granville, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, though rejoicing at an agreement he had so largely contributed to secure, felt a little uneasy about the future condition of the old inhabitants of the country, and, to relieve his anxiety, addressed to Sir John Young, then Governor General of Canada, a despatch dated 10th April, 1869, from which I quote the following paragraph:

"I am sure that your Government will not forget the care which is due to those who must soon be exposed to new dangers, and in the course of settlement be dispossessed of the lands which they are used to enjoy as their own, or be confined within unwontedly narrow limits."

"That Government, I believe, has never sought to evade its obligation to those whose uncertain rights and rude means of living are contracted by the advance of civilised men. I am sure that they will not do so in the present case, but that the old inhabitants of the country will be treated with such forethought and consideration as may preserve them from the danger of the approaching change, and satisfy them of the friendly interest which their new governors feel in their welfare."

We all know, Sir, what took place at that time on the banks of the Red River. I now proceed to quote from the same letter:

"To remedy the evil, Lord Granville telegraphed to the Governor General, advising the issue of a proclamation in the name of Her Majesty, in order to quiet the minds of the disturbed. In that proclamation of the 6th Dec., 1870, we read:

"Her Majesty commands me to state to you that she will always be ready through me, as her representative, to redress all well-founded grievances and any complaints that may be made or desire that may be expressed to me as Governor General.

"By Her Majesty's authority I do therefore assure you that, on union with Canada, all your civil and religious rights will be respected."

"Lord Granville, having heard of the proclamation and of the good-will of the Canadian authorities, wrote as follows to Sir John Young on 8th January, 1870: 'I observe with great satisfaction the anxiety manifested by the Canadian Government to avoid any collision with the insurgents in the Red River settlement and to exhaust all means of explanation and conciliation before having recourse to force.'

"Unfortunately the difficulties of communication prevented the knowledge of the proclamation being imparted to the interested parties at Fort Garry, and, on the other hand, the same difficulty of communication left the Canadian officials at Pembina in the greatest uncertainty. Expecting that the affairs were progressing, as understood when they left Ottawa, they thought they had but to proclaim the transfer and secure by force their entry in the North-West. They acted in accordance, but the result was altogether contrary to their hopes, and the difficulties were increased to such a lamentable extent, that Lord Granville expressed his regrets to the Governor General in a despatch dated 20th January, 1870.

"I much more seriously regret the proclamation put forth by Mr. Macdougall and the commission issued by him to Colonel Dennis * * * Those proceedings do not render Her Majesty's Government less desirous of the restoration of tranquillity under the authority of the Dominion, but they have certainly enhanced the responsibility of the Canadian Government."

"The trouble had assumed such a dangerous aspect that the Federal authorities demanded the help of men who could command the confidence of the disaffected. The Very Rev. J. B. Thibault, Vicar-General, and Colonel de Salaberry were sent to Fort Garry to make known to the people the good disposition of the Government towards them. A few days later, Donald A. Smith, Esq. (now Sir Donald) was sent as special commissioner under the Great Seal. The three were to act jointly with Governor Macdavis to secure the pacification of the country and to advise the old settlers to send delegates to Ottawa, to make known their grievances and desires. The Rev. Mr. Thibault was to distribute the proclamation on the 6th of December, but only after conferring on the subject with the Hon. Wm. Macdougall, who was supposed to be still at Pembina. The hon. gentleman had left, so the Rev. Mr. Thibault could not see him, and the box containing the copies of the proclamation was deposited at Pembina, pending new instructions. The three gentlemen sent from Ottawa did their best to establish confidence in Canadian rule. A convention of forty representatives from the different districts of the Red River settlement was summoned for the 25th January, 1870, at Fort Garry, with the object of considering the subject of Mr. Smith's commission and to decide what should be the best for the welfare of the country. The convention assembled and, under the presidency of Judge Black, discussed the affair for which they were summoned, until the 10th of February following, and they framed a Bill of Rights.

By a resolution passed unanimously, the convention accepted the proposition made to send a delegation.

The proceedings of the convention came to a close by the nomination of a Provisional Government having a President, a Secretary of State, &c."

"The President of the Provisional Government made known to the convention his choice of the persons he would appoint as delegates of the North-West, and the Secretary of State notified these gentlemen of the choice the President had made of them. The following is a copy of the letter addressed to one of the delegates:

"FORT GARRY, 21st Feb., 1870.

"REV. J. RITCHOT, ST. NORBERT, R.R.S.

"REVEREND SIR,—I am directed to inform you that you have been appointed by the President of the North-West Territories as co-commissioner, with John Black and Alfred Scott, Esquires, to treat with the Government of the Dominion of Canada upon terms of confederation.

"I am, Reverend Sir,

Your obedient servant,

"(Signed) THOS. BUNN,
Secretary."

"Unfortunately, the troubles were not at an end; within a few days most regrettable circumstances occurred, which prevented the fulfilment of what had been decided. The delegation was postponed and Bill of Rights put aside.

"At the same time Bishop Taché was requested to proceed to Fort Garry. The proclamation of the Governor General was handed to the prelate with request to give it to the insurgents, in order to determine them to make known their grievances, complaints or desires to the Governor General. Special importance was attached to a delegation, and to obtain it, Sir John A. Macdonald, in his letter to Bishop Taché, 16th February, says: 'In case a delegation is appointed to proceed to Ottawa, you can assure them that they will be kindly received and their suggestions fully considered; their expenses coming here and returning, and while staying in Ottawa, will be defrayed by us.'

"The new envoy, on his arrival at Fort Garry, communicated to the leaders the desire of both Imperial and Canadian Governments with regard to a delegation; he insisted on the necessity of the measure. The Provisional Government were very diffident; the delegates themselves, who had been chosen a month before, were showing great reluctance, specially as they would not be allowed to go, except on the promise of laying and defending before the Government of Ottawa a new Bill of Rights. After several days, all the details of the delegation had been agreed upon and the delegates received their credentials, dated 22nd March, all three alike, with the exception of the names. The following is a copy of the one handed to Judge John Black.

"To this I add the list or Bill of Rights mentioned in the same. The document is rather long, but as it has never been published before it may prove interesting to many as a historical document.

"Thus equipped the three delegates started on their way to Ottawa, leaving Fort Garry on the 24th of March, 1870.

"To JOHN BLACK Esq.

"SIR,—The President of the Provisional Government of Assiniboia in Council, by these presents, grants authority and commission to you, John Black, Esq., jointly with the Rev. N. J. Ritchot and the Honorable A. Scott, to the end that you betake yourselves to Ottawa, in Canada; and that when there you should lay before the Canadian Parliament the list entrusted to you with the presents, which list contains the conditions and propositions under which the people of Assiniboia would consent to enter into Confederation with the other Provinces of Canada.

"Signed, the 22nd day of March, in the year of Our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and seventy.

"By Order,

(Signed) "THOMAS BUNN,
Secretary of State.

"Seat of Government,
Winnipeg, Assiniboia."

"BILL OF RIGHTS.

"Prepared by the Executive of the Provisional Government and handed over to the North-West delegates.

"1. That the Territory of the North-West enter into the Confederation of the Dominion of Canada as a province, with all the privileges common with all the different provinces in the Dominion.

"That this province be governed:

"(1.) By a Lieutenant Governor, appointed by the Governor General of Canada.

"(2.) By a Senate.

"(3.) By a Legislature chosen by the people, with a responsible Ministry.

"2. That, until such time as the increase of the population in this country entitle us to a greater number, we have two representatives in the Senate and four in the Commons of Canada.

"3. That in entering the Confederation, the Province of the North-West be completely free from the public debt of Canada; and if called upon to assume a part of the said debt of Canada, that it be only after having received from Canada the same amount for which the said Province of the North-West should be held responsible.

"4. That the annual sum of \$80,000 be allotted by the Dominion of Canada to the Legislature of the Province of the North-West.

"5. That all properties, rights and privileges enjoyed by us up to this day be respected, and that the recognition and settlement of customs, usages and privileges be left exclusively to the decision of the Local Legislature.

"6. That this country be submitted to no direct taxation, except such as may be imposed by the Local Legislature for municipal or other local purposes.

"7. That the schools be separate, and that the public money for schools be distributed among the different religious denominations in proportion to their respective populations, according to the system of the Province of Quebec.

"8. That the determination of the qualifications of members for the Parliament of the Province or for the Parliament of Canada be left to the Local Legislature.

"9. That in this Province, with the exception of the Indians, who are neither civilised nor settled, every man having attained the age of 21 years, and every foreigner being a British subject after having resided three years in this country, and being possessed of a house, be entitled to vote at the elections for the members of the Local Legislature and of the Canadian Parliament, and that every foreigner other than a British subject, having resided here during the same period and being proprietor of a house, be likewise entitled to vote on condition of taking the oath of allegiance.

"It is understood that this article is subject to amendment by the Local Legislature exclusively.

"10. That the bargain of the Hudson Bay Company with respect to the transfer of government of this country to the Dominion of Canada never have in any case an effect prejudicial to the rights of the North-West.

"11. That the Local Legislature of this Province have full control over all the lands of the North-West.

"12. That a commission of engineers appointed by Canada explore the various districts of the North-West, and lay before the Local Legislature within the space of five years a report of the mineral wealth of the country.

"13. That treaties be concluded between Canada and the different Indian tribes of the North-West at the request and with the co-operation of the Local Legislature.

"14. That an uninterrupted steam communication from Lake Superior to Fort Garry be guaranteed to be completed within the space of five years, as well as the construction of a railway connecting the American railway as soon as the latter reaches the international boundary.

"15. That all public buildings and constructions be at the cost of the Canadian exchequer.

"16. That both the English and French languages be common in the Legislature and in the courts; and that all public documents, as well as the Acts of the Legislature, be published in both languages.

"17. That the Lieutenant Governor to be appointed for the Province of the North-West be familiar with both the English and French languages.

"18. That the judge of the Supreme Court speak the English and French languages.

"19. That all debts contracted by the Provisional Government of the Territory of the North-West, now called Assiniboia, in consequence of the illegal and inconsiderate measures adopted by Canadian officials to bring about a civil war in our midst, be paid out of the Dominion Treasury, and that none of the Provisional Government, or any of those acting under them, be in any way held liable or responsible with regard to the movement or any of the actions which led to the present negotiations."

"While all this was going on at the banks of the Red River of the North-West, great anxiety and uneasiness continued to prevail in the Colonial Office in Downing street and at Ottawa; numerous despatches and telegrams were exchanged between the two. The following will give an idea of what was desired, hoped or feared:—

"On the 5th of March Lord Granville telegraphed to Sir John Young: 'Her Majesty's Government will give proposed military assistance, provided reasonable terms are granted to the Red River settlers.'

"On the 17th of March the same to the same: 'Let me know by telegram when you know delegates have started from Fort Garry.'

"Sir F. Rogers, Under-Secretary for the Colonies, writes on the 22nd March: 'Troops should not be employed in forcing the sovereignty of Canada on the population of Red River should they refuse to admit it.'

"On the 4th of April, the Governor General conveyed by telegram to Earl Granville starting information: 'Smith came here on Saturday from Fort Garry with bad news. A Canadian called Scott was, by Riel's orders, tried by court-martial and shot, with the view, it is supposed, of compromising Riel's followers before Taché had arrived. They say the delegates are coming, but it is quite clear Riel will yield to nothing but force. Things now look, I think, very bad.'

"On the 7th of April, the same telegraphed to the same: 'Last of the delegates is expected at St. Paul on Thursday the 14th, the others arrived there to-day, and may reach Ottawa on Saturday the 9th.'

"Distressing as the news was, Earl Granville had still confidence in the negotiations he had so constantly urged; on the 9th of the same month he telegraphed to the Gov-

ernor General: 'Let me know as soon as you can by telegram result of negotiations with Red River delegates.'

'It is evident from the above documents that Her Majesty's Government had no desire to impose by force the sovereignty of Canada on the settlers of Assiniboia, but that they were exceedingly anxious of a peaceable settlement through negotiations with the delegates. No need to add that all this was said and done in perfect good faith, on the part of Earl Granville, and that Her Majesty's Government intended to bind themselves to protect and safeguard the agreement, secured not only with their sanction, but at their explicit and repeated request.'

'The two first delegates arrived at Ottawa on the 11th; in spite of what had been said and promised, they were arrested. This incident, which could have caused serious complications, was learned with regret by Lord Granville, who telegraphed to the Governor General: 'Was arrest of delegates authorised by the Canadian Government? Send full information by telegram.'

'Sir John Young answered the next day; 'Arrest of delegates was not authorised by the Canadian Government.'

'On the 23rd of the same month of April, Earl Granville thus informed the Governor General: 'Canadian Government to accept decision of Her Majesty's Government on all portions of the settlers' Bill of Rights.'

'The very same day the negotiations began at Ottawa. Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George Cartier were appointed by the Canadian Government to treat with the three delegates of the North-West.

'The first interview was merely preliminary. On Monday the 25th, the two Ministers and the three delegates met again; the delegates insisted on a written acknowledgment of their official position and declared that the list or Bill of Rights they had brought with them was the only basis on which they were authorised to treat with the Government. Objections were made, but after a long discussion, it was agreed that the written acknowledgment would be given next day, and the list be produced by the delegates.

'On the 26th, at the next meeting the promised letter was given by the Ministers and the List of Rights produced by the delegates, and, practically, the official negotiations began this day and lasted until the 3rd of May, when the principal points on the List of Rights were agreed upon, leaving some details for further consideration.

'It is not generally known that the new Bill of Rights was the basis of negotiations, but it is nevertheless the case, and many points granted, as expressed in the Manitoba Act, were demanded in no other document, except on the List of Rights presented by the delegates.

'The first article is a very important feature of this new Bill of Rights. It contains the demand for the establishment of a Province covering the whole North-West, with all the privileges and governing machinery appertaining to other Provinces, including a responsible Government. This met with strong objections, but at last was conceded on the condition of reducing the new Province to very small proportions.

'Article II also caused a long discussion; it asked for the control of all the lands of the North-West by the Local Legislature. To this, both the Imperial and Canadian authorities refused to accede, but to condone for this refusal they gave to the children of the half-breed inhabitants of the country one million four hundred thousand acres of land, which had not been asked for, and with the understanding that by-and-bye they would also give some lands to the parents of those children and to other old settlers.

'The question of separate schools, as demanded in the 7th article of the List of Rights, was taken into consideration; the delegates were promised that they would not only have the benefit of the provisions of the 'British North America Act,' but they might rest assured and might assure the people of the Red River, that separate schools would be guaranteed to them.

'The recognition of the use of the French language, as an official language, was conceded as expressed in the 16th article of the List of Rights, with the promise that attention would be paid to the demands of the 17th and 18th articles, as in fact it has been done, if not completely, at least enough to satisfy the interested parties.

'The whole list having been examined, accepted, modified or rejected to the satisfaction of the negotiating parties, the Governor General telegraphed to Earl Granville on the 3rd of May: 'Negotiations with the delegates closed satisfactorily.'

'The negotiations had been asked for, they had been urged both by the Imperial and Federal authorities, the Government of Her Majesty had exacted from the Canadian Government the acceptance by the latter of the decision of the former on all points of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. LARIVIERE.

They had sent an official envoy to Ottawa to watch the conference, and when it is announced that the negotiations are closed satisfactorily it must mean that the Imperial Government is satisfied that its views on this subject will be carried out, and that no inferior authority would have power to disturb them.

'Lord Granville, in one of his despatches, says: 'I am glad to learn that the proceedings adopted against the Rev. Mr. Ritchot and Mr. Scott were promptly disposed of, and had not been renewed; and I take this opportunity of expressing the satisfaction with which I have learned from your telegram of the 3rd inst., that the Canadian Government and the delegates have come to an understanding as to the terms on which the settlement of the Red River should be admitted into the Dominion.'

'All this is previous to the Manitoba Act; it is a treaty between contracting parties placed on a certain footing of equality, as the Government of Her Majesty had declared 'troops should not be employed in forcing the sovereignty of Canada on the population of the Red River, should they refuse to admit it.'

These are the conditions upon which all that territory entered into the Confederation, and, therefore, when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said there are no vested rights, I say there are, and those rights are contained in the agreement, or in what I might call the treaty which was entered into between the authorities of this country and the people of the North-West through their representatives.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. LARIVIERE. I think I am dealing with the question. This question of the dual language has been discussed in the North-West Legislature. We have had here an address from that noble body which I will not read because it is already on record. That address was prepared by a sub-committee of the Council, and upon receiving that address the Council had a debate. The chairman of the committee who prepared the address, laid it on the Table, and a short debate followed. From the local paper there I quote the following:—

'Mr. Justice Rouleau asked hon. gentlemen to give their reasons for wishing to abolish the dual language which had been in their Constitution for so many years.

'Mr. Mitchell also asked for reasons. What harm had the French language done? What objection had there been to it? It was a little expensive, but the expensive way was the best. They were asking for a law to deprive the oldest residents of the country—the pioneers—from reading their own language.

'Mr. Oliver supported the contention of the judge. As a matter of courtesy, the members who introduced this question should give an explanation of their reasons.'

Well, Sir, we have the explanation of the chairman of that committee in bringing down that report.

'Mr. Cayley went over the history of the enactment of the section imposing the dual language in the North West, it having been put in at the instance of Senator Girard fourteen years ago. The discussion in his own district was to one effect, that the continuance of the dual language in the North-West was unnecessary. When a question of this sort, which might hurt the feelings of some of the residents of the country, came up, it was best that members should not state all their private reasons.'

This is the reason given—that is to say, no reason at all was given, because it was assumed that it would not be well to state the private reasons. So this document, which has been termed an address of the North-West Council to this House, was decided upon not for public purposes, not for the benefit of the public at large, but for private reasons that could not be stated publicly; and we are to-day called upon to act upon the request of men who pretend to have reasons, but private reasons such as cannot be stated publicly. Mr. Thorborn said:

"It was stated as the opinion of the assembly that the sentiment of the people was against the continuance of the section. This was very signally acknowledged by the Executive, on opening the session, by his not reading the speech in French as well as English."

There we find a reason at last :

"Mr. Mitchell again asked what harm the dual language did. They proposed to take away a right from a certain class of the people. There was no common sense in it."

This is the debate. But no reasons were given, no more reasons were given than those which we see in the reports of the proceedings of that Council. This address was passed, it is true, but we have a very long and able speech made by Mr. Justice Rouleau. Unfortunately that gentleman is only an *ex-officio* member of the Council, and could not give his vote against the address that was presented at the time. Now, I wish to refer, *en passant*, to some of the judge's remarks. It appears that the hon. member for North Simcoe has some admirers in the North-West Territories; that he has created a certain school, which, however, is no school at all. He has followers there—anti-Frenchmen. When His Excellency the Governor General visited that country last summer, at Calgary they built an arch over the roadway opposite the hotel, and, of course, the most appropriate motto that could be put on that arch was the motto of His Excellency's coat-of-arms—*sans changer*. But that was French, and the people had the greatest objection to put a French motto in the streets of Calgary. So they went on and translated it, and put up the words "no change." But as the arch happened to be opposite a hotel, the poor hotel-keeper did not have a single customer on that day, because everybody was afraid to go in there for fear that they would get no change. But here is something extraordinary, Mr. Speaker, though not a similar case, which happened a few years ago in the Province of Ontario, in a little town called—shall I name it?—St. Thomas. There is in that town a young ladies' school, and although they may be admirers of the hon. member, still they love the French language in that institution. Of course, they had to have a motto for their school. It was somewhat of an ambitious motto, I dare say, and, perhaps, it well became this institution, because it was a very good institution. Of course, an institution, like a nobleman, must have a motto, if nothing else. They had to have a motto from some other language than the English, and without having the fear of the hon. member for North Simcoe before their eyes, they adopted—not a Latin or a Greek motto—but a French motto, because all great men have French mottoes, and in that respect they differ from my hon. friend, whose motto is anti-French. Well, they selected a sentence in English, which, translated into French, would make a splendid motto. Their idea was to convey the impression that their institution was second to none in the country; and they took the two shortest words they could find in the English language and translated them into French. They took "second to none," which means "never behind," and so they looked up a French dictionary and found that a literal translation of "never behind" was *jamais en derriere*. Well, Sir, when I was called away from the question a little while ago, I was giving the history of that address presented by the North-West Council.

There is a point upon which I wish to call the attention of this House. We have been asked to trust to the majority of the people of the North-West for the future of our interests, to trust them for the preservation of our rights, for the maintenance of our religion, our schools, and even our language. Now, the other day, in voting in favor of the amendment of my hon. friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), we refused to accept the suggestion that had been made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I wish to show you that we were perfectly right in refusing to accept the amendment of the member for West Assiniboia, and in accepting the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier, because the history of what has taken place in Manitoba is certainly not satisfactory, and is a proof that if in the future we are treated in the same manner as we have been in the past, we are not so certain about the safety of our rights and interests. As I told you a little while ago, under the Constitution of Manitoba we have rights in regard to our language and to our schools, and those rights and claims cannot be interfered with. Moreover, at the time of Confederation, our then Lieutenant Governor, whom I am glad to see on the floor of this House, Sir Adams Archibald, took every precaution to prevent friction between the two classes of the community who were then very excited after the little rebellion that had taken place. The then Lieutenant Governor gave to each class of the community a fair, just and proper representation. Although the French had a small majority and the Catholics a small majority, the Lower House—and we had two Houses—was divided into 24 constituencies and sub-divided, so that 12 members were given to the English-speaking Protestant community, and 12 members who could be returned by Roman Catholics, whether Irish, English or French. The Upper House was composed of seven members, and the Roman Catholics were given a majority of one on account of a majority of people of that faith in the Province. Thus the then Lieutenant Governor dealt with the question in a liberal-minded manner, to the satisfaction of every class. Later on we were asked to abolish our Legislative Council. The Council was the only safeguard we possessed after the influx of population had taken place, and the Catholic and French population had been outnumbered, and if the Council had been retained the rights of the majority could never be endangered. A debate took place in the Legislature on that proposition. In that debate the French members complained strongly that they were asked to vote away the only safeguard they possessed—the Upper House. What took place at that time? The English-speaking members came to the front, and said: We must do away with the Upper House because the Federal Government, led by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, insisted upon a reduction of the expenses of the Administration and insisted on the abolition of the Upper House, and if the request is not acceded to we will not get the better terms which are so much required. The French members accepted the proposition, on the promise that on no occasion would they have reason to complain of any attempt on the part of the majority to interfere with the rights of the minority. I have extracts from speeches made at that time. This is what Mr. W. F. Luxton, who was then member for Rockwood, said :

"There were some questions of settlements which lay close to the hearts of the French people, and he could assure them that, notwithstanding the movements of the member for Kildonan (John Sutherland), the English members would not ruthlessly deal with these if the French representatives were sufficiently patriotic to support the measure before the House. They would recognise their generosity and not forget it."

Another member, quoting from the late Francis Evans Cornish, who was then representing High Bluff, a distinguished advocate, and at one time Mayor of Winnipeg, sitting in his seat and speaking on the same question, said:

"He believed the old settlers and the French would make common cause if their rights were infringed upon, and he could assure them when the Canadian party became the very great majority it would not be found oppressive."

In its issue of the 12th February, 1876, the *Free Press* gave the reasons why the French members voted in favor of the abolition of the Legislative Council:

"On the profession of liberality made by the English-speaking representatives upon the floor of the House, under these circumstances, every French member of the Assembly voted in favor of the measure."

This is a treaty entered into between the French and English-speaking members of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba, when the French members were asked to surrender their right to the Legislative Council, which was their safeguard, and to trust to the future, relying on the promises of the hon. members who were then representing the English-speaking portion of the population. What has been the result? To-day legislation is being passed, in that very Legislature, unanimously passed, by the English-speaking members of the House, to abolish the French language, and they are going to abolish the Separate Schools in the face of the agreement solemnly entered upon in the Legislature by their predecessors. In the face of that fact, can it be matter of surprise that we should be reluctant to accept anything less than the fullest guarantee that this House can give? But we have trusted the future before, and we are willing to trust it again; but I hope we will never have the same history repeated as that which we have to record with regard to the Province of Manitoba. It may be said: You will not meet with the same fate in the North-West. I hope such may be the case; but as all sorts of extraneous matters have been brought into the discussion, I will quote a paragraph from a newspaper. The *Moosomin Courier* on 5th September, 1889, published an article headed "One people, one Language." It said:

"Are they [the Roman Catholics] a superior kind of people from Protestants, that they hold themselves aloof by having separate schools."

"To private schools no one can object, but we most emphatically protest against separate schools being maintained by the Government, for any denomination other than Protestants. Our motto is: 'One People, One Country, One Religion.'"

This is the kind of literature that is being circulated by the newspapers in the North-West. Knowing these facts, are we to be blamed if we resist any attempt to deprive us of what we consider and claim to be our vested rights, and if we ask this House, in which we have perfect confidence, not to delegate its power to the Legislatures, which do not view matters in the same light as we view them? I believe we should be thankful to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), for having brought on this

Mr. LARIVIERE

debate. We are already beginning to feel the good results that will come out of it. I am to-day in receipt of a newspaper published in Winnipeg, a paper that has always advocated the abolition of the French language in the Province of Manitoba—the *Manitoba Free Press*. In the course of an article it says:

"In Manitoba we have abolished, as we think, the use of the French language and are now proceeding against Separate Schools. From the light of the recent debate at Ottawa, it would not seem so sure that we have been right in assuming to settle the language question alone."

This is the beginning of the result that we are going to derive from this debate, and therefore I am not sorry that it has taken place. I shall lay aside several matters that I intended to bring before the House, and I will conclude my remarks by stating that what has been said by some hon. gentlemen to the effect that the French language was not recognised in the United States was erroneously so stated. I take from "The American Statute Law" the following:—

"The language taught in the schools is, by the Constitutions of three States, to be English; but in Louisiana the instruction may be given in French."

From the same book, "The American Statute Law," I take the following:—

"By the constitutions of four States the laws, public records and written legislative and judicial proceedings shall be promulgated, and preserved in the English language only. But in Colorado, laws are also to be published in English and German, and in Louisiana the Legislature may provide for the publication of laws in the French language, and that judicial advertisements in certain designated districts may be made in French. So in Missouri, certain charters, &c., in the German language. So in Maryland, proposed amendments to the constitution, in German."

We see from this that there are only four states where the English language is at all the official language. From this authority (which, being the statute law of the United States, cannot be questioned), we can see what takes place with regard to the language question right across the lines; the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to the contrary notwithstanding. I could cite some other instances to prove the law in the United States with regard to this matter, but I think this ought to be sufficient to convince hon. gentlemen. Let me just quote something with regard to the French language in the Island of Jersey. So much has been said about the other British colonies that I will not refer to them. I will quote from a book written by Abraham J. LeCras, entitled "The Laws, Customs and Privileges, and their Administration, in the Island of Jersey," as follows:—

"*Language*.—Notwithstanding English is now generally spoken in the Island, the language of the State and of the Court is a French dialect peculiar to ancient Normandy, and which operates very much to the prejudice of English suitors, whose causes are usually the most important that are brought before the local tribunals, because a sworn interpreter is not appointed. In the case of Godfray on the prosecution of the Crown v. Robertson (1838) on the demand of the defendant that the said Godfray, who was a witness, should give his deposition in English, as the former did not understand French, the Court (Bisson and E. Nicolle), on the conclusions of the Attorney General, overruled the demand, and decided that it was only Her Majesty in Council who could alter the form of proceeding in this bailiwick."

We see from this that even in an English colony the French language alone is official. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has read some telegrams which he has said to have received from the North-West, where assemblies

or meetings have been held, declaring that the mass of the people were in favor of the abolition of the French language. I am in receipt of an address from Qu'Appelle, dated the 7th of February, 1890, in which it is stated (I translate from the original French):

"Please accept profession of our profound gratitude for the opposition you have given to the Act concerning the abolition of the French language in the North-West Territories, and for your vigorous defence of our rights, &c., &c."

I shall not take time to read the whole document. This is signed by 217 people; and amongst those who signed I find the names of J. B. Farrell, C. B. Spencer, W. H. Finnerty, J. A. Crooks, J. R. Oliver, and others. About one-third of the names are of English, Scotch, Irish, and even German-speaking persons, and they congratulate me on the stand I took when the first reading of this Bill was proposed to this House. Here are 217 names of opponents to this Bill from one locality alone; so that the unanimity which we have been told existed in the North-West in favor of the abolition of the French language does not exist. I have to thank the House, Mr. Speaker, for the attention which has been paid to my remarks; and I am sorry that I have felt it my duty to detain you so long. I have again to express the hope that the proposition made by the hon. Minister of Justice will be accepted. I, for my part, accept it as a compromise, although I do not admit that this House has the right to ask us to deprive the French people of the North-West Territories of a single portion of what I consider to be their rights. Yet, in order to promote the peace and tranquillity of this Dominion, I accept this amendment as a compromise, and I hope that the House will unanimously endorse it. I trust that in the future we shall have no reason to complain of the position we have taken to-day.

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

After Recess.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would suggest, as this is the seventh day on which we have been discussing the measure which was before the House this afternoon, that the consideration of private Bills should be postponed until Monday. All the members in town having charge of private Bills consent to this postponement. I, therefore, propose that we should go back to the Order of this afternoon.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have much pleasure in supporting that. I think it is a very reasonable proposition.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I desire, with the permission of the House, to offer a few remarks in explanation of the reasons why I cannot support the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister of Justice, and seconded by the hon. Secretary of State. It has been stated, in justification of that motion, that it is a compromise between two contending parties whose extreme views could not be reconciled. But I have not heard that the party most interested in this question, that is to say, the French population of the North-West Territories, have been consulted or represented in this compromise; on the contrary, it appears that the two wings of the Government party in this House, French and English, have agreed to settle

their differences by sacrificing the rights and privileges of the French population of the North-West. To effect that object, they agree upon this compromise amendment, which professes to maintain the rights and privileges of the French-speaking people in the old Provinces of Canada; but the rights and privileges of the French people of the North-West are to be left to the tender mercies of a council, which, according to the hon. member for North Simcoe, has intimated to the Lieutenant Governor that if he should dare to speak French in their presence, they would leave the Chamber in a body. A compromise proposed under such circumstances I cannot accept; I cannot agree that under one pretence or another the constitutional rights of the minority in the North-West should be sacrificed. Some people are willing that those interests should be sacrificed in the name of Provincial rights or Provincial autonomy; but there is no question of Provincial rights or Provincial autonomy in the present instance. There are no Provinces in the North-West Territories which are under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament, and are to a great extent governed by laws enacted by this Legislature. But even were Provincial rights in question, there are some rights which have been put above all others—above even Provincial rights—by the Imperial Parliament; these are the rights of minorities. Now, it is proposed by this compromise amendment, to leave the rights of the minority in the North-West to the control of the Legislative Assembly there after the next general election. If that course is the right one, how is it that the Imperial Parliament, in the Act of 1867, did not leave to the Parliament of Canada the right of deciding whether one language or two should be spoken in this chamber, and whether its proceedings and records should be printed in one or two languages? And how is it that the same control was not given to the Legislature of the Province of Quebec over the language of its proceedings and records? The fact that this subject, so far as it concerned the Dominion and the Province of Quebec, was settled by the Imperial Parliament in the Confederation Act, proves that it is not of the essence of Provincial rights that a Provincial Legislature should have the power of deciding in what language its proceedings should be carried on, or its records printed. Now, I contend that we are in the midst of a crusade organised by the hon. member for North Simcoe for the purpose of depriving the French population of their language, their institutions, and their schools. His programme has been promulgated in Ontario, Manitoba, and the Territories, and we are asked to-day to help him to carry out his scheme. That hon. gentleman, both in this House and outside of the House, has stated that his programme for his future lifetime is the abolition of the French language in Manitoba and the North-West, the abolition of the Separate Schools in Ontario, the abolition of the French language in the House of Commons, and, in the course of time, the abolition of the French language, in the Province of Quebec, although he does not expect to succeed for several years. Now, what is the object of the proposition made by the hon. Minister of Justice, in the opinion of all the newspapers, French and English, Liberal and Conservative, which have discussed the

hon. Minister's proposition during the last three days, as well as in the opinion of a great many members who have discussed the matter? It is agreed that that proposition is really the McCarthy Bill in disguise. The *Star* of Montreal is a very influential Tory paper, enjoying one of the largest circulations in Canada, and it stated immediately after the amendment was proposed:

"The vote on Mr. Beausoleil's amendment to Mr. McCarthy's Bill is an indication that one of the motions now before the House to bring about the abolition of the dual official language system in the North-West will be carried by a considerable majority. Evidently the House will not adopt Mr. McCarthy's motion under any circumstances, but for all practical purposes it does not make much difference whether the House takes the bitter McCarthy pill, the same pill sugar-coated by Mr. Davin or the same pill sugar-coated by Sir John Thompson. * * * Mr. Davin's amendment to allow the North-West Assembly to relieve Parliament of the responsibility of abolishing the dual language system after the next election, and Sir John Thompson's amendment in other words to do precisely the same thing. The difference between Sir John Thompson's amendment and Mr. Davin's is that Sir John's begins by affirming the covenant rights of the French to the official use of the French language and denying that community of language is in the interests of national unity, and ends by giving the Local Assembly power to smash the alleged covenant and establish community of language, while Mr. Davin's amendment leaves the covenant alone. * * * Whether Sir John Thompson's amendment or Mr. Davin's amendment carry, Mr. McCarthy will have brought about the abolition of the dual language system in the North-West."

The *Witness*, which is an extreme Protestant paper, and which, though it pretends sometimes to be Liberal, is very illiberal at bottom, said:

"The Dominion Parliament, in passing this resolution and empowering the Assembly to take action, as well as in suggesting it, is responsible, in spite of itself, for the settlement which is to follow. The French-speaking, that is, the French and half-breed population of the North-West is not so insignificant as we assumed from declarations in Parliament, which remains uncontradicted. In 1885 it formed about twenty-four per cent. of the enfranchised population of the Territories, and about twelve per cent. of the whole population, Indian and white. What the verdict of the Territories will be, is clearly evident beforehand, especially as the proportion of the English-speaking and French-speaking populations has greatly increased during the past four years."

So much for the English press. If we turn to the French press, we find *L'Etendard*, both of yesterday and to-day, has denounced the amendment as being similar, in every respect, to the McCarthy Bill; and now we have *L'Electeur*, the most important Liberal newspaper in the Province of Quebec, saying as follows:—

(Translation). "This last concession was hardly made when we saw Sir John A. Macdonald trying to secure a still more important one, and threatening his partisans with an immediate dissolution if they would not yield submissively to this new sacrifice. Sir John has, in fact, caused his Minister of Justice, Sir John Thompson, to move an amendment to the McCarthy Bill, which, on the whole, is, in a disguised form, nothing short of the Davin amendment. [We give in another column the text of the Davin amendment.] Once the principle sanctioned as regards the North-West Legislature, it shall apply to Manitoba, where our compatriots are still in a minority, and where both parties have agreed to repeal, of their own free will, the official use of the French language. It is easy to understand that, once the principle sanctioned, the door is open, and that the last bulwark that protected one of our rights is down. The French language will be abolished in the Territories and Manitoba, where the French Canadians have, nevertheless, been the first pioneers, the first civilising people. There is no room left for idle hopes."

Here is the advice it gives:

"Our friends in Ottawa are, unfortunately, on the Opposition side, that is to say, powerless to secure the triumph of their broad and liberal ideas, to which the
Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

Hon. Mr. Blake, a few days ago, gave voice in eloquent words. But we beseech them to stand firm and to do their duty to the end, and we feel that they shall have, not only the sympathies of our co-religionists and fellow-countrymen, but also those of an imposing number of fair-minded English-speaking people who consider as an honor to follow the traditions of the Liberals of old England, and follow the steps of those who, in the old country, defend the cause of Home Rule and equality of rights for all races and all creeds under the British flag."

I might quote several other newspapers which have declared themselves on this amendment moved by the hon. Minister of Justice, and, without exception, they all agree that it is a sacrifice of the rights and privileges of the French population of the North-West, in order to purchase peace in this House, because the Government expect that, if this amendment be adopted, we will hear no more about the repeal of clause 110 of the British North America Act. But I may say that this is only the beginning of the agitation led by the hon. member for North Simcoe, and that so long as there will be a remnant of French or Catholic institutions, whether in the North-West, or in Manitoba, or Ontario, or in any other portion of the Dominion, we will have that hon. gentleman coming into this House, year after year, and endeavoring to perpetuate this agitation which has been excited under his leadership. There is only one effective way of finally settling this question, and that is to vote for the amendment I have proposed, and thus clearly put on record our opinion, which is that of almost every hon. gentleman who has spoken, that this Bill of the hon. member of North Simcoe is a mischievous attempt to set race against race and creed against creed. It is for this House, and especially the Government, to take a bold stand, and say, once for all, that such an attempt shall not be tolerated, and by a crushing vote of the whole House against the five or six, or it may be ten, who would follow the hon. member for North Simcoe, declare that we are not prepared to give these men the means of disturbing the good feeling and understanding which now exists between the two races in this country, and we will not allow them to perpetuate the division which they have started and which has given rise to feelings it will take a long time to allay. It is not by yielding to the fire-brands who go through the country sowing the seeds of discord, that we will become united, but it is by showing them that the good sense of the country, as represented in this House, is in a position to deal with them in a summary manner by stamping out this agitation, and showing them they have no standing in the House or the country and that their course will not be tolerated. I am very sorry we are not about to take this course, and all the more so because I am obliged to separate myself from my most esteemed leader, in whom I have always had the greatest confidence. But this question has been left an open one, and I take the opportunity of voting according to my judgment, and in accord with the sentiments I feel so strongly in this matter, even though I be compelled to differ from my leader. Another cause for regret to me is that, by separating myself from my leader, I shall be obliged to vote in company with the hon. member for North Simcoe, but it will be the first time, and I hope the last, because I hope that the next time that hon. gentleman, or any other, attempts to create trouble in the country, a more vigorous policy will

be followed, and that the House will be almost unanimous against those who attempt to destroy the happiness, the prosperity, and the good feeling that now exists, and I hope will always exist, between the different creeds and races of this country.

Mr. WALLACE. It is not my intention, at this late stage of the debate, to make any lengthy remarks, but I cannot allow this question to pass and give a silent vote upon it. We have been, on more than one occasion, brought face to face with racial and religious difficulties. For these difficulties, I think no man in this country is more responsible than the ex-leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for West Durham. That hon. gentleman, nearly twenty years ago, made capital out of the Scott murder case in the endeavor to gain power in Ontario, and when he had accomplished his purpose, he quickly dropped the subject so as not to embarrass his friends in the Dominion elections that were then about to follow. At a later date, on the question of the hanging of Louis Riel, the hon. member for West Durham, in his London speech, told the people that he would not make a platform for his party out of the Regina scaffold. Well, every true-minded patriot in this country commended that sentiment. But what did we find afterwards? when the Government thought that a murderer is a murderer, no matter what his nationality may be, we find the hon. gentleman taking the other side of the question and going back on the record he had made for himself in London, going back upon the declarations he solemnly made in London, though he knew the whole facts of the case then as much as he did afterwards, and as much as he knows them to-day. We find this hon. gentleman in this House, within the last few days, regretting that these difficulties were coming up again; but I believe that no one in this country is more responsible for these difficulties than the hon. gentleman himself. With reference to the question which is immediately before the House, we have been told that the North-West Council had no mandate from the people to dispose of this question, and we were told by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) that they were in a state of tutelage. I think there is no portion of the people of this country more intelligent than our North-West settlers. They are the flower of the older Provinces of Canada; they are young, enterprising and intelligent men; they are young men of education, and I think they are as well calculated to express an opinion upon questions as they arise as the population of any other portion of this Dominion. Therefore, while I am in favor of the Bill as introduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy); and while I regret that the tone of this debate, on the other side, was not in imitation of the moderation of the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill, I think the people of the North-West themselves are better qualified to pronounce upon this question than even we are in the House of Commons. Another reason is that the House of Commons to-day may repeal the 110th clause of the North-West Territories Act, and next Session, or in the next Parliament, it may re-enact that clause; and, therefore, we would be brought face to face, either at every Session of Parliament, or in every new Parlia-

ment, with this question. If we relegate it to the North-West Council, or to the new Legislatures we are creating in that country, to which each time we are giving largely increased powers, we know this, that when once you give power to a Local Legislature, you can never take it away again. The Local Legislatures are tenacious of any rights and privileges which are given to them; and, therefore, when you clothe them with a certain power, that power remains with them. Therefore, if either of these amendments is adopted by the House, you are more permanently settling the question than even by the adoption of the Bill itself. For these reasons, I will favor the amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Justice, though it does not go as far as I would like to go, or as far as the amendment of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), which I more favor. But we cannot have everything our own way. While a spirit of compromise and conciliation is abroad, I think, as patriots, and as loyal citizens of Canada, we should try to meet each other half way. In the first place, therefore, I give my adhesion to the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Justice.

Mr. WATSON. This debate has taken a very wide range, and, to my mind, the practical question before the House has not been discussed as it should have been. If it had been so discussed, this debate would have ended three or four days ago. I am rather surprised that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Wallace) appears to desire to revive the old debate on the Riel question. That is a matter which is entirely foreign to this debate. I think the French people are somewhat to blame for this discussion. I believe that clause 110 was, in a sense, smuggled into this Act by Senator Girard in the Senate, and that it should never have been there. From reading the debates, I think that clause was inserted contrary to the wishes of the hon. gentlemen who were then in power, but, as that House was composed of a majority who were against the policy and principles of the majority in the popular House, they did as they pleased, and, if that clause had not been accepted, that Bill would have been delayed for another season. In regard to the visit of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to the North-West, he did not trouble me very much on his visit to Portage la Prairie. Even up to the present, I have some doubts as to the honesty of that gentleman, and as to his sincerity, in wanting to do good to people of the North-West. It appears to me that he came there more for the sake of agitation than for any practical good. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) made a reference to his visit and his speech on that occasion. I think his quotations from that speech are perfectly accurate, but he also referred to the Attorney General of the Province of Manitoba, who stood on the platform on that occasion, and he said he did not envy him his company. It was hardly necessary for the hon. member to make that statement, as this House knows that the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) has not much use for the Attorney General of Manitoba, and that about the time he came around the legislative halls of that Province, the member for Provencher was very scarce. I believe that no change should be made in the

constitution under which people live without consulting the people, and, though I believe that section 110 was smuggled into that Act and should never have been there, nevertheless as the people of the North-West have been living under that clause enacted by this Parliament, I do not think we should remove it without consulting them. I am not a lawyer, but I much prefer the amendment of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to that of the Minister of Justice, which has so many surrounding clauses, which contains so many things that appear to a layman to be a mystery. The amendment of the hon. member for West Assiniboia is plain, and I do not feel disposed to vote for the amendment of the Minister of Justice, as it recites certain things with which I do not agree. It says :

"That, on the contrary, this House declares its adherence to the said covenants and its determination to resist any attempt to impair the same."

I believe, that at any time when it is in the interests of any Province of the Dominion that even the British North America Act should be changed, it should be changed for the convenience of the people living under that Act. Believing that, I could not consistently vote for the amendment to the amendment. It is quite possible that the Province from which I come may have occasion to seek to amend the British North America Act in some measure, to relieve them from some privileges which were granted to a minority in that Province which are objectionable to the majority. The French language is practically done away with in Manitoba, as far as the Legislature is concerned. It has been abolished by a vote of twenty-four to six, and in a full House of the representatives there would have been a vote of thirty-two to six. The people of the North-West Territories are similarly situated to those of Manitoba, and I have no doubt they desire to have only one official language in the North-West. Another reason why I cannot vote for the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Simcoe is the fact that I find that six of the gentlemen composing the North-West Council expressed themselves as being favorable to the power being granted them by this Parliament to deal with this question. They did not ask that an Act should be passed to repeal clause 110, as I understood from the hon. member for Simcoe, but they asked that they should have the power to do away with the French language if they saw fit. I will quote some extracts from the speeches delivered by a few of those gentlemen in the North-West Assembly. The hon. member for Provencher stated that Mr. Judge Rouleau had expressed himself as being sorry that he had not a vote, in order that he might cast it against the memorial presented to this House. I find in the report of the speeches in the *Press* the following :

"Judge Rouleau spoke at great length upon the question. He claimed that no action could be taken until the people had a chance to express themselves upon the matter. Let the members make it an issue at the next election if they wished. He had spoken French before he had spoken English, and this memorial proposed to deprive him and others of their mother tongue. He closed by again claiming that the question should be decided by the electors, and hinted that some of the members who would probably vote for this now, might suffer at the next election.

"Mr. Haultain pointed out that the assembly, in asking for the removal of a restrictive clause, was simply asking for more powers, and that they could make the use of the power to deal with the language question, an issue at the

Mr. WATSON.

next election. He favored but one official language on the ground of convenience and economy."

"Mr. Oliver regretted that the discussion had taken such a wide range."

I think we can say the same thing in this House.—

"He represented a large number of French-speaking people, and did not consider that he was going against their interest in asking for extended powers, so that we could deal with this matter ourselves. He had always strongly advocated that the people of this country should be allowed to manage their own affairs, and would support the memorial."

"Mr. Neff said that the dual language system had been imposed upon us and we were simply asking for the privilege to retain it or not, as we wished. He had no desire to deprive French-speaking people of a luxury; they could not be prevented from speaking their own language, but he objected to its being an official language."

"Mr. Ross,"—

I think this gentleman represents Calgary or Moose Jaw.—

"Mr. Ross also represented a mixed community. He owed much to the French-speaking electors in his district, and would be ungrateful if he did them any injustice, but did not consider that he was doing them any injustice in asking that the people's representatives in the North-West be given the power to deal with this matter."

"Mr. Hoye said this dual language seemed to be a bugbear to some people, and yet not one member had been able to show any injury done by it. No action should be taken until the question was brought before the different constituencies."

Now, Mr. Speaker, with that evidence before me, I cannot do otherwise than to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, because I believe it gives the people the exact power they ask for. To my mind, the amendment to the amendment is simply putting this matter off to another year. It is not giving the power they ask for, and if the amendment of the Minister of Justice is carried, no doubt we will have a repetition of the debate that has taken place here for the last six days, a debate which, I think, is very much to be regretted. There is no doubt it has given rise to race and religious feelings that will not be quieted for years to come. I was a little astonished at a statement made by the Minister of Justice, and also one made by the Minister of the Interior. The Minister of Justice, in speaking in defence of his amendment, said it would be cruel to deprive those poor people in the North-West of the privilege of using their mother tongue; that a man might be tried there and convicted, and, after the trial was over, he might not know what he was convicted for. Now, it appears to me that there is a good deal of special pleading in a statement like that. I have yet to learn that any British subject, or anyone else, in the Dominion of Canada, be he of British nationality or of any other has suffered from a miscarriage of justice because he did not understand the language in which the statutes were printed. That being the case, I have no doubt that, when the French language is done away with in the North-West, there will be no occasion for saying that these people do not understand the law because it is not printed in their own language. The hon. Minister of the Interior, in his remarks last night, made rather a startling statement. He said that he visited six townships in Manitoba during his trip last fall, and he found nine different nationalities in those six different townships.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Excuse me, not in Manitoba; but in the North-West, I found in two townships representatives of nine nationalities.

Mr. WATSON. I took down the sentence which followed that statement, in which he said it would be cruel if the laws of the land were not printed in the language of these nationalities. I do not really think he meant it, but, if he did, it would be a very expensive luxury. Sir, I believe the amendment of the hon. member for West Assiniboia commends itself to a great number of the hon. gentlemen in this House. There is no doubt that the appeal made by the First Minister yesterday to whip his followers into line had considerable effect. It was a very strong appeal; he rose equal to the occasion, and to my mind made the best speech I ever heard delivered in the House. There were none of those little stories with which that hon. gentleman is accustomed to regale the House. But I hope that the amendment of the Minister of Justice will not be adopted, for the amendment of the member for West Assiniboia is the only one that will satisfy the people of the North-West, will give them the power they ask for, and will prevent a repetition of the unpleasant discussion which has taken place in this House for the last few days. The hon. member for Provencher said he considered it a fortunate thing that this question had been brought before the House, but I do not share in his view; I think it a very unfortunate thing. No doubt the hon. gentleman feels a little warm on the question, because a similar question is arising in Manitoba in connection with the French language and separate schools, which are going to be done away with in that Province, — at least separate schools will henceforth exist in a much modified form. As I said before, I thought the French people were to blame to some extent for this discussion in the House, inasmuch as I believe that this clause was smuggled into the Bill by Senator Girard in the Senate some years ago. I believe that one of the causes of irritation in Manitoba in reference to separate schools is the fact that while the hon. member for Provencher was a member of the Government of Manitoba he secured special privileges for the separate schools, and when the Protestants, who are the great majority of that Province, found that the separate schools were receiving much more than their share of the grant, they became aroused, and when a change of Government took place they decided that the moment was opportune for abolishing the system. With regard to the French language in Manitoba, I may say that, while I do not know what the custom is in the North-West, one of the principal reasons of the abolition of the official French in Manitoba was the expense. It has been stated here that the printing of French in the North-West amounts to only \$400. I know that in Manitoba it costs a considerable sum of money, and it costs the general public a large sum of money in addition to what it costs the Government, because under the Land Title system all notices of application to put land under the Torrens system have to be advertised in the *Gazette*. This costs a considerable sum to the applicants.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House at any length, but I desire merely to state the conclusion at which I have

arrived after listening to the discussion. I regret that the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beansoleil) was not carried, as I should like to have seen it adopted. That amendment having been defeated, I think the next best course to take is to adopt the amendment of the Minister of Justice, and I am, therefore, willing to vote for it. I am willing to do so because it contains an emphatic declaration against the principle of the Bill proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Of course, if that amendment went further in the direction of extinguishing the question at once I would feel more satisfied, for I am afraid it may come back; but under the circumstances, when I see that the flame is extending over the country, I think the first thing to do is to quench it at once. I place this question above party considerations, and I consider it on the broad principle that we must have peace and amity in this country, and that its future depends upon it. It is no doubt unfortunate that this subject has been brought before the House. It has arrayed a compact body of French members against the English-speaking members, which is a circumstance to be deplored. As the Minister of Public Works said, it has arrayed a compact phalanx of French Canadians in defence of their rights. In order to secure harmony, not only in the House, but throughout the country, I am glad to support the conclusion arrived at by the wiser heads on both sides of this House. No one will deny that the leader of the Government is not only a politician but a statesman, and although I am with him this time, it is certainly not because I belong to his following. At the same time I am glad to follow my leader, who on this occasion has shown his patriotism and devotion to his country, and who advocates the principle of the autonomy of the Provinces that has already been sanctioned. I am also very glad to follow the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), whose brilliant speech must have brought conviction to many members. From these considerations I accept the amendment proposed by the Minister of Justice, not as the best conclusion possible, but as a means of soothing the bad feelings that have been aroused all over the country.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The imposing debate, Mr. Speaker, brought on by the campaign carried on throughout the country by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and by the measure which he has submitted for the consideration of this House, clearly shows the importance of the privileges and the rights which it attacks. Several of my colleagues, at the opening of the campaign undertaken by the hon. member against the French Canadians, the first inhabitants of this country, believe that the good sense of the English people will consider this quarrel which the hon. member seeks to fasten upon us as a quarrel of but little importance. Several thought, at the beginning, that this mountain in labor would bring forth but a small and ridiculous mouse. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Simcoe has been backed up in his campaign by other gentlemen, whose talent, and the means which they have employed, to excite the prejudices of their fellow-citizens who are not of the same race as ourselves, in the Province of Ontario, it is impossible to ignore. The hon. member has aroused

against us, I repeat, his fellow-countrymen; and as the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) has said, there has arisen a dark cloud on our political horizon, carrying within it a war of race, a war of religion, a war against the institutions of the first inhabitants of this country. Happily for us, Mr. Speaker, the good sense of the public men on both sides of the House has been, in the face of this dark cloud, the light of hope, which has animated the courage of all true patriots within the Dominion. I can only compare some of the speeches of the hon. members, who have endeavored to raise prejudice against us; on account of the small value of their arguments; on account of the lame reasonings which support them; on account of the few historical precedents which they have quoted in order to justify the attitude which they have taken against us—I can only compare these speeches, set going by these hon. members in the road of public opinion, to light carriages, to cabs which carry no load. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if I applied the same simile to some of the speeches made by hon. members, as well on this side of the House as on the other, I ought to compare these speeches to massive waggon wheels pushed along the road of public opinion by powerful orators; I might say that these waggons carry boxes which contain solid reasoning, formidable reasoning, philosophic reasoning, and historical facts. Woe to the light cabs without a load, driven at an immoderate gait, by thoughtless drivers, if they should happen some day to knock against, in the road of public opinion, and in the road of history, these massive waggons which are laden with historical truths and true philosophical teachings. What are, Mr. Speaker, in short, the complaints of the hon. member for North Simcoe against the French Canadians and the French race, not only in the Province of Quebec but against the small handful of those of our nationality who have tried their fortune on the prairies of the West? The hon. member desires, be the cost what it may, to make the regions of the West, what he calls a British country. But is not the Province of Quebec a British country? Are not we in that Province subjects of Her Majesty, equally as are the citizens of the Province of Ontario, and as would be those of the North-West, were they all Saxons, as the hon. member for North Simcoe desires? I do not see what difference there is between an Anglo-Saxon subject, and a British subject of French Canadian origin. I do not see what difference there can be in the minds of English statesmen, in the eyes of the friends of the Empire, between a British subject of French origin or of Irish or Scotch origin, or even one of the subjects of Her Majesty in the vast Colony of the East Indies, and a Saxon like the hon. member for North Simcoe; we are all subjects of the same Empire, we are all citizens of the same Empire, and as such we ought to have equal rights. Great use has been made, Mr. Speaker, of the word "British," during this debate; and I have remarked, especially, that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in moderate yet unjust language, has, in a way, profaned this noble expression. Every subject of the British Empire, to whatever race or nationality he may belong, can claim the same title. The hon. member for North Simcoe and the member for Albert have pretended that if French were spoken in the North-West it

Mr. DUFOUR.

would no longer be a British country. And, say they, the French Canadians ought not to delude themselves to the point of believing that the North-West ought not to be a British country. No, Mr. Speaker, we have never been under this impression, we have never asked for it, and we would be the most grieved parties in the Dominion, if the North-West was not going to continue forever a British country. We wish, just as much as the hon. member for Albert does, or the hon. member for North Simcoe, that the North-West should continue to be a dependency of the Dominion of Canada, or rather form a portion of the Dominion, and that it may be a British country, if it should not be like the Province of Quebec, it would be such to the same extent as is the country whence comes the hon. member for Albert. But what do they mean to say, when using the expression "British?" Does this mean exclusion for some of the subjects of the Empire? Do we understand by that, unequal rights for certain subjects of the Empire, or again the rights of certain subjects of the Empire entirely ignored? Does this mean short-sightedness? No, Mr. Speaker, I have always held the highest opinion of British subjects and of British countries. I have always understood that the British language was a noble language; that a British country was a noble country in which liberty and equal rights reigned supreme. But, as the hon. member for Simcoe understands it, would it be a case of equal rights if all the subjects of the Empire were obliged to adopt the customs and the religion as well as the language of the hon. members for North Simcoe and Albert? Do these hon. members understand by equal rights that one ought not to do anything but what they do, to think only as they think, and to act only as they act? This liberty is a liberty which is not British. The hon. member for Simcoe profanes this noble expression, degrades this noble title, of which every subject of the Empire is proud. He desires to give it a narrow meaning, at which, no matter what English subject, if he but understands the importance of the title of "British subject," would blush. The hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, who share the opinion of the hon. member for North Simcoe, seem to believe that without unity of language the country is exposed to every plague, and that with unity of language a country is secure against all disorders and all misfortunes. They have cited the great American Republic as being a country which has prospered extremely, and they have attributed, so to speak, all this prosperity to the fact that American subjects enjoy this great prerogative, this grand privilege which is the hobby of the hon. member for North Simcoe, namely, unity of language. But why, I ask the hon. member, did a civil war break out in the heart of this same great Republic, which according to him enjoys unity in language? Why did this great civil war, which has had no equal in the annals of modern nations, this great civil war which has been one of the greatest scourges of the American people, why did it break out in a nation in which unity of language existed? The hon. members, Mr. Speaker, who have treated so learnedly this subject, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and several of their colleagues on both sides of the House, have shown, by the

clearest possible evidence, that it is possible to be a great nation, that it is possible to become a great people while not possessing unity in religion, unity in language, or unity of race. And, unless we believe that it is by presumption, or that he is impelled thereto by an evil genius, I cannot understand what induces the hon. member to persist in this crusade, in the face of historic verity, in face of precedents, which have been held up before his eyes, and which the hon. member ought to have known before they were pointed out to him by his colleagues; for everybody knows that the hon. member is a man of great skill, a well informed man, a man who has studied deeply. But, notwithstanding all this, like a blind man, like a deaf man, he cries without ceasing that without unity of language it is impossible or nearly impossible for this Canada, which we love so much and which we cherish, to become a great country. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is unjust towards us. I ask this House, I ask every impartial man, what would Canada be to-day, had it not been for the support of the French nationality in all the great questions which the present Government, and that which preceded it, have carried out? Who was the man who followed up, with the utmost perseverance, the acquisition of those great Territories, respecting which the hon. member for North Simcoe has embroiled us to-day? Was it not Sir George Etienne Cartier, one of the old colleagues of the hon. the present Prime Minister? Has not the Province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker, paid its large portion, as well of the purchase money of the North-West, and for the construction of the Pacific Railway, as for all the great public works which have been constructed by the Government to open up the North-West to civilisation? And, in spite of all this, what does the hon. member for Simcoe wish to do to-day? What does he undertake? He undertakes to deprive the people of the Province of Quebec, of their just share in this great heritage,—towards the purchase of which, towards the colonisation of which, they have so largely contributed. This, Mr. Speaker, is the unjust undertaking of the hon. member with regard to the Province of Quebec; whereas without us, I do not hesitate to say it, without us there would be no North-West, no Canadian Pacific Railway, no colonisation in the West, and this vast country would be in a wild state. If the Dominion is to-day in possession of these rich Territories, she owes them to the French element, which the hon. member fights against with so much vigor. I do not understand how they can require that we should be at the same time loyal subjects of Her Majesty, and that we should be disloyal towards our mother tongue. We must defend it with all our powers; it is our right, and it is our duty. And I declare that the man who voluntarily surrenders his mother tongue, is not a good citizen, he is a man whose loyalty would not remain firm after every trial, as that of the subjects of Her Majesty ought to do. The hon. member for Simcoe has not always reasoned in the same way respecting minorities. Everybody remembers the attitude taken by the hon. members for North Simcoe, for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) as well as that of several other members who follow them, when in this House, the resolution asking for "Home Rule" in Ireland was rejected; we all know that,

at this period, these gentlemen raised objections to this resolution, stating that we were going to sacrifice the Protestant minority in Ireland, and to place it at the mercy of the Roman Catholic majority. Such were the objections from these hon. gentlemen. Have these hon. members two weights and two measures—the one for the Roman Catholics, the other for their coreligionists the Protestants? I must hasten to conclude. I know that the House is anxious to close this debate; but I was surprised at the remarks which some of my colleagues speaking the English language made. And I cannot pass them over in silence. It has been admitted that the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin), was moderate as respects the expressions used in his speech on the present question, but it is alleged that he was too vigorous in its utterance. I cannot conceive how these hon. members can reproach the hon. Minister of Public Works with having testified by a degree of vivacity in his speech,—he, one of the fathers of Confederation, he, the successor of the illustrious statesman, Sir George Etienne Cartier. I think that he would have been wanting in his duty if he had not borne witness against the resolution of the hon. member for North Simcoe, with something of indignation. In any case it would not be me who would blame him for it. It is to my knowledge that several of my English colleagues,—and I do not say it of them as a reproach—in support of interests much less serious than those which are now being discussed, displayed much more energy in their language than did the hon. Minister of Public Works. My compatriots, Mr. Speaker, the French Canadians of the Province of Quebec, will be doubtless much obliged to many hon. members in this House,—I may say to the great majority of the members of this House—for the sympathy which they have extended to our nationality, during this debate, for the respect which they have shown for the rights of minorities, and for the firm determination which they have shown to defend them on all occasions. Among those distinguished men, who have come forward generously in support of the Government, in order to make easier their task, and to assist them in giving us justice, I must mention the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and I regret that again, this evening, on account of his great liberality towards us, it has been thought proper to attack him somewhat violently.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DUPONT. The speech of the hon. member for West Durham, as well as the other speakers who have spoken in defence of our cause, will dwell in the shrine of history; they will serve as lessons for our successors in this House, and for our posterity; they are founded in reason and on justice, and they show the true position in which minorities should be placed, in no matter what country. It might be said that in the family of the hon. member for West Durham,—I must render him this acknowledgment; and you all know, moreover, that he is no political friend of mine, I did not, in general, support his policy when he was leader of a party in this House,—it might be said, I say, that in questions of right, on great questions of justice, the hon. member has shown that British fair-play

was, so to speak, bred in the bones of the family of Blake. I believe that every good citizen, every man who is a friend to his country, ought to be dismayed at the conclusions arrived at by the hon. member for West Durham. He has concluded his train of reasoning by these forcible words: if justice is not done to the minorities, if we kindle in this country a war of races, a religious war, neither prosperity nor progress will ever be possibilities for us. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, which ought to frighten us the most, whether it be this formidable conclusion or the inevitable contained in this conclusion. If the policy of the hon. member for North Simcoe should prevail, I believe that the conclusion of the hon. member West Durham is inevitable. I think that every patriot who loves his country, no matter to what nationality he may belong, should make superhuman efforts to keep the nation far from the path of discord into which the hon. member for North Simcoe and his friends desire to thrust it. I think that every public man,—and it seems to me that they wish to do it, for the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), intensely warlike as he is, has spoken with moderation and wisdom. He also has come to the aid of the Government to assist them in settling this difficult matter,—all public men should work together in concert, and with all possible energy, to lift us from the way of discord into which we are entering, and to thrust the nation from it as from a nest of vipers. Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks I conclude, heartily thanking the House for having kindly given me their attention.

Mr. SCRIVER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great length to which this debate has extended, it having now occupied seven days, and sympathising as I do with the natural impatience of the House, I shall not detain hon. members more than such time as will enable me, in a very few words, to explain the position I take on this question. I regret exceedingly that the question which is now before the House has been brought into it. I feared, when the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was introduced, it would give rise not only to great differences of opinion, but perhaps to angry and intemperate discussion, and would excite great feeling, not only in the House, but throughout the length and breadth of the land. The impassioned, not to say intemperate, utterances of some leading members on both sides of the House have satisfied me that my apprehension had some foundation. I was desirous, therefore, that some solution of the question should be reached which would remove it from this House, and relegate it to some authority to which it would be reasonable, just and fair to refer it, and I was glad, therefore, when the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) submitted the amendment he proposed. It met my views completely under the circumstances, and I determined at the time it was submitted that, unless some modification of it was proposed which would more fully meet my views, I would support it. With regard to the amendment proposed by the Minister of Justice, it does not meet my views as does the amendment submitted by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I think that if the decision of this question is relegated to the people of the North-West, whom it mainly concerns, those people should be given the power

Mr. DUPONT.

to consider it in all its aspects, and it should not be divided into portions as is proposed by the amendment of the Minister of Justice. I agree with the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), in considering that a half-hearted measure, and I shall, therefore, feel constrained to vote against the amendment to the amendment, and, if that should be lost, to vote in favor of the amendment moved by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I recognise that the House is anxious to reach a decision on this question, and I shall, therefore, not attempt to discuss it at any length. I confine myself to the question now before us. It is not a question as between the amendment and the original motion proposing the second reading of the Bill, but is a choice between the amendment by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Minister of Justice. I desire to say that, as I approve more highly of the wording of the amendment offered by the member for Assiniboia than I do of that offered by the Minister of Justice, I shall be forced to vote against the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, in the course of this debate, I stated that my opinion was that the best and most proper time to settle this question would be when Parliament felt that the time had come to extend to the North-West Territories a larger measure of local autonomy than they now enjoy. I voted for the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) on this express condition. I did not approve altogether of the wording of the amendment of my hon. friend; but I thought, on the whole, that the idea therein expressed, that our institutions in the North-West should be permanent, was true to this extent, that they should be permanent in every particular so long as the present form of government in the North-West endured. This view has not prevailed, and the consequence is that the House is not called upon to deal with this question. I then also stated that when the time came, be that time early or late, the only way to deal with the question before the House would be on the broad principle of local autonomy. I thought from the first, and I still more than ever believe it, that the only method under which we can carry out the system of Confederation, the only method by which we can give justice and fair play to minorities, wherever minorities may be situated, will depend altogether on the adoption of the principle of local autonomy. It has been stated to-day that there really is no question of autonomy or Provincial rights here. It may be said we have no Provincial rights, in the technical sense, in the Territories, but the principle involved is the same. Although the Territories have not been organised into Provinces, the principle applying to the case is the same as if they had been so organised. The only difference is that their powers would be supreme and absolute if they were organised into Provinces, and that they should not, in my judgment, be subject to the revision of the Central Government. For all that, the principle remains unimpaired, and should be acted upon, that the will of the people of the Territories affected ought to be the will which

should prevail in the solution of this question, and of all other similar questions. My hon. friend, the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), stated this afternoon that the best method of solving this question, with a view to Provincial rights, would be simply to affirm the principle of the Bill itself. Surely, my hon. friend was not serious in so speaking. The Bill of my hon. friend from Simcoe proposes to abrogate clause 110 of the North-West Territories Act, which clause provides that either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Council or Legislative Assembly of the Territories. If you simply repeal this clause, you remove from the Legislature of the Territories the power which they now have of using either the French or the English language in their debates. What I understand by Provincial rights—and I suppose what my hon. friend must understand—is, that the people of the Territories should decide for themselves whether or not they are to have the privilege or the *onus* of having two official languages. If you remove that law, you take away from them the privilege which they now have of using the two languages. I do not believe that is in the direction of Provincial rights, or Provincial autonomy. The amendment of my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, tends to uphold Provincial rights and local autonomy, and I am happy to extend my congratulations to the Prime Minister, and to his Government that more and more, and day by day, the force of circumstances brings them over to this principle. More and more the principle grows, and they are forced to adopt it, in spite of their former practice in older times. It is stated, however, against this amendment of the Minister of Justice, that it is not so complete as the amendment moved by the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). It may not be so complete, but it is not the less just, for the amendment of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice involves this: that in the debates of the Local Assembly of the North-West, and in the recording of their proceedings, they shall have the privilege of using one language or the other, or both, and they shall be empowered to decide for themselves whether they shall have only one official language or two official languages. There is, then, the question of the courts, and it has been stated (and I think properly stated), that the use of the language in courts, would be acknowledged as beyond the power of the Dominion Parliament. There then remains the question of the printing of the statutes. So long as we provide the Territories with a revenue, can any serious objection be taken to the fact that we should provide for the printing of the laws and ordinances in the North-West? I can see very well that if the Territories had to provide that out of their own revenue, to impose any obligations upon them, which they would not want to assume, might be a grievance. But so long as we give them the revenue, surely no man can object; and we who supply the money ought to have the power to put upon it an obligation (which is not after all an unreasonable obligation), and which on the other hand is in the tendency of peace and harmony. It has been stated that this amendment was a compromise. I must say for my part, and the First Minister will bear me out, that there has been no compromise between him and me. I always have stated publicly as well as privately, and I have never disguised my thoughts on this

matter, that, in my judgment, sooner or later, and better sooner than later, this question had to be settled upon the broad basis of local autonomy. In fact, if this question has taken a wider range than is involved in the principle of local autonomy, it is simply because the member for Simcoe has chosen to make it so. If the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), instead of placing as the basis of his Bill, that there should be a community of language, and that this community of language should extend everywhere in the Dominion where French is spoken, had simply left it to the will and the desire of the people of the Territories, we would not have had one-half or one-tenth part of all the trouble we have had over this question. But it is because the people of Quebec have good reason to suppose that this was a preliminary skirmish, soon to be followed by other attacks, soon to be followed by attacks which would reach them in their own Province, that they have been so excited. A few days ago, the hon. member for Simcoe, speaking in this debate, disclaimed the idea of imposing his will upon the people of Quebec and attempting to deprive them of their language; but it seems that the hon. gentleman is not so brave here as he was in Manitoba; for in Manitoba he is recorded as having stated that if the French language was abolished in that Province, it would be abolished in Quebec. Is it to be wondered that the people of Quebec have felt as they have felt upon this question in face of such a threat as this? I want to say to my fellow-countrymen of French origin that we must expect, in the face of such a declaration, that, some day or other, this agitation commenced here will be carried into our Province. Let us remember this: that if we are prepared to stand by the principle of local autonomy in the North-West Territories, we will stand ten times, and a hundred times, stronger when we have to meet an attack in our own Province. If we are now prepared to stand by the principle of local autonomy, I submit that, when the time comes, we will find a tower of strength in the position which we may take upon this question. This is one of the reasons which impel me to take the action I propose on this measure, that is, to support the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice. I quite realise that it must be painful for many hon. members from the Province of Quebec to vote for a measure which may, perhaps, imply the possibility that the French language should cease to be the official language in the North-West Territories. I have no reason to suppose, and I do not for one moment suppose, that the people of the North-West Territories would act unjustly or unfairly towards the French minority. I know it has been said that, if we vote this measure, it is a foregone conclusion that the French language will not be an official language of the North-West, because the Legislature has already expressed its opinion in favor of removing it as an official language. Well, that is true; but we must remember that at present there is not one single member speaking French in that Legislature, and if, after the next election, there should be no change in the representation, if there should be no French representative in the North-West Territories Assembly, surely no one will complain if, under such circumstances, after the attention of the people has been roused to the question, the Local Legislature were to adhere to its present intention. I

believe, for all that, that if there were even a sprinkling of French members in the Local Legislature, the majority would act with the same spirit of fairness towards them that the Legislature of Upper Canada evinced in 1793, as shown in the incident to which our attention was directed by the Prime Minister yesterday. I believe that they would act in the same spirit of fairness towards the minority which was evinced by the Legislature of Canada in 1845. As I said a moment ago, I am not at all surprised that some of my fellow-countrymen should feel strongly upon this question, and that they should propose to adhere to their present intention. As for myself I must say it is a matter of deep anguish to me that upon this question I have to sever my connection with such a life-long friend as the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil). I know he is acting for the best interests of his country according to his lights, and I am sure he will give me credit that in voting as I shall have to do with the Government on this question, I do so not out of any love to the Government, but with the conviction that in so doing I am acting in the best interest of my party and my country.

Mr. IVES. I desire to occupy the time of the House only for a moment, in order to say that I am against both the spirit and intention of the Bill of the hon. member for Simcoe. For my own part, I think it would have been far preferable if this House had deferred the settlement of this whole question until such time as the increase of population in the North-West Territories had made it necessary that portions of that territory should be organised into Provinces. I believe it is impossible at the present moment for any member of this House to know what will be the position or character of the population which may settle in that vast domain. We may perhaps have on the Saskatchewan a territory large enough for a Province, including in its population a large majority of people speaking the French language, and we may perhaps have in Alberta a population purely English; and when the different parts of that territory are organised into Provinces, the question could be very easily settled by this Parliament without annoyance to the people of the Territories, and without straining unduly the principle of local autonomy to which my hon. friend who last addressed the House has referred. In that way we might perhaps arrive at a settlement of this whole question without this debate or this agitation. For these reasons, and because I would not see the French language abolished in this House or in the country, any more than I would see the French Canadians obliged to leave the country, I supported the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil). But that motion has been disposed of, and we have now to choose between the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice and the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and when I have to choose between these two amendments I naturally choose that which least disturbs present conditions. Therefore, I intend to support the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice. If I could be assured that an amendment would be carried in this House to defer the whole question until the organisation of Provinces in the North-West Territories, I would support such a motion; but in the division we had on the amendment of

Mr. LAURIER.

the hon. member for Berthier, we saw arrayed on one side almost the whole force of the members from the Province of Quebec, who have no objection to the French language or institutions, and we saw arrayed on the other side, all the other members of this House. When our views, therefore, failed to meet with the approval of a majority of the House, I think it is a serious risk to persist, as does the hon. member for Berthier, in rejecting the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice, which certainly is not a serious interference with the rights of the French Canadians, but is a safe and fair compromise measure, and one which ought to be supported.

Mr. McCARTHY. I quite appreciate the desire of the House that this debate should close, and I would not have risen now to say a word if it had not been for the personal attack which, even at this late hour, the leader of the Opposition could not forbear to make upon me. I desire to repudiate the statement he has made with regard to my saying anything in Manitoba which I have not said here. My reference in Manitoba was not to the French language in the Province of Quebec; but there, as in Montreal, it was to the possibility—which I then thought was within reach, and which I do not yet deny to myself the hope of being accomplished—that the title and fabrique questions may yet be settled in the Province of Quebec, and settled I dare say with the aid of my hon. friend who now leads the Opposition. That was the question I referred to, and not the question of the French language, as my hon. friend will see if he will do me the justice to read the deliberate statement I made in Montreal. Having troubled the House again, I would like to say this with regard to the amendment before us. It has been stated here that this amendment is a measure of peace; but I wish this House to understand that what may be a measure of peace here, between the hon. members on both sides of this House, may be anything but a measure of peace in this country. For my part, I see in this amendment every possible evil which we have had suggested to us throughout this debate. It relegates a portion of this difficult and disturbing subject to the people of the North-West. That certainly is not a measure of peace, so far as they are concerned. It leaves the remaining part to be dealt with by this Parliament; and the House very much mistakes, no matter what its vote may be to-night, if it thinks that this Parliament has heard the last of this question; for I can assure this House that if the matter is disposed of here to-night by the adoption of the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice, I shall bring it up again at the earliest opportunity. If this is so—and that is certainly within my right, as the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) said last evening, and not only within my right, but within my duty—then where is the benefit of postponing, or delaying, or procrastinating on a question which we are told involves so many difficulties? This may or may not be a matter for the Territories to settle themselves, or for this Parliament to settle; but this measure raises no question between the right of the Territories and the right of this House to deal with it; because every member of this House knows perfectly well that if the Bill I have introduced passes this House, it will be with the full

assent and concurrence of a great majority of the people of the North-West Territories. But whether it is a matter for the Territories or for us to decide, we are neither doing one thing nor the other by making a pretence here for the sake of peace, by shaking hands across this table, by the leaders on this side and on that side putting their heads together and coercing their followers,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McCARTHY—because an amendment which will satisfy neither one party nor the other is not going to satisfy this country.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, the division which we appear about to reach will, I believe, close this debate; but the division list will not define the exact position of those who will vote nay. They are composed of three distinct parties: Those led by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who wish to reach his Bill, in order that they may support it; those led by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), who wish to support neither amendment nor the Bill; and those who wish to reach the first amendment, that proposed by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), in order that they may support it. I wish to define my position to be that I desire to reach the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), because I prefer it to the one moved by the hon. the Minister of Justice; but if the choice lay between the amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Justice, and the original motion, I should support the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice.

House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Sir John Thompson):

That this House, having regard to the long continued use of the French language in old Canada, and to the covenants on that subject embodied in the British North America Act, cannot agree to the declaration contained in the said Bill as the basis thereof, that it is expedient in the interest of the national unity of the Dominion that there should be community of language amongst the people of Canada;

That, on the contrary, this House declares its adherence to the said covenants and its determination to resist any attempt to impair the same;

That, at the same time, this House deems it expedient and proper and not inconsistent with those covenants that the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories should receive from the Parliament of Canada power to regulate, after the next general election of the Assembly, the proceedings of the Assembly and the manner of recording and publishing such proceedings.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Jones (Halifax),
Bain (Soulanges),	Kenny,
Barnard,	Kirk,
Béchar, d,	Kirkpatrick,
Bergeron,	Labrosse,
Bergin,	Landry,
Bernier,	Langelier (Montmorency),
Blake,	Langelier (Quebec),
Boisvert,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Borden,	LaRivière,
Bowell,	Laurie (Lieut.-General),
Bowman	Laurier,
Brien,	Lépine,
Brown,	Lister,
Bryson,	Lovitt,
Burdett,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Cameron,	Macdowall,
Campbell,	McCulla,
Cargill,	McDonald (Victoria),
Carling,	McDonald (Picton),
Carpenter,	McDonald (Cape Breton),
Casey,	McGreevy,
Casgrain,	McIntyre,
Chapleau,	McKay,

Choquette,	McKeen,
Chouinard,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Cimon,	Madill,
Cochrane,	Mara,
Cockburn,	Marshall,
Colby,	Masson,
Cook,	Massue,
Corty,	Meigs,
Costigan,	Mills (Annapolis),
Coughlin,	Mills (Bothwell),
Coulombe,	Mitchell,
Curran,	Moffat,
Daly,	Moncrieff,
Dauoust,	Montplaisir,
Davin,	Perley,
Davis,	Pope,
Dawson,	Porter,
De St. Georges,	Prior,
Desaulniers,	Purcell,
Desjardins,	Putnam,
Dessaint,	Rinfret,
Dewdney,	Riopel,
Dickey,	Robillard,
Dickinson,	Roome,
Dupont,	Ross,
Earle,	Rykert,
Edgar,	Scarth,
Edwards,	Shanley,
Eisenhauer,	Skinner,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Small,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Smith (Sir Donald),
Ferguson (Welland),	Smith (Ontario),
Fiset,	Sproule,
Flynn,	Stevenson,
Foster,	Taylor,
Freeman,	Temple,
Gigault,	Thérien,
Girouard,	Thompson (Sir John),
Gordon,	Trow,
Grandbois,	Tupper,
Guay,	Turcot,
Guillet,	Vanasse,
Haggart,	Wallace,
Hesson,	Ward,
Hickey,	White (Cardwell),
Holton,	Wilmot,
Hudspeth,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Ives,	Wood (Brockville), and
Jamieson,	Wood (Westmoreland), and
Joncas,	Wright.—149.
Jones (Digby),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	McNeill,
Armstrong,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Neveu,
Barron,	O'Brien,
Beausoleil,	Paterson (Brant),
Bell,	Perry,
Bourassa,	Platt,
Charlton,	Préfontaine,
Couture,	Robertson,
Davies,	Rowand,
Denison,	Ste. Marie,
Doyon,	Scriven,
Ellis,	Semple,
Gauthier,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
Gillmor,	Tyrwhitt,
Hale,	Waldie,
Imce,	Watson,
Landerkin,	Weldon (Albert),
Lang,	Weldon (St. John),
Livingston,	Welsh,
Macdonald (Huron),	White (Renfrew),
McCarthy,	Wilson (Elgin),
McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Lennox), and
McMullen,	Yeo.—50.

Amendment to amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to on the same division.

Main motion, as amended, agreed to on the same division.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 24th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ELBOW RIVER WATER POWER COMPANY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved :

That the Order of the House of the 14th instant, referring Bill No. 76, to incorporate the Elbow River Water Power Company, to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, be discharged, and the Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the Montreal Bridge and Terminus Company.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec.)

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 45) to incorporate the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Canada Cable Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate Belding, Paul & Company (Limited).—(Mr. Curran.)

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Northern and Western Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The Canada Eastern Railway Company."—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 16) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Samuel May.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the Hamilton Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Duck Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Leeds and Grenville.)

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 81) respecting "The Don Improvement," Toronto.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 82) to confirm an agreement between the Montreal and Western Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Alberta Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 84) to amend the Act to incorporate the Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Corby.)

Bill (No. 87) respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the North Canadian Atlantic Railway and Steamship Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Mr. PLATT.

Bill (No. 89) to amend the Act to incorporate the River Detroit Winter Railway Bridge Company, and to change the name of the company to the River Detroit Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 90) to amend the Act incorporating the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Bill (No. 91) to grant certain powers to the Chambly Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Ontario Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Bell.)

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 94) to incorporate the Thousand Islands Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Bell.)

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the Department of Marine, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1889.—(Mr. Colby.)

CANADIAN HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS.

Mr. VANASSE asked, Whether the Government have taken notice of the following remarks made by Mr. Brymner, the Dominion Archivist, in his report for 1888 :—

"I have the honor again most respectfully to draw your attention to the reports of Mr. Joseph Marmette respecting the documents in Paris. No doubt can be entertained as to the importance of having them copied as soon as possible; and I may be allowed to remark, in this connection, that our courts are now engaged in determining claims for considerable sums, which it is impossible to settle without recourse to the Paris documents. Our archives cannot possibly do without one copy of these papers."

And also of the following remarks contained in the report of Mr. Marmette for 1885 :—

"May I be permitted, in conclusion, to speak strongly regarding the expediency of having copied, as soon as possible, the manuscripts connected with our history, which are to be found in the public offices and the libraries of Paris. Should there come upon France any political storm, such as burst upon her in the revolutions of 1789 and 1830, and in the horrors of the Commune in 1871, the criminal hand of a frenzied person—by burning a public office or certain buildings in Paris—might again burn thousands of pages unknown to our historians, without reckoning the dispersion of important papers which a populace thirsty for pillage might occasion. For example, have we not assurance that a number of manuscripts relating to the history of Canada are to be found, at the present moment, in St. Petersburg, where they were carried by the Secretary of the Russian Embassy, Pierre Dubroski, who, at the time of the sacking of the Bastille, in 1789, and of the pillage of the Abbey of Saint-Germain des Prés, in 1791, himself gathered hundreds of bundles of manuscripts, at this moment still stained with mud.

"However far removed from our reach these documents are, however not entirely lost to us; but can we avoid feeling the most bitter regrets when we find Harris—*from whom we have borrowed the foregoing details*—add the following in his 'Notes to be used for a History and Bibliography of New France': 'So neglectful were they of the archives in the office of the Minister of Marine, that their precious documents served to feed, during five weeks of the winter of 1793, the stove of a picket of the National Guard stationed in the very building where the archives were lodged.' And further on he adds: 'In 1830 an employé gave up the archives to be pillaged, and sold them, by weight, for his own profit,

whole bundles, of which some were bought up at the price of fifteen centimes the document by autograph hunters, whose collections are still enriched by their possession.' Again, at page 5 of the introduction to the same work, HARRISSE says further: 'The letters of Pierre Voyer d'Argenson, Governor of Canada from 1658 to 1661, were deposited in the Library of the Louvre, which was burnt by the communists in 1871, while the despatches of Louis d'Aillebout de Coulanges (1648-1651-7), of Lauzon (1651-1656), of the Marquis de Tracy (1655-1667), and of M. de Courcelles (1668-1672), have never been recovered.'

Are the Government aware that there are now in the office of the Minister of Marine, in France, more than one thousand volumes of manuscripts relating exclusively to the history of the various Provinces forming this Dominion? Have the Government any intention of causing copies to be made of these documents and papers, in order to deposit them in the Archives Office of Canada? If so, when? If not, why not?

Mr. CARLING. That matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. CIMON asked, In how many counties has "The Canada Temperance Act" been put into force since its passing? In how many counties has this Act been repealed? How many counties are now petitioning for the bringing of the Act into force?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Act has been put into force in seventy-one counties; it has been repealed in thirty-one counties; and there are no petitions at present for submitting it to any other county.

THE FISHERIES QUESTION.

Mr. FLYNN (for Mr. JONES, Halifax) asked, Whether, in view of the negotiations respecting the fisheries now going on at Washington between the British Minister and the American Government, as announced by the leader of the Government to this House, it is the intention of the Government to appoint a Canadian Commissioner to take part in the negotiations, and to watch over and protect the interests of Canada?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been no formal commission issued, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries left this afternoon at half-past one in order to represent Canada at Washington.

CLOSING OF POST OFFICES ON SUNDAY.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec) asked, Whether the Government have any petition asking for the closing of post offices on Sunday; from whom; when; what action have they taken as to such petition, and what do they intend to do in relation thereto?

Mr. HAGGART. There is no petition in my Department asking for the closing of the post offices on Sunday.

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada, or any of the Departments, and the Messrs. Anderson, or any other parties, respecting the Atlantic mail service.

Mr. FOSTER. It is impossible to bring down this correspondence at the present time. I think the reason will be obvious, when I state

to the House the present position of the negotiations. The House is well aware of the negotiations which took place previous to last Session, and also of the vote of \$500,000, which was taken last Session, for the purpose of procuring, if possible, a fast line of steam service between this country and Great Britain. The negotiations were continued after the Session, and a provisional contract entered into with the Messrs. Anderson. These gentlemen, however, found it impossible to carry out their contract, and handed it back to the Government. Since then negotiations have been and are still going on, and it would be exceedingly injudicious in the public interest to make known those negotiations while they are still unfinished.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot at all accept the explanations, if explanations they can be called, of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman has told us that the House was aware that there had been negotiations going on previous to last Session. I do not know that the House was ever aware of any such thing. The hon. gentleman asked last year for an appropriation without giving to Parliament any of the information which Parliament should have been given previous to the granting of the vote asked for. The hon. gentleman has not forgotten that last Session, before taking the vote, it was moved from this side that no appropriation should be made until the House was put in possession of all the demands for tenders, and all the tenders received, and all information as to the nature of the service required. We have not had yet any information, and it is certainly not at all satisfactory to the public, after twelve months have elapsed, to be told simply that negotiations are still pending, and that nothing has been done which could be laid before Parliament. Parliament, in my judgment, is entitled to some information on the subject, but, of course, if the hon. gentleman refuses to furnish it, all I can do is to submit under protest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. Minister of Finance has declined to bring down the papers because to do so would be an injury to Canada. As mentioned by him, a vote was taken last Session for half a million dollars in order to get a fast line. The Government had to get as fast a line as any that entered the port of New York, and the Messrs. Anderson, a firm of shipbuilders of high standing, came here and entered into a provisional contract. But it involved a very large sum of money, £2,000,000 sterling, to carry out that contract, and they were to go to England and do what they could. They thought they could get the money, but the demand for steel and the amount required were so great that they were unable to carry out their contract, and they availed themselves of the two months allowed them by their agreement within which they might declare their inability to form a company. Now, the Government have been endeavoring to get other contractors, but the hon. gentleman will see that to publish the negotiations and correspondence would simply show our hand to any other party we might be dealing with, and it is not advisable we should do so.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think it is much to be regretted that the Government did not see their way to bringing down the correspondence the House is entitled to, especially after the long time which has elapsed since this matter was brought

before the House. As the hon. the leader of the Opposition has stated, we took exception to the vote last year on the ground which hon. gentlemen maintained most energetically when they were in Opposition—that appropriations should always be accompanied with all the explanations and information that can be produced on the subject. Now, twelve months have elapsed. The Government are in possession of the offers from Messrs. Anderson, and we want to know what were the terms upon which the Government entered into a contract with these gentlemen. We wanted to know what speed they had arranged for, whether one of the terminal points was to be in the Dominion and another in France; whether these steamers were to possess the speed which the hon. the Minister of Finance said they could possess when he brought down his resolution. The right hon. the leader of the Government says now that that vote was to obtain a line equalling, in speed, the fastest lines in New York; but, according to the Government organs, which, no doubt, were inspired, the time for completing the voyage stipulated between this country and Liverpool would only require a ship to make sixteen knots an hour. If that be the case, there is a very marked difference between the speed of the steamers running from New York and the contract which the Government papers announced as entered into with the Messrs. Anderson. For these and other reasons, the Government are bound to put the House in possession of the desired information. We all saw distinctly last year that the hon. the Minister of Finance was discussing a question he did not understand. Certain figures had been given him respecting the route and distances and the cost of transport and the speed of the vessels, which were made up for the occasion, and when objections were pointed out to the hon. gentleman he could not answer them, because they were plain facts stated by the owners of steamboat lines and shippers who had engaged in that business all their lives. The hon. gentleman found his estimates were entirely inaccurate. When the Government entered into this contract with the Messrs. Anderson, it was obvious from the very commencement that they were bound to fail because they were asking, according to their speeches, for a class of steamers which could not be maintained on the subsidy given. They were asking for a port in France as a port of call, which would be destructive to the success of the line, and there were other conditions which, coupled with these, made it useless to expect success in a well-known commercial community like London. What was the result? The Messrs. Anderson, when they went to the other side, were met with a letter from the head of the Allan line, and it was very natural that they should be so met. They said, we propose to put on those steamers and they gave information as to the amount of Canadian traffic, and, when the moneyed men of England found that two large fleets like those of the Dominion and Allan lines would not accept the terms which the Government offered them, according to their explanation to this House, it was only natural that the moneyed men of England would have nothing to do with the matter, and I believe that they will have nothing to do with it now. This delay is most disastrous. It is disastrous to the interests of the country. I am informed that these

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

two lines have made an offer to the Government to put on a sixteen or seventeen knot line, and I have always contended that that is sufficient for our business if it is connected with a good freight line. I desire to know if that is one of the proposals which the Government are considering or if they are still running abroad to get other competitors, and are keeping the real competitors, who would deal with this in a proper way, out of the competition? One of these companies is building a steamer at present of between 5,000 and 6,000 tons. That is the Dominion line, and it has been awaiting the action of the Government to know whether the sixteen or seventeen knot service would be accepted; because, if it were accepted, that line would put in the machinery to make that speed. I believe they have pressed the Government to say whether they will accept that offer or not, and the last communication states that the matter is still unsettled.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What line is that?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Dominion line.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are subsidiary to the Allan line.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They are now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have had no direct communication with the Government.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman will not say that the Dominion line have not asked him or his Finance Minister to consider them as negotiators. I know as a fact that they have, and the Finance Minister will not deny it if the First Minister does.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The First Minister may not be aware of all the facts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am aware of all the facts.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My information is that they have approached the Government, and have stated that they are prepared to enter into negotiations for a line of sixteen or seventeen knots, and that that took place no longer than three or four months ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Never in the world.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And they were informed by the Government that the matter was all adrift, and that they could give no information on the subject. Consequently, it is probable that that steamer of 6,000 tons will probably be turned into a freight steamer, because the Government cannot give any information on the subject. I think the Government are not only treating the public very unfairly, but are treating this House with great disrespect. They tell us they had a contract with the Messrs. Anderson. The hon. gentleman says that will show for itself in the hands of the public. Does he suppose that the public do not know what the Messrs. Anderson were at? They are evidently out of the field. Now, are the Government negotiating with another company, or are they still negotiating with the Messrs. Anderson, because the remarks of the hon. gentleman would suggest that the Andersons are set aside and that the Government are negotiating with some other company. This delay is of the most delusive.

character. Either the Government never intended to put on a fast line, or they are keeping it back for some purpose of their own. There is quite properly and quite naturally an anxiety on the part of the commercial people to have a fast mail service, but I say that a line of sixteen or seventeen knots, with a proper capacity for carrying freight, is sufficient in the interests of Canada, and under those circumstances I think the Government are not serving the interests of Canada either commercially or in a postal sense, by keeping the matter hanging over so long. We have constant intimations from the Government organs that this Government is going to give us this fast line, and when members of the Government speak, as the Minister of Finance spoke at Toronto last year, they state that this is going to happen at once, and they do not appear at the same time to attempt to take advantage of the offers made from either of these companies. I complain of them, first, for not giving us the information they possess; secondly, for not negotiating with our own companies, composed of men who have built, to a large extent, the trade and traffic of this country, who have a fine class of steamers, and are prepared to put on a larger class of steamers of sixteen or seventeen knots to meet the necessities of our service.

Motion negatived on a division.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE—STUDENTS' MARKS.

Mr. PLATT moved for:

Return showing:—1. The number of marks for all subjects received by each cadet of the present first and second classes at Royal Military College, Kingston, from 1886 and 1887, respectively, up to 30th June, 1889. 2. The names of the cadets now serving as non-commissioned officers, together with a statement showing the total number of marks received by each, and number of marks obtained by each in each subject. 3. The names of the cadets who failed in the examinations in June, 1889, and who left the college. Also, a statement showing the names of cadets who were permitted to have special examinations after June, 1889, and the subjects of examination in each case.

He said: The object I have in moving this resolution is to obtain for the information of the public, details as to the conduct of the Military College, which I think it is for the interest of all to have placed before the public.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think this cannot be granted. There can be no objection to the granting of the number of marks received by each cadet, provided that the names of the cadets are not given. It would be very unjust to any of the young men who have been unfortunate, that their names should be given; and that is always true with regard to universities and educational institutions. There can be no object then, in giving the names of the young gentlemen who have not succeeded in getting the requisite number of marks, and in publishing their names to the world as having failed early in life. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want that. But he can number the cadets as Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and so on, and giving the number of marks each one has received. The third clause of the motion cannot possibly be granted. With regard to the second clause, I presume the hon. gentleman has an idea that there has been some favoritism shown, or, if not, I do not see why that motion is made. The

first clause of the question can be granted on condition that the names of the cadets are not given. The first and the second clauses can be given, but the third cannot.

Mr. PLATT. I have no desire to get any information other than that which is usually granted, or that is unnecessary. I do not apprehend that it will be necessary for the information which I wish to obtain, to give the names of the cadets and the marks they receive. If the right hon. gentleman objects to that clause I am willing to amend it so as to satisfy him in that respect. I am also willing to eliminate the first clause which asks for the names of the cadets who have failed. Otherwise, I think the information asked for is reasonable and necessary.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the right hon. gentleman is in error in saying that these particulars are never published. We know that in every examination that takes place in the medical or legal professions, the names of the candidates are always published according to the position they occupy as the result of the examination.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Only the successful ones are published; the unsuccessful ones, never.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not wish to parade the name of any one who has been unfortunate enough not to pass the examination; but I thought the object of my hon. friend in bringing this motion forward, was to clear away a misapprehension which exists in the minds of a good many people. I know that, in my own Province, there is a feeling that favoritism has been shown. I know a gentleman in Halifax who spoke to me on the subject, and said that his son had obtained a much higher number of marks than some others who had received their commission, and he wanted this matter brought before the House. Now the question has been brought up, I might as well say what I have to say upon the subject. Of course, it is very desirable that the public should have confidence in that institution, and that they should feel that when their sons have passed the examinations at the Military College, they are going to stand on their merits, and if they have a higher number of marks than others, and any commissions are to be given, they are entitled to them. I hope that the motion of my hon. friend is to remove that misapprehension. I think it would be very desirable that the right hon. gentleman should bring down the names of those who have passed, and the number of marks they have respectively obtained. It would not be putting them in a more equivocal position than the candidates for other professions in the country, whose names are always published in the regular rotation in which they have passed their final examination. Of course, I would not desire, and I think it would be unkind, to ask that the names should be published of those who have failed in their examination, or who have left the college; but only those should be published who have passed their final examination in the order of merit in which they stood. I think this would interest the public, and would be more satisfactory, and give more confidence in the college than exists now in the minds of a good many people. I know nothing personally of these complaints, but I have been spoken to frequently on this subject, and I think now that it ought to be cleared up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand, the hon. gentleman does not charge any favoritism on the college, but on the Government. He says that a friend of his complained that his son had got a larger number of marks than any other person who got a commission. Well, that does not show any favoritism on the part of the college, but it might be the subject of a motion, if the hon. gentleman is inclined to make it, with respect to the granting of the commission. I think, perhaps, the best plan would be for the hon. member to allow his motion to stand over, and he and I will get together and settle the terms of his motion so as to meet his views.

Mr. PLATT. I will consent to that.

Motion allowed to stand.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORTS.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland) moved for :

Return showing the number of reports of the Geological Survey published respectively for each year of the last ten years, the number sold each year, the number distributed gratuitously, and the number still on hand.

He said: In making this motion I desire to say that from information which has reached me, not only from parties connected with the Civil Service, but also from members of this House, the reports of the Geological Survey are of very little value to this country. Now, Sir, if that Department is of any use at all, it is to give information to the public. It is not absolutely necessary in the governmental machinery of any country, but it may be useful for the purpose of gathering information and spreading it among the people in order that the resources of the country might be developed. I have been informed that there are tons upon tons weight of reports of the Geological Survey that are lying in the cellars of the Department and are being eaten up by the mice and the caterpillars, and being destroyed. I have been informed by members of this House that they have made applications to that Department for copies of these reports and have not received them; on the contrary, they have been treated very curtly when they asked for them. I am also informed that special reports have been published by the officers in charge of field work, which reports are of particular value to the public. I understand that none of these special reports are distributed to the public at all. If such is the case, I think it is desirable that the attention of the Minister in charge of that Department should be called to it, in order that the money of the people, voted by this House and spent in geological work, should be expended in such a way that the people may derive some benefit from getting the information thus procured. The Geological Survey Branch state that their reports are for sale at certain places; but, on those places being visited, the reports are found not to be for sale there. Besides, the public have no notice given of the place where they can be had. There is very little use in placing reports in the hands of booksellers in obscure streets in a city, when no notice is given to the public as to where these reports are to be found. By adopting this motion and obtaining the return, members of the House will be better able to deal with the subject subsequently.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Of course there can be no objection to the return being brought down, in fact my officers have already been preparing it. I

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

believe there is a large number of these reports on hand for different years, a great many more copies of the reports for some years than for others. I have found on enquiry that some years there has been a very large demand for a certain report, while in other years there has been a very slight demand. The distribution of the reports is regulated by Order in Council, and a number of Orders in Council have been passed from the time of Sir William Logan down to the present. I think every hon. member receives one copy from the Department and two more from the Printing Committee, consequently every hon. member should receive three copies. This matter, I repeat, is regulated by Order in Council, and the director and myself are bound by that Order. Should it be thought necessary to make the distribution more liberal, I would have no objection to this being done, but it must be remembered that this is a very expensive report. These reports are placed at different points for sale, and, if they have been sold out, the party who is selling them has only to apply to the Department for fresh copies and they will be furnished. The special reports referred to by the hon. gentleman are, I presume, the reports of the individual surveyors who are allowed to publish them under their own direction, and the applications for those have not been at all numerous, although the distribution of them is made on application. No application made to me since I have been in office has been refused. I have also succeeded in obtaining for institutions and for some individuals copies of these reports, where I found we had a large number on hand. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has brought forward the matter, and the return will be brought down at a very early day, in order that the House may understand the exact position of the matter.

Mr. ELLIS. The great difficulty regarding the reports is that you have to go through an enormous number of pages to find out any information which may be required. What is really wanted is a small manual, indicating clearly where the information and details are to be found, compiled from these reports, and the whole matter thus brought within the space of an ordinary blue book. These reports are printed on most expensive paper and prepared in a most expensive manner. I have been applied to twenty times, I suppose, by people in New Brunswick for copies of special reports. I presume the people who made these requests really wanted the information embodied in these reports. In order to furnish it I had to supply them with very valuable books, whereas the whole matter might have been placed in a comparatively small compass. A different system should be inaugurated. The Geological Department desire to make a very great display in a scientific direction, but what is required is not such scientific display, but a display for the economic purposes of the Dominion.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Very few people are aware that the special reports are printed. I can well understand, for example, that a special report made on the Lake Superior district would prove a great advantage to the people of that district and might be the means of inducing capital to come in; but not only are few people aware that such reports are printed, but I am informed there are many printed and few distributed. Our

object should be to give full information as to what is being done in that Department, and the reports printed should be distributed to the public.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTED GRAINS AND SEEDS.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) moved :

That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—That it is expedient to remove the duty on, and place on the Free List all grains and seeds which do not ripen in Canada, but which are now largely imported and sown for the production of food for cattle under the system of feeding called soiling and ensilage, now largely adopted by the farmers of Canada.

He said: I am encouraged in making this motion by the statement made by the hon. the Minister of Customs last Session, when he declared that this matter would receive the serious consideration of the Government, and that, if it was found it did not interfere with any other important branch of agriculture, it would receive every favorable consideration. I cannot see what other branch of agriculture this would interfere with. In the farmers' institutes last year there was no question in connection with agriculture which elicited a greater amount of discussion as that of soiling and ensilage. I have also been encouraged by the course the Government is pursuing in setting apart \$25,000, which the Government organs declare they are going to set apart, for the purpose of bringing in seed barley, to be distributed among the farmers of the Dominion, so as to test the different varieties and find those best suited for the English market. While the Government is in this respect taking a step that will result in a benefit to the farmers, it is much more important that they should encourage the farmers of the Dominion to go into the system of soiling and ensilage. I understand that they have engaged Professor Robertson, and that he has been going to the several farmers' institutes, to explain to them this system. I am perfectly aware that Professor Robertson, at all these institute meetings which he attended during the last three or four years, advised all he came into contact with to go into this system of feeding cattle. He advises strongly that butter-making ought to be gone into during the winter months—something that has not heretofore largely engaged the attention of the farmers of this Dominion. Under the system followed by the farmers heretofore, that was almost impossible, but now it is found that ensilage is one of the best feeds that can be given to cows for the production of good butter during the winter. I have been encouraged also by the statement of the hon. the Minister of Customs, that the Government will take into consideration all young industries and all branches of industries not largely followed in Canada. Well, this is a new branch of the agricultural industry in Canada, and one that is calculated to be very advantageous to the people. Mr. Robertson stated, at the meeting of the Dairymen's Association held in this city the other day, that the system of feeding ensilage to cows would reduce the value of the daily ration fed to a cow from 22 cents to 15 cents. Take this for the half year, and you will find it means a saving of \$12.75 upon each cow in the Dominion. In the Province of Ontario alone, we have over 700,000 cows. Take \$12.50 of a saving on each cow, and you will find a total

saving of \$8,750,000 by adopting the system of ensilage. I hold it is the duty of the Government to assist the farmers in the production most profitable to them, and most in the interests of the agricultural community in the future. While I commend the action of the Government in seeking out new descriptions of barley, to supplant the six-row barley we have been accustomed to grow in Ontario, and find a profitable market in Great Britain; I hold with Professor Robertson that the day has come when the farmer ought not to be the exporter of any grain but wheat. At the meeting of the Dairymen's Association at Ottawa, Professor Robertson said that farmers ought to consume all the coarse grains on their farms, and import all the cheap coarse grains they can obtain, in order that the animals they export may go out in a finished condition, and not in the condition in which a large number are sent out at present. Let me observe that a very large amount of raw material is brought into the Dominion to assist the various manufacturers to carry on their occupations. In 1888, \$1,605,000 worth of wool came into the country, duty free, to favor the wool manufacturers, and even the woollens we have are not gaining very rapidly on the market of Canada; because I find, during the last year, that \$10,000,000 worth of manufactured woollen goods were brought into the Dominion. So that with all the advantages of free wool our manufacturers are not keeping out the imported goods and giving to the farmers of Canada the market they were promised under the National Policy. \$3,800,000 worth of raw material came into the Dominion in favor of the cotton manufacturers, and yet those manufacturers put the whole amount of that duty on the price of goods they sell in the Canadian market. The tanners received in hides and skins \$1,587,000 worth of raw material free for their interests. We find that the manufacturers of furniture and other goods made from lumber and timber got \$867,000 worth of raw material brought into the country; making a total of \$7,896,000 worth of raw material which came in, in the interests of these four manufacturing industries. It is a very small amount involved in what the farmers have been asking, and I hope the Government will see their way to give us that relief. It has been said that the farmers have not come to Ottawa, and ask for the relief which we have asked for on the floor of the House, but the Government cannot be ignorant of the importance of this branch of industry. I was at the Experimental Farm, and I found that the Government had silos there and were experimenting with ensilage, and I think they are succeeding very well. When it is thought important to spend the amount of money which has been spent on the Experimental Farm, in order that the farmers of the country may be indirectly benefited—because some \$248,000 has been spent upon the Central Experimental Farm in order to give the farmers an indirect benefit—is it too much to ask that the small amount should be granted which will encourage the mode of farming to which we are now tending, and which will make farming more profitable than any other scheme that could be devised. I hold that it is the duty of the Government to encourage the farmers by every means in their power. In regard to animals, we find that we have in Ontario 1,928,000 head of cattle. If, as Professor Robertson states, it will save \$10

a head to adopt this system, I ask what will be the amount saved to the farmers of Ontario by its adoption? Many of the most advanced farmers are seriously taking into consideration the building of siloes, in order to keep the ensilage over until the next summer, and making arrangements to feed the cattle under cover during the day time, and only to let them out to pasture during the night. Seeing that this is so important a measure and that such large interests are involved in it, it is the duty of the Government to assist us by every means, because this system is one which returns to the soil almost all which is taken out of it. Compare this system with that which they are encouraging to-day, of distributing barley among the farmers to enable them to send to the English markets a class of goods which may find a market there. The farmer who will consume his own produce and make farming pay, deserves more encouragement than the farmer who is sending his barley to the English market, because every load of barley which is sent to the English market is so much fertility taken off the farm. I do not think those who take this position could long hold the position which we, as farmers, have long occupied. It is the duty of the Government, and of those who take so great an interest in agriculture, and those who occupy seats behind the Treasury benches, to give us assistance in this matter. Although farmers have not come in large deputations to the House of Commons, let me read what took place at a farmers' institute in East Middlesex, and that is perhaps the third county in the Province of Ontario which can grow corn with profit to the farmer. I believe that only Essex and Kent are more favorable than East Middlesex for the growing of corn. From the *Globe* of 3rd February last, I take the following:—

“At a meeting of the East Middlesex Farmers' Institute yesterday, the paper read by Mr. F. R. Shore, on the subject of the duty on coarse grain evoked a long and animated discussion. Finally, the following resolution, moved by Mr. F. R. Shore, seconded by Mr. R. Gorwell, was passed with only four dissenting votes: ‘Resolved, That, in the opinion of this institution, it would be beneficial to have the duty removed from American corn.’”

I may say that the gentleman who moved this resolution has been a life-long Conservative, one who has had the scales removed from his eyes a short time ago with respect to the benefit of the National Policy to the agricultural community. Let me read part of a resolution passed at the Central Ontario Farmers' Institute in Toronto, and see whether or not the farmers who sent the delegates, and the delegates who met there, are afraid of the importation of coarse grains into Ontario, or believe that it will deprive the farmer of his own market:

“Therefore, this Central Institute do respectfully ask the Government to reduce the tariff on articles of prime necessity to the farmer, such as iron, steel, coal, cottons, woollens, rubbers, sugars, corn and salt.”

That is the view of the Central Farmers' Institute, and the discussion was carried on apparently without any political feeling, and when the vote was taken there was some seventy who voted for the resolution, twenty-four refrained from voting, and only three or four voted against it. It is the duty of the Government to pay attention to all these facts; and, if I have not been misinformed, a number of petitions have been sent to the Government from agricultural societies in the Province of Quebec asking them to remove the duty on corn. In face of these petitions and resolutions, it is

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

certainly the duty of the Government to give us the relief which we ask. It is a very small amount which is involved. Compare the exports of last year with those of 1881 and 1882, and you will find that the value of agricultural products exported is about \$16,000,000 less than the exports at that time. This may perhaps be caused in part by the failure of crops, and no Government can give us good crops, although the leader of the present Government stated, when the National Policy was adopted, that he was in league with the Clerk of the Weather, and that when the Conservative Government was in power, we should have the refreshing shower and the genial sunshine and the good crop. I must say that, if the hon. gentleman was in league with the Clerk of the Weather, he has steadily neglected his duty in those respects. At all events it is the duty of the Government to give us the relief which we ask in this resolution.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The motion before the House, although it may appear a small one to some, is one of great importance in the questions that it raises. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) has referred to the resolution passed by the Farmers' Institute. I know the gentleman who read the essay that day, and who moved the resolution my hon. friend has just read to the House. I can state that he is a gentleman of very large experience and of great intelligence; and not only that, but he is one of the largest stock breeders in the Province of Ontario, a man in every way qualified to judge of what he is talking about. It has been pleaded in this House, and may be again before this debate is ended, that this is really but a small matter. We may be told that only a small quantity of seed is imported into the Dominion, and that the duty collected upon it does not amount to very much. But, Sir, we are all familiar with the proverb that it was the last straw that broke the camel's back. It is so at the present time. The farmer has to pay a little on one thing, a little on another thing, and a little on everything under the sun, and it comes to a large amount when taken in the aggregate. This, perhaps, is an opportune time to enter upon a reform in this direction. I need not tell the hon. members of this House who are engaged in agriculture, that, at the present time, agriculture in this Dominion is in a sort of transition state, that we have come to a crisis in the agricultural affairs of this country. Some twenty years ago, our neighbors on the other side of the line conceived the absurd idea that they could manufacture in their own country everything they needed, and that they could compel other countries to pay cash for what they had to sell. They thought that wheat was king, and that they could compel England to buy their wheat and pay gold for it, while they manufactured the articles they needed for their own consumption. That idea was founded upon a fallacy. There are laws in trade as certain in their operation as the laws of gravitation, and one of them is: that people must buy where they sell, that they must exchange the articles they have to sell for the articles which they need to buy. This was the fallacy that the American Government committed, and I need not tell this House that the Canadian Government, a few years later, slavishly followed the example of the United States, and made the very same fatal mistake; and what is the result to-day? It has always been

found in the world's history that a demand stimulates a supply. England was no exception to the general rule that a nation must buy where it sells, and when she found that America was determined not to buy from her, she resolved to find some other place in which to purchase her bread supply. She turned her attention to other lands, and found there was an illimitable area of fertile soil in India, for example, fit for the production of wheat, and in this and other countries, she stimulated a production of those articles of food she needed, and she found there a market in which to trade off her manufactured articles. Previous to that time the people of these other countries never thought of raising a bushel of wheat for export, whereas, now they contribute the largest part of the supply that Britain needs. The English people said to them: If you will raise wheat for us, we will give you in exchange the articles we manufacture, and which you need; and the trade has been profitable on both sides. Now, look at the results as far as America is concerned. In India they can raise about three bushels of wheat for the same cost that one can be raised for in America, and they take British goods in exchange. What is the result? The United States thought that they could coerce England into buying their grain and paying gold for it, and they find now when it is too late that they have made a mistake. The market has gone from them, and apparently gone for ever; for Britain can exchange her manufactured goods in the countries where she has stimulated the production of wheat, but she cannot send her manufactures into the United States and Canada in exchange for the articles she requires. Such is the state of things now that the market for cereals, which the United States formerly enjoyed, has gone from them. Well, Sir, Canada is in much the same condition as the United States, and we have to meet these changed conditions; we have to meet the fact that the products of the soil are fetching a much smaller price than they formerly did. We have another fearful condition to meet: we find that the farms are losing much of their former fertility, that the virgin soil is being exhausted, and that not only the products of the soil fetch a smaller price, but that we can also produce much less in quantity of those products; so that the candle is lighted and is burning at both ends. Now, the hon. member for Huron has pointed out one way by which that altered condition can be met; he has pointed out how the burden upon our farmers can be eased off in one direction, and the fertility of the soil increased. It is only by making one acre produce as much as two formerly did, that we can meet these changed conditions. As I said at the outset, it may be pleaded that these are very small matters; but when you come to take the amount of duty paid on all these articles that the farmer requires, it amounts to a tremendous aggregate. The other day I received a letter from a very intelligent gentleman, a farmer, in my own constituency, and he drew my attention to the fact that the combination among the salt manufacturers, rendered possible by the tariff—for the tariff is responsible for every one of the combinations that we have in this country—he pointed out that the salt combination had so raised the price of salt, that the price had become so burdensome to the consumer, that salt has ceased nearly

altogether to be used as an article for manuring the land. This gentleman has had experience in the use of salt for manure, and he knows perfectly well that while it is good on almost all soils, upon certain kinds of soil no other manure can be applied that will produce such marked results as salt. Mr. Glen, the gentleman who wrote me, did not write only in his private capacity, but he wrote as Master of Elgin Division Grange, and his statement was endorsed by Mr. Little, Master of London Division Grange. Hon. members are aware that the duty on salt in barrel is 15 cents per 100 lbs.; the duty on salt in bulk, the variety used for fertilising purposes, is 10 cents per 100 lbs., or \$2 per ton. This duty is so large as to almost prohibit our farmers using it. They find under the altered condition of things that it is practically out of their reach. This gentleman formerly dealt in salt. I wrote to him for particulars, and he waited until the East Middlesex Farmers' Institute held one of its regular meetings, and then the information was given. The subject was there fully and fairly considered in all its aspects, and it was moved by Mr. James A. Glen, Master of the Grange, and seconded by Mr. James Lammamin:

"That, whereas, owing to the combination of salt manufacturers, the agricultural community are compelled to pay 45 cents per barrel more than under competition, and the use of salt for manurial purposes has fallen off almost entirely, we are of opinion that salt should be either put on the free list or the duty reduced to 10 cents per barrel and salt in bulk to 30 cents per ton, and that binding twine should be put upon the free list."

This motion was carried unanimously. The tariff upon this article enables the manufacturers to combine and advance the price for all purposes for which it is used. It is used for cattle, in the manufacture of cheese, for curing hay and for manure, and the duty and the combination, resulting as a necessary consequence from the duty, has enhanced the price very materially and prevented its use in directions where it was formerly beneficially employed. So much is it the case that when I left London it was retailing from \$1.20 to \$1.30 per barrel, while in Michigan it was 70 cents per barrel. That is the way our farmers are fleeced. Then with respect to the item of fertilisers: we remember the time when the Government imposed a duty of \$6 per ton on every kind of fertiliser that came into the country. After a hard struggle we got it changed to 20 per cent., which still is a heavy discrimination against the farmer. Last Session a motion was made from this side of the House to place fertilisers on the free list, but it was voted down. After prorogation I returned home and saw in the *London Free Press* a letter written by Chas. James Fox, who has always been a supporter of the present Government, drawing attention to this matter. He said:

"Last Session a motion was moved to put fertilisers on the free list; voted down. It is all very well to speak of our phosphate mines. They may represent much wealth, but in any case, and in the case of most farmers, it is not the phosphate they want, but an article containing a large proportion of nitrogen and potash. My experience in buying in Canada is, that I pay dearly for an article containing little else but the native phosphate rock ground up or else a large proportion of the German kanit. In buying in New York, I have always met with success, knowing I am getting a good article, and I have always paid the duty without grumbling."

Here is a worse grievance than the duty. On 1st April he got a notice that his fertiliser was at

the Grand Trunk Railway station. He sent on the 2nd for it, with the duty; sent back 12 miles with the answer that a sample of it must be sent to Ottawa to be analysed before he could get it. Went himself on 8th; got same answer. He goes on to say that if he cannot get it before the proper time to apply it, the use of it would be lost to him. He adds that he has been a Conservative thirty-four years, but if this is the way farmers are treated, the sooner we have a change the better. Again, I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is one article which enters into every implement and tool on the farm—I refer to iron. In order to stimulate the production of iron in this country, the farmers are called upon to pay double price for the raw material of every article into which iron enters. That is the way the farmers are fleeced. Let me say a few words in regard to binding twine, which the Middlesex Farmers' Institute has asked to be placed on the free list. We know there is a combination of manufacturers of twine, and that the increased price farmers are called upon to pay has become a serious matter. A farmer was formerly called upon to pay 11 cents a pound, and that was a considerable tax, because three pounds of twine, on an average, are required for an acre of grain, or a tax equal to 33 cents per acre. Last year the manila twine manufacturers combined and raised the price until the merchants charged 18 cents a pound. It was ascertained, however, that two pounds of flax twine were equal to three pounds of manila, and this competition brought down the price of manila to 15 or 16 cents a pound. Taking the price as 15 cents, a farmer has to pay 45 cents per acre for binding twine. Farmers are in other respects placed at a disadvantage compared with other classes. Duties are imposed with a view to stimulate all other industries, but they are apparently intended to discourage the farming interest. Take salt, for instance. It comes in free to the curer of fish, and yet when a farmer requires to use it for manure, he is called upon to pay an almost prohibitive duty. Not only is that the case with regard to salt, but in the case of twine, the ship-rigger or sailor can obtain it for rigging a vessel and for use on ship board, for a duty of 5 per cent., while the farmer is charged 25 per cent. Why is this discrimination made against the farmers? Farmers should have the same privileges as the fish-curer. In regard to the motion which the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) has brought before the House, I desire to say that this is a serious question, and one that will increase yearly in magnitude. One of the ways in which we can meet the changed condition of things is by working less land and producing more to the acre. If we can obtain the same results from 50 acres that we now obtain from 100 acres, there will be so much capital saved to the farmers. Any farmer who has had experience in the soiling system knows that this can easily be accomplished, that greater results can be obtained from one acre on the soiling system than from even two or three acres under the system now in vogue. Among the principal imports into our part of the country are the "Mammoth" sweet corn and the "Western Dent," which do not ripen and cannot be produced in Canada. What this resolution asks for is, that the farmer shall have the privilege

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

and benefit of importing them duty free. Another article which it would greatly benefit the farmer to allow in free of duty is turnip seed, which, from experience, it has been found cannot profitably be produced in this country. A very good seed is produced from that imported, but if we go one step further than that, the turnips become woody and rooty. I have not time to go through the full list of these articles which it would benefit the farmers to import free of duty, but I would urge on the House that the farmers, in their present embarrassed condition, claim the attention of the Government, and that everything that can be done ought to be done to facilitate them in their operations, and to lessen the strain upon their resources.

Mr. ROWAND. I wish to trouble the House for only as short a time as possible, while I give my reasons for seconding this resolution. Let me first refer to the present state of the agricultural interests in this country. It has been stated on the floor of this House during the present Session, by a prominent gentleman who claimed to be a practical farmer, that the farmers of the country are in a prosperous condition. Such is not my experience. I would like very much to invite that hon. gentleman to the counties of Bruce and Huron, or some of the neighboring counties, to address a farmers' institute, and endeavor to convince the farmers that they are in a prosperous condition. I hope the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to accept the invitation, and I am quite sure that when he returns his opinion will be greatly changed. The First Minister was pleased to quote the remarks of the hon. gentleman I have referred to, as an evidence of the prosperity of the country, and to that right hon. gentleman I also tender an invitation to meet the farmers at their institutes, when I am sure he would obtain a more correct idea of the condition of the farming community. I regret that I am unable to say that the farmers are prosperous, because I know from my own experience, and from the experience of my neighbors around me, that such is not the case. What the reasons are which have led to this depressed condition of the farmers it is, perhaps, very difficult to say, but we are all well aware that one great reason is the failure of land to produce so abundantly now, as it did formerly. Another reason is that we have at present to enter into competition with the markets of the world, and this competition has largely reduced our prices. These are, in my opinion, the two prominent and important reasons which have led to the depressed condition of the farming community of this country. Any one who has had to do with farming in new countries knows well, that in clearing up the land the great return is from the raising of grain, and the exportation of it. Farmers are a very conservative class generally, and it is pretty hard to get them out of one rut into another. Our farmers have so long pursued their present system of farming—to the ruin of a great many of them, I am sorry to say—that they find it difficult to give up their present system and make new experiments. I would like very much if I were able to endorse the view that the farmers are in a prosperous condition, but I cannot. I am obliged to state the very opposite, and I do not do it with a desire to decry the country, for I know there is an old Scotch proverb which says: "It's

a dirty bird that fouls its ain nest." The farmers in the section of the country that I live in have gone on raising grain, and for the last three years we have had partial failures of crop, each year worse than its predecessor, and last year the worst of all. They have been working under the impression that perhaps they would have a chance for improvement next year, and they have worked hard, saved hard, and cropped a greater portion of ground, at more expense and labor, but still the failure has been worse than ever. These men are now in a very bad position. We may go to them and say: "Gentlemen, you have got to change the system of farming you have been following in the past, for it is not going to tide you over your difficulties. You must get out of this grain-raising for export. You must retain all you raise on your land and return it to the soil to make it fertile, and to do that you must get improved cattle." Now, every farmer knows that a man who has been depending on the growing of grain has generally neglected to improve his stock, and that is the position of the majority of our farmers. We have to tell these men that if they are to get improved stock they will have to invest a certain amount of capital; and there are very few of the poor fellows, who, struggling along as they have been for the past few years, are able to secure the capital. We should also remember that our markets for stock are brought down to a very fine point, and that if we go into the markets we must go with the very best articles we can produce, or else we cannot get along. I have no doubt that many of the poor farmers must go to the wall. If they make place for others, who may, perhaps, have more capital, a change in this direction would come. However, we should do all in our power to assist the farmers who are now in straightened circumstances. The great struggle with us is to cheapen production, and that is the only cure we can see for our difficulties. I have heard it stated by an hon. Minister in this House, that the farmers have not presented their grievances to the Government. We do not believe that there is any use sending large deputations to the Government, because we know that they cannot make our lands more fertile. I can, however, assure the hon. Minister that if things continue the way they are, and if he wants deputations from the farmers, he will soon have plenty of them. Here is a very small concession which we are asking in the interest of the farming community, and why does not the Government grant it cheerfully? We asked the same thing last year, and I was led to suppose from what the hon. Minister said, that, unless there was some great difficulty to be overcome, these articles used by the farmers would be admitted free of duty. I do not see why that was not done. If we propose any measure of this kind, the cry is generally raised in this House that it interferes with the National Policy, but I do not think any one will believe that this at all applies in the present case. The seed which we want admitted free of duty does not enter into competition with our native corn, and if we had the privilege of bringing it in free I do not think there is very much likelihood of it being used for food as a general thing, because last year—I cannot speak of this year—our own coarse grains were cheaper for feeding purposes than corn would have been. Therefore, there could be no difficulty in this direction. I would make this suggestion: If there is a

difficulty about removing the duty from seed corn for this purpose, let the Government remove it for one or two months in the spring of the year, when the farmers will require their seed, and then reimpose the duty for the rest of the year. We are told that this is a small matter. As the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) has said, all our burdens are made up of small matters; but if this is a small matter to the farmer, it is a small matter to the revenue; and seeing that so many things come in free as raw material for other industries, I do not see why this little benefit cannot be conferred on the farmers. No class in this country has to-day more need of assistance, and although it would be a small thing to give the farmers free seed corn, it would be an encouragement to them, as it would be in the direction of cheapening production, for it would enable the farmer to produce on one acre what he now produces on two. Therefore, I hope the Government will see fit to grant this concession to the farmers of the country.

Mr. BOWELL. I was not in the chamber when the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) introduced his resolution, but I understand that he referred to some remarks made by myself and by the Minister of Finance when this question was under the discussion of Parliament last Session. He is quite right in saying that I promised the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) that this matter would receive the attention, not only of the Department of Customs, but of the Government. The matter was considered very fully, but, in addition to the difficulty of making a distinction between the varieties of imported corn which might ripen and those who might not ripen in certain sections of Canada, there was also the difficulty which presented itself when the matter was submitted to the Minister of Justice, that the provisions of the law would not enable the Government, even if it were thought advisable, to place seed corn on the free list. It could only be done by a change in the tariff at the hands of this House. For that reason the subject was dropped by the Department. I have looked a good deal into this question of the importation of corn for the purpose of seeding, as well as into the difficulties that must necessarily arise in drawing a distinction between the different varieties that would be required for the purposes indicated by the resolution. It is clear that it would be no easy matter to decide as to what varieties would ripen in Canada, because that which will ripen in British Columbia will not ripen in Ontario, and that which will ripen in the south-western peninsula of Ontario will not ripen in this locality; and this would be a constant source of annoyance. Further, from what little practical knowledge I have of administering the tariff and Customs Act, I believe it would be impossible to carry out such an arrangement. In almost every case of importation of a variety of corn by a farmer or dealer, the question would arise as to whether it would ripen in this country or not. Apart from that, the duty on corn for this purpose is so infinitesimal in amount that if it were abolished I scarcely think any farmer would go through all the trouble that would attend its importation. The object the hon. gentleman has in view would be better attained by placing corn on the free list,

and if a motion to that effect were made, it could be dealt with either yea or nay. Professor Robertson in his report on the subject of sowing corn, points out that although as much as three bushels per acre have been sown, half a bushel when properly planted has produced more than three bushels sown broadcast. Professor Robertson is an authority on this subject, and his report gives the results of tests on the Ontario Model Farm. He tells us that half a bushel per acre will produce 24 tons of fodder, although the average is 16½ tons. According to this statement the tax on the farmer amounts to 3¼ cents per acre; or, calculating by the ton produced from one-half bushel seeding, two mills and a fraction for every ton of feed produced; or, if the statement made by Mr. Robertson be correct, that half a bushel properly planted will produce 24 tons per acre, then the duty amounts to less than 1½ mills per ton. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, that this is a very small matter, and it is very questionable whether the farmers of this country would ask the Government to change its whole policy in order to accomplish so little. I do not propose to enter into a general discussion of the points which have been raised in this debate by the hon. member for South Middlesex and the hon. member for South Huron. They have drifted away into the whole question of protection, alleging that the United States has done wrong, and that Canada, in following its example and adopting the National Policy, has also done wrong, and has imposed enormous burdens on the farmers. That question, I think, can be more properly discussed when the hon. Finance Minister brings down his Budget, and the proposed changes in the tariff. Now, as this is a question which can only be dealt with by the tariff, I would ask my hon. friend whether it would not be better to allow it to stand until the changes proposed are laid before the House. Then the whole question can be discussed upon its merits, as to whether corn should be free or dutiable, or whether you should confine the free corn to the descriptions "mammoth" and "sweet tooth," and two or three others which, it is alleged, will not ripen in this country. That is as far as I desire to discuss this question at present. I have no hesitation in saying, however, that I take exception *in toto* to the principle laid down by the hon. gentlemen who have discussed this question. Although not a farmer myself, and although it might be presumption on my part to combat the opinions of those who have been, probably, farmers all their lives, there is a general principle involved which, I think, any one who has thought out the question can discover, even if not a practical farmer. It is for my hon. friend to say whether he will adopt the suggestion I have thrown out, namely, to leave the general discussion over until the Budget speech is before the House and the changes in the tariff are proposed, or whether he will press his motion to a vote at present. I do not see how the Government can, under the circumstances and for the reasons I have given, do otherwise than resist the motion made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. the Minister of Customs has declared himself as opposed to the principle involved in this question, and at the same time

Mr. BOWELL.

asks us to allow it to stand over in order that he may discover whether or not the Government propose to grant the relief asked for.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not go so far as that.

Mr. MULOCK. I so understood the hon. gentleman. Let me remind him that last year this same motion was made, and, at his suggestion, withdrawn, and nothing has come of it since. The only reason the hon. gentleman gave us why this change should be made is the most extraordinary one, that it would cause annoyance to the Custom house officers. I have been under the impression until now that public servants generally existed for the convenience of the public, but I now find that an exception must be made in the case of the Custom house officials, who, instead of being our servants, are our masters.

Mr. BOWELL. The annoyance to which I referred would be to the farmers and the importers.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend, if I understood him correctly, said it would be most difficult to distinguish in the Custom houses the classes of grain which ripen in this country from those that do not, and that this difficulty would cause annoyance in the carrying out of the law. If the Department is so broken down that it cannot administer the law in the interests of the public, it is time it should be reorganised. The hon. gentleman said that the tax is so small it is not worth remitting. To that I would reply, on behalf of the taxpayers, that if it is so small, it is not worth collecting.

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

After Recess.

Mr. SEMPLE. It appears from the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Customs, that the small request which is now preferred on behalf of the farmers, will not be granted. It is well known that under the National Policy the farmers are subjects to be bled by nearly every other class. It is well known they receive very little consideration, and one reason assigned for not granting their request is that it is too small. Well, if the request is such a small one, it is all the easier granted; but I can easily understand that the chief reason for not granting it is that it would injure that great image, the National Policy, and take one prop away from that fetish which the hon. gentlemen opposite are so particular shall not be touched. I am sure that the farmers need not expect any aid from hon. gentlemen opposite who, in times gone by, posed as the farmers' friends. That title, however, they can claim no longer. There is no doubt that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture is endeavoring to do something for the farmers in one respect, by bringing barley from England and introducing it into this country, so that we may grow it here and have it to export in the future. That is a very laudable object, and I can see no reason why he should not allow corn for seed purposes, which is the raw material for the most profitable articles the farmers have to sell, to come in free, for it is very evident that the cheaper the farmers get their corn the better for them, and will encourage the sowing for feed to a larger extent. In the past, wheat-

growing was what the farmers chiefly depended on, but to-day whatever money they make is made out of cattle, horses, butter and cheese. Our exports are going forward in that direction, and I have no doubt that, if the Government would yield to the request of the farmer by granting this motion, a great impetus would be given to the agriculturist. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture, in bringing out barley from England in order to test the growth in this country of the kind used by English brewers, is making an experiment the result of which will be awaited with great interest, and I am sure that, when the estimates for his Department are before us, we will find a great deal of money spent to less advantage. We have been spending tens of thousands of dollars on immigration, for which, perhaps, there have been very little returns, but I promise my hon. friend that if he would give the farmers cheap corn for seed a profitable return would soon be reached. When this becomes known it will be appreciated at its true value. I am very glad that the hon. the Minister has got as one of his assistants a gentleman who looks after the dairying branch, and who can testify to the value of corn. That is one of the great points which he has made in addressing the farmers' institutes throughout the country, and the farmers are meeting now in various parts to discuss what would be for their greatest advantage, and this is one of the most important subjects discussed. I am glad the motion has been brought forward by my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. McMillan), who is a practical farmer and has had large experience in these matters, and I hope the Government will not think it is doing too much to accede to this small request of the farmers.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). We have been asked to allow this debate to stand over until the Government comes down with the Tariff Bill, but the Minister of Customs has shown us clearly that the duty on corn is not included in the changes which are to be made, because he says he is opposed to the principle of the resolution which I have introduced, and in that case he must be opposed to granting what the resolution asks. The Government have been sending out men to educate the farmers in the most improved methods of farming, and one result of that has been to induce the farmers to get over their prejudices in regard to ensilage. How many farmers have I heard say that it was impossible to take green vegetable matter and keep it for any length of time. But, in consequence of the visits which have been made to them by gentlemen from the Experimental Farm and from the Agricultural College at Guelph, their prejudice as to ensilage has been overcome, and now there remains only one body which requires to be educated to its duty; and, as long as I have a seat in this House, I will do my best to educate the Government of the day in regard to its duty to the farmers. I hope every farmer in this House will aid the Government to do its duty in assisting the class which is struggling more than any other class in the country. I shall bring up a motion of this description annually, as long as I am here, in regard to this matter and in regard to other articles upon which the farmers should have consideration. It may be said that this is a very small amount, but the amount of binding twine is

very small also. Though it is small in regard to the amount which goes into the Treasury, it is not small in regard to the amount taken out of the pockets of the consumer. For every cent that goes into the Treasury on binding twine, 11½ cents goes into the pockets of the manufacturer; and that is another article which ought to be placed on the free list. I cannot accede to the request of the Minister of Customs to withdraw this motion, but I must submit it to a vote of the House, so that the educational process may be brought to bear on the Government in regard to this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the vote is taken on this question—and the hon. gentleman has intimated that he intends to insist upon a vote—I wish to say a word or two, so that this may not be taken upon the assumption which my hon. friend has just made. I listened attentively while the Minister of Customs was speaking, and I did not understand him to say that he was opposed to the principle of the resolution moved by my hon. friend, nor that no such change would be made when the tariff was brought down, or that any such change would be made. This is one of a series of resolutions which are being brought up, and some of which will be brought to a vote, which affect tariff matters, and upon which the opinion of the Government will not be given until the tariff is brought down. When that is done, for whatever changes are made we propose to be able to give a good reason, as we do for whatever changes are not made. In the meantime, I think it would be wiser that this motion should not be pressed to a vote. If it is so pressed, the Government will be obliged to refuse the motion.

Mr. PLATT. I think the reason assigned by the Minister of Finance for asking the withdrawal of the motion is the very best reason why the House should express its opinion upon it. If the Government wish to know the opinion of this House before they complete the structure of their new Tariff Bill, I know of no way in which they can in so short a time obtain the view of Parliament. About a year ago I had the honor to introduce a similar resolution to the House, and it was withdrawn at the request of the Government and upon the express promise of the Government that they would give it an early and fair consideration. They tell us to-day that they have given it consideration during the past year, but have been unable to discover any means by which the object of this resolution can be effected. If they have passed a whole year discussing it without arriving at a conclusion, can we imagine that, without an expression of the view of this House, they will arrive at any conclusion before the end of the Session.

Mr. BOWELL. The trouble is, they did not say so.

Mr. PLATT. I understood the Minister to say that, owing to the impracticable character of the proposal, he was unable to carry out the principle of the resolution.

Mr. BOWELL. I said I believed it to be impracticable, but, even if it were not so, my advice from the Department of the Minister of Justice was that we had no power to put this on the free list by Order in Council, but that it could only be done by Parliament.

Mr. PLATT. The reason given by the Minister is a new reason which is quite different from that which he gave last year, when he said that the Government were competent to place these grains on the free list for seeding purposes. Beyond that, the excuses given by the Government to-day are the same as they gave last year. In the first place, we are told that it is a very small matter, and we are led, by the Minister of Customs, to believe that, because of the smaller quantity of seed used per acre in the production of this ensilage, it is a very trifling matter. If he understood the extent to which this new industry is growing through the country, he would understand that the increased acreage will more than make up the reduction of the seed per acre. He puts it at half a bushel per acre. I am told that the farmers are advised by the professors who address them to use about that amount of seed, though I believe the farmers in the best part of Ontario are in the habit of using from one and a-half to two bushels an acre. This subject is becoming yearly of greater importance and magnitude to the farmers. The hon. Minister points to the difficulty of deciding what varieties of grain will or will not ripen in this country. That is a matter of very little moment. All the kinds of grain that are imported for this purpose are such as will be imported for no other purpose. No farmer, no dealer in grain, will import such grains as are used for seeding or for ensilage, for any other purpose; it would be too expensive. Whether it will ripen in this country or not, is a matter of small moment, so long as the hon. Minister is made aware that it was imported for seeding purposes alone. I have listened to the discussion thus far, expecting that the old excuse would be brought forward which was put forward in the debate early last year—that this was one of a series of attacks upon the National Policy. I have not heard that announced on the Government side to-day; in fact I understood, as most hon. members understood, the hon. Minister to say, that he was opposed to the principle embodied in the resolution, but I believe he has withdrawn that statement, or, at least, has said that he did not so express himself.

Mr. BOWELL. I have either been singularly unfortunate in expressing my views, or the hon. member has misunderstood me. I said, the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), had introduced the question of protection as a whole, and that I dissented from them.

Mr. PLATT. From the speech and not from the resolution. Well, it does not seem to make any difference when the farmer's interests is brought in question, whether it is an attack upon the National Policy, or whether it is in accordance with the principle which is the foundation of that policy. If it be an attack upon the National Policy, it cannot be granted on the ground that it is an attack on the National Policy. If it be in line with the National Policy, then it is refused because it is a small matter and difficult to manage. I wish to reiterate what I said last year, that the definition of the National Policy, as laid down by the leader of the Government himself, is such as to warrant any member, in bringing such a resolution before the House, in claiming that it was a part and parcel of the prin-

Mr. BOWELL.

ciple of the National Policy which was embodied in that resolution. The leader of the Government, speaking in 1887, used these words:

"That policy the Government adopted and carried out, in 1879—the National Policy—was simply this: That it made the free list as wide as possible, of the articles which could not, for climatic or other reasons, be produced or manufactured in Canada, and that raw material which could be made up here would be imported free."

This is exactly in keeping with the resolution which is now before the House, and it cannot be stated by any members upon the opposite side who so warmly supported the National Policy as a whole, that it is an attack. It is simply a request made, this time, at any rate, on behalf of the farmers of the country, on behalf of the agriculturists, and it would be to their advantage; and I think it is too bad that the farmers should be denied this request on the ground that it would cause a little annoyance or difficulty in the Customs Department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sorry that the Finance Minister has not announced to the House that the Government are seriously considering a change in the tariff in the direction suggested by the member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), and, under the circumstances, it might be quite reasonable that he should consent to a withdrawal of the resolution in order to enable the Government to present their tariff changes. But the Finance Minister has not made any such announcement. He has not led the House to believe that it is their intention to make any such a change. The fact of the matter is that the Minister of Customs has said there are so many difficulties in the way, he finds that if he were to make a change in the tariff which would enable the Government to favor the farmers to the extent of permitting those commodities to enter free of duty, it would so upset their present arrangement and entail such an amount of trouble, that he does not feel that it could possibly be done. I say it is very much to be regretted that the Government, on all occasions when a proposition is made for the purpose of trying to better the farmers' condition, are willing to raise any number of obstacles in the way of meeting their demand. It is too bad that while the crank of the National Policy machine can be turned to better the condition of every manufacturer in this country, every man who is a producer of any other commodity than the farmers, they can reap some advantage by that particular policy, but when it comes to the farmer there is no possibility of his being considered. During all the years that I have sat in this House in no single case has the Government ever made an effort to benefit the condition of the farming community by the operation of their National Policy. In every single case the operation of that policy has been in the other direction. Take, for instance, the item my hon. friend referred to this afternoon—the item of salt. A number of the manufacturers and producers of salt in this Dominion were anxious to be placed in a position that they could make more money in the production of salt, and immediately the Government met their views and put a duty upon salt, and the result is that the farmers of the country are called upon to pay an increased price for a commodity of which they use very much more than any other class in the com-

munity. After all, the farmer must bear the burden. Every single turn that is made of the protection crank touches the resources of the farmer, and tends to increase the price of everything that he has to buy and consume. When the Government are appealed to, to help them to better their position financially, when the farmers are trying and struggling with the difficulties arising from a failure of crops the last year or two, the Government will not even give them any benefit on this one small item of salt; they will not even say that they will promise to consider and modify the tariff so as to meet the views of the farmers; they want to procrastinate and put off any action. The Minister of Finance does not want to hold out any promise just now; he would rather the matter were left over. Last year the hon. member who moved this resolution did meet the request of the Government; he agreed to leave it over. Was there any one benefited by that? No, Sir. The Government did not move one step; the matter remains to-day where it was twelve months ago. The probabilities are that changes will be proposed in that tariff in the direction of meeting the views of men who are producers of other things than farm products, manufacturers who can combine together and bring all their influence to bear upon the Government. But simply because the farmers do not come down here in large numbers and spend their money on railway fares, and go to a great expense to press their interests upon the members of the Government, the Government will not listen to those who are sent here to represent them. The farmers are not able to contribute to election funds like the manufacturers and others. When the First Minister goes out before a general election he does not call the farmers together and ask them to contribute, on the ground that they are reaping great advantages from the operation of the National Policy. The right hon. gentleman is able to do a great many things, but he has not had face enough to go before the farmers and ask them to assist him in a federal election. They do not reap such advantages as would enable them to do anything of the kind. I suppose we shall have to wait until the hon. Finance Minister makes his announcement in the Budget speech. The House has been in session over a month, and we have not yet got the Budget. It is to be earnestly hoped that we shall get it before long, and that it will show some little intention of meeting the pressing interests of the farming community in the way of reducing the duties upon some of the articles that enter largely into their daily consumption. The duty on iron was raised some years ago, and the farmers suffered very severely by that change. Among no class of the community is more iron used than by the farmer, and the advance in duty caused a rise in the price of all articles into which iron entered. Such an advance strikes at the farmers' resources and tends to pauperise them. I hope the Minister of Finance will take this matter into serious consideration, and will come down with a proposition to meet the views of the farmers on these important questions and give them some relief.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Last year, when this question was before the House, I said a few words, in which I expressed my opinion that the question

of ensilage was of great importance to the farmers of this country. I said I believed that this was going to cause a revolution in the system of farming, and that the introduction of this fodder corn, if grown here, was going to make the greatest difference possible with the farming community. I said then it was going to take the place of the fodder for all our dairy farmers; that this ensilage, which a few years ago was unknown, was becoming a burning question with the farmers, and rightly so, when we consider that an acre could grow from twenty-five to thirty tons of ensilage, and that from four to five tons of ensilage would feed a cow for two hundred days. This shows that an acre of land will yield more fodder for cattle in this than any other way in which it can be utilised. If that is the case, it is of the utmost importance to our farmers, more especially as it is known that, if the ground is properly prepared, the crop will grow as well in dry seasons as in wet seasons, in fact better in dry seasons, that they should know that it will afford a fodder for our cattle that has hitherto been unknown. As an hon. gentleman who has spoken to-night had stated, wheat and barley growing has become a thing of the past, and our farmers cannot compete with the rest of the world in these commodities. There is no question, however, that in dairying our farmers have the means of making money. I believe that while our farming community are in a depressed condition it is well known that those who have been feeding cattle are not so depressed. They have been doing well, fairly well; and there is no reason to doubt, if they continue in that line—I speak for old Canada, and more particularly the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec—that they will become more prosperous in the future than they have been in the last few years, and they will resume their old condition of prosperity. But this change must be brought about by means of dairying. To insure success in dairying we must have cheap fodder, and, no matter whether the season is dry or wet, we must have a certain production of fodder for cattle; and that result can only be brought about by the adoption of the ensilage system. In Wisconsin a few years ago there was not a single silo in that State. To-day there are between 2,000 and 3,000, showing the advanced state of knowledge on this subject, and that the farmers are satisfied that by this system they have a certainty of production and good fodder for their cattle. I know this system of farming has been introduced among the farmers of Ontario, because even in the eastern part a great many silos were started last summer, and, so far as I can learn, they have been very successful. It is, therefore, very desirable that the Government should take this question into their earnest consideration and do what they can to encourage the farmers in adopting this system. The Minister of Agriculture has started a silo at the Experimental Farm. I should like him to see that the experiment is extended, and every encouragement given to farmers to start silos upon their own farms. If this is the case, why not let farmers bring in corn free of duty. I expressed that sentiment last year. The Minister of Customs said he would try and frame some regulation by which it could be done. I am sorry to say no such regulation has been framed; but that it can be done I have no question. I believe a regulation can be framed to accomplish

this result, in the same way as the Government have been able to frame a regulation to admit free materials to be used in shipping, salt to be used in curing fish, twine to be used in making fishing nets.

Mr. BOWELL. You can do it by law and by the tariff.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Why not do it? The hon. Minister says this is a very small matter. Perhaps so, but if farmers did not take advantage of it that would be their fault. Let the farmers know that this corn can be brought in free of duty to be grown for ensilage purposes, and it will be a great advantage to them. I do not altogether like the resolution, because it is not well framed; but as I think it is in the proper direction I will vote for it; it is in the direction of an encouragement to the farmers to establish silos and grow corn for this purpose, and I, therefore, support it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is a practical farmer, or has ever done much in that line.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I have ploughed as many furrows as you have.

Mr. TAYLOR. No; I farmed during a good many years. The hon. gentleman talks of corn for ensilage purposes. Professor Robertson has stated as a fact that the best corn for that purpose is our own Indian corn, if the land is properly cultivated. We can grow all those kinds of corn in Canada which are necessary for this purpose. Of course, we have sweet corn and varieties that will not ripen in this country. They will grow and answer the purposes of ensilage; but, I repeat, Professor Robertson has stated it as a fact that the best corn is our Indian corn. I do not believe the farmers want to jeopardise the National Policy by having it torn to shreds piecemeal. The Minister of Customs has pointed out that the duty is only 2½ cents for corn, sufficient for an acre.

Mr. BOWELL. 3 cents.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yet the farmers of this country, judging by the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, are ground to death by taxes. I believe our farmers are a sensible body of men. They acknowledge that the Government of this country cannot be carried on without raising a certain revenue, and they are willing to contribute their fair share to the public revenue by Customs duties rather than by direct taxation, as suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite. Those hon. gentlemen appear to have a special commission from the farmers to advocate their interests in this House and in the country. It is evident from the news we have heard from Haldimand during the last few days, that the farmers do not believe it. It is very much like the story of an American agent who visited Scotland lately in the interest of some railway company in the United States. In travelling through Scotland in a railway car he found himself seated opposite an old Scotch farmer, to whom he said: "Scotland is a grand country;" to which the Scotchman replied: "It is good enough for me, at all events." The American said: "You should see the United States; that country would make your eyes stare, and you would make a fortune in a year or two." "But," said the Scotchman, "you Americans are such atrocious

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

liars that we do not believe a word you say." "Well," replied the American, "so far as I am concerned, my mouth never uttered a lie in all my existence." "Well," said the Scotchman, "you are like the rest of your race, you speak through your nose." In my opinion the words addressed by the Scotch farmer to the American would apply to hon. gentlemen opposite. They do not believe a word they say in reference to the National Policy grinding to death the farmers of this country. I believe the farmers are satisfied with the National Policy, and I believe they want even a higher duty put upon some of the grain coming in here, in place of throwing the duty off altogether. If we once open the door to bringing in free corn for feeding purposes, we will lower the price of the grain and oats grown in this country which is used for feeding purposes. This story about ensilage does not, in my opinion, amount to much, for the farmers of the country can make all the ensilage they require with the corn grown in this country; if not, they are willing to pay a few cents to reap the rich benefits the National Policy confers on them.

Mr. TROW. Not being a practical farmer myself, I cannot speak with the authority of my hon. friend the mover of the resolution on the subject of bringing in corn free for farming purposes. At the same time, I must dissent from the views of my hon. friend from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Taylor), for the reason that the corn which my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) proposes to bring into the country will, at least, yield one-third more per acre than any corn grown in Canada. Further, there is more saccharine matter and greater feeding properties in that corn than there is in our native corn. It is a very reasonable proposition, that it is to the greater advantage of the farmer to cultivate that corn which will produce the greatest yield per acre. In the section of the country in which I live, those farmers who have turned their attention to dairying are in better circumstances than those who have been continually cropping their lands with cereals one year after the other, because the lands have become exhausted by continual cropping, as the crops take a certain amount of nutriment out of the soil which is necessary for production. A change in the system of farming must take place, or our farmers will, sooner or later, become impoverished, as they are now in many instances. As I have said before, those who have given their attention to the feeding of stock and dairying are in decidedly better circumstances than those who raise nothing but cereals. The lands require a change, and it is almost impossible to keep down noxious weeds when it becomes deteriorated by overcropping. The raising of eight or ten bushels per acre (that is about the average, I believe) is very unprofitable, while our dairymen make a return in five months of from \$30 to \$40 per cow during the summer season, which is more than they can raise on four acres of land by the culture of grain. It strikes me that it is a very easy matter for the Minister of Customs to allow corn of that kind to come in free of duty. The hon. Minister himself says it is a simple matter; and if he did so, I do not think the corn so imported would be used for any other purposes than that stated.

General LAURIE. I do not think too much can be said in favor of encouraging the system of

ensilage among our farmers. For the last eight or ten years, I have myself raised about 600 tons per year, and I think, therefore, I may be considered as having a very fair experience of the subject. I only wish that silage was stored to a much greater extent by the farmers of the country than it is at present, because, in my opinion, it has proved to be a great success. I cannot, however, accept the statements which have been made on this side of the House as to the small amount of seed required, and the small amount of duty paid into the Treasury. Speaking from the point of view of the farmers of the Maritime Provinces, with whose condition I am best acquainted, I can state that we cannot raise a crop there on half a bushel of seed, but that we require two bushels. Neither can we raise a good crop for ensilage with the native corn, and we must have southern corn. From my experience, I should say that the duty we have to pay is about 15 cents an acre on two bushels of seed, from which we obtain about twenty tons of good feeding: that is to say, the duty is three-quarters of a cent per ton. This, of course, is an item worth considering, but at the same time, we have to consider the difficulties we would labor under if we attempted to import on our own account. I conceive that it would cost us more to make private importations than it does through the merchant, as at present. If I recollect aright, the proposal last year was that the farmers should be permitted to import for themselves, which seemed to me a very impracticable and a much more expensive arrangement than the present one. I think, under the circumstances, it is more judicious that we should vote against this resolution, and leave the matter in the hands of the Government; at the same time pressing upon them the necessity of moving in the direction of facilitating our importations by laying down such regulations as can be conveniently carried out. It is true, as an hon. member opposite stated, that the Department is for the country, and not the country for the Department, but, at the same time, we have to pay for the Department, and if you throw extra and onerous duty upon it the more we will have to pay, and the arrangement in the end will not be very practicable. I think it is wiser to leave it to the Government to deal with the question, when they are arranging the general matter of the tariff, as I understand they propose to do.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to say a word or two on this question. I regret that I only arrived in the House a few minutes ago, and consequently I have not heard at length what the Government propose. My hon. friends have, however, informed me that the Minister of Customs has practically refused to consider the motion before the House. I am surprised to hear this from the Minister of Customs, because I most distinctly understood from him last year—

Mr. BOWELL. If you have been so informed, you have been informed incorrectly; I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. FISHER. Do I understand the Minister of Customs, that it is to be taken into his consideration?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman had been here it would be unnecessary for me to repeat what I have already stated several times. I said that the whole question of the tariff was under consi-

deration, and whether the Government proposed to deal with this question or not, would be understood when the Minister of Finance laid his proposition before the House. I thought, under the circumstances, it would be better not to discuss this question now, but to wait until the tariff changes were before the House.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister said the same thing last year.

Mr. BOWELL. I beg your pardon; I said that the Government would consider the matter.

Mr. LAURIER. And they are still considering.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps if the hon. the leader of the Opposition, who is usually most courteous, would allow me to complete what I say—

Mr. LAURIER. Oh, very well.

Mr. SCRIVER. The leader of the Opposition is always courteous.

Mr. McMULLEN. Which cannot be said of the Minister of Customs.

Mr. BOWELL. I will not bandy words with that hon. gentleman, because he is too well known. His courtesy exceeds all bounds, therefore I admit not only his courtesy but his excessive politeness on all occasions, no matter what the subject before the House is. What I said before on this matter I desire to say now. I stated, I was under the impression then that I had power, under the Customs Act, to treat this matter as we did articles brought in for manufacturing purposes. The Government and the Department did consider it. I made enquiries at the Department of Justice, and was informed that we had no power to deal with the question by Order in Council, and that it could only be dealt with in a Tariff Act.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to hear the explanation of the hon. Minister of Customs, and I regret that I did not hear it before; but it is no more satisfactory than the statement of it which my hon. friends gave me. I understand that the hon. Minister of Customs found that he could not deal with the matter in the Department, but I have not seen any evidence that he intends to deal with it by law. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues could have made the change before the end of last session if they had been desirous of aiding the farmers in this matter. Now, the arguments which have been made against this motion seem to me to be very trifling indeed. It is said that the motion is a trifling one, and matters very little to the farmers; and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said that he was quite sure the farmers were prepared to bear their fair share of taxation. I have no doubt that is perfectly correct; but we maintain that they bear a great deal more than their fair share of the taxation of the country. I believe the farmers are waking up to that fact, and we have seen an evidence of it to-night. I am glad to see the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) appear as an advocate of the farmers' rights, and I have all the more pleasure in congratulating him from the fact that he is not a farmer. That the hon. gentleman, belonging to the profession he does, and occupying the position he does, should be—I was almost going to say forced, but I am sure he is willing—should be induced to stand up and advocate the rights of the farmers in

this House, shows that the farmers are waking up to their interests and are in earnest. A year ago, when this question came up before the House, the hon. member did not use his eloquence to advocate the cause of the farmers.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I did.

Mr. FISHER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. It only shows that—

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That your memory is not good.

Mr. FISHER. Or that I did not know it at the time; but I am very glad that the hon. gentleman is on our side, and that he has shown that there is no greater difficulty in dealing with this question than there is in dealing with others of a similar character. We find manufacturers asking that their raw material should be put on the free list without any consideration of what effect such a change might have on others or on the public revenue, and very often the Ministers agree to their demands. I maintain that this seed grain is practically the same thing to the farmers that raw material is to the manufacturers; and if the hon. Minister of Customs can make arrangements in his Department to admit free the things mentioned a little while ago by the hon. member for Frontenac, when imported for certain purposes, while imposing a duty when they are imported for other purposes, there could be no difficulty in distinguishing between corn brought in for seed and corn brought in for other purposes. I should be glad to see all corn brought in free, but that is not at present the question, and I will not discuss it. As a practical farmer, having some experience with ensilage, I would say a few words on that subject. I endorse what an hon. member from Nova Scotia has said, that many varieties of corn suitable for ensilage are grown in the States and will not ripen in this country. The hon. member for Leeds quoted from Professor Robertson's report, and I was surprised to hear the opinion quoted, for scientific authorities have not yet come to a definite conclusion as to the best kind of corn to grow for ensilage. Experiments are still going on, such as those on the Experimental Farm last year, and Professor Robertson as well as other authorities know that the subject has not yet been sufficiently tested to enable them to give an authoritative decision. More than this, there is but a very small portion of this country where corn can be ripened surely and satisfactorily, so that the great mass of our farmers have to buy it from a distance. Therefore, a great many farmers in the eastern Provinces, even if they could get corn from western Canada which would serve their purpose, could get it very much more cheaply from the States to the south of them. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) has just put in my hands Professor Robertson's report, where I find this statement:

"The best fodder for the silo is ensilage corn, known as Mammoth Southern sweet corn or Burrill and Whitman corn. It is a Virginian or Georgian corn, and grows a large bulk of stalk and leaf. It is of certain vitality, and when grown on good soil, properly prepared and cultivated, is proof against drouth. It has a high feeding value per ton. By planting in rows three and one-half feet apart, with three grains to the foot, the largest feeding return per acre will be obtained."

This is in the last report of the Council of the Agricultural and Arts Association of Ontario. I do

Mr. FISHER.

not pretend to say that this is an absolutely final opinion, because I know that Professor Robertson and others are still experimenting on the matter; but still I believe it is the opinion of the majority of the authorities that the large southern corn does produce a great deal more food per acre than the northern corn. I am very much surprised that the Government are not willing to yield in this matter, because, as the hon. Minister of Customs has said, it is a mere trifle. I confess that I am proud of the taunt which the hon. member for Leeds throws across the House, that we on this side profess to speak for the farmers. I believe we do speak for the farmers; a majority of us represent farmers, while the great mass of hon. gentlemen opposite are not elected by the farmers in their constituencies, but in spite of their opposition. If the farmers of the country were able to elect the men they wish to represent them, apart from the other classes of the community, I am sure a much larger number of those holding the opinion we on this side hold, would sit in this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite got into Parliament by the aid of certain interests, but if they appealed to the agricultural class, they would be left behind in a very small minority.

Mr. CARGILL. I happen to come from the County of Bruce, and in that county we have a large number of very intelligent farmers. If any evidence be wanting in support of that statement, I would just say to you, Sir, that they send two members here to support the National Policy, so that consequently two-thirds of the population of the County of Bruce are supporters of this Government. With regard to the question of corn, the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, has told the House that Professor Robertson has come to no definite conclusion as to the results accruing from the different crops of corn grown in this country, and cannot state which seed produces the most bountiful crop. In my own county I had the privilege of attending the Farmers' Institute meeting, and upon that occasion a very intelligent farmer who presided, and who was president of the institute, said that the Premier of Ontario had shown his wisdom in establishing those farmers' institutes throughout the country, and in sending the professors from the Agricultural and Experimental Farms to those institute meetings in order to educate them in the science of agriculture. At the meeting I have mentioned, I listened very attentively to Professor Robertson. He told the audience that on the Experimental Farm in the County of Wellington, they had experimented with some twenty kinds of seed corn, and his opinion was that we would have better results from our own native corn than from any American corn imported for the purpose of growing ensilage. Our hon. friends opposite profess always to voice the interests of the agricultural community of this Dominion. I take exception to that, for we have here on this side of the House a very large majority who represent a greater proportion of the agricultural interests of this Dominion than hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not know that I would have said anything upon this question had not my colleague from West Bruce (Mr. Rowand), a man for whom I have a great deal of respect although he is a Reformer, spoken. He is a gentleman who,

I am quite satisfied, would never make a misrepresentation, and when he spoke respecting the importation of this corn for ensilage purposes, he did not take exception to the National Policy or try to ridicule it in any particular way. He does not believe that this Government can devise legislation which will have the effect of giving us good crops, but he is a rational man coming from the County of Bruce. Now, with respect to the farmers in this country, I may say that, taking them in proportion to numbers, they will compare favorably, in a financial point of view, with the manufacturers of this country. The manufacturers, a few of them, accumulated their wealth previous to the introduction of the National Policy. They had a very large amount of capital to work on. True, the National Policy stimulated the manufacturing interests of this country, but it gave rise to competition, competition produced lower prices, and the farmers to-day are reaping the benefit of those lower prices. To-day you can buy a binder for \$150, for which, previous to the introduction of the National Policy, you would have had to pay \$300, and everything else in proportion. They talk about the cost of twine per acre for binding corn. Why, previous to the manufacture of those binders, it would cost the farmer 50 cents per acre, and \$1 per acre if he had a good heavy crop, to bind his crop. In my younger days, when a boy working on the farm, I remember distinctly when we used to cut the crop with the cradle. It took two good men to follow the cradle, and from two and a-half to three acres a day was a good day's work in cutting grain. To-day, the farmers can bind their grain, notwithstanding the value of twine has increased, very much cheaper per acre than before, since the binders have come into use. In my native county I can name numbers of farmers who went in there with a very small amount of means and settled on land, and these men have gathered estates worth from \$50,000 to \$100,000. I could give the names if necessary, and I will venture to say that throughout the length and breadth of this country, if you will compare the manufacturers who have been in business for the last thirty or forty years, with men who have been engaged in farming during the same time, you will find that the farmers have, in proportion to numbers, succeeded better than the manufacturing community. As to the quantity of corn to be sown to the acre, I may say that Professor Robertson, in his lecture at the institute in my county, said he had made several experiments in order to ascertain the probable quantity of corn to be sown to the acre. He had tried it in drills, by planting it three, five, and seven inches apart, and he declared that the best results came where it was sown seven inches apart. Taking that as a basis we only require three pecks of corn per acre in place of two bushels, and from that amount of seeding the best results have come.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) never fails to tell us that he represents the farmers on that side of the House. Well, Sir, we all recognise the fancy farmer, and are glad to have him present on every occasion. But I would just remind the hon. gentleman that on this side there are representatives of the farming interest as well as on that, and that while he poses as the representative of a small portion of the Province

of Quebec, there are hon. gentlemen on this side who represent the great majority of the Province of Ontario, and are entitled to speak for the farmers. While we would be well pleased to have the farmers receive their seed-corn free, we also appreciate the great difficulties that would be experienced in accomplishing that result, unless the market was left open to a great amount of importation of coarse corn for the purpose of feeding. Perhaps there are not more than one or two ports in Canada where it would be possible to find an officer in charge who could distinguish between the particular grade of corn which would be necessarily used for seeding purposes, and the great bulk of corn which would come in for the purpose of feeding and of distillation. In my own port, the city of Stratford, 22,000 bushels of corn were imported during the past year, and I venture to say that there is not a Customs officer in that port who could tell the difference between one grade of corn and another. The same thing would apply as to wheat, and it would apply to all kinds of coarse grains. I think the farmers have ascertained that it is not to their interest that corn should come into this country, even under the pretext of having cheap seed and saving 7½ cents a bushel, which is the duty charged, so as to open the flood gates to the importation of corn for feeding purposes, which would come into competition with the products of their own farms. They know that is too great a risk. While the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and two hon. gentlemen on this side, have taken the position that ensilage is the finest and best product that can be raised on a farm, the most economical and the most useful, and that it would be desirable to extend that to every farmer, I am sorry to say that at present very few appreciate the usefulness of raising it for the purpose of feeding stock. But I do not think, even if the advantage of 7½ cents a bushel on the cost of corn in this country for seeding were considered on two bushels of seed per acre, that would be a sufficient guarantee, unless the Department of Customs could find some better plan of introducing it into this country than they have at present. I think the Minister of Customs cannot but perceive from the discussion which has taken place, not only this Session but in previous Sessions, that it is the view of the House that the farmers should be relieved of any burden—no matter how small it may be—which is not in the interest of the great farming community of Canada; but, I am sure that the farmers of this country are not so ignorant as not to realise the difficulty that surrounds the position. We have the best evidence from the farmers themselves, that one bushel or one and a quarter bushels is sufficient to seed an acre with corn for ensilage purposes. So that the duty being 7½ cents a bushel, the cost would not be more than 10 cents an acre in duty to raise twenty tons of ensilage. Surely, for the sake of the saving of 10 cents on twenty tons of ensilage on an acre, no Minister of Customs would take the risk of admitting this article free. I would say to the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) that the best evidence we could have in regard to the difficulties surrounding the farmers in Canada is given by the farmers themselves. If we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States we would admit all grains free, and if the farmers were in favor of that pro-

posal the results would have been found in the recent election in the County of Haldimand. If the hon. gentleman will read a portion of the address delivered by the defeated candidate—a former member of this House—Mr. Colter, at the nomination for that county, and will remember the platform on which he stood, he will see that that platform was free trade in corn as well as in other articles with the United States. I will read a few words of Mr. Colter's taken from the *Globe* on that occasion :

"A few closing words from Mr. Colter contained the declaration that the Liberal party stands on the platform of unrestricted reciprocity on this occasion, as they did a year ago. He stood upon that plank and proposed to fight to the end on that platform. (Prolonged cheering.) Other constituencies are watching Haldimand, to see what the result will be. On the other side, too, there are men watching the result. Free trade, unrestricted reciprocity between the countries would benefit us and the United States."

Now, we have in this extract a plain declaration that Mr. Colter stood on that particular platform. We have also the recollection that that county is an agricultural county. No one will pretend to say that there are any large manufacturing interests in that county. If, then, the solid farmers of Haldimand have so overwhelmingly changed their position and their views, I ask, why is it? It must be because the platform which was adopted by the Reform party has not been acceptable to them. Otherwise, why should there be a change from the 49 majority by which Mr. Colter was previously elected, I suppose without having made a declaration that he was a supporter of free trade or of unrestricted reciprocity? Last year this platform was adopted by the party, and the hon. gentleman had to go to his constituents, and it is evident that that platform has evoked the indignation of the farmers of Haldimand. While it has been said that the roads were bad, and that the Conservative party were furnished with snowshoes to go to the polling place, at all events the other side has been snowed under, and that must have been by the farmers, in consequence of the policy which they adopted of unrestricted free trade with the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite have their answer from their own friends from that county, which was so intensely Liberal. We all remember the bitter battles which were fought there, and the narrow majorities which were so often obtained; but here we find that the gentleman who has come to grief was the one who stood by unrestricted reciprocity. Of course, he is regretted, perhaps not on both sides, for on this side we may not be so sorry that his platform broke down. I venture to predict that, if those hon. gentlemen will go into any farming constituency, and will make the same declaration as they made in Haldimand, they will have the same result in any case. I am not opposed to the farmers having free seed if they cannot produce it, but we have had a statement to-day that we grow as good corn here as they do in the United States. In any case, the amount which is imported is so small, that I think this is simply an insidious attempt to break down the National Policy, which has been more successful in building up the interests of this country than the policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, with its sixty-five millions of a population.

Mr. HESSON.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). This appears to me to require a few words. Whether you take the duty off the corn which is to be used for seeding purposes or not, is of very little consequence. When I was in New York State last summer, at Clifton Springs, I examined several farms where ensilage was used, and found, in the majority of cases, the corn used for this purpose was western corn and not ensilage corn. Dr. Foster says that he prefers the ordinary western corn to the ensilage corn for ensilage purposes. There is no duty on ensilage corn in that State, and yet they prefer the ordinary western corn. I believe it would be the same thing as far as we are concerned, and that most of our farmers would prefer the western corn to the ensilage corn for ensilage purposes. I can quite understand why the hon. gentlemen make all these motions now, even though they are of minor consequence. They have learned that tariff resolutions are to be brought down by the Government, and they desire to be able to say to the country, if any changes should be made in the direction in which they are moving, that they forced the Government to make these changes. From their standpoint they are probably quite correct in doing this, but it will take a little more than 15 or 20 cents to each farmer in this country to convince them that it would be to their advantage to break down the National Policy. If hon. gentlemen desire to do the farmers of this country a good turn, why do they not move to give them a cent a pound additional on pork, or two cents a pound additional on beef? Most of the pork and beef used in the cities and towns in the Province of Ontario—and I fancy it is the same throughout the Dominion—is brought here from Chicago, cattle raised on the western prairies at very small cost, brought to Chicago and killed there, and then pushed upon our markets, taking the place of the pork and the beef that ought to be grown by our farmers, and would be grown by them if American pork and beef did not come into competition with it. If a real desire to benefit the farmer existed in the minds of the hon. gentlemen opposite, they would move in that direction instead of moving to save 20 cents a year on seed grain, which, from all the information that I can gather, would be of no benefit, because the farmers would not, to any large extent, use ensilage corn, even if they got it free of duty. The farmer requiring but a small amount of seed, he would just send to his seed merchant and buy it, and the question would not arise whether he pays 20 cents or 40 cents a bushel for the seed, because all the duty you take off would go into the pockets of the seed merchant and not into the pockets of the farmers. It would not pay the farmer to take his own team to drive off to get the small quantity of seed that he would require, but he would procure it through the local merchant who would reap all the benefit.

Mr. BERGIN. I had the honor for the last twelve or fifteen years, of a most intimate acquaintance with the late Frank Morris, the father of the silo system in the United States and in this country. I had many discussions with him as to the character of the seed that ought to be used for the purpose of producing the best ensilage. He had large farms in Maryland and immense tracts under corn in Texas and in Georgia, and he told me that the result of his experience was that the

corn of the climate in which the silo was to be used, was the corn which was best adapted for the purpose. He told me that southern corn would not ripen in the north, and would not produce the same amount of juice or the same amount of sugar that the corn of this country would produce, because of the shortness of the season and the cold of our northern climate. There was no better authority than he during his lifetime—it is not quite two years since he died. I submit that his testimony, after a great many years of practical experience in growing corn in different portions of America, ought to be a complete answer to the remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I was very glad to see the change that has come over the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher). If I recollect aright that hon. gentleman, a year or two ago, was not such a friend of the farmer as he professes to be to-night. I think I recollect that when a motion was introduced into this House for the purpose of doing away with fraudulent and imitation butter, that hon. gentleman stood up in his place in the House and advocated the use of oleomargarine and butter and all that sort of thing, so as to give cheap food to the people of this country. The hon. gentleman shakes his head; I appeal to every member in this House, and I appeal to the *Hansard* if such is not the case.

Mr. BOWELL. He backed out afterwards.

Mr. BERGIN. He backed out, but that has nothing to do with the statement I made. If we convinced him, it shows that we made him a friend of the farmer whether he desired it or not. The hon. gentleman told us to-night that he is a practical farmer. Well, if what I hear from his county be correct, he is more scientific than practical; in fact I have heard that like his great prototype, he fed his cattle so scientifically that when he had accomplished a similar end, and had got his cattle to live on one straw a day, they died in the early spring time, and he buried them decently.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I think we have had some examples of the results of scientific medical men and lumbermen, and retired individuals of every class, who have experimented in farming. It strikes me that my hon. friend who has just sat down has wandered a good way from the subject when he undertook to discuss oleomargarine. My recollection of that question is that if our friends on the other side of the House had been able to carry out their views, we would have had a large institution in Canada to-day manufacturing this article; and if the farmers of Canada have anybody to thank for excluding that article, it was those who represent the farmers on this side of the House. I think it was my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) who moved the resolution finally excluding it, and I never heard anybody say that the motion introduced by him was not a wise and good one. I would like to suggest to the Minister of Customs that while it is not necessary for him to be led by people on this side of the House, if he is going to take his adviser on that side, I would advise him to get out of the circle of medical men and lumbermen, and all that class of people, and listen to the advice of his supporter from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), who does do a little farming, and knows whereof he speaks. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has level ideas on that

question, and I respect him when he gets up and has the courage of his opinion, though he recognised that he is not a farmer. Now, I do not think it is necessary to drag in the whole National Policy in discussing this one question. When my hon. friend from Leeds undertook to get up and speak in defence of the line that he thought it was the duty of the Government to take, it seems to me that he was travelling altogether out of the record. My experience is, that when the manufacturers come down to the Government and complain that the shoe pinches them in any particular direction, a modification of the tariff is made for their benefit sooner or later. I have no doubt, that if my hon. friend thought that the tariff did not suit him with respect to the building of carriages, he would not hesitate to wait upon the Minister, and he would keep on waiting, until he got what he wanted. But the farmer's duty is simply to endure all that is put upon him, and never say anything. When hon. members opposite tell us, that if the duty were taken off corn, it would be like the duty that was taken off coal, I would like to suggest to my hon. friend, that if he voted to reimpose that duty on coal, he would see hornets in a short time, he would see the manufacturers moving up around the Minister, wanting to know what this duty was reimposed for. He would soon undertake whose pockets 50 cents a ton came out of in the matter of the coal duty. So it is in regard to this matter respecting the farmers. I say to the Minister of Customs that while it is a small matter, it is a matter not surrounded with so much difficulty as hon. gentlemen would like us to believe. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) would like the House to believe that farmers could not tell corn suitable for seed imported from the south from ordinary western corn. That hon. gentleman evidently never handled corn, and does not know whereof he speaks. I venture to say that any intelligent farmer who has handled western corn for seed purposes, if his seedsman should undertake to give him a third-class article brought in here for consumption or for distilling purposes, would very soon tell him that that was not the corn he wanted, that he wanted a number one article; and, moreover, when it is mammoth southern sweet corn which is imported for that purpose, there is no very serious difficulty in distinguishing it from the ordinary corn for consumption. This concession might be fairly made in the interests of the farmers without any serious difficulty, and I respectfully suggest to the Minister of Customs whether it is not worthy of his consideration as to whether this concession could not be made. It is all very well for the member for Bruce (Mr. Cargill), to tell the House what it costs the farmer to take off his crop in olden days when he had to swing the cradle, and when a man received 75 cents for a day's work. The conditions under which farmers operate to-day are, however, entirely different, and if farmers to-day want to make their business a success, they must reduce the cost of production to the very lowest margin. What is the position of the farmers to-day compared with those of other protected industries? Take the last Trade and Navigation Returns issued from the Department of Customs, and if you look over the exports for last year, you will find that one-half of the gross exports sent out of the country to pay the exchanges of purchased goods were the products of

our farmers. The value of the bulk of those products, is, moreover, fixed by the price in the foreign markets where they have to compete with the world. Under those circumstances it is only fair that the farmer should receive all reasonable concessions, and I fail to see on what grounds hon. gentlemen opposite consider this an attack upon the National Policy. Are the farmers forever to be told that the National Policy is not to do anything for them? Are they to be told that duties are to be imposed which are of no advantage to them, and when it is proposed that a concession in this direction should be made to benefit them, are they to be told that that concession will not be made? I do not read the National Policy in that light, and if the First Minister were present, he would repudiate the idea that the National Policy was intended to be interpreted on any such lines. It is because hon. gentlemen opposite will not view the question on its merits, and will not consider there are other important interests beside those of manufacturers to be considered, and, forsooth, because this does not run in the particular groove marked out by them, that the proposition must be voted down and set aside. I say to these hon. gentlemen that if they continue to pursue that policy, they must expect to alienate the farmers from them, and I submit that it would be wise on the part of the Minister of Customs to take this matter into consideration, and, notwithstanding the sneers hon. gentlemen opposite indulge in with regard to concessions made in binding twine and other matters, he should endeavor to give the relief asked. Some hon. gentleman said this was only a small matter, and that few men would have sufficient energy to take advantage of it. I admit it is a small matter, at the present time, but he has failed to understand the farming community and to see the disadvantages they are enduring, if he neglects to adopt this proposal.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I will not trouble the House with any prolonged remark, and I would not have said one word, but for the fact that the Minister of Customs seemed to indicate to the House that he proposed to consider the proposition submitted by the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. I am afraid I lie under the imputation which has been cast across the floor by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), that I am not a practical farmer, that I am engaged in another line of industry; but I venture to assert that it is no reason, because I am not a practical farmer, although I have been sent here year after year and election after election by an agricultural constituency to represent it on the floor of Parliament, I am not capable of forming an intelligent opinion on this question presented to the consideration of this House. I would say to the Minister of Customs that I hope he will not allow such a specious proposition as this which has been submitted to the House to induce him to consider the question of taking off the duty on grains coming into Canada; because I believe, notwithstanding what may have been said by hon. gentlemen opposite, and we have had their statements year after year during the last ten or eleven years, I am strongly convinced that the farmers of Canada have benefited to a very great extent by the imposition of duty on coarse grains coming into

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

this country. Surely hon. gentlemen have not observed the course of events as they are passing before their eyes at this moment. Have hon. gentlemen examined the market reports as they appear in the journals of the day? Are they not aware that oats can be purchased in Chicago at 19½ cents, while they are worth in Toronto 30 or 32 cents? Surely they will not tell the House or the farmers of the country that if there was no duty imposed on coarse grains coming into Canada, oats worth only 19½ cents in Chicago, and corn, which can be purchased there for 27 or 28 cents, would not come into competition with our coarse grains and reduce the price of oats below that at which they stand to-day in the Toronto market. I am perfectly convinced that the imposition of duties on coarse grains has benefited our farmers to a very great extent. When I hear a practical farmer like the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurier) tell this House that the duty upon ensilage corn in Canada does not exceed three-quarters of a cent per ton, or fifteen cents per acre; when the member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), who seemed to be a practical farmer from the manner in which he dealt with the question, tells the House that three or four times as much fodder can be grown from the ensilage corn brought in from the United States as can be grown from the corn raised here, then I say hon. gentlemen are raising a very great howl about a very small matter. It seems to me they will be unable to convince the farmers that the entering of the thin end of the wedge as they propose would be of any benefit to the farmers whatever. I heard the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), an hon. gentleman to whose remarks on agricultural matters I listen with a great deal of attention, because I believe him to be a practical man and one who understands what he talks about, state, in regard to salt, that the price of the article had been raised to the farmers of the country. Surely he knows that the farmers can import salt free of duty if they choose to bring it from the United Kingdom.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I say they can import it entirely free for any purpose. Let me read to him the clause of the Customs Act:

"Salt, coarse, ten cents per 100 lbs. (not to include salt imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession, or salt imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries, which shall be free of duty.)"

My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) if he reads the Customs Act, will see that all salt imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession can be imported entirely free of duty, and that, therefore, the farmers of this country are not subject to the imposition which my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) declares has been imposed upon them. I simply rose for the purpose of endeavoring to impress upon my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, that, from my point of view, he should not consider the question of reducing the duties on these coarse grains, because, I believe, if he did so it would be a blow to the farmers of this country.

Mr. WATSON. This question of corn for ensilage is a matter that is hardly interesting to the people of Manitoba as yet, but no doubt it will become so in the near future. I would not have

spoken on this occasion had it not been for the fact that the member for Bruce (Mr. Cargill) happened to draw into the discussion the question of binding twine. The duty on binding twine may not be of much importance to the hon. gentleman in his county where the farmers grow but little wheat, but in Manitoba it is a heavy tax. We fully realise there that the duty on binding twine does affect the farmers in Manitoba to the extent of the duty, which is 2½ cents a pound, or about \$13.50 a year on a farm of 300 acres, a very large tax upon the farmers for the purpose of keeping up one or two binding twine establishments in Canada. I was struck with the argument advanced by the member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), when he stated that at present a large portion of the beef and pork consumed in the towns and cities of Canada was imported from Chicago. It does occur to me that it would be a good thing for the Government to take into consideration this fact, and not to raise the duty upon these articles, but to admit free of duty all feeding material required for our stock. I understand from the returns that there are some thirty-six thousand head of stock cattle exported from this country to the United States annually, which are fed in the United States and no doubt returned to us in beef. The average price for these is \$14 per head, which is paid to the farmers in Ontario. Now if these cattle were fed in Canada they would be worth \$50 each. It appears to me that in view of this fact the Government ought, in the interests of the farmers of Ontario, admit corn free of duty for feeding purposes. We should remember that this corn cannot be grown in Canada, except in a few counties, and I believe it would be in the interest of Canada and in the interest of Manitoba that the duty should be removed. The people of Manitoba would like to be able to import their corn free, as they could grow more barley to ship to the United States, and get more corn in return for food. While I am speaking on this subject, I would call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that a petition has been forwarded from Manitoba to the Government, signed by all the members and Senators, and asking that coarse grain should be admitted free in Manitoba this year. I call attention to this fact, because I find that on some occasions Ministers were not aware of petitions addressed to them. The reasons given in this petition for the request, is because the oat crop is very light and it would be a very great benefit to the farmers of Manitoba, particularly this year, if the Government could, by Order in Council or otherwise, admit, free of duty, not simply corn but all grains for seed. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Cargill) is a manufacturer of lumber, and I think his comparison about the "cradle" in the old days when you could hire a man for 75 cents a day, was very inappropriate. Would the hon. gentleman compare the old muley saw which in those days cut 2,000 feet of lumber per day with the gang saw he uses now and which cuts 50,000 feet a day? I think the illustration would be just as good as the one given us by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not suppose my hon. friend the member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) needs any defense at my hands against the assault made upon him by the hon. member for Stormont (Mr.

Bergin), but as the latter hon. gentleman was pleased to indulge in some not very brilliant attempts, I must say, of wit at the expense of my hon. friend for Brome, I cannot help asking from what source he obtains his information with regard to the scientific and practical knowledge or ability of my hon. friend from Brome as a farmer. If the hon. member for Stormont had had the opportunity, which I have had, of visiting the hon. member for Brome at his own home, he would not have said what he did with regard to the cattle belonging to that hon. gentleman. I can assure him that there are no more complete or well-managed farm buildings in all that beautiful country, known as the Eastern Townships, than those which my hon. friend has built upon his farm. Both as a practical and a scientific farmer he has set an example to his constituents, and to the people of that country generally, which has been a vast advantage to them. Though the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) may not on the floor of this House have the appearance of a practical farmer, I can assure my hon. friend for Stormont that he is one; that he gets up in the summer time at an hour quite as early as the majority of his neighbors do, and that he goes to his fields and sees that his work is well done, and is not afraid to put his own hand to the plough. I had the pleasure of seeing the cattle belonging to the hon. member for Brome; and, so far from their being in the condition which the hon. member for Stormont said that he heard they were in, I can assure my hon. friend for Stormont that they have quite as good a chance of surviving this, and many years to come, as have the majority of the hon. gentleman's patients.

House divided on motion of Mr. McMillan (Huron):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Laurier,
Bain (Wentworth),	Lavergne,
Béchar, d,	Lister,
Blake,	Livingston,
Bourassa,	Lovitt,
Bowman,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brien,	McIntyre,
Burdett,	McMillan (Huron),
Campbell,	McMullen,
Casey,	Meigs,
Casgrain,	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	Mitchell,
Davies,	Mulock,
De St. Georges,	Neveu,
Dessaint,	Paterson (Brant),
Doyon,	Perry,
Edwards,	Platt,
Eisenhauer,	Robertson,
Ellis,	Rowand,
Fiset,	Ste. Marie,
Fisher,	Scrifer,
Flynn,	Semple,
Gauthier,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
Hale,	Trow,
Innes,	Watson,
Jones (Halifax),	Weldon (St. John),
Kirk,	Wilson (Eglin),
Kirkpatrick,	Yeo.—59.
Lang,	
.	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Jones (Digby),
Bain (Soulanges),	Kenny,
Barnard,	Labrosse,
Bergeron,	Landry,
Bergin,	Langervin (Sir Hector),
Boisvert,	La Rivière,

Bowell,	Lépine,
Brown,	Macdowall,
Cameron,	McCulla,
Cargill,	McDonald (Victoria),
Carling,	McDougald (Pictou),
Carpenter,	McKay,
Chapleau,	McKeen,
Cochrane,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Corby,	Madill,
Costigan,	Mara,
Coughlin,	Marshall,
Coulombe,	Mills (Annapolis),
Curran,	Perley,
Daly,	Porter,
Davin,	Prior,
Davis,	Putnam,
Denison,	Riopel,
Desaulniers,	Roome,
Desjardins,	Ross,
Dewdney,	Rykert,
Dickey,	Searth,
Dickinson,	Skinner,
Dupont,	Small,
Earle,	Smith (Ontario),
Ferguson (Welland),	Taylor,
Foster,	Temple,
Freeman,	Thérien,
Gigault,	Thompson (Sir John),
Gordon,	Vanasse,
Grandbois,	Wallace,
Guillet,	Weldon (Albert),
Haggart,	White (Cardwell),
Hesson,	White (Renfrew),
Hickey,	Wood (Brockville),
Jamieson,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Joncas,	Wright.—84.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) and the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Cimon) have not voted.

Gen. LAURIE. I am paired with the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden).

Mr. CIMON. I am paired with the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier).

Motion negatived.

MAIL SERVICE AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. Fiset (Translation) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence with the Government, or any officer thereof, respecting the arrival, departure and distribution of mails at Rimouski.

He said : Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, when I rose to explain the object of my motion, I was asked to let it stand, but I am most happy that it was called again to-night. I shall make very few observations. This motion is about to the same affect as the one made some time ago by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier). We have much to complain about the way mails reach Rimouski ; and when I say Rimouski, I mean the whole county of Rimouski. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we receive the mails from Montreal for Rimouski by the Intercolonial Railway at 8.50 p.m. ; they are distributed at about 9 or 9.10. The second mail reaches there at 10.30 : that one is not delivered ; it is the Quebec mail, the most important to us, but we cannot answer our letters on the same evening, owing to the morning trains passing through Rimouski at 6.30. Moreover, with respect to the mails we receive on Saturday evening, the only ones delivered on the same evening are the mails from Montreal ; the Quebec mails are only delivered on Sunday morning, between 8.30 and 9 o'clock. On Sunday mornings, the express train reaches Rimouski at the regular time, 6.50 ; no express train reaches there on Mondays ; therefore, no mails can be sent, and a letter sent from Ottawa on Friday reaches Rimouski on Saturday, but the Rimouski people

Mr. SCRIVER.

can only answer it the next Tuesday, and it is only on Wednesday that the answer can be received here, which makes four days. Mr. Speaker, I think that when the mail service for Rimouski was carried on by stages, we had our letters sooner than we have them now. The fact is, the letters sent from Quebec to Rivière du Loup by the Intercolonial reached us the next morning, and on the same day the answer was forwarded to Rivière du Loup, so that in three days' time the service was done, whereas now the conditions are changed owing to the train hours. I wish it to be well understood that I in no way wish to blame the hon. the Postmaster General ; it is rather the Railway Department that is answerable for this state of things ; but I think the hon. the First Minister, who is at the same time Minister of Railways, will comply to our requests as he has promised us. When I say that Rimouski has to complain about, I am speaking of the whole County of Rimouski. If Rimouski is ill-ministered to, the more so the parishes below Rimouski. These are the few observations I had to make in moving in this matter.

Mr. HAGGART. If there is any inconvenience in the delivery of the mails at Rimouski, it is not the fault of the Post Office Department. The mails for Rimouski are now sent every day by the regular express train leaving Quebec in the morning, and carrying the mails of the previous day from Quebec and places between Quebec and Montreal. This train reaches Rimouski about 8.30 p.m., and the mails are delivered the same evening. A second mail is sent by a mixed train leaving Quebec in the afternoon. This mail reaches Rimouski too late to be distributed the same evening, and is delivered the next morning. No change can be made in these arrangements until there is a change in the time of running the trains on the Intercolonial Railway. I believe the subject of changing the time-table of the Intercolonial Railway is at present engaging the attention of the Department of Railways and Canals, and as soon as that change is made, I hope to be able to make a change in the time of delivering the mails at Rimouski which will be more satisfactory to the people there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I may say to the hon. member that the question of the train service on the Intercolonial from Lévis to below Rimouski was considered. As stated by my colleague, the Postmaster General, strong representations were brought to bear on the Department of Railways and Canals by my hon. friend the member for Témiscouata (Mr. Grandbois), showing that the special train which leaves Lévis for Rivière du Loup stops there and that the mail has got to wait there for the down train which leaves Rivière du Loup for Campbellton, through Rimouski. As stated by the Postmaster General, this mail reaches there too late to be distributed the same evening ; it can only be delivered the next morning. My colleague, the hon. the First Minister, has the matter under consideration and I think that before long it will be remedied.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing :—1. The number of marks for all subjects received by each cadet of the present first and second classes who have succeeded at examinations at Royal Military College, Kingston, from 1886 and 1887, respectively, up to 31st June, 1889. 2. The names of the cadets now serving

as non-commissioned officers, together with a statement showing the total number of marks received by each. 3. Also, a statement showing the names of cadets who were permitted to have special examinations after June, 1889, and the subjects of examination in each case.—(Mr. Platt.)

Copies of all claims made by Elphège Cardin, Jean Cardin, George Tonnancourt, and Bruno St. Germain, to be compensated for damages occasioned to their lands by the dam erected in the Yamaska River; of all correspondence arising out of such claims; together with a statement of all sums allowed to each of them in settlement of their claims.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Report and plans of the Engineer of the Department of Public Works employed to make a survey and examination, with a view to the construction of an inter-provincial bridge across the Ottawa River, between the Village of La Passe, in the Province of Ontario, and the Village of Fort Coulonge, in the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Return showing the names of all parties in arrears for hydraulic and other rents up to the 1st inst., and the amounts respectively due by such parties.—(Mr. Somerville.)

Copy of the report of Sandford Fleming, C. E., of the examination made by him as to sawdust, &c., put in the Ottawa River by the saw mills at the Chaudière and other mills on the Ottawa River.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Statement showing, in detail, the population by origin, according to the census of 1885, of that part of the provisional district of Saskatchewan lying to the south of the line between Townships 47 and 48, and bounded on the west by the line between Ranges 11 and 12, west of the 3rd Initial Meridian, and on the east by the 3rd Initial Meridian, in the Dominion Lands system of survey, now the Electoral District of Batoche. Also of that part of the same provisional district lying to the east of the 3rd Initial Meridian in the Dominion Lands system of survey, and bounded on the north by the southern boundary of the Electoral District of Prince Albert, now the Electoral District of Kinistino.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Return of the casualties to trains on the Intercolonial Railway, arising from collision, broken rails or otherwise, for the calendar year 1889, the respective causes and dates, the amount of damage (if any) in each case to property, the amount of compensation paid to owners of property destroyed or damaged, as well as amount of claims for loss or damage to property (if any) unsettled.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Deputy Minister of Marine, or any other officer of the Marine Department, and the Auditor General, or any other official, in reference to unsettled returns of revenue from fishing licenses, or for any such receipts unaccounted for.—(Mr. Lister.)

Copies of all correspondence which has passed between the Auditor General and the Minister of the Interior, or any other person, in reference to the allowance for travelling expenses of William McGirr, private secretary to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.—(Mr. Lister.)

Return of the number of cases entered in the Vice-Admiralty Courts of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick respectively, during the years 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888 and 1889; the number of cases entered during the same years in the Vice-Admiralty Court of Nova Scotia; and the number of cases entered during the same years in the Vice-Admiralty Court of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Return showing receipts and expenses of each North-West Territories Registry Office from 1887 to 1889.—(Mr. Davin.)

Copy of the memorials sent by Joseph Holden and John Shera to the Hon. Edgar Dewdney, Minister of the Interior, respecting second Homesteads in the Territories.—(Mr. Davin.)

Return showing the number of self-binders, reapers and mowers exported from the Dominion during the past three years; giving the names of the exporters, the countries to which exported, and the amount of drawback allowed on each of the articles so exported.—(Mr. Patterson, Brant.)

Copies of any reports made by the Chief Engineer on the survey of Tracadie Harbor, Prince Edward Island, some years ago.—(Mr. Davies, P. E. I.)

Copies of reports made by the Engineers or Surveyors who surveyed and reported on Cove Head Harbor, Prince Edward Island, some four or five years ago.—(Mr. Davies, P. E. I.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 25th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 98) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George T. Smith.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Owen Sound and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Inverness Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the Louisburg and Richmond Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That Government business shall take precedence every Thursday, on and after Thursday of next week, 6th March, during the present Session, after Questions put by Members.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope the right hon. gentleman will not insist upon this motion, for certainly we have not reached that stage of the Session when such a motion is usually allowed. The hon. gentleman must remember that we have not yet discussed one single public Bill of all those on the Order paper. If the Government take Thursday, it is as much as to say that all these Bills will not come under consideration this Session. I think the motion is premature.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the motion is made any sooner than last year, if my memory serves me aright. I think the general feeling among the members is that we should get through the public business as soon as possible, so that we may get away early. It is no fault of ours if further progress has not been made with the public Bills and Orders. I have often had occasion to say that it is too much the habit of hon. members, when they put Bills or resolutions of any kind on the paper, to allow them to stand day after day. The proper time for such measures is the beginning of the Session, when, from obvious reasons, the Government measures cannot be presented. We have, day after day, gone over the list without fruit. However, if the hon. gentleman would agree, that after next Thursday, every Thursday shall be Government day, I will alter the motion to that extent.

Mr. LAURIER. That is so much, at all events, and I am glad to say we will have next Thursday. I am afraid that, perhaps, hon. members who are in charge of public Bills have not been as diligent as they might have been, to bring them forward in the earlier part of the Session. The example of

the Government in this respect seems to be contagious.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government is all right.

Mr. LAURIER. We must remember that not one-half of the Reports are yet brought down. The Government has called us early this Session, but I am not aware that they were at all ready with their measures.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes.

Mr. LAURIER. I did not expect, of course, that the right hon. gentleman would agree with me in this. As the hon. gentleman consents to give us next Thursday, perhaps that will do.

Mr. MITCHELL. The right hon. gentleman will bear in mind that this is not the first time I have protested against his foreclosing the general business of the country. If this motion is carried, the Government will monopolise almost the whole time, and hon. members will practically have but one day in the week to do business. I have protested against this, Session after Session, and although the urbanity and courtesy of the hon. leader of the second great party of this House has caused him to give his consent, I do not consent, and I protest against Thursday being taken away from the people. If our mouths are closed in this fashion, we will have no opportunity of getting the questions we desire before the House and the country. The right hon. gentleman says the earlier part of the Session is that in which private members should deal with Public Bills; but why do not the Government, who have the whole year to make preparations, come down with their Bills in the early part of the Session?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So we do.

Mr. MITCHELL. If so, we have not seen much of them, nor has the Government made much progress with them. I protest against this motion. Of course, I know I will be voted down, for I do not command a majority in this House, but when it comes to a majority of the public sentiment of the House and of the country, I have it with me.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I wish to pay every respect to the leader of the third party, and if he will mention to me any of the measures that he has standing to his name on the Order paper, I shall be glad to give them special prominence.

Mr. MITCHELL. Nothing the right hon. gentleman has addressed to the House this Session has pleased me more than the remark he has just made. I have half-a-dozen claims before his Department, corresponding to the claim I made in relation to the damages done by the railway to the poor widow's cow. I can get no satisfaction whatever on account of those claims, but I must admit that they have not yet been brought fairly before the right hon. gentleman. I intend at an early date to bring them before him, and I want him to take them into consideration, so as to get those troublesome matters out of the way. If he will name any particular day, I shall be very glad to call upon him in his office.

Some hon. MEMBERS. To-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was going to say "to-morrow," but I am afraid I cannot count on that. The hon. gentleman was so pleased at being able to "cow" my hon. friend from East

Mr. LAURIER.

York (Mr. Mackenzie) when he was at the head of the Government, that he, no doubt, thinks he will be able to "cow" me, and that I will have to back down.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope I may be as successful in the one case as I was in the other.

Motion agreed to.

THE FISHERIES QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are read, I think it necessary to call the attention of the hon. First Minister to a very important telegram from Washington which appears in the Canadian papers, and which, with the permission of the House, I will read:

"THE BEHRING SEA QUESTION.

"WASHINGTON, 24th.—Secretary Blaine and Sir Julian Pauncefote have reached an amicable agreement upon the Behring Sea fishery controversy, and the question of damages sustained by British vessels will be submitted to arbitration. The details of the agreement cannot be ascertained, but it is known that the Government of the United States will not, under any circumstances, permit foreigners to catch seals, even in disputed waters, during the seasons when our own subjects are prohibited from catching them. In other words, the United States will pay whatever damages the poachers have suffered in the past, where there was no sign of prohibiting poaching, and England guarantees that they shall not trespass again. It is not known who the arbitrators will be."

I do not know whether this statement is true or not, but I call the attention of the First Minister to it, because I am sure that a telegram of that kind will have a very disturbing influence on the community if it is believed that the British Government, without consulting Canada, and without Canada being represented, has taken upon itself to deal with the important questions involved. I may as well mention another rumor which I have heard—that a communication was sent to His Excellency the Governor General by Sir Julian Pauncefote, within the last forty-eight hours, informing him that very considerable progress had been made in the negotiations, that they had arrived at a crucial point, and asking that some one be sent down to Washington on behalf of the Canadian Government to furnish him with information on certain points. There is also a rumor that the Government had sent the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; but it appears to me that the Government ought to have someone there of more experience than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on a question about which he is not better informed than a great many other people in the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As to whether the Minister of Marine is the proper person to send, I do not think my hon. friend and I would agree. I have reason to believe that the hon. Minister of Marine has fully and thoroughly acquainted himself with the various questions connected with the fisheries, both on the Atlantic and the Pacific. The rumor the hon. gentleman has read, I am not responsible for; we cannot help what newspaper reporters put in the press; but I will tell the hon. gentleman exactly, so far as I know, how the matter stands. Of course we knew how matters stood at Washington, as we have always been fully informed; but on Saturday night a telegram came to His Excellency from the British ambassador, saying that he had received instructions from England to discuss the various questions, and was only awaiting the Canadian re-

representative. That was received on Saturday night; I sent it to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on Sunday, and he started yesterday at one o'clock for Washington.

CAUGHNAWAGA RESERVE.

Mr. DOYON. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Government to the fact that I asked, at the beginning of this Session, for the production of the report of the operations of Mr. McLea Wallbank as land surveyor of the Indian Reserve of Caughnawaga. The hon. the Minister of the Interior answered me that he had no objection to produce that document. During last Session I made the same request, and I received the same answer; nevertheless, the report has not yet been brought down. Am I to understand that the Government, although having no objection to lay that report before the House, has no intention of doing so? If, on the contrary, it is disposed to produce it, I would desire to know how soon, for I might say that it is not without good reason that I ask for it. I thought the matter had been forgotten, and that is why I have taken this opportunity of recalling it to the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I understand that the hon. gentleman wants to know when the report and the map of the survey of the Caughnawaga Reserve will be brought down. The map is a very intricate one, and it will take a long time to prepare it, and, therefore, I cannot say when it will be brought down.

Mr. DOYON. The hon. Minister will recollect that, in a private conversation with him last Session, I asked for that report, and he told me that if he could not produce it during the Session, he would file it during the recess.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will bring it down at the earliest possible moment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—DUTIES ON SEEDS.

Mr. COUTURE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I regret that reasons beyond my control prevented me from attending yesterday's sitting, when the House was called upon to vote on a most important question as regards the agricultural class; I refer to the motion of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), in favor of free importation of seeds not produced in Canada and used for the fattening of animals, the improvement of the lands and for silos. Had I been here, I should have voted for the motion of the hon. member for South Huron, as I understand his proposition is calculated to do immense service to the agricultural class.

PRIVILEGE—THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. It has been spread over the country that by voting as we did the other evening against the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice, I and a certain number of the members of this House voted for the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I did not take the necessary time last Friday to explain my view of the matter, because I desired to enable my colleagues

to take the train so as to go to their homes. I was of opinion, first, that all the hon. members in favor of Mr. McCarthy's Bill had to vote against any amendment tending to prevent that Bill from being read a second time; second, that all the hon. members in favor of Mr. Davin's amendment had to vote against any sub-amendment tending to prevent that amendment from being affirmed by the House; third, that all the hon. members opposed to any change being made in the existing law had to vote against the sub-amendment offered by the hon. Minister of Justice, as they would have to vote against Mr. Davin's amendment, and the Bill itself, had they reached a vote. The Bill presented by the hon. member for North Simcoe was struck off the Order paper for the second reading by the adoption of the sub-amendment, and no direct vote was practically taken upon the Bill itself. I have consulted very high authorities on this point, and I may quote Bourinot, our worthy Clerk, who has been so justly honored by the Queen lately, who, at page 130, says:

"If a resolution opposed to the principle of the Bill be resolved in the affirmative, or the motion that the Bill be now read a second time be simply negatived on a division, the measure will disappear from the Order Book."

So that we never had a vote on the Bill itself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes, we had.

Mr. AMYOT. The meaning I gave to my vote was that I was opposed to any change in the existing law, and I am authorised to make the same statement on behalf of the hon. members for Laprairie (Mr. Doyon), Napierville (Mr. Ste. Marie), L'Assomption (Mr. Gauthier), Joliette (Mr. Neveu), Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), St. John's, Quebec (Mr. Bourassa), Chicoutimi (Mr. Couture), and I do not doubt that if the hon. members for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), and Chambly (Mr. Préfontaine), were here, they would join in the declaration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to call the attention of the Government to the fact that, although the right hon. the First Minister himself indicated some time ago that important changes were likely to be made in the tariff, we have not only not yet got the Budget but have no intimation as to when the Budget is likely to come down. It is important, both to the business of the House and the interests of this country, that the period of suspension should not be prolonged any longer than possible, and the Government ought to be in a position to tell us within a day or two when they propose to bring down their financial statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. the Minister of Finance is not here, and will not be here the first part of the evening unless specially sent for, and, therefore, I cannot speak specifically in answer to the hon. gentleman. But the hon. gentleman must have seen that ever since the Session began, all kinds of deputations have visited Ottawa for the purpose of pressing their various interests on the attention of the Government with respect to the re-adjustment of the tariff. There is too much tendency on the part of the various interests to postpone discussing subjects or calling the attention of the Government to them until Parliament has met, which is really the most inconvenient season for that purpose. Still, they come during that period, and, I think, until this

last week we have had deputations here representing most of the industries of this country. Their representations have been carefully considered by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, and I have no reason to doubt these hon. gentlemen will be able very shortly to bring down the results of their examination.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will take the opportunity, then, when the House adjourns, or thereabouts, of asking for some information, and the right hon. the First Minister, I understand, will mention to the Minister of Finance what I have said, in order that he may give the information desired. I am aware of the difficulty which the hon. gentleman speaks of, in the matter of deputations putting off important questions until the last moment, and I do not think it is fair to the Government or the country that deputations should postpone coming here until within a few days of the Budget. Speaking with some little experience, I know it is utterly impossible for a Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Customs, or the Government generally, to make the requisite enquiries in the course of a week or ten days, which is generally the amount of time allowed by these deputations, but that is, to a certain extent, in the Government's own hands, and the sooner they bring down the Budget, the less likely they are to be troubled with these deputations.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the return asked for by the hon. member for Muskoka has been brought down yet—with reference to the opinion of the law officers of the Crown on the constitutionality of the Jesuits' Estates Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will shortly be laid before the House. His Excellency was bound to ask for permission to bring the papers down, he has that permission, and we will bring the papers down.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to make a motion with reference to the printing of this when brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not in order. It will be printed as soon as it comes down, I can tell the hon. gentleman, without a motion.

THE ADULTERATION ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 9) further to amend the Adulteration Act, chapter 107 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Costigan.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULLOCK. I understand that some persons engaged in the trade of selling agricultural fertilisers have made representations to the hon. gentleman with regard to some of the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They have, but that question will be treated in the Act to amend the Fertilisers Act, and has nothing to do with this Bill. The question of amendments to the Fertilisers Act are entirely distinct from this Act, and the Fertilisers Act amendments will be taken up later in the Session, after I have heard representations from all the parties interested.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have received representations from parties interested in fertilisers, but
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

as the hon. gentleman says they are not affected by the Bill under consideration, but will be dealt with in another Bill, I will wait until that Bill is before the House.

On section 4,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I object to the general principle of amending Acts by simply declaring that certain words are altered or struck out. It makes it very difficult to understand what the law is, and it would be far better to repeal the whole section and re-enact it with the amendment.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Bill is prepared by the law officers, and they, I suppose, take the course which is generally pursued.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think it is a vicious principle to adopt. If a new edition of the Revised Statutes were issued to-morrow, it would contain these amendments, and it is difficult to follow them under the present system.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Some years ago this matter was discussed, and it was agreed that, wherever it was proposed to amend a section, the section should be reprinted in the amending Act with the changes inserted in it, and should be altogether repealed in the original Act. That is certainly a much more convenient system to adopt, and one which makes it much more easy to interpret the statute.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I remember the discussion referred to by my hon. friend, and there is no question whatever that very great inconvenience arises to laymen, at any rate, if not to lawyers, from the practice to which my hon. friend has alluded. I forget who was the Minister of Justice at that time, but I understood that the Government then promised to set a good example in Bills of their own, and to reprint the amended clause in the Bill. It seems to me that reason and common sense are wholly in favor of that course.

Mr. MULLOCK. At present, if any one wants to know what the law is, he has to buy half-a-dozen copies of the Statutes in order to understand one paragraph.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are these reports simply to be published at the option of the Minister, or will all the reports be published?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, all reports will be published.

On section 8,

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It strikes me that this is a very undesirable clause. We find in this proviso that any individual who, through no fault of his own, may have purchased an article that is ultimately found to be more or less adulterated, is placed in a position that unless he can show that he sold the article as he received it, and that he has at the same time a warranty from the party from whom he purchased this article, he is liable to a heavy fine. But the clause does not even stop there; for if he has a warranty, if he shows that he purchased this article in good faith and understood that it was pure when he purchased it, after proving all this, he is still liable to a fine. Why should a man be placed in that position unless it can be shown that he was in some way responsible, and knew he had an article in his possession that was not pure, and sold it knowing that it was not pure? In that case he should be held responsible;

but if he has exercised all due diligence to ascertain whether the article was pure, he should not be held responsible. Am I to understand that the Minister considers every trader is to be looked upon as a rogue, that no one is honest except the Government, and that they must adopt measures of this kind to vex and harass every individual who is engaged in any legitimate trade?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think it would be sufficient to show that the party had reasonable knowledge that the article was adulterated. But this is introducing an elaborate defence.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This Act, of course, is adopted for a purpose. We have found in the administration of the Act, as it now stands upon the Statute-book, that it was impossible to enforce it. There were thirteen cases in succession where parties were proceeded against, and the prosecution failed to obtain one conviction. Consequently it became necessary to devise some remedy in order that the guilty parties might be convicted. In England it has been found necessary to adopt just such a clause.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It strikes me that if the accused proves certain things, he ought to be discharged, and only liable to pay the costs incurred. As I read this Act, if he does not give notice he will only be liable to the costs; but if he gives notice, he will only be liable for the penalty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is liable to pay the costs if he proves all these facts, and by section 21 of the existing Act he is liable to the forfeiture of the goods themselves. But if after having given notice he proves that he relied upon that as his defence, he only incurs forfeiture, which is not a penalty. He is not relieved from forfeiture in any case.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If he proves that he is really innocent he is still liable to a penalty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is not innocent; he is guilty of having adulterated food exposed for sale. If he proves that he used reasonable diligence to prevent the food that he has for sale being adulterated, he is not liable to a fine, but still the goods are confiscated.

On section 11,

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have been requested by Boards of Health, by gentlemen connected with the Dairy Association, and by others, to make some arrangement by which analysts should be appointed for certain classes of goods. One reason given is, that it is very inconvenient to forward samples long distances, and that the constituents change in such case; another reason is, that if these analysts were appointed for special purposes, the convenience of the public would be served, and their evidence would be available in the courts. I move the insertion of the following clause as a sub-section to section 3:—

The Governor in Council may, on the nomination of his Council, in any city, town, township or municipality, appoint examiners for such municipality, to examine such articles of food as may be determined by the Governor in Council, but such appointment shall not be made unless, and until the person so nominated has undergone an examination before the Examining Board above mentioned, and obtained a certificate setting forth that he is competent and duly qualified to examine and certify as to the nature and purity of articles of food for the examination of which he is to be appointed, in which case his certifi-

cate of analysis with respect to such article shall have like force and effect as certificates of the official analysts appointed under the Act.

Mr. WILSON. What salary is attached?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Under the present law the Governor General in Council has the power to fix the amounts to be paid in fees for the analyses made. The question of payment was discussed when the proposition was first made to me, and those who urged this matter on my attention stated that the question of salary was a secondary consideration with them, and that the municipalities would be willing to pay the salary. What they wanted was the authority under this Act. Parliament has already given in the Act, as it now stands, power to the Governor in Council to pay every analyst a certain fee for each analysis. Accordingly, these analysts appointed will be paid in fees according to the work they do; there will be no salary attached to the office.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The Governor in Council has power under the existing Act to pay the analysts whatever is the amount to which they are entitled for their services. This is covered by the fourth clause. It is all very well for those persons, with whom the Minister conversed, to say that the cost was a minor consideration, and that the municipalities would be willing to pay the salaries. Has the Minister any evidence that the municipalities would be willing to do so? If they do not, the amount must be paid by the Government, for there are no means whereby this Government can compel the municipality to expend any money.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we are practically doing the same thing to-day. If there are more samples sent for analysis, than can be attended to by the employes down here, the Government have to employ other persons and pay them. The analyst has got to be paid whether the analysis takes place here or in the municipality. I think this amendment to the law will be found to be very convenient, and will be much appreciated by the people, for I have heard objections frequently raised as to the difficulty of sending down samples to Ottawa, and complaints that very often they are spoiled in transit, so that a correct test of purity cannot be made. Again, the difficulty of sending samples such a distance, prevents many from taking advantage of the Act. I have frequently been written to by persons in my county, to know if the Government could not so amend the law, as to allow analysts to be appointed for the county, or a town, or for a few municipalities, so that he could be within convenient reach of persons from all parts of the county. This amendment provides for that. As to the question of payment, I would be much better pleased that the money should be paid to individuals in the locality, who are capable of making correct analysis, than that it should be paid to persons living in Ottawa. If our people in the country can discharge the duty, they are more in touch with the people around them, and they would be more alive to the importance of the subject, and see that an analysis would be a thorough protection against adulterated food.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. member cannot consider what he his talking about.

Mr. SPROULE. May be you think so.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). He says that these analysts should be paid by the municipalities.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman either misunderstood me or I did not make myself clear. I did not say anything about the municipalities paying. I said that the analysis had to be paid for; and that being the case, I would prefer it should be paid to competent persons living in the municipalities than to residents of Ottawa.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not see that this Parliament has any right whatever to interfere in the matter. We might as well adopt regulations as to the weight of bread, or as to other matters which are now under the control of the municipalities. I think the Minister will find, if he examines this clause, that he is encroaching on local and municipal rights and privileges.

Mr. SPROULE. We always had power to provide for the analysis of food.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is, I believe, a very reasonable proposition, and it is brought forward at the desire of persons from all parts of the country, who have sent numerous petitions asking that it should be done. It is not encroaching on local or Provincial rights, for it simply provides that if the municipality wishes to do a certain thing, they may be enabled to do so under this Act. The discussion will do no harm; and if hon. gentlemen wish to have the clause struck out, I have no particular objection, and the Bill can pass without it.

Mr. BROWN. The people of Hamilton are very much in favor of the proposition made by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. I have had a communication from the chairman of the Board of Health of that city, strongly sustaining this proposition in relation to analysis, particularly with regard to milk. The provision, as I understand, is simply that municipalities shall have the power to appoint an analyst if they so wish. I believe this will be productive of a great deal of good, for it will better insure the purity of milk and other foods supplied to the city. The City Council of Hamilton and the Board of Health are strongly in favor of the proposition. I understand that most of the municipalities are of the same opinion, and I trust the clause will carry.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It strikes me that the wording of the clause is not very clear, and that it tends to put a severe tax on a person who may be really innocent of any intention to adulterate food, and who may endeavor to comply with the Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I shall look over the clause carefully before the third reading.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I agree with the observations made by my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), that we might as well regulate the weight of bread, or make regulations as to the cleaning up of backyards in towns and villages, as to legislate in the way we now propose. This provision lies more clearly within the police regulations, which are part of the municipal law of every country, rather than within the criminal law. The discussion we have had goes to confirm the view I expressed when the original Bill was before us—that this is a police regulation and connected with civil rights, rather than a *quasi* criminal act.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPROULE.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CARLING moved second reading of Bill (No. 17) to amend the Patent Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CARLING. The first and second sections take away from the Minister of Agriculture the power to decide on the validity of patents, and transfers it to the courts.

On section 2,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This section compels the patentee of an article to manufacture it in the country. I am informed that in other countries the patentee is only required to be in a position to furnish the article to the public at a reasonable price if it is demanded. Does the hon. Minister know what the law is in other countries in reference to that?

Mr. CARLING. This is the same as the law in the States and in England.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This provision seems to require that the patentee himself or his legal representative shall carry on the manufacture.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is exactly the same as the present law, except the latter part of the section, which gives the jurisdiction to the Exchequer Court instead of to the Minister.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am aware that it is the present law, but this is the proper time to have it corrected if it is not right. I am informed by those who have studied the matter, that the United States and England do not require the patentee to manufacture, but they do require that he should be in a position to supply the public with his invention at a reasonable figure if the public call for it. This provision requires him to manufacture whether the public call for it or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot speak with authority on that point, but I think the enactments are substantially the same, because to require a man to have the article when anybody wants it, is practically to require him to manufacture. This provision does not require the patentee himself to engage in the manufacture, because there are provisions in the Patent Act with reference to the assignment of patents, and the more general practice is for the assignees to carry on the manufacture, and not the patentees.

Bill reported.

TRADE MARKS AND INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS.

Mr. CARLING moved second reading of Bill (No. 18) to amend the Act respecting Trade Marks and Industrial Designs. He said: The only change is to remove the trial of contested cases from the Department of Agriculture to the Exchequer Court concurrently with the ordinary course.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE COPYRIGHT ACT.

Mr. CARLING moved second reading of Bill (No. 19) to amend the Copyright Act. He said: This is on the same line as the Bill just passed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 43) to amend chapter 4 of 52 Victoria, intituled: "An Act to authorise the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies." He said: By a clerical error in the Land Subsidy Bill, the land grant was given to the North-West Coal and Navigation Company instead of to the Alberta Company, and this Bill is to correct that mistake.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

PUBLIC STORES ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 53) to amend the Public Stores Act. He said: In the year 1887, at the request of the Imperial Government, an Act was passed to prevent the use of articles marked with the Imperial marks for public stores, and in that Act there was a schedule describing the various marks then in use for the public stores of Her Majesty's Army and Navy. It has transpired that, although the Act was passed at the instance of the Imperial Government, the schedule was not correct, inasmuch as one of the marks there described for worsted thread had been discontinued. The schedule should be amended in accordance with the practice established in the Imperial service, and this Bill is introduced for the purpose of making the correction.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE, CHEQUES AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 6) relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes.—(Sir John Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 60,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The attention of the Committee was called to this clause by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who mentioned that it embodied a very important principle, and I, again, call the very special attention of the Committee to it this afternoon. The effect of the clause is that the bank paying on a forged endorsement is not responsible. I will endeavor to present shortly some of the arguments upon which that proposition rests. The clause has been attacked as being a total reversal of our present law, as it does not provide that the bank shall bear the loss in any case of forgery. That is not the fact. The clause provides that, if a cheque is regularly drawn, being made payable to order, the mere fact of the endorsement upon it being forged shall not render the bank liable to loss in consequence of the forgery. Therefore we have as the first principle that the cheque must be

properly issued, and if it is properly issued, the loss is not to fall upon the bank if the endorsement is forged. That is represented to be a fair principle, because the business which the bank transacts is a business between it and the customer with whom it transacts its business. The proper business of the bank is to pay the money which the customer deposits there at his request, and not to guarantee the intervening transactions between the person who gives the cheque and those who receive it and those through whose hands it may pass. If the maker of the cheque chooses to make it payable to order and not to bearer, he must, in all fairness, bear the risk of its going into hands where it may be improperly endorsed. No such thing can happen in the case of a cheque payable to bearer. Another argument in support of the clause is the liability which the bank incurs in all cases of refusing payment of a cheque. No matter how numerous the intervening transactions may be, and although the endorsers may be entirely unknown to the bank, the bank is called upon to pay on a cheque on which not one of the endorsements can be verified, or to refuse payment at its own risk and liability for damages. I am using the word "cheque" for convenience to represent these documents. I may add that the principle of this clause has been adopted in England and has been acted upon there for thirty-seven years, and I think it is reasonable, in this respect, to assimilate our law to the English law.

Mr. MULOCK. When this clause was before the House on a previous occasion, I expressed my view in favor of it as I then understood it, and, if it were limited to cheques, I would still be in favor of it, but, as I understand, the clause refers also to bills of exchange. The interpretation clause shows that, and applies not only to an ordinary cheque for money deposited in the bank, but to a bill of exchange in the widest sense. A person may draw on a bank not by a cheque, but in the ordinary way of business. A bank may be willing to honor a draft, not because there is money of the drawer there, but because the customer does his regular business there. I would ask the Minister of Justice to cut down this provision and make it applicable simply to cheques pure and simple.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MULOCK. I observe that section 63 makes a cheque a bill of exchange payable on demand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is important that we should understand exactly what the hon. gentleman intends to do. As I understand this clause, it is not incumbent on the bank to show that the endorser or the payee is the person whose name purports to be on the cheque. This goes to the root of the whole of our present system of cheques. If I make a cheque payable to the order of John Smith, and the bank pays it to somebody who endorses that cheque who is not John Smith, the risk is shifted from the shoulders of the bank to my shoulders. That is my understanding of the clause, though, of course, the Minister may correct me if I am wrong. I have the strongest objection to that provision. I see no reason why these corporations who derive their existence from us, and who get considerable benefit from the Parliament of this Dominion, should be relieved from the liability they now in-

cur, at any rate, as regards the original payee. As regards subsequent endorsers something might be said; but that the hon. gentleman, as I understood, should allow any bank or person to escape liability by reason of a forged endorsement of the name of the original payee, seems to be a most objectionable thing, and one on which I, for my part, will certainly divide the House at a later stage. I do not think any sufficient reasons have been advanced, except the convenience of the banks themselves, and I submit that the convenience of the general public is of much more importance than the convenience of the banks. I do not believe that any considerable loss has accrued to them from the existing state of the law, and I think that before such a very material change is made, a much better reason should be given than the Minister has, as yet, brought forward. In fact, as I understood him to say, he was not himself much wedded to this innovation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman was not in when I explained the clause this afternoon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I have just come in. But I ask the hon. gentleman whether I was not correct in supposing that under this clause the bank was discharged from liability, even in the case of the original person to whom the cheque was made?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it revolutionises our whole system of cheques, and I do not think such a revolution should be made without a much better reason than I have heard adduced as yet. It is a great convenience to the mercantile public, and to private persons who do business with banks, that they should know that, when they give a cheque to a particular man, the bank should take reasonable precautions to identify that man, and I do not see why they should be relieved of that duty from existing provisions of the law.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the Minister should show some reasons for this change. Does the recommendation come from the banks? Has there been any agitation among the bankers, or is it merely an idea of my hon. friend himself? Because it has been followed in England for a number of years is no reason why we should adopt it. There are a great many English laws which are applicable to their condition which would not be applicable to ours, and this change, it appears to me, is one of them. As my hon. friend in front of me (Sir Richard Cartwright) has observed, we have found great convenience in this country in transmitting cheques from one party to another, and generally without any of the inconvenience which the hon. gentleman is providing against. But I submit that whether the fact that a bank is henceforth to be relieved from the result of forgery, will not in a measure tend to create forgery. If people, knowing that they have got to go through the inspection of the bank officials, knowing the difficulty they will have to meet, are disposed to present a cheque that is not properly endorsed, and are deterred by these precautions, when that supervision is taken away, as it will be, under the operation of this Bill, it is a question whether people so disposed may not actually be more disposed to run the risk than

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

they are under the present circumstances. The banks, I contend, are responsible for the signatures of their customers, and they should be responsible for seeing that the cheque or bill is properly endorsed. You might just as well relieve the bank from the responsibility of paying a cheque that was drawn or forged in another man's name. I cannot see that a distinction can be made in this case. If the banks are careful, and are bound to see that the cheques are in the signatures of their customers, I think they are equally bound to take every precaution, in the interest of the customers with whom they deal, and of the public generally, to see that these cheques are properly endorsed before they are paid; otherwise I think it will lead to a great increase of forgery in that direction.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that the local press, at least in the section from which I come, appears to be almost unanimous in condemning this proposed amendment to the law, and the few business men with whom I have had an opportunity of conversing, also condemn it. They think it is shifting the responsibility from the banks to the shoulders of the parties against who are made the drawers of these cheques, and that it will make the banks much more careless. They have now such ample control over the financial operations of the country and over business men, that it is used many times to the disadvantage of the business man, and to give them the advantage of this proposed amendment would be giving them even greater powers over business men than they are entitled to have.

Mr. BLAKE. Our course of business is not exactly the same as that in England, and we make a much wider use of cheques than is made in England. They have a system of crossing cheques which does not exist here, or exists but to a small extent. It does seem to me, that unless the hon. gentleman is prepared with proofs furnished him of the inconveniences which have been actually shown to exist from the present system, there is no ground for the change. If the suggestion is that the banks are placed in very great difficulty, that their duty to their customers and the exigencies of business oblige them to receive cheques which are forged, and that consequently great losses accrue to them, why, that is a state of things that ought to be considered. But we have before us no information that that is the condition of things, or that the banks have found it a serious obstruction or a difficulty to have this responsibility imposed upon them. I must confess, that I should view with great reluctance the removal of that responsibility, at any rate, in so far as it is connected with the genuineness of the endorsement by the persons to whose order the cheque is made—subsequent endorsements may be open to a different consideration. But that the drawer of the cheque should lose his money because the person in whose favor he has drawn it does not genuinely endorse it, or because it is endorsed otherwise, I do not see. Unless, therefore, the hon. gentleman is able to show that the course of business throughout the country is seriously inconvenienced, that there is a serious difficulty in the banks carrying on their business, I, for my part, am disposed to give my vote for the continuance of the present law.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There is a good deal of argument on both sides. I think there are

very good reasons why this change should be made. With regard to these cheques on bankers standing differently from bills of exchange or promissory notes, a good deal may be said. The cheque is drawn from the banker; originally in England it was only drawn payable to the bearer. In 1853, I think for the first time, this rule was introduced, when cheques payable to order were allowed. Now, there is a broad line of distinction. The bank is supposed to know the signature of the person, therefore they are responsible if they pay a cheque which has been forged. If the cheque is endorsed by individuals of whom they know nothing, the bank is placed in this dilemma: either they have got to refuse that cheque and run the risk of an action, or they have got to pay it and bear the loss. The advantage of drawing a cheque payable to order is, that it enables the drawer to have a voucher, and he draws the cheque in this form to suit his convenience. If it is for his benefit, why should he not take the responsibility? With regard to the changes made in England, I find the reasons succinctly stated by Chief Justice Cockburn, who was probably member of Parliament at the time the Bill was passed, and the reasons given by him in the case of *Charles vs. Blackwell*, were these:

"Now, the purpose of the enactment we are dealing with was, when cheques payable to order were expected to become general, to protect the bankers against the possibility of forged endorsements. The only reason why cheques had not been drawn payable to order before being, as I have stated, the expenses of the stamp, when the Stamp Act of 16 and 17 Victoria included these cheques among those which should be subject to the penny stamp, it was, of course, foreseen that the great convenience arising from the use of such cheques would make them of constant recurrence. It was equally certain that the use of cheques drawn to order would expose bankers to serious danger from forged endorsements, payment upon which, as the law then stood, would have been to their own loss. It was against this danger that the 19th section of the Act was intended to protect them. Against forgery of the writing of his own customers, the banker must be assumed capable of protecting himself. He is, or ought to make himself, acquainted with the signatures of his own customers. He cannot be acquainted with the signatures of whole multitudes of payees or agents who have to endorse cheques drawn upon him, and made payable to order. It was not unreasonable, therefore, that while the customer obtained the advantage of being able to draw cheques payable to order, the possibility of forged endorsement should be, as between him and the banker, at his risk. By making a cheque payable to order, the drawer obtained the advantage that if the cheque is stolen or lost before it reaches the payee, it cannot be paid without a forged endorsement, the risk of which many persons, who would not scruple to present a cheque payable to bearer, in fraud of the true owner, and pocket the proceeds, might yet be unwilling to run. Furthermore, he obtains, through the endorsement of the payee, an acknowledgment of the receipt of the cheque and of its payment. Obtaining this benefit, it was but reasonable that the possibility of a forged endorsement should be at his risk, or, at all events, be a question between him and the payee, leaving the banker free from liability."

There is very great force in this reasoning. While a banker is supposed to become acquainted with his customer's handwriting, the drawer of a cheque should assume some responsibility; and when a customer draws a cheque payable to a party whom the banker does not know, and the cheque is presented at the bank drawn in that form for the customer's own benefit, he should take the risk as he receives the benefit. The bank is placed in this dilemma: If it pays the cheque, then it is liable for the loss; if the bank refuses the cheque, then it runs the risk of an action being brought against it for dishonoring a good cheque.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have no doubt it will be a matter of convenience to the banks to have the change proposed; but, on the other hand, the interests of the general public must be considered. Unless it can be shown that a great inconvenience will result to the banks, a change so great as this should not be adopted. While I can add little to the arguments already adduced, I speak in order that the Minister may understand that this is a question in which great interest is taken and, if the change is not particularly demanded, the hon. gentleman should consider carefully the expediency of making the change. While the bank runs some risk, and in some few cases, loss, although in a mercantile life extending over a great many years, I know of only one case where a bank has suffered loss. It must be borne in mind that this system contributes business for the banks. A large amount of money is paid in this way, solely on account of the security given to the person drawing the cheque, and if you should wipe out that security and make every cheque or bank draft to order no greater security than an open cheque payable to bearer, the question arises whether you would not draw business from the banks, and find that payments were largely made through express companies instead of through the banks. So, while the banks run some risk, the present method means profit to those institutions. I submit that this is an additional argument against the change proposed. I feel positive that in many cases the change proposed would result in withdrawing what is a profitable business to the bank, and that the express companies would be found transmitting large sums to parties which otherwise would have been remitted through the agency of banks.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House. It would be a great mistake to make the change contemplated in this direction, and the convenience of the public should always be considered in preference to the convenience of the banks. This system is of great convenience to the public, and it has been generally adopted by the people on account of the security given, by the bank being obliged to see that the signature to the cheque is a genuine one. Unless it could be shown that the banks have lost very largely, it would be very unwise to make the change contemplated. Moreover, when a system has become general and the public have got accustomed to it, it is always unwise to change it and adopt a new mode of business with which the people are not acquainted. It is especially a convenient system of remitting money from one part of the Province to another. From the town in which I live, you can send a cheque payable to "John Smith" in Toronto or elsewhere. He presents it in Toronto, and if the bank does not know him, they can require that he be identified. The people have become accustomed to the system, and unless it can be shown that there has been great loss and inconvenience, it would be unwise to change it. I do not think the banks should be relieved from the responsibility under which they rest at present. The banks are not compelled to do this business unless they find it profitable, but, if they do it, they should not be relieved from that responsibility. I sincerely hope that the Minister will not press this clause, but that he will allow the law to remain as it has

remained for many years, and which the people of the country understand and appreciate. I certainly think that it would be very unwise to make the change contemplated.

Mr. EDWARDS. I cannot hope to add anything of importance to what has been said on this question, but I wish to express my sincere desire that the hon. Minister of Justice will see his way to not enforce the change now contemplated in this respect. In my opinion, if this change be made it will disturb the commerce of the country to a very great extent indeed. I cannot agree in the opinion that this idea is only for the protection of the person who gives the cheque, for I believe, that it is very largely intended for the convenience of the receiver of the cheque. In my business I draw a great many cheques, and I always ask the party to whom I give a cheque, "Will you have this cheque payable to bearer or to your order?" In almost every case the party receiving the cheque wishes that it should be made payable to his order, for the reason that if he loses the cheque he will be protected. If this proposed clause becomes law the finder of a lost cheque may go to the bank, and if the bank will pay the money, he will receive it and the responsibility is removed from the bank entirely. In the neighborhood of our place of business there is no bank, and a great many people come to us and deposit their money, and ask us to give our cheque for safety in remitting. So far as the bank is concerned, my opinion is, that one of the first motives of a bank should be to protect its own customers. I can hardly believe that the banks desire such a change as this. Of course it is generally understood that the presenter of a cheque has got to be identified, and the onus is on the bank; but what would be desirable would be to make the law so that the presenter of the cheque would be compelled to identify the endorsement if requested. So far as this line of endorsement goes down from one person to another, it is almost always the case that when a cheque is endorsed for the second or third time it gets into the hand of some commercial man whose endorsement is well known and who has a bank account. When he goes to his banker and deposits that cheque the responsibility is on him, for he guarantees the previous endorsements. So far as I am concerned I think it would be a very serious evil indeed, if this change is made, and I sincerely hope it shall not be made.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), when he referred to the convenience of the present system, has stated all that can be said in its favor. In proposing by a Bill to regulate the relations of parties to bills of exchange and promissory notes, and, so far as this question is concerned, the relations of bankers to their customers, I suppose it is not fair to impose a liability upon the banks for the convenience of a portion of the public with whom it has no dealings whatever. We provide completely for the relations between a bank and its customers when we propose that the responsibility shall fall, as it does now, upon the bank, if the signature to the cheque is not genuine or duly authorised. But it is but just to provide that the signature of the customer of a bank having been put to that cheque, he issues it at his own risk when he makes its payment depend upon the endorsement of other

Mr. CAMPBELL.

persons with whom the bank has no dealings, and whose signature the bank may have no opportunity of identifying. Should we make the loss fall on the bank for the convenience of persons who have no dealing with the bank? If we do so, I think we would put the loss on the wrong shoulders for the convenience of the public, and at the expense of one of the parties to the transaction.

Mr. BURDETT. The hon. Minister does not state what justification there is for changing the law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have stated the justification. I was quite aware that the Committee did not hear me very well, as there was confusion in the chamber. The hon. member for St. John stated the reason fully in his argument, while the case against it depends, as was said by the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), on the inconvenience of making the change. I admit that inconvenience, but when we are adopting a system as we are now in consolidating the law with regard to bills of exchange and promissory notes, I think we should place the relations of everybody concerned in these instruments on a fair and just footing. The argument in favor of the change, when we are coming down to first principles, is, that it is but fair that the responsibility of a bank, as the agent of the person who draws the cheque, should depend on and be limited to the genuineness of the signature which the customer appends to his cheque, and that it should not be responsible, when he, for the convenience of payment, for the convenience of having a second voucher, or for the convenience of his friend who deposits money in order to get a cheque payable to order. We provide that the bank should not be subject to the risk of perhaps a dozen intermediate endorsements by parties, not one of whom may be known to a single officer of the bank. It seems to me that we are putting the matter on a fair basis, when we limit the responsibility of the bank to the genuineness of the signature, and the genuineness of the authority of the person who has signed the cheque. I think it is but fair that we should provide that it shall either be the signature of the person who professes to draw it, or the signature of one who has due authority in that regard. When we have found that the owner of the money has drawn the order that the money shall be paid, the agent ought to be protected from all liability when he complies with the demand, of what appears on its face, to be the proper authority to pay the cheque. This argument is strengthened, when we remember that the bank has no protection, no means of verification, no communication with any of these intermediate endorsers, but is liable to an action at law if it dares to refuse payment of a cheque on an authority which it suspects may be a spurious endorsement. There is one other observation which I forgot to make and which, to some extent, meets the argument of the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). The hon. gentleman was good enough to call attention to the fact that there exists in practice, a marked difference between the use of cheques in this country and in England, in this particular, that a system of crossed cheques has grown up in the mother country, and has not yet been established here. Dealing with this matter, as I have said, upon fundamental principles, as we

are endeavoring to do, we are providing side by side with this provision all those provisions which relate to crossed cheques. What will be the position of the hon. member for Russell? He can draw his cheque, he can still draw it payable to order; he has only to cross his cheque in accordance with the provisions of this Bill and every one who takes that cheque knows that it can only be paid by the bank on which it is drawn to another bank. The hon. member therefore has but to draw two lines across his cheque, and mark "bank" on it, and that cheque must go into some other bank before it can be paid by his own bank. That being so, every person into whose hands that cheque may come, fraudulently or otherwise, knows that he must go to some bank and establish to the satisfaction of that bank his authority to receive that money to such an extent that the second bank will pay. He has only to do that in order to check to a very great extent the danger which would arise from a false or fraudulent endorsement. A person who makes a cheque payable to order does so either for his own convenience or that of the payee, and thereby imposes on the bank additional risks and obligations; and if he neglects to draw two lines across it and mark "bank" upon it, and in addition to that, desires that the bank should run the risk of loss from a forgery in an endorsement, he desires to establish a principle which appears to me to have nothing to commend it.

Mr. BLAKE. It will be observed that no answer has been given to the appeal made by several members to the hon. Minister to state whether this change is proposed upon information which the hon. gentleman has verified as to the existence in the past of considerable inconvenience and loss resulting from the existing practice; and, therefore, up to this time, we are to understand that we are dealing with it—as the hon. gentleman himself put it—upon first principles—upon the question as to what is abstractly right or best. I do not myself think that, after the very long experience we have had of one system, we can ignore the practical result of that system, and I do not think it is reasonable to suggest theoretical inconveniences or risks of a grave character as a sufficient ground for altering the law of the land as it has been for a great number of years, and to which the people have adjusted their commercial transactions. My opinion is that a very good test under these circumstances is the test of experience, and if it has been found that the banks are exposed to very serious inconveniences or risks—on the one hand, risk of an action because they refuse payment of a cheque which turns out to be properly endorsed, or, on the other hand, risk of a loss because a cheque, which they have no means of verifying, turns out to be improperly endorsed—or if it has been found that the security which the general public dealing with the banks has had up to this time, and under which they are carrying on the money transactions of the country, is insufficient, we want some statistics to show to what extent that has been the case. But, in the absence of proofs that there has been any serious inconvenience or loss in practice, I decline to accept theoretical reasons of hardship as a ground for altering the law.

Mr. DESJARDINS. My limited experience in banking leads me to believe that there is no such inconvenience experienced as to necessitate a

change in the law. The banks are willing to accommodate their customers, and to accept any risk for the endorsements of the cheques which they receive. It is a very common practice for customers to make their cheques payable to order, and they know very well that but for that arrangement the person receiving the cheque would have no security against loss by the cheque getting into wrong hands. He knows very well that the accommodation the banks are willing to give would be minimised to such an extent that their customers would suffer considerably. As far as my experience goes, there is not much danger of cheques being paid to the wrong persons. Every bank has its own customers and its own means of indentifying those who ask payment of endorsed cheques, so that I think this change would be neither in the interest of the customers nor of the banks.

Mr. KENNY. This matter of conducting the business of the country by cheques is one which, of course, concerns the commercial community more particularly, and I can readily understand that there should be great objections to any innovations. I note specially the remarks of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), but in considering this question, there seems to be a disposition to throw all the responsibility upon the banks. The hon. the Minister of Justice has explained to us that in a subsequent section provision is made for adopting the system of crossing cheques, and if the hon. member for Russell, when one of his customers desires a cheque on exchange for the money deposited in his hands, will simply cross that cheque after he has signed it, he will then protect himself and his bank. There is no place where the system of cheques prevail to such an extent as in England, and in no city to such an extent as in London, and the extent to which the system prevails there is largely due to the fact that they have adopted this system of crossing cheques, whereby a cheque can only be cashed by a bank. This is a great protection to the customers of a bank, and also to the bank, and, as a commercial man, I must say that if we can adopt the system, which is equally convenient to us as the system which prevails to-day, and at the same time give more protection to our banks, without causing ourselves the slightest inconvenience, it is only fair that we should adopt it. This system of crossing cheques, English experience shows us, is a better system than the one which prevails in Canada to-day, and is not only a protection to the bank, but is equally convenient to the customers of the bank; and, therefore, as a commercial man, obliged to use these cheques, I think that if we would incorporate the system of crossed cheques it would be a very great improvement.

Mr. BLAKE. While I do not at all object to the introduction of the system of crossed cheques, I do not think that in the present condition of banking in this country, with reference to agencies and so forth, and the use made of cheques in this country, it is to be expected that the inconveniences we are now discussing will be removed by the introduction of this system. To a very large extent they will remain. It will be very useful, indeed, in large cities where there is a number of banks, but it would not be found applicable or convenient in a large portion of our transactions outside of large cities, in the rural districts.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This clause will operate in favor of the banks in this way: If you wish to make from Ottawa a payment in Toronto, and draw your cheque payable to order and send it through, under this clause your cheque will be no security, and the result will be, in order to secure safety, you will have to give the bank 25 cents to get a bank draft. If my hon. friend were interested in banking, I would say that it would operate to his advantage.

Mr. BURDETT. He is a bank president.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). His plan would result in business being given to the banks at the expense of the general public. As the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has pointed out, before such a radical change as this is made in the system which has been carried on for thirty or forty years, there ought to be examples of hardship or loss shown. Every business man knows that when he pays an account by a cheque payable to order, he does not care whether he gets a receipt or not. The cheque is a receipt. But the hon. gentleman is going to oblige the general public to be careful in every case to take a receipt for the money, and is going to infuse into commercial circles a feeling of insecurity with reference to remittances. He will force people to buy bank drafts, in order to be secure, instead of sending cheques payable to order as they do now. I am sorry to see the hon. gentleman taking such a ground. I fail to see the force of the arguments he addressed to the Committee, and I would say, with the hon. member for West Durham, that we should not deal theoretically with this matter, but if there has been no inconvenience and no loss, we should stick to what has been found to work well in practice.

Mr. TISDALE. I feel strongly that this clause is a step in the wrong direction. I have had some personal experience in dealing with banks, and I have yet to learn that anybody who has a bank account worth having has any difficulty in getting a bank to take it, under the law as it is now. As has been already remarked, these cheques payable to order serve as receipts, and we have heard no complaint of loss on the part of the banks under that system. If there were any complaints, we might then consider the question of crossed cheques. Our system of banking here is quite different from that in England. Our banks make a great deal more money out of their customers than do the banks in England, as we have more discounting and a different class of bank accounts. I would regret very much to see this clause retained in the Bill. The bulk of the Bill is very excellent, but, until there is a greater demand or more reason shown why the banks should have this protection, or why they themselves require this change, I would regret very much to see it become law.

Mr. WALDIE. I was about to say that our business is done with towns and villages where there is no branch of a chartered bank. If crossed cheques are necessary, they would have to be returned to Toronto to be cashed. Now, these cheques are passed to the different merchants in the different localities, they are forwarded by them to their correspondents, and by those correspondents they are forwarded to Toronto. It would cause a great deal of difficulty and great inconvenience to us, if this Act were amended as it

Mr. BLAKE.

is proposed. It would be of great inconvenience to our employes and to others to have marked cheques which could only be cashed through a bank.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think that would be the effect of requiring the cheques to be crossed. The hon. gentleman will see that it would not be necessary for them to come back immediately to the bank in Toronto or to come back earlier than they do now. The only effect of this provision is that they must be presented at another bank than that on which they are drawn. Taking Algoma and Muskoka, to which I understand the hon. gentleman refers, the effect of the provision would be that the merchants who cash those cheques would be very careful as to the authenticity of every endorsement.

Mr. WALDIE. The effect would be that we would have to stop making payments in this way. The people to whom the payments are made are not so well known as the hon. gentleman supposes, and it would, therefore, stop our business if it were done in that way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), I may say that I do not think this would have the effect he seems to expect, of sending all this business to the banks in the sense that every one who was going to a distance would have to get a bank draft instead of a cheque, because, as he will observe, a bank draft is subject to the same restrictions as a cheque. The cheque drawn by one bank on another is as much subject to the provision of this Bill as any other cheque, and, therefore, this could not have the effect of sending business to the banks. As to the inconveniences arising from the present system, every one knows that not a month passes without a bank being subjected to loss by virtue of the law being as it now is, and that without any fault of the bank and without the bank having any means to protect itself. In regard to the statistics which have been spoken of, if I gathered up the statistics on this point, what would be gained? The question of inconvenience, great or small, is a relative question, and it would, of course, be said that the banks are better able to bear inconvenience and loss than their customers are. But the question is not one of convenience or statistics. The question is whether the provision is right or wrong. If it is not right in principle, though it has not been assailed by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) as being wrong, that is another question, but I believe I can recommend it to the Committee by arguments which will show them that it is right, though some people prefer to shift a loss to the shoulders of a corporation rather than bear it themselves. I am not going to submit any statistics on this subject, or to urge it on the Committee because the banks are interested in it. It goes without saying, that every one who is interested in banking would desire to see this provision passed; but that is no reason for its place in the Bill. The reason why it is here is that we thought it right to adopt it. I have been twice asked why I did not show who urged the adoption of such a provision. Will it commend the provision of this Committee any more to say that the banks are in favor of it or are not in favor of it? If there were no better reasons to urge, I would have abandoned it as

hour ago. However, I am convinced that the weight of opinion in the Committee is against the clause. It has been said that I am wedded to the clause. I am not wedded to the clause. We are here to make the best Bill we can, and I am grateful to the Committee for the free discussion which has taken place. I propose to allow this clause to stand for the present, and if, on further consideration, the Committee is not convinced that it is right by what I have said in favor of it, I shall withdraw it.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 6) relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes.—(Sir John Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 69,

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there any provision made with respect to the security?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; we cannot define that. Similar clauses with respect to security and actions on lost instruments are clauses which are now in force in all the Provinces, and the sufficiency of the security is to be determined on the trial of the action. It is impossible to define what amount of security shall be given, or what kind of security. If on the trial of the cause the security offered shall be proved to be sufficient, the party recovers; but it is left to be determined as a question of fact.

On section 75,

Mr. BURDETT. There was a case in the Central Bank recently, where a party received a cheque which had been marked, but he never received the cash, and it was held that the drawer was discharged. I presume this is an exact copy of the English law, and probably it had better be left to its course, and no change made for cases like the one I have mentioned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The drawer at common law was discharged entirely if there was any delay at all in presenting the cheque. This is intended to relieve the drawer *pro tanto*, to the extent of the damage suffered.

On section 76,

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the reason for introducing this change in the present banking system? So far as I have ever heard, the system of doing business by cheques has been generally satisfactory, and any disturbance in the present arrangement would cause considerable confusion. I understand that banking institutions may possibly have suggested the change, but before we make a radical change of this sort it would be well for us to know the necessity for it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is nothing compulsory about this, and, therefore, it does not make any change in the law. As the hon. member will see, one can now draw a cheque in any form he pleases, and subject to any condition he pleases. This is but a convenient provision which, put on the face of the cheque, will notify the holder how it can be cashed. It is the form which is in existence in Great Britain and most other countries.

Not only is the system of crossed cheques in use in the mother country, but, to a limited extent, it has been in use here, especially in the case of cheques issued by Canadian banks payable in England.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there any system of this kind in force in the United States?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot say.

Mr. BURDETT. It is in use in some of the States.

Mr. WALDIE. If this system is adopted generally, it would obviate some of the objections we made to the other clause. It is a permissible provision, I suppose?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 80,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Suppose a crossed cheque is given by one person to another, the person receiving it cannot present it at the bank where it is payable, but must present it at another bank. Is the bank at which he presents it bound to cash it? If it does not, and he cannot get it cashed by the bank on which it is drawn, what is his recourse?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course, he need not take the crossed cheque. If he does take it, he knows he takes it subject to his chance of getting it cashed by a bank other than that on which it is drawn. In effect, he takes a cheque subject to that limitation.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). One other question. Suppose a crossed cheque is presented at a bank and the bank cashes it, and by the time that bank presents it to the bank on which it is drawn, it is found that there are no funds there, in what position is the second bank?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The second bank has recourse against the drawer only. It takes the risk of collecting funds from the bank on which the cheque is drawn. But the holder of a cheque, under no circumstances, can present it for collection, and the bank will at once ascertain whether funds are available or not.

On section 82,

Mr. WALDIE. If a bank is negligent in forwarding a cheque, would it not be liable for that negligence?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This section is merely to provide for the case of a bank collecting for a customer, in which case the bank shall not be liable, provide it acts in good faith.

On section 86,

Mr. McMULLEN. Where an endorsed note is held as collateral security to any instrument, in order to hold the endorser without protest, there should be some note on the bank that would settle the point between the parties, and show that the assent has been given.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a question of fact which has to be proved.

Mr. KENNY. Supposing the maker presented his note as collateral security, and the endorsement was satisfactory, how would the assent of the endorser be obtained to continuing the security?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In any way that any contract may be made—by act, word, or instrument under seal.

Mr. WALDIE. Where the holder of the note given as security extends the time of payment, I think the endorser should have some notice of that extension.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). If the extension is given without the consent of the endorser, then the endorser is no longer liable.

Mr. McMULLEN. Supposing a man wants to borrow ten thousand dollars from a bank and gives an endorser as guarantee to that extent. He will draw the funds as he requires them, and meet his notes by other paper put in for discount. That may continue for years, and if the endorser is to be held as a continuous running security and is willing to assume that risk, that should be stated on the instrument by using the words "waive protest" or in some other form. Otherwise, it will be difficult to prove his assent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What the hon. gentleman suggests is no doubt what the bank would do as a measure of prudence under the circumstances. But it may be done in other ways with perfect validity. It may be that the endorser derives benefit from the continued security. It will be a question of evidence to prove that he was in some way a party to the transaction before being deprived of his right. The burden of proof will always be on the bank, and that is the best security that the bank will take precaution to have the evidence clear.

On section 89,

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Why is a distinction drawn in this 4th sub-section, which says:

"Where a foreign note is dishonored, protest thereof, except in the Province of Quebec, is unnecessary."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Merely because that is now the law of the Province of Quebec, and it was thought best, in drawing this Bill, to avoid altering the law which is peculiar to that Province in regard to bills and notes, except where it could be done without inconvenience. It was represented to us that the law, in regard to protesting foreign as well as inland bills, should be continued. That representation came not only from the professional notaries, but also from the banking institutions.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I understood that the last time this Bill was before the Committee, the Minister of Justice took the ground that the fees for the protest of notes should be the same all over the Dominion, which must result in very much increasing the fees in Ontario, if they are to be the same as those in the Province of Quebec. I think that principle should be applied to this section, and that the law should be made uniform throughout the Dominion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said that it was the object to make the provisions of the Bill uniform wherever we could do so. I think, however, that we will have to abandon that view as far as the fees are concerned, and that the better course will be, both as to the requirement of a protest and the fees connected with a protest, to leave the law on both sides as it was before,—that is, the law in Quebec on the one side, and the English-speaking part of the country on the other.

Mr. KENNY.

Mr. WALDIE. It seems to me that when foreign bills are protested, they should not be treated in different ways in different parts of Canada. They ought to be treated in the same way everywhere.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. So they are.

Mr. WALDIE. If there is a necessity for protesting a foreign bill, it should be under a general law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This has only reference to the fees.

On section 93,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of this is to show that by the use of the word "protesting" it is not intended that the extension should be necessary, provided it is noted in the protest.

Mr. SPROULE. This clause seems to make provision for the protesting. A good many people hold the opinion that a Bill ought to be protested without employing a notary public to do it. There ought to be a provision allowing a bank clerk to protest a note the same as in the old country. I see that several papers advocate it, and a good many business men think it ought to be done. By that means you could do away with the cost of the protest, which is a considerable item in many instances. In certain localities it is impossible to get a notary public without going a long distance. I see there is a provision here that a magistrate may do it, but I think it might be left to a bank clerk or any person.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I think it will tend to prevent many negligent people from paying their notes, or from providing to meet them in some way. It is a good inducement to people to fulfil their engagements.

Mr. SPROULE. I hold the object of the protest is simply to notify the endorser that the note is not paid, and to hold the security good. It is a notice to him that the party who is liable for it has not paid it, and it is for his interest to see that the note is paid.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the only function of a protest. I think, if the hon. member will reflect upon it, he will see that the one class of persons, above all others, who ought not to be allowed to make the protest, would be the people in the bank.

Mr. SPROULE. They do it in England.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They have done it in England. They have there the same provision we have here, that where a bill is dishonored and the services of a notary cannot be obtained at the place where the bill is dishonored, any householder or substantial resident of the place, may, in the presence of two witnesses, give a certificate, signed by him, protesting the dishonor of the bill. It is not for the purpose of notifying the parties, but it is to establish, with some degree of notoriety, that dishonor has taken place, that being the most important step in the history of the bill, but a fact which requires to be proved afterwards, and to which some degree of notoriety must be given. We have on our Statute-book at present a provision that whoever shall make a protest, and whatever may be the circumstances under which it may be done, it shall not be made by the bank, as the bank might be the party interested, and such party

might manufacture evidence of facts which did not exist. The hon. gentleman will see further, that the principal effect of the present law is to be able to establish afterwards, in a court of law, the fact of dishonor and due notice by the protest itself. We have done away with the necessity of calling witnesses, by providing that the protest can be put in as evidence; but if you leave the matter to an interested party, to an officer or clerk in a bank, who may have neglected his duty in regard to giving notice, to make the evidence afterwards, the whole question is left at the mercy of even the humblest clerk.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It would be more satisfactory to every one concerned to have an independent officer outside of the bank to make the protest.

Mr. SPROULE. I have here an opinion written by an eminent authority, in which it is stated as follows:—

"The necessity for a legal gentleman's services in this regard are not necessary, and we trust the English system, of having a junior clerk of the bank send the circular notices after the teller has certified that the document was presented and not paid, will be adopted instead."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is writing on a different subject, the giving of the notice of dishonor.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The law should be left as it is at present, and the notice should be given by notaries. This provision is very good where notes are made payable at places where the services of notaries are not available; but, there are some parts of Ontario where justices of the peace are not quite so thick as they are in the Province of Quebec, and it might be difficult to obtain the services of a justice of the peace to protest a note when the services of a notary were not available.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The provision with respect to justices of the peace is taken from the Code of Lower Canada. There is a choice only between adopting that provision, or the English provision, which provides that the duty may be performed by any householder or substantial resident.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think it would be better to go to the extent of the English law, as in some villages in country places it might be impossible to obtain the services of even a justice of the peace for the protesting of a note. I agree that wherever notarial services can be obtained they should be utilised, but when they cannot be obtained, and in some instances when the services of a justice of the peace might not be available, in those cases the clauses in the English Act might very well be adopted.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a discrepancy which might occur, if it is intended that this Act should repeal the provisions of the Civil Code of the Province of Quebec. There is a provision passed by the old Parliament of Canada in 1866 which says, that no provision of the Civil Code will be held to be repealed by a statute unless the particular article of the Code is expressly mentioned. I am not prepared to say that this Parliament is bound by that provision, but I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the

enactment in question, which he will find in the Statutes of 1886.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the Bill makes provision in that regard. All those articles of the Civil Code which are interfered with, are enumerated in the third section of the Bill.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I suppose that will provide for the matter I referred to.

Mr. WALDIE. Is it decided that the Act should come into operation on the 1st July?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the Committee wishes, I have no objection that it shall be the 1st of September.

Mr. MULOCK. I think that will be better.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will make it the 1st of September.

On schedule 1,

Mr. BURDETT. With reference to the fees provided for in this schedule, I may state I have had a long letter from a bank in Ontario which suggests that all dishonored notes shall be stamped, and, for a fee of 25 cents, a clerk of the bank could mail the notice at the close of banking hours. I think this would save considerable expense. I can understand the inapplicability of that principle to paper payable in another place than in the bank. There is another matter to which I wish to refer. In Ontario a note is payable at some village, perhaps ten miles from the county town, where there is a notary, and I would suggest that some slight fee for mileage should be allowed, if one has to travel that distance. The fees in Ontario at present are very moderate, and I think nobody can grumble if the present fees are not increased.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will allow this schedule to stand.

Committee rose and reported progress.

THE BUDGET.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now that the hon. Minister of Finance is here, I will take the opportunity of repeating what I said to the hon. First Minister, that it would be very desirable, if possible, that the hon. gentleman should give some information to the public, and to the House, as to when he expects to bring the Budget down.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall be very glad to do that as soon as I can find out that I am able to make a reasonable forecast of the time. I do not know at present whether I could come anywhere near a reasonable anticipation of the exact time or not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume, from that statement, that the hon. gentleman is not likely to bring it down this week, at any rate.

Mr. FOSTER. Not this week.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think he should at least give the House three or four days' notice of his intention.

Mr. FOSTER. I will do that.

PRIVILEGE—THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would also take this opportunity of calling the attention of the First Minister to the fact that he stated in his

place that he proposed, a few days ago, to lay on the Table a letter from his son, Mr. Macdonald, of Winnipeg. He must have received the letter. Is he prepared to lay it on the Table?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A telegram was addressed to me, and I gave it to the Minister of Customs. In that my son stated, "I am writing." I received the letter, but it was not written as if intended to be laid before the House. It contains some language which is not quite parliamentary, and which might render him liable to a motion by my hon. friend. So I have sent for a revised copy of the letter in parliamentary diction.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Harbors and Rivers, Ont.—Construction of Port Arthur Harbor and dredging Kaministiquia River... \$65,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. Minister of Public Works say what the total cost of Port Arthur harbor has been?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total expenditure on the Port Arthur harbor works, from the 1st July, 1884, when the work was begun, to the 21st December, 1889, was \$381,000; for additional works, from the 21st December, 1889, to June, 1890, \$27,000. The vote applied for in the ordinary estimates for the section of the breakwater in 1890-91, inclusive of superintendence, \$40,000. Additional grant required for protecting the base of the breakwater, and preventing erosion of the bottom, \$35,000. Total probable cost of the works, including \$387 contingencies, and what we now ask for, will be \$483,000. For that, we have probably the best harbor and safest on the large lakes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the length of the breakwater?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All the information is in the departmental report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that the hon. gentleman had only completed the construction of two outlying piers, which, although valuable and important works, did not appear capable of sheltering a great deal of shipping. I do not know what quantity of shipping this breakwater will shelter, or how long it is intended to be, but the piers would not offer accommodation to any considerable quantity. Does the hon. gentleman know the depth of water?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The depth at low water at the contract opening is 18 feet. At the north-east opening it is 250 feet wide between the end of the breakwater and the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator wharf, and the depth is 17 feet. After the completion of the 1,500 feet now under contract, there will be a depth of 17 feet at the western end, and ample room for steamers and vessels to pass. The hon. gentleman will find all the information in the report, which is much fuller than the previous two years' reports.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman secured, besides the two piers, a basin of any considerable area?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the depth of water through that basin?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Seventeen feet, as far as I can say.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. the Minister of Public Works has stated that the report is fuller than that of last year. I pointed out, last year, that there was a great absence of detail in all these reports, so that it was difficult to arrive at anything approaching a correct idea of the amount of money spent on these various public works; and the hon. gentleman promised then that in future his reports would be more in detail. Although the report this year is much more lengthy, still, in my judgment, it is no better than last year's. What we should have in each case is the original estimate, the amount of the contract, the amount of money expended, the further amount required, the name of the contractor, and when the work is expected to be finished. It is utterly impossible to go through the records of previous years to get at information, which the hon. gentleman could give us in this condensed form. We would have in this way, in brief, the whole question, and dispense with the necessity on the part of the hon. gentleman of giving a great deal of explanation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is right, and it would be better if in each report there was a *résumé* of what appeared in former reports, so that the whole matter might be seen at a glance. Of course, being at the head of the Department, and seeing what has been published in the previous reports, I, as well as my officers, thought that the reference to the previous reports might do, but I see that it would be a saving of time and trouble to hon. gentlemen who have not the matter before them to have that condensed in one report, without reference to those which preceded it. I will see that this is done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With reference to the dredging of the Kaministiquia River, \$25,000, I might ask the hon. gentleman to inform us what is the depth of water he has now secured by this dredging?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to pages 103 and 104 of the Appendix to the Report of the Department of Public Works. The depth is not given, but it says:

"In 1886 dredging was commenced in the river and has been continued from year to year, so that the largest steamers can now reach the elevators at Fort William without difficulty."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The largest steamers would draw, probably, 17 or 18 feet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose the largest steamers on the lake are those of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount required to secure a depth of 18 feet, and this amount is to complete the dredging to that depth.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is very satisfactory, particularly in view of the fact that my hon. friend the former occupant of those benches was reviled very considerably for suggesting that a depth of 9 or 10 feet was practicable, and now the hon. gentleman has obtained a depth

of 18 feet without any very considerable expenditure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A great many things have happened since then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; many things have happened to show that Mr. Mackenzie was correct in a great many of his ideas, though they have not been carried out always in the way in which he intended them to be. I would ask what has the total cost of this amounted to? What has been expended for dredging on this river?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total expenditure from July, 1884, to July, 1889, was \$152,994. The additional amount required is \$25,000, so that the total probable cost of the improvement of that river will be about \$178,000.

Kingston Graving Dock \$160,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What are the estimates for the completion of this dock?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total estimated cost of the dock, including everything, is \$318,000, and this is required to complete the dock.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have taken exception on more than one occasion to this vote and to the appropriations made for such purposes, unless the docks in Halifax were placed in the same position. I beg to remind the Minister and the Government that, when the dock at Halifax was first talked of the present High Commissioner led us to believe that it was contemplated by the Government to assume the dock at Quebec, and that, as the dock at Esquimalt was a public work, it was the policy of the Government to make all these dry docks public undertakings. Then we asked that the money to construct a dock at Halifax should be loaned to us on the same terms as those upon which it has been loaned to the city of Quebec for the same purpose. That was refused by the Government, and they subsequently made us a grant of \$10,000 a year for twenty years, the city of Halifax giving another \$10,000 a year, and the Imperial Government also giving \$10,000 a year. Under that arrangement we have secured our dock. I say it is unfair that the citizens of Halifax should be called upon to assess themselves for \$10,000 a year for this dock, while the people of Quebec have been relieved of the burden of their dock and the interest, though it is a similar public work, and the people of Quebec have also obtained a loan of about four million dollars for the tidal docks there. We wrote off \$500,000, last year, of the loan to the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec, so that they now owe to the Government \$3,500,000. I do not know what prospects there is of our ever receiving that money or any interest upon it, but it is the general impression with members from all the Provinces, that we shall never receive one cent from the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec, for the four millions of money we loaned them for the tidal docks at the Louise Basin. If that is the case, and the Government are now proposing to build a similar work at Kingston, I repeat that we in Halifax are entitled to be placed in the same position, and to be relieved from the \$10,000 a year which, I admit, we voluntarily assumed, but which we were compelled to assume in order to obtain the construction of that dock.

I think the Government will see that we should not be placed in a more disadvantageous position than other parts of the Dominion. If Kingston is to have a dry dock constructed as a public work, it is simply another evidence that the principle which I have laid down is correct, because the Government are constructing public works all over the Dominion; and, although they will not own the dock in Halifax, because it has been constructed by Imperial money partly, I think it will be as useful, if not more so, than the dock at Quebec. I do not suppose that my argument will have much weight with the Government, but I consider it my duty, as representing Halifax, to bring this to the notice of the Government, and I shall never cease in my efforts to have the city which I represent placed on the same footing as other parts of the Dominion, in respect to these undertakings.

Mr. KENNY. I must say that my hon. colleague has placed this matter very well indeed before the Government, and I think he might possibly have made out a stronger case than he has. As I understand it, the \$10,000 which the city of Halifax received from the Dominion Government was not a grant to the city of Halifax. I understand that there is an Act on the Statute-book whereby the Dominion Government pledges itself to give \$10,000 to aid docks in any part of the Dominion, when the Government is satisfied with the *bona fides* of the undertaking, so that the city of Halifax is not under any obligation to the Government for the \$10,000 it has received. My hon. colleague has fairly contrasted the usefulness of the Halifax dock with that of the Quebec dock. There can be really no comparison. The Quebec dock is closed for six months in the year; the Halifax dock is available all the year round. It is occasionally contended that there is ice in the harbor of Halifax; if there is a little ice, at all events there is plenty of water in the harbor of Halifax. As regards the dock, it is infinitely more useful, and is entitled to the same consideration, at least, from the hands of the Dominion Government, as the Quebec dock or the dock at Kingston. As regards the amount of money spent by the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec, it must be borne in mind by my hon. colleague that the citizens of Halifax objected to putting the harbor in commission. I do not know that they were wise in doing so; perhaps if we had followed the example of Quebec, and got ourselves pretty well in debt, then we might have come to the Dominion Government and asked for relief. But here it is contemplated to aid Kingston in a manner in which the dock at Halifax has not been aided, nor any other dock in any part of the Dominion. I would just say to the Government that I shall be very much surprised if that is done, and I hope they will take the claims of Halifax into their most favorable consideration.

Cape Tormentine Harbor \$110,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman does not state the amount of the contract which was given to Mr. Murphy for the construction of that work, nor does he state the depth of water which he expects to get at the end of the pier. I am speaking of the last contract.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The last contract amounted, at schedule rates, to \$169,000. The

contractor was Mr. Edward Murphy, of Toronto. The completion will take place on the 28th October, 1890, but I am afraid that it will go beyond that date. We expect to get 16 feet of water.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How far is this pier from the site of the one which was contracted for in the first instance? Is this the same site as the original one?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; so I am told.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the hon. gentleman estimated what it will cost to build the pier on the other side—on the Island side?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood there was a survey made and some report. Of course, the hon. gentleman can hardly give so large a contract on the New Brunswick side, without ascertaining whether it is feasible on the Island side.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt it would be feasible. But if the hon. gentleman wishes for that information, I will give him all I have later on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is an intimation which the people in that quarter are looking for with no small anxiety; because, as the hon. gentleman knows, there is a good deal of difference of opinion as to the feasibility of constructing a pier, unless at the expenditure of an enormous sum of money, which would afford sufficient depth of water for steamboats to ply there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A survey has been made, I suppose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so; I have no doubt that it was made at the time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because, unless it has been made, we have been going blindly on with the business.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it was made by the Railway Department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like the hon. gentleman to ascertain whether the pier, now being built, is on the site of the old pier, for which a contract was entered into and abandoned. My impression was, and I hope I am correct, that this pier is being built half a mile further to the west.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is on the same site as the first contract.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where the pier was originally being constructed, many mariners thought it was a dangerous place, and could not be constructed so as to insure safety to the steamers plying there, and I understood that the site had very properly been changed to a position half a mile further west.

Improvement of Ship Channel between
Quebec and Montreal..... \$50,000

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). I would like to have some explanation on this item. If I remember rightly, when the Government last year assumed the maintenance of the channel between Quebec and Montreal, they stated that the amount asked for, which was \$100,000, would complete all the works that would be necessary. This year we see \$50,000 more asked for, and we do not know how much yet will be required. How is it that

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

more is needed than was expected last year? On this side of the House we contended that the Government did not know what they were undertaking.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. The amount required to complete the works that have been under the charge of the Harbor Commissioners, and have been assumed by the Department of Public Works, was \$250,000. A sum of \$100,000 was voted last year, and this year we have asked \$50,000 more, and a portion of the \$100,000 remains to be expended. The amount of \$50,000 would employ our dredges and other machinery to go on with the work required to complete the channel. A sum of \$100,000 more will be required to complete it as intended by the Harbor Commissioners. We shall then have a channel through which large steamships may pass, but at certain portions of the channel there are very sharp curves which vessels can hardly pass without touching bottom, and where there is always danger of vessels going ashore. These elbows will have to be removed and the channel straightened so that vessels may not be exposed to this danger. That was, however, all foreseen by the Harbor Commissioners and stated in their report. We are continuing with that work as well as with the works at Cap à la Roche and Cap Charles. They have been carried on in order that there may be as great a depth of water over the shoals there as in the ordinary channel, so that there may be a minimum of danger to vessels. These works are carried out with all possible economy, but we cannot do otherwise than finish the works to complete the channel, which have already cost so large a sum.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). Events which have occurred since last Session go to prove that the Government did not know what they were undertaking. The hon. Minister of Public Works has just stated that he was prepared to straighten the channel in some places on account of the sharp curves. I admit that if he wants to have a safe channel between Quebec and Montreal, he will have to straighten the channel in many places; but how much such a work will cost, no one can tell. I may mention that a very serious accident took place last spring in front of Longue Pointe, a short distance from Montreal, when two steamers, the *Polynesian* and *Cynthia*, came into collision. The disclosures made by the witnesses in the case, which was brought before the Vice-Admiralty Court of Quebec, proved a most serious state of things. The result of the investigation by the Harbor Commissioners was that no one was to blame, that the channel alone was to blame. The people were not, however, satisfied with the decision of the Harbor Commissioners. The case was taken into the Vice-Admiralty Court of Quebec, and a few months ago the court held one of the steamers, the *Polynesian*, to be blameable. The case is now to be taken before the Privy Council. It was proved very clearly that the channel is so difficult and so crooked, that it would be almost impossible, under the circumstances in which the steamers were placed, to have avoided a collision between them, even with the greatest prudence on the part of the pilots of both steamers. After this accident another accident occurred, which again goes to show the difficulty of navigating the

channel. In this case two steamers grounded. I do not remember the date, but, to the best of my recollection, it was in October, and they grounded in the channel between Montreal and Quebec. It was very fine weather at the time, and daylight. They grounded so seriously that it was a question whether they should not be docked at Quebec, and every one thought it was most imprudent on the part of the managers of the company, especially on the part of one of the companies, to allow the vessel to go to sea in that injured condition. Every man engaged in shipping was of the opinion that it was most imprudent to send one of the steamers to sea after the accident, which again was due to the condition of the channel. An accident occurred which would have been more serious even than that, and which might have blocked the channel for an indefinite time. At the place where the grounding occurred the channel is very narrow, and if the first steamer had grounded sufficiently to remain stranded the other steamer would have ran into her, the second steamer following at a distance of about half a mile, which was not a sufficient distance to have stopped her; and the result would have been that the channel between Quebec and Montreal might have been blocked for the remainder of the season. This fact shows that a large portion of the channel will have to be widened and straightened. How much that will cost I do not know, and the Government has no idea. The place where this accident happened was considered one of the best parts of the channel, and it is evident that some improvements are required there; but how much they will cost no one knows. When the discussion came up last year I was told by some pilots that the Harbor Commissioners in Montreal had very prudently saved their money and had carried out the work in such a way as to avoid blasting the rock at the bottom of the river; but now we have arrived at such a condition that, if the Government commence to blast, they will have to blast for miles and miles, because the bottom is almost level. I do not think the Government know much more than I do as to the cost of the work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount of money now asked, and the balance remaining over from last year, is for the purpose of completing the works intended by the Harbor Commissioners when the harbor works were taken over by the Government. The hon. gentleman is perfectly correct in his statements with regard to the collision which occurred near Longue Pointe and the grounding of two or three other steamers elsewhere. But I think the hon. gentleman might state this also: that the season was an exceptional one. The waters in all the lakes and rivers of Canada were very low. Notwithstanding this fact, vessels in Montreal were loaded as if the depth of water was that of an ordinary season. The result was that some vessels grounded, I am glad to say without any great damage being done to them. During seasons when the water is lower than usual, a little precaution might be exercised in the direction of loading vessels less than usual. The hon. gentleman states that we may have to deepen the channel, and that we do not know what it will cost. The Government have not undertaken that responsibility, and the hon. gentleman is, I think, a little too much frightened

about it. I do not believe there will be any necessity for that for some time to come. Last year was an exceptional season, as the water was very low. Vessels have passed up and down there drawing 25 feet of water. Prudent men will not load their vessels to the full depth, because it is quite possible that there might be a boulder or something in the way which might be carried into the channel in the spring. If any such occurrence should be reported to us, of course we would send a dredge there at once, but I do not think we need apprehend the necessity of deepening that channel more than it has been deepened. The money we have been expending is to complete the work of straightening the channel, and for deepening at Cap à la Roche and Cap Charles. There may be work at some other places, but this was the work included in the estimate made at the time.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Montreal will be thankful to the member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) for the anxiety he has shown about the channel between Montreal and Quebec. I may call my hon. friend's attention to the fact, that although two or three slight accidents occurred last season when the water was very low, hundreds of steamers have gone through that channel without accident. I know for a fact that vessels have been loaded to twenty-seven and a half feet, and have gone safely through the channel. The only thing which remains to be done now, will be to remove some boulders which may get into the channel by the action of the ice in the spring, and, perhaps, straighten some parts of the channel where it is needed. The deepening of the channel so far has proved quite a success, and I am sure the shipping interest is well satisfied with the work that has been done.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I do not deserve the compliment that the hon. gentleman has paid me, as I did not intend to champion the interests of the harbor of Montreal, for I know that there are gentlemen here better qualified to do that than I am, and I wished simply to defend the interests of the public treasury. I want to know how much it is going to cost to have a good channel between Quebec and Montreal? The hon. Minister of Public Works has, on two or three occasions, made use of an expression which is rather perplexing to me. He stated it would cost \$250,000 to carry out the works contemplated by the Harbor Commissioners, when last year they handed over the channel to the Government. What were these works so contemplated by the Harbor Commissioners? The Commissioners were very economical, and rightly so, because they had to take out of the shipping going to Montreal the expenditure for deepening the channel, and they did it as cheaply as it possibly could be done; but will the Government be as economical as the Harbor Commissioners had been? Will they confine themselves to carrying out simply those improvements which were proposed by the Commissioners? I am very much afraid they will not. If we consider that portion of the channel opposite Longue Pointe where a terrible calamity took place last year, involving great loss of life and money, we know that the Harbor Commissioners never intended any improvement to that portion of the channel, and I think the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), in whose

county that portion of the river is, will not contradict me in this. I am very much afraid that the Government will be called on to make some improvement there and if so they cannot do it out of the \$250,000. That is why I fear we shall not rest at the expenditure mentioned last year.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The collision between the two steamers at Longue Pointe was purely an accident, and it was admitted on all sides that there was no more danger there than there would be to two steamers passing each other upon the ocean. That accident might as well have happened on the Atlantic as on the river. It has been established that there was sufficient depth of water there, and that the channel was wide enough to allow two or even three steamers to pass at a time, but it was a pure accident, which might have happened anywhere. Nobody considers that it will be necessary to change the whole channel in front of Longue Pointe because of an accident which may not happen once in forty years.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). According to the decision of the Harbor Commissioners, before whom the two pilots were brought, the accident was due simply to the bad channel, and not to any imprudence or negligence of the pilots, who were both acquitted. The hon. gentleman knows, as well as I do, that the two pilots were acquitted on the ground that there was no blame attached to them, and if that be so, where was the difficulty?

Mr. DESJARDINS. The blame ought to be attributed elsewhere. I think there was a change made in some of the beacons, or something like that, which deceived the pilots.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). It was proved before the Harbor Commissioners and the Admiralty Court at Quebec, that the whole trouble was because of the dangerous nature of the channel, and the sharp curves which it takes there. It was a very serious accident, involving the loss of several lives, as well as £100,000 sterling. If accidents of that kind are to be avoided, a very large expenditure must be incurred.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The explanations given by the hon. Minister are all very well as far as they go, but he has avoided giving the explanations with reference to the expenditure on the river between Montreal and Quebec. Last year, when this question was up, it was pointed out by some hon. members on this side of the House that, in addition to the amount assumed by the Government for what had already been expended, there would undoubtedly be a very large annual expenditure. The hon. Minister of Public Works took exception to that view, and told us that the work would be finished, that the appropriation then made was ample for the purpose, and that the current would keep the river clear. Now it seems that so far from that being the case, we are asked to vote a very large sum. I find by the Public Accounts that we spent \$243,000 last year. We have before us a very bald report from the Harbor Commissioners, respecting the deepening of the channel between Montreal and Quebec. I venture to say that this is a very unsatisfactory position to have that work in. If we are to be called on every year for a large appropriation for that work, we ought to know it. If the view of the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) is

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

correct, that that part of the river has to be straightened, at such an expense as he intimates, it is better that the House should understand it at once; because it is evident that the Minister knew very little about the matter last year, and if he knows no more this year than he has explained to the Committee, he is not in possession of very much more information to-day. I should like the hon. gentleman, if he can, to give me, either now or on a future day, the amount of receipts and expenditures on the graving dock at Quebec last year, which I cannot find in the Auditor General's Report. With regard to this item under discussion, I think we should have some assurance, on which we could rely, from the Minister of Public Works, that the amount he now asks is a finality, because, if we are to have such a vote every year, this work will land us in a very heavy expenditure.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid my hon. friend has not followed exactly what I said, and I will tell him how the matter stands. The amount we asked last year, \$100,000, the \$50,000 we are asking this year, and \$100,000 which we may have to ask next year or the year following, will complete the works as intended by the Harbor Commissioners. I cannot state what amount will be required every year to keep the works in order, but it cannot be a large amount. We shall probably require a dredge or two in the spring to clear the channel of boulders deposited by the ice and other accumulations, and perhaps one dredge during the remainder of the year. In 1888 there was expended \$50,000; in 1889, to the 1st of July, \$243,000; for 1890, to the 31st of December last, it was \$67,962—that is, out of the \$100,000 voted by Parliament;—so that we have about \$33,000 remaining, which, with the \$50,000 we are asking for now, will give us a sufficient sum to carry on the work to the 1st of July of this year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is, about \$360,000 expended. The hon. gentleman will remember that his estimate last year was very much less than that. He was indignant that we should take exception to his statement last year. He said that he had all his information from his engineers, and he gave us a positive assurance, and if the House cannot rely on the information given by such a painstaking member of the Government as the hon. Minister of Public Works, it shows that very little reliance can be placed on ministerial statements in the future. It is evident from what the hon. gentleman himself admits, that he was not last year in possession of such information as should justify him in informing the House in the positive manner he did.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman may have misunderstood me, but I made the same statement then that I make now. So far as I know the hon. gentleman, my statement is worth as much as his. If I make a mistake in a statement, it is not done willingly; the hon. gentleman should know that, and he has no right to suppose that I should attempt to deceive the House. I have been long enough in Parliament to expect not to be treated in that way by the hon. gentleman; I expect better treatment from him.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The *Hansard* will show.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I say that the estimate of the Harbor Commissioners is \$250,000 to complete the work, and it is impossible to say what amount will be required annually to clear the channel after the spring freshets. The channel at Longneuil was considered and is still considered good. There was no grounding of the vessels in the channel, but there was a collision, and the Admiralty Court at Quebec, found that one of the vessels was at fault, and mulcted its owners in a very large sum of money for damages to the hull of the other. That has been appealed from to the Privy Council, and the judgment there will finally decide who was in fault. But in so far as the channel was concerned, I have not heard that it is not as good as ever. If the Harbor Commissioners had stated that the pilots had not been in fault they would have condemned themselves, but I have not heard that they did so, before this evening.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman has gone out of his way very unjustly to take exception to the extremely mild and moderate criticism of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones). He must not suppose that in administering the Public Works Department, and expending enormous sums of money yearly, he is beyond criticism. Surely we have the right, not only to criticise the votes he asks for, but to recall his statements of previous years with reference to the same votes. When these works were taken over from the Montreal Harbor Commissioners, we stated on this side that Canada was involving itself in a large expenditure, and in the opinion of my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Langelier) that expenditure was hardly justified. The Minister of Public Works, however, assured the House that, after spending some \$250,000 in purchasing the plant and work of the Harbor Commissioners, the deepening of the harbor in the manner contemplated by the Commissioners and set out in the report submitted to the House, would not cost over \$200,000. On that statement, he received the first instalment of \$100,000; and he now says he will require \$50,000 or \$60,000 this year, and probably \$100,000 next year. The hon. gentleman should be called to account for that. He did not speak without the book last year, but he read from his book and gave all the details, which made up a total of \$200,000. On page 217 of the *Hansard* will be found his explanation in detail. He then stated that \$200,000 would complete the work, and that it was not the intention of the Government to deepen the channel more than 27½ feet, which was the depth contemplated by the Harbor Commissioners. For a painstaking Minister, the hon. gentleman seems to be enormously out in his calculation. Either he or his engineer has blundered. I have been accustomed heretofore, when the hon. gentleman read from his book, to place some reliance on his estimates, but if he is proved not only wrong in his estimates, but loses his temper when the error is brought home to him, I must confess to losing faith in the hon. gentleman. Here is a trifle of \$60,000 in which he is out in this matter, and I only hope that the country will get clear by the expenditure of another \$100,000, which I very seriously doubt.

Esquimaux Graving Dock.....\$12,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. From the 30th June, 1881, the amount paid was \$1,058,471. In

1888 we expended \$90,000; in 1889, \$7,900; in 1890, \$7,150. Now the amount asked for is \$12,000. The engineer says that this vote is to make provision for substituting iron gates, at an estimated cost of \$12,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What were the receipts last year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think about \$18,000 or \$20,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does this complete the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Public Buildings—Nova Scotia.....\$23,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the claims of Dartmouth to a post office. It is a place of 6,000 or 7,000 people, and which gives a revenue of nearly \$1,700, and the building where the post office is kept is in a wretched condition. Considering the size of the place, the people are entitled to a respectable building. Perhaps I should not advocate the claims of Dartmouth so much, as they have always cast a big majority against me, but my duty compels me to bring this matter to the notice of the hon. gentleman. It is a place more entitled to a public building, than many of the small places, not only in my Province, but in other parts of the Dominion, which have buildings, and I hope the hon. Minister will take a note of this, and be able to make some provision in the Supplementary Estimates for it.

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to this question of erecting post offices, we had quite a lengthy discussion last year. I think it is high time the Government should lay down some rule by which they would be guided in erecting post offices. If you take up the items of public buildings, you will find that there are several places in this Dominion the receipts of which are far in excess of what are had at points where post offices are being built. The Annapolis post office receipts amounted to \$2,026.85; the Dalhousie post office receipts were \$1,123, and there are eighty places in the Province of Ontario alone where the receipts are from \$2,000 to \$2,500 and some over \$3,000. In the town in which I live the receipts are over \$3,600, and there is no talk of a post office. In Harriston, the receipts are \$3,200, and there is no post office. There ought to be some system laid down that, when a place contributes to the public revenue a sum of say \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year, or in excess of that, it should become entitled to the erection of a public post office, but the system of the Government peddling round patronage in this way in order to gain political support and make political capital for the moment, is not creditable to the Government, but very discreditable. In view of the financial embarrassments of the country, and the difficulties which this Dominion has to contend with, having an annual expenditure of about \$40,000,000 altogether, I say that the expenditure of \$25,000 or \$30,000 on the erection of a post office in a place where the receipts are only \$1,150 or \$2,000, or about that amount, is an evidence of gross extravagance and recklessness on the part of the Government. There should be some principle laid down that when the receipts in any place reach a certain amount, that place should be entitled to a public building, and not otherwise.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has accused the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), of urging the Government to what he has just designated an act of gross extravagance. I recently heard the senior member advocating the erection of a post office in the town of Dartmouth. I called the attention of the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General to that a year or two ago, and I was told that the income did not warrant the expenditure which I urged, and I now find that the hon. gentleman who sits by the side of my hon. colleague says that the Government would not be warranted in erecting a post office in the town of Dartmouth.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not say so.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman says that the Government is guilty of gross extravagance if it erects a post office in a place where the post office receipts are only \$1,000 or \$2,000 a year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I said that some system should be established.

Mr. KENNY. I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, but I understood him to say what I have stated. It unfortunately happens that, in the town where my hon. colleague and myself are advising the Government—in the public interest of course—to erect a building, the income does not reach the figures which the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), in his wisdom, tells the Government it should reach before any building should be erected. I think the Government would be quite warranted in erecting a building at Dartmouth, and my hon. colleague (Mr. Jones) has placed before the House very reasonably and fairly the claims of that town to a building. I hope, when it is erected, if it is erected, the building will be of sufficient dimensions to include a post office savings bank. The people there very much desire it. Dartmouth is a place which is growing in importance, and in material wealth, as well as in its admiration and devotion to this Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no doubt that, if the hon. gentleman brings his powerful influence to bear upon the Government, he may succeed in getting the building, more especially if he shows that the place of which he speaks is becoming more devoted to the Government of the day. He would stand a far better chance of securing it, however, if my hon. friend here (Mr. Jones) had not suggested it at all. If it had come altogether from the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Kenny), I have no doubt he would have secured it; but, as the suggestion came from my hon. friend (Mr. Jones), the Government are not likely to grant it.

Mr. KENNY. Not if they take your advice.

Mr. McMULLEN. I repeat that it is wrong that the Government should peddle round their patronage in regard to the erection of post offices in every small, petty, miserable place where the receipts are not more than \$1,500 a year, and should leave places with receipts of \$3,000 and \$4,000 a year unprovided for. My hon. friend by my side (Mr. Jones, Halifax) is perfectly justified in asking for the erection of the post office of which he has spoken. If money is to be squandered, it may just as well be squandered in that little town as well as in any other little place. But

Mr. McMULLEN.

other places which are becoming trade centres have no public buildings erected there. The convenience of the public is overlooked, I suppose, because they are in constituencies which do not send members here to support the Government. Why is it that Woodstock, with receipts of \$7,000 a year, has not had a post office till recently, while you find places like Joliette and St. Jérôme—small places where the receipts are practically nothing—have public buildings erected there. One of these places happens to be in the constituency of the Secretary of State, where the receipts are only about \$1,200, and another is erected in some other place, and these buildings are placed there with a view, if possible, to secure the kindly feeling of the people of that section, so that they may send men here to support the Government. That is why they peddle these post offices around the country, and I say it is a disgrace to any Government to act in that way.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) was afraid just now that the Government would spend money on a dry dock at some other place than Halifax, and now he wants to have a post office erected in a small suburb of that city. I do not think that there is a Custom house in Dartmouth, or an Inland Revenue office. We had this matter talked over last year, and it is certainly objectionable that in these very small towns, which are made up, for the most part, of wooden shanties, the Government should erect these massive buildings of brick and stone. The hon. gentleman has justified the expenditure on these buildings on the ground that the Government are creating things of beauty, which would remain a joy forever in the country, but the fact is that the contrast between the buildings erected by the Government and those which surround them, leaves a very unfavorable impression.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I see there is nothing in the Estimates for the buildings at Lunenburg, where the Government purchased the site four years ago. When I first came here, the reason given was that the Government could not perform all these works at once, but I see that the Minister has passed this over again, and, unless he provides for it in the Supplementary Estimates, the people of Lunenburg will have to do without a post office for another year. I beg to call the attention of the Minister to this matter, and he brings down the Supplementary Estimates provision will be made for it. In the discussion last year the Minister assured us that appropriations were made without regard to politics, and if that be so, I think he must be convinced that the town of Lunenburg has some claim upon the Government for aid. The ground has been lying idle for three or four years, while the business of the town has been growing very rapidly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before leaving this item, I wish to remind the hon. gentleman that three years ago when the post office in Charlottetown was finished, the citizens extended the public gardens, which surround the public buildings, to the Dominion post office, and the gardens have been kept for the last two or three years at the expense of private citizens. We have never asked or received any public aid. These gardens are very handsome, and contribute to the health and beauty of the city. A very large requisition was for-

warded to the hon. gentleman's Department, praying him to take down the wooden boards which were put around those grounds, and afterwards erect something in the nature of a fence. I went myself to the Public Works Department and saw the chief architect. I asked him if he had received that petition, and he said he had, and also that he had a report from Mr. Harris, his local engineer, on the matter, and that it would be attended to at once. I accepted that statement, and I think, if I am not mistaken, that he sent a letter to me to that effect. But I am positive that he made that distinct declaration to me, after consulting with the head of the Department. Last year the Minister stated in a casual way that the matter would be attended to. The year went by, and the ugly wooden boarding remains there as a disgrace to the Government and a disfigurement to the grounds. No attempt has been made to put up the fence, and I cannot understand how it is that this gross act of neglect continues, and that the word of the chief architect has been distinctly broken in the matter. The citizens were very much annoyed about it. The square is right in the centre of the city, and this thing is worse than an eyesore. After I received the promise of the chief architect, I wrote to the mayor of the city and to the chairman of the citizens committee, informing them that the matter would be attended to at once. When I went home I was asked several times how it was I had written this letter, and that the matter had not been attended to, and all I could reply was that the Department had given me their solemn pledge that it would be done, and that I would make enquiry when I came up here. It is a small matter, and would not cost over a couple of thousand dollars, if it cost one thousand. It is too bad that, in the capital city of the Province we have been obliged, for three years, to submit to this ugly fence, which is a disfigurement to the gardens, an eyesore to the public, and a disgrace to the Government. I hope the hon. gentleman will give this his consideration. I want to be able to write down and say something to the citizens at an early date, so that for the coming season we will not be subjected to the annoyance.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take note of it.

Mr. LAURIER. I wish the hon. gentleman would also take note of the complaint made by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have done so. I have seen the hon. gentleman, and told him what I would do. The hon. gentleman is aware that in the ordinary estimates we only ask appropriations for works that are already begun. If there is anything for Lunenburg it will be put in the supplementaries.

Mr. LAURIER. The fact that the Government purchased the ground three years ago is an admission that a building is needed, and is a promise that it will be erected.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I make no promises.

Mr. LAURIER. What, then, means the Minister's reference to the Supplementary Estimates, if there is no promise?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not want to be told by the hon. gentleman that I have made a promise. I have made no promise. All I say is that the hon. member who represents Lunenburg has spoken to me about it, and I told him that I would submit the matter to my colleagues. Therefore, if anything is given, it will be put in the Supplementary Estimates, and it cannot be put elsewhere.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think we have had this same subject for discussion for three or four years in succession. It does seem to me that the House has in a large measure abdicated its functions and transferred its authority to the Government of the day. Now, on questions of public policy, it is the business of the House to determine, and it is the business of the Government to administer, the public policy, whatever it may be. We have a right to find fault with them if they do not administer it honestly and efficiently. To determine what shall be the policy in matters of this kind, is clearly within the province of the House and not within the province of the Government. Now, it is the right of the Government, in the exercise of matters of patronage, to appoint those to office whom they may think proper, for the purpose of carrying their measures into effect, and for the purpose of administering the law; but it never can be assumed, without a gross abuse of authority, that it is any part of the patronage of the Government to regulate the public expenditure with reference to the political complexion of the various sections of the country. We are all contributors in the same way to the public revenue. Those electors throughout the country who return hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, are as much contributors to the public revenue, and as much entitled to derive benefits from it, as those who return hon. gentlemen opposite. This House, in the discharge of its public duties, ought to decide this question with respect to the erection of public buildings, that public buildings should be erected in localities which contribute most largely to the public revenue. That is the rule which should bind hon. gentlemen opposite when they have a majority in this House, and bind hon. gentlemen on this side if they should take the place of hon. gentlemen opposite. As regards the expenditure of public money in the erection of public buildings, we all stand on a footing of equality, and it is a most improper proceeding for hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to erect public buildings in places contributing small amounts to the public revenue, and leaving places which make large contributions wholly unprovided for. Before this House separates, unless some other hon. member does so, I shall feel it my duty to propose to the House for its adoption this proposition: that places contributing the largest sum to the public revenue, whether Customs, Inland Revenue or Post Office, should first be provided for, and then it would be proper for the House to see, in so far as the public resources would permit, that that policy is honestly carried out by the Administration. When we come to adopt that rule we shall have a more healthy condition of public sentiment than perhaps we have at this moment. I am making no charge at this moment against the Administration; I am simply stating what would be a proper rule of public

policy and one which this House should adopt, and one which this House should see that the Administration of the day, whtever may compose it, honestly and fairly carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the hon. gentleman is exactly correct in the rule he desires to lay down, and that it would have invariably good results. The hon. gentleman is aware that in important towns in the West, where, judging by the population and the business done, the people are entitled to have a post office erected, the Government find it convenient to rent a suitable building, and do not erect a public building there. In some places, on the other hand, it is impossible to obtain a suitable building without paying too high a price, and the Government are then justified in making a considerable outlay for the purpose of procuring the necessary accommodation for the public. If the hon. gentleman imputes motives to the Government in erecting these buildings, and suggests that they are erected for the purpose of strengthening the hands of the Government, I say that if the hon. gentleman will only look at the course pursued by his friends in Ontario, he will find that the expenditure of public money for colonisation or other purposes is invariably made with the object of strengthening their hands.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is a bad rule, whoever follows it.

Public Buildings—New Brunswick.... \$6,500

Mr. McMULLEN. On what principle did the Government decide to erect a post office at Dalhousie, N.B., where the receipts amounted to only \$1,153 last year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government thought a post office should be erected there, and submitted the question to the House and the House agreed to it. A contract was carried out, and we required \$5,000 more to complete the work.

Mr. McMULLEN. What did you allow for rent?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That I do not know.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Postmaster General's Report he will find that \$40 was allowed for the rent of a building. How much does the Minister propose to expend on the construction of the building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$23,000. We have expended \$11,977; there was a balance due on 1st December of \$6,600, and these sums, with \$5,000, will complete the building.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Government had a post office rented for \$40. They have decided to erect a building to cost \$23,000, the interest on which, at 4 per cent., will amount to \$920 a year. We are receiving \$1,153 revenue, out of which we are paying \$450 to the postmaster and \$80 for allowances. So that the net revenue is only \$600, and yet we are going to erect a post office, the interest on which, at 4 per cent., will cost \$920. I desire to draw the Minister's attention to two or three places in my riding where public buildings are required. At Mount Forest there is a postal revenue of \$3,384, but no post office building. The sum of \$160 is allowed as rent for a post office, which is a very small amount considering the ex-

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

cellent accommodation obtained. Harriston, another town in my riding, has a postal revenue of \$3,189. Let the hon. gentleman make a note of these facts. It might assist the Government, politically, to erect public buildings in these two important towns, and I am perfectly willing to jeopardise my political prospects if the Government will erect these buildings, at a cost of say \$23,000 each. I fully endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It is time this House should define the principles that should be adopted by the Government in the erection of post offices throughout the country. An understanding should be made to the effect that towns contributing largely to the revenue should have the first claim for public buildings.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has spoken simply of a post office at Dalhousie. The building will also contain a Customs house and examining warehouse. Some other sum, therefore, should be added to the \$40 rent mentioned by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. We would be very glad if the hon. gentleman, when he erects post offices in the towns I have indicated, would add Customs houses and other additions. I should like to know what the total Customs house revenue of Dalhousie was last year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$4,900.

St. John Dominion Building.....\$1,500.

Mr. ELLIS. I wish to call the attention of the Government to a matter which does not, perhaps, come exactly under this item. Last year there was a vote of \$650 for the Fredericton post office, and I find that there was expended on repairs on the said post office \$1,130 or thereabouts. There were two gentlemen employed as clerks of works, and three rooms were plastered and fitted up in the building at a cost of seven or eight hundred dollars. A sum of \$330 was paid to the clerks of works to superintend that expenditure. I find that one of them, who is a very near relative to the sitting member for the county, got \$200 and another \$100. It does appear to me that \$330 is a very large sum to pay for superintending the fitting up of two or three rooms in that post office.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think that must have been taken out of some vote specially made for that last year.

Mr. ELLIS. I call attention to page 175 D of the Auditor General's Report, which states that \$1,129 was expended in repairs on the Fredericton post office. \$330 went to the clerks of works, leaving about \$800 of actual expenditure on improvements to the building.

Public Buildings—Quebec..... \$91,800

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). This seems to be a very large amount compared with last year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The buildings did not require so much last year.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Perhaps it may be owing to the change made in the clerk of works. There was a very good superintendent of works below Quebec some years ago, and a very good supporter of the Government also, yet I understand, that, for reasons completely unknown, he received a letter stating that his services were no

longer required. I refer to Mr. Joseph Garneau, of Quebec. To his great surprise he discovered that a gentleman named Lépine was employed to superintend the works in his place. I do not think there was ever any reproach against Mr. Garneau, and the only reproach I had against him was that he was a very strong Tory. His ability to superintend the work, or his honesty, I do not think were even questioned by anybody. Rumors in Quebec alleged that Mr. Lépine was appointed to superintend the works at the demand of some of the contractors who were not satisfied with Mr. Garneau. The public were very well satisfied with Mr. Garneau, but it appears the contractors were not, and they asked that he should be superseded. I cannot say for Mr. Lépine what I said for Mr. Garneau. I will not say any more, but I will confine myself to stating that public opinion does not give him the same character as it does to Mr. Garneau.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is there any increase in the number of employes at Grosse Ile ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not aware of any. With reference to what the member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) has said, I may tell him that he is mistaken. Mr. Garneau was appointed clerk of works for the building of the immigrant sheds, and when that work was completed, his services not being required, he was discharged, as is done in every other case.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). If I am not misinformed he was employed to superintend some works below Quebec.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). If he had given satisfaction there was no reason to discontinue him.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We had no complaint against Mr. Garneau, but as he was employed for a special work, when that work was finished his services were dispensed with. We do that in every case.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). What strong recommendation had Mr. Lépine to be appointed. I have known Mr. Lépine for several years, and the last qualification I would attribute to him would be any knowledge of the work he was appointed to superintend. He has been employed in different capacities, changing very frequently. He has never been very long at anything, and I never heard that those who employed him were ever satisfied. Why he was employed to superintend the Government work, is more than I can understand. If no other explanation is given by the Minister I shall be compelled to take the one stated in Quebec, and which I heard from several parties, that he was appointed to superintend at Percé and elsewhere at the particular request of the contractors.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is not so.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like that the Minister should tell us the amount expended on these works last year, because if we look at the Auditor General's Report, we find that a much larger sum has been spent than the small amount of \$500 would imply. If the Minister has the information, perhaps he will give it to us, then we

shall be able to tell whether this man Lépine has been performing the work efficiently or not. We find from the Auditor General's Report that moneys have been paid for services rendered as far back as the year 1881. What I want to obtain is a detailed statement of the expenditure from July, 1889, up to the present time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In 1888 we expended \$3,829.28 ; in 1889, \$2,230.13, and in 1890, \$499.69.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If \$499 was all that was required to keep the quarantine in proper condition during last year, the Minister must certainly have some detailed statement to show why he is asking \$2,500 for this year. Perhaps he can tell us whether the clerk of the works is to have a better salary or not. These clerks of works are peculiar officials ; they are well paid, and they get paid for Sundays as well as for week days.

Mr. CURRAN. I am glad to know that the hon. Minister of Public Works is accused of having been too extravagant in regard to these clerks of works, especially in regard to the person with whom my hon. friend from Quebec Centre is acquainted. My experience, however, has been quite the reverse, for I am sorry to say that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has been exceedingly parsimonious. I know a case of a very deserving gentleman who is extremely competent, as the hon. Minister knows very well, and I could not get him kept on for a week after the work was hardly completed ; in fact, I tried my level best to have this gentleman kept on, for I felt that he would be required in a few weeks again, but I did not succeed. I am glad to know, however, that there is a tender spot in the hon. Minister's heart, and I hope that the generosity that flows therefrom will not be entirely towards the friends of the hon. member for Quebec Centre, but that some of it will be towards the friends of the member for Montreal Centre. I trust that he will see whether the services of this man Lépine cannot be dispensed with, and some efficient man from Montreal put in his place.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am glad we have a deputy Minister of Public Works who is ready to give us the information which we have been unable to extract from the Minister himself. I must congratulate my hon. friend on having an eye to the boots of the hon. Minister of Public Works, and I have no doubt that when he takes that position he will keep his clerks of works on after the works are completed, but I am sorry that the friend of my hon. friend from Quebec Centre will have a very poor chance, because the hon. gentleman already announces his intention to have him removed to make way for a friend of his own. But the hon. gentleman did not give us the detailed statement I asked for, and I must again ask for it from the Minister.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was surprised to hear the hon. member from Montreal Centre say that he was not able to influence the hon. Minister of Public Works to keep a friend of his in employment. We know that he exercises a very powerful influence in securing the dismissal of some who are employed. Last year, a very noted case was brought before this House of two gentlemen who were dismissed because they voted against the hon.

gentleman. Therefore I am rather surprised to hear him now make the confession that he does.

Mr. CURRAN. It is really too bad, after an explanation has been given in this House over and over again, and the utter lack of truth has been shown in a charge of this kind, by affidavits filed with the Department and placed on record in *Hansard*, that a member of this House, who after all is supposed to be a gentleman, should again reiterate this old slander. If it came from any one else, it might make some effect on me; but, really, the position of the gentleman who has made this attack on me is so small in the opinion of the vast majority of the members of this House—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CURRAN. I say he has no right to make this charge against me, and no gentleman would do it.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is to be the entire cost of the Joliette post office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$25,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. Would the hon. Minister give us some information with regard to the receipts at that particular point?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$2,691.

Laprairie Post Office.....\$5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the cost of that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will cost less than \$20,000 altogether.

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the receipts?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$587.29.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What is the population?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In 1881, the population of the town was 1,341. It may be about 2,000 now; and the population of the parish was 1,840.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That is a very fine building for a small population. There must be some exceptional circumstances that warrant this expenditure, or we will have to conclude that the hon. gentleman intended to benefit some political supporters. I would like to have information that such is not the case, for if the impression should go abroad that the Government are influenced by political considerations in the construction of public works, it will have a very injurious effect on the Government, and I am sure the hon. the Minister of Public Works is anxious that such should not be the case, and that he should enjoy the high appreciation of his fellow-citizens.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This building is erected for the good of the people. That county is represented by an hon. gentleman who sits on the opposite side of the House and votes with my hon. friends opposite. But, notwithstanding that, as we thought the building was required for that district, we gave it.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The people of Laprairie have shown public spirit. They offered the site themselves, and although the permanent population is not very large, in summer Laprairie is quite a watering place and quite a number of people go there, so that something better than the poor room that was formerly used is required for a post office.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). There is another reason which induced the Government to incur this expenditure. There have been two local elections during two years, and another is expected shortly. That peculiar circumstance explains the transaction.

Mr. GUAY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am not so amiable in the eyes of the hon. Minister of Public Works as the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Doyon), because if I have understood the hon. Minister aright, I believe that he said that it is thanks to the demands of that hon. member that he has finally decided to make so considerable an outlay in that village. If it is really for the *beaux yeux* of the member for Laprairie that such an expensive post office is given his county, I regret very much that I am not so amiable as he is, because I represent one of the most important towns in the Province, having a population of 10,000 souls. The hon. Minister will admit that I have often endeavored to convince him that the town of Lévis ought to have its post office, and its Custom house. If the hon. Minister would find me as amiable as my colleague of Laprairie he would put into the Supplementary Estimates to be brought before the House in a few days, a sufficient sum to erect a building worthy of the town of Lévis and of the Government.

Mr. DESJARDINS. (Translation.) And of the member for the county.

Montreal Dominion Buildings.....\$15,000

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if he is going to do anything towards deepening the channel of the Miramichi river this year. I have tried in vain for the last two Sessions to get the hon. gentleman to do justice to the county I have the honor to represent. He makes fair promises, and then writes down to the people who oppose me in my county to tell them that they do not want anything such as I recommend. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that the system of navigation, which has been so much improved by the deepening of the river, has been arrested for the last two years, because I oppose the Government. They have in every way shown their animus, even in the advertisements given to the papers. They do not send advertisements to the *Herald*—the same as they do to the *Gazette*.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Although it is a much better paper.

Mr. MITCHELL. A mighty sight better paper. There is some life in the *Herald*. It gives you an account, and an accurate account, of what occurs in the caucuses of the Government, and yet the gentlemen on the Government side of the House refuse to send their advertisements to the only live paper in Montreal—I mean the only live English paper in Montreal. I say to the hon. Minister, for whom I have great respect.

An hon. MEMBER. Name.

Mr. MITCHELL. I refer to the hon. Minister of Public Works, for whom I have great respect.

Mr. WELSH. That is more than I have.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may tell my hon. friend that I have great respect for the Minister of

Public Works, though he is in damned bad company.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is that you say?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression.

Mr. MITCHELL. What expression? "damned!"—I withdraw it. It seems to me that the Chairman is putting on a good deal of side in this matter. However, I withdraw the expression, and now I am in order again. I have a grievance in regard to the deepening of the channel of the Miramichi River, which the hon. gentleman has heard me speak of before, and, with his facility of expression, he has replied that he would consider it, and so on; but it has never been done. I take this opportunity of saying to him that I think he will promote the passage of his estimates if he will simply say to me now that he will look into the matter, and will do what is right. I know that when he says he will do what is right, he will do so; and he knows that I have pointed out to him before that that channel should be deepened, and he has admitted that to be a necessity. I think my hon. friend will agree to this. If he says he will have that river properly attended to, I have no doubt he will. The dredges were only removed because the man who opposed me said it was not necessary to keep them there, and that was for the purpose of defeating me at the next general election, but I do not think that is very near. We will have two Sessions before that. The old sorcerer, as my hon. friend on this side called him the other night, will not have the election before that. If my hon. friend will say that he will have the Miramichi River deepened, I will allow this item to be carried.

Mr. DESJARDINS. What is the item?

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is one that affords an opportunity for me to call attention to a matter which has been neglected more than any other in this Dominion.

Mr. WELSH. I beg your pardon; that is not true.

Mr. MITCHELL. And what for? Because I have opposed hon. gentlemen, and yet I supported them the other day when Sir John Thompson's resolution came up. I tell them there was a time, when Mackenzie's Government was in power, when they refused to pay a poor widow woman \$40 for her cow, and for forty days I fought them, and I made them pay that widow for her cow. If this Government does not do what is right and fair, I tell the hon. the Minister of Public Works, for whom I have a great amount of respect, though he is associated with such a lot of—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will not say what, because they will call me to order. I tell the hon. gentleman that unless he deepens this channel—I think he is an honest man—he had better beware. He had better do what is right in deepening that channel, or I will not say what I will do. I have a lot of claims, some five or six of them, amounting in all to some \$1,400 or \$1,500, for damages

sustained by people on the Derby branch of the Intercolonial Railway, and I now give the Government warning. There was a time when I had more vigor and more enterprise than I have to-day, and the Government and these Grits who are around me refused to do justice to the claims I presented, and stated they would not pay them or inquire into them. Now, in regard to these three or four claims which I have, if they are not paid, there will be another cow case before these Estimates get through. I do not see the Minister of Railways here to-night, but I hope the Minister of Public Works will tell his chief that if he does not pay these claims, he will have another cow case which will occupy three or four weeks before these Estimates get through.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Is this amount of \$1,250 for the electric lighting, extensions and alterations to the Montreal Post Office intended to provide for the Government taking upon themselves the lighting of that building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; it is for the usual work and requirements of the postal service, as recommended by the mechanical engineer.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the entire amount paid annually to the *Gazette* for the purpose of producing electric light there?

Mr. MITCHELL. They cannot pay too much to the *Gazette*.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract was laid before the House last year, I do not remember now exactly what it is.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does this add in any way to the contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; but if we require more lamps, or if the lamps get broken, we must pay for that separately from the contract, and we must pay the man who looks after the lamps. The contract is to give us so many lamps at such a price.

Mr. MITCHELL. The *Gazette* supports the Government, and you cannot pay too much to the *Gazette*. I want to say that unless the Minister of Railways deals with the question of the few claims I have, I am just going to raise Cain in the matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister said it was the intention of the Government to increase the number of lights in the Montreal Post Office. I want to know if this increase will add to the increased sum that the *Gazette* draws for power.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think not. The amount of the contract was a bulk sum. The contract with the *Gazette* Printing Company was for so much, they were to give us so many lamps, with so much power, and so on. But we find now that the post office requires more lamps, and therefore we had to extend the power in the building and put in new lamps.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). How many more years has the contract to run?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. One year.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many more lights did we use last year than at the time the contract was given?

Mr. MITCHELL. The *Gazette* has got this contract, and it can get anything it wants. It supports the Administration, it does what it is told,

and it has a right to every consideration that the Government can give it. My hon. friend has no right to take an exception to the vote.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec.) It is worth a good deal.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think it is worth much myself; still it has a right to all it can get.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many increased lights were used during the last year over the number used under the contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That I cannot say now. I will take a note of it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are you prepared to say that the deepening of the channel of the Miramichi river is going to be continued?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take a note of it. I will look into the case.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will you say that you will give it your full consideration.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will give it my consideration.

Rivière du Loup (Fraserville) Post
Office, Custom House, &c..... \$8,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the receipts at this point?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The postal revenue is \$2,583; Customs duties, \$5,357.

St. Henri Post Office..... \$8,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice the receipts at this point last year were \$1,289.89. What is the entire cost of that post office to-day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. St. Henri is a portion of Montreal now. The postal revenue is \$1,445. The post office will cost about \$20,000.

St. Hyacinthe Post Office, Custom
House, &c..... \$8,000

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec.) How much is that post office going to cost?

Mr. MITCHELL. It depends when the election is coming off.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec.) That is a growing town.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the Minister whether he will tell the Minister of Railways that I have presented my claims.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I said I would.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope you will use your influence to get that paid, because if you do not—I don't want to use any threats, but I am on the war-path.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This post office is larger than at other places, because the city is important, and is growing.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.... \$30,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This amount includes materials for completing the south dormitories, which are being built by the convicts, and the amounts required for different buildings in connection with the institution.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

Mr. MITCHELL.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 26th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ESQUIMALT DRY DOCK.

Mr. PRIOR asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed at once with the work of lengthening the dry dock at Esquimalt? If not, whether negotiations are proceeding between the Imperial Government and Dominion Government in regard to the same?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Correspondence is now going on between this Government and the Imperial Government on this subject.

SUPPLIES FOR GOVERNMENT STEAMERS.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether tenders were called for by advertisements in various newspapers, last year, for furnishing supplies for the boarding of the employes on the Government steamers *La Canadienne*, *Druid* and *Napoléon III*; who secured the contract, and what were the terms thereof? Is it the intention to call for tenders this year for the same object?

Mr. COLBY. Tenders were not called for by advertisements in various newspapers last year for furnishing supplies for the boarding of the employes on these steamers. Arrangements were made with the masters of the vessels for boarding the employes at the rate of \$12 per month for officers, and \$10 per month for seamen. It is not the intention to call for tenders this year for this service.

FLOGGING IN STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, 1st. Is flogging used as punishment for escape in the penitentiaries of the North-West, and, namely, in Stony Mountain Penitentiary? 2nd. Was a prisoner flogged about one month ago in the penitentiary of Stony Mountain for attempting to escape? 3rd. Had this prisoner only three weeks more of seclusion to undergo? 4th. Was he, two days after having been flogged, declared insane and sent to the Kingston Insane Asylum? 5th. Are there any by-laws and regulations about discipline and punishments inflicted in penitentiaries? 6th. Is flogging one of the punishments inflicted, and in what cases? 7th. Are the regulations made by the Government or by the authorities of each penitentiary? 8th. If these regulations are made by the authorities of each penitentiary, are they submitted to the approbation of the Government? 9th. Is a memorandum of the punishments inflicted kept by the warden of each penitentiary and a report made annually to the Government? 10th. Is it the intention of the Government to define very explicitly all the cases in which flogging can be inflicted in penitentiaries, when it is not inflicted in execution of a judgment of a court of justice?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 1st. Flogging is not used as a punishment for escape in the penitentiaries. 2nd. I have no knowledge of any prisoner having been flogged about a month ago

at Stony Mountain Penitentiary for attempting to escape; I have made enquiries since the hon. gentleman put this question on the paper, to ascertain whether such could be so or not. 3rd. I have no knowledge of the prisoner to whom this question relates. 4th. No prisoner at Stony Mountain has been declared insane and sent to the Kingston Asylum. 5th. There are by-laws and regulations about discipline and punishment inflicted at the penitentiaries. 6th. Flogging is one of the punishments which may be inflicted in certain cases; the hon. gentleman will find the subject dealt with in one of the sections of the Penitentiaries Act of 1886, and many regulations on the subject have since been made which I will bring down for his information if he desires. 7th. The regulations are made under the Penitentiaries Act by the inspector, but with the approval of the head of the Department of Justice, and, as a matter of fact, although this is not required, they have been approved by the Governor in Council. 8th. The regulations are not made by the authorities of the penitentiaries. 9th. A memorandum of the punishments inflicted is kept by the warden of each penitentiary, and a report is made immediately to the Government through the inspector; but I may mention, for the hon. gentleman's information, that it is prescribed in the regulations that, in regard to any case which the warden thinks one for corporal punishment, he is required to take evidence under oath and transmit it to the Department for approval before inflicting the punishment. 10th. It has not been considered necessary to define the cases for flogging more particularly than that it has been done by the regulations.

AID TO ST. SAUVEUR, P.Q.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Whether the Government received any application from the Municipal Council of St. Sauveur, Quebec, or from any of the officials of the said council, asking for aid, after the disastrous conflagration of the month of May last? If so, have the Government come to a decision with reference to said application, and what is the nature of that decision?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An application was received, I believe, from the Municipal Council of St. Sauveur and other parties. The Government have the matter now under consideration.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTION FEES.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to relieve merchants and others, who use weights and measures, of the fees now charged them for inspecting the same?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not the intention of the Government to relieve the parties referred to from the fees for inspecting weights and measures, nor has any application been made to that effect.

FEE FOR REGISTERING LETTERS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to reduce the fee now charged for registering letters? If not, why not?

Mr. HAGGART. It is not the intention of the Government to do so, as the present system is working well and no complaints have been received.

INSOLVENCY LAW.

Mr. GUILLET asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, this Session, a Bill dealing with insolvency?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce, this Session, a Bill dealing with insolvency.

CORNWALL CANAL.

Mr. BERGIN moved:

1. That on Wednesday, the 17th day of April, 1889, the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald presented to the House a return to an Order of the House of the 18th March last past, for plans and surveys of the then proposed Cornwall Canal, by J. B. Mills and Benjamin Wright, Esquires, Civil Engineers, and by Capt. P. Cole, Royal Engineers, in the years 1832, 1833 and 1834; also for surveys and report of Colin Carman, Esq., C.E., of a proposed change of location of Cornwall Canal, from Sand Bridge, through Hoople's Creek to Archibald's Point, with plans, profile and estimates; also reports, plans and surveys made by Mr. Clemas, C.E., in 1826.

2. That embodied in said return, under the signature of John Page, Chief Engineer, and addressed to the Secretary of Railways and Canals, is a letter, which said letter is in the words following:—

“OTTAWA, 28th March, 1889.

“SIR,—It is considered proper to state that the survey of what is called Hoople's Creek and Sand Bridge Gully, Feeder Line, was made a number of years ago, at the request of Dr. Bergin, M.P. for Cornwall.

“When the plan was sent in, it was, I believe, accompanied by an estimate of the probable cost of carrying out the scheme; but the estimate having been mislaid, the resident officer, Mr. Tom S. Rubidge, was requested to furnish a copy, which he did, along with the accompanying letters.

“Relative to this matter, it may be stated that the project appears to have been thoroughly investigated and discussed prior to the works of the Cornwall Canal having been undertaken, fully fifty-five years ago; and, judging from existing circumstances, it does not appear to have been looked upon favorably—a result that very few, if any, of those persons whose aim is solely the interests of canal navigation will be at all likely to regret. For its resuscitation now, so far as access to or egress from the canal is concerned, no reason worthy of the slightest consideration can be assigned, beyond that of allowing more water to enter the canal at about two miles below its upper end, consequently affording the means of drawing from a larger surface area, but it should be borne in mind that the canal under any circumstances, for a considerable distance above lock No. 20 and for the whole distance—4½ miles—below it, is and must continue of the ordinary width so long as economy continues to be an object.

“2. The question of ‘Brazil,’ however interesting in itself, or its effects upon the admission of water at certain times during the winter, has nothing whatever to do with canal navigation, which, it is well known, does not begin until the season for such accumulation is past and closed before it occurs. The question, therefore, seems in a great measure to resolve itself into whether it is better to spend nearly a million of dollars for the purpose of pleasing the member for Stormont and Cornwall, or reserve the money for a purpose where it is certain to be productive of a really serviceable and useful effect.

“This gentleman, I am credibly informed, in a far-fetched, elaborate oration, specially remarkable for length and want of point, occupied the House of Commons for several hours recently in talking about the Cornwall Canal and its projectors, leaving it to be inferred what a very different state of matters would now exist had they possessed a capacity of foresight, having even a very small share of the keen penetration claimed for his long range back-sight.

“Moreover, that defects in my humble self—intensified by obstinacy—have perpetuated and are continuing to eternalise the evils past, present and future, which he looks back upon in such a way as impels him to bring the matter before Parliament, and although of a different nature to the study of the human frame and system, he feels himself no less capable of fixing definitely the proper

course that should be adopted by the Government, irrespective of what others may advise.

"It is truly surprising how some men possess facilities for getting at all kinds of knowledge, which others, apparently of fully as large individual capacity, are unable to reach satisfactorily, although assisted by training and experience; still, one occasionally meets a phenomenon of this kind that does not wholly collapse when probed. However, such instances are rare.

"From the worthy Doctor's elevated standpoint and far-searching vision, he perceives that nothing has been done right, and, indeed, never can be done satisfactorily on the Cornwall Canal, until the whole management has been taken out of the hands of the Government and placed solely under his enlightened control, or that of a person like him, who can at once deal with valves, roller plates in the bottom, the whole condition of the gates, working of crabs, effects of chain-winding upon the systems of lockmen, the position or location of the line, entrances, or whatever is necessary to get the whole into shape and keep everything in the best condition.

"I am at a loss to understand in what way I have had the misfortune to incur the ire, or rather to sink so low in the estimation of a person who appears to possess such unusual views of justice, honor, and the characteristics indicated in the speech previously mentioned.

"It may, however, be stated that it is not generally looked upon as a prominent mark of bravery for even a non-combatant officer to attack a person whose hands are tied, or even for a gentleman of the lancet to assail, in the most prominent place possible, the character, professional or otherwise, of one who is absent, or not in a position to answer the charges; still, in all such cases it is presumed that a great deal depends on the sense of justice, honor, and object of the attacking party.

"Before closing this letter it may be stated that the vast array of ancient records examined for the occasion, and the use made of them and kindred all-but-forgotten matters, has a strong resemblance to juggling with the subject for the supposed entertainment of those who had sufficient patience to listen to such a bitter, far-fetched onslaught upon an absent person, who had no more to do with them than the worthy Doctor had to do with framing the original Bill for the reform of Parliament, or with the settlement of the question of the Clergy Reserves.

"It, therefore, seems as if the statements were made under the impression that the declaimer possessed the proverbial advantage enjoyed by the chimney sweep, of being fully secure from retaliation in kind.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"JOHN PAGE.

Chief Engineer.

"The Secretary of Railways and Canals."

3. That the said John Page, the writer of the said letter, is a salaried officer of the Department of Railways and Canals, has been many years in the public service, and, therefore, not ignorant of what is due to the dignity of this House and to the consideration and respect due to its members.

4. That the said letter of the said John Page, so presented to this House on the said 17th day of April, 1863, is a scandalous, false and malicious libel upon a member of this House, and a high contempt of the privileges and of the constitutional authority of Parliament.

He said: It will be in the recollection of the House, no doubt, that I took occasion last year to bring before Parliament what I believed to be the errors in connection with the construction and enlargement of the Cornwall Canal. I pointed out what I believed to be a mistake in its location, in the first instance, and afterwards a mistake which I thought was made by the Chief Engineer of Canals. I did this in the discharge of my duty as a member of Parliament who had under his eye this great public work, and who had reason to believe that we stood in the face of a great peril to the trade and navigation of this country. I spoke strongly, perhaps, on the subject, but I spoke strictly within the lines of what I believed to be the truth, and for the purpose of arousing the attention of the Government to the dangerous condition of this great public work. Intentionally, I was not guilty of any discourtesy to the Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals. On the contrary,

Mr. BERGIN.

before putting this motion on the paper, I placed myself in communication with him. I told him what papers, reports and plans I required, and was informed by him that he had never seen any such papers, reports or plans, and that none such were in his possession. I told him where they could be found, and, at his request, I forwarded them to him with a most courteous note. After several weeks, when requiring these documents, before making my statement to the House, I visited the Department of Railways and Canals, and asked the Secretary when it would be convenient for him to return to me these documents. He sent a messenger to Mr. Page, and within a few minutes these documents were brought to me by the messenger, and deposited on the table, with this message: That he wished me luck of my old books. This was all the attention he gave the matter. There were several members of Parliament present when this impertinent message was delivered. Instead of making a report upon the statements I had made, which could have been of any value to the country, Mr. Page addressed a libellous letter to the Secretary of the Department of Railways and Canals, and had that letter also published in the *Ottawa Free Press*. I do not intend to draw attention to this any further or to repeat any of the statements made by this gentleman in his letter; but that the House may know that the opinion I gave was not mine alone, but the opinion of all the great engineers in this country and in the United States,—for I have hundreds of letters from them, and from gentlemen engaged in the forwarding trade in this country, who are thoroughly alarmed at the methods which are being pursued,—and to show that it is not a matter which, as Mr. Page says, has been resurrected by me, I will, with the permission of the House, read a short paragraph from a work published by Mr. Kingsford, a very prominent engineer, in 1865, upon the location of this canal:

"On looking at the location of the canal one cannot but be struck at the singular want of judgment in it. In every way it is a striking contrast to that of the Beauharnois. The latter leaves the river bank and strikes boldly for a direct route, curving with a large radius when necessitated to change its course. The former hugs the shore, and curves and winds with it. Some saving may have been made in the cost of the land, but it is a small item compared to the heavy embankments, which this adherence to the river bank necessitated. The consequence is, that very serious breaks have taken place which could only be repaired at great cost. Whether this arose from imperfect and careless construction, or from the very nature of the work, it is difficult to say. But the fact is certain, and it is so far suggestive, that no point in the canal system needs more closely to be watched. In case of war with the United States, a knowledge of this weakness would require that this point should be specially guarded. Some half-dozen men with picks and shovels, opening these embankments, would, in an hour, inflict an injury which it would take months to repair. No such misfortune could occur in any of our other canals; and here, in a military sense, is the weakest point in the whole system; the more unfortunate as, geographically speaking, no canal is so exposed, and as has before been remarked, it will ever be at the mercy of a judiciously planted piece of heavy ordnance discharged from American soil."

With this I shall conclude what I have to say. I do not desire to say one harsh word with regard to the gentleman who wrote this letter, but I desire to repeat the opinion that I expressed last year with regard to the dangerous condition of this canal, which danger has been increased a hundred-fold by the manner in which the work was conducted last year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If I might be allowed to say a few words, I would say that I regret extremely that the letter referred to in the motion ever appeared in the return laid before the House. It is a letter which ought not to have been made an official document at all. It is a letter written by Mr. Page to his superior officer, in which he speaks very strongly, and uses language which, in a public document, is quite inadmissible. He, no doubt, felt wounded by the strong language used by my hon. friend, in the exercise of his duty, in his place in Parliament, but this is not a letter intended for publication. It is not addressed to the House, and in no way can be considered as a breach of the privilege of Parliament. The mistake was made primarily by the officer who selected the papers for the return and included these documents, which he ought not to have done; and, in the second place, I, while acting temporarily in the place of my predecessor in the Railway Department, looked over the return and ought to have withdrawn that paper. All I can say is that I regret that it included that paper, and on behalf of the Department, including myself, I apologise to the hon. gentleman for its having been brought down. I hope my hon. friend will not press his motion.

Mr. BERGIN. With the permission of the House, I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. MITCHELL. It affords us a great deal of satisfaction to see the discipline which is maintained on that side of the House.

Motion withdrawn.

FREE IMPORTATION OF MINING MACHINERY.

Mr. PLATT moved :

That machinery designed for use in mining operations should not be subject to Customs duty when imported into Canada for mining purposes.

He said : I desire to state that it was not at the instance of any party or parties interested in the introduction of mining material, free of duty, into this country, that I placed this motion on the Order paper. I became aware, on several occasions last year, that efforts were made by parties interested in the importation of mining machinery, to induce the Government to admit that machinery free of duty. I also became aware of the fact, which every hon. member I suppose is aware of, that the mining industry, although at present an infant industry in this country, is just about entering upon a period of development far beyond what many of our people realise. The vast, and, I may say, illimitable mining resources of this country are becoming more and more apparent to the people, and we are looking forward to the day when the mining industry of Canada will be second in importance only to the agricultural industry. When we look over the geological map of this country, and when we contemplate its mineral resources, we cannot but look forward with pleasure to the day when Canada will be *par excellence* the mining country of the world. I believe it is the duty of the Government, particularly at this time, to give every encouragement to those who are trying to develop those vast resources, and it is that view alone which has induced me to place this motion on the paper. Since I did so, I have discovered that many of my fellow members, especially the representatives from

the Province of British Columbia, are likewise deeply interested in the success of the object I have in view. Many of them are from mining districts, some are immediately from those regions where mining operations are carried on; and I have moved this resolution with the object of allowing members to express their opinions on the subject, so that the Government may be enabled to arrive at some definite conclusion in regard to this matter before the Tariff Bill is brought down.

Mr. MARA. I am very glad to see that there are other portions of the Dominion, as well as the Province of British Columbia, agitating in favor of the free admission of mining machinery. There is at present no question of greater importance to our Province than the free admission of mining machinery. Last Session, the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Barnard) brought this matter before the House, and clearly proved that the machinery required to treat our refractory ores is not manufactured in the Dominion. He also clearly showed that the manufacturers would not suffer by the free admission of this machinery; that at present mining machinery is practically barred from entering into the Dominion; and that, if it were admitted for two or three years free of duty, the manufacturers would have a much larger market than they have at present. Since last Session the attention of the Minister of Customs has been repeatedly called to this question by the Provincial Government, by the different Boards of Trade, and by the press of the Province, which, although divided on every other subject, is united on this. We cannot understand why that gentleman will not yield to the representations which we have made. We consider that, in a matter affecting the tariff, we have a strong claim upon the Dominion Government. We pay a very large sum yearly into the Dominion Treasury. Last year we paid in Customs duties and Excise, \$1,100,000, nearly five times as much as the Province of Prince Edward Island, 50 per cent. more than Manitoba and the North-West Territories combined; and, estimating our population at 100,000, exclusive of Indians, we pay more than twice as much per head as any other Province in the Dominion. In a matter of this kind, affecting an infant industry, we contend that, where we can show that it will not injuriously affect any other industry, the Government ought to yield to so reasonable a request as we have made. Situated as we are, so far from the manufacturing centres of Ontario and Quebec; having to pay a very heavy toll upon all manufactured goods taken into the Province, whether they are from Ontario or from Quebec, from the United States or from England; being, as far as manufactured goods are concerned, consumers rather than producers, the tariff presses heavily upon us. When the National Policy was framed, it was intended to protect every interest and to assist every industry. The farmer of Ontario is protected by the duty on his coarse grains and root crops; the manufacturer of Ontario or Quebec is doubly protected—first, by a high tariff on all goods manufactured in the Dominion, and, secondly, by the admission of such raw material, free of duty, as is required for manufacturing purposes, and is not the product of Canada. The coal-miner of Nova Scotia is protected by a duty of 50 cents and 75 cents a

ton on coal; the iron industry of Nova Scotia is also protected by a bounty; but you will look in vain for any single article which is protected for the benefit of British Columbia, and on the free list there is not a single article intended to foster or encourage any industry in that Province. While we are supporters of the National Policy because we believe it is in the interest of the Dominion, and that the whole country has prospered under that policy, and that British Columbia has had its share of prosperity, we also feel that, where one industry is so heavily handicapped, it is the duty of the Government to yield to our remonstrance and remove the duty on that article. Since the discovery of gold on the Fraser River, British Columbia has produced over \$50,000,000 of gold. Almost the whole of this has been taken from alluvial diggings. The placer-mining has not been successful, and the miner has devoted his attention to quartz, which will be more permanent, will give employment to a greater number, and be of greater benefit both to the Province and to the Dominion. In prosecuting his search for quartz he has, to a large extent, been successful. Large bodies of low grade ore have been found all over the mainland of British Columbia. In the district of Kootenay, along the line of railway, mining development has been retarded largely owing to the mining belt being practically locked up in a dispute between the two Governments. That, I am happy to say, is settled, and we may soon look for an era of prosperity in that section. But when we take the far-off district of Cariboo, as well as the southern and western district of Kootenay, districts almost inaccessible, far removed from roads and trails, where the cost of transportation is high and living expensive, the miners and prospectors have had many difficulties to contend with. In regard to the southern district of Kootenay, that portion to which I now call the attention of the House, if hon. members will look on the map they will find that it is bounded on the south by the States of Montana, Idaho and Washington, and is only separated from them by an artificial or imaginary boundary line. These States are rich in gold, silver, copper and lead; and the large output of gold and silver from these States has contributed greatly to the wealth of the United States during the past few years. The prospectors of quartz labor under difficulties that the ordinary miner has not to contend with. The miners who are working placer-diggings, or hydraulic mines, can, by their own individual efforts, or aided by mining companies, succeed in working their mines, but with the quartz-miner it is different. It takes years of labor and a large outlay to get a quartz mine successfully opened; and even then the capitalists have to step in before any successful working can be done. In that portion of Kootenay bounded by Montana and Idaho, the topographical features are somewhat similar to those of the States I have mentioned. The formation of rock is the same, and, as might have been expected, the miners, in their march northward across this artificial boundary, have discovered large bodies of low grade ore, and mines which will equal any of those in Colorado, Nevada or Idaho. Last year, in visiting that section of the country, I obtained a list or memorandum of shipments of ore from a few of the mines there. To show the state of development of these mines,

Mr. MARA.

I will read returns of the shipments of ore from that section for 1889:

	Tons.	Oz.	
Silver King....	70	230	silver, 20 p.c. copper.
No One.....	146	87	“
Little Donald..	85	90	“ 35 p.c. lead.
Spokane.....	65	40	“ 70 “
Della.....	20	120	“
Sky Line.....	15	225	“
Krao.....	12	95	“ 50 p.c. lead.
Gallagher.....	14	119	“ \$14 gold.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose these yields are in each case so much per ton?

Mr. MARA. In each case per ton; and I may say they are authentic. Several of the returns I got from the mine owners, and the others were furnished me by the Gold Commissioners. Now, you will see that these returns are not samples from a few ounces of rock, but returns from shipments of hundreds of tons. It may be said, that where the rock will yield such a large return, there should be no difficulty in procuring machinery or capital necessary to work the mines; and so it would be, if these returns represented the whole of the ore extracted from the mines. But this ore, when run out from the tunnel, has to be picked by hand by experts. The freight alone from the Silver King Mine to Butte, is \$33 per ton, and from the Hot Springs Camp to Helena, \$26.50 per ton, so that miners can only ship the higher grade ore; and instead of shipping it all, there are now lying on the dump hundreds of tons of ore that it will not pay to move for want of mining machinery to reduce the ore. Here we have hundreds of tons of ore that, in treating, would give employment to a great number of men, and representing hundreds of thousands of dollars, but it is lying there idle, simply because the rates of transportation are so high; and the Government imposes a duty upon mining machinery so high that such machinery cannot be brought into the country. I do not think a stronger argument can be used in favor of the Government yielding to the concession we ask. I visited another mine called the Blue Bell or Hendricks' Mine. In that mine I went down 100 feet below the surface, and traced a vein of ore 87 feet wide. The greater portion of this only yields from 4 oz. to 10 oz. in silver, and one small portion yields 20 oz. in silver, and gives 50 per cent. in lead. Several shafts have been sunk on this mine; the ledge has been cut across in several places; and to-day there are thousands of tons of ore exposed to view. That mine can produce more galena, and more lead than is to-day consumed in the whole Dominion of Canada; and I was informed by Dr. Hendricks, one of the principal owners of the mine, that, were the duty taken off mining machinery, their company would be prepared at once to put in a plant that would cost about \$200,000—the machinery alone would cost \$100,000—but they were not prepared to pay into the Treasury of the Dominion something over \$30,000 in shape of duty. In discussing this question with these mine owners, who are chiefly Americans, I said to them: Now, you are Republicans; in your own country you are protectionists; how is it that once across the line you throw your protectionist principles to the wind, and you cry out for free trade? Their reply invariably was: That is not the case. We were protectionists at home, and we are protectionists here. We believe in the policy

of America for Americans, and we do not blame you for insisting on a like policy of Canada for the Canadians. But we say this: You do not manufacture in Canada the machinery requisite for the treatment of our ores, and even if you did manufacture that machinery there is no means of our getting it into Kootenay. Steam drills are manufactured in Montreal, but they could not get one in Montreal because they had no means of taking it in from our side, and this rock drill had to go in from the American side and had to pay a duty of 30 per cent. I was informed that, instead of that one drill, there would be a dozen drills in use in Kootenay if they could be taken in free of duty. I met there a very intelligent man from Spokane, a representative of Spokane capitalists, and in conversation with him I learned that the capitalists he represented would also put machinery on the different claims in which they were interested if the duties were removed from mining machinery. He was originally in a bank at Spokane; he is a man who has some knowledge of geology and assaying, and was selected by the Spokane people to purchase locations for them in the Kootenay country. I asked him to give me the benefit of his views in writing, which he did a short time afterwards, and which, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read to the House. He states:

"In relation to the benefits accruing to this section by the abolition of duties upon mining and reduction machinery, I have to state that were such a measure accomplished, I would within a year have a concentrator of from thirty to a hundred tons here, as well as at least two hoisting plants, and probably a quartz mill and other mining machinery, such as machine drills, &c. I am positive that at least two others would do as much more, and I further feel confident that a very large and complete smelting plant would be erected; and, of course, with the advent of these industries the progress of this section would be apparent. At present we cannot obtain these things in the Dominion, and if we could, transportation to this point is at present impossible, and that renders protection in one case a hardship, without any industry being protected, hence nothing is accomplished favorable to any party. Our ores in the main are of such a grade that we must be able to mine and reduce cheaply to insure a profit, and the margin of profit is so small that machinery on any but one or two claims would not be feasible while duties exist and transportation is exorbitant. It is apparent, then, that great things must result with the energetic working of the claims and a vast amount of industries incidental to extensive mining accompany and follow up the new era of prosperity, and, in my opinion, all it needs to bring on this state of affairs is a little fostering by the Government in the shape of duty rebates and better transportation."

I might say with respect to the question of transportation that that is a difficulty which, I believe, will very shortly be solved. Every northern transcontinental line is now seeking an entrance into Kootenay. The Northern Pacific are about to build a line from Kootenay to Bonner's Ferry, from whence a steamer can be taken to any of the mines on Kootenay Lake. The Spokane and Northern Railway Company has an application for a charter now before the House for a line running from the international boundary near Pan d'Oreille, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are applying for a charter from Sproat's Landing on the Columbia River to Nelson on Kootenay Lake. So the difficulty with respect to transportation will soon be solved, and it only remains now for the Dominion Government to say whether they will assist the mining industry, by allowing mining machinery to be admitted free of duty. It may be said by members of the Government that the

letter I have read, as well as the information I have furnished, is from American sources. I admit that; but I will say this, that it is only through American enterprise, industry and capital that that section of the country has been opened. However, the same feeling pervades every other part of the Province, namely, that unless the duty is taken off mining machinery, very little advance can be made in the mining industry for years to come. A few days ago I read a letter published by a resident of Victoria, a representative of British capital to the extent of \$500,000, and the representative of a company which is doing good work in developing the mines of Nicola, in which the matter was put very clearly. I may add that he is a supporter of the Government, and a Conservative, and, being an Englishman, he, John Bull like, goes straight to the point and strikes out from the shoulder. I will read an extract from his letter. After referring to the work done in the Nicola country, he says:

"You might assist that development by more vigorously and persistently pressing for the removal of the practically prohibitory duty levied by the Dominion Government on mining machinery, without which the mines cannot be worked. The situation at present is this: The Province which owns the minerals acts most liberally to those engaged in mining. It gives them away to whoever discovers and prospects them. It makes trails and roads to render mineral districts accessible. It does all this without deriving any revenue, except small sums from miners' licenses and record fees, which do not begin to recoup it for its large and generous outlay. The Dominion, which does not own the minerals, but which would gain the lion's share of benefit from a mineral development, through its heavy tariff neutralises the efforts of this Province by prohibiting the working of the mines unless it first receives a toll of 30 per cent. of the value of all machinery necessary to extract the minerals from them."

"To show you how this operates I will instance Nicola, and what applies to that district applies to all others in the Province."

"The ores of Nicola are refractory. They consequently require far more expensive machinery to treat them than free milling gold ores, which, except at and near the surface, have not yet been discovered in British Columbia. This means a large outlay and the payment of about twenty thousand dollars to the Dominion for the privilege of working Provincial mines that the Dominion never owned. I know that outside capitalists look upon this Dominion 30 per cent. tax on mining machinery as little better than a blackmailing operation, and they prefer to invest in semi-barbarous countries, such as South Africa, where they are not plundered of a portion of their capital before they have a chance of investing it, as they are at present if they venture into the Dominion of Canada."

"My opinion is that an output of precious metals from the quartz mines of Nicola, and other mining districts of British Columbia, will be delayed until the Dominion permits mining machinery to be brought in without the present proposterous duty being levied upon it. Every well-wisher of this Province should energetically protest the continuance of a tax which stops the investment of capital in mines and prevents the development of the greatest natural resource British Columbia possesses."

That is the opinion expressed by nearly every man, miner or trader, who has an interest in British Columbia. What we ask is this: That the Dominion Government should take the duty off such machinery as is not at present manufactured in the Dominion; and we contend that the manufacturers, instead of being injured, would be benefited by that measure. To-day little or no machinery is brought in, because there is no market; but we hold that if you remove the duty for two or three years, you will open up to the manufacturers of Canada a very much larger market than exists to-day. We say that such machinery as concentrating machinery, quartz mills, reduction mills, sampling mills, and refining works, are not manu-

factured here, nor will they be manufactured until the market increases. So our request is a very fair one. We ask that the Government will take the duty off that class of machinery for a short time, and we further ask that they will remove the duty from all machinery, including motive power, in that part of Kootenay at present inaccessible from our own side. It is so far removed from the railway system of the United States, that the people have not the advantage of the bonding system; so, whether it is American or Canadian machinery, the parties have to pay the duty, and if Canadian machinery, they will have, practically, to pay the duty twice. I again maintain that our petition is a fair one. We are not asking for the protection given to the farmers or the manufacturers, we are not asking for a bounty such as is given to the iron industries at Londonderry, we simply ask that the Government will endeavor to foster and encourage our infant industry by removing the duty on certain machinery, the result of which would be that the manufacturers of Canada would be afforded a larger market in a few years. I venture to predict that in the district of Kootenay, if that policy be followed, inside of three years you will have a market for more mining machinery than is manufactured in the whole Dominion to-day.

Mr. BARNARD. I took the opportunity last Session of introducing this subject to the attention of the House, and I then endeavored to express my views pretty fully upon it. Since that time I have interested myself in the matter, and I have on several occasions endeavored to impress on the Government, the great necessity, in the interests of the Province of British Columbia at any rate, of making some change which would assist the miners there, and enable us to introduce capital to develop the great natural wealth which is lying dormant in that Province. Had not the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) introduced this resolution, I, possibly, would have been compelled to bring forward a similar one later on in the Session. However, in view of the statement made by the hon. the Minister of Finance that the Government intended making some changes in the tariff, I would have deferred it until I ascertained whether they did, or did not, make the changes which we desire in this respect. I have submitted to the Minister of Finance a list of mining machinery which we hope will be admitted free of duty, and the greater part of which is not, I am quite satisfied, manufactured in Canada. I am in hopes, as all the members from British Columbia are, that the Government will be able to place some of these articles, if not all of them, on the free list. In the meantime I will defer making any further remarks on this subject, until the Minister of Finance has announced the changes in the tariff which he proposes.

Mr. CURRAN. I desire to state, in regard to some of the remarks which have been made here, that I have been informed by several manufacturers that the statement that we do not manufacture in Canada all the mining machinery required, is not correct. The manufacturers have assured me, and I have no doubt that they have also assured the Government, that they are perfectly able to manufacture in Montreal, and, I believe, in other large manufacturing centres as well, all kinds of machinery of whatever description may be

Mr. MARA.

required for mining purposes. The hon. Minister will, no doubt, give this matter due attention and do justice in the premises. In the meantime it is perfectly certain that the discussion of to-day must do good, if it does nothing else than attract the attention of manufacturers to the statements made here, and induce them—if the distance be too far to transport the articles manufactured in either Quebec or Ontario—possibly to establish branches of their industries in that new Province, where, if all that we have heard to-day be correct, there will be a very large field for them to reap a rich harvest in the manufacture of this mining machinery.

Mr. DAWSON. It is quite evident that a great deal of machinery required at present in mining is not manufactured in Canada, and that there are certain kinds of machinery referred to by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara) which are not produced in this country. I would certainly favor the maintenance of the duty on such machinery as can be manufactured in this country, so as to prevent competition; but the fact is that in these new districts of Algoma and British Columbia (which must depend greatly on mining, and where there are new mines being discovered every day), it is very desirable that, until we can ourselves produce the machinery required in mining, it ought to a certain extent be admitted free of duty. There are certain things, such as diamond drills, and complicated machinery like amalgamators, which are not produced in this country, and which cannot be produced profitably until the mining industry has been much more developed than it is at present. In the existing condition of affairs there is not a sufficiently large market for the sale of such machinery. I, therefore, wish to support the members for Yale (Mr. Mara) and Cariboo (Mr. Barnard) in their contention with regard to the expediency of admitting certain machinery free of duty. I would not wish that any machinery which can be manufactured in this country should be admitted free, but the Government should take this into their favorable consideration, and see if in some way the demands of certain sections of the country in this respect can be met.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Perhaps no Province in the Dominion is more interested in the mining industry than the Province from which I come. Our vast coal fields and gold mining enterprises there, are even now of great value, and are increasing every year. I know it to be a source of complaint among those interested in that industry, that they have been compelled to pay duty on a class of machinery which is not made in the Dominion. I remember when, a few years ago, the duty was first placed on coal by the present Administration, one of the gentlemen of Halifax, who is supposed to represent the coal interests—who made it a question during the election, and had always advocated that a duty should be placed upon coal—was anything but satisfied when the regulation for the tariff on coal was presented to Parliament. That gentleman, who is recognised as an authority on the subject, said, that while the Government had imposed a duty on coal, they had taken away largely, if not entirely, the advantage which the miners would gain, by imposing heavy duties on machinery and other materials used in mining. The miners have always

labored under the disadvantage of being compelled to pay heavy duties on what they required to develop their mines. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) made the statement that all mining machinery could be manufactured in the Dominion, but that seems to be contradicted by other hon. gentlemen who spoke on the subject. Whether it is manufactured in the Dominion or not, is of very little consequence. If it is made in the Dominion, of course it is only sold at the relative value which the machinery would cost, plus the duty if it were imported. There is, therefore, no advantage to the miners of the country that they can purchase machinery in the Dominion, because we know that manufacturers of machinery, like other manufacturers, fix their prices at what it will cost to lay down the foreign article plus the duty. I add my testimony to that of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that, in the interest of the coal and gold mining industries of Nova Scotia, it is of the highest importance that miners should have free access to the markets of the world to purchase their machinery, and in which they can get the best articles at the lowest possible price.

Mr. BROWN. I feel much interested in the question before the House, for on my recent visit to British Columbia I was much impressed by the statements made by the members for Yale (Mr. Mara) and Cariboo (Mr. Barnard) that a certain class of machinery which was not manufactured in Canada, and which very likely, for a great many years to come, would not be manufactured here, should be allowed to be imported free of duty, so as to enable the people of British Columbia to develop the great natural wealth of their Province. As my friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) states, there is a large quantity of machinery which can be manufactured in Canada. Certain manufacturers in the city of Hamilton, which I have the honor to represent, have informed me that they are quite prepared to manufacture a large proportion of the machinery required in the development of the mines of British Columbia. No doubt other centres of industry will be able to do the same thing, and as the city of Hamilton will soon be connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the manufacturers there will be able to forward this machinery to British Columbia at reasonable freight rates. There can, however, be no doubt that to promote the progress of British Columbia and to develop its great mineral wealth, such machinery as my hon. friend for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has referred to, should be admitted free of duty. I feel very strongly on this point, and I make these few remarks in support of the contention of my hon. friends.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara) has furnished us with some useful information as to the working of this particular feature of the tariff, in regard to the great mining industries of the Province from which he comes. We have expended many millions of public money to develop the resources of that Province and to add to the material wealth of the whole of Canada, and to-day the hon. gentleman has informed us, on the authority of a gentleman whose name he did not give, but whom I understand to be in political sympathy with the party to which he belongs, that the present tariff in its operation, locks up the

mining wealth of British Columbia as effectively as nature has ever done. On that statement, coming from the source it does—and it cannot be said for a moment that the hon. gentleman or his witnesses are animated by anything but the best interests of the country in asking for relief from that state of things—I cannot understand on what just grounds relief can be denied. Apart from the artificial obstructions offered by the tariff, there are sufficient obstacles presented by nature itself to the development of the mining resources of British Columbia, and, certainly, until some change is made in the tariff, which is within the reach of the Government, we need not expect any returns from the vast sums we have expended for the development of that Province. Could a more forcible attack on the Government come from any source than that which has been disclosed by the correspondence of my hon. friend? He says those great gifts of nature, those great undeveloped laboratories in the bowels of the earth, are locked up and made useless to man, by reason not altogether of natural obstructions, but by reason of the artificial obstructions imposed by the Administration and endorsed by the House, and, in a sense, by the country. Under these circumstances I think we are bound, as a Parliament, to give the fairest consideration to the proposition, and I think we can do so without impairing the general scheme which hon. gentlemen opposite have supported, and which they deem to call the National Policy. We can, without prejudice to that scheme, provide relief in the present instance. As hon. gentlemen have said, the tariff should not be available to handicap industries established in Canada, when Canada herself does not provide relief. Here we have the exact case to justify the suspension of the operation of the tariff in regard to this particular industry, at all events until manufacturers are found in this country ready to supply the needs of the mining industry. Therefore, in order to meet the views presented by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, while not jeopardising this great industry by giving occasion for the cry of the National Policy being in danger, I beg to move the following amendment, which, I think, leaves the National Policy in all its integrity, and is, perhaps, an argument in favor of its existence, at all events by admission, as it does not suggest an attack upon it:

That the motion be amended by inserting after the word "machinery" the words, "of kinds not manufactured in Canada."

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. mover of the amendment seems to take the ground that it would not be an interference with the manufacture of machinery in the country. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) has stated that in that city all the facilities exist for manufacturing all kinds of machinery used in the country. Now, if I understand the object of the mover of the original resolution, it is to relieve, as far as possible, those engaged in mining from the burdens now imposed upon them by the duty on their machinery. We are all happy to hear that we have in this country the facilities for manufacturing mining machinery; but I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that these people in the city of Hamilton who manufacture machinery, when they come to sell it to the miner, are going to obtain the cost of producing it, with a fair profit, and the duty added. If that is not so, all I have to say is that the

manufacturers in the city of Hamilton are different from any others in this Dominion or on this continent. I need not tell the House that the mining industry is a very important one, for the House has shown its sense of its importance in the past by granting bonuses to railways to give access to the iron and coal mines of this country and has imposed almost prohibitory duties for the purpose of encouraging mining in the country. I think it was the sage of Assiniboia who once made the remark that this country is one of large, of undeveloped resources. Well, it has mineral resources besides coal and other iron, and I need not tell the House that a great many of these lie a great way beyond, not only railway, but water communication, and they are at present impossible of development, owing to the immense cost of getting the machinery to the ground. Some years ago a member of the British Columbia Legislature, a Mr. Mason, showed me a specimen of native gold which he himself had broken from the rock, and from which he had chipped the stone with a small hammer, showing the native gold. He told me that there were immense quantities of that metal in all parts of British Columbia, and he was then in Victoria trying to form a company for the purpose of developing it; but the insuperable barriers to mining it successfully were, first, the duties on mining machinery, and next, the cost of getting the machinery to the ground. The motion before the House does not in any way deal with the latter question, but it does deal very materially with the question of the first cost of the machinery. I think it is the duty of the Government to do all they can to develop these undeveloped resources, and to afford every facility for getting the machinery into this country at the very cheapest rates. If you want to give bounties, and we have given bounties to manufacturers before now, it does not make any difference whether we give them directly or lighten the burden by throwing off the duty. In either way, the miners are benefited, and by the plan of throwing off the duties you lessen the cost to the consumer.

Mr. PRIOR. As this is such an important subject to the people of British Columbia, I do not think it right that I should let it pass without saying a word. It is the most important subject that will come up during the Session affecting the Province of which I have the honor to be a representative. The hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara) has laid the matter so fully before the House that I need not say much as to the necessity for the change in the tariff which he has suggested. But I would like to say a word in reply to the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) and the hon. the senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown). These gentlemen said that manufacturers in those cities had informed them that they were perfectly capable, and indeed anxious, to make the machinery required to treat the ores in British Columbia. I may say that in Victoria there are iron works perfectly capable of making the machinery themselves without our being obliged to come east; but that is not the question. The question is: Is that machinery made at the present time in the Dominion? The fact is, different ores take different treatment, and you require different machinery to carry out those treatments; and no manufactory is going

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

to set to work and spend a large sum of money in patterns and patents of a certain class of machinery until it is perfectly certain that it is the right sort to treat the ores. Therefore, I cannot see why the Government should put any spoke in the wheel by preventing the duty being taken off the machinery which must be got in the States until it is proved to the manufacturers in this Dominion what kind of machinery is required, and I hope the Government will see their way to comply with the request of the hon. member for Yale.

Mr. CHARLTON. A year ago last summer, as a member of the Ontario Mining Commission, I came in contact with a great many miners, in various parts of the Province. The Commission visited all the mining regions of Ontario, and in the course of its investigations, took the evidence of 150 miners and persons connected with mining. Among other things which these miners declared desirable in their interests, for the purpose of securing greater development to the mineral resources of the country, was the introduction, free of duty, of machinery not manufactured in Canada, and the investigations made by the Commission on this point were of the closest and most convincing character. It was found that various kinds of machinery were not produced in Canada, such as for amalgamating work, stamps, diamond drills, &c. It is only reasonable to suppose that in the United States, where the mineral production amounted to \$542,000,000 in 1888, compared with less than \$16,000,000 in Canada, the development in machinery and methods for producing ores has been much greater than it has been in Canada. Now, this is a matter on which the miners undoubtedly are good judges as to their wants. We visited the copper region in Sudbury, the silver region west of Port Arthur, the mineral regions of all parts of Ontario, and there was no dissent among the miners anywhere as to the desirability of the introduction of mining machinery from the United States, not produced in Canada, free of duty. It was quite evident, from the result of our investigations, that the want of this has been one of the great bars to the development of our mineral resources. Canada unquestionably possesses mineral resources of great extent and importance, both in the precious metals and in copper, iron and other metals. The mineral resources of Ontario are second to those of no region on this continent, although their development, and, consequently, their production, is very small, and anything that will tend to develop this industry will be in the general interests of this country. I hope the hon. Minister of Finance will take into account the vast importance of this almost undeveloped industry. The mineral production of the United States is \$542,000,000, against our \$15,000,000, and is four or five times greater *per capita* than ours. Our own mineral resources are probably greater than theirs, except in coal, and the Government should seriously consider what steps may be taken to promote mining in Canada, and no step they could take will have a more direct beneficial effect than the one they are asked to take by the hon. member for North York. The hon. member for Montreal tells us there is no kind of machinery used in mining that is not made in that city, and the hon. member for Hamilton tells us what can be done by Hamilton; but the

miners, without a dissenting voice, from one end of Ontario to the other, as far as my personal knowledge goes, tell us that mining machinery cannot be produced in Canada, as regards many of the kinds required, and that it would not pay manufacturers in Canada to attempt the production of these, because the sale of the machinery, after incurring the expenditure necessary to manufacture it, will be problematical. Consequently, we must import the machinery, and if the miner has to pay 35 per cent., that will likely deter him or the capitalists from embarking in the enterprise. Nothing would be more likely to develop the vast mineral resources of Ontario, and every section of the Dominion, than the passage of this resolution.

Mr. COOK. It is very well known how rapidly the mineral resources of this country are being developed, particularly on the north shore of Georgian Bay, in the Owen Sound and Algoma districts. There are large quantities of nickel there, it is said, sufficient to supply the world, and nickel is becoming a very important metal, as it can be alloyed with iron. But the proposal of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) does not meet the case. In the first place, if a party wishes to order machinery, such as is required for large establishments as they have at Sudbury, by ordering all that he requires in one or more establishments on the other side, he is placed in a more favorable position as regards prices than if he ordered part in Canada and a part in the United States; and besides, in having a portion of the machinery made in Canada, and a portion in a foreign country, these two portions may not work satisfactorily together. For these considerations I shall vote against the amendment of the hon. member for North York and for the original motion. I wish to do what I think is the best practical thing for the interests of this country, and, if it is going to ruffle the feelings of any hon. gentleman on the other side or on this, it is no matter to me. I do what I consider my duty to my constituents and to the country, and I shall, therefore, vote against the amendment of the hon. member for North York.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). Coming, as I do, from the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, representing a constituency 600 miles in extent, I shall support this resolution. I think we should be allowed to get all the mining machinery required in that country as cheaply as we can, so that we may get a population there which will make it really a country. Being handicapped by the long haul, and the distance we have to take our machinery through the mountains afterwards, I think we ought rather to be paid a bounty than to be asked to pay a duty on the machinery which comes into that country.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see any possible objection which protectionists can have to the amendment of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), seeing that it does not propose to interfere with any protection which is now, or which may hereafter be given to the manufacturers of mining machinery in Canada. If such machinery is to be taxed, then protection subsists in regard to it; and in regard to all other kinds of machinery no harm is done by their free admission. I, therefore, do not see what objection protectionists can have to this amendment. For my own part, I shall vote

for the main motion. I believe in encouraging the largest and most productive industries of the country, and the mines are worth vastly more to the country than all the manufacturers of mining machinery who exist now or ever could exist in Canada. The manufacture of mining machinery is only a means to carry on the mines, and I do not consider it is fair to carry out a national protective policy in such a way as to encourage the means at the expense of the object. A national protective policy should encourage the industry of the country, and the only way in which the mining machinery industry can benefit the country is by benefiting the mines. Notwithstanding the existence of manufactures in Hamilton or elsewhere, I intend to vote for the motion of my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Platt). The object of every patriotic policy must be to obtain the greatest good for the greatest number, to follow a course which will add to our wealth and standing, and which will give employment to the greatest amount of labor. That has been said to be the object of the National Policy; and now we will see whether the Government will take advantage of this opportunity, and carry out that policy in this respect, because the development of our mines would add much more to our development than any protection of the manufactures of mining machinery. If the amendment of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) carries, I shall vote for the motion as so amended as the best that can be adopted under the circumstances, but I shall in the first instance support the original motion.

Mr. McKAY. I believe it is the desire of the House that nothing shall be done to prevent the development of the mining industries of the country, and I think the adoption of the amendment of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) will aid in developing those mining industries while, at the same time, not interfering with the manufacturing industries which are now established. In Hamilton we have men who are largely engaged in making this machinery, men who have had large experience in it. One of the gentlemen at the head of a manufacturing concern in Hamilton has had large experience in making this machinery on the Pacific coast. I believe, if the amendment of the hon. member for North York is carried, it would be more preferable than the motion, and more satisfactory to all the different interests.

Mr. MARA. While thanking the hon. member for North York for the few kind words he said in favor of our Province, I take exception to the statement he made that the Dominion of Canada spent millions, in opening up and developing the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not say that. I said, for the purpose of doing so.

Mr. MARA. Well, for the purpose of doing so. The Dominion Government did nothing of the kind. They spent millions in order to obtain a terminus on the Pacific coast. That money was not spent for the benefit of British Columbia, and British Columbia derived very little benefit from the expenditure of that amount of money. As to the amendment and the motion as they now stand, I put it to my hon. friend from Prince Edward

(Mr. Platt), whether it would be to the interest of the miner, or of the mining industry, that the motion should be pressed to a vote to-day. If it were, it might be defeated, and that would mean that the hands of the Government would be strengthened to allow matters to remain as they are. I am satisfied that my hon. friend does not wish that; neither do I; and I would suggest whether it is not well to withdraw the motion, or allow it to stand, or I will propose that the debate be adjourned, and stand adjourned until such time as the Government make known to the House their proposed tariff changes. Then we can deal more easily with these matters than we can at present. If, however, the question is then pressed to a vote, I will be with the hon. gentleman. I, therefore, move in amendment to the amendment:

That the debate be adjourned until after the proposed tariff changes are laid before the House by the Government.

I will withdraw that, if the hon. gentleman will withdraw his motion.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to say a few words on this discussion, which has upon the whole been an interesting and a profitable one. A great many members, comparatively, have spoken in the course of this debate, and a great many opinions have been given from practical men and persons who are well acquainted with the districts from which they come, in reference to the mining resources of different parts of our Dominion. I may say that what was stated by my hon. friend from Cariboo (Mr. Barnard) is perfectly true. During the past year he has been constant, in season and out of season, in pressing this matter upon the attention of the Government; not only himself, but other members from British Columbia, who have similar interest with him in this respect, have also made strong and vigorous recommendations to the Government to take off the duty on mining machinery. Persons interested in mining development in Ontario, in the Lake Superior region, and who are anxious to get in mining machinery, have also been pressing the Government to make some modification in the matter of admitting such machinery for the purpose of developing those mines. The same thing has taken place in various other portions of the country where mining development is comparatively new. The Government have not been idle in the matter; and I may say to the House that there is no one subject in connection with the tariff which has engaged more of our attention during the last few months, than the question which is the subject of discussion to-day. But, of course, there are difficulties connected with it. There are three interests which are to be considered. In the first place, there are those who are interested in putting in mining machinery for the development of new mines at the present time; they want a modification of the duties. There are those who have, under the National Policy, been investing their money and who have been engaged in developing the manufacture of machinery of various kinds in this country; and no person can take a comparative view of the state of the manufacturing industry ten years ago and its state to-day, without seeing the immense strides that our manufacturers have made in the way of producing

Mr. MARA.

machinery of almost every description and of excellent quality as well, to be used in mining industries. That interest has to be regarded, and it may well be considered by those who have invested their capital in that way, and who have arrived at a good degree of development in that industry, and are producing machinery of a very extensive character and of good quality, that it would not conduce to the permanency of the best interests of the country in that line, should we agree to the request of my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Platt), that all mining machinery should be allowed to come in free. His motion is very wide indeed. It would include everything, from the most complex and the largest kind of machinery, to the simplest forms of machinery, which are made in Canada just as well and just as cheaply as they can be made anywhere. Then there is another interest to be considered, which is the interest of those miners who, during the last ten, fifteen or twenty years, have gone into mining ventures in this country, who have been at the cost of putting in machinery, who have imported it and have paid the duty upon it. New machinery put into new mining industries would compete in a certain way with their own, and involve a competition which would be looked upon as being somewhat unfair to them. So that these three interests have all to be considered, and have been considered by the Government. Then, of those who ask for free mining machinery, there are three different classes. There is one class who want the duty taken off all mining machinery so that it may come in free. That class is represented by my hon. friend the mover of this motion, provided we take the motion as the index of his own views on that subject. I think that motion is wider than the sense of this House, or the sense of the country, would approve. There is another class who want only such machinery to come in free of duty as is not made in Canada. Now, any hon. gentleman who looks at the matter will understand the difficulty of coming to a conclusion as to what machinery can be made in the country and what cannot be made in the country, a much more difficult thing, perhaps, than to come to a conclusion as to what machinery is made in Canada and what is not made. Then there is another class who want mining machinery brought in free for a limited period, machinery of such a class as is not made in Canada. These are the three classes. I could not quite understand what was meant by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara), when he stated that mining machinery could not be taken in there from the east; that an implement, for instance, from Montreal could not be taken into the Kootenay district, because it had to go through American territory, without paying double duty. I think that cannot be so, because we have, just as they have in the United States, arrangements for bonding by which, on their side, articles can be taken from the United States territory through Canadian territory into the United States again, and *vice versa*, without payment of duty. However, these are the conditions of the question. The Government have had them under serious and earnest consideration—we have them under consideration to-day. The duties which are involved, if we were to let mining machinery in free, would be considerable. Although it may be that the Gov-

ernment would have had a right to do that by Order in Council, the matter was so important that, suppose they had decided to take the duty off such machinery, it would scarcely have been wise to do so in view of the fact that Parliament was soon to meet, when the great interests involved in this matter could be taken up and considered by Parliament. It has been announced that the Government intend to make certain tariff changes, and I am in a position to state, as I have stated here, that we are considering this matter with a view to its best possible solution. Under the circumstances, it does not seem necessary to press the matter to a vote. I think my hon. friend who moved the resolution ought to take the assurance that I have given that the Government are carefully considering this matter, and to abide events, at least until the Government's opinion, after mature consideration, is laid before the House, when each hon. member will be at liberty to take such course as he sees fit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If this question was brought under the attention of the House for the first time to-day, there might be some force in a portion of the hon. gentleman's contention, looking at the matter from his own standpoint. But it must be remembered that the Government have had this matter pressed upon them, not once or twice, but three or four times over. They have had ample time to make up their minds on this matter, and they ought to know exactly what they are prepared to do. For my own part, I think the motion of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) is an excellent one, and is conceived in the best interests of the people of this country. There is no one class who deserve more consideration from our hands than the miners of this Dominion, who are attempting to explore and develop the mining resources of Canada. Even in my own locality, although deposits are not as rich as they are in some other portions of this Dominion, I know that enormous inconvenience, enormous delay and enormous mischief has been wrought by, what I do not hesitate to call, the most barbarous policy of the Government in refusing to allow explorers and miners to obtain the use of properly constructed tools. Now, I believe it would be found a matter of considerable difficulty, and a matter of constant dispute, to decide what kinds of machinery can or cannot be profitably manufactured in Canada; nor do I believe that many kinds of machinery for mining purposes can be profitably manufactured in Canada, if manufactured at all; or that it is at all likely, under any circumstances, that mining machinery can be manufactured in Canada at such a cost as to free the miners from a heavy and unnecessary tax if they are compelled to have recourse to our limited market. I say, therefore, that I believe my hon. friend from Prince Edward is moving entirely in the right direction, entirely in the interest of a deserving class in this community, and entirely in the interest of this country, in pressing that all this mining machinery should be admitted free. Further, I think that, as the Government ought to have made up their minds on this question—they have had plenty of time to do it—my hon. friend has nothing to gain by delay in pressing the House to a decision on this motion.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. I am in favor of the most liberal protection being given to manu-

facturers in Canada, but I think this question is open to some exceptions, and this is one of those cases where an exception should be made; and I am, therefore, in favor of the motion of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt). At the same time, after the representations made by the Minister of Finance, I think it advisable that the amendment of the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara) should be adopted now, and I hope that the Government will give their consideration to this motion, and that, without further action on the part of any member of the House, they will be prepared to accede to this request. It is of the greatest importance possible that every encouragement should be given to the development of the industries, mining and otherwise, of British Columbia; and as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis) said, the expenses of transport are alone sufficient against that country. So that I certainly think the duties against all importations there, especially when the articles are for developing the great resources of that country, should be made as light as possible.

Mr. PLATT. Had the hon. the Minister of Finance requested the withdrawal of the motion, or that we should grant an adjournment of the debate without further discussion, upon the ground that he was giving his best and most favorable consideration to the question under discussion, we might have been disposed to grant the request. But he preceded his request by remarks which led me to believe that he is not at all prepared to accept the principle of the resolution. He has told us plainly that he believes the resolution which I have the honor to place before this House will not meet with the approbation of the House and the approbation of the country. If that be his opinion, I cannot reasonably expect that the principle will be embodied in the new Tariff Bill he proposes to bring down; and if he is not yet convinced that the people of the country are willing, for the purpose of encouraging the mining industry of Canada, to admit mining material free of duty for a limited period, if you like, or for any length of time that may be necessary, this House will be failing in its duty if it does not do its utmost to force its opinion upon the Government. The hon. gentleman tells us of various difficulties that stand in the way. We have heard of those difficulties before. They are difficulties which will meet any Government under the circumstances, when they are nursing and cherishing what is known in this country as a protective or National Policy. It is part and parcel of that policy to throw difficulties in the way whenever such questions come before us. The manufacturers, who have had ten years of protection, the hon. gentleman tells us, have arrived at a certain degree of development and prosperity; and it was understood when the policy was adopted that after those industries became established, those other industries which were for the time suffering in consequence of the protection afforded those manufacturers, would in turn receive benefit, and those industries which had been able to get on their legs in this country, would no longer receive the benefit of a protective tariff. Now, mining is an old industry, but as regards its development in this country it is still an infant industry. Manufacturing industries, if they have arrived at the degree of prosperity which the hon. gentleman states they have reached, are no

longer infant industries, and I hold that the mining interests of this country are such that it is the duty of the Government to see that those older industries, so long supported by the policy of protection, should no longer stand in the way of the advancement of the mining industry. I maintain that the resolution I have submitted is one which will meet with the approbation of the country, because our people are becoming alive to the importance of the mining industry. We know that while in the past many mines in Ontario have remained undeveloped, new processes have been introduced which are likely to be brought into use in Ontario for the refining of the magnetic iron ores, the machinery for which will not be manufactured here for many years. We are aware that these new machines are just being manufactured in the United States, and some other countries. Take, for instance, the appliances connected with the Edison process for separating magnetic iron ores, the new inventions for reducing copper and separating the nickel which exists so largely in the ore of the mines about Sudbury, and we find we possess the class of mines which American capitalists are seeking to develop, and which American ingenuity and industry promise to render profitable. We know that for many, many years past, mines like Coe Hill and others of magnetic iron ore, have remained white elephants on the hands of those who thought it was impossible to remove from the ores the sulphur they contain. Mr. Edison has discovered a method by which he is confident this can be done, and he has already selected a site in Trenton, and likewise sites in other places, for the erection of works into which he is willing to put his own money, and he has already made offers to different corporations as to what he is willing to do, and wherever his name is mentioned capital will flow into those enterprises. This is just the time for action, and there should not be a moment's delay in publishing what this country is willing to do on behalf of the mining industry, and the Government will not be justified in pursuing the course indicated by the Minister of Finance in yielding to those difficulties which he says are before his eyes at every turn, and in refusing that for which my motion asks. If the whole concession for which I ask cannot be granted, I hope the request embodied in the amendment will be granted; I will be willing to accept that rather than lose all. I suppose the motion for the adjournment of the debate will be carried. I think, however, as the discussion has aroused so much interest, and has been participated in by members on both sides of the House, I will scarcely be justified in taking the question out of the hands of the House, and I will leave it with the House to decide.

Mr. BARNARD. Considering the discussion which has arisen on the subject, it may not be amiss to refer to the fact that a year or two years ago the Government of British Columbia, in order to stimulate mining industries in the section which I represent, erected works intended as testing works in the district of Cariboo, at a cost of \$15,000 or \$16,000. The Government expended that money itself to assist the mining industry in that district, and to promote the introduction of capital there. They made what I deem to have been a justifiable request on the Dominion Govern-

Mr. PLATT.

ment, namely, that a rebate of duties should be allowed in that case. I believe the matter has not been settled yet, but that a discussion has arisen between the Provincial Government and the Dominion Government as to whether machinery of that class was or was not manufactured in Canada. Unfortunately, the whole works were burned down the other night, immediately after their completion, and I would suggest to the Government, if application is made for a rebate of duty, as the Provincial Government propose to re-erect the works, it should be granted as applicable not only to the machinery in the works destroyed, but also to the new machinery.

Mr. WALDIE. In view of the courtesy which Ministers extend to all delegations that wait upon them, it is only reasonable, I think, that the representatives of the people be permitted to present their views on a vote, and thus assist the Minister of Finance in coming to a decision.

Mr. BLAKE. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment is not in order. It is a motion to adjourn the debate, and is, therefore, a substantive motion and cannot be an emendatory motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is not a substantive motion; it is an amendment to the amendment, and, although improperly worded, it is in order as an amendment; but it ought to read: "That all the words in the main motion and in the amendment be struck out, and the following words substituted therefor." As an amendment I hold that it is in order, while if it were a substantive motion I should have to declare that it is out of order, since it specifies an undetermined time that the debate should be adjourned to; instead of being put as all motions for adjournment, either of the debate or of the House, are, purely and simply, that the debate be adjourned now.

House divided on the amendment to the amendment.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Archibald (Sir Adams),	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Audet,	Lépine,
Bain (Soulanges),	Macdonald (Sir John),
Barnard,	Macdowall,
Bell,	McCulla,
Bergeron,	McDonald (Victoria),
Boisvert,	McDonald (Picton),
Bowell,	McKay,
Brown,	McKeen,
Bryson,	McMillan (Vandreuil),
Cameron,	McNeill,
Cargill,	Madill,
Carling,	Mara,
Carpenter,	Marshall,
Chapleau,	Masson,
Cimon,	Massue,
Cochrane,	Mills (Annapolis),
Cockburn,	Moffat,
Colby,	Montplaisir,
Corby,	O'Brien,
Costigan,	Patterson (Essex),
Coulombe,	Perley,
Curran,	Pope,
Daly,	Porter,
Daoust,	Prior,
Davin,	Putnam,
Davis,	Riopel,
Dawson,	Robillard,
Demison,	Roome,
Desaulniers,	Ross,
Dewdney,	Scarth,
Dickson,	Shanly,
Dickinson,	Skinner,
Dupont,	Small,

Earle
 Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),
 Ferguson (Renfrew),
 Ferguson (Welland),
 Foster,
 Freeman,
 Gordon,
 Grandbois,
 Guillet,
 Haggart,
 Hesson,
 Hickey,
 Hudspeth,
 Jamieson,
 Jones,
 Jones (Digby),
 Kenny,
 Kirkpatrick,
 Landry,
 Langevin (Sir Hector),
 LaRivière,
 Smith (Sir Donald),
 Smith (Ontario),
 Sproule,
 Stevenson,
 Taylor,
 Temple,
 Thérien,
 Thompson (Sir John),
 Tisdale,
 Vanasse,
 Wallace,
 Ward,
 Weldon (Albert),
 White (Cardwell),
 White (Renfrew),
 Wilmot,
 Wilson (Argenteuil),
 Wilson (Lennox),
 Wood (Brookville),
 Wood (Westmoreland).—109.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
 Armstrong,
 Bain (Wentworth),
 Barron,
 Béchard,
 Bernier,
 Blake,
 Borden,
 Bourassa,
 Bowman,
 Brien,
 Burdett,
 Campbell,
 Cartwright (Sir Richard),
 Casey,
 Casgrain,
 Charlton,
 Chouinard,
 Choquette,
 Cook,
 Couture,
 Davies,
 De St. Georges,
 Dessaint,
 Doyon,
 Edwards,
 Eisenhauer,
 Ellis,
 Fiset,
 Fisher,
 Flynn,
 Gauthier,
 Geoffrion,
 Gillmor,
 Godbout,
 Guay,
 Hale,
 Holton,
 Innes,
 Jones (Halifax),
 Kirk,
 Lang,
 Langelier (Quebec),
 Laurier,
 Lavergne,
 Lister,
 Livingstone,
 Lovitt,
 Macdonald (Huron),
 Mackenzie,
 McIntyre,
 McMillan (Huron),
 Meigs,
 Mills (Bothwell),
 Mitchell,
 Mulock,
 Neveu,
 Paterson (Brant),
 Perry,
 Platt,
 Purcell,
 Rinfret,
 Robertson,
 Rowand,
 Ste. Marie,
 Scriver,
 Semple,
 Somerville,
 Sutherland,
 Trow,
 Turcot,
 Waldie,
 Watson,
 Weldon (St. John),
 Welsh,
 Wilson, (Elgin),
 Yeo.—77.

Amendment to the amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. What are the proceedings now?

Mr. SPEAKER. The main motion will be put now as amended.

Mr. BLAKE. I think, Sir, that the only method in which the Speaker can regulate the proceedings is to act on what I understand to be the rule, namely, that a motion to adjourn the debate is a substantive motion, and not an amendment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I observe that in the course of the Pacific Railway debates, a motion was made by the hon. member for Shelburne to the effect "that as an offer for the construction and working of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been received by the Government, this debate be adjourned, in order that the Government may lay said offer on the Table of the House," and that motion was ruled out of order. The Speaker remarked that a motion to adjourn the debate, or a motion to adjourn the House, must be always purely and

simply to that effect. This is not the character of this motion which has just been before us, and it is open to the objection that was then made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, your point of order ought to have been taken before the members were called in. I take it that the expression of the House is: that it is inexpedient to discuss this matter any more for the present. That is the opinion of the House, and, no matter in what form it may appear on the Journals, it is quite clear that we are not going to discuss this question further now. The resolution is, perhaps, a little irregular by using the expression that "the debate be adjourned," but it means that it is inexpedient to discuss this question until the tariff is brought down by the Government. That is the question simply, and I think it ought to be looked on in that light.

Mr. BLAKE. There is the question of the regularity of our proceedings also. The motion which the House has agreed to is a motion to adjourn the debate until a certain time, but by a process of amendment, eliminating necessarily that main motion, which was, after all, the question before the House. That is the inextricable tangle into which, I think, we have gotten, by not observing what I understand to be the rule, and which I ventured to suggest before the division was taken, namely, that a motion to adjourn is of necessity a substantive and not an amendatory motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I suggested, the motion ought to have been written in a different form, and I think if it were to be taken as an amendment it should state that all the words after "That" in the amendment and in the main motion be struck out and the following words substituted therefor: "that this debate (or rather the discussion) on the proposed question of altering the tariff should be adjourned until after the Government submits the proposed changes in the tariff." The question now is, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the main motion as amended.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. That is as we decided it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; I suppose no member will have any objection that this should be worded so that an irregular precedent may not be established.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly, I would like to correct it. That was simply my object.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have put the question as a sub-amendment, and with the consent of the House, if there is no objection the sub-amendment will be worded so as to be entirely within the Rules.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear; that is all I want. It can be made to read that the question of changes in the tariff shall not be discussed; and not that the debate shall be adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER. That, I think, would be the proper motion.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Now that the hon. gentlemen have explained the parliamentary practice, I would like to know the effect of the resolution. Do I understand that these gentlemen from British Columbia, who made these eloquent speeches to show the resources of that Province, and the necessity for free machinery, have really voted against

the introduction of free machinery into this country?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

An hon. MEMBER. Of course they have.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course they have not.

Mr. MULOCK. If this motion is allowed to stand as carried, I would like to know whether the resolution will again appear on the paper, or whether the discussion is killed on this motion or amendment for the Session?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I am right in saying that the question affirmed by the House has been, that instead of pronouncing that the tariff ought to be changed so as to allow mining machinery to be brought into the country free of duty, which was the effect of the main motion as first proposed by the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt), the House has affirmed that it is inexpedient for the present to discuss the matter, until the tariff changes are laid by the Government before the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the House gives a certain discretion to the Clerk of the House and myself, we will see that the motion, as printed in the Journals, will be so arranged as not to conflict with the Rules of the House, or with established precedents.

Mr. BLAKE. And keep the mining machinery out too.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. If it is proposed, Mr. Speaker, that you and the Clerk of the House shall amend the motion so as to conform to the practice of the House, we shall have to conform to that practice by retaining the question on the paper. The only motion that would be regular, would be a motion to adjourn, the effect of which would leave the question still on the paper. Now it is proposed to amend the proceedings so as to make this motion regular, or, in other words, to make the motion read as it ought to have been worded originally: that the debate be adjourned. If that is to appear on the records, then our proceedings should also be corrected, and the motion should be continued on the Order paper.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That was not the question—that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. CASEY. I understand that the effect of this motion as adopted by the House—

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Ferguson of Welland has the next Order of the Day.

Mr. MULOCK. The motion, as amended, has not been put yet.

Mr. SPEAKER. I declared it carried.

MAIL SERVICE, COUNTY OF MEGANTIC.

Mr. RINFRET (Translation) moved for :

Copies of all petitions and correspondence respecting the change made in the carrying of the mail from Craig's Road Station, on the Grand Trunk Railway, to Leeds, County of Megantic; also of all petitions and correspondence respecting the carrying of the mail from Jiggin's Post Office to Wilson's Mills, Lower Leeds, County of Megantic.

He said: In making this motion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Government upon the

Mr. MITCHELL.

change which has been made in the carrying of the mail between the parish of Saint-Sylvestre, in the County of Lotbinière, and Leeds, in the County of Megantic. Formerly, the mails were sent directly from Craig's Road Station, on the Grand Trunk Railway, to Leeds through Saint-Sylvestre. Last summer, through a certain arrangement made by the Post Office Department, the Wilson Mills' Post Office secured a daily mail, instead of a tri-weekly mail which they had before, but, at the same time, it was decided to do away with the carrying of the mails between Saint-Sylvestre and Wilson Mills' Post Office. Several of the voters of Saint-Sylvestre wrote to me, complaining about this arrangement. The upshot of their complaint is that by giving a daily mail to Wilson Mills, two or three families are favored against some twenty-five families settled on Craig's Road, in the parish of Saint-Sylvestre. I should like to obtain copies of the petitions, of the correspondence with the Government, and also, of the reports of the Post Office Inspector, so as to be acquainted with the two sides of the question. I understand, however, by the information I have received and which, I have every reason to believe, are well founded, that an injustice has been done to the voters of the parish of Saint-Sylvestre, for these informations were furnished to me by wholly reliable persons. I myself have conferred about the matter with the honorable the Postmaster General, who said to me that, unfortunately, he could not comply with the requests made to him. I think it would be but fair to have a new investigation made, and I am quite sure that should this investigation take place, justice would be done to the electors of Saint-Sylvestre, as it would show that their complaints are well founded. The carrying of the mails between the two post offices I have just mentioned, had given general satisfaction for over sixty years, and I think the Government ought not to have done away with it without very serious reasons. In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I once more ask that the Postmaster General should order a new investigation, and I think the electors will never be satisfied until they get it.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no objection to bringing down the papers the hon. gentleman moves for. There was a petition, as he states, against the proposed change. The inspector reported in favor of the present mode of carrying the mails. There was a counter-petition sent in, stating that the present mode was not satisfactory, and that the old system was the best. The question was again referred to the inspector, and he reports that the present system is the best for the locality; it gets a daily mail now instead of a tri-weekly mail which it had before, and the cost to the Department is only \$100 against the previous cost of \$125.

Motion agreed to.

FRAUDS IN THE SALE OF CEREALS.

On the order (Mr. Burdett) for Committee of the Whole :

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to prevent frauds in the sale of cereals and seed grains.

Mr. BURDETT. The hon. Minister of Justice has kindly consented to allow my Bill to be con-

sidered as part of Bill No. 65 to amend the Criminal Law. Therefore, my motion will drop.

Motion dropped.

RETURN ORDERED.

Statement showing the number of Government wharves, piers and breakwaters repaired in Prince Edward Island during the year 1889, the amount expended on each of said wharves, piers and breakwaters.—(Mr. Perry.)

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Northern and Western Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The Canada Eastern Railway Company."—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 26) relating to the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Hereford Railway Company.—(Mr. Ives.)

Bill (No. 25) respecting the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company (Limited).—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 56) to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1889, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Erie and Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Lister.)

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wilson (Elgin):

That, in the opinion of this House, the Electoral Franchise Act ought to be repealed, and that it is preferable to revert to the plan of utilising for the elections of this House, the Provincial Franchises and Voters' Lists.

Mr. TROW. When the House discussed this subject the other day, I moved the adjournment of the debate for the express purpose of allowing other members to speak on this question, who were not in the House at the time, and who were anxious to do so. No matter how long this discussion is carried on, I do not know that it will bear fruit. The First Minister is wedded to this idol, and has been so since Confederation. He had brought this measure down Session after Session, and on several occasions it was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. We had been so accustomed to hear the First Minister mentioning this Franchise Bill that when it was brought down in 1885 we never for a moment supposed that it was his intention to push that measure through during the Session for various reasons. One was that the House had already been in session seventy-eight or eighty days, about the length of an ordinary Session, before the Bill was brought down. Another reason was that

when this Bill was introduced—and the First Minister, I must say, as a rule, is generally very clear in pointing out to the House what he intends to promote—but on this occasion the Bill was introduced in a very crude state, and the First Minister only occupied seven or eight minutes in explaining to the House its numerous clauses. However, I have no faith that our discussion will be of much avail, for the simple reason, and as I said before, that the First Minister is so wedded to this idol. I, for one, could never see the propriety of putting the Dominion to the expense of getting up a voters' list. Hitherto the voters' lists had been prepared by the municipal authorities of the various Provinces, who were sworn to do their duty, and who did it free of expense to the Dominion. I have never heard any complaint of that system; there was never any petition presented to this House against it, either from individuals or from any of the Provinces. There was no necessity for any measure passing this House so objectionable to all the members as was that Bill—I say all the members, because I never met a Conservative, in the House or out of the House, that approved of that measure. I have conversed with many men in my own riding who have enjoyed a party advantage from that Bill, because when the first division took place I know that I was placed at a disadvantage. In my riding a good many men voted against me on the first revision, for the simple reason that I did not attend to the list, and others neglected to do so in my interest. What aroused my friends more than anything else, when the last revision took place, was the fact that the leading Conservative organ in my riding came out with a paragraph stating that my opponent had been over the county, and that he had taken from the roll or added thereon no less than 1,200 names. This was a serious affair in my riding, and of course it aroused my friends, and we went to work and went through the riding, and tried to remedy this as much as we possibly could. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) says that this Act is an inexpensive affair, and that to arrange the voters' lists in the various ridings costs scarcely nothing, that the candidates have no reason to complain, because the expense is so trifling. He stated that he had attended the revising barristers' court all over the riding, and the expenditure was about a quarter of a dollar a day, the price of his dinner. Well, so far as my friends and myself are concerned, we are in the habit of eating three meals a day, and I know this Act is expensive, not only to Reformers, but to the candidates as well, and, at all events, we know that it costs the country at large \$400,000 a year. Now, why should we submit to such an unnecessary expenditure? Why should there be 200 revising barristers appointed, and why should there be 200 clerks and 200 bailiffs—about 600 officers—for no earthly purpose but to gratify the hon. First Minister? If it had not been for the determined opposition, day after day, and week after week, of the Liberal party in this House, that measure, in the crude state in which it was introduced, would have placed the whole vote of the country in the hands of the Conservative party. I am sorry to say that the hon. First Minister, whenever a general election takes place, tries to place the Reformers at a disadvantage. We can recollect the time when money was

the means used to influence an election. Then we find the next general election that the National Policy was devised for the same purpose, and it drew to the Conservative party some of the best manufacturers of the country who had previously voted in the Reform interest, but who afterwards, from purely selfish motives, supported the Conservative party, and have since kept them in power. The next plan adopted was to carve up the constituencies of Ontario. What has taken place between here and Kingston? The Reformers should at least have 14 members out of 30, but after the cutting and carving the Reformers have 3 members and the Conservatives 27. Is that the proper way to face the electors of the country? This Franchise Bill was more corrupt even than the Gerrymander Bill itself. Had it passed as it was first introduced, and had not the Opposition made such determined efforts to purify it, because they did so and the First Minister yielded to some extent and the most objectionable clauses were removed, the Bill would have been still more objectionable. It is imperfect now, for the simple reason that, after a member has been obliged to absent himself from his ordinary avocations during three or four months in each year to attend Parliament, he is compelled to lose two or three months more, in order to perfect the roll. And yet the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) says it costs nothing. I know it costs him nothing; I believe he is telling the truth, because his riding was made purposely for a Conservative when it was gerrymandered. He has a nice Conservative riding in which no Grit need appear as candidate. The result was that no effort was made by the Reformers to change a single name on the list, and it is a question in my mind whether there was any change made in the lists, for the revising officer held two or three courts in his riding in one day. It was merely a walk over the course in North Perth; and yet, the hon. gentleman says this Act costs nothing. Others do not occupy such a position. When my riding was gerrymandered, I was two hundred votes in the minority when I started on the contest. I had something to do, and my friends had work to do, and I have had something to do at every general election since. I have to see that every elector is placed on the roll, but I fail to get them all there, because the Conservative party appoints the revising barrister, and they are naturally anxious to euchre me on every possible occasion. In my opinion there is no necessity for incurring such an expense as is involved by the Franchise Act. The country is woefully in debt. Then, why spend \$200,000 or \$300,000 yearly? The Secretary of State says it will not prove so expensive in the future as it has in the past, and he adds, that there is no necessity to have the lists made annually. How does the hon. gentleman propose to guard himself against a bye-election? Will he disqualify and deprive electors of the rights of the franchise? That is the only alternative open to him unless the lists are made up yearly, as the changes in the riding are very considerable. The changes from the first revision of the lists number hundreds of thousands of voters over the Dominion. Young men come of age, persons remove from the riding, remove from one township to another, and continually changes are going on; and unless the list is made up annually, it is utterly impossible to have a correct one. Why cannot

Mr. Trow.

this work be carried out, as formerly, by municipal officials sworn to do their duty? There is an assessor sworn to assess justly and honestly. He knows every man in the riding, he sees them daily, and he is, moreover, watched. After he has returned the roll, it is revised by the Revision Court of each municipality. As a rule, these municipal officers represent both sides of politics, and no one in any township with which I am acquainted, dare place upon the roll any man not entitled to be there, or remove improperly any name from the roll. The result is, that our lists formerly were perfect. How can we expect the lists to be perfect to-day? They are made up hundreds and in some cases thousands of miles from the locality, and a typographical error in the Ottawa printing office may prove a serious matter. Printers may unintentionally make a mistake. I observe in the leading Conservative journal in Toronto, the *Empire*, an article discussing the election in Haldimand; it states that the revising officer left off the list a number of names, and then it proceeds to tone down the statement by remarking that of these as many were Conservatives as Reformers. What right had the revising officer to leave any names off the lists? Why should these men be deprived of their votes merely because that official did not do his duty? The *Toronto World* condemns the list, and approves of the resolution of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Wilson). In the interests of the country and of this House, the present system should certainly be wiped out. Let us go to the country and have a fair fight. I have no doubt the First Minister will hatch something for the next general election. We do not know but that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is in collusion with him. How do we know what scheme may be submitted to the community at the next general election? There is certainly something to be hatched, and if the First Minister were to be transported to the Windward Islands, or elsewhere, the Conservative party would be like a rope of sand and become demoralised within twelve months. The manner in which the First Minister keeps his party together is by adopting some new scheme for the next general election. What it will be, of course, we do not know; but every election there is a move made by which the Reform party is taken at a disadvantage. Why not have a free and independent fight? Let us go before the country and let the people decide. Why tie the hands of your opponents behind them, and then say it is a fair battle. The First Minister should come down and yield to the wishes of the people; and I am satisfied that if a secret vote were taken not five members on the other side of the House would vote against the motion of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson).

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will permit me to make some remarks on the subject which is now before the House. The Act upon which we are called to vote has been characterised in many ways. Some have called it odious, others arbitrary, I shall side with the latter expression. In my opinion, this Act is one of the most arbitrary that any Legislature has yet dared to pass in any Parliament. In fact, it is a means like any other of depriving the people of Canada of their free will by preventing them from voting according to their wishes. The Government,

by causing such a law to be voted has imposed considerable expenses upon its opponents. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to take the county of Rimouski as an instance. I have the honor to represent an immense county; the county of Rimouski is one of the largest in the Province of Quebec; it numbers 32 parishes. To make the revision of the lists in the county, requires at least 32 days, or rather 64 days, including the final revision. Now, the opponent of the Government, if he wishes that the revision should be well done, should first devote at least one day to a parish to prove those who have a right to vote and those who have no right to do so. I say one day for a parish, and that is the least that it can take. What are the expenses of the revision for these 32 parishes? He must devote two days to a parish, for he must accompany the revisor at the time of his first visit, and afterwards, at the time of the final revision. In a county like that of Rimouski, let us put the expenses at \$5 per day. We consequently arrive at the sum of \$160 of expenses imposed upon the opponent of the Government if he wishes that the lists should be proved a little in his favor. Add to this, Mr. Speaker, the loss of time to a professional man, as are the greater part of the members of this House, for him whose livelihood depends upon his profession, is it possible for him to give up the practice of his profession during two or three months of the year, when he has already spent two or three months' time sitting in this House? Still another expense the Government imposes on its opponents: the law requires that if we desire to take any names off the lists, we should be obliged to notify those whose names we desire to take off as not having any right to vote. Well! Let us suppose that in a county of from 5,000 to 6,000 voters, we notify 250 to 300 persons by registered letters, here is an outlay of \$25 or \$30 imposed upon the opponent of the Government, for it is well known that the Government having appointed its officer, the latter will be very much inclined, notwithstanding his good intentions and his honesty, to give fair play to the Government sooner than to its opponent. Add, besides, what it costs for certificates of baptism, in order to prove who among the farmer's sons are of an age to vote. This expense is also pretty large. A copy of each certificate costs from 20 to 25 cents. But this is not all, Mr. Speaker. In the county of Rimouski, do you know what happened? We notified people by registered letters. Well! these letters were returned to the Dead Letter Office, and here are eleven of them, which I am holding in my hand at this moment, all registered letters. Will they tell me that, again, in this circumstance, we have had fair play? No, Mr. Speaker. There is still something more, and upon this circumstance I shall take the liberty to call the special attention of the hon. Minister of Justice. Here is a list of 50 electors; they are employés of the Intercolonial. I do not wish that these people should be deprived of their votes, but am I to be told that it is just and reasonable that the law should allow them to vote in two or even three counties? I do not believe that such is the intention of the law. Nevertheless, these people have registered their names, some at Point Lévis, others at Rivière du Loup or at Ste. Flavie, and even at Campbellton; in four different divisions. Here are 34 who reside at Rivière du Loup, in the county of Temiscouata.

and at the same time have had themselves registered at Ste. Flavie. Therefore these people, who earn a salary of \$450, \$500 or \$600, have right to vote in two counties. Would it not be easy for us, who are well worth \$600, to go and vote in two counties? Is it because these people are the employés of the Government that they are going to have a right to vote in two counties? Is it because they travel upon the Intercolonial that they have the right to vote in two counties? I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is the intention of the law. They have been contested before the court, and they have been kept on the lists because it is not known where their home is. Consequently, at the next election these people will vote at Rivière du Loup, or at Ste. Flavie, and should time permit—and, of course, there will be a disposition to place a special train at their service—they will go and vote at Campbellton. Here are 16 others who reside or are looked upon as residing at Campbellton. They come to spend a day, or a night, or sometimes two days at Ste. Flavie, and for that they have been entered upon the lists at Ste. Flavie. Is that the intention of the law? I do not believe it is, and I believe that by drawing the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to this fact—and I also call to it the attention of our hon. leader—we shall see this great injustice done away with. But mark well that this question having been brought before the courts, has unfortunately been decided against us. I shall say no more about this, only that I should cause it to be observed that this is repeated every year. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, it can be seen that the length of time required for the revision of the lists is almost incredible. Thus, we began the revision of the lists in the month of June last; we are now almost in the month of March, and we have not got them yet. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for having been so good as to give me your attention during the few observations I had to make; but I hope that when the people shall have an opportunity of speaking out their mind about this law, they will come as we have had to come, to disapprove of it.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Before the House comes to a vote upon this question, permit me, Mr. Speaker, to make a very few observations. There is no doubt that the Franchise Act, which, like any other piece of legislation, ought to have been enacted for the advantage of the people, has not met with general approbation, and to say that it is popular in the country would be encroaching a little too much upon the truth. The Liberals to a man execrate it, and you will admit, Sir, that they form a considerable portion of the Dominion—about one-half of the whole people.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). And three-fourths of the honest people.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Not only that, but I have good reason to believe that a large portion of the Conservatives do not like it. They would not proclaim their dislike from the hustings lest it would hurt the interests of their party; but in private conversation from man to man, they admit that it is a piece of legislation which was unnecessary, expensive, and which imposes useless burdens on the country. My hon. friend, the Secretary of State, told the House the other day, that a great reduction had been made upon the cost of the

last revision of the voters' lists as compared with the first revision, which took place in 1886. He told us that the first revision cost the country from \$400,000 to \$500,000, and that the last revision cost only something like \$151,000.

Mr. HOLTON. That was only for the printing.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I am reminded that this will cover only the expense of the printing of the lists. The Secretary of State further added that he hoped he would be able to bring about a still greater reduction in the future. Well, suppose he does; suppose that the whole thing could be done for \$100,000 a year, I say that it is still too much, for \$100,000 is a considerable sum of money. It is a useless expenditure, and when it is spent for such an object, which can give no satisfaction to the people, it is nothing else than money wasted. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have told us that this Franchise Act has been approved by the people, because they say that at the last general election the right hon. the Premier was supported at the head of the Government. I do not hold that opinion, for I believe that at the last general election the electors of the country forgave the right hon. gentleman for this new political sin, as they have been in the habit of forgiving him many other sins which he committed during his political career. They supported the right hon. gentleman for the great services which they thought he had rendered this country in the past, and his success was due to his own personal prestige more than to anything else. It is well known that he is himself the embodiment of that party, and that if he should disappear from the political scene the party would have to be reorganised upon another basis, and we would soon see gentlemen now occupying the Treasury benches sitting on the Opposition benches. The preparation of the voters' lists is a work which, as every one knows, causes a great deal of trouble, and a great deal of expense and loss of time, to a certain number of people. It is impossible for the revising officer of a district alone to complete the lists. I do not insinuate, or make any complaint against the preparation of the lists in the county which I represent, for the revising officer there, I am pleased to say, is an honest man, and one who would not willingly do the least injustice to any person. Notwithstanding his good-will, his honesty, and his good intentions, it is impossible for him to prepare the voters' lists without the assistance of other persons. How could he find the names of persons who died since the previous revision, or of those who have left the county; how could he add to the list the names of newcomers, and of young men who have come of age during the intervening period? unless the information is given him by persons who interest themselves in the preparation of the lists. We all know that when the time comes for the revision of these lists that both political parties have to keep representatives there in order to see that the name of no one of their friends be omitted, and to see also that no name of an opponent who is not qualified to vote be placed upon the list. This work is exceedingly annoying, troublesome, and expensive, and some other scheme ought to be resorted to. The motion which is before the House proposes the adoption of the Provincial lists which are prepared for the election of members to the Local Legislature. I think, Sir, that experience

Mr. BÉCHARD.

has taught us that this is the best scheme we can adopt, and that municipal councillors are the best qualified persons to prepare the voters' lists. They generally live in the different sections of the municipality and each one knows perfectly well the persons who died in his section, those who have absented themselves, the names of the newcomers, as well as the names of the young men who have become of age and are entitled to vote. I think that this is the most simple manner in which the work of preparing the lists could be done. From 1867 to 1885 we had five general elections in this country, and at every one of these elections we used the Provincial lists. No one has ever complained of this. Not a voice was raised against the use of these lists, and not a single petition—at least to my knowledge—has been presented to this House asking for a change. On the other hand, since the adoption of the present Franchise Act, every time the lists have been prepared there have been complaints, and in this Parliament there have been protests against it Session after Session. Some hon. gentlemen object to the use of the Provincial lists, on the ground that Provincial Governments might disfranchise a part of the electors; such, they say, as Mr. Mercier has done in disfranchising officials of the Federal Government in the Province of Quebec. I am not prepared to say whether Mr. Mercier was right or wrong in disfranchising some Government officials. I do not know the reason which impelled him to do so, but I can believe that he had a good one. Mr. Mercier, as well as anybody else, knew, I suppose, that in election times great pressure is brought to bear on Government officials, and that although they are told that they may vote freely as they please, yet this is communicated to them in such a way as to let them understand at the same time that if they do not vote for the Federal Government candidates they will run the risk of losing their positions. Mr. Mercier, believing that the right to vote should belong only to free men, and knowing that in many cases Government officials are treated like slaves, considered that that right should not belong to them. I repeat, that I am not prepared to say whether he was right or wrong; that is a subject which requires a good deal of consideration; but I have this to say, that if we want Government officials to vote at elections, they should be protected against the pressure of those who employ them, and should be left perfectly free to vote like men, without running any risk of losing their places if they do not vote according to the wishes of their superior officers. Now, Sir, the assumption that Provincial Governments might disfranchise a part of the electors is, I think, groundless. I do not see what interest the Provincial Governments would have in disfranchising a part of the electors. The lists would be revised every year by the municipal councils. Then, suppose for one moment that for some exceptional reason the Provincial Government should disfranchise the electors of one municipality, these electors would be disfranchised only so far as the local elections would be concerned, and would not be affected as to their rights in the elections of members of this House. Therefore, I say that the use of our Provincial lists for the election of members to this House could not in any way affect the interests or the integrity of this House. For instance, the Prov-

ince of Quebec is entitled to sixty-five representatives in this House of Commons. Well, let Quebec elect them under the franchise established by the Local Government. What does it matter to me that Prince Edward Island elects the six members to whom that Province is entitled in this House, by manhood suffrage or by a franchise based on property qualification? All that this House has to do is to see that Quebec sends only sixty-five representatives here, and that Prince Edward Island sends only six, without considering under what franchise they were elected. Now, Sir, we were told the other day by the hon. Secretary of State that when we used the Provincial lists for the election of members to this House, it happened in some municipalities that electors voted on old lists which had not been revised for a couple of years. That is quite true; but, Sir, that was the exception and not the rule. For several years more attention has been given in the different municipalities to the preparation of the lists every year. But even suppose it should be the case, as the hon. Secretary of State says, in a few municipalities; things would not be in a worse condition than they have been and will continue to be with the lists prepared under the Dominion Franchise Act, because we are told that those lists will only be revised every two or three years. Suppose that some consideration of the public interest had induced the Government last summer to dissolve Parliament and have a general election, the electors would have been compelled to vote on a list which had been prepared three years before; and this would not have been the exception, but it would have been the rule throughout the whole Dominion. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Public Works, the other day, told us that this Franchise Act is the basis of our existence. Sir, I will take the liberty of dissenting from that opinion. From 1867 to 1885 we existed without this Franchise Act, and during that period we accomplished a great many things. We displayed sufficient vigor to spend a great deal of money; we organised all the Departments of this Government; we executed great public works; we improved our internal navigation; we constructed the Intercolonial Railway; we also constructed that gigantic work the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think these achievements are sufficient to show that we have had a vigorous life without the existence of the present Franchise Act. No, Sir; the basis of our existence, in my humble judgment, lies in a full and honest application of the federal principle in the management of our political system. In a country like Canada, where we have a population composed of different races, speaking different languages, professing different creeds, and having different habits, there is but one way of maintaining among the various sections of our people a common interest, a bond of union, a feeling of brotherhood—in a word, a love of country—and that is, by upholding a political system which will give sufficient protection to every section of the people. That system, Sir, is the federal system; and I hold that the best friends of this country will be found among those who endeavor to apply in all its fulness the federal principle to the administration of our public affairs, whilst those who would centralise the administration of our affairs in Ottawa will soon find that their work has been productive of deplorable results. If we are going to gradually encroach upon

the jurisdiction of the Local Governments in questions which legitimately belong to their domain, we will open the door to discontent, disturbance and perhaps, in the end, disunion. I repeat that the best way to keep this country in peace and to shut the door to any cause of disturbance is to uphold as much as possible the federal principle; but if the Government are determined to keep control over the preparation of voters' lists for the election of members to this House, they should resort to some way of amending the present law in order to render the preparation of those lists more simple and easy. I know that expression has been given to the opinion that the adoption of manhood suffrage would greatly simplify the preparation of the lists. I concur in the opinion that it would, but, on the other hand, I do not think that this principle would meet with general favor in this House. I know that hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches, as well as the leader of the Opposition, are hostile to that proposition; and I venture to say that the elections which have just taken place in the German Empire and have resulted in great gains to the Socialists are not perhaps calculated to create a feeling of sympathy with universal suffrage. I believe, however, that the objections which militate against that principle in the old European societies do not exist on the young Continent of America, and it is my humble opinion that before long that principle will rule from one end of America to the other. I believe that even in our country the next generation will tolerate no other suffrage; but, be that as it may, I am free to say that though I have always admired the principle of manhood suffrage, yet I would not like to see its application here on account of the electoral corruption to which it generally gives rise. In conclusion, I think that the Government could do no better than do away with the present Franchise Act and adopt for the election of members to this House the provincial lists. Let our lists be made according to the franchises which the people of the different Provinces choose, whether manhood suffrage or suffrage based on the ownership of property. This is a question which ought to be settled by the Provincial Governments, as they are best fitted to know the franchises most in harmony with the education, the instincts, and the tendencies of the people.

Mr. BRIEN. I had not the honor of a seat in this House during the memorable debate in 1885, when this abominable legislation was placed on our Statute-book. I believe that the resolution now before the House, proposed by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), is one which voices the sentiment of nine-tenths of the people of this country, as well as nine-tenths of the members of this House, if the latter could free themselves from their party ties. I believe this specially to be the case under present circumstances, when our general interests, both agricultural and manufacturing, are in a depressed condition. One of the strongest objections against this Act is the large expenditure it creates. We, who have had experience in assisting at the revision of these lists, know too well how heavy the expenditure is, and can speak with no uncertain sound. In the constituency I have the honor to represent, the first revision alone cost

the Reform party the sum of \$700, and I presume it cost our opponents as much, making a total of \$1,400 for one constituency. This system has cost the country directly through the Government, \$420,000, as shown by the Public Accounts, and if we add to that the cash outlay in the constituencies, taking South Essex as an average, that outlay, amounting to \$300,000 in all, would make a total of \$720,000. But that is not all, for there is the additional expense to the voters in attending the revision of the lists, in order to see that justice is done. I am positive that, altogether, the Act does not cost the country less than \$1,000,000 a year. Besides this, I believe that the sentiment of the country at present is in favor of a more liberal franchise than is given under this Act. It is to be regretted that the right hon. gentleman, in introducing this measure, did not more thoroughly explain it, for if it were intended that industrious citizens, as hon. gentlemen opposite represent, should all have a vote, that intention has not been carried out, for to-day, when wages are in a depressed condition, every industrious man has not a vote and cannot obtain it. In looking over the report of the Bureau of Industries of Ontario, I find that the wages of farm laborers, who are hired by the year with board, are \$157, and without board, \$250. This shows distinctly that there is a very large class of useful, industrious and intelligent citizens who are deprived of the franchise, owing to the franchise income being more than they can earn. Besides, the law is very disagreeable in its application, inasmuch as it demands an investigation into the private affairs of individuals in order to ascertain the ownership of land or property of any kind, and when all this is done, there are many who are deprived of voting, owing to the impossibility of their earning the amount prescribed by this Act, namely, \$300. Hon. gentlemen in this House will readily understand how difficult it may be for laboring men or any other class to figure up and retain in their minds the exact amount they earn. I have seen men placed on the stand for an hour, trying their best to figure up the amount, which it was impossible for them to entirely recollect. Under the provincial law, in 1886, the income of wage-earners required was \$250, and non-residents were not given a vote. "One man, one vote," was the principle, which I think is a good one; but, even after deducting the number of non-residents, there is a larger number on these lists than appears on the federal lists. As has been frequently stated in this House, we also think it is a violation of the federal principle. We think this right should have been left to the Provinces entirely. There may not be in our Constitution so much objection to the Federal Government taking the power to make that list if they see fit, but I think it is only a power which should be considered a reserved power, and should be used only in case of an emergency. The strength of a Government does not particularly depend upon the possession of power, but upon judicious and wise administration. I am somewhat surprised to listen to the arguments of hon. members opposite, who speak as though the Provinces had some evil design or some revenge to seek upon the Federal Government. The absurdity of that argument is manifest when we consider how Confederation was brought about in the first place. Is not the Federal Government the offspring of the Provinces? Then, if this child has proved a wise and good child, there

Mr. BRIEN.

is no danger of the Provinces desiring to weaken the Federal Government in any way. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) said, the other night, that he would be willing to keep this measure on the Statute-book even if it cost twice as much as it has. I wonder if the hon. gentleman will be willing to do so; it will cost, at that rate, as I think I have proved, two million dollars for every revision, which would be ten million dollars for every Parliament. I think that is more than this country is able to bear. With all the oratory and all the argumentative power of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, they have not shown a single argument for the existence of this statute which is tenable in any way at all. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) also seemed to desire to attribute the national sentiment that should exist in this country to such legislation as this Franchise Bill. If the national sentiment of this country depends upon such legislation as this, God help the national sentiment, for I am sure it is not based on a very sound foundation. Another strong reason why this resolution should carry is that the Provincial Government have to deal with the everyday matters of the people, they are more in touch with the people, they understand more thoroughly the wishes, sentiments and desires of the people. No stronger proof of this can be shown than the fact that nearly all the Provincial Governments are to-day Liberal. This Act is like most of the enactments of a Tory character—retrograde—and I hope the House to-night will adopt the motion of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), and will remove this mark of Cain from the Statute-book forever.

Mr. DAWSON. I desire to say only a very few words in regard to this matter. In the first place, the Dominion Franchise Act is very generally objected to by hon. gentlemen on the other side. I do not object to it, for, defective as it may be, and it is impossible for anyone to say it is perfect, though it has been very much improved, still, I say the Ontario Elections Act is a great deal worse, even in the very features in which it is claimed that the Dominion Act is so bad.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In what way?

Mr. DAWSON. That is as regards my district. The difficulty there is to get the voters' names on the list, and even now that they have adopted manhood suffrage in Ontario, the assessors, either through misfortune or neglect—I would be sorry to say through intention—have left off a great many names, and on one occasion, when the matter was brought before the judge, he reprimanded them very sternly on that account. But there are many other objections to the Ontario Elections Act which I shall allude to presently. No new measure, when brought forward at first, can be expected to work very smoothly, and every great measure is susceptible of improvement. No doubt this Dominion Franchise Act is susceptible of amendment, and I think it might be very greatly improved in my district by diminishing the size of the polling districts, which, in order to meet, in some measure, the conditions of the Act as to the population required, are now made much too large. Generally speaking, they are much larger than ordinary election districts in Ontario. Some of them are more than 100 miles in length from east to west

or from north to south, and it is very difficult to get the voters to the polls; the Ontario law is equally defective. The same difficulty is experienced under the Ontario system, and the difficulties arise as much from the nature of the country as from anything else. In such a district I believe the only true system is household suffrage. Another objection to the Ontario franchise is that the secrecy of the ballot is not sufficiently provided for. The ballot has been adopted as a principle in the election of members for the Dominion and in all the Provinces of the Dominion, but the Ontario Act is so framed that the secrecy of the ballot is not regarded. When voters come to the polls, they know it can be found out how they vote, and there thus exists a means of exercising influence over them in certain cases, and this is very objectionable. I believe that the Act will be amended during the present Session of the Ontario Legislature; at present sufficient secrecy is not attached to the ballot under the law of that Province. Then, in reference to this question of manhood suffrage which has been spoken of by several hon. gentlemen, I do not think that, if it were properly explained to the people of Ontario, in respect to its nature and in regard to what it leads to, it would be popular. Take, for instance, a district in which there are five thousand electors. They possess the land, they are the owners of that district, they look upon it as being theirs, and they look to their children inheriting it after they are gone. Tell these five thousand electors, and make it perfectly plain and palpable to them, that five thousand navvies in some large city, men who have newly come to the country, who have been here only a sufficient time to entitle them to manhood suffrage, men who have nothing at stake, who have no interest in the country, will have as much to say in the legislation of the country as they themselves would. When put clearly in view before the electors I think they will be very unlikely to approve of it, and manhood suffrage would not be very popular among them. Now, with regard to the revising barristers, I would be sorry to believe that they could be at all tampered with in any part of the Dominion; at all events in the district which I have the honor to represent, the breath of suspicion has not even attached to them from either side. There are two revising barristers in Algoma, one in the western part of the district and one in the eastern part; one of them, I believe, formerly belonged to one stripe of politics, and the other to the other stripe; but in neither case has it ever been for a moment suggested that they were capable of being influenced either one way or the other. They have acted with the strictest impartiality, and no one has even called their integrity in question. They have certainly very arduous duties to perform in such an enormous district, a district 1,100 miles in length and 700 in width, and with settlements scattered among islands. It is very difficult for them to get over it, and no doubt, notwithstanding their exertions of last summer, a good many names have been left off the list. But that is also the case with the Ontario lists, and it arises from the necessities of the case. They cannot avoid it. In that vast district the population has been increasing very much of late years. It is now—I mean the district—divided by the Government of Ontario into no less than four judicial districts;

the district of Rainy River on the west, which is of itself a vast territory; the district of Thunder Bay, the district of Eastern Algoma, and the district of Manitoulin; all of them very large, and all of them now very populous districts. They still have only one representative in this House, but they have two representatives in the Local Legislature, and I hope the day is not far distant when they may have two or three or more representatives in this Parliament. I mention these things in order to show that an immense labor is thrown upon the revising barristers. We hear a great deal of the exodus, and of people leaving the country and never returning to it. That is a thing, Sir, which, in the district I have the honor to represent, we do not hear spoken of.

Mr. McMULLEN. Because they cannot get out of it.

Mr. DAWSON. They are coming in every day and the population is increasing every summer. Fifteen years ago the white population in that district was under 5,000 souls; now we have a population exceeding 70,000, according to the best estimates that can be given. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot point to any exodus from that district. They talk about our population going to Dakota and the Western States, but I am happy to be able to assure this House that many very substantial settlers from Ontario and elsewhere are spreading over Algoma, attracted to it by the lumber trade, attracted there by the mining, and attracted by the fisheries, which are now becoming very extensive. I will mention one fact which may astonish the members of this House. Some years ago, when I was speaking of the great lakes, I suggested that the day was, perhaps, not far distant when the shipping passing through by Sault Ste. Marie would probably equal that of the Suez Canal. Well, Sir, I am now in a position to inform this House that during the past summer, in the short period of six months, a greater amount of shipping passed through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal than ever passed through the great Suez Canal in one year. The shipping passing through the Sault Ste. Marie last summer amounted to 7,500,000 tons, and the Suez Canal has never reached that amount of actual net tonnage.

An hon. MEMBER. Speak of the Franchise Bill.

Mr. DAWSON. The Franchise Bill covers the District of Algoma; and, I think, the information I am giving is of interest to the House. In another part of the district a large fleet of vessels will be found in an inland lake; we have now twenty-two steamers plying on that little inland sea, the Lake of the Woods. Sir, I merely rose to express my faith in the Franchise Act. I believe the Franchise Act is susceptible of improvement; that it will be amended from year to year. We must give our friends of the Opposition great credit for helping to improve it; and, I think, it is susceptible of being made a very good Act. I hope the time will come when we shall see a uniform Dominion franchise—the same franchise in Prince Edward Island that we have in Ontario, and the same franchise in British Columbia that we have in Manitoba.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before this question is put on this matter, I desire

to make some remarks with respect to this electoral law and to enter my protest against it. I am the more warranted to do so, as this law was discussed on all the hustings, in all the public meetings, at the time of the last election, and as my opponent, who was one of the supporters of this measure—which has been very severely criticised up to the present time—was not accepted by the constituency, I pledged myself to make every effort to cause it to be repealed. I am opposed to this Act because I consider it was passed for political purposes, and it would be more courageous of the Government, should they take the responsibility of it and state that this Act was passed in order to keep them in power, and that they desire it to be kept in our Statute-book, in order to preserve themselves in power. I must state at once, Mr. Speaker, that I am not opposed to the principle of this law, so far as it extends the franchise, and the best proof I can give of this, is that, at the beginning of the Session, I placed on the Order paper a Bill for the purpose of causing the franchise to be still further extended, that is to say, to give the right of vote to farmers' sons who absent themselves during six months of the year, to students and to fishermen. We know that, according to the law such as it existed before last year, these people could absent themselves without using their right of vote, but I believe that through inadvertence, clause 7 of the statute was repealed, and they are now deprived of their vote. As I desire that all these people, who side, I state it with pleasure, with the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec and even in the Dominion of Canada, should have a right to vote; I say that I am in favor of the principle of this Bill, inasmuch as it extends the franchise, but I am opposed to this Act, because it is too expensive and because it is impossible to put it into force. I say, moreover, that this Act was passed for purely political purposes, and the best illustration I can give of this and the best proof that it was especially put into the Statute-book in order to the control of the Dominion elections, is that the most devoted leaders of the Conservative party were appointed in all the counties to administer it; and when the Conservative leaders were too honest, leaders disqualified for fraudulent electoral practices were appointed. In my county there were two men disqualified for fraudulent electoral practices. Well, of these two men, one was the Conservative candidate, and the other the revising officer during the last election. The Government cannot plead ignorance of the fact that their revising officer was condemned by the courts for fraudulent electoral practices, for during the very first Session I had the honor to sit in this House, I brought this question before the House, and I quoted the judgment disqualifying Mr. Hubert Hébert for fraudulent practices. If the hon. Minister of Justice desires to verify the fact, he has only to refer to Vol. 9 of the Quebec Law Report, page 35, and he will see, in the case of Bernatchez and Fortin, that the Hon. Justices Routhier, Plamondon and Angers rendered the judgment of which I have just spoken, disqualifying this Mr. Hubert Hébert. Nevertheless, in 1885, when this electoral law was passed, in spite of there being, in the county of Montmagny, very respectable Conservatives and men who deserved the position much more than Mr. Hubert Hébert, the Government hastened to appoint this same disquali-

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

fied gentleman to the office of revising officer. Is it not the plainest proof that if this electoral law was passed, it was with the sole purpose of controlling the electorate and of putting into the hands of the Conservative headmen, particularly the least scrupulous, the revision of the electoral lists? Now we are told: But this Act you wish to be repealed and, nevertheless, there are no complaints about it, there are no petitions asking for its repeal laid upon the Table of this House. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Government is not serious. Does not the Government take our complaints as a protest? Were not the votes cast for the Liberals at the last elections complaints and protests against this electoral law? For it is well known that at the last elections, the electoral campaign was especially fought upon this electoral law. Is the Government ignorant of the speeches made, and the votes recorded by 70 or 80 Liberals, asking for the repeal of this law? Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, does not the Government know that the hon. members for Montcalm (Mr. Thérien), for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) and for Rouville (Mr. Gigault), rose in this House, and entered their protest by their voice and their vote against this iniquitous law? Is the Government waiting to see the statutes seized upon and their leaves torn away to show that there are complaints against this law? When members are seen to rise one after the other and ask for the repeal of this law, it is still said that there is no complaint, that there is no protest, and of all this no account is taken. But, Mr. Speaker, I might retort the argument against the Government, and say to them, if there are no complaints against this law, were there any more against the Provincial law? Did the Government which put aside the Provincial law, which had existed for twenty years, show that there were any complaints against that law? Did the Government lay before the House any petitions asking that that law should be removed from the municipal councils? Far from that, the people were not even consulted; this Bill was brought up in the House on the eve of the elections, for the purpose, as I have stated, of placing the control of the electors' votes in the hands of the friends of the Government, and it would be much more courageous of the Government, should they say: we had this law passed in 1885, so that we should be kept in power by controlling the votes at the elections then approaching, and we are keeping it with the same end, in view of future elections. Now, Mr. Speaker, another reason which has been given is that the law is too expensive. Well, I believe that the best reason, that the best protest which can be given against the Government, and against this law, are the measures which the Government introduce at each Session to suspend its carrying out. We contend that the law is too expensive, and we show by public documents, and the report of the Auditor General, that it has cost upwards of half a million of dollars up to the present time. The best reason, showing that it is too expensive, lies in the fact that the hon. Secretary of State himself stated in his speech that if this law was to cost from \$150,000 to \$160,000 a year, it should not be carried out, and it was shown that it has cost more than that. Therefore, when a law is too expensive to be carried out, does it not carry in itself the germs of its death? When a law is so expensive that the Government

is bound to suspend it at every Session, in order not to spend the people's money, what is then the reason for keeping it, if the reason is not a political one? Can it not be seen that the only object is to keep into the hands of the Government, and of its friends, that electoral machinery which is so useful in the elections. Notwithstanding all these protests, and in spite of what was said by the hon. the Secretary of State in his speech on behalf of the Government, it is not carried out, because it is too expensive, and yet they keep it in the Statute-book. Well, I believe that this excuse is a lame one. Has a Minister ever been heard to say: Here is a law sanctioned by the Legislature, and, however, it is suspended because it is too expensive? I believe that this is the only law throughout the country ever suspended in this way; and I believe a good many members should be suspended with it. Well, the fact that they are bound to suspend a law, is the best proof that it cannot be carried out. I might add that the members on this side of the House are not alone in complaining about this Act. Does not the Government know that the *Gazette* of Montreal, the organ of the member for Cardwell, does not the Government know that the *Toronto World*, and a crowd of Conservative members, have stated that this law is too expensive and that it should be repealed? I say then that our duty, as Liberal members, elected principally upon this question in order to defend our electors, is to record our votes in the way I, for one, shall record mine. Now, the hon. Secretary of State has made a statement which is not accurate. I believe that he made it in good faith, for I am satisfied that he had no intention of deceiving this House. This is what he said in his speech.

"Now, speaking of the Province from which I come, I may say that for the last twenty-five years, on an average, we have never had elections on which the lists were not two or three years old."

Well, I believe that this is impossible, I believe that there cannot be more than a county or two—perhaps the county of Terrebonne is one of these exceptions—where the lists are not made every spring. The municipal law of the Province of Quebec requires that the lists should be prepared from the 1st to the 15th of March each year, and that, under a penalty of \$200 against the secretary or mayor of the municipality. It is well known that the secretary prepares these lists, and that they are revised from the 15th to the 30th March. If they are not, they become law by the simple lapse of time. Well, if the lists are made every year, how can the elections take place under lists three or four years old? It is absolutely impossible. It is only under the Dominion Act that elections are carried on, on lists two or three years old. If we consider what happened at the time of the last revision, we shall see the disadvantage of holding elections on lists three or four years old. Thus, in my county, there was a difference of at least 800 names on the new list. Nearly 300 names were taken off and about 450 were added to it. Thus, if there had been an election in my county before this last revision; in other words, if the lists of 1885 had been voted by, would such parties as should have registered their votes four years after the first list, be really electors of the county? Would that have been really the vote of the electors of the county? Assuredly not.

Let us take, for instance, the election in the county of Richelieu, which took place last autumn, when my hon. friend (Mr. Massue) whom I see here, personally with pleasure, although politically I should have preferred to see his opponent here, was elected. Can my hon. friend from Richelieu speak here as the representative of the electors of Richelieu? Can he say that the electors of the county voted for or against him? For, in that county, there may be a difference of 1,000 or 1,200 votes; the town of Sorel alone may cause a considerable difference. Well, can a member elected in 1889, under the lists of 1885, rise in this House and say that he is the representative of the county? I say, no; and I say that that is one of the inconveniences of this law. I say that that is an encroachment upon the liberties of the people. And, were there only this reason, I say that this law should be repealed. Mr. Speaker, I shall not say any more about this, but I did not want to allow this opportunity to pass without recording my protest, particularly when we hear the hon. members on the other side, although those among them who uphold this law are very few, and that those who approve of it are still fewer, say that there is no protest against the law. Well, I, for one, stand up to record a protest in behalf of my county. And if it is still claimed that no requests or petitions have been presented to this House asking for the repeal of this Act, the Government must take into consideration the speeches made in this House by the hon. members on this side. With these observations, Mr. Speaker, I may say that I shall vote for the motion now before the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) paid a very doubtful compliment to the measure under discussion when he asserted that the franchise law was susceptible of being made a good law. I doubt whether his assertion is correct, because I do not believe it is possible to divest that Act of its objectionable features. It never can be made a good Act, because it never can be made a just Act. It is an Act which places on the Statute-book a set of machinery to accomplish a purpose which was better effected without it. The hon. gentleman told us the operation of the Ontario law, in regard to the creation of the voters' lists, was not satisfactory in Algoma, and a moment afterwards he admitted that the operation of the Dominion law was equally unsatisfactory. I apprehend the difficulty in both cases to be that in Algoma, a vast and sparsely settled country, the institutions are in a formative stage, and matters will not be in the same condition when the municipal institutions have been brought to bear on all the localities in that great region. The Ontario Act, the hon. gentleman says, is not as good as the Dominion Act, because the ballot cannot be made secret. That objection does not apply to the Dominion election law. All the use of the Ontario Act is to give us a list, and our own law will provide as to the mode of casting the ballot, and if the Ontario law is deficient in that respect, it has, at all events, no bearing on the question before us. Manhood suffrage, the hon. gentleman has told us, will not be popular in Ontario. That is a question on which there is great difference of opinion. The Ontario Legislature, in adopting manhood suffrage, acted

in accordance with the opinion that seems to have actuated the present Government in retaining manhood suffrage in Prince Edward Island and British Columbia. So far as the suffrage of the Dominion is concerned, it strikes me that any taxpayer ought to be a voter, and there is no citizen of the Dominion, twenty-one years of age, who is not a taxpayer under the operation of the tariff we have in this country, which is about to be revised by the Minister of Finance in a way probably to exact some more money from voters who are of age. I think we may claim that the payment of taxes should entitle any man who pays them to a vote, and every citizen of the Dominion, every British subject, contributes sufficient to the revenue to entitle him to a vote if he takes a sufficient interest in public affairs. The hon. gentleman says that an attack has been made on the revising barristers. In the course of this debate I have not heard any unfavorable criticisms with respect to the conduct of revising barristers. It is not the conduct of revising barristers of which we complain, but the character of the law, the unnecessary law which imposes on the country a very expensive double machinery at great public inconvenience. I am happy to say that the very great majority of the revising barristers discharged their functions impartially and justly. As regard the revising barrister in my own riding, who unfortunately died recently, the duties could not have been more impartially, more justly, and more honestly discharged than they were performed by that gentleman. But that is not the objection we have to this Bill. The fact that there is a yearly occurrence here of the discussion of this matter attests the fact that there unquestionably exists in the country a great amount of popular disgust, not dissatisfaction only, but disgust with this Act. It is a legislative abortion, nothing more and nothing less, and the attempts made by the Minister of Justice to lick this Bill into shape, so that it can be worked, have proved abortive, because the thing cannot be done. The law is universally unpopular. I assert this, and I believe it to be true. I do not believe, if you could arrive at the private opinions of hon. gentlemen who support the Government, you would find half a dozen who would not pronounce the Act unnecessary, oppressive, vexatious and unduly expensive.

My colleague from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) the other night, in defending this Act, dropped an observation which showed very clearly where the shoe was pinching him. After defending the Bill, he wished it could be managed so as to work more cheaply. I have no doubt his experience recently with respect to the revision of the list in his riding has left him with the impression that it would be a fine thing if the Act could be worked more cheaply, that he, in common with all other hon. members who had to attend to the revision of the list, has wished that the Bill could be worked more cheaply if not worked out of existence altogether.

The Secretary of State, in his defence of the Act, admitted that its operation is so expensive it would not do to have a new list every year, although the Act introduced in 1885 provided that there should be an annual revision of the list, and that the revision should be completed by the 30th November of each year. Yet the hon. gentleman rose and told us that owing to the expense of the revision, it was not advisable to have a list every

Mr. CHARLTON.

year. The fact that there was no revision from 1886 to 1889 is a confession on the part of the Government that the Bill is unnecessary and that the country will not stand this large outlay every year. Are we to have this state of things continued? Are we to have a revision of the list once in three years, or possibly once in two years? Suppose there had been some crisis, and we are always liable to have a crisis here, and a dissolution had followed last year, we would have had an election held over the whole Dominion on a list three years old, and not a voter under 24 years of age could have cast a vote. It is an outrage on the liberties of the subject to leave this country in such a position that we are liable to have a general election held on a voters' list three years old; and if this Bill is one that the Government cannot revise every year on account of the expense, it is better that the law should be swept away. The law is an abuse of the Government's power, and of the privileges they possess, and it is an outrage on the people. I presume, from what I hear, the list of 1889 is to be the list on which the next election will be held. We may have another Session of this House, and perhaps two more Sessions; it is probable that the First Minister may wait, until after the census returns of 1891 are received, to gerrymander the constituencies of the Dominion, and he may hold an early Session for that purpose. I quite look forward to a general election in 1892 taking place on the revision of last year, for I apprehend from the statements of the Secretary of State that the Government do not think of incurring further expense in that regard. It has been shown that the return of expenses already incurred on the list of 1889 amounted to upwards of \$150,000. I suppose there has been no return made of the expenses of the revising barristers, each of whom will receive a salary of from \$400 to \$500, and these with other expenses will swell the expenditure for the revision of 1889 to a quarter of a million of dollars. The Government shrink, and very properly so, from inflicting on the country such extra outlay. They have this miserable measure, and it is necessary to have a revision only once in three years in order to save expense. What I condemn is the uselessness of having adopted such a measure.

The Secretary of State told us in the course of his speech the other night that the discussion on this Bill in 1885 was a scandalous discussion. The hon. gentleman made a slight mistake; the statement he should have made was that the Bill under discussion was a scandalous Bill. What was the character of the Bill? Here it is in all its naked deformity as it appeared when first introduced. It contemplated a legislative fraud, nothing more and nothing less, and the Opposition on this side of the House fought that fraud for months, and finally reduced it to its present shape, divested of some of its most objectionable features, and made of it a legislative bungle as the best thing that could be done with it. What did it provide among other things? In the second section of the Bill I find that a person means a man married or unmarried, including an Indian, and the First Minister told us that this would include the Indians of Ontario, Quebec, the Maritime Provinces, and the barbarous Indians of the North-West, and Sioux, Crees and Blackfeet; and we discussed this question, we fought this item for days and days before

we could obtain any modification whatever. Finally we came down to a settlement upon the civilised Indians in the older Provinces, but the original contemplation of this Bill was to invest the whole Indian population, the wards of the Government, with the franchise. Nothing but the opposition of the members on this side of the House prevented the perpetration of this great outrage, and yet, this was the scandalous discussion that the hon. the Secretary of State alluded to in his speech the other day. What were the provisions of this Bill with regard to the revising barristers? The revising barrister, according to the original Bill, was simply required to be a barrister of five years' standing, and what were his powers? He was empowered to prepare, to revise, and to complete the lists. He was the autocrat in whose hands was placed the power to make the list, to revise the list, to publish the list, and power was also given him to do this in almost any way he chose. He could consult any source of information for the purpose of determining in his mind who he should put on and who he should leave off the list, and if the subject desired to appeal from his decision he was allowed to appeal, only provided that the revising barrister had a mind to let him do so.

Mr. MULLOCK. That was on a question of law.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; and on a question of fact the aggrieved person could not appeal at all. The question of fact was likely to be more important than a question of law, and would involve whether a man had qualification to go on the list, whether he was of age, and a dozen other things which might be settled by evidence, if an arbitrary revising officer ruled against that man unjustly, we then had the proposition of the original Bill to deny an appeal altogether on a question of fact, and to allow it on a question of law, only if the revising barrister wished. That was a provision in this scandalous Bill which we had under discussion for several months. This discussion, which lasted until some time in July, left this measure in the shape in which it went on the Statute-book; a useless Act, a cumbersome Act, an expensive Act, an Act that started another set of machinery to do what could be better done with the machinery already in existence. A result of the discussion was, that the Government were obliged to drop some of the palpable frauds intended to be perpetrated when the Bill was introduced.

The member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) stated the other night that the discussion upon this question made us the laughing-stock of the country. I do not think the hon. gentleman is correct in that. There was a very great amount of indignation existing in the country with regard to this Bill, and the people as a rule have approved of the course taken by the Opposition in striving to get it repealed, or, at all events, to have it placed on the Statute-book in the least objectionable form. The hon. member for Montreal also said that the Bill was not discussed on the hustings, and that statement is also incorrect. In my own riding, as was the case generally throughout Ontario, it was one of the leading points discussed. The indignation with regard to this Bill in 1885 led to the defeat of the Government candidates in many ridings where they had majorities previously, and where mem-

bers had been returned to support the Government before that time. The hon. gentleman also told us that we forced the Government to pay an extra indemnity. I suppose the Government was forced to pay an extra indemnity to keep its members here to carry this Bill, and in that way we may have forced the Government to bribe its members to stay here to perpetrate a wrong by giving them an extra \$500 apiece. "Any way," says the hon. member, "we are satisfied with this Bill." Of course they are, but why? "Because it continues us in power," he says. Exactly. They introduced the Bill for the purpose of continuing them in power, they proposed to continue to perpetrate this great outrage on the principles of justice in order to continue them in power; the Bill in its operation is designed for that purpose; the Bill accomplishes that purpose, and consequently the member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) is satisfied with it.

Let me again ask, what necessity was there for this Bill? Was there any dissatisfaction existing in this Dominion with regard to the franchise we had since Confederation? Had there been a single voice raised in protest against the use of the Provincial franchise for the purpose of sending members to this House of Commons? On the contrary, Sir, this system had worked with the utmost smoothness; there had been no complaint, there was no popular demand for a change, nor was there even a whisper from the people asking for a change in the direction made by the Government. Did this system improve the system previously in use? I claim it did not. I claim further, that it is perfectly proper that the franchise should have been controlled by the Province, it being a civil right, and the control of civil rights being guaranteed to the Provinces by the 92nd section of the British North America Act. The Federal Government should not have interfered with the exercise of this civil right by the Local Legislatures. Each Province sends to this Parliament a certain number of representatives. They are the representatives of that Province; they enter this Federal House representing the Province from which they come, and surely it is proper that the Province sending representatives to this Parliament should themselves arrange the franchise on which those representatives should be elected. I believe that, on the broad principle of civil right, the interference of this Government, by the passage of this franchise law, was an usurpation of authority. The municipality machinery by which the voters' lists are created in the Province, is the most proper, the most economical, and the most efficient system by which it could be done. In every municipality in Ontario there is a township council composed of five members, coming from the different wards of the township. These gentlemen, from the assessment rolls, and from other sources of information, form the voters' lists. It is subjected to revision before a court composed of this council, and any person in the municipality who deems that his name ought to be put on that list, or, who believes that some name is on the list which should not be there, may appear, without expense, before that court of revision and have the error corrected. Then there is the final revision before the judge of the county, and the system is a perfect one, inexpensive, efficient, speedy, and, in every respect, a striking contrast to the operations of the Dominion franchise law.

Now, Sir, this law which we condemn was professedly drawn from English precedent. The name "revising barrister" is a name copied from the English Act; but was there anything in the circumstances of the two countries that were parallel? Were there any similar circumstances in the Dominion of Canada and in the Government of Great Britain that made the case parallel in any sense whatever? In Great Britain there is one voters' list, and not two. In Great Britain the lists are formed by the overseers of the poor, who are municipal officers, elected by the people, and they are revised by the revising barrister, as they are in the Province of Ontario by the county judge. The English revising barrister is not a Government appointee, but a legal officer appointed by the court. His duties are purely legal; he has nothing to do with the Government, and they cannot exercise any influence upon him, nor can they secure his appointment or dismissal. When these lists are formed by the overseers of the poor they are revised by the legal officer, and the Government does not intervene in the formation of these lists in any way whatever. Compare that system with ours, and what do we find? You find that the revising barrister here is a Government official, and that he holds office during the pleasure of the Government. He is not appointed to revise the work of somebody else—of overseers of the poor, of township councils, or of municipal officers of any description; but he is appointed to discharge the functions of all of these—the functions of a council, of municipal officers, of a judge—to do the whole thing; he is to make the list, revise the list, and publish the list. He is a creature of the Government, and he is responsible to the Government alone. He may be an honest man, and discharge his duties faithfully and honestly, or he may be a scoundrel and play into the hands of the Government, and by his action reverse the decision of the people in many ridings; and when this official has discharged his duty, the lists are brought down here to be printed in a Government office under the supervision of the Government. There is no check on the Government whatever: they may perpetrate any rascalities or forgeries or outrages, and the people have no recourse. The whole system is a legislative abortion, to say the least of it, under which the people are at the mercy of the Government and their officials.

A good many references have been made in the course of the discussion of this Franchise Act to United States precedents, and I will refer to a few of them. My hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) in the course of his remarks said that we cannot have a nation anywhere under the federal system without federal control of the franchise. The hon. gentleman has not read history very closely, I think. The American Republic is a nation, and the very first steps taken with regard to the franchise in that country was to hand the matter over so the states in federal elections, just as we did in Canada for eighteen years. The hon. gentleman also told us that the federal elections and the states elections did not take place on the same voters' lists or on the same day. Again the hon. gentleman is very wide of the truth. The elections of the United States, both state and national, are held on the first Tuesday of November. Formerly, two states, I believe, Ohio and Penn-

Mr. CHARLTON.

sylvania, held their state elections in October—I speak subject to correction; but those two states have changed their practice, and now hold all their elections, state and federal, simultaneously on the first Tuesday of November; and now, throughout the whole United States, on the same day, and with the same rolls, elections are held for members of Congress, for electors who elect the president, for members of the state assemblies, for officers of the state, and for county officers.

The hon. Secretary of State tells us that the franchise in the United States is uniform. He says there was no difficulty in arranging that the state franchises should be the national franchise, because the state franchises in that country were uniform. I can inform that hon. gentleman that when the law was adopted by the constitutional convention of 1787, the franchises of the various states were not uniform, but that, on the contrary, there was a greater diversity in them than exists in the franchises of the Provinces of Canada to-day. If that hon. gentleman will turn to Elliott's reports of the debates on the Federal Constitution, he will find, on page 654 of vol. 4, the following statement with regard to the franchises that existed in the thirteen states that formed the American Union at the time of the adoption of the constitution: In Maine, citizenship and three months' state residence; in New Hampshire, residence and payment of taxes; in Massachusetts, citizenship, one year's state and six months' district residence and payment of taxes; in Connecticut, citizens in freehold and six months' residence, or one year's performance of militia duty, or paying a tax, blacks excepted; in Vermont, one year's residence; in New York, citizenship, a certain state and district residence, having paid tax, or performed militia duty, or been assessed, or having labored on highway, freehold for people of color; in New Jersey, one year's county residence and an estate worth £50 proclamation money; in Pennsylvania, citizenship, two years' residence and payment of taxes; in Delaware, two years' residence and payment of taxes, blacks excepted; Maryland, citizenship, state residence of one year, county or city, six months, blacks excluded; in Virginia, white male citizen, twenty-one years of age, district residence, freeholder or leaseholder; in North Carolina, freehold and a year's residence; in South Carolina, citizenship, two years' state residence, a freehold, or six months' district residence and payment of taxes, blacks excluded; in Georgia, citizenship, six months' county residence and payment of taxes, if assessed. These were the qualifications for voters in state elections for the thirteen states that comprised the American Union in 1787; and, yet, the hon. Secretary of State tells us that the reason the United States Constitutional Convention found it practicable to adopt the state franchises for the election of members of Congress and President, was that those franchises were all uniform, while in reality there was a greater disparity in them than existed in the Provincial franchises in Canada when this franchise law was introduced.

Well, Sir, instead of English example in this matter, which is not at all parallel or similar, it would probably have been more convenient to pay attention to American example which is exactly parallel and similar, because we know that the United States Constitutional Convention had

to grapple with a question of exactly the same character as we had with regard to federal and provincial franchises in this country; and it would have been well to look, first, at the method of settling this question in the United States, and secondly, to the result of that settlement, as shown by their 100 years' experience. In that Constitutional Convention there were such men as George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, Edmund Randolph, Robert Morris, and James Madison. I would not claim that these men were superior to the men who framed our franchise law—the right hon. the leader of the Government, the hon. Minister of Customs, the hon. Minister of Militia, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue; perhaps these men are superior to those fathers of the American Republic, but if they are, they would have acted wisely to have taken the lesson of experience which that country could give in regard to this matter. Now, what were the features of the franchises in the United States which that Constitutional Convention grappled with? What were the plans proposed before that convention and discussed by them? Was there more than one plan discussed, before the convention arrived at a conclusion? I answer, yes; they had this matter under consideration for several months, during which various plans were proposed and received ample consideration. There were four distinct plans before that convention with regard to the franchise. The first plan was that there should be federal control of the franchise, such as we have in this country by our Dominion Franchise Act, and that the United States should adopt a uniform franchise throughout all the states, irrespective of state franchises. That was the first proposition considered, and it was rejected. The next was that the State Legislatures should be allowed to elect the members of the House of Representatives, as they now do and always have done with reference to the members of the Senate. That plan was rejected. It was thought proper to allow the State Legislatures to appoint only the least numerous branch of the National Legislature and have the people elect the other. The next plan was that the state should, in each case, designate the mode of election of members of the House of representatives, and that plan was rejected; and the plan adopted, after ample discussion, was that the state franchise in each state should serve for United States purposes, the only proviso being that it should be the franchise in use in each state for the election of members to the most numerous branch of the State Legislature. That is the broadest and most popular form of franchise in each State, and that plan was adopted in 1787. How has it worked, and how long has it been in operation? It has been in operation more than 100 years, and has worked without friction, and given general satisfaction. There never has been the least question raised, as to the wisdom of the settlement of that question, by the Constitutional Convention of 1787, and it is acknowledged on all hands now, that had the convention adopted any other mode, or any other one of the four plans I have mentioned, it would not have worked and a change would have been necessary. Why was this experience disregarded by our Government? Was it through ignorance? I do not think so. I think the Government were perfectly aware that

this was the proper and judicious way of dealing with this question, and that the motive which influenced the Government was not to secure the best method, but to adopt a plan which would place in their hands an unfair political advantage. They had but a short time previous gerrymandered the ridings of Ontario, in a more or less corrupt manner, and they then proceeded to pass a franchise law, which would be more scandalous, corrupt and effective for the purpose of retaining power, as the hon. member from Montreal, the other day, said it succeeded in doing. I do not know that it is necessary for me to detain the House longer upon this question. There has not been in the history of any Anglo-Saxon community or commonwealth, since England has been a nation, an instance of as great an outrage upon popular rights as this very scandalous and infamous Franchise Bill. I characterise it as scandalous and infamous, and have always felt that it was so. There is only one thing in all the legislation of this country that makes my blood boil, that makes me thrill with indignation, and that is this piece of rascality, for rascality it is. It was conceived in rascality, it was designed to perpetrate a political fraud, and it has succeeded admirably in carrying out the mission the Government intended it to perform. When the time comes, as come it will, when this statute shall be dropped from our Statute-book, and we shall return to the common sense system of one set of voters' lists and machinery, and allow the Provinces to make their own lists, and our elections to be held on those lists, the whole people, with scarcely a solitary exception among the millions who inhabit this Dominion, will say, Amen.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not think that I would have said one word upon this subject but for the fact that the hon. member for North Norfolk has to-night, as on former occasions, characterised this Act as a scandalous piece of legislation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I hear my hon. friends opposite say "Hear, hear." I do not think it lies in the mouth of any hon. member of this House to characterise legislation within the competence of this Parliament, as scandalous legislation. It seems to me that the argument which these hon. gentlemen adduce, that we have no right to fix a franchise for ourselves in this Parliament, is one that is not capable of being successfully sustained. I quite agree with these hon. gentlemen that this Act is an expensive Act, that it entails considerable expense upon the country; but when these hon. gentlemen have offered that objection to the Act, unless they have some objection to the basis of the franchise fixed by it, they have offered the sole objection they can against it. Can it be contended for one moment that the rights of the Provinces are interfered with in the slightest degree by our exercising the privilege which the Act of Confederation confers upon this Parliament? Will it be pretended that the Local Legislatures of the Provinces should have the right to usurp the functions of this Parliament and to fix the basis of the franchise on which members to this Parliament shall be elected? Hon. gentlemen opposite have said a good deal about the convenience of having the voters' lists fixed by the municipali-

ties, and they have said a good deal about the revising officers, although, I think, in listening to the discussion which took place upon this resolution since the debate began, almost every hon. gentleman opposite has declared that he has no fault to find with the officers appointed under this Act. With perhaps one or two exceptions, I have not heard hon. gentlemen complain of partisan conduct on the part of revising officers appointed under this Act; but it is declared that it would be much more convenient if the lists were made by the municipal officers, and more particularly has that argument been advanced by members from the Province of Ontario. Perhaps it would be more convenient, but we have no power to impose on the municipal officers of Ontario any duty with respect to the making of those lists under an Act of this Parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I say we have no power to impose these duties upon municipal officers in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Does my hon. friend deny that proposition? Does he deny that we have not the power to compel the municipal officers to make the lists under an Act of our own? The municipal officers in the Province of Ontario make up the voters' lists under the Ontario franchise law, and they are compelled to do so by the legislation of that Province; but has this Parliament any power to compel those municipal officers to make up the lists under the Act now being discussed? The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made a somewhat vigorous—I might characterise it as an almost vicious—attack upon the revising officers. He declared that they were the creatures of the Government, that they might do monstrous things under the provisions of this Act, that they could put upon the voters' list what names they choose, and keep off the list whomsoever they choose. Sir, this Act defines how they are to proceed in the exercise of their duty; it defines the mode in which they are to obtain the information as to those who are eligible to be placed upon the list. But not only that, the hon. member for North Norfolk declared that these revising officers were appointed to hold office during the pleasure of the Government. I do not so understand the clause of the Act which provides for their appointment, which reads as follows:—

“The Governor in Council may, from time to time, appoint a proper person, to be called ‘the revising officer,’ for each or any of the electoral districts, who shall hold office during good behavior, but who shall be removable on address by the House of Commons, and whose duties shall be to revise and complete, in the manner herein-after provided, the lists of persons entitled to be registered as voters under the provisions of this Act in such electoral district or portion of an electoral district for which he is appointed.”

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for North Norfolk was reading from the Bill as originally introduced.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am reading from the Act as it stands upon the Statute-book, and that is what we have to deal with at the present time. This Act provides to my mind the most thorough means of dealing with those revising officers if guilty of any malfeasance of office. It declares how they are to get the information as to who should go

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

and who should not go upon those lists, and the oath which revising officers are requested to take is an oath which no man would take who would not discharge his duties properly, or, if he did not discharge his duties properly, after taking the oath, he would be guilty of gross malfeasance of office, and would be subjected, no doubt, to the penalties provided in the section to which I have referred. If we are to admit the principle that this Parliament has the right to fix the basis of the franchise which will elect members to this Parliament, we have the right to create the machinery and appoint the officers who will make these lists. We have no power to compel the municipal officers to perform that service for us, and, not having that power, our duty is to appoint officers who are under the control of this Parliament and who can be punished if they do not discharge their duties properly. The cost of administering this Act seems to be the only argument which can be urged against it, and I hope, after what fell from the Secretary of State the other night, that the cost will be materially reduced in the future.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentlemen who have spoken in defence of this Bill have assumed that, if we adopt the list prepared by the different Provinces as the qualification for the election of members of this House, we are transferring to the Local Legislatures the power to legislate for us as to the franchise which should elect the members here. We adopted the provincial franchises of the different Provinces, and that system continued to govern the election of members of this House for seventeen years. By what process was that done? It was by an Act of this Parliament. We declared by an Act of this Parliament that we would make the qualification of the electors of members for this House the same as that for members of the Local Legislatures. The franchise was adopted not in virtue of the Act of the Local Legislature, but because of the Act of the Parliament of Canada, which declared what was the qualification of those who were entitled to elect members to this House. The hon. gentleman tells us that there is no objection to this measure except the single matter of expense. How comes the expense? Why should there be so much expense attached to the preparation of the voters' lists for the election of members to this House, more than in the preparation of the lists on which members of the Local Legislature are elected? It is simply because we have not the necessary machinery for the preparation of the lists. It is because those who prepare the provincial lists are the representatives of the people in the different municipalities. They are acquainted with the voters who put their names on the list in the first instances, and then there is an appeal from the parties who prepare that list to a county judge. At least, that is the rule in Ontario.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Is not the same basis adopted by the revising officer in forming the voters' lists as is adopted by the township clerk or the town clerk?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The term “revising officer” is a misnomer, because this official is the man who prepares the list in the first instance, besides revising it, and that is an altogether different function from that performed by the revis-

ing barrister in England, from which our system was professed to be copied. In the preparation of the provincial lists, the people who know the voters prepare the lists in the first instance. There is the township assessor, there is the court of revision, which is constituted of the council, and these prepare the list. All these parties are personally acquainted with the people who reside in that particular locality. The hon. gentleman says we have no power to name the municipal councillors to prepare the list in the first instance. I do not accept that statement. Why, who are the judges for the trial of controverted elections? We have designated the judges of the provincial courts, and by virtue of that designation, we have made them judges for the trial of controverted elections for the Dominion of Canada. In the same way, not conferring upon them any powers as members of a municipal council, we might designate as those who are to perform these duties the parties who are for the time being elected as municipal councillors in the various municipalities. The hon. gentleman has argued, as many other hon. gentlemen who have preceded him have argued, that because this is an independent Legislature, not deriving its existence from the Legislatures of the Provinces, we ought to have a voters' list entirely independent of the voters' lists in the various Provinces. In the United States, as my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has pointed out, the Constitution leaves no option to Congress, but declares that the basis for the election of members to the most numerous branch in the State Legislature shall be the qualification for the election of members to the House of Representatives. This was not in our constitution, but we declared the same thing by Act of Parliament, and for seventeen years that system prevailed here. Everyone admits that no abuse arose under it, that there was no complaint, and it was patent to everybody that it put those who were candidates to no expense in the preparation of lists, and in fact was entirely satisfactory. My first objection to the present system is that an interested party—the Government and those who support the Administration—are those who nominate and appoint the revising officers, who are not only revising officers, but who prepare the list in the first instance. That is not done in England. The revising officer there is appointed by the judge when he is on the spring circuit, and the overseers of the poor prepare the list in the first instance. The Government have no control either over the preparation of the list or the appointment of the revising barrister. There is that marked difference between our system and that which exists in the United Kingdom. There is an important feature of our constitution which the hon. gentleman has overlooked. The representation of the Provinces in this House is based upon population, not as between different electoral districts, but as between the Provinces. What does that imply? It implies that the representation in this House was to be a provincial representation. I had before me the provisions of the convention that were adopted by the Legislatures in the various Provinces, and in those articles that were framed by the Quebec convention it was expressly provided that the Provinces should determine not only the boundaries of the electoral districts for the election of members to this House, but the qualification of the

voters who were to elect the members to this House. All this was changed in London, all this was changed after the representatives of the people had pronounced upon it. The change, it is true, has placed under the control of this Parliament the determination of the voters who are to elect members to this House, but that was not done by the representatives of the people of the various Provinces. Let me call the attention of the House to the articles of Confederation as they were prepared. This was done after very careful consideration, and among those who prepared these articles of Confederation were certain members of the Government of the day, who certainly did not suppose that they were doing any violence to the federal system in conferring upon Provinces the power to determine the boundaries of the electoral districts for the election of members to the House of Commons, and the qualification of those who were to return those members. Why was it intended, in the first instance, to put the whole matter under the control of the Provincial Legislatures? It was because the representation was a representation from the Provinces and for the Provinces, and as between the Provinces the representation was to be based on population. Now, Article 17 reads as follows:—

"The basis of representation in the House of Commons shall be population as determined by the official census every ten years; Upper Canada having 82, Lower Canada, 65."

And so on. Then the next Article is:

"Until the official census of 1871 has been made up there shall be no change in the number of representatives from the several sections."

And so on. Article 19:

"Immediately after the completion of the census of 1871, and immediately after every decennial census thereafter, the representations from each section of the House of Commons shall be readjusted on the basis of population."

Readjusted by whom? Readjusted by this Legislature? Not at all, readjusted by the Legislatures of the different Provinces in accordance with the census that were obtained. Article 20:

"For the purpose of such readjustment Lower Canada shall always be assigned sixty-five members, and each of the other sections shall, at each readjustment, receive for the ten years then next, succeeding the number of members to which it will be entitled on the same ratio of representation to population."

Article 21:

"No reduction shall be made in the number of members returned by any section, unless its population shall have decreased, relatively to the population of the whole Union, to the extent of 5 per centum."

Article 22:

"In computing at each decennial period the number of members to which each section is entitled, no fractional parts shall be considered."

And so on. Article 23:

"The Legislature of each Province shall divide such Province into the proper number of constituencies, and define the boundaries of each of them."

That is the provision—that the Legislature of each Province shall do this when the census was taken. And yet hon. gentlemen who assisted in framing this federal system, and who subsequently arranged it in London in this respect, have now seriously argued that it would not be a federal system if such a system was carried into effect. Every one will see that the whole theory of giving to each Province representation in proportion to population, as against every other Province, supposes that the representation was to be a provin-

cial representation. More than that, our condition is not the same. What do we find in our Electoral Franchise Act? We find provisions giving fishermen qualifications upon the ownership of nets, upon the ownership of boats. You have special qualifications. Do these apply to the people all over this Dominion? Every one knows that they do not, and we, from Ontario, are no proper judges of the qualifications of the people of other Provinces in this particular, who, themselves are best qualified to speak on this matter, and for themselves. Why, Sir, if we were to divide ourselves up into Provinces and each section sit by itself, it might be that we would determine the question as well as they would in the Provincial Legislatures. But I say that it is for the Province of Nova Scotia to determine, it is for the representatives of Nova Scotia to say what shall be the qualification of the electors of that Province, for the purpose of returning the members that it is entitled to send here as a part of this Federal Parliament. That was the intention, that was the arrangement made. It is true that we have had our Constitution changed in this particular by the Convention that sat in London after the Legislatures had adopted those articles of Confederation here; but it did not take away from this House the power of saying, as it may properly say, that the qualifications for the election of members for the House of Commons shall be the same as the qualification of members to the Local Legislature. The same people return members to both Houses. Both insist upon the theory, as all representative governments insist upon the theory, that the people are fit for self-government, and if they are fit for self-government they are as well qualified to sit in their representative capacity in the Local Legislature, to say what shall be the qualification of an elector for the election of a member, either to the House of Commons to represent the Province, or the election of a member to the Local Legislature to represent a Province, as the representatives of a Province can be in this House. It is perfectly plain that so far as the principle of our Constitution is concerned, there is no violation of that principle in providing that provincial lists shall be the lists upon which the election shall take place. If that be so, the whole question is one of convenience. It is a question whether it is more convenient for the Government or for some one else to name a revising officer, or an officer to prepare the voters' lists wholly independent of the local authorities, or whether it is more convenient that the lists should be in the hands of the local authorities, that they should prepare it in the first instance, and that there should be an appeal from the lists so prepared to the county judge. In my opinion, there can be no question about this point. Every one knows that for eighteen years we were without expense and without inconvenience; and when the Secretary of State referred to the expense, a few evenings ago, of the preparation of the voters' lists, he left out what is by far the most vexatious portion of the whole proceedings, and that is the supervision, the care that is required on the part of candidates and active party men in the various portions of the constituency, in order to prevent the lists being grossly unfair or extremely imperfect.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That was done before.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I venture to say that if you were to leave the preparation of the voters' lists in the various electoral districts wholly to the returning officer, you would have a list from which a large proportion of those who are entitled to go upon it, would be left off. How is it now with regard to the local lists? These lists are made up by the men who are brought in contact with the people every day, who personally know them, and who are capable of preparing a list without needing to be specially looked after or specially aided. An expenditure of over \$400,000 was incurred in printing the first list. That is a very small portion of the expense. It does not take into consideration the expense which the candidate is obliged to bear in seeing that no name is omitted from the list; it does not include the expense which some rival candidate of the opposite party is obliged to incur in the preparation of the list. All these are matters of very serious expense, and unless there is constant attention there will be an imperfect voters' list. There is no comparison between the condition of things that would exist under the local arrangement, if there was no special supervision, and under the list that would be prepared under this Act if there was no special supervision. When we look at the question of convenience and the question of expense, we will see there is everything in favor of the provincial list and everything against the list which is now on the Statute-book.

Mr. FOSTER. If the House will pardon me, I will offer an observation or two before this debate closes, not, however, because I think that the Act as it stands on the Statute-book needs any fresh defence from this side of the House, taking into consideration what has been urged from the other side during the continuance of the present debate, because I find on noting down what has been the line of observation, and what have been the reasons advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite, that they have not attacked the principles of the Bill as it at present stands on the Statute-book. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has taken antecedent discussions, which arose before the British North America Act was framed, and he has told us what our constitution should be, and that the franchise under those antecedent discussions should have been left to the different Provinces. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) could not find in the Act, as it at present stands, sufficient ground on which to found his complaints, and he commenced to discuss a Bill which does not appear in the form of an Act of the Statute-book of to-day. He discussed what he termed the objectionable features of a draft of the Bill which was submitted to the House in 1885. One thing that must be remarked by those who have followed the present discussion, is the lack of argument against the principle of the Act as it appears on the Statute-book. This remark, I think, may be made: to what does this discussion tend? In 1885 a Bill was introduced into this House for the regulation of the Dominion franchise. It was discussed with all the ability possessed by the Opposition at that time, which is largely the Opposition of to-day; every feature of the Bill was discussed, and discussed most exhaustively. At the end of the discussion the House passed upon it, and by an overwhelming majority approved of the principle of the Bill; they went

to work to perfect the details, and it was placed on the Statute-book. This was the first victory for the principle of the Bill. The Opposition at that time stated that, although they were in numerical inferiority in the House, there was the intelligent electorate to whom they could appeal, and that just so soon as their arguments in the House got before the people and were reiterated upon the hustings, the people would be found to condemn the Bill. Those arguments went forth. The arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite were spread upon the pages of *Hansard*, were published in the newspapers, and, afterwards, as an hon. gentleman has stated, were reiterated from every hustings in the Dominion when the general elections came round. In spite of all the arguments which could be used, and the presentation to the people of what was stated to be the infamous features of the Bill, the election of 1887 returned the very same party to power which had introduced this Bill and made it law. And the people did more than that? They returned almost identically the same members who had voted for the Bill, hon. gentlemen who met the discussion in the country and came out triumphantly on that as on other issues. That was the second victory for this Act. Year after year at the bye-elections this cry has been used for all it was worth in the different constituencies, and we have had confirmation after confirmation of the party and the supporters of the party who were instrumental in introducing the Act and placing it on the Statute-book. Now five years after the Act was placed on the Statute-book and the principle affirmed by the House, and the principle adopted by the electorate and the Act affirmed by them by overwhelming majorities, we find this Session that day after day has been employed in a vain discussion of a Bill, the principle of which has been as thoroughly sifted as has the principle of any law now on the Statute-book of Canada. To what does this tend? It is a principle of parliamentary constitutional government, and a principle of practical guidance for the despatch of business in Parliament—although it is perfectly within the right of hon. members to discuss any measure which has stood for years on the Statute-book and been reaffirmed year after year—that once you have had your fight and done all you can against or for the principle of a Bill, and the question has gone to the country and has been affirmed there, we had better, as a matter of practical parliamentary business, bow to the decision of the majority in Parliament and the majority in the country. There is no proposition made to perfect the defects in the Bill introduced this Session. It is a long and vapid discussion on what hon. gentlemen are pleased to call the infamous characteristics of this Bill, in which a great many harsh expressions have been used and in which in my humble opinion very few arguments have been employed. The main argument used is of two kinds. One has been alluded to by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), who characterized it the argument of expense. That is the chief argument which I think is valid to-day, and I think that largely depends upon this: Is this Bill necessary, is it expedient, is it a proper principle for the guidance of a Federal Parliament which seeks to keep its autonomy and independence, that it should regulate its own franchise? If that is expedient, and necessary, and right, then we have

to face the question of expense, whatever it may be, and unite to make the expense as reasonable as possible, in order to effect what we consider to be the greater object. It seems to me, although I am not a constitutional lawyer or a lawyer at all, that, leaving aside all antecedent discussions and all reasons which have been urged as to what ought to have been or might have been, it was contemplated by the framers of the British North America Act, and it was embodied in the Act, to give to this Parliament power to regulate its own franchise; and that the Provincial Governments should have the arrangement of their own franchises, and so long as we keep from dealing with the franchises of the Provincial Governments, we would not be interfering with them, and so long as they keep from dealing with the franchise of the Dominion Parliament they would not be interfering with us. The British North America Act says:

“Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all the laws in force in the several Provinces at the Union relative to the following matters or any of them, namely,—the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly, or Legislative Assembly in the several Provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elections, and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of seats of members, and the execution of new writs in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution,—shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the several Provinces.”

There was given to the Federal Parliament the power to arrange its own electoral districts, the power to take charge of all these things which are mentioned in section 41, and, for the time being, for convenience sake, it was agreed to adopt certain arrangements which existed, and decided that these should be followed, until the Parliament of Canada should be pleased to make such other provisions as they wished upon any of these questions. With reference to all the matters which are noted in section 41, from Confederation up to the present, I find that the Dominion Parliament has legislated upon every one of them, and the last one that it took under consideration was the one which was the most important of all. In 1885 the Federal Parliament took up this fundamental question, and put it in line with its legislation upon the other subjects which, under that section of the Act, was granted to it to legislate upon. It seems to me, therefore, that there is no question at all of interference with provincial rights, when this Parliament takes upon itself to say what shall be its own franchise, and to regulate it according to its own wishes and desires. My hon. friend says that this is an unpopular measure. I ask him where he finds the evidence of that unpopularity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Among the members who support the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it because, that since 1885, after six or eight weeks of talk, there is continually coming back to these hon. gentlemen the echoes of their own words and that they translate these echoes into an evidence of the unpopularity of the Act? Is it that when they put before this Parliament, and before the public on the hustings in 1887, the iniquities—as they were pleased to style them—of this Act, the people rose

in a mass and hurled into political oblivion the men who had been instrumental in placing this Act upon the Statute-book, and placed the opponents of the measure in positions of power and honor? It is not so. Has there been a single voice on the Conservative side of the House during this discussion raised in opposition to this measure, or to denominate it as unpopular? No. You may take the discussion of the press, and the other public discussion outside of this House, and which is very little indeed, and you will find no evidence of the unpopularity of the measure, other than that which exists in the minds of men who in 1885 determined to burk its passage by obstructive methods, and who, having failed in that, are determined to keep up this wearisome and unprofitable discussion year after year in this Parliament. Well, Sir, some good things have followed from the enactment of this law. Since this Bill, which widened the franchise immensely in many portions of the Dominion of Canada, became law, and since thousands of young men, and thousands of laboring men who had not the franchise before, came into possession of it, the power of example has been such that there is scarcely a Provincial Legislature which has not almost immediately patterned after this Act, and gone one better than this Act, and widened their provincial franchise as a result of the liberal franchise which was given to the people of this Dominion when the Act at present under discussion was put on the Statute-book. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) with that ready force of language which he can use, brought a charge against the Government of having, in their present arrangement of printing the voters' lists under Government supervision, in a Government bureau, manipulated the lists.

Mr. CHARLTON. Of being able to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. If his language meant anything, it meant that the Government by printing the lists in the bureau here had the power to exercise, and was disposed to exercise, the manipulation of the lists to their own advantage.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; my assertion was that the Government had power to do so.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). What did that imply?

Mr. FOSTER. If there were any use in bringing such a statement as that into the argument, the only use that could be present in the hon. gentleman's mind was an insinuation that the Government did do such a thing, or were prepared to do such a thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is an evidence they ought not to have that power.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman did not make that insinuation it was a useless argument, and he is not a gentleman who would waste his own time, or the time of the House, in presenting an argument which had no point in it. I think this is a statement which the hon. gentleman should have well weighed before he made it on the floor of Parliament. It is not a light thing to charge a political party, or a Government by a political party, with an act, or the intention to do an act of that kind; and a public man of the standing of my hon. friend, with ambitions such as he has, with

Mr. FOSTER.

the breadth and scope of thoughtful reasoning which my hon. friend so often shows in this House, should not make a statement of that kind, which even in the way of insinuation would go to reflect upon a political party in this country, unless he had the very best ground for making such an assertion, and then it should be made not as an insinuation but as a direct charge sustained by proof. There is not only no foundation for the charge—my hon. friend does not believe it himself—but there is no possibility of such a thing being done. There is no necessity for me to enter into the *modus operandi* by which these names on the voters' lists are got from the revising officer, and the shape in which they are necessary to be put before the sheriff, or the returning officer, at an election. That is all laid down in the Act; and the *modus operandi*, as worked out, gives no power to the Government to manipulate the lists. The list, as it ultimately appears, and as ready for use, is a list which comes from under the signature of the revising officer, who is a sworn officer, a responsible officer, and, I believe, an honest officer. It has also been said by my hon. friend that the Act was kept upon the Statute-book because it would keep the present party in power. That implies that the Act is dishonestly administered. The Act itself provides for the revision of the lists under the public gaze, and under public supervision, and the public have access to the court of revision which is presided over by a judge or a revising officer who has a legal experience of at least five years and who is a responsible and sworn officer. I do not think it lies within the power of my hon. friend or any other hon. gentleman to say that the revising officers of this country, during the five years that they have had the working of this Act in charge, have, in any instance, prostituted their position, or prostituted the power which they have under the Act, in a dishonest and illegal way to perpetuate in power the party under whose Government they have obtained their appointment. There is nothing about which people would be so sensitive as the taking away of franchise rights which are authorized to them by the law, and which are considered the very foundation of stable and good government in this country; and it is not possible for a revising officer to unfairly use the power given to him by the Act without arousing a storm of public disapproval about his ears which would very soon find its echo in this Parliament; and yet from 1885 to the present time not one hon. gentleman has stood up on either side of this House and made charges of maladministration against a revising officer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) made a statement to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. Unhappily I am not a Frenchman, and I found it difficult to understand my hon. friend, who speaks very rapidly, so that I am without the information he gave in making the statement which I do. However, what I was going on to say was that there is not a particle of evidence to be derived from the country at large; and I believe that it has been stated over and over again, and that it is the common opinion of the men about these boards that the revising officers have faithfully and honestly done their

work, and done it quite as well as any set of revising officers under provincial jurisdiction or municipal law would do it, or are doing it to-day.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. Minister of Finance, in replying to hon. gentlemen who had spoken on this side to-night, has characterised the discussion as empty, vain, and vapid. No doubt the hon. gentleman would infinitely prefer that there should be no discussion on this subject. I can easily understand that he and his friends would like all discussion on this Franchise Act to be avoided, because every discussion that takes place in this House goes to prove the object with which this Bill was originally introduced into Parliament, namely, to perpetuate the present Government in power. The hon. gentleman says that the principle of this Bill having been once affirmed and recognised, it is useless for us to discuss it from year to year. Sir, if I understand the question aright the present Act is not the one which the Government proposed to this House in the first instance. The Act now under discussion, though still possessing a great many very improper clauses, and taking away the liberty of the people of this country and placing it in the hands of revising barristers, is not the Bill which the Government originally submitted to this House; and I have always thought that the members of the Opposition committed a grave mistake on that occasion in not allowing the original Bill to pass in all its deformity, so that the country might have realised to the fullest extent its character; because the people would not very long have permitted such a measure to remain on the Statute-book. But, in the exercise of their judgment, and, as they thought, in the interest of the people at large, the Opposition opposed it clause by clause, and were largely instrumental in moulding and fashioning it and stripping it of many of its absurdities and enormities. But no matter what changes were made or can be made in that measure, it can never be made an Act which the people of this country will be willing to accept; and if the hon. gentlemen who sit behind the Government were free agents, this Bill would be swept off the Statute-book by an immense majority. Hon. members opposite, publicly and privately, over and over again, on the hustings before their constituents and in their intercourse with members on this side of the House, have denounced that measure in as strong terms as any members on this side; and if they were permitted—I use the word advisedly—to exercise their independent judgment in this matter and vote as they liked, that Bill would be swept from the Statute-Book to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I know that there are many high-minded and honorable men on that side of the House, and I can sympathise with them at the loss of self-respect which they must feel at sitting there and listening to the dictation of the Government which compels them to support a measure which they condemn in their hearts. The Minister of Finance says that there never has been a cause of complaint against the revising barristers. Surely the hon. gentleman must have a very short memory, or he must remember that when this Parliament first met, member after member rose in his seat and complained of the difficulties under which he labored in consequence

of the partiality of the revising barrister in his district. I suffered to a considerable extent—I will not say that it was corruptly done, but it was carelessly and indifferently done; for I found, as a result of an examination of the county, that in the different districts five or ten, and sometimes fifteen or twenty, electors who supported the views of this side of the House were left off the lists; and we remember that many hon. members on this side of the House drew the attention of the Government to similar events in their own constituencies. Therefore the hon. Minister of Finance cannot consistently make the boast that he makes to-night, that there were not causes of complaint against the revising barristers. What did we see in Prince Edward Island the other day? We saw a revising barrister who had accepted the notices of some two or three hundred people that they were not residing in the district where their names appeared on the electoral list, and when the court was held and these people came before it to prove that they were electors in other districts in the same county, the revising barrister struck their names off and would not take their evidence as to that fact. That was a high-handed act. The case was not so bad in my own county, where the revising barrister—I will give him the credit of saying—took every precaution to transfer a voter from one district to another when his name was on the list. These circumstances go to prove that the revising barristers in all cases have not acted in the high-minded and honorable manner which the hon. Minister of Finance has claimed. The hon. gentleman said that this Parliament undoubtedly possessed the right of regulating the mode of elections in the various Provinces and the franchise. Well, we do not dispute that. But allow me to refer him to the action of the Government which was led by Mr. Mackenzie. In 1874, that Government divested themselves of all authority in this matter, by passing an Act transferring to each Province the right to regulate it. In that Bill, did they take power to appoint revising barristers? Did they take power to secure a correct revision of the lists in their own interests? Did they make any arrangement or provision whereby their own friends should have the power of revising these lists? No; on the contrary, they declared, in that Act, that the returning officers should be the registrars and the sheriffs of the various electoral districts where elections would be held. These sheriffs and registrars were, in a great many cases, the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite; and a very large proportion of the sheriffs and registrars in Nova Scotia at that time held views in sympathy with my hon. friends. But a Liberal Administration placed this matter entirely in the hands of those officers of the Government of Nova Scotia, irrespective of their political creed. That was a very different mode of settling this question, from the one pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite. It showed that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie desired to gain no party advantage, and utilised the officers of the Local Government, knowing their ability to discharge those high functions; and in that they showed a high-minded purpose which hon. gentlemen opposite would do very well to follow. The Franchise Act was introduced by this Government with two objects in view, as they declared. The first object was said to give a broader franchise. It was contended at the time

that the franchise in the Provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were not as liberal as the Act contemplated they should be. It was also stated that the other object was to secure uniformity. Well, since the passage of that Act, if it had any *raison d'être* on the ground of broadening the franchise, that ground has disappeared. The Province of Ontario have since adopted universal suffrage, which goes far beyond the Act now under discussion. The Province of Nova Scotia have widened their franchise; they have made their franchise income \$250, instead of \$300; they have given to the fishermen and farmers a broader franchise than they have under the present Act. In New Brunswick they have almost universal suffrage. So as regards the argument that the present Act gives a more liberal franchise than those of the various Provinces, that falls completely to the ground, because the franchises of the various Provinces are much more liberal than the Act now before the House. Again, the Act was intended to secure uniformity. It was recommended on the ground that it was necessary to have a uniform franchise for the election of members to this House, and what do we find the Government did? One of the first clauses in the Bill was to create a different franchise for Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, where the Government found their Bill would create difficulty. They were advised by their own political friends that if they ventured to force this law on Prince Edward Island it would work against them, and they, therefore, violated that principle of uniformity, which was given as a chief reason for the support of the Act. In British Columbia it was violated for the same reason. Therefore, both the grounds on which the Act was recommended have been departed from, and the Government stand to-day driven to the last resort of defending the Act as it stands, in the interest of nothing else but the Tory party of this country. Under this Act, the Government by means of the manipulations which they can make of the lists, through their revising barristers, and through the trouble and inconvenience it creates, the Government have the advantage. One hon. gentleman said in public that it served the Government a good purpose before and will again. Take the unfairness of this Act as applied to instances in my own county. Under the system in Nova Scotia, every electoral district under our Municipal Act makes the electoral list. Now, the lists are made up by men who know all the surroundings and the people in that district, and, therefore, no trouble ever arises. These municipal councils are composed of Liberals and Conservatives. In some cases there may be a majority of Liberals, and in others Conservatives; but we have heard no complaints, and the Act always worked well. There was never any desire on the part of the people to keep any names off the electoral list, and, on the whole, the working of the Act was inexpensive and satisfactory. But under the present system these men have to come a long distance; they have to send in their applications a long time in advance to be placed on the list. All this work has to be got through by agents, and, then, when the lists are made up for final revision, the revising barrister holds his court. In places such as Muskoka, which extends 400 or 500 miles one way, and 600 or 700 miles the other way, how would it be possible for

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

the electors there to meet the revising barrister, and have their names placed on the list? In my county, as elsewhere, the revising barrister has the power of holding courts in such places as he deems necessary under the circumstances. I do not mean to say that, in the exercise of that judgment, he acted unfairly, but he grouped together two or three or three or four electoral districts along our shores, from one end to the other, running east, from thence about 100 miles running up into the country some 30 or 40 miles. Well, it was utterly impossible that these numerous electors grouped together through three or four districts could attend his court, because our fishermen along the shores have not the means of transit. We have no railway, and they would have to go a distance of 30 or 40 miles to attend the court. In the cities, of course, that objection would not apply so much, but will any hon. gentleman contend for a moment that in a sparsely settled district, such as the one I have referred to, it could be expected that these various people, scattered all over these 30 or 40 miles, should go that distance to the revising officer's court in order to have their names put on the lists? They simply will not do it, and a very considerable portion of the electors in the rural districts are disfranchised. In the operation of our own system, where it was confined to a smaller limit, these men would be placed on naturally by those who knew them. They would be placed there by those who knew them and saw them every day and were familiar with their daily walks and avocations; but now a revising barrister who is unknown to them may go down there and find, as the revising officer did find, that these men could not, and would not, and did not, come that distance to have their names put upon the list. In that respect the Act has worked most unfairly. The whole Act has in many cases worked to such great disadvantage in the county which I represent, that I speak very strongly about it, and no Act such as this can ever be made satisfactory. We want an Act under which the people can qualify without all this trouble and annoyance. I am not now referring to the expense of the Act; but every hon. member on the other side of the House must know, as well as we do, the inconvenience and expense to which he is personally subjected. He knows very well that, in a large constituency, he is naturally looked to to interest people in having the electoral lists completed. Hon. gentlemen know, and have felt, and have mentioned, over and over again, the expense and annoyance to which they have been put in order to have these lists completed, because the electors will not come out unless they are looked after, and that involves delay, and trouble, and expense. I have no doubt, taking all the members in this House, that, from \$400 to \$500, would not be too large an estimate to put for the average expense and loss of time involved in completing these lists. Under these circumstances, I ask what is to be gained by keeping this Act upon the Statute-book? We have now a machinery which has always proved satisfactory, and, if we have a machinery which is provided for by local legislation, why should we not accept it instead of this cumbersome and expensive machinery provided for in this Act. The Secretary of State has stated one reason for not having revised the lists more frequently, and that was the expense. That is a

very good reason for repealing the Act. Up to the beginning of this year, we know that all the bye-elections have been run—at least in Nova Scotia—on the lists which were made in 1885. Could it be supposed in any country enjoying the blessings of self-government that any Administration would dare to take upon themselves the control of the electoral lists for four years, and, consequently, not allow those people who should be qualified, either by purchase or by coming of age, or by moving into the district, or in any other way, to go on the electoral list? What would be the state of opinion in England in regard to such a matter? We copy as much as we can from English practice and precedent in this House and out of it. Suppose the present Government or the late Government in England were to decide that no revision of the voters' list should take place for four years, and that the elections of to-day should be run on the lists of four years ago, there would be such a storm of indignation from one end of the country to the other that would hurl any Government from power. In England they have a strong public opinion, they have a highly intelligent and cultivated public opinion, and they would not dare to take the liberty with the electorate there which this Government are taking with the people of Canada. It is an unfortunate sign of the times and shows that we are not advancing in the sense of independence of the Government, or improving our position, but it shows that the people are satisfied to be governed by the Government of the day regardless of the principles upon which they are governed. That is a very unfortunate sign of the decline of public opinion and independence in this country. These reasons are sufficiently strong for us on this side of the House—no matter what hon. gentlemen may do on the other side—to continue the agitation, not only this Session but every Session, and, although the Minister of Finance may say this is vain, and vapid, and a waste of time, we shall discuss the question whenever this House meets, and shall endeavor to place before the people of the country the enormous and unnecessary cost to which they are subjected. We hope, ultimately, to convince them, even if hon. members of this House have not the independence to act for themselves, that this Act should be repealed, and that we should save the money now expended upon it.

Mr. HAGGART. I desire to make a few remarks in answer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). The hon. member for Bothwell stated that, in the preparation of the British North America Act, the delegates agreed that the franchise should be fixed by the Provinces themselves, as well as the divisions of the constituencies, and he stated that was the form in vogue in the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say anything about the United States in that connection.

Mr. HAGGART. You quoted the example of the United States, but, perhaps, not to that extent. I think it must have struck every hon. gentleman in the House, that the result of that would be that whatever the political complexion of the different Provinces might be, if they had the fixing of the electoral districts, as well as the franchise, the representatives who would be sent would be in

accordance with their political views. The member for Norfolk said we ought to adopt the principle of the United States, that the parties who should vote for the election of members to this House should be those who had a right to vote for the most numerous body in a Provincial Legislature. That means that the Provincial Government should fix the franchise for this House. In the United States it is no such thing. It is true that the Constitution of the United States provides that the electorate for Congress shall be the same as that for the most populous branch of the State Legislature, but the time and manner of the election, the electoral districts, whether the vote is to be by districts, or by other divisions, is fixed by Congress. The power is vested in the Central Government, and one of the anomalies and one of the faults found by all the writers on the Constitution of the United States is that the fixing of the franchise for the House of Representatives is left to the different States instead of being vested in Congress itself. Let me quote to you some authorities on the matter, and afterwards, I think, we will hear no more of adopting any system similar to that in the United States, which is complained of as one of the blots on the Constitution of the United States:

"Thus Congress may prescribe the day and month for holding the election, and make them the same throughout the country, with the limitation that the election must be once in two years. Congress may also prescribe whether the choice shall be by single districts, or by a general vote in each state; and may, no doubt, divide the states into congressional districts."

In every state of the Union, as stated by the hon. member for Norfolk, they have a different qualification. In some they have manhood suffrage with different terms of residence; in one or two, I think, they have a slight property qualification; in a great many a man must be 21 years of age to have a right to vote; in five or six states, I think, a man must be 25 years of age to have a right of voting for members of the House of Representatives. Now, let me quote an authority on this question, in reference to the qualification of the electorate being in the hands of the states, and it shows clearly, I think, that it is an anomaly, that it is an absurdity, and the writer proposes different means for the purpose of getting rid of it.

Mr. TROW. Will the hon. gentleman name one state that has a property qualification?

Mr. HAGGART. I think there are one or two.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Massachusetts has a property qualification.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member for North Norfolk read the names of several states in which some property qualification was required when their constitution was formed.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is all changed since then.

Mr. HAGGART. I will read what this author says:

"It is certainly, however, an anomaly that the general Government of the United States should have no control over its choice of its own delegates in Congress; that it should be powerless to define the qualifications of congressional electors. It must be conceded that this is a defect in our organic law which needs amendment; it was an unnecessary and unfortunate concession to the theory of state sovereignty and independence. One code of rules should certainly prevail throughout the country to regulate the choice of representatives, and this should be the work of Congress, or of the people in its sovereign capacity. The nation should dictate in the selection of its own legislators. The integrity of the separate states is suffi-

ciently guarded by allowing to each an equal voice in the Senate, and by permitting them to appoint Senators, and to control the selection of Presidential electors; the more national branch of Congress, that which comes directly from the people, should be entirely under the management of the one body politic which is represented in the general government.

Mr. CHARLTON. What are you reading from?

Mr. HAGGART. I am reading from "An Introduction to the Constitutional Law of the United States, by John Norton Pomeroy, LL.D., Author of 'Lecture on International Law in time of peace,' Ninth edition, Revised and Enlarged by Edmond H. Bennett, LL.D., Dean of the Boston University Law School." Nearly every authority will state the same thing, if the hon. gentleman will look them up. Now, the only objection which remains to be answered is the one of expense. We have a right under the British North America Act to fix our own franchise and it is our duty to do so. We have done so, and I have never heard an argument from hon. gentlemen opposite, or a suggestion, of any manner by which it could be done more cheaply, unless we adopted the franchise of the different Provinces, a principle which is condemned by every writer in the United States.

Mr. SEMPLE. Although I am not a lawyer, I have given this subject considerable attention. The Minister of Finance seems to be of the opinion that too much attention was given to this question, and he seems to take it for granted that we should continue as we are. But I apprehend that it is the duty of this House to rectify evils when they exist. I can assure my hon. friend that he will hear of this Act in this House, and in the country, and in every other place, until both the Franchise Act and the Gerrymander Act are abolished. Since the Gerrymander Act came into force equal rights have departed from this Dominion. We do not enjoy equal rights at the present time. The Gerrymander Act enables a minority of the electors to elect a majority of the members. I listened the other evening to the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill) whom I respect very much. He said that Bruce was two to one Conservative. But if he had taken the pains to look up the votes that were given he would find that if Bruce had elected three representatives, without the aid of the Gerrymander Act, it would have sent three Reformers here with 900 of a majority. So you see from this one instance that a minority of the electors can return a majority of the members. It was considered before the Franchise Act came into operation that the National Policy and the Gerrymander Act were not enough to ensure the return of the Government, and so they invented the Franchise Act. That Act was brought into existence after full consideration of its importance to the Government. The Minister of Public Works has said that on this side of the House we ought to be well satisfied with the Act. Perhaps they have reason to be satisfied. I know that in my county, before the election of 1887, the Liberal Conservatives of that riding, who were in the secrets of the party, were saying that they had made a gain of two or three hundred votes. The hon. member for Perth has made the assertion. The same was done in the electoral district he represents. I do not accuse the revising barristers of injustice; so far as I have seen, they desire to do justice. But this is a cumbersome Act, hard to be understood. A great many difficulties present themselves, and

Mr. HAGGART.

people who were accustomed to using the local lists had a good deal of trouble with the present Franchise Act. That was the cause of the gain in the past, but I fancy that when the Act is better understood there will not be so much gain in the future. The judges, I am sure, whatever may have been their predilections in the past, are determined to do justice as long as the case is presented properly before them. Now 200 votes was a large gain to make in one electoral district by the stuffing of the voters' lists. I am aware that there were five Ministers of the Crown, and all their majorities put together did not amount to 200; so that a very little gain in the different ridings explains the reason why these hon. gentlemen are here to-day. I have often heard it stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that they were returned by reason of the National Policy. They want to make it appear that this was the great issue before the country. I know they made a gain in the towns and cities, through the National Policy, but they made no gain in the country. If you stated to the most pronounced Liberal Conservative in the country that his party had made a gain through the National Policy or that it was a benefit to the country, he would think you were making a false statement or only talking for fun. They have made their gain through the Franchise Act, the Gerrymander Act and a liberal distribution of funds. Although this Act is only evil and that continually, still I suppose there can be some amendment made to it. To show it is unjust I may mention when the final revision is made, and the tenant cannot be placed on the list unless he has resided there and paid a year's rent, while those who qualify on income can be placed on the list if they have been residents in the country only one year. So if a tenant employs two or three men, they will have a vote and he will not have a vote. The tenant requires to be a resident of the electoral district for a year, but those who qualify on income only require to be resident in the country for a year. This is unfair and unjust. The Act is also very unjust in that certain persons not being residents on the 1st of January, 1885, but became residents shortly afterwards found when the elections were held in 1889 that they had not votes. When the Canada Temperance Act was voted on in different parts of the country in 1888 the names of a large number of people who ought to have votes were not on the lists, such as Methodist ministers, high school teachers, and other teachers who had been in the locality only for a short time. This intelligent and moral class of the community are deprived of their just rights through the operation of this partial and unjust Act. But their rights would be given by using the Provincial voters' lists. It has been stated that some of the Provinces have borrowed legislative features from the Dominion Franchise Act. That is not the case with regard to Ontario, at all events. The income franchise was a portion of the Ontario law, and when the Dominion Government incorporated it in their measure they placed the amount at \$400 a year, and it was only by the persistent efforts of the Opposition that the amount was reduced so that a workingman earning \$300 a year should have a vote. There was no greater display of patriotism shown in this House than was manifested when the Opposition members fought this distasteful measure

night after night for over two months for the purpose of continuing to the country a pure voters' list and opposing an Act that was originated with the intention of stuffing the lists. I hope the First Minister will see his way to remove this measure from the Statute-book. The chief reasons why he maintains it are to give an exhibition of his power, and to retain the extensive patronage connected with it, costing the country for two revisions over \$700,000. A printing bureau has been established, and a larger building will be demanded, then more men will be required to do the printing, and in various ways there will be an extension of the patronage of the Secretary of State. The lists as prepared in Ottawa may be right or wrong; at all events, judging from the past, we have very little reason to hope for anything good from the Government. We all remember the unjust action of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the Reform party, in regard to the gazetting of members, and although it might be imagined that he would be compelled to take a back seat, he was actually promoted and given a larger salary.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It will be useless for me to address the House at any length, as I do not think I will be able to offer anything new in criticising the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. But I feel that if a measure of this kind should remain on the Statute-book, it should be shown that a strong necessity existed for its retention there. The Postmaster General said we are entitled to a Franchise Bill and to have a franchise for the Dominion Parliament. Admitting that to be the fact, then it rests with the Government to show the necessity of such a measure. Has that been done by hon. gentlemen opposite? I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to prove that one tittle of evidence has been adduced up to the present time showing any necessity for such a measure. Yet it has been shown, and especially was it shown by the Secretary of State, that it was a very expensive measure, and unless the expenses were reduced materially as compared with the cost of the first revision, it was a question in the hon. gentleman's opinion, whether such a measure should remain on the Statute-book. The hon. gentleman, although he said he did not speak for the balance of the Cabinet, said he failed to see any necessity for a revision each year. So the hon. gentleman practically announced to the House and the country that the Government had placed on the Statute-book a measure which they do not intend to carry into effect. The Act stipulates that a revision should take place every year, and yet we find the Secretary of State stating that he does not think it necessary. What result might that cause? The Government having control of the voters' list, and the Secretary of State in particular, and it was considered that a new revision would be unfavorable to the Government, they might come down to the House and announce that there was no necessity for another revision before next election. From the subservience of the followers of the First Minister, so long as it pleases the First Minister, hon. gentlemen opposite will be prepared to endorse the view of the Secretary of State and deprive the people of those rights and privileges which every subject should enjoy in the Dominion. I say it is opening the door to a wrong which might be inflicted upon every member in this

House, and that even his own admission goes to show that there is no necessity for this Bill remaining on the Statute-book, and that, therefore, it should be repealed. My hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White) conveys the impression that this Act was as good, if not better than the Act in operation in Ontario, and that there was no more difficulty in getting names placed on the Dominion lists than upon the local lists. I entirely differ with him. I am firmly of opinion that if he will examine the question carefully, he will find that every individual in Ontario, who is entitled under the provincial law to be placed on the list, can be so placed at comparatively little trouble and no expense. Can any one who has taken the trouble to go through the turmoil of looking after a revision of the Dominion lists say that there is no difficulty in getting names on that list? If the Dominion list was as easily revised as the local one, is it to be expected that the Government would have had only one complete revision since 1886? I contend that the last revision was not a complete one, and the Government knows it, for, if report speaks true, it is one of the reasons why they were not in a position to appeal to the country on account of the incompleteness of the last revision. If we have had only one revision it is evidence that it was because of the difficulties of the revision, or else that the supporters of the Government opposed it. My hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) seems to think that the Ontario list is a very bad one, and that in that vast region of Algoma it was almost impossible for any one to be placed on the local list. I would like to know if the Government of Ontario is to blame because of the extent of territory in Algoma?

Mr. DAWSON I said it was no better than the Dominion list, and that there were mistakes in the one as well as in the other.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Although, I may not be able to convince the hon. gentleman, I think I will be able to show him that the Ontario list is the better one. I was about bestowing a compliment on the hon. gentleman when he interrupted me. I was about telling him that although Algoma was a very extensive territory it had an influential representative here to speak for all its interests. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to tell me, that the various municipal officers in the district of Algoma are not much better able to determine the names of those who shall be on the list, than the single revising barister under the Dominion Act? Will he pretend to tell me that it is as easy to approach the Dominion revising officer as it is to approach the assessor and municipal clerks in the various municipalities of the extensive territory which he represents? Let us consider the arguments offered by the hon. Minister of Public Works, the first hon. gentleman who replied to the remarks made on this side of the House. I have read his speech over and over again, with the hope (I was almost going to say with the desire) that I might find some argument in it which would show a reason for this Act being continued. True he said that we had an election upon it, and that they, on the other side of the House, were well satisfied with it. So well he might be, because he knew that the First Minister intended and desired, when he introduced this Bill, that it should bring grist to the Government mill. If they are quite well pleased with the result of that revision, it is no

more than what the First Minister intended. The object of the First Minister has been to keep the Minister of Public Works and other members of the Government in power year after year, by reason of his ingenuity, his great influence and the strong hold he has upon the country. They might well be satisfied with the Act; but let me ask was the same opportunities and the same conveniences granted to the opponents of the Government as to its friends? I contend that the Government of the day, having in their hands the appointments of the revising barristers, who were to prepare and to revise these lists, took an advantage of the Opposition in this House, and we need not be surprised at the Minister of Public Works offering the argument which I have referred to, as the sole reason why this Act should continue upon the Statute-book.

Mr. TAYLOR. Question.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). You will get the question as soon as I get through, and not sooner. Let me refer to the arguments offered in defence of this Bill by the Secretary of State. He admitted honestly—and I will give him credit for it—that it was a very expensive measure. He stated that the first revision was more expensive than he expected, and that it cost somewhere about \$413,000. He says the second revision costs a great deal less. Have we had a full report of the cost of the second revision? It was the duty of the hon. Secretary of State, when this matter came up for discussion, to bring down a full return showing its cost; but he did not give us the information which he ought to have given to a free Parliament, so that Parliament might be in possession of all the facts in coming to a decision. He says it cost \$151,000 odd. Does that cover the whole cost? A return brought down showed that up to last February between \$80,000 and \$90,000 had been spent, and we find by the Estimates, that the Government took to themselves the right of expending \$260,000 more. Perhaps we shall find the Auditor General's Report giving us a detail of the expenditure for the second revision, and showing that instead of costing \$151,000, it will have cost between \$300,000 and \$400,000, as the first revision did.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I beg pardon of the hon. member. I would not like him to speak in error, as it would lengthen the debate, but the report has been put before the House, and it is the report of the Auditor General himself, not mine.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. Secretary of State knows that we have no account for the expenditure up to the present time in the Auditor General's Report. He knows that the larger portion of his expenditure has taken place since the 1st of July.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am sorry to again interrupt my hon. friend. It is not the report of the Auditor General which is published; it is a report which I have laid before the House, and which gives the expenditure to the 31st of January, I think, and if my hon. friend does not know it, it is before the House.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Perhaps the hon. Secretary of State has brought down a report in the last two or three days; but what does it show? Does it show the total expenditure? Are all the accounts of the various revising officers and all the

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

accounts for printing included in it? Does the hon. gentleman intend to imply that it covers the full amount of the expenditure that has taken place? I think not, and I think it will be found that it is not a full account of what the second revision has cost. Is the revision of 1889 a true, and correct, and honest revision of the voters' lists? Is it equal to, or will it in any way bear comparison with the revision of the municipal lists that has taken place in the Province of Ontario or in the other Provinces? I say it does not. I say that the hon. Secretary of State by his own confession has proven to this House the absolute necessity of repealing this Act; because he says that if the future cost is likely to be at all as great as it has been, it will be a serious matter. Although he has given us the amount paid up to the present time, he has not given us complete figures, as a very large number of bills have yet to be paid. Now, Sir, I might refer to the statement made by other hon. gentlemen. The hon. Minister of Finance said that there had been no arguments presented against this measure except the argument of cost. I would ask him whether any argument has been offered by the Government or their supporters, to show any necessity for this measure remaining on the Statute-book. If they cannot offer any such argument, it ought to be repealed. The most remarkable argument I heard was that offered by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). He said we ought to rise superior to party feelings, and display a national sentiment in this matter. What are a few dollars and cents, he asked, in comparison with the national sentiment which ought to animate the members of this House? Sir, I was quite surprised to hear a gentleman who had claimed to monopolise almost all the loyalty that was to be distributed in this country, making the admission on the floor of this House that this Act was really necessary to sustain a national sentiment of loyalty in this country. The thought struck me had there never had been any national sentiment before 1885, either before or after Confederation, and after the passage of this Franchise Act, were we suddenly to inaugurate a national sentiment, which was going to develop this country into a great nation? That was a very powerful argument in favor of sustaining this measure; but I would like the hon. gentleman to understand that there was a strong national sentiment existing in this country prior to the passage of this Act; and if it was not a deep, earnest and abiding sentiment, the injustice that was about to be perpetrated by the First Minister in inflicting such an Act as this on a civilised community, would have almost destroyed that national sentiment, which I am proud to feel exists amongst the Opposition members of this House to a much greater degree than among the Government members. Sir, it is unnecessary for me to make any further remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) says "hear, hear." I know it is unnecessary to try to use arguments sufficiently strong to convince that hon. gentleman against anything that is put before him by the First Minister. But let me say in closing that I believe there is a strong feeling in the country adverse to this Bill. In the various Conservative conventions which have been held throughout the country, no approval of this measure has been recorded, but

resolution after resolution has been passed by those conventions condemning the Dominion Franchise Act. When we find upon the public platforms not a single supporter of the Government attempting to defend a measure of this kind, its unpopularity is evident, and I hope the good sense of this House will vote to repeal this Act which has been a source of discord and dissatisfaction in the country ever since it was placed in the statutes.

House divided on motion of Mr. Wilson (Elgin):

That, in the opinion of this House, the Electoral Franchise Act ought to be repealed, and that it is preferable to revert to the plan of utilising for the elections of this House the provincial franchises and voters' lists.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain (Wentworth),
Barron,
Béchar, d,
Bernier,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brien,
Burdett,
Campbell,
Casey,
Cusgrain,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Chouinard,
Cimon,
Cook,
Coulombe,
Davies,
De St. Georges,
Dessaint,
Doyon,
Dupont,
Edwards,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,
Fisher,
Flynn,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Guay,
Hale,
Holton,
Innes,
Jones (Halifax),
Kirk,
Labrosse,
Landerkin,
Lang,
Langelier (Quebec),
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lovitt,
Macdonald (Huron),
McIntyre,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,
Meigs,
Mills (Bothwell),
Mulock,
Neveu,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Platt,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Rowand,
Ste. Marie,
Scriver,
Semple,
Smith (Ontario),
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Thérien,
Trow,
Turcot,
Waldie,
Watson,
Weldon (St. John),
Welsh,
Wilson (Elgin),
Yeo.—78.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,
Bain (Soulanges),
Barnard,
Bell,
Bergeron,
Boisvert,
Bowell,
Brown,
Bryson,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Chapleau,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corby,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Curran,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Dawson,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
LaRivière,
Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Lépine,
Macdonald (Sir John),
Macdowall,
McCulla,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougal (Pictou),
McKay,
McKeen,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Massue,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moffat,
Montplaisir,
O'Brien,
Perley,
Pope,
Porter,
Prior,
Putnam,
Riopel,

Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dickinson,
Earle,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Ferguson (Welland),
Foster,
Freeman,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hagart,
Heeson,
Hickey,
Hudspeth,
Jamieson,
Jones (Digby),
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Landry,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross,
Scarth,
Skinner,
Small,
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Vanasse,
Wallace,
Ward,
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wilson (Lennox),
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland).—99.

Motion negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Albert has not voted.

Mr. WELDON. I paired with the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden).

Mr. AMYOT. The leader of the Third Party has not voted.

Mr. MITCHELL. I made a conditional pair with the hon. member for Montreal West, that if he was out of the House when the vote was taken, I would pair with him, as he was not sure that he could be present. Otherwise I would have voted as I always do in the interests of the public, with the minority in this case.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 27th February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That as the time for presenting reports from Committees on Private Bills expires this day, the same be extended to Thursday, the 27th March next.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 96) for better securing the safety of certain Fishermen.—(Mr. Jones, Halifax.)

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. DICKEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 102) to amend the Canada Temperance Act. He said: This Bill is purely of a local character. It applies only, in its practical effects, to a few counties of Nova Scotia, where a doubt has been raised as to whether or not the Act is in force. In the revision of the statutes a former statute was left out, and the omission has given rise to some doubts, which I propose to remove.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. LAVERGNE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 103) to amend the Canada Temperance Act. He said: My object is to allow, in cases where a prosecution is brought under section 104, two justices of the peace to adjourn the case if the sitting magistrate is sick or absent. At present, if the sitting magistrate cannot attend, the case has to be withdrawn, and considerable inconvenience and defeat of justice has been caused in our section by this provision. I wish also to amend section 107, under which cases taken under the Summary Convictions Act cannot be adjourned for longer than eight days. The consequence is that in some sections where the district magistrate, who is the person most competent to deal with those cases, can only hold his court once a month, as he may have several districts to attend to, and if a case is not ready it has to be withdrawn, since it cannot be heard within the eight days. I propose to give power to the magistrates to adjourn the cases for a longer period.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADA.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether there has been any correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Imperial Government, or the Government of Newfoundland, respecting relations between Newfoundland and Canada; and whether any such correspondence will be brought down forthwith?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is some correspondence, but of a limited character, between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland, and it is now going on. We cannot well bring it down in a perfect state, and would require to have the consent of the other Government.

DEFENCES OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether there has been any correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Imperial Government with reference to the defences of any part of British Columbia; and whether any such correspondence will be brought down forthwith?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state that there has been correspondence between the Canadian Government and the English Government, with reference to the defences of British Columbia. This correspondence is of an official nature. Negotiations are still going on, but it would not be in the interests of the public service to bring it down at present.

CANADA AND JAMAICA.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether there has been any correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Imperial Government respecting relations between Canada and Jamaica; and whether any such correspondence will be brought down forthwith?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no recent correspondence between the Imperial Government and Canada on this subject.

LEGAL SERVICES IN PETERBOROUGH.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What amount of money has been paid to the following legal gentlemen respectively, namely:—W. H. Moore, A. P.

Mr. DICKEY.

Poussette, Q.C.; John O'Meara, John Green, E. A. Peck, and John Burnham, Q.C., all of Peterborough, on account of legal services, or otherwise, rendered by those gentlemen, or any of them, on account of, and in regard to, the following works, or any of them:—1st. The purchase of the site and the construction of the Peterborough Post Office; 2nd. The purchase of the site for the construction of the Custom house at Peterborough; 3rd. On account of the Trent Valley Canal, distinguishing if paid on survey or construction, or damages to land consequent on construction; 4th. On account of any other services within the last five years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the answer to these four questions to-day, but I would suggest whether he would not do better to move for a return, instead of putting this in the form of a question. In the last paragraph, he asks for a statement of these fees for the last five years from all the Departments, and that would take some time to prepare.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I might meet the views of the hon. gentleman, if I dropped the fourth question, and then probably to-morrow he could give me an answer as to the other.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will.

FIRE AT ST. SAUVEUR, QUEBEC—DAMAGES SUSTAINED BY "B" BATTERY.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec) asked, 1st. Whether the Government are aware that on the occasion of the fire at St. Sauveur, Quebec, on the 16th May last, the men of "B" Battery, under the command of their officers, worked heroically in endeavoring to arrest the flames; 2nd. That they destroyed or damaged their uniforms at the said fire; 3rd. That, by order of the Officer Commanding Regiment Canadian Artillery, Colonel Montizambert, Commandant of the said "B" Battery, wrote on the 6th December last, to the Mayor of Quebec, claiming \$478.37, being the amount of the damages done to the said uniforms, and leaving it to be inferred that the men were to pay, or had paid, the amount of the said damage? Whether the Commandant acted under instructions from the Department of Militia in dealing with this matter? Have the Government made the men of the said battery pay the amount of the said damage, or is it their intention to make them pay the same; and if they have already paid the amount, is it the intention of the Government to refund the money?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state, first, that the Minister of Militia is aware that, on the occasion of the fire at St. Sauveur, Quebec, the men of "B" Battery, under the command of their officers, worked heroically in endeavoring to arrest the flames; on that occasion, one of the best officers of the corps unfortunately lost his life in his efforts to save property, also a very meritorious non-commissioned officer. Secondly, it is reported that their uniforms were damaged to a considerable extent. Thirdly, a report has been asked by telegraph from the officer commanding the battery, as to what course he has taken in reference to an application to the Mayor of Quebec, claiming an amount for the damages done to the said uniforms. The Commandant did not act under instructions from the Department of Militia in dealing with

this matter. A yearly issue of clothing is made to each man. The additional clothing to cover the claims of those who suffered in consequence of this fire will be settled at the same time.

THE FISHERIES QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understand that a telegraphic message has been published in the newspapers from which it appears that the Government at St. Petersburg has directed its Ambassador at Washington to take part in the negotiations which have reference to Behring Sea, and to enter into an attempt, at all events, to establish a close season. I suppose, from that, that the question of this being a closed sea, belonging to the United States, must have been practically abandoned, but it would be gratifying to the House and to the country to know if the Government have any information to that effect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is in the interests of Canada or of that question that we should enter into a discussion of it, or should even state precisely what we believe to be the condition of affairs. Anything which is said here will be published in the United States, and whatever is said will assist those who are attacking the administration of the United States or the action of that Government. It is infinitely better that the matter being now under discussion there, Canada being represented and England being represented, and the United States, of course, being represented, while Russia is naturally interested in the matter, as to the best means of preventing the diminution or extermination of the seal, it should not now be discussed here. All I can say to the leader of the third party is, that I am sure he knows the importance sometimes, when everything is going on satisfactorily, that certain documents should not be produced.

Mr. McMULLEN. I take this opportunity of suggesting that, when questions are put and answered which are of an important character, such as this, the speakers should allow their voices to be heard. We on the back seats cannot hear a word that he said, and might as well be out of the House. It is highly desirable that the House should be permitted to hear what is said on these important questions. The only way we have to ascertain what has been said is to read the *Hansard* on the next day. For myself and for other hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, I would request that when hon. gentlemen on the front benches speak on these important matters, they should let us hear what they say.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right, and I shall endeavor in future to raise my voice so that I can reach him. The effect of the answer I gave to my hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) is that everything at Washington is as pleasant as any Canadian could wish, so far; but I think it is not for the interests of Canada, and that it would not assist the progress of negotiations at Washington, that a statement should be made from time to time of what the state of the negotiation is exactly from day to day.

TRADE WITH JAMAICA.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. friend from West Bruce put a question on the paper as to the relations of this Government with Jamaica. I

would ask the First Minister whether any communication has taken place between this Government and the Government of Jamaica in reference to an exhibition which is to be held there next year? Having large commercial connections with Jamaica, I was asked by the Government there if I would act in concert with other gentlemen on the commission which is dealing with that exhibition. I replied that, while individually I would be willing to render any assistance in my power, I thought the best thing for them to do was to place themselves in communication with the Government of Canada, who would naturally, in a matter of that kind, if they took an interest in the matter, appoint their own commissioner. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman could inform me now, without my giving notice of the question, whether anything of that kind has transpired.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been a communication respecting that exhibition, and on its receipt it was referred to the Minister of Agriculture, who will report upon it.

WRECKING, &c., IN CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. CHARLTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) to permit reciprocity in wrecking and towing of vessels and rafts. He said: Mr. Speaker—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With the permission of the House, I will make a statement respecting these three Bills. The Government have had communication with Her Majesty's Government, and Her Majesty's Government are carrying on a correspondence with the authorities at Washington on this whole subject of wrecking and coasting. That correspondence is now in progress, and I think that the Government must ask that these Bills be postponed for the present, because it is a little absurd that we should be legislating here while Her Majesty's Government are pressing upon the United States Government the strong views of Canada on the subject of reciprocity in wrecking, and reciprocity in coasting as well.

Mr. CHARLTON. I might suggest to the leader of the Government, whether it would not be proper to enter upon the discussion of these Bills, and after discussing the merits of the case, to refer the Bills to a special committee, and there let the matter rest until we see what is the outcome at Washington.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not the slightest objection.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I do not think there is any use in referring the Bills to a special committee. If the Government will say that we shall have time to move these Bills later on in the Session, so that, if the House consents to them, we may send them to the Senate, I would let them stand while that correspondence is in progress. But if we are to have a discussion, we must have a vote, and either pass the Bill or reject it. If the Government, upon their responsibility, say that the matter is engaging their attention, and that negotiations are now in progress with the authorities at Washington, upon this very subject, of course I would not wish to press the matter. I am so anxious that the question of reciprocity in wrecking should be favorably considered, that I would not like to injure it by premature discussion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps it would be as well, then, to place the items at the foot of the list, with the understanding that we shall give the earliest information on the subject, so that, in case the negotiations do not result as we would like, the hon. gentleman can bring these Bills up again.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would object to putting them at the foot of the list.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Let them stand at the head.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think myself it would be in the interest of the country to have this matter discussed now, or whenever we have time to attend to it. It is not likely that at a later stage of the Session we will have time to devote to a full discussion of this question.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. BROWN moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) to make further provision as to the prevention of cruelty to animals, and to amend chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill I may be permitted to make a few observations upon it, although I do not intend, at this stage, to make any lengthy observations. Should, however, the occasion require, by action that may be taken in the course of this discussion, I shall take another opportunity of replying to any statements that may be made. Hon. gentlemen will remember the singular career of this measure in the House last Session, when it was carried on one occasion by a vote of one, and then reversed by a vote of one, and then, when it became a tie, the Speaker kept the measure before the House. Afterwards when it came to Committee, the House was in such a state of excitement that my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), who was in the Chair, was so convulsed with laughter at the scene around him, that he could not observe that I was speaking. All that was required on that occasion was a few moments of speaking to the House, in order that the hon. gentlemen who were out of the building might have time to come in and record their vote. My hon. friend the genial member for Montreal did not only not see me in the crowd of members that were standing up, but he did not hear the Minister of Customs telling him that I was speaking. However, I may state now that the object of this Bill seems not to have been understood by some persons. I am sorry to say that in many quarters of the country the object of the Bill, from statements made, seems to have been misapprehended, although I do not wish to make any charges against any one. I wish to state at the outset, that the Bill does not affect in any way true and real sport. The object of the Bill is one which all true sportsmen throughout the country will support, and do support. The Bill is mainly to provide against trap-shooting. We all know that the first element of sport consists in a contest between the man and the animal, where the man does the best he can, and the animal does the best it can. But in this case which the Bill designed to meet, the animal has no chance for its life, has no chance to exert its instincts to do the best it can. The object of the Bill is to prevent the cooping up of birds in boxes, and putting them into traps, and giving them no chance for their

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

ives. As I will be prepared to show you, this trap-shooting business is attended with acts of great cruelty, to say nothing of the degrading and debasing associations of gambling and, in some cases, disturbances. I am also able to prove that in the large cities and in country towns, too, where this trap-shooting is followed, it is creating a band of young thieves all over the country. Some persons are fond of doves and have dove-cotes, for the good training of their children, and creating a love for these innocent birds, and when trap-shooting matches take place these dove-cotes, in many instances, have been robbed by boys and the birds sold to these trap-shooters, and no questions are asked. Many a man having doves costing \$20 a pair, has lost them, and they have been sold for 15 or 20 cents and no questions asked, the birds having been stolen by a band of young thieves and sold to trap-shooters. I have letters in my possession from gentlemen of position in the city of Toronto and other places, giving absolute proof of this fact. I know that my hon. friend who will follow me will tell you that there is no cruelty in trap-shooting. If he has the courage to say on the floor of this House what he says elsewhere, he will tell you that this measure has been promoted by cranks and those who know nothing about sport. Since I introduced this measure last Session, the press of the country on all sides has spoken out in support of it; the people have spoken in support of it. I have presented to this House petitions containing between three and four thousand signatures, and on those petitions are the names of the Chief Justices of New Brunswick and Manitoba, of all the leading clergymen of the country, of leading school teachers and professors of universities, professors of Trinity College, Toronto, of Knox College, Wycliffe College, McMaster Hall; and all the leading teachers who are interested in the education of the youth of the country have signed petitions to this honorable House praying us to pass this measure. They ask us to pass this measure because they consider that the practice that is aimed at is degrading to grown-up society, and they consider that it is in the interest of the youth of this country that a measure should be passed that will educate the youth of the country properly in regard to what is legitimate sport and what is debasing sport. No one knows better than hon. gentlemen in this House that a child's course through life is largely influenced by the first impression it receives. I ask the hon. gentleman who will follow me, and any hon. member who opposes this measure, if he would take his child to see a trap-shooting match, or a cock fight, or a dog fight, and if he would point to it and say: My child, that is the way I wish you to grow up, and I want you to encourage cruel sport like that. Hon. gentlemen may oppose this Bill, backed up by influences to which I do not care to refer; but there is not an hon. member here who would take his child to witness such an exhibition. I claim that this Bill does not interfere with true sport. I hold the opinion that concentrating or driving animals into limited space and confining them is not sport. We often hear of cases abroad where animals are brought into a narrow compass so that they cannot readily escape, and men sit at their ease and shoot them. Is that sport? I say it is nothing of the kind. But, perhaps, one of the most degrading

exhibitions is that of trap-shooting birds which, when relieved from captivity, have no chance of saving their lives. In the United States a case was decided where a man was brought up for cruelty to animals by shooting a pigeon at a trap-shooting match. He defended the suit. The decision is of importance to this House. Here is a summary of the decision, which was given by Judge Yerkes in Bucks county court sitting in quarter sessions :

"To make out the offence, 'the Commonwealth must show, first, that the pigeon was ill-treated or abused; second, that the manner of the treatment was wanton or cruel. One of the pigeons was wounded and alighted upon a tree, and as soon as its wounded condition was discovered it was killed. Is it ill-treatment or abuse to wound a living creature so that it lingers in that condition for a period, long or short?' Speedily answering the question in the affirmative, the judge next proceeds to consider whether the action was wanton. 'There is wantonness,' he argues, 'wherever pain is caused without cause or good reason.' Warming up to his task, the judge then disposes of the plea that pigeon shooting is necessary to develop marksmanship. He suggests that clay pigeons or glass balls would answer as well as live pigeons, and further hints that if the members of the Philadelphia Club are training themselves for army service in time of war, it would be a good scheme for them to use rifles rather than shotguns. Denying this as a sufficient argument for the shooting, the judge as speedily overrides the point that the shooting was done to prepare the birds for food. 'When pigeons in captivity are needed for food,' he argues, 'there are quicker and surer ways of killing them than by shooting.' The final blow is dealt to the defendant's cause when Judge Yerkes approaches the point made in his favor that he did not intend to wound, but to kill. It appears to the legal mind that the holding of a shooting contest pre-supposes that some will shoot better than others—that while some will kill their birds others will wound. Summing up his points, the judge decides that a misdemeanor was committed by Mr. Lewis."

I may dwell for a moment longer on the question of non-cruelty or otherwise, because I know it is a subject that will be referred to by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). In the Massachusetts House of Representatives a commission was appointed to satisfy themselves respecting the cruelty that was practised on birds shot from traps, and evidence was taken under oath, and a report was made to the Governor of the State. In the evidence given, a statement was made to this effect:—Mr. Matthews of Winthrop, Mass. :

"One morning, after a pigeon-shoot, I found three pigeons on the coving of my stable, right on the eaves. During the next night they died and dropped down. I examined them. One had a leg broken and had two shots through the body. Another had a leg broken and had one eye put out. After one of their shoots, four birds came to my place in just the same way. I live a mile away, in an air-line, from the shooting grounds."

"When the Winthrop Club was started I was one of the members, and belonged to it three years. I got sick of it and left it. Then, about one bird out of eight would get away."

"Q. You said you got sick of it?

"A. Yes."

"Q. On what account?

"A. Well, because I did not like the treatment of the birds. I thought it was not right."

"Q. From your experience, during three years, what is your opinion about the humanity of the thing?

"A. I think it is cruel."

"Q. In what particular point does the cruelty consist?

"A. In the first place, of their catching these birds with the snares, and of boxing them, and keeping them the way they are kept for three or four days. I think there is cruelty in taking and confining any animal in a spot, and for a man to take a loaded gun, and stand and pull away a trap for the bird to come out, and then shoot at him where he cannot have any chance to help himself. But if a man is out after wild game, then the bird has got a chance to take care of himself."

"Q. Is this pigeon shooting cruel above the shooting of wild game?

"A. It is; because the bird is caged and housed. He is convicted to be shot, the same as a man is convicted to be put upon the gallows to be hung. He does not have a chance to take care of himself."

"This practice of pigeon shooting has a bad influence on boys. Where boys are offered 15 or 20 cents apiece for birds, if you have some very nice pigeons on your place you will find the boys snaring them to get this 15 cents."

I have already stated that this Bill has been largely supported by the country. I have spoken of the support I have received in the form of petitions which I presented to this House from all quarters and from the very highest people in the land, the highest in law, in church and in commerce; and the other day, when I presented a petition from the city of St. John, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) stated that he had never before seen a document containing 161 names of greater weight and importance from that city. I have a letter from the Humane Society of Fredericton, stating that they have been too late to be able to send a petition, and that they are in favor of the passage of this Bill as being a step in the right direction. And this communication, I may say, states that the Most Reverend Metropolitan Bishop Coadjutor of Fredericton, the Chief Justice and other Judges, and others support the Bill. I cannot for the life of me see why any objection should be taken to this measure, because, in asking support for it, I am simply asking support for a law promoted in the interest of humanity, in the interest of mercy to God's dumb creatures, and as a good example to our young people. I have in my recollection a statement made to me by a public official, who has seen many of these pigeon matches in the course of his duty, and he declares that a more depraved and demoralising sight it has not been his lot to witness, and that the influence upon those who have anything to do with it is bad. In England they have taken hold of this subject in a thorough manner, and in the right way. Not only have they prohibited this cruelty, but they are educating the children of the land to realise its demoralising influence. In one school in England, where the teaching of kindness to animals has been made one of the principal subjects and is taught the same as a lesson in geography or in any other subject, they have traced the career of 7,000 pupils who have passed through the institution into the battle of life, and so far as the authorities could learn anything about the career of the ex-scholars, they have made a declaration to the Humane Society of England that not one of those 7,000 children, so far as known, have ever been convicted, or even charged with a criminal offence. I repeat again, although it has been chosen to be made a sort of ridicule in relation to this Bill, that a society has been formed in England to promote the education of children in kindness to God's dumb creatures, so that they may be taught this noble principle from their youth up. These children pledge themselves that they will be kind to any dumb animal, that they will feed the birds in winter, and that they will never rob a bird's nest. That organisation is called "The Dickey-Bird Society."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROWN. Some hon. gentlemen have thought, that because they choose to call this "a Dickey-Bird Bill" they offend me, but they are mistaken in that; they do not offend me. I am

proud to say that there is such a society in England, and I hope there soon will be a similar society in Canada. I venture to say that any young man or young woman, who grows up in the early training of being kind to animals, the chances are greatly in their favor that they will be better citizens and better fathers and mothers. I hardly believe it possible that a man who has become a hardened criminal, has ever had the advantage in his early life of this kind of tuition. As I said before, I do not propose at this stage of the Bill to detain the House longer, but I may inform hon. gentlemen that when this Bill reaches the Committee, I propose to eliminate this last clause. I was prepared, last year, to strike out this clause, had it not been for the exciting scene in the House, when the Bill was in Committee. The clause which I propose to omit is as follows:—

“3. Any person may lawfully destroy or cause to be destroyed any animal found to be abandoned, or not properly cared for, when, in the judgment of two justices of the peace, called by him to view the same in his presence, it appears to be injured, disabled or diseased past recovery.”

I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in bringing forward this measure I did so at the request of nine Humane Societies in Canada, and each of these societies had their suggestions to make. The Toronto Society, the Hamilton Society, and, I think, another, stated that they had, occasionally, cases where a person having used a horse until that horse became worthless, discarded it and left it to linger and die without food or water. It was thought well, in consequence of this, that such a clause should be introduced. Representations have, however, been made to me that this clause might be productive of harm in more ways than one, and I feel disposed to meet the views of certain hon. gentlemen by eliminating that clause from the Bill. I take my stand upon this measure in the interests of common humanity, and in the belief that killing for killing sake is wrong. I believe that killing for the need of man is right, but that it should be done, even then, with the greatest possible mercy to the animal. The fact that this brutality in killing pigeons is done, merely because it reduces the physical exertions of those who participate in the so-called sport, makes it more objectionable morally. I mean by this, that the real sportsman looks with perfect horror on any kind of so-called sport or amusement which simply confines animals in order that he may shoot them in his laziness, and without the possibility of giving the animal a chance for its life. I can prove, and I will prove, if I have the opportunity at a later stage of the debate, that this is brutalising and immoral, from the speeches delivered in the British House of Commons by such eminent men as Mr. Anderson, of Glasgow; the late Mr. W. E. Forster, Chief Secretary of Ireland; Earl Percy, Lord Randolph Churchill, and others, who condemned this brutal sport, and, as a result of whose exertions, a Bill similar to the one now before this House, passed the House of Commons in England by a vote of 195 to 40. I may point out again, that the object of the trapper in these pigeon-shooting matches is to make the bird fly as eccentric as possible, and that in obtaining this object, the grossest brutality is perpetrated. When the trapper takes the bird

Mr. BROWN.

from the trap he sometimes twists his tail, or pulls a handful of feathers from its bosom, so that the bird in its excitement and pain may fly in different directions, and make it all the more difficult for the gunner to hit. It is said that there is no cruelty in this sport, and the petition which has been presented by my hon. friend states, that when a bird is wounded it is retrieved. If it is not, I suppose a boy goes after it with a stick and hammers it on the head, until he kills it. Cases have been mentioned to me of birds, after having been shot at a shooting match, fluttering away in a wounded state and being picked up in the agonies of death, a mile and a half from where the shooting took place. Will any one say that that kind of a sport is not cruelty to birds? In a shooting match, it must be expected that some birds will be killed and some wounded, and we know with what anxiety the fate of a bird is watched by those who have their hundreds of dollars laid on the result of the match. At a shooting match with live pigeons, which took place in New Jersey the other day, \$16,000 was put up, to be gambled away in the shooting of those doves which have been the emblems of innocence ever since the days of creation. I hope this Parliament, by its action in relation to this measure, will rebuke such cruel sports, and give the weight of its opinion in favor of that which will tend to the moral good of the community, the putting an end to practices which no legitimate sportsman has ever asked for. I have letters in my possession from men who have been engaged as sportsmen all their lives, who have shot live pigeons out of their trap, but who, through the brutality of the scene, became so ashamed of the so-called sport, that they have never gone back to it. A clause of this Bill defines what an animal is. My hon. friend, in his jocular way, may perhaps tell you that this Bill punishes a man for overdriving a hen. Well, that is a very ridiculous and stupid thing to say; but I will tell you what this Bill will do: it will punish a man for overdriving or acting cruelly to a horse or a dog. I do not think hon. gentlemen will differ from me when I say that man can never repay the debt that he owes to the horse; and yet, go into our streets, and you will see brutes in human form overloading their horses, and lashing and cursing them if they cannot draw the load, forgetting that while they are outraging society, their curses and lashings are heard by the pitying ears of a God above them, who will see that justice is done. I know that last Session this measure did not receive its full consideration by many hon. gentlemen. I know that there was a good deal of amusement and fun taken out of the measure; but I know that, beneath all the fun and sport, there were warm hearts beating in many breasts that felt that the measure was right; and I think that to-day they will realise its importance, and consider it in a serious way. Indeed, I am convinced that they will, and that the hour for serious action in this matter has arrived. I will take the liberty here of saying that I do not quarrel with the participators in such sports; I believe there is a great deal of thoughtlessness about them. I have found more good than evil in the world, to tell you the truth; I think the world is growing better as it is growing older; and I have never condemned men who somehow or other have got into the groove and

participate in sports of this kind. But I want to stop the sport, and then the men will not be there to take part in it. Let us declare, what the consensus of public opinion affirms, that everything which tends to make a man indifferent or unkind to any of God's creatures is wrong—that the sport which coops up an animal and makes a target of it is wrong—that the practice of killing animals for killing's sake, is contrary, not only to the whole spirit of humanity, but contrary to the will, the law and the design of God. In moving the second reading of this Bill, as I have said, I am here as the spokesman of the humane societies in Canada, which are supposed to represent the humane people of the localities where they exist. I know that they do, and without any reflections on those who are opposed to me, I know that the petitions sent to this honorable House in support of this measure come from men of all classes, and from men who adorn the classes to which they belong. Now, I hope that this House will, by its vote to-day, show its appreciation of this measure, and will do its duty in providing for the prevention of cruelty to animals, who are too patient to complain, and too helpless to protest. I am here to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves, and I hope this House will take a calm and considerate view of this important question. I could go on for a longer time in substantiating the position I have taken; but, as I have said, I will not weary the House by giving further extracts, but will simply move that the Bill be now read the second time.

Mr. TISDALE. I can congratulate the hon. gentleman upon one thing, at all events: we have got the same Bill that was thrown out of the House last Session. Previously I could not find out exactly what he was after; but this time we can see that he is after the same thing that he was after last Session. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman in the opening of his speech, that this Bill has had a singular career; and hon. members will agree with me, I think, that he has already made hon. members weary of the Bill, both in the House and out of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. TISDALE. Perhaps not, but I am expressing my own view; and if hon. members do not agree with me, they have more patience than I have. After the consideration the House gave to the Bill last year, I think the hon. gentleman should have discovered that the House was weary of it, and should have accepted its verdict in a matter of no greater importance than this, and not have troubled the House with it again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. TISDALE. Well, it is for the House to say. I am not at all complaining that the House has not the right to so consider it for three weeks if they choose. I will join cheerfully in the discussion from the start to the finish, and see that the subject gets proper justice. Before alluding to the particulars of the Bill, I want to disavow, on behalf of the sportsmen of Canada, England and all civilized countries, the implied allegation—the hon. gentleman did not make it directly, but he, no doubt, intended it as a direct allegation, because he brought it forward in support of his Bill—that the sportsmen of Canada, England and the United States are cruel. I may say that the Bill—and I

will give reasons in brief why I make the assertion—is intended to cover up its true objects, and appeals to the public and this House on grounds that the Bill itself does not legislate about; in other words, the hon. gentleman alleges it is for the prevention of cruelty to animals, yet in his remarks he does not offer a single argument except against trap-shooting. If the hon. gentleman had brought in a Bill for that purpose, and petitioned against that sport, he would have simplified matters very much. But he has not done so. Before proceeding, however, to criticise the Bill, let me say that I heartily concur in the hon. gentleman's remarks about the necessity of educating our youth in kindness and gentleness to all God's creatures. But I deny this allegation, that there is in this country, either among the sportsmen or the people who handle animals, any cruelty which is not guarded against by the law that he re-enacts; for the important part of his Bill is already law, and additions are only made to it to give importance and draw our attention from the real matter he is aiming at—the abolition of trap-shooting. Did he say one word, beyond some allegations about cruelties in England or the United States, to show that it was cruel to shoot an animal? Not at all. Lest I forget it, I wish to correct the hon. gentleman in one point, for I do not think it is right, in discussing a measure, to let the House hear only half the proof. He told us that this Bill was thrown out of the House of Commons in England.

Mr. BROWN. The hon. gentleman has not been listening very carefully to what I said. I said that the Bill was carried in the House of Commons, instead of being lost.

Mr. TISDALE. I meant to say that the hon. gentleman said it was carried; but he forgot to tell the House that it was subsequently thrown out in the House of Lords by a majority of three to one. He would have led this House to believe that it had become law in England.

Mr. BROWN. Not at all.

Mr. TISDALE. When an hon. gentleman stands up and quotes the action of another Legislature, and gives us to understand that the Bill had been passed by a large majority, without stating that the other branch of the Legislature had rejected it by a vote of three to one, he evidently wants us to understand that the measure became law, or why would he quote it as a precedent at all? In England they legislated in a logical manner. They declined to say that shooting a bird out of a trap, after it has flown, is cruel. The hon. gentleman says: If you ask me whether shooting a bird is cruel, I will say, certainly not. That is the whole question. If the birds are ill-used in the trap, or in being brought to the trap, the logical remedy is the one the English Parliament adopted. They said: We deny that it is cruel to shoot a bird when it has flown from the trap, but we will pass as strong a law as you wish to punish anybody who uses the birds cruelly before they are set free. The hon. gentleman knows that this House will pass as strong a law as is required for that purpose, if the present law is not strong enough. What has been the result in England? They refused to abolish the sport, but they passed a law so stringent that since then, neither in the press nor in either branch of the Legislature, has

anybody raised the question of abolishing trap-shooting. If the hon. gentleman wants a law here I will guarantee that the sportsmen of this country will take more trouble than he would, to have such a law passed and see that it is enforced. The hon. gentleman failed to explain his Bill except with regard to trap-shooting. But that is only a small part of it. There are other very serious provisions which he inserted, in order to give an importance to his measure in the eyes of those who are not aware of the law as it exists. He re-enacts the very strong law against cruelty to animals, which is now on our Statutes, and of which I heartily approve. In fact, the principal provisions of his Bill are re-enactments of clauses that have been law for a long time, and the best proof that these clauses are severe, is that the hon. gentleman could find no words to change or improve them. But then he adds three clauses, which do not affect trap-shooting, and then he adds the trap-shooting clause. The sum of his Bill, which he tells us is aimed at trap-shooting, and in respect of which one clause would have been sufficient, is that he re-enacts the preamble of the present law, adding a few words which do not, in my opinion, cover any more ground than the general terms of the present law, and then he adds three new clauses. Let me read what the present law is, because I find very few hon. gentlemen have taken the trouble to look up the law, but have taken it for granted that there was no law on the subject. When they see the very stringent law which is now in force, I think they will agree that it is not necessary at all to reopen the question :

"Everyone who wantonly, cruelly, or unnecessarily beats, binds, ill-treats, abuses, over-drives, or tortures any cattle, poultry, dog, domestic animal or bird,—or who, while driving any cattle or other animals, by negligence or ill-usage in the driving thereof, the means whereby any damage, mischief or injury is done by any such cattle or other animal; or who in any manner encourages, aids or assists in the fighting or baiting of any bull, bear, badger, dog, cock, or other kind of animal, whether of domestic or wild nature, shall, on summary conviction before two justices of the peace, be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$50, or to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three months, with or without hard labor, or to both."

That is the present law. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the very law he speaks of, under which the American judge convicted a party for maiming a pigeon, is not as strict as the present law. What more does he ask us to enact? These are the three new clauses :

"(d.) Having the charge or custody of any animal, unnecessarily fails to provide the same with proper food, drink, shelter and protection from the weather; or—

"(e.) Being the owner, driver or person having the charge or custody of any animal, wantonly and unnecessarily leaves disabled or abandons such animal; or—

"(f.) Wantonly and unnecessarily carries or causes to be carried, in or upon any vehicle, or otherwise, any animal in a cruel or inhuman manner; or—

I ask whether there is any evidence before the House—certainly the hon. gentleman has not brought any—to support the declaration that the farmers of this country, the stock raisers and breeders, and the cattle dealers, starve or ill-treat their cattle in carrying them. That is what the hon. gentleman asserts.

Mr. BROWN. No.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman says "no." Then, why does he ask this House to adopt this provision? The hon. gentleman dare not send any

Mr. TISDALE.

of his petitions to a rural constituency. I say this statement is a wanton and deliberate misrepresentation of our people. This is the serious part of the Bill. He wants us to say, that the people of this country are so cruel and inhuman in the treatment of animals, that it is not sufficient to have the provision which has been law for years, and under which I have not heard any pretence that ample punishment could not be meted out to any offender. What does he petition us to do? Here is the petition :

"To the Honorable the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled:

"The petitioner of the undersigned humbly prays that your honorable body may pass the Bill for the further Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, introduced by Adam Brown, Esq., M.P."

Is there any statement there that our farmers, stock raisers or breeders, ill-use, starve or inhumanly tie their animals? I am sure that out of 2,000 or 3,000 people who have signed those petitions, very few have read the wording. Nearly all these petitions came from Toronto, Ottawa and Hamilton. How does the hon. gentleman get them? I am told that in Toronto two or three boys were hired to go around with them and get signatures, and that this was the *modus operandi* of the hon. gentleman. It is very simple: "Will you sign this petition?" "What is it about?" "A Bill against cruelty to animals." "Oh, certainly I will." Of course anyone would sign a petition of that kind, but I believe that very few would sign who had any idea of its meaning. I want to correct the hon. gentleman in regard to some statements which he has made this Session and last Session. I suppose he misunderstands the law, or he would not make those misstatements. He says this Bill will prevent cock-fighting and things of that sort, but that is provided for in the law at present, under which not only the man who organises the cocking-main is liable, but also every one who is present at it. I have seen the law enforced, and have seen all parties, not only those getting up cock-fights, but also those who were present, hauled up before the magistrate. The hon. gentleman wants the House to understand that he is bringing in that as something new. The new clauses have nothing whatever to do with that. In regard to trap-shooting, let me explain. In the Province of Ontario, and I suppose in most of the other Provinces, there is a law, which is much stronger than the proposal of the hon. gentleman, providing that you shall not shoot a bird except game birds or birds required as articles of food, with the special exception of sparrows and black-birds. Those birds were not at first excepted, but they became such a nuisance that people were hired to kill them if possible. If any of the other Provinces have not such laws now in existence, they can pass them if they choose. Is there any evidence in the petition which I have quoted that the people who signed it knew they were asking for the abolition of trap-shooting? I do not think petitions are worth much, because people frequently sign petitions without knowing what they are for, but, at least, they should have the opportunity of knowing what they are signing by the information being given in the petition itself. Do these people say they want trap-shooting abolished? They say nothing of the kind, but simply that they desire the House to pass the Bill introduced by Adam Brown, Esq. It is true that doleful

consequences may result to us if we do not agree to this, because there are some names on this petition which would affect a strong-minded man as well as a tender-hearted man. We find that Emma Sweetlove is in favor of this Bill, and so also is Sophia Savage; so we must be very careful as to what we do. It must be observed that a great majority of those who signed the petition are ladies, and I should like to ask if the ladies are to legislate or the members of this House? If you take the evidence against the Bill, and read the petition, you will find that it does not ask the House to reject the Bill simply, but it states why the petitioners think the Bill should be rejected. This petition has been signed by several thousand people, and it is as follows:—

"To the Honorable the Senate and House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, in Parliament assembled:

"The petition of the undersigned, residents of the Dominion, humbly shows:

"That your petitioners are informed that certain persons are seeking to obtain amendments to the law for prevention of cruelty to animals for the purpose of preventing the shooting of certain birds;

"Your petitioners assert that such persons are acting upon a mere sentiment, and without a knowledge of the subject;

"That gun clubs and sportsmen take pains to avoid the practice of any cruelty in regard to birds used in trap-shooting, and that with modern close-shooting guns birds are usually killed instantaneously, but if wounded, are retrieved and killed with the least delay possible;

"That if pigeons are not so used they will rapidly increase and cause great loss and injury to farmers and annoyance to townspeople; and that sparrows have already become such an injury and nuisance that farmers, gardeners, and people of all classes are anxious for their extermination;

"That the use of the birds mentioned for trap-shooting affords the only efficient and comparative humane means of checking their increase;

"That to stop such shooting would be a great and unwarrantable interference with the business of those engaged in the gun trade and manufacturers and dealers in shooting materials.

"Your petitioners therefore pray that no legislation may be passed to interfere with or prevent shooting birds from traps."

The hon. gentleman has seen fit to attack this practice as being one of great cruelty. He mentions no case, refers to no club and to no town in which this cruelty has taken place, and I defy him or anyone else to mention any place in Canada where cruelty has been practiced. I am not a member of any gun club. I never shot a bird out of a trap, but four or five gun clubs sent me a list of their members and some other information, and I find that there are about 150 gun clubs in Canada with about 15,000 members. I received information from the gun clubs in Toronto, Montreal, Guelph and Chatham. These are from Toronto, Montreal, Guelph and Chatham. The Dominion Gun Club Alliance sent it to me as an illustration of the occupations of those whom these gentlemen indirectly accuse of using inhuman means. I would not have alluded to it if the hon. gentleman had not brought it up in the House, and I may say that he never could have got his petitions signed, he could never have got the sympathy of the ladies in regard to this Bill, if untrue reports had not been circulated about the cruelty of people in handling birds. One lady who spoke to me about the Bill wanted to know why I opposed Mr. Brown's Bill, and when I explained the matter to her, she said: "I never understood it before. I do not think there is any cruelty in shooting birds in that way, but I do not like their eyes to be put out or their wings broken." There

is an impression growing up among many that this sort of thing transpires among these gun clubs. Now, there have been sent me the occupations of 200 members, belonging to four gun clubs, some of which occupations are these: Two judges; one high sheriff; twenty-two gentlemen; thirty manufacturers; thirty-five merchants; four lawyers; four physicians; eight city officials; four commercial travellers; four merchant tailors; nine railway conductors and officials; nine bankers; twelve clerks; seventeen farmers; four court officials; seven dentists; nine insurance agents and officials; three veterinary surgeons; eight contractors; two cattle dealers; three printers and journalists; six brokers; five real estate dealers; two civil engineers; two artists; two architects; five jewellers; five painters. The balance of the members are made up of these occupations: builders, photographers, machinists, gardeners, millers, bricklayers, bakers, nurserymen, druggists, florists, shoemakers, marble cutters, students, carpenters, blacksmiths, accountants, auctioneers, tailors, plumbers, tinsmiths and bill posters. There are about sixty occupations represented by these members, and yet the hon. gentleman would have the House of Commons and the country believe all these men are guilty of cruelty. He has not brought forward one petition, one letter from a man or a woman, to prove that gentlemen constituting these gun clubs have been guilty of cruelty to animals. This is a serious thing. The hon. gentleman asks me if I would like my own son to go trap-shooting. I certainly would. I say that it encourages him to engage in manly sport, and it teaches him how to do it. Young men drink less, they play cards less, they learn less evil habits, if you teach them how to carry on field sports. Their morals are better, they have more manliness in every way; and I repudiate the charge that this sport tends to make them cruel. Let me read, in this connection, a short extract from the *Field* newspaper, written when a Bill was before the English House of Commons, a precisely similar Bill to this one, so far as trap-shooting is concerned. The *Field* made these remarks:

"Our readers will hardly need to be reminded that Mr. Anderson's Bill is the thin end of the wedge."

We can say the same of Mr. Brown's Bill here—

"In its original state, it aimed at the abolition of pretty nearly all sports; and, should the Pigeon Shooting Bill be passed, it will most probably not be long before some measure is introduced to put a stop to something else, and the passing of the present Bill will be used as an argument for passing others of a more sweeping character. We repeat that we argue this question on a broad ground, and do not identify ourselves in the least with the pastime of pigeon shooting. We insist upon the elements of cruelty and sport being kept distinct in this matter, and object to sentimentalism usurping the place of common sense."

Mr. BROWN. What is the date?

Mr. TISDALE. I have not the date. There is a long article, and I would be glad to read it to you if I had time. It was written when the Bill passed the House of Commons, and before it went to the House of Lords. Now, there are one or two other matters that I must mention in justice to the hon. gentleman, because he claims that they tell in favor of his Bill. Last year he told us that the Hubert Gun Club of Ottawa was in favor of his Bill. I have no doubt he thought they were, but about the same time a communica-

tion appeared in an Ottawa paper stating that the Hubert Gun Club were not in favor of his Bill, though individual members might have been. But a gentleman who belonged to a gun club here writes to the public and says :

"The Ottawa Gun Club does not shoot live birds, and is in favor of Mr. Brown's Bill."

"Yours truly,
"Dr. McPHEE,
"President Ottawa Gun Club."

This tender-hearted doctor! I mentioned this to the talented and witty member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). He said: "The doctor should not pose as a great humanitarian. I know a much better gun club than that. I know a gun club that does not shoot at all." That is, a gun club who do not use powder and shot; and a club that never shoots live things does not amount to much. I come now to the last class who support the hon. gentleman's Bill, and I do so with great diffidence—I allude to the ladies. I find that the hon. gentleman had a meeting in Ottawa, and the ladies passed a resolution, in which they said :

"It is the earnest wish of the Women's Humane Society, of Ottawa, that the Bill to be introduced by Mr. Adam Brown should pass both Houses and the Council."

Now, bless their dear, sentimental tenderness of heart, they want Mr. Brown's Bill to pass. They do not say anything about hard-hearted farmers, or horse dealers, or stock men who have been guilty of cruelty to animals. I am sure they do not know what is in the Bill, but they know that it is against cruelty to animals. Now, we all admire, I am sure, the tender-heartedness of the ladies. We know that we have to appeal even more to their tender sympathies and their goodness of heart than to their judgment, and probably it is very well that is so, because if we did not succeed in that way, a great many of us would go unmated for our lives. But when it comes to a matter of sympathy, then good-bye to their judgments, take them as a whole. Probably they go upon the same line as one tender-hearted lady, who wrote to an hon. member in favor of the Bill. She wrote him in the anxiety and the interest that she had taken in this Bill; and what do you think she asked? To oppose a Bill to prevent cruelty in driving animals, or in starving animals, or in trap-shooting? No. She said: "I hope you will support dear Mr. Brown's Bill." Now, I cannot blame the ladies. I want to make a confession; they say that confession is always a proper thing, and I want to confess honestly that I believe that, if I were a woman, and the hon. gentleman should approach me with his genial manners and beaming smile, I would certainly surrender at discretion; so that I cannot blame the ladies at all. But I would ask the hon. gentleman, how about the men? Now, the dicky-birds have been whispering about the corridors of the House for the last few weeks that hon. gentlemen were going to support this Bill—not because they believed it was necessary, not because it was wanted, but because, like the resolution of the ladies, and like the letter I have read, it was "Dear Mr. Brown's Bill." I would, then, ask hon. gentlemen in all seriousness, whether they do not think this comedy has been on the legislative boards long enough. There is great danger that, if it stays on much longer, the comedy may turn into a farce.

Mr. BROWN. You mean your comedy,
Mr. TISDALE.

Mr. TISDALE. The comedy of this whole Bill, and the circumstances surrounding it, and the canvassing for it. I will finish with one short quotation taken from the debates in the English House of Lords when a similar Bill was before it. Earl Fortescue, in concluding a speech against that Bill, said :

"There were important measures which the time of Parliament might be usefully employed upon; but he protested against the time and labor of the Legislature being wasted upon a proposal of this kind. Nero fiddled while Rome was burning."

I, therefore, move in amendment :

That the word "now" be struck out of the motion, and the words "this day six months" added at the end thereof.

Mr. TROW. I rise for the purpose of asking an explanation from the promoter of the Bill. I desire to ask him whether he intends, if the Bill should get into Committee of the Whole, to expunge sub-section 3 of section 3. In this sub-section there is embodied a dangerous system of legislation, for it not merely applies to birds, but to all animals; and the definition of animals includes any horse, mare, gelding, bull, ox, cow, heifer, steer, calf, mule, ass, sheep, lamb, goat, pig, hog, sow, dog, or cat, and every other domestic animal, fowl or bird, or wild animal, fowl or bird, tamed or domesticated. In fact, it includes all animals. I have known in my part of the country, and particularly in the backwoods settlements, cases where sheep have been worried by dogs, and the poor animals, in order to escape their vicious pursuers, had gone into the bush and remained there. Under sub-section 3 of this Bill, power is given to two magistrates as follows :—

"Any person may lawfully destroy or cause to be destroyed any animal found to be abandoned, or not properly cared for, when, in the judgment of two justices of the peace, called by him to view the same in his presence, it appears to be injured, disabled or diseased past recovery." Frequently animals go astray. Your horse may leave your stable and get into the woods and be unprovided for and uncared for, and some vicious and ill-disposed person may capture the animal and have it destroyed under this sub-section. This Bill would be bad legislation unless this clause were expunged. If this were done in Committee, I would support the Bill.

Mr. BROWN. I am glad my hon. friend has drawn the attention of the House to this clause. In the remarks I made on moving the second reading of the Bill, I stated that I proposed to eliminate this clause. I propose that sub-section 3 be totally expunged. The arguments of my hon. friend and other arguments submitted to me privately by an hon. gentleman opposite, are so convincing that I shall expunge the whole of it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. As the hon. gentleman who spoke last very properly said, a considerable portion of this Bill is a re-enactment of the present law. That being the case, we need not trouble ourselves about it, and if the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) chooses to make a little change in the arrangement of the clauses, it can do no possible harm. Then we come to the new clauses in the Bill, one of which deals with starving animals. The hon. gentleman who spoke last seemed to think that this was casting a reflection on our farmers and all the inhabitants of this country. I do not think it does anything of the kind, for it can only apply to an inhuman person

who starves animals, and there are such persons in the country. From my personal knowledge I can give two examples which have occurred within recent winters. Adjacent to my dwelling there is a house which is occupied by tenants who removed after remaining there a short time, the winter before last. One day I heard a whining noise, and on proceeding to the house I found a dog, unable to walk, which had evidently been left there to starve. I had the dog fed for two or three days, and then I got the chief constable to kill it. Last winter a similar case occurred, but the dog was a very handsome spaniel. I sent my children several days to feed it, and then I got a person to take charge of it, and it is well and happy now. These facts show that this is not a mere matter of sentiment, but it is a matter that requires the adoption of a law under which offenders may be discovered and punished. It is casting no imputation on our people to say that in cases of such cruelty being practiced the party should be punished. With respect to shooting birds from traps, I hold that no person has been more fond of sport than I have been, but I must confess I never shot a bird from a trap. I would not allow one of my sons to go to a trap-shooting competition, not on the question of cruelty, but on account of the evil influences which, I believe, are connected with such meetings. It is not sport in any sense of the word. If a sportsman goes after deer or goes duck shooting he has exercise and shows much labor and skill, and it is not merely the shooting of a deer or a duck wherein lies the pleasure, but it is in the keen sense of sport, and the great exercise it gives sportsmen, not only in Canada, but in Scotland and in other countries, which produce keen sportsmen. Whoever would think of a Scotchman in the Highlands tying a deer and going fifty yards away and shooting it. Would you call that sport? Would you call it sport if a few wild ducks were taken to a pond and strings tied to their legs and then shot? I deny that this is sport. I think there are evil influences surrounding such meetings. You do not find men in the country who go duck shooting take an interest in gun clubs, but the people who take interest in such clubs are people in cities, such as Toronto and Hamilton, who know nothing about sport, who congregate in taverns and bet large sums of money on the result; and that is the kind of so-called sport at which the hon. gentleman is aiming in introducing this Bill. When the very objectionable clauses which the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Trow) has pointed out, are expunged, I will, with very great pleasure, support the Bill.

Mr. ELLIS. A greater amount of cruelty is practiced on domestic animals, both in captivity and transportation, than people are aware of. It is well known that people in such cases frequently defy the officers appointed to carry out the law. Sometimes the magistrates before whom the cases are brought are very much embarrassed from the lack of distinctness of the law on the Statute-book. The main object of the re-arrangement of the sections and the additions made is to endeavor to point out clearly, for the use of magistrates, what the law really is. I trust the House will allow the Bill to pass. Pigeon-shooting is a most objectionable sport in every way, and it is besides a brutalising spectacle: these pigeon-shooting matches. In

the first place, the birds, by the fact of their long confinement, have lost all their wild nature, and are rendered incapable of protecting themselves. They frequent and build their nests near the resorts of man, and a great many of them have been used for scientific purposes, to show the variations which nature makes in her progress. We know very well, Mr. Speaker, that there is no bird which is so much used in the interests of science as the pigeon, and no bird which is trained for such a variety of purposes to beautify nature. These birds when shut up by the so-called sportsmen, are utterly unprepared to use the defences of life which nature has given them. Men who stand up in the face of Heaven, and in the sunshine of the day, to shoot these defenceless creatures, do not deserve the support or the countenance of men like the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), who is, I believe, a true sportsman. Another objection to these pigeon-shooting matches is the temptation which they place in the way of children in the cities to steal birds. Very often these are valuable birds, in the way value is counted in this matter, and it is on record that youths are often tempted to steal them to supply the demand of those interested in such shooting matches. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow) proposes to strike out the last clause of the Bill with reference to animals which are allowed to stray, and to suffer for want of food and shelter. I live near a long sea beach, and it is a common thing in the fall of the year to find horses or other animals turned out to die. If a person destroys an animal, the owner in all probability will turn up, and very likely declare that a valuable horse has been killed. He may have abandoned the animal, but when he has a chance to get paid for it, he probably comes to the front and claims it. That is the reason why the Humane Societies ask that this provision should be made in the Bill. We ask from the House a fair consideration of this measure in which so many people are interested, and which will do so much to protect dumb animals from cruelty.

Mr. SCRIVER. Before the question is submitted to the House, I desire to say a word or two. I agree with much of what the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth) has said in regard to the Bill. I believe with him that this so-called sport—I will not debase the word by calling it “sport”—of shooting birds from a trap is brutalising. I have been enabled to judge somewhat of its character, and I am as much opposed to it as any member of this House could be. With regard to what has fallen from my hon. friend in reference to the practice of shooting birds for the sake of practice and skill, and as to the character of gun clubs and other such associations, I believe, from personal observations, that he has been much too sweeping in his condemnation. I believe that practice of this kind with the gun is necessary in order to enable one to acquire skill in shooting. Modern inventions have been of a character to enable sportsmen to acquire that skill without resorting to the brutal practices in which they have been engaged in the past. The use of these discs, sometimes called “Peoria blackbirds,” has been pretty universal among gun clubs, and practice of that kind has enabled young men to acquire the skill which they need,

for the successful pursuit of what may be called "wild" sport. I have had the opportunity of attending these gun club meetings. I may say that they are not confined to the cities, but that they are to be found very frequently in rural districts as well. I can assure the hon. gentleman that they are not at all attended by demoralising circumstances. Young men assemble solely for the object of attaining the skill of which I have spoken, and I have seen no betting nor drinking at any of the meetings I have attended. My own sons—I have three of them, grown-up young men—have, I may say, an inherited fondness for "wild" sport, and, so far from forbidding them attending those gatherings, I have rather encouraged them to do so, and given them my own countenance by attending the meetings myself. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hudspeth) must have been unfortunate in his observations, or he must have been unfortunate in the character of the clubs which exist in his part of the country, when he has been led to pronounce the sweeping condemnation he did to-day.

Mr. COCKBURN. I do not rise for the purpose of taking any part in the debate before the House, but rather to correct the extraordinary statement of the member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth), that the people of Toronto are not true sportsmen, and know nothing about sport. I speak for Centre Toronto in particular, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that there are to be found in that division some of the keenest and truest sportsmen on this or any other continent. Further, I may state that these keen sportsmen have no sympathy with the objects of the Bill now before the House, and that they consider it unnecessary. While I express this feeling with reference to the keenness of the sport as practiced by men in Centre Toronto, I may also state that the same feeling exists in other large cities with reference to this measure.

Mr. MULOCK. Before this motion is put to a vote, I desire to say that, last Session, I opposed the Bill for two reasons. First, because I objected to the third sub-section of section 3 in regard to the nature of the legislation, even if it were within the jurisdiction of this House; and, secondly, because I thought that clause was beyond the jurisdiction of this Parliament. The hon. gentleman who moved the Bill has given me to understand, both before the discussion began, and also during the debate, that he now intended to abandon that sub-section, and I, therefore, intend to vote in favor of the second reading of the Bill. When it gets into the Committee I shall endeavor, as far as I can, to see that the objectionable clause shall be struck out.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Tisdale, (six months hoist):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Joncas,
Audet,	Jones (Halifax),
Bain (Soulanges),	Labrosse,
Barnard,	Landerkin,
Bell,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bergeron,	Lépine,
Bernier,	Livingston,
Bourassa,	Macdowall,
Bryson,	MacKenzie,
Burdett,	McCulla,
Cameron,	McKay,
Campbell,	McMillan (Huron),

Mr. SCRIVER.

Cargill,	McNeill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Marshall,
Casgrain,	Mason,
Choquette,	Massue,
Chouinard,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cimon,	Mitchell,
Cockburn,	Moncrieff,
Cook,	Montplaisir,
Corby,	Neveu,
Coughlin,	Patterson (Essex),
Coulombe,	Perry,
Couture,	Pope,
Daoust,	Rinfret,
Davis,	Robillard,
Denison,	Roome,
Dessaint,	Ste. Marie,
Doyon,	Shanly,
Dupont,	Small,
Ferguson (Welland),	Sproule,
Fiset,	Taylor,
Gauthier,	Thériou,
Geoffrion,	Tisdale,
Gigault,	Tyrwhitt,
Godbout,	Vanasse,
Grandbois,	Wallace,
Guay,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Hickey,	Wilson (Elgin),
Innes,	Wood (Brockville),
Ives,	Yeo.—82.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald (Sir Adams),	Landry,
Armstrong,	Lang,
Bain (Wentworth),	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Barron,	Laurier,
Béchar, d,	Lavergne,
Blake,	Lister,
Boisvert,	Lovitt,
Borden,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Bowell,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bowman,	McDonald (Victoria),
Boyle,	McDonald (Pictou),
Brien,	McGreevy,
Brown,	McKeen,
Carling,	McMullen,
Carpenter,	Madill,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mara,
Chapleau,	Meigs,
Charlton,	Mills (Annapolis),
Cochrane,	Mulock,
Colby,	O'Brien,
Curran,	Paterson (Brant),
Davies,	Perley,
Davin,	Platt,
Dawson,	Purcell,
De St. Georges,	Putnam,
Dewdney,	Robertson,
Dickey,	Rowand,
Dickinson,	Scriver,
Earle,	Simple,
Eisenhauer,	Smith (Ontario),
Ellis,	Somerville,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Stevenson,
Fisher,	Temple,
Foster,	Thompson (Sir John),
Freeman,	Trow,
Gillmor,	Waldie,
Girouard,	Watson,
Gordon,	Weldon (Albert),
Guillet,	Weldon (St. John),
Hesson,	Welsh,
Holton,	White (Cardwell),
Hudspeth,	White (Renfrew),
Jamieson,	Wilnot,
Kirk,	Wilson (Lennox),
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Westmoreland).—91.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the second time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. JONCAS moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman explain what changes the Bill makes?

Mr. JONCAS. The Bill is purely of local interest. Its object is to place Gaspé on the same basis as the district of Algoma and the district of Cariboo, as it was before the passing of the Act of 1888, amending the Dominion Elections Act. At that time, I think through an oversight of the hon. Minister of Justice, Gaspé was put on the same basis as all the other constituencies in the Province of Quebec. But the condition of things has not changed in the county of Gaspé; the means of communication are not any better than they were before 1888; and it is physically impossible for the returning officer of the county to post up his proclamations in eight days, as the Act at present requires him to do.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Magdalen Islands are a portion of the county of Gaspé, and it is almost physically impossible to have proper communications there at certain seasons of the year.

Mr. JONCAS. There is a special clause with regard to the Magdalen Islands; but I am speaking of the mainland, where there is a distance of about 70 miles, which has to be travelled in winter on snow shoes, and which even in summer is almost impossible.

Mr. MITCHELL. How much time do you ask?

Mr. JONCAS. The same as is given to Algoma and Cariboo—15 days.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that what the hon. gentleman desires is simply to restore the law as it stood in the Revised Statutes of 1886, and all that requires to be done is to repeal a certain section of the Act 51 Vic., and to reenact section 4 of the Revised Statutes, chap. 8.

Mr. JONCAS. It would mean the same thing.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

FOREIGN CONTRACT LABOR.

Mr. TAYLOR moved second reading of Bill (No. 8) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor in Canada. He said: The House has been occupied for some time in dealing with a Bill entitled an Act to prevent Cruelty to Animals. The Bill of which I am moving the second reading deals with men. In the Statutes of the United States there is an Act similar to the one now before this House, and that Act, whether it was the intention of the people of the United States in passing it or not, has been so interpreted as to deal cruelly and hardly with many residents of the counties of Leeds and Grenville, and not only with them, but with the workmen of Canada all along the line. I am and always have been a protectionist, believing that the policy of protection is the true policy for any young country to adopt. Therefore, I hailed with delight the introduction of the National Policy into this country, believing that by giving protection to the industries of Canada we should benefit the laboring classes as well as the agriculturists by creating a home market for the products of the farm. The constituency which I have the honor to represent borders on the River St. Lawrence. Opposite

that constituency is located that beautiful world-renowned spot, known as the Thousand Islands. Perhaps ninety-five per cent. of those islands lie directly opposite the county I have the honor to represent. During the last ten or fifteen years, owing to the policy adopted by the American Government of disposing of the islands on the American side, there are, within a radius of twelve or fifteen miles, no less than five summer resorts, namely: Clayton, Round Island Park, Thousand Island Park, Westminster Park, and Alexandria Bay. I presume, within that distance, there has been expended during the last twelve or fifteen years, not less than \$7,000,000 or \$10,000,000 in improvements, chiefly by persons who go there to reside during two or three months of the summer. No doubt, many hon. gentlemen have visited this beautiful summer resort, and know that what I am saying is correct. I believe that our Government purposes dealing with the islands on the Canadian side as the Americans have dealt with theirs, by disposing of a certain number, which will thus be improved and aid in building up the pleasure resorts of Canada, for it is well known that the fishing on the American side is not good, owing to the fact that the channel there is narrow and the current swift, while on the Canadian side the contrary is the case. For the last ten or fifteen years, many residents of the county which I have the honor to represent, have sought employment on the American side—some waiting at the hotels, others working on the grounds, and the greater portion rowing tourists who come to spend a few weeks or months there, and pass three-fourths of their time fishing in Canadian waters. To my surprise last year, some 250 or 300 of our people were driven home and not allowed to work on the American side. I will just read a report from the *Gananoque Reporter* at the time, which was the first intimation I had of there being on the American Statute-books an Act known as the Alien Labor Act:

"The United States law in reference to the employment of foreign laborers has been given an unexpected interpretation along the border in this vicinity. Heretofore it was understood that the prohibition of foreign labor applied only to such as was imported under contract. And we have seen this given in United States papers as the true interpretation; with the further explanation that men who voluntarily went to that country, without pre-engagement to work, could lawfully be employed at any occupation. But the law is now being very differently administered, and all along the line those who have Canadians in their employ have been officially notified to discharge them or suffer a penalty of \$500. This is a serious matter, as between carpenters, boatmen, farm hands, and others, two or three hundred men have been thrown out of employment about Alexandria Bay, the Parks, and on farms and islands in that section. Many of those men have their homes in the Townships of Lansdowne, Escott and Yonge, on the Canadian side of the line, and have for years been faithful assistants to employers in New York State. We are informed that even a Canadian oarsman will not be allowed to row for fishermen in American waters. And if this is true, it will only be a fair return for the Dominion Government to insist that American oarsmen and fishermen shall confine their operations to their own side of the line."

As soon as this Act was put in force on the American side, a deputation of the men who were driven home came to see me about the matter. I was not at that time acquainted with the law, and I asked that matters should be allowed to remain as they were for a few days, and in the meantime I would visit Ottawa and interview the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Customs

about the matter, so as to see what could be done. I immediately came to Ottawa and had a conference with these gentlemen, the result of which was that the Customs officer at Gananoque was instructed to visit the American side of the river and find out the facts. While this was going on, and while a correspondence, I presume, was being had with the authorities at Washington, our people were remaining at home out of work and unable to return. Knowing, as I did, that if the tourists residing at the American hotels were not allowed to fish in Canadian waters, these hotels would soon close up, and knowing the hotel-keepers were not in favor of having the Act enforced, I took it upon myself to issue the following notice, a copy of which I sent to the Government here, and copies of which I sent to the American hotel-keepers on the American side :

"WARNING TO AMERICAN FISHERMEN.

"Owing to the fact that the Alien Labor Act of the United States is being enforced by the people of both Saint Lawrence and Jefferson Counties of the State of New York, in the said United States of America; and also owing to the fact that a number of Canadians, resident in the County of Leeds, Province of Ontario and Dominion of Canada, who have been in the habit, for some years past, of working on the American side of the river during the summer months at different occupations, such as rowing, fishermen, &c., and returning to Canada on Sabbath day, have been driven home from the United States by the Customs officials of that country, I hereby give notice to all persons interested that any boat found fishing in the River St. Lawrence, opposite the South Riding of Leeds, which embraces all that part of the Canadian waters of the said river lying west of a point five miles west of the town of Brockville to a point three miles west of the town of Gananoque, both in the said county of Leeds, on and after the 15th day of the present month of July, 1889, if the oarsman rowing said boat or the persons fishing in said boat are not residents of Canada, they will be dealt with according to the terms of the Fisheries Act of Canada, which means confiscation of boat and fishing tackle, without further notice; also, that this law will be strictly enforced in these waters until such time as the American authorities apply and enforce a different construction to the Alien Labor Act and allow our people to resume their avocations without let or hindrance; then so soon as this is done and the same friendly relations allowed to continue, which have been observed for so many years past, the Fisheries Act will be allowed to stand in abeyance, as it has in the past; but in justice to many of my constituents who have thus been dealt with by the people of the United States, no other course is left but to protect our own people."

"GEO. TAYLOR, M.P.
For South Leeds."

"GANANOQUE, 2nd July, 1889."

Mr. CHARLTON. Signed by whom?

Mr. TAYLOR. Signed by myself.

Mr. SCRIVER. Under what authority?

Mr. TAYLOR. Under the authority of the Fisheries Act, the sections of which bearing on the matter I will just read:

"1. The Governor in Council may, from time to time, grant to any foreign ship, vessel or boat, or to any ship, vessel or boat not navigated according to the laws of the United Kingdom or of Canada, at such rate and for such term not exceeding one year, as he deems expedient, a license to fish for, take, dry or cure any fish of any kind whatsoever, in British waters, within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of Canada, not included within the limits specified and described in the first article of the convention between His late Majesty King George the Third and the United States of America, made and signed at London, on the twentieth day of October, one thousand eight hundred and eighteen."

"2. Any commissioned officer of Her Majesty's navy, serving on board of any vessel of Her Majesty's navy, cruising and being in the waters of Canada for the purpose of affording protection to Her Majesty's subjects engaged in the fisheries, or any commissioned officer of Her

Mr. TAYLOR.

Majesty's navy, fishery officer or stipendiary magistrate, on board of any vessel belonging to or in the service of the Government of Canada and employed in the service of protecting the fisheries, or any officer of the Customs of Canada, sheriff, justice of the peace or other person duly commissioned for that purpose, may go on board of any ship, vessel or boat within any harbor in Canada or hovering in British waters within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors in Canada, and stay on board so long as she remains within such harbor or distance.

"3. Any one of the officers or persons hereinbefore mentioned may bring any ship, vessel or boat, being within any harbor in Canada, or hovering in British waters, within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbors in Canada, into port, and search her cargo, and may also examine the master upon oath touching the cargo and voyage; and if the master or person in command does not truly answer the questions put to him in such examination, he shall incur a penalty of four hundred dollars; and if such ship, vessel or boat is foreign, or not navigated according to the laws of the United Kingdom or of Canada; and (a) has been found fishing or preparing to fish, or to have been fishing in British waters within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of Canada, not included within the above mentioned limits, without a license, or after the expiration of the term named in the last license granted to such ship, vessel or boat, under the first section of this Act; or (b) has entered such waters for any purpose not permitted by treaty or convention, or by any law of the United Kingdom or of Canada for the time being in force, such ship, vessel or boat and the tackle, rigging, apparel, furniture, stores and cargo thereof shall be forfeited.

"4. All goods, ships, vessels and boats and the tackle, rigging, apparel, furniture, stores and cargo liable to forfeiture under the Act, may be seized and secured by any officers or persons mentioned in the second section of this Act; and every person opposing any officer or person in the execution of his duty under this Act, or aiding or abetting any other person in any such opposition, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to a fine of eight hundred dollars and to two years' imprisonment.

The last section of this Act applies it to the inland waters of Canada.

"This Act shall apply to every foreign ship, vessel or boat in or upon the inland waters of Canada."

Mr. MULOCK. Were you one of the persons named in the Act to give a notice?

Mr. TAYLOR. It did not require any notice for me. I took legal advice in regard to it. The police magistrate of Gananoque was a legal officer there. A fishery officer said he would seize the first boat that would cross the line after the notice was given.

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

After Recess.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the House took recess, I had read a few extracts from the Canadian fishery laws, and, as I interpret those laws, they apply to the inland waters of Canada, to the River St. Lawrence, to that part of this country to which I had my special attention drawn in reference to the working of the Alien Labor Law. I also read a copy of a notice which I had sent to a prominent hotel-keeper on the American side, who I knew took a deep interest in the fisheries, knowing that his guests, as well as those of all the other summer resorts, spent a great portion of their time among the islands in the River St. Lawrence, on the American side of the line. I knew that he knew that, if the fishery laws of Canada were to be enforced, he and the rest of the proprietors of those summer resorts might almost as well close their doors. I knew that from a letter which I had seen from the Collector of Customs of the district, a copy of which

I have in my hand, and an extract from which I will read. This is from Mr. Morse, Collector of Customs, Cape Vincent, and was addressed to his sub-collector, Mr. Thomson, at Alexandria Bay. In pointing out to him how he should work the Alien Labor Act, he says :

"1st. In prohibiting the landing of persons under the contract labor law you are to act as in the execution of the customs laws, upon the personal examination of the persons you prohibit and upon information and observation. As a basis of prosecution for penalties, or the return of a person who has landed here, you are to report to me the facts. All facts from others than yourself to be made by affidavit.

"2nd. The law does not prohibit aliens or foreigners voluntarily coming into this country seeking for employment and contracting for work after their arrival here.

"3rd. If, however, aliens from Canada enter the United States under a contract made previous to such entry to perform labor or service of any kind (except such as is exempted by law) in the United States, such entry and such contract are in violation of the law, and it does not make any difference that such entry is only for a day, and is renewed or repeated from day to day, or other short intervals, providing that previous to such entry a contract has been made to perform the labor."

Then he quotes the sections of the American Alien Act :

"4th. If an alien comes here from Canada after a job of rowing on the waters within the United States, and makes a contract here to row, and, while such contract is in force, returns to his home in a foreign country, and again enters for the purpose of performing the contract and pursuant to its terms, the latter entry being under a contract previously made to perform labor in this country, is prohibited by the said law.

"5th. You, however, state a case different from the above, and more difficult to answer, viz.: Suppose an alien comes here from Canada and makes a contract here to row a man to fish in Canadian waters, then to return the fisherman to this side at night, the oarsman then returning to his home in Canada, repeating the same thing day after day in pursuance of a contract previously made; or, to put the case more strongly, suppose the oarsman was, previous to his entry, employed to row as aforesaid, how does the law apply to the case? There is some necessary labor performed on the waters within the United States, but much the larger part is done on Canadian waters. Technically, perhaps, there is a violation of the law by so doing. I do not believe the Department would advise any action in such a case, neither do I believe a person can be convicted in our United States courts for so doing. The labor is upon a great inland river, a boundary between two countries, and cannot be said in this case that the contract is to perform the labor in this country. It seems to me that the oarsmen of Alexandria and Clayton would prefer to make no complaint, and take no notice of the labor of Canadian oarsmen fishing or rowing in our waters, when much the larger amount of the work is performed in Canada. A retaliatory measure would spoil, or largely injure, the business of oarsmen on the River St. Lawrence within this district. As an officer I should not notice a case like the one last above stated, without orders from the Department."

This is signed by Mr. H. E. Morse. I knew, as well as Mr. Morse knows, that, if a retaliatory Act were adopted, or if we were to enforce the Canadian fishery laws against Americans, the business of the oarsmen and hotel-keepers on the United States side would be practically ruined. As soon as the gentleman had received a copy of the notice that I had sent to the Department, he called a meeting of hotel-keepers, and a deputation started for Washington the next morning. The result was that after having an interview with the officials at Washington they returned, and the report was sent to me, that all along the frontier, so far as my constituency was concerned at least, our people could return to their work in the United States as heretofore, and they did return and work there during the entire season. The law was not enforced against either our oarsmen or the people doing work on the islands, or in the hotels, or other

resorts over there, during the entire season. But still I felt it my duty to represent my own county in particular, and I also feel it my duty to look after the best interests of the workmen and of the Canadians generally throughout the length and breadth of our country. I will read you extracts from papers and letters that I have in my possession, showing that while the law was withdrawn in so far as it referred to that portion of the river opposite the South Riding of Leeds, or the Thousand Islands, it was not so applied in other parts of the country, and I think that a Canadian is as good as an American any day, and a little better. I think I can prove by the debates of the American Senate when this Bill was before Congress, that it was not the intention to enforce the Act in the way it has been enforced by the American people this year. I hold in my hand the correspondence which has passed between the American Government and the British Government in reference to the enforcement of this law; and I have also a *précis* of the debate in the Senate on the Foreign Labor Contracts Bill. I will read one or two extracts which go to prove that it was not the intention, when this Act was being passed, that it should be applied to isolated people such as I have referred to—cases of workmen coming over from Canada and working a few months and returning to the States; but it was intended to apply to laborers working on large jobs, railway employes, and so forth. The Act was passed to prohibit contract labor being brought in for that purpose :

"Senator Blair, who had charge of the Bill, said that it was not aimed at immigration, but at slavery, at the introduction of servile labor. Wages should be protected from the effects of imported gangs of laborers.

"Senator Morgan opposed the Bill. There were, he said, men on the floor of the Senate who had come to the United States as day laborers and miners.

"Senator Sherman defended the Bill. It was not directed against free men, but against men who, under contract, were not their own masters."

I gather from the debate that it was not intended to apply the Act to every man, but only to those who came in bound under a contract to perform certain labor. The great bulk of the men who went into the United States this year were driven back over the line, men who went there seeking employment, many of them living on the Canadian side of the line, who went across in the morning to perform their day's labor and came to their homes in the evening. At several places in Canada, such as Brockville, Prescott and Windsor, many Americans who live on the American side do the same thing. They come into Canada in the morning, bringing their dinner with them, and after performing their day's labor they return home at night, and there is no notice taken of them by the Canadian Parliament under any Act now upon our Statute-books. But I claim that while the Americans have this law on their Statute-books Canada should have one equal to it, in order to protect our own laborers; if they wish to enforce it meanly, as I think they are doing, then I think we have a right to pass a similar law to protect our own laboring men. I have here a notice issued by the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada :

(Copy.) "GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY OF CANADA.
"NIAGARA FALLS, April 17th, 1899.

"DEAR SIR,—I have been notified by the Superintendent that as your duties are on the American side of the river,

you will not be permitted, hereafter, to live in Canada, and that you will either have to move to the American side, or resign from the company's service.

"This is to comply with the United States law, and to prevent yourself and the company from being subjected to the penalty prescribed for infringement of the law."

"(Signed) J. H. MURRAY,
"Agent."

That notice was served on one of the Grand Trunk Railway employes, living on the Canadian side, who was going over to the American side, and, after performing his day's labor, returning at night. He had either to move over into the United States and become a citizen of that country, or to leave the employment of the Grand Trunk Railway, which I have no doubt he did. I have another letter which I received within a few days, and which I will read :

"St. CATHARINES, 24th February, 1890.

"Mr. TAYLOR, M.P.

"Sir,—I am glad to see that you have taken a step in the right direction as regards the Alien Law as a setoff against the American Alien law. But if you can only get the Bill to pass, you will confer a great boon on the working-men in Canada, and thousands will thank you for doing so. Here is a case close to Dr. Ferguson's door. Henry Hayes, Niagara Falls Centre, was watchman for I. Davis at the Museum, Niagara Falls, Ontario. The Government bought the land and Mr. Davis moved his museum across the river to Niagara Falls, New York. Henry Hayes went as watchman across the river. The American authorities ordered Mr. Davis to discharge the man or stand the consequence of the law, \$1,000 fine, and fifteen days to comply with the law. But as Mr. Hayes had a home on this side of the line and did not want to leave it, he was discharged. I wanted Mr. Hayes to make an affidavit before a magistrate and send it to Dr. Ferguson last March. But no. I have written Mr. Rykert to support you in this Bill. Can you let me have a copy of the Bill, and oblige,

"Yours respectfully,

"JAMES BROWN."

Then we have the celebrated case of Bouck, which was the first intimation we had that the Alien Labor Law was being put into force against Canadians. I have the particulars of that case, which were submitted to Mr. Inspector Hepburn, and declared strictly correct. The facts are as follows :—

"The strictness with which the Alien Labor Law in the States has been administered has, in certain cases, been a trifle ridiculous. The law, as applied to the wholesale plan of contracting for cheap labor among the off-shootings of Europe, may have much to justify it from the standpoint of the American native workman. But the way in which it is occasionally strained, so as to exclude individuals who may cross over from Canada, seems to be below the dignity of a great nation. The *New York Times* recites a case in point. One Harrison Bouck, who had been living in Canada, entered New York State in search of work, and was hired as a farm hand by Mr. Brown, of the town of Lisbon. Thereupon he went to his father's home in Canada to get certain clothing that he had left there, and promised that he would return to Lisbon before the end of the week. On his way back he was intercepted at Ogdensburg by an astute Inspector of Customs, and the case was referred to Secretary Windom, who applied to Mr. Hepburn, the new Solicitor of the Treasury, for an opinion. The Solicitor found that the labor contract was made in the United States after Bouck's arrival at Lisbon. He did not find that Bouck had been led to cross the boundary the first time by any agreement as to his future employment. But he held, Secretary Windom concurring, that the man should be sent back, and his argument deserves to be published intact :

"It is not necessary, in order to constitute a violation of this law, that the contract for alien labor should be made in the foreign country from whence the laborer migrates. The unlawful contract may be made here. The character of the contract must depend upon the fact whether the agreement was antecedent to the actual importation or migration. In the present case it appears that the hiring was subsequent to his first coming to the United States, but it may well be doubted, from the circumstances of the case, whether the actual immigration of Bouck was not subsequent to his employment, and

Mr. TAYLOR.

when he returned to the United States with his wearing apparel. His first visit without his wearing apparel would strongly indicate that it was experimental and prospective, and that his actual immigration to this country depended upon the contingency of obtaining employment, which he secured, and which was secured under the contract referred to, before making more permanent arrangements. Therefore, unless it can be shown that Bouck's first visit was made with the *bona fide* intention of becoming a resident of the United States, and was not contingent upon any special employment, I am of the opinion that his case comes within the prohibition of the law, and that he should be returned to his own country."

There is a case where a young man went over there seeking employment, found it, made a contract, returned home for his clothing, and on his way over was intercepted and sent back to Canada. I think that of itself is enough to arouse the feelings of every Canadian, and I say we should have on our Statute-book a law that will treat the Americans in the same way—if they so deserve it. The Bill which I have introduced is, as I have said, a copy in every particular of the Bill passed by the Congress of the United States. I think it would be better if some further amendments were made to it ; what I ask is, that the House will pass the second reading, go into Committee of the Whole upon it and then refer it to a sub-committee, which can investigate the subject thoroughly and hear the representations of parties who might be affected by it. A deputation waited on me stating that if one clause of the Bill was put into force it would prevent some industries in Canada now in operation receiving skilled labor from the United States to perform certain work, and then return there. That is something we should guard against, for we should not cripple any industry by prohibiting skilled workmen being brought in to do specific work for which we cannot procure suitable labor here. I do not understand why laborers from Canada should be excluded from the labor market of the United States, and yet we should give laborers from the United States free ingress to our market, which should be controlled by and kept for Canadian workmen. I hope the House will deal with this Bill in the interests of protecting the laboring classes and our Canadian workmen, and I have pleasure, therefore, in moving its second reading.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has made out a very strong case in the course of his very exhaustive speech on this subject, and I have no doubt the attention of hon. members has been more prominently called to it by his speech than by the illustrations of the existence of the law in the United States. It certainly seems to be very unneighborly, and I am not at all surprised that a good deal of indignation was felt in various quarters, especially along the frontiers of Canada, at this legislation. I rather believe that the legislation in the United States was in the first place not designed for Canada, that it was caused by the overflowing of European immigration, perhaps of Chinese immigration as well, and that really the case of Canada never occurred to Congress at the time they were dealing with the evil, when the scum of Europe was overflowing into the United States, and that law was adopted without any special exemption of Canada. However, there the law is, and it has been put into force. From what little I have heard from time to time I believe the authorities of the United States will be inclined to exempt Canada, but they have no power to do so ; that can only be done by Congress, and whether

Congress will be inclined to do so or not, I cannot say. There is this difference between Canada and the United States—the United States do not want any more people there, and we do; and this is a very marked difference between the two countries. I should like to hear a general expression of opinion in this House on this subject, but, in the meantime, I would say to my hon. friend that I would prefer the debate to be adjourned so that hon. gentlemen, including myself, may read the hon. gentleman's speech, and not come to a conclusion for a little while.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is one point mentioned by the hon. gentleman, which, perhaps, deserves the attention of the Government, and that is this: if I understood him aright, he caused to be issued, or he induced some officer of the Government to issue, a sort of proclamation warning all Americans off Canadian waters. I should like to know under whose authority that was done, and whether it was done with the approval of the present Government of Canada?

Mr. TAYLOR. I beg to state that I did not cause any officer to issue the notice. I issued the notice referred to, taking full responsibility for it, over my own signature, and it had the desired effect. But I said further, that I had secured the services of a police magistrate, a gentleman, who, under the Fisheries Act, is authorised to act. I had also secured the services of the fishery officer to accompany the police magistrate in the expedition, as we intended to capture the first steam yacht that entered Canadian waters from the American side towing some dozen small boats, for the purpose of going into Canadian waters to fish for the day. We intended to make a seizure, and see how the law would bear us out. The fishery officer, who is chief constable at Gananoque, and the police magistrate, had interpreted the law as I did, and we intended to make a case there if the notice that I had sent to the hotel proprietor on the other side, signed with my own hand, would not have the effect I expected it to have, for I knew they would not want to close their hotels if fishing could not be done in Canadian waters.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have a Minister of Marine, but I was not aware we had a Lord High Admiral of the fleet. I trust the hon. gentleman, in signing that proclamation, appended to it the name of "J. Taylor, chief whip of the present Administration."

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the statement of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is the most extraordinary I ever heard in this House. Here we find an hon. gentleman, for the reason that he happened to be a whip for the Conservative party, and an influential one, too, and one who takes a very active part in whipping the boys when they are wanted to vote, occupying the position of a filibuster on the raging St. Lawrence, and issuing circulars to a nation of 60,000,000, warning them against coming into the waters of Canada, and, I suppose, threatening them with all sorts of dire consequences if they did come in. I hope the hon. gentleman has realised about this time the folly of the course he pursued. It was one that might have led to very serious consequences, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not repeat the great mistake he has made in issuing circu-

lars, and in interfering with what is specially the duty of the Government of this country. What I would like to know is this: The right hon. gentleman has very properly stated the view taken by the American Government, or rather the construction put by the American officials upon the law passed by Congress. He has stated that Congress has passed that law and are bound by it, and that we are also bound to take the consequences of the law passed by the Congress and Senate of the United States and assented to by the President. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman, if he felt as deeply about this matter as one would infer from his remarks, and if he felt that an injustice was done to Canada by the construction put upon the law by the officers of the United States Government, whether he or his Government has made any representation to the United States Government with regard to the injustice done to the constituents of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), a gentleman who has served the Conservative party so faithfully, inside this House and outside of it? I would like to ask the Premier, whether any correspondence has taken place between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States with reference to the injustice perpetrated by the severe construction placed upon that law, and its harsh operation against Canadian workmen? I do not believe that the Congress of the United States ever intended, when that law was passed, that it should be construed in the manner it has been against the people of Canada, and in this I agree with the right hon. gentleman. I am sure there is too much liberality among the people of the United States to perpetrate any such iniquity as that. Here are two countries located alongside of each other, in the utmost unanimity and good friendship, and such a state of things as the hon. gentleman has referred to could not possibly occur with the consent of the people of either country. The right hon. gentleman, sitting there with that placid smile on his countenance which he can so well command when it suits his purpose, could not, I am sure, allow such an injustice to be perpetrated without some remonstrance on his own behalf, and on behalf of the Dominion. However, he has not told us that he ever sent any such remonstrance to the United States in regard to this matter. The right hon. gentleman, who so well understands the diplomatic course that ought to have been pursued, is responsible to this country for neglecting his duty in not having remonstrated against the injustice done to the constituents of the member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who is his *fidus Achates*, and his principal whip. I have the highest respect for the people of the United States, but, at the same time, I think it is the duty of the Government of Canada to tell them, in a case such as this, that they are not doing justice when laws of a stringent character have been more stringently applied than was ever intended by Congress. I believe that the Government of the United States should be told that their officers have enforced the law in such an unreasonable manner as to interfere with the people of a friendly neighboring country, who legitimately and of their right, go into that country to seek employment. It is the duty of this Government to tell the House what steps they have taken to prevent the continuance of this injustice, or whether or not they

have remonstrated against the continuance of the injustice, which not only the hon. member for Leeds, but the right hon. gentleman the Premier himself has referred to. I shall await with some little interest to know what steps this vigorous Government, with such a large majority behind them, have taken to defend the interests of Canada, and to uphold the rights of the people.

Mr. LAURIER. There can be no necessity, in my opinion, that this matter should be adjourned for another day, for surely there can be no two opinions upon this question. I am sure, from what the Prime Minister himself has stated, that he would not be prepared to vote against such a measure as this. I believe the right hon. gentleman was right when he stated that the measure to which the hon. member for Leeds has alluded, never was conceived by the Congress of the United States in any hostility towards Canada. It was, as was well said by the Prime Minister, conceived against Chinese immigration, and against a certain very objectionable class of immigration from Europe. The right course for the Government to follow in this matter would have been the course suggested by my hon. friend for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), namely, to send a remonstrance to the United States Government to the effect that the legislation passed by Congress to protect the United States from a certain class of immigration, was taken advantage of by certain of their officials, to carry it out in a spirit not calculated to promote friendly relations between the people of this country and the people of the American Union. I would be sorry if we should hesitate to reject this motion, because it might carry the impression that we want to retaliate against our neighbors when there is no such intention here. If an Act has been passed by Congress, not with the intention of injuring Canada, but which is construed to injure Canada, I think that by simply remonstrating against this abuse to the United States Government, we would have our remedy. The hon. gentleman may not think this, but I do. I believe that by showing we have a desire to maintain friendly relations with our neighbors, and by showing that an Act of theirs not so intended, has been construed against us, they would be disposed to meet us half way, and to do what would be necessary on their part to maintain these friendly relations. For my part, I shall object, so far as I can, that consideration of the Bill should be adjourned. I desire to have an expression at once from this House upon the question.

Mr. HESSON. I think the House owes a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) for bringing this matter forward. This is an important measure which he proposes, and I think it is worthy of serious consideration by the House. I happen to know a great many circumstances, very much in the same direction as the hon. member for Leeds has represented as existing in his own constituency, and I believe that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), in his experience must know that such a state of things does exist, and that many persons have been compelled to abandon their own country and go to the United States, in consequence of the line of policy the American Government has pursued in this matter. I am not inclined to believe that the

Mr. MITCHELL.

Congress of the United States ever intended that this law should operate against the Dominion of Canada. I presume that they have had no reason to do so, because I believe that we give employment to as many Americans as they give employment to Canadians. While, however, they may not have intended that Canadian laborers should give up their employment or reside on the other side of the line, still the fact remains that this has been the effect of the law, and the Customs officials have so interpreted it that working people who happen to be employed in the United States are compelled to give up their homes in Canada. These are facts which every member in this House is cognisant of; some hon. gentlemen are more directly interested in the matter, as they reside on the frontier, where the injustice is more felt. I do not wish to express an opinion that this Government should retaliate, but I think that we should feel it our duty to consider the position of our workmen who are compelled to abandon their allegiance to their country in order to obtain employment in the United States. I do not know whether or not this Government has made a protest to the Government of the United States, but if they have not done so they ought.

Mr. MITCHELL. Quite right.

Mr. HESSON. I agree with hon. gentlemen opposite that this Government should have made a protest against the operations of this Act of the Congress of the United States. We know those grievances do exist, and know that very many valuable citizens have been lost to the country in consequence. I do not ask the Government to retaliate, although if we were forced to take that course, I think we could very well afford to take it; because, I think, we should obtain from them as many citizens as they will obtain from us. I do not think it was the intention of the American Government to make this law apply to Canada in the way it does; but that is the effect of it; and, I think, it is time we heard from the Government as to whether they have made a protest against it or not. I, as a supporter of the Government, would like to see them stand up for the true interests of Canada and Canadian labor, and let the American Government know that if they carry out that law as against Canada, we shall have to legislate in the interest of our own labor and our own homes. I think the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has only performed his duty as a representative man, who witnessed what was going on before his own doors. My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) must have experienced the same thing, both at Sarnia and Port Elgin, where many of the employes of the Grand Trunk Railway were obliged to abandon their homes in Canada and go to Detroit and Port Huron in order to retain the employment they had before that order was enforced. The American Act is still in operation, and, I think, the Government should enquire whether it is to be continued against Canada or not; and if so, they should take some steps to counteract it. I, at any rate, protest against it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why do you not get your chieftain to tell us what he did?

Mr. HESSON. That is what we are now doing. The matter has now been brought to the attention

of the Government, and if they are not in a position to answer now, I hope they will soon be, and, in the meantime, I think this Bill should be allowed to stand.

Mr. LISTER. There is a great deal of truth in what the hon. gentleman has just stated. I think the hon. member for South Leeds is entitled to a good deal of credit for bringing this matter to the attention of the Government and the House. Whether the law passed by the United States Congress was intended to apply to Canada or not, the American officials have applied it to Canada, and there is no question but that they have enforced it in a very harsh way indeed. In the county I come from, there is a town of some 2,500 inhabitants, composed almost entirely of employes of the Grand Trunk Railway Company—men who have lived on the Canadian side all their lives, and who had acquired homes at Point Edward of considerable value. These men, owing to their employment being on this side, and the works where they were employed being on the other side, were suddenly compelled to abandon their homes on this side and go to the other side to live, entailing upon themselves great expense and loss. Now, Sir, I do not believe in the law of retaliation. I am inclined to take the view of the matter which the First Minister has given to the House, namely, that the law was not intended to apply to Canada; and if the Government take steps to lay the state of the case before the American Government, something may be done that will accomplish the end desired. With regard to my hon. friend from South Leeds, I think we ought to be very much pleased that he did not come into conflict with the American authorities on the occasion to which he referred, because if he had acted in the way he threatened to do, somebody might have been put on trial for murder, and that person might have been my hon. friend. However, he seems to have alarmed the Americans in some way, because this odious order was not enforced. If the American Government insist on enforcing this law against Canadians, our Government ought to pass a like law and enforce it with equal stringency. But, not knowing whether the Government have made representations on the subject to the Government at Washington, I do not think it would be wise or prudent on the part of this Parliament to enact a law that would only increase the possible friction now existing between the two countries. I believe that if proper representations are made to the American Government, the law will be repealed, at all events so far as Canada is concerned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There can be no doubt that in the cases which the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill has brought to the notice of the House, very great inconvenience has resulted to the people he represents. That inconvenience has been repeated to a less extent in various other parts of Canada where the two countries approach each other. But however serious my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Hesson) may be, he can be perfectly safe in relying upon one fact, namely, that when the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and the hon. leader of the Opposition gravely charged the Government with dereliction of duty in not representing to the authorities of the United States that their law ought not to be enforced in their own

country, they were entirely in a jocular mood, and were endeavoring to perpetrate a joke on the House. There can be nothing plainer to anyone who reads the United States Statutes than that this law applies as much to Canada as it does to Italy. There can be no point clearer than this, also, that Canadians cannot be exempted from its operation unless all British subjects are equally exempted. What rights we in Canada possess in relation to the United States are possessed by every British subject; and the difficulty that would be presented, in regard to the non-enforcement of that law, would be that Canada would be simply made the place of entry into the United States for every British subject, and, possibly, for every other foreigner who might claim to come in any way under allegiance to the British Crown. This is not the only subject in respect of which the enforcement of the laws of the United States, passed for their own protection, has been inconvenient to the Canadian people. Cases were brought to our notice not many months ago of inconvenience from the unequal operation of the laws of the two countries with respect to the currency of the two countries. At several points we find neighboring cities, one under the Canadian flag, the other under the United States flag. In the Canadian city the American currency passes as freely as our own; in the city under the flag of the United States Canadian currency is not only subject to various legal restrictions, but, by a statute of the United States, is subject to taxation, as personal property, even if it be found in one of the banks. For instance, in Windsor the currency of the United States circulates just as freely as our own, while in Detroit, just opposite, an officer of the United States goes into every bank and levies a tax for United States purposes on the Canadian currency he finds there. Is it to be contended that, by any remonstrance whatever, we can prevail on the Government of the United States not to enforce the laws they choose to pass for their own protection? While these laws were not passed by the United States for the purpose of harassing the people of Canada or imposing restrictions on the relations between the two countries, they were passed for the protection of the people of the United States—the one for the purpose of promoting the circulation of the national currency, and the other for the protection of the labor of the United States, under the circumstances into which the United States have grown, of having an ample population and an ample supply of labor of their own. That being her condition, having an ample population, having a large surplus supply of labor, this very strict contract labor law was passed at the instance of the labor organisations. Would the Congress of the United States, would the people who were at the back of the agitation, and who eventually succeeded in procuring the passage of the contract labor law, submit, for one moment, to the law of the United States being put in this condition, that while it is necessary in the interest, as they deem it, of the people, especially of the laboring classes of the United States, that the importation of contract laborers should be prohibited as against all countries in the world, the importation shall not be prohibited provided it comes from British territory. To expect such an amendment to the law as it exists in the United States would be exceedingly unreasonable. As regards the enforcement of that

law by the officers of the United States and the hardships that have arisen through those officers taking steps to enforce it in the way complained of by the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill, and as regards the taxation of Canadian currency in the banks of the United States, those subjects have been, as promptly and as strongly as possible, brought to the notice of the United States authorities—not with the hope that we could reasonably expect them to fail to enforce a law of their own country, but that they should instruct, if it should be in their power, their officers on the frontier, to exercise some discretion as regards that enforcement, and to limit if possible the enforcement of the law to the purposes for which it was passed. Not many months ago two members of this Government waited upon the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and brought this matter, with as much formality and force as could possibly be used, to his attention. He gave the subject full consideration. He examined the statutes upon the subject, he made an enquiry into the circumstances under which the law was in force; and the answer which he gave was one of which this Government could not, under the circumstances, complain. It was this, that Congress had deliberately adopted legislation of that kind, with the view of enforcing a policy which was thought necessary in the interests of the people of the United States, and that Congress, having adopted that legislation, it was as much binding upon the President and every member of the Cabinet and every officer of the United States as any law of the country could possibly be; that as regards the enforcement in a harassing manner against the people of Canada, of these laws of the two descriptions to which I have referred, nothing could be further from their wish or intention, and that the enforcement had not originated in consequence of any instructions from the Administration at Washington. But he pointed out that the law of the United States being so, it was in the power of the humblest citizen of the United States to compel the officers of the United States to do their duty and enforce it, and in the very case which occurred in Detroit with regard to the taxation, and in the cases to which the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has called our attention to-night, if they were investigated to the bottom, it would be found that, not under any instructions from Washington, and not by the excessive zeal of the United States officers on the frontier, but on the complaint of some person on the frontier interested in the stringent enforcement of these laws, the officers of the United States were compelled to do the duty which these statutes impose upon them. Is it reasonable that any member of this House, under these circumstances, should ask us to represent to the President of the United States or his Cabinet that his officers ought not to be allowed to enforce the law? Any person who has examined this subject carefully must see that it requires no instructions from Washington and no superfluous zeal on the part of the frontier officers to carry out laws of this description, in the state of the labor movement in the United States at present. Only a few months ago I entered, for the first time, in a steamer from my own Province, the city of Boston. We were met at the entrance to the harbor by a tug which

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

brought to the side of our vessel the quarantine officer of the port, the Customs officer of the United States, and an officer of the Knights of Labor organisation, the latter for the purpose of seeing that this contract labor law was enforced. That officer came clothed with the authority of the state, though appointed by the organisation of the Knights of Labor, for the purpose of seeing that, on every vessel that entered that port, there was no citizen of a foreign state who was going into the city of Boston under contract with any of the people of the United States; and when that officer of that labor organisation, clothed with that authority, and acting side by side with the officers of the United States, found a person who, under any circumstances, seemed to be open to the suspicion of having violated the contract labor law, that person was sent back, at the expense of the vessel which brought him into port, even if he had to be sent to the farthest part of the earth. Under these circumstances, it will be seen that it does not require any specific instructions from the authorities of the country or any superfluous zeal on the part of their officers to enforce this law. The people of the United States who procured the passage of these labor laws and who are interested in their enforcement, take care that they are most diligently enforced from day to day, and compel the officers of the United States to carry out the statutes to the fullest extent. Therefore, it is a simple question, not of the enforcement, but of the repeal or modification of the law, and any person who knows the present attitude of those connected with the labor movement in the United States to-day, knows that it would be unreasonable to expect Congress to depart from this policy at present, merely because, in isolated instances here and there, there have been, on the frontier, cases in which the execution of the law has gone beyond its intent. But if hon. members have any doubt upon that subject, or want any official confirmation of what I have said—if the hon. gentleman who intimated to-night that the citizens of Canada suffer this inconvenience on account of the laxity of the Government of Canada, and that the administration at Washington is unaware of the law being so enforced against the Canadian people, is still of that opinion—he need only take up the blue-book on this subject, which was laid before the Imperial Parliament in 1889, and there he will find, not only that the enforcement of the law with regard to Canada, was brought to the notice of the American and the Imperial authorities, by representations—as regards Washington, from their own consuls, and, as regards the Imperial authorities, from their consuls—but they will find there stated fully, on the part of the labor organisations in the United States, and endorsed by the persons connected with the administration of the United States, in a higher or lower capacity as the case may be, the reasons for the policy on which it is contended, against the Imperial remonstrances, that these laws ought to be enforced against Canada. The case they would make in that regard, I do not for a moment intend to endorse, even by implication; but their case is that, not only is there a continuous movement from Canada to the United States of laborers seeking employment and going into the United States under labor contracts, but there is a continuous exodus from Canada

to the United States of paupers and mendicants of various kinds, who, it is alleged by the United States authorities, are filling the charitable institutions along the frontier. I not only do not say that these statements are correct, but I do not believe they are correct. I merely mention the fact that they are expanded on the record here and show that the subject of the enforcement of those laws against Canada has been fully considered, fully represented to the authorities at Washington, that the matter has been deliberately decided upon and has been brought to the knowledge of the Imperial authorities as well. Still, however, that is quite consistent with the statement made by the First Minister that these laws were not adopted at first in any spirit of hostility to the people of Canada or to their entering the United States. As to the cases which have been brought forward by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), I quite admit the hardships which he shows has characterised these cases; but, with great deference to him and those who agree with him in believing that some measure of this kind might be justified by irritating and hostile legislation, I think it would be an unwise course for us to adopt harsh and irritating legislation against the United States, because irritating legislation has been adopted against the people of Canada. In this country, we have not, as the First Minister has pointed out, a surplus population, it has not become a matter of anxiety with us as to how we shall check the influx of population into the country. On the contrary, in many parts of the country, we have a great need for immigration and the very restrictions which have been put on this immigration into the United States are turning day by day in the interests of Canada, by turning immigration in this direction. I think it would be unwise to impose restrictions on immigration. Besides, the hon. gentleman will see that this Bill, as drawn now, and indeed in any way in which he could draw it as a measure of retaliation, would injure many interests in Canada. I do not refer particularly to the industry to which he specially referred, but a Bill of this kind, if drawn as a full measure of retaliation, would extend so far as to prevent the railways and steamboats which pass between this country and the United States, bringing American citizens into Canada who might be in their employment. When a train came from the United States in charge of the conductor, the engineer and a staff of men who were not citizens of Canada, but were under contract, this Bill would apply to them and they would be released from their contract, if the Bill could be passed by this Parliament effectually for that purpose. I would also have grave doubts as to the power of this Parliament to pass the second section, which makes null and void all contracts entered into between persons in Canada and persons out of Canada, looking to the importation of persons affected by these contracts into Canada. For these reasons, I think that, while admitting the case to be as strong as the hon. member for Leeds has presented it to the House—and certainly, from the cases which he presented, it is as strong as he represented it—it would be unwise for Parliament to pass an Act extending to the whole of Canada such a measure, because these grievances have arisen in certain localities.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman on one point. He seems to imagine that I assumed that a distinction could be made in favor of Canada against all the other nations of the world by the Government of the United States. I have never assumed that. I have contended that, while the contract law of the United States applies to the labor of Canada as it does to that of all other countries, still, as applied to this country, whence people go voluntarily over to seek employment themselves, the application of that law by the officials of the United States has been an unjust, an unreasonable, and an unfair one, and, if the hon. gentleman had represented that fact to the Government of the United States, I believe there is too much honesty and fairness in the Congress and the people of the United States to make such an application of the law which should never have applied to this country, and, I believe, does not legally and strictly apply to it. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the fact, that the currency of Canada deposited in a bank at Detroit or anywhere else within the American boundary is liable to taxation. It is only liable to taxation if that bank reissues it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We are aware of cases where Canadian currency lying in the bank was assessed by an official of the United States, and taxed. The hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) shakes his head, but I know it, and it was represented to the Treasury at Washington, by whom it was investigated through a commissioner, and not only was it admitted that this was done, but they said they were bound by the law to have it done.

Mr. MITCHELL. Of course, if the hon. gentleman knows it, I am bound to accept his statement. However, I am satisfied that there is too much fair play and too much of a spirit of justice in a neighboring people such as the American people are to make the Foreign Contract Labor Law apply to cases such as my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has laid before the House, and, if a proper representation of those cases had been made to the United States Government, I am satisfied some satisfaction would have been given, or there would have been some relaxation of those laws. I agree with the hon. Minister of Justice that this law should not pass. We are not in a position to create a spirit of retaliation with the people of the United States. We should rather tolerate even injustice, while making a remonstrance against it, but we should above all things maintain peace and friendship with the great country on our border, kindred with us in interest, in trade relations, and in everything of importance in such a great continent as this. At the same time, it is the duty of the Administration of Canada to see that, in cases such as the hon. gentleman has brought under the notice of the House, a proper representation is made to the United States of the stringent application of that law, which should not apply in such cases at all, and I believe does not apply, and I do not believe that such an application could be maintained in any court in the United States. The Government should bring this to the notice of the American Government and try to get a modification of the regulations, if there are any regulations, or of the application of the law which is made by the officers who control it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I agree with the Minister of Justice as to the meaning and extent of the operations of the American law upon this subject, and as to the impropriety of undertaking here to pass any retaliatory measure. I think any such course on the part of this House would be extremely prejudicial to the interests of the people of this country. In my opinion, it would be quite out of our power to strengthen our hands in dealing with the action of the American Congress and the law on this particular subject if we were to follow their example in this respect. I know that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches some twelve years ago laid down the doctrine of retaliation with a great deal of clearness and energy; but I am glad to learn from the observations made by the Minister of Justice this evening, that the Government are receiving new light, and that they begin to discover that, after all, the policy of retaliation is one which is not always in the interests of the people who are being governed. The hon. gentleman has pointed out the provisions of this Bill; and I entirely agree with the observations made by the Minister of Justice that much of this Bill lies beyond the competency of this Parliament. We, in this respect, differ from the Congress of the United States. They, being authorised by the constitution to legislate upon the subject of trade and commerce generally, according to the construction put upon these words of the constitution by their courts, have a much wider jurisdiction than we possess here in dealing with the same subject. The power of our own Legislature to deal with the subject of property and civil rights makes it, I think, more than doubtful that we should have power to interfere with contracts in the way proposed in the second section of this Bill. Then, it is to be observed that the Congress of the United States, in passing this Act, have legislated generally; they have not legislated against Canada specifically. The legislation that prohibited contracting with laborers in this country, prohibited contracting with laborers in every other country as well, so that if we were to undertake to pass a retaliatory measure against the United States, confined to contracts with citizens of the United States—assuming, for a moment, that such legislation would be within our jurisdiction—we would be adopting a measure wholly different from that which they have adopted. It is true that the hon. gentleman proposes to legislate to prevent contracts with all aliens, and also with foreigners. I do not know whether he meant by foreigners, all who are not citizens of Canada. We know that by the construction put upon those words in the issue of a writ in the United Kingdom, people of the colonies are accounted foreigners, all who are outside the realm, as well as those who are of foreign and independent states; and I am not sure whether the hon. gentleman means by foreigners to include persons who are British subjects not residents of Canada, as well as those who are residents or citizens of foreign countries. But if it is his meaning, I feel quite sure that the legislation proposed would be extremely mischievous, if this House were to adopt it. Now, I could not help noticing the observations made by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). The hon. gentleman seems to think that a great hardship was

Mr. MITCHELL.

imposed upon the Canadians by the legislation of the United States. If I remember rightly, that hon. gentleman has over and over again declared that we had adopted a fiscal policy in this country which was to give employment to all our people here, that they were not to go abroad to seek employment, that such legislation was intended to keep them at home. But the hon. gentleman now complains that so many of them want to go abroad that a great hardship is inflicted upon them because they are not at liberty to enter into contracts with parties residing in the United States. I do not know how the hon. gentleman reconciles his complaint of this evening with his contention on former occasions; but it does seem to me that if the hon. gentleman is right to-night he has been wrong for the past ten years. Now, I do not agree with one contention put forward by the Minister of Justice. He says that Congress was within its rights in doing as it has done. I admit that. It had power so to legislate, and it is responsible to the people of the United States for the legislation it had adopted. I also agree with him when he says that the President of the United States has no option in the matter; the executive authorities of the United States must administer the law as they find it. But I do not admit that it is wholly beyond the power of this House, or of the Government of this country, to take some action in the matter. It seems to me that if the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches had taken as much care to establish close relations with the people of the United States, with the Congress and President of the United States, as they have taken to establish relations with the Government of the United Kingdom, many of these difficulties that we are now called upon to confront, never would have risen; and if there was a commissioner at Washington attached to the British Embassy, representing the people and the Government of this country, those difficulties of which we complain would, in many instances, be got rid of. I do not think that the people of the United States generally, or their representatives in Congress, are hostilely disposed to the people of this country; I believe they are anxious to remain on terms of good neighborhood; and that it only requires a well informed person who is fairly capable of representing us at Washington, to secure a removal of all those difficulties of which we complain. It seems to me that such a measure as one dealing with contracts or agreements with aliens residing abroad at the time the contracts were made, is a measure the modification of which might have been secured, if the Government of Canada had been represented at Washington. Now, the Minister has said, that representations were made by the foreign officer through the British Embassy, with regard to this subject, and that the Government of the United States laid down two propositions, one was that they had a very large immigration to the United States from Canada of persons who went there for the purpose of making the United States their home, and that a large number of paupers left Canada with a view of settling in the United States, or at least of obtaining employment there, and that the object of that legislation was to prevent the United States being made the refuge for Canadian paupers. Well, I do not know what answer the Government of Canada has made to that. It seems to me that it was

the duty of the foreign officer, if any such representations were made to the British Embassy at Washington, to have communicated these representations to the Government of Canada, and it was the duty of the Government of Canada to take immediate steps for the correction of any evil of that sort. Now, while I agree with the observations of the Minister of Justice, that the measure was one upon which Congress was competent to legislate, and that the executive authorities of the United States were called upon to enforce this law at the instance of any private party who chose to prosecute persons for its violation, I also maintain that it was the business of the Government to take active steps to secure the modification or the repeal of that law, and I think they are open to the censure of this House in having failed to take such steps. In my opinion the step that ought to be adopted is to appoint a commissioner, or to secure the appointment of a commissioner representing Canada, specially interested in the affairs of Canada, at Washington. Sir, there can be no doubt whatever that the foreign representatives of England everywhere feel that they have discharged their duty if they do what is looked for and expected of them by the English people and their representatives in Parliament. It is to them that they are responsible and not to this Parliament or the Government of this country; and until we have parties appointed who represent the people of this country, who are responsible to the people of this country, to the Government and Parliament of this country, we will never have our affairs quite satisfactorily attended to at Washington. Now, I think that this measure and what has happened with regard to it, are sufficient to justify the Government in taking active steps to secure the appointment of a commissioner at Washington, and to obtain the consent of the English Government to that appointment, in order that the interests of this country may be properly protected; and that where legislation is being initiated, calculated to breed friction between the neighboring Republic and ourselves, we ought to have a party there directly responsible to us, thoroughly well informed in regard to all these matters, and capable of taking such steps as may be necessary to prevent wrong being done, and to secure the correction of any wrong that Canada has suffered. While the hon. gentleman who brought forward this Bill, did well in bringing the subject before the House, I think it is unfortunate he should have brought it before the House in this form, because I cannot conceive anything more detrimental to the interests of this country, than that this House should seriously entertain a measure like this, with a view to placing it on the Statute-book.

Mr. DENISON. I think every hon. member of the House must recognise the force of the remarks that have fallen from the hon. Minister of Justice, and we must all recognise the difficulty of dealing with this subject; at the same time, I think we are bound to bend our energies to the subject and see if some means cannot be taken to ameliorate the position of affairs at the present moment. When we find our neighbors to the south are competing with our people, while our people cannot compete with them on the same terms, it is certainly desirable that something should be done to remedy the

grievance. It is now possible for a man employed on the Grand Trunk at Windsor to live in Detroit, but it is not possible for him to live in Windsor if he is employed on the Grand Trunk at Detroit. That seems to me to be a most unfair, unjust, and bad arrangement. While I consider the Government of the United States never intended this law to apply to Canada, I can also see the difficulty pointed out by the hon. Minister of Justice, that, if a change were made and Canada were exempted, this country might be made a channel through which to import laborers from Europe to the United States. While seeing that difficulty, it seems too bad that a minister should be mulcted in a fine of \$1,000 because he came to the United States to preach the Gospel. It seems too bad that 60 Canadians employed at Port Huron should be compelled either to resign their positions or remove to the other side of the line. It is a fact that 8 of our citizens did move to the other side rather than lose their employment at Port Huron. There is no doubt this subject is attracting much attention throughout Canada, and we know the people are becoming alive to the situation. I have here a letter from W. T. Cohn as follows:—

"BELLEVILLE DISTRICT ASSEMBLY, K. of L., No. 235,

"OFFICE OF RECORDING SECRETARY,

"GANANOQUE, 31st Jan., 1890.

"GEO. TAYLOR, Esq., M. P., House of Commons, Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—At the annual meeting of the D. A. 235 recently held at Kingston, a resolution was moved by delegate Wm. Kelly, seconded by Wm. Helm, and unanimously resolved, that this D. A. fully endorse the Anti-Alien Bill of Geo. Taylor, Esq., M. P., and at the same time recommend the addition of a clause shutting out American contractors. And a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. Taylor, and to the Legislative Committee.

"Most respectfully, yours obediently,

"WM. HELM,

"K. S. D. A. 235."

I have also had placed in my hands the following letter, addressed to Mr. Taylor by R. R. Elliot, Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Knights of Labor. He says:

"OTTAWA, 26th February, 1890.

"GEO. TAYLOR, Esq., M. P., House of Commons.

"DEAR SIR,—On behalf of organized labor in the Dominion of Canada I beg to thank you for your effort to secure the passage of an Alien Contract Labor Law. We earnestly trust it will receive favorable consideration at the hands of the House.

"Yours faithfully,

"R. R. ELLIOT,

"Chairman Legislative Committee."

While I recognise the difficulty of passing such a Bill as is proposed, at the same time I think that if we had such a measure on the Statute-book, it might be interpreted in such a way as not to exercise undue pressure on our neighbors, and yet be the means of securing some arrangement with them by setting off one against the other.

Mr. CASEY. I differ in some few respects from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). First with respect to the appointment of commissioners. I am not aware from the past history of Canadian commissioners that they have ever been able to exercise any real influence on what was done by the British Embassy with which they were conjoined. In the case of the last Fisheries Treaty it was clear that the Canadian Commissioner had very little to do with the framing of the treaty. In the case of the coming fisheries treaty I am afraid

the same result will occur; and, moreover, in case of dispute the presence of a Canadian commissioner joined to the British Ambassador, will merely enable the Americans to say that any arrangement arrived at had been agreed to by the Canadian as well as by the British representative. I do not think the Canadian commissioners, whether to England, Spain or elsewhere, have shown themselves to be such a success that we should seek to multiply the number. As to creating friction between this country and the United States by passing a measure of this kind, I think hon. members have attached too much weight to that consideration. It is, of course, desirable that friction should not be created, but I do not see how friction will be created between the two countries by the fact that we had passed a law similar to theirs, and one not directed particularly against the United States, because it is not directed against the United States, but applies to all foreign countries. I do not see why any friction should arise from the passage of such a Bill, unless the Bill were passed with a professed and declared intention of retaliating against the United States. In that case I would protest against its passage in every possible way. I abhor the idea of retaliation as much as possible. If the United States have been so mean as to have treated us meanly in this connection, that is no reason why we should so treat them. If the passage of this Bill rested on the ground of retaliation, every self-respecting member of the House should vote against it. It is not on that ground I regard the Bill with any favor, but on quite another ground. The Minister of Justice has told us that remonstrances have been made by the British Government and by the Canadian Government on the United States Government in regard to the enforcing of this law; at all events, whether those remonstrances were made by both Governments or not, remonstrances have been made. In reply it was pointed out by the United States Government, fairly enough, that they could not prevent their officers from executing the law. But I must say that is not the only ground of complaint. It is not only a complaint that the law is carried out, but it has been complained by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), that the law has been applied to cases to which it should not have been applied. In that case a remonstrance would have an effect, and if the attention of the Government has not been called to that fact, it is well that their attention should be called to it now. It is to be hoped and believed that the Government of the United States will restrain their officers from abusing the law to the disadvantage of Canadians who wish to enter the United States. It has been stated that men going over there, not under contract, but to seek employment, have been shut out by this Act. That I believe is an abuse of the law, and is not only against the spirit but against the letter of the law. All the remonstrances against the spirit of the law might doubtless be unavailing in the United States, yet remonstrances against the abuse of the law would be efficacious; and we hope that if such remonstrances have not been made by the Canadian Government, they will soon be made. It is a very sad thing that we have to discuss this question at all. As my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has pointed out,

Mr. CASEY.

it has been claimed all along by the present Government that their fiscal policy would prevent such an exodus as this from our country to the United States. If all that they told us were true, there would not be an opportunity for the Americans to apply their alien law against Canadians, and there would consequently be no reason to ask for retaliative legislation. I am, in one respect, sorry to have to state that I do not believe that this retaliatory legislation will have any effect if passed. I do not fear that, if this Bill should pass, it will cause a friction between the two Governments, because, unfortunately, there is no immigration from the United States into Canada. The flow of immigration is all the other way. There is no danger at present, that an alien law passed by this Government would ever be applied against United States citizens, and that is the unfortunate part of the affair. While the United States Government are maintaining at London—falsely, no doubt—that the Canadians go over there as paupers to be supported by the charity of the people of the United States, no such complaint can be made on this side, for the Americans do not come here even to fill our poor houses. Therefore, if this law should pass, there is no immediate probability of its ever being applied. After all these considerations I come to one reason which leads me to support strongly—not perhaps this measure, but a measure in this direction—and that reason is, that a Bill of this kind is a necessary complement of what is called the National Policy, now in force in Canada. I do not admit the justness of that appellation of "National Policy." I do not admit that it is "National," but, at all events, it is certain that the policy is one of protection to the manufacturers of the country. It protects the manufacturing industries beyond all doubt. Now, Sir, I say, that while we have this policy in force, which (call it by any name you like) protects the manufacturer, it is necessary in all fairness, and in all justice, that we should add to that policy some measure to protect the operative who works under the manufacturer. If you protect the man by whose capital manufactured goods are produced, you should protect the laborer who produces them. It was for the purpose of protecting the laborers from the competition of alien workmen, that this law was passed in the United States. It was found, that if there was a strike of operatives in any factory, the manufacturer was in the habit of hiring laborers abroad to replace the native workmen. This produced difficulties and complaints, which this law was passed to remove. I hold that, under a high protective tariff, some such law as this we are now discussing, should be adopted for the protection of the laborer. The laborer has to pay an increased price for everything he drinks, eats, and wears, in consequence of the protection given to his employer, and some protection should be given to the laboring men to protect him against the employer, who is at liberty to go abroad and to select his laborers to replace the native workmen. I claim that to omit such a piece of legislation as this now proposed, is to give the lie to the professions of those who have introduced and sustained the National Policy. The whole object of that policy, as announced to the country, was to secure employment for native labor, and to prevent our people from going into

the United States. When an hon. member of this House now proposes a measure to prevent the importation of foreign labor to replace the native laborer in those very industries which are said to have been created by a protective tariff, I think that no member of a protectionist Government, and no member who supports that Government, can reasonably or honestly oppose such a Bill. I do not say that I, myself, approve of the Bill in its detail. I think there are very many objectionable features in it, but I believe it to be an integral part and a necessary consequence of the so-called National Policy—that is, if you have protection as a part of that policy. I do not, by any means, believe either in protection, or in the limitation of immigration, and taking each by itself I hold that neither is a sound principle, but if you have the one you must have the other. Two poisons may sometimes counteract each other, and if we must have the poison of protection, we must also have the poison of limited immigration to counteract it. I would not go the length of discouraging immigration of every kind, but I believe that if you protect the manufacturer, the possessor of capital and the employer of labor to the extent of 35 per cent. on an average, you ought also to protect the laborer who works for him. Of course these propositions are contrary to my principles of free trade, but those who adopt the principle of protection must, in all logic, in all justice, and in all fairness, adopt the other. I believe, that while the majority of this House seem to be determined to adhere to the false principle of protection, it is only right, in view of the disabilities placed on the laboring men of this country, that we should adopt the antidote of a limited immigration. I believe further that this is not a Bill which ought to be in charge of a private member. If the Government be true to its principles, it is a Bill which they should introduce on their own responsibility. If the Government is to retain the confidence of these laboring men, whom they have led to believe that their only salvation lies in the maintenance of a protective tariff, they should take the responsibility of defending their rights. It must be apparent to every one that the Government refuses to give to the laborer the protection they give to his employer, for if they were willing to stand by the workmen they would introduce this Bill themselves, and not leave it to a private member. Moreover, a Bill of this kind, which may involve international difficulties, should be introduced by the Government of the day. I throw the whole responsibility upon them. If the Government say that the House will be more prepared to vote upon this matter in a few days, when they shall have more information to give us, the responsibility is upon them for the postponement. But I do not see why we should be any more ready at a future time than we are now. The hon. Minister of Justice has told us everything that can be told about it, and what is there more to know except to go on with our own policy? But I should, perhaps, have dropped that point, because my argument goes to prove that, whether the United States maintain their Act or not, whether they enforce it stringently or not, we, as a protectionist Legislature, speaking in the sense of the majority, to be consistent with our protectionist principles, should adopt a measure of this kind, and put the laborer on an equal footing with the

employer. Without postponing the question, therefore, we should throw the responsibility on the Government, either of introducing a measure of this kind—one which would, perhaps, be better digested than the measure before us—or else of admitting once for all that their professions of being the friends of the workingman are entirely election “highfalutin,” simply intended to catch the votes of workingmen for the occasion, and not intended to bring about any practical legislation for their benefit afterwards. I will not venture to name all the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who represent industrial constituencies; they are too numerous to mention; but I might take, for example, my hon. friends from Hamilton, who represent a peculiarly protectionist city, whom the workingmen of that city sent there to support a protectionist Government under the belief that it would benefit them. I ask them how they feel about this Bill. Are they prepared to sustain the Government that refuses to protect the workingman as well as his employer? I might ask scores of others on that side of the House the same question, but I suppose their answer will be in accordance with whatever course the Government choose to take in the matter. It is highly probable that instead of consulting their workingmen constituents, as they should do in a matter of this kind, they will consult the wishes of the Government, and will follow any course the Government choose to take. Considering the imperfections of this Bill, I shall reserve my opinion as to whether I shall vote yea or nay on this particular Bill; but as a measure of this kind is desirable, it is very possible that I shall vote for the principle of the Bill, though not for its details. But no protectionist can consistently vote against a measure of this kind, and no Government that professes to be a friend of the workingman can consistently refuse to take charge of it.

Mr. HESSON. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoken.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken on the question. If he desires to make a personal explanation he can proceed, but not otherwise.

Mr. HESSON. I desire to make an explanation. I think I have spoken with great moderation on this question, and if there is a desire to get information, I think hon. gentlemen on both sides should be willing to hear it. But if hon. gentlemen are not willing to hear me, I suppose the adjournment of the House can be moved. I exceedingly regret that an important question of this kind should be made the occasion of raising a debate on the National Policy.

An hon. MEMBER. That is not a personal explanation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that he rose for the purpose of making a personal explanation.

Mr. WALLACE. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman having relieved me of the responsibility by moving the adjournment of the debate—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That cannot relieve you.

Mr. HESSON. When my hon. friend moved it, I was not speaking.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire simply to say, that in expressing dissent from the statement of the hon. Minister of Justice that foreign currency was taxed in banks in the United States when lying there, I did so on the authority of the cashier of a National Bank, who lives across the border close to where I live. He told me some months ago that the tax was imposed only on the currency taken out of the bank, and not when it was received or while it was lying in the vaults of the bank. Further, I know it to be a fact, that in that particular bank, and in other similar institutions on the border, Canadian currency is received at par, and is paid out by the banks at par to their Canadian customers, so that the tax in those cases is not imposed.

Mr. LÉPINE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, allow me to say a few words in reference to the Bill just brought up by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), in order to limit the immigration of foreigners under contracts or agreements respecting work to be done in Canada. I do not quite share the opinion of the hon. members who suggest that the consideration of the Bill should be postponed. In the speeches delivered this evening, we have an evidence that the members of this House are fully cognisant of the Bill. Besides, a similar law has existed for several years in the United States; every hon. member of this House is aware of its working, and I see no reason for postponing the consideration of the measure now submitted to this House. We should, therefore, proceed at once with the discussion of this Bill, proposed in the interests of the laboring class, which is certainly the most numerous of our commonwealth. This Bill, which has been asked for for a long time by the laboring class, in no way contemplates to restrict immigration into Canada. The Canadian people, Mr. Speaker, have always declared themselves earnestly in favor of immigration. We want immigrants. The people acknowledge that from immigration they will draw elements of prosperity and serious guarantees of improvement. Canada, it cannot be denied, possesses vast tracts of land. We have the North-West Territories, the Saskatchewan Valley and Manitoba, which contain treasures of fertility and riches which, to become public property, require to be worked. And, Mr. Speaker, when one considers that Canada, with an area as large as that of all Europe, as yet only numbers 4,500,000 inhabitants, one is inclined to think of the number of years which must elapse before all these resources can be put into working order; before we can work our mines, our lakes, our prairies, and our rural fields. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the laboring class are in favor of immigration. Every one is agreed on this point; but it is necessary that we should know well the points to which that immigration should be directed. It is necessary above all, Mr. Speaker, that we should know that it is the country that has need of immigration, not the cities. It is above all necessary that we should know that it is not mechanics that are wanted, but agricultural laborers. The Bill proposed by the hon. member for Leeds, has no doubt for its object to check the flood of immigration of the mechanic class, which

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

steadily increases and is altogether detrimental to the interests of Canadian workmen. An enlightened glance is sufficient to force the conviction that the mill and the workshop will always find the hands they require among Canadian workmen. Why then, Mr. Speaker, should we go abroad to seek for mechanics? Why should we desire to multiply the number of mechanics in Canada? Would it, perchance, be with the object of causing wages to be lowered? Here is a singular way of being useful to the laboring class! That is not, I believe, the mission that the representatives of the people have to fulfil. And besides, it would be a singular system of colonisation; it would be a singular means to take to improve the material position of the laboring class in Canada. No, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. members of this House would do an act of justice by taking into immediate consideration the Bill proposed by the hon. member for Leeds and above all, by passing it. If, as pointed out by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) we have the right to protect the Canadian products against the competition of foreign products; if we have the right to protect our industries; we ought also to protect the laboring classes. We should apply the same principle to the workmen of our country. I am far from being actuated by any feeling of exclusiveness; but, after all, if in the large cities and in all the industrial centres of Canada, there are hundreds of mechanics out of employment; if we see every year a certain number of Canadian mechanics still forced to leave their country—although for some years, thanks to the National Policy, the number of such has considerably decreased—I do not hesitate to say that by continuing to apply the National Policy to workmen, we shall see the number of Canadians who go to the United States not only decreasing, but perhaps disappearing altogether. And, moreover, we may perhaps see what we all hope for, a considerable number coming back to our country. I say, then, that if we still have workmen who are out of work here, it is altogether useless to go and seek for any abroad. The Bill which is now before the House, if it should be passed, would considerably protect our working classes. I remember, some years ago, certain Canadian manufacturers crossed the Atlantic for the purpose of bringing out 300 or 400 German and Italian workmen, whom they brought here under false representations, to replace Canadian workmen. The National Policy had enabled these manufacturers to considerably increase their business; it had put them on the road to fortune, and yet these men, from selfishness, I am inclined to believe, would not allow Canadian workmen to profit by the advantages which the National Policy had secured to them. Well, Mr. Speaker, I firmly hope that this House will consider this Bill which is earnestly asked for by the laboring class; this Bill which is indispensable to them, and the need of which has been felt for a very long time. The laws of the United States prevent American manufacturers from coming here to engage Canadian workmen by contract. Well, why cannot we retaliate? We actually retaliate in all that relates to manufactured articles; we can do precisely the same thing for our workmen. Besides, the United States have passed that law several years ago. France, last year, passed a nearly similar law for the protection.

of its workmen against the competition of Italian and German workmen. England is on the point of passing a law similar to that which exists in the United States. I am at a loss to know why Canada should not adopt the same course. Is it because we do not feel as much interest as other countries in the well-being of the working classes? Is it because we do not desire as much as they do to see them prosperous and happy? I hope we do. Well, if such is the feeling of the hon. members of this House, if they really desire to see the working classes happy and prosperous, they certainly ought to give their most earnest consideration to the Bill now proposed to them, and which, without injuring any one, would be useful to thousands of citizens.

Mr. HESSON. I rise for the purpose not only of making an explanation, but replying to the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. member is not in order and I have the floor. He has spoken already.

Mr. WALLACE. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HESSON. If the hon. gentleman had allowed me the privilege, which is usually given to hon. members, I would not have put my hon. friend to the inconvenience of moving the adjournment of the House, in order to afford me a few moments of explanation in reply to the observations made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I thought that this question was of sufficient importance to have caused hon. gentlemen opposite to refrain from dragging in the effects of the National Policy on the labor markets of Canada. I had hoped that this question, one of such vast interest especially to our laboring classes, was of sufficient importance to have called for the quietest and calmest consideration of the issues involved. But both these hon. gentlemen were bound to have their fling at the National Policy, and stated that the laborers of Canada were forced to emigrate to the United States in spite of the hopes thrown out when that policy was introduced that it would give employment to our own people. I regret exceedingly that no question can be brought before this House which hon. gentlemen opposite will consider on its own merits. In a matter of such importance as the one under consideration, I should have expected the hon. gentlemen opposite to assist the Government in framing some policy—whether of the kind that would involve legislation similar to that which the Americans have adopted, and which would prevent American laborers coming into Canada for employment, unless they brought their families here, or of any other legislation deemed suitable under the circumstances—without wandering into a discussion of the National Policy. If hon. gentlemen opposite would reflect, they could not fail to perceive that if our laborers, with the slight taxation imposed upon them in this country, seek a field for employment in the United States, where there is a protective tariff of the most rigid description, their course cannot be prompted by any desire to escape the burden of taxation here. The hon. member for Bothwell knows, as well as any hon. member in this House—for he lives in the western part of Ontario—that we have lost valuable Canadian citizens, not because we did not

try to give them employment, but because the tariff in this country was probably too low to afford employment to all those who sought it, and they consequently went to the American side. The hon. member for Lambton and the hon. member for South Essex could inform the House that there has been a large emigration to the American side on account of the law compelling men who work in the States to live there with their families; and they know that many of these men are employes of the Grand Trunk Railway, which is purely a Canadian enterprise, and all the capital invested in which is English or Canadian capital. These men are, in their daily work, obliged to cross the St. Clair and Detroit rivers, and on the American frontier they are informed that before they can be allowed to continue their work they must bring over their families. If there is anything lacking, it is that our protective policy has not been as strong as that of the United States, or it would, perhaps, have given more employment to our people than it has. Hon. gentlemen opposite should assist this Government in their course towards the American authorities, and in their endeavor to urge upon the American authorities, that if this labor law was not intended to apply to Canada, it should be withdrawn, or the officers on the frontier should be advised by the Washington Government not to enforce it against Canadians. They should assist the Government in some way to get even terms, at all events; and if it must come to that, I will support the Bill of my hon. friend if nothing better can be done, and have an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. If the Americans, with their sixty-five million population, can afford to disregard the good feeling that ought to exist with their neighbor who, though smaller in numbers, has as great capacities and as great a future—if they can afford to disregard what is fair and just to a country which has treated them justly and fairly, there is no reason why we should not adopt similar legislation in our interests. That the Americans should enforce such a policy against a neighboring country and prevent our laborers living on the Canadian frontier from crossing the line to their work and returning to their families at night, is a most contemptible proceeding towards a country which, though smaller in point of population, has as great a future and as much independence as their more powerful neighbor.

Mr. GILLMOR. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken said, the other day, that if he had his way he would not allow a bushel of wheat or oats to come into Canada from the United States. He wants an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. That is the foundation of the policy of the Government. They have practiced retaliation from the beginning, and retaliation is a natural outcome of protection. This labor law of the Americans is the natural result of their policy. The laboring classes in the United States have found out that they are not protected by the high tariff, and that the thirty-five and fifty per cent. duty has not benefited them, and, consequently, they are now seeking for protection by keeping out foreign labor. I am a free trader, and opposed to retaliation. The policy I would advocate towards the United States is one of conciliation. But the present Administration seems to be drawing in their horns a little.

They were very bold when they put the duty on fruit baskets, and no doubt they had good reason for doing so, because our friends across the border were small enough and mean enough to put a duty on tin cans used for canning fish. That game has been going on for a long time, and now we are coming to the natural fruits of protection on both sides of the line. Of course, I do not know what is the best to be done, but I think the Government should have some policy on this subject. As to the question of labor, we know something about it in my country, because we have suffered there. Our lumbering men have been in the habit for years of going to the State of Maine and taking their horses and men there to operate in winter time. Now they have been stopped. One of my constituents last year took a contract to lumber in some part of Maine or New Hampshire—I do not know which—he went there with his crew of men from Canada; and, while he was there, some information was given against him and he had to flee from that country. His operations were broken up, and he had to get back to Canada as quickly as he could, in order to save a fine of something like \$2,000. He dare not go back to that country. Conciliator as I am and free trader as I am, I must say this is very trying. These friendly relations, so far as workmen going from New Brunswick to Maine and from Maine to New Brunswick, have existed for so many years, that it is very annoying to have this law operating against us, and it is very injurious to our interests. It is particularly annoying in view of the fact that, in the cotton mill in St. Stephen's, which was placed there, as it was supposed, to give employment to Canadians, we have 200 or 300 operatives employed—not as skilled laborers—who live in Calais, in the State of Maine. They receive their money in Canada, they are employed in Canada, and live in the State of Maine. Yet, when our people go over to work in lumbering, the law is enforced and they are driven back or compelled to become citizens of the United States. In fact, I am informed that some have had to go there and become citizens before they could hire their men. Then the men go across and are hired there, and then they can go on with their operations, but they must become naturalised before they can do what they have been accustomed to do there for so many years. I know this is a difficult matter for the Government to deal with, but I am pleased to see that they are beginning to look at these matters reasonably. This makes manifest the close and tender relations between Canada and the United States, and shows that this policy of stand-off, of Canada looking out for Canadians and the United States for their own subjects, should cease. This policy of protection and of retaliation is ripening, and I think we should pursue a policy of conciliation instead of one of retaliation. I do not know whether the Government have been informed in reference to what I have stated in regard to my county, but the people I represent complain that, while they are prevented from going over to the States to labor there as they have done for so many years, they see half the employés in the large cotton mill in St. Stephen's, who are Americans living in Calais, in the State of Maine, obtaining labor and money from a Canadian institution. Even for free traders who would like to get on harmoniously

Mr. GILLMOR.

with the neighboring Republic, this is hard to bear. It is very irritating, but I should think it would be the duty of the Government to look into the matter, and, if any relief can be afforded or any arrangement come to, they should see that our people are treated there as we treat the citizens of the United States here.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). This is a matter of very great and vital importance to my constituency. I quite disagree with the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Gillmor) on the subject of conciliation. We have done a great deal in the way of conciliation, we have paid much for conciliation, we have deprived our citizens of many of their rights for the sake of conciliation, and I am certain this country can never purchase conciliation. The only way in which we can get fair play is to stand on our broad territory and assert our rights. When we do that to the fullest extent, I am sure we will be respected by the American people, and I am sure that, if we require anything for our national existence, which I deny, if we require anything for our future prosperity and comfort in this country, we shall only get it by standing on a broad ground of Canadian nationality in this country. We shall never get it by bowing at the altar of the American Government, or of the American parties, whether Democrat or Republican. We shall never get it by kneeling at their feet and begging for something in the interests of our people. We have been trying the plan of conciliation for a number of years, and my constituency has paid a large price for the sake of conciliation in the way of abandoning all duties on fruits and fruit trees. I tell the House that the abandonment of those duties by the American Government was a delusion and a snare. They professed to have complied with the conditions of the old Act of Parliament which was enacted in this country in 1848, which crept into the Act which made it a part of the National Policy of this country. Taking advantage of this old clause in the Act, the Americans took off, as they said, the duty upon fruits and fruit trees. After that was apparently done, they put such heavy charges upon the papers required to make entries, upon the entries themselves, and so forth, that the fees you had to pay amounted to a protection of from 25 to 100 per cent. in favor of the fruit-growers in the United States. There is no good faith kept by them in any of these things. Take the case of the Grand Trunk at Niagara Falls, which has been running since about 1856. The terminus is on the American side of the river. The employés who have been at work on that road for about 30 years have been given notice that, unless they domicile themselves in the State of New York, they cannot be employed on that side of the river. These are people who are paid by Canadian money, who work on a road built by Canadian and British capital, and yet they are told they cannot domicile within British territory and do the work of Canadian employers in the State of New York. I have a petition from the Board of Trade of Niagara Falls, setting forth these facts. These employés have their little homes on the Canadian side of the river, which they have built up by their industry and their hard-earned money, and they have to abandon those homes and go and board on the other side of the river, or they will not be

allowed to work any longer on that side. This was put in force not by the protectionist party of the United States, not by the party which adopted the National Policy of the United States—the Republican party. This great obstruction was put in force by the Democrats, the free trade party of the United States, if there is such a thing as a free trade party in the United States at all. It was the late President and Democratic party of the United States who adopted this principle. They sent a man monthly to the yards of the Grand Trunk Railway, to examine where people are domiciled who work there. If they are not domiciled in the United States, the companies are given notice that they must dismiss these people, or they will be liable to a fine of \$1,000 for every man that they employ. Sir, it is a source of very great aggravation, it is something that one can scarcely understand and believe in this nineteenth century, that people professing to be the most liberal people, the most democratic people, the most generous people in the world, should deprive a man of the privilege of earning bread and butter, simply because his house did not happen to be built within the United States. I am anxious that something should be done by which this evil may be remedied; but I am just as well satisfied as I am satisfied of my existence, that nothing can be done in the way of prostrating this country before the American people. The only course you can take is to live in this country independently, just as if no such country as the Republic of the United States existed at all. We have all the resources necessary to greatness, we have everything that is essential to our well-being, to our happiness, to our comfort, to our prosperity; and I must say that after holding out the hand of good-fellowship for years, when we find that we are spurned, that we are despised, it is time for us to withdraw our hand, and say to the people of the United States: We can live as if you had no existence at all, and our intention for the future is to live independently of you.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I am very much surprised at the speech of my hon. friend. He has spoken from a western standpoint, but if his views were carried out in the Maritime Provinces, dissatisfaction as the people are there now with Confederation, that dissatisfaction would be increased tenfold. My hon. friend speaks about a remedy by means of this Bill; if he would be consistent, let him push forward and bring in a Bill cutting off all intercourse between Canada and the United States. In spite of all restrictions upon trade, our trade with the United States is increasing every year. The hon. gentleman says we ought to stand upon our Canadian nationality. Sir, we are handicapped continually in our Canadian nationality by the position we occupy as a colony of Great Britain, and we find that the very rights we are contending for are to be given away in the interests of the Imperial Government. I say that, so far as we are concerned, let us work for our own country, and, as was suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), let us take such steps, that we can appoint our own commissioners to the United States; men who will look after our rights, and pay that attention to Canadian interests which I do not believe they

have received from the present diplomatic service of the mother country, I believe when we get that done the spirit of retaliation which, to a large extent, is evidenced by this Bill, will very soon disappear. Now, this Bill is bad in principle and bad in detail. It has been put forward by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), and in effect admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite, that this is simply the outcome of the National Policy, that it is a necessary result of our policy of protecting manufacturers, while the laboring classes are to be crushed between the upper and the nether millstone, and the consumers, the farmers, the fishermen, the lumbermen, and all others who are not engaged in certain manufactures, are to be taxed continually for the purpose of protecting the manufacturers. Now, the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) has stated that we are very lightly taxed, if so, how is it that people go to the United States, where they are so much heavier taxed than we are? It used to be contended, at one time, that Canada was a cheap country to live in, in order that we might get a foreign immigration. But that system has been done away with, and a heavy system of taxation has been adopted that is sending our people elsewhere. What we want to-day is population, this country is starving for population. Yet here we are asked to enact laws which will keep out not merely the people from the United States, but the people of the whole world. We are now trying to induce immigration from Europe, the Mennonites, the Scandinavians, the Germans, and yet we are asked to place upon our Statute-book a law which, if it is put in operation like the laws in the United States, will prevent all these immigrants from entering our country. If, as has been urged, undue advantage has been taken of this Act by parties in the United States, that is a matter which the Administration of this country ought to take hold of. It is true that after that law has been passed by Congress, the executive is obliged to put it in force; but if it has been used for improper purposes to the injury of our own people, then it is the duty of this Administration to take the matter up and defend our people in the courts of the United States. Let them protect our people and assist them in having this wrong construction of the law abandoned; let them call to it the attention of the American Government, so that the injustice may be remedied. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison), spoke of the case of the clergyman in New York, who was sued for this penalty. So far as I understood, that action was brought for the very purpose of showing the absurdity of such a law as this. I say that such a law as this is a humiliation and a disgrace to the United States, and I contend that we should not be guilty of a similar legislation, but we should rise above such a policy. My hon. friend from Welland (Mr. Ferguson), speaks of retaliation. Why, for the last ten years we have had nothing but retaliation. We were told this National Policy would bring the United States to our feet. When it was started in 1878, Sir Charles Tupper said that in two years it would bring the Americans to sue of this country for trade relations. It has failed to do so. We have gone on in that spirit, and the result has been to create a hostile spirit instead of that amicable feeling which ought to exist between the two countries. Instead of legislation of this

sort being adopted, we ought to live in amity, and endeavor to work together in harmony. A short time ago we asserted on this side of the House, that a large number of Canadians had gone to the United States, and the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) asked to have that question investigated, and to test the assertion about a large exodus from this country to the south of us. We were then told, over and over again, that the exodus was greatly exaggerated, but to-day it is put forward with regard to this law, that it prevents our people from going into the United States to seek employment. We were told that under the National Policy our people would remain at home, that they would not need to go to the United States, that they would find sufficient employment in this country. All that now turns out to be a mistake. As I said before, we are battling the whole world. I am not sure but that under the construction of this Bill we might not keep out people from every country. I do not say such is the case, but it may be that when this Act is put in force we would find that not only would it prevent people from coming in from the United States, but it would also prevent them coming from the mother country, and from every other country. I do not mean to say that that would be the construction placed upon it, but it might be open to that construction, and this circumstance shows that the principle in an entirely vicious one. I agree with the Minister of Justice that the second clause of the Bill does not come within the power of this Parliament to enact. There are also other matters of detail deserving serious consideration. If this Bill were put into force, manufactories which have been claimed as having been created by the National Policy might be closed, because skilled workmen could not be imported from the other side of the line. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) has pointed out that the great cotton mill in New Brunswick obtains its skilled workmen from the United States; and in other large manufactories throughout the country there are very many workmen from the United States, and from England and Scotland, and yet under this Bill that labor could not be imported. The details are, however, unimportant as compared with the principle of the Bill. That principle is vicious. The principle of retaliation is one that is unworthy of our position. Let us rise above any such principle; for it is no reason that because others do wrong, we should do wrong. Let us base our laws on the principles of peace, order and good government, and not on the principle of retaliation, or on the principle of endeavoring to build up a Chinese wall to entirely exclude one country from dealing with the other; for it would be necessary to carry out the principle put forward by the member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), to actually pass a law to prohibit our railway trains and steamships entering the United States.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I desire to offer a few remarks upon the Bill of my hon. friend for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) now before the House. During the summer of 1889 I was quite cognizant of the high degree of injustice meted out to Canadian mechanics and workmen in some of the border towns lying opposite the constituency I have the honor to represent. During the months

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

of July or August, I think, a dozen or so of mechanics went across to Ogdensburg to obtain employment in connection with a public work in course of erection there. At the same time, I may remark, that Americans were coming over from the village of Morristown, on the other side, to Brockville, where some public works were in course of erection, and were there obtaining employment. Our citizens were justly indignant when one morning—one Monday afternoon I think it was—those workmen appeared in somewhat of a hurry at Brockville, declaring that they had been approached by one of the United States officials on the other side, who, in a most peremptory manner, told them to leave that country for Canada. They were not even allowed to go to their boarding house; they were not allowed one hour in which to remain in the country. They were guarded from the place where they were working to the cars they were to take for Morristown, and they were guarded until they boarded the ferry for the Canadian side. What rendered this case especially onerous, and apparently unjustifiable in the minds of those who were not aware of this Act, was the fact that we were granting employment to Americans, who came from the other side, in the town of Brockville at this very time. It must be remembered that from the head of Lake Ontario down to Montreal the Canadian side furnishes more employment, in this reciprocal way for labor, than the towns on the other side of the river. I make that statement fearless of successful contradiction; because, with the exception of Ogdensburg, there is between the city of Kingston and Montreal, no town of any considerable importance whatever on the American side. I, at that time, deemed it my duty to communicate with the Government and urge upon them the necessity of taking some action in the matter. I was glad to hear they had done so. It occurred to me, as it must occur to almost every person who reflects on the subject, that the legislation in the matter proposed by the hon. member for South Leeds, must be attended with very great difficulty. First, it must, to say the least, be very doubtful whether this Parliament has any jurisdiction to pass and enact such a law. I do not think it has that power. In the second place, if this Parliament did have jurisdiction to enact such a law, would it be in the best interests of the Canadian people that any such law should be enacted? Two wrongs do not make a right; and I can only repeat what I said in a communication addressed to the *Herald*, not the *Montreal Herald*, but the next best paper, the *New York Herald*, at the request of that paper, during the time those difficulties were exciting considerable attention throughout the entire country. I said then, and I wish to repeat it now here, because I have not changed my mind on the subject, that the whole difficulty was not so much in the enactment of Congress as in the manner in which the American officials interpreted it. I do not believe that in the case of those workmen who went from Gananoque and Brockville to the other side and there obtained work, the Act was properly enforced. The men were living in Canada; they left this country and went to the United States in search of work; they did not go to the United States in pursuance of any contract previously entered into. Upon that point I addressed the following letter, which was merely the expression

of my opinion as a lawyer on the subject. Whether it was owing to the attitude assumed by my pugnacious friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who is always seeking to protect the interests of his constituents, whether it was owing to anything I may, in my humble way, have contributed or not, I know very well that after these efforts had been put forth, and the Government of this country had made representations—and I had been assured they were making representations—those difficulties ceased, and to-day we have practically very little trouble along the border, at least along the border of the constituency I represent. I stated in that letter as follows:—

“The main object of the United States Alien Contract Labor Law was to prohibit the importation of aliens under contract to compete with American wage-earners by working for less wages in the United States. Such, at least, is the impression which prevails regarding the law in foreign countries, and such was the understanding of some Canadian workmen who, living along the border, crossed over to the United States and engaged in work there as they had been accustomed to do in previous years.

“I may say that the privilege, if privilege it can be considered, is reciprocal on the part of both countries, especially among the people on either side of the River St. Lawrence. Great, therefore, was the surprise and indignation of some Canadian mechanics, who, while employed in Ogdensburg, were approached by a United States official, ordered to quit their work and leave the country forthwith. And so careful was the official to see that his orders were carried into effect, that the Canadian workmen were not lost sight of for a moment, until they boarded the boat that was to take them from Morris-town, N. Y., to Brockville, Ont., where they lived.

“This unlooked for and summary treatment of these men excited a great deal of indignation among people on this side of the border, the utmost cordiality having always existed between the communities bordering upon either side of the river.

“As stated above the main object of the Legislature appears to have been to prevent the importation of aliens under contract to compete with American workmen. Now, these Canadians, who were dismissed from their work and ordered to leave the country, voluntarily left Canada, and were not under contract to any Americans, but obtained the work for which they went into the foreign country, on their arrival there. This took their case outside the scope of the law in question. I believe it has been urged on the part of those acting in the enforcement of the law against those Canadians that they were in the habit of crossing the river and going to their homes on Saturday nights, returning to their work on Monday morning, and by coming into the country in this way after they had entered into a contract for the work had been guilty of violating the law. But this is not to be entertained for a moment. It was a violation of neither the spirit nor meaning of the law which was in the mind of the Legislature at the time of its enactment.

“In those portions, respectively, of the State of New York and the Province of Ontario bordering upon the River St. Lawrence, there is very little difference in the rate of wages, and it is not an uncommon thing to find American workmen seeking to obtain employment on the Canadian side. In fact there were instances of this to be seen here at the very time when the Canadians were sent from the United States back to their own country. In view of the very close business relations between the people on both sides of the line, it will be, in my opinion, most unwise, if not impossible, to strongly enforce the said Act as against Canadians.

“The instructions contained in the letter of Acting Secretary Batcheller to the Collector of Customs at Cape Vincent, N.Y., indicate that the United States Government are sensible of the difficulty, not to say impossibility, of enforcing such a law between the two countries.

“I am satisfied that, in its application to Canadian workmen in the St. Lawrence district, the Act has met with a strange interpretation at the hands of the United States officials. To say the least, it has a very unneighborly look, causing ill-feeling and accomplishing little or no good.”

Now I have not changed my views since that time, and I quite agree with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in the remarks he has

made to-night. What this Government ought to do, and what this Government I believe has done, in the interest of these workmen who have been annoyed in this way, is to make a representation, as strong as diplomacy will permit, in order to let the United States authorities see that a proper and a reasonable interpretation has not been placed upon this Act. I can quite understand, Sir, that an official—perhaps at the instigation of interested parties—may act unjustly or arbitrarily and contrary to the spirit of the law. I have, however, faith enough in the good sense of the people of the United States that, if the matter is brought to their notice, in the proper spirit, the harsh enforcement of these regulations will be relaxed. In reference to some remarks which have fallen from our friends on the other side, I may say, before concluding, that I do not see how unrestricted reciprocity would remedy this state of things, because with the largest measure of unrestricted reciprocity, we would still be foreigners coming under the operation of this Act. No matter what our trade relations are, whether we are governed by the system of protection or whether we have unrestricted reciprocity, that is not going to at all relieve us of the present difficulty. The only thing which can in any sense lessen what is a very great inconvenience, and a very great loss to some of our people, is that the United States Government be impressed with the great necessity which exists of so enforcing a regulation, or a law of this kind, so that the pleasant relations existing between the two countries may not be disturbed.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I coincide to a very large extent in the tone of the remarks of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. I think my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) when he unfolded to us to-day the efforts he had taken, at an early stage, to protect the rights of Canadians, will be apt in the history of this country to take rank with Governor Foraker, and those gentlemen of the United States who have declared that we were on the verge of war. I tremble for the interests of this country, if my hon. friend in his raid down through these peaceable waters, had succeeded in apprehending any American boats, and I fear the results which must have followed from that encounter. I think it is fortunate for us on this occasion that his warlike demonstration has succeeded so effectively in frightening the Americans from coming into Canadian waters. Aside from that, I really do not think my friend has very much to complain of. The shoe pinches in this particular case in his own locality; and, after all, let me ask, are the Americans not doing exactly for America what he and his friends claimed they were doing for Canada: keeping Canada from the Canadians—while they are simply keeping the United States for the Americans. If the protective system as advocated by him and his friends, is to be of any value at all, it must be built up for the special purpose of having everything for ourselves. I believe that occasions like this, and discussions like this, must clearly show to every unprejudiced mind, that if our relations are to continue as they have for years past with the United States, something more friendly than this system of “fencing off” each other in this fashion, will have to exist between the two countries. I think this is one of the strongest evidences

that the National Policy, when carried out in its entirety, does not exactly work in the interests of all parties, as these gentlemen would lead us to believe. The current of our trade relations with the United States, for the last three years especially, goes to show, most distinctly, that, in spite of the two great walls we have built up on each side of the boundary line, the people of the United States, and we ourselves, find it to be in the interest of both parties to trade more and more with each other every year. If any one will look at the last trade returns of Canada with Great Britain, as published in the *Montreal Gazette* of to-day, he will find (while the Finance Minister has been rejoicing in the increase of exports and imports, and the consequent bounding revenue into the Treasury for the last seven months of the fiscal year) that for the month of January last our trade with Great Britain has shrunk immensely as compared with the corresponding month of last year. On the other hand our trade has correspondingly grown with the United States. I would like to remind my friend from the County of Welland (Mr. Ferguson) when he speaks so feelingly—and I confess from his standpoint with very good grounds, of the manner in which the workmen employed by the Grand Trunk Railway, paid by Canadian money, are treated by the Americans in their relation with them, just across the boundary of his own county—of this increased traffic between the United States and Canada, as witnessed by the returns of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. And when you remember the operation of the inter-state law upon American trade within the United States boundaries, it is not much wonder that they look around for another process by which they can squeeze these railway companies while keeping themselves within the bounds of the law. This whole matter goes to show clearly to my mind that it is to the interest of both Canada and the United States to cultivate friendly relations—that it is our future destiny, however much we may kick against it, and it is to our interest to extend and enlarge those friendly trade relations at the earliest possible moment, so that we shall arrive at a more equitable basis on which to discuss our fisheries and labor relations. Just so soon as we place ourselves in that position there will be a clear gain to both countries, and I do not care how soon that reality comes. In the history of the development of this country, sooner or later, the common sense of both parties will lead to that result. While I am pleased that this discussion has taken place, and pleased at the tone with which the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) has discussed it, I do feel satisfied that it is not along the lines laid down by the hon. member for Leeds that we should be found travelling in order to overcome this difficulty, although we may attempt to carry out the National Policy in that line; but I believe that we are to find a solution of the difficulty in cultivating those friendly relations which are steadily growing and increasing between the United States and Canada, and which will be productive of benefit to both countries.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The motion for the adjournment of the House is not withdrawn, and before it is, I wish to say a word on the observa-

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

tions made by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson). I think the hon. gentleman must be under a misapprehension, because there is nothing in the United States Contract Labor Law which at all interferes with a contract between an alien and any person in the United States, if the contract is made within the United States.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman is out of order. He has already spoken on the question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman forgets that the motion for the adjournment was made at his instance.

Mr. HESSON. And the hon. gentleman who made the motion has withdrawn it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The motion is not withdrawn.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I heard the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who moved the motion, withdraw it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He could not withdraw it without the consent of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the motion was not put from the Chair.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was put from the Chair, and it was not withdrawn. Now, I know cases of contractors in the State of Michigan being prosecuted for employing Canadians. They pleaded that the contract between themselves and the Canadian laborers was entered into in the State of Michigan, and their contention was upheld by the court that that contract did not come within the provisions of the law. And I know that to-day there are hundreds of persons living in Windsor who are employed in Detroit, and no objection is made to their employment, because their contract was entered into in the city of Detroit, and not on this side of the boundary.

Mr. TISDALE. Last year the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) introduced into this Parliament a measure, the principle of which I supported, in favor of extradition, even if the United States would not grant the same thing to us. The present Bill is in the same direction, and while I do not approve of the action of the United States, I do disapprove of a similar action on the part of this Parliament, because two wrongs do not make a right. I do not think there is any necessity at the present time for any law of this sort. I understand from public report that negotiations are now going on at Washington; and while any hon. gentleman in this House knows that I am not in favor of trucking in any way to the United States, I am, on the other hand, decidedly against any legislation that will excite feelings of irritation until it is known whether the negotiations between the two countries will come to anything or not. Therefore, I hold that any legislation of this kind at the present time is injurious, improper and uncalled for. Let us wait to see if we can arrange matters; and whatever the result may be, though it should involve force, I am prepared, as my past record shows, to stand up against the United States if necessary for the rights of Canada; but until then, the same arguments which led me to support the measure of the hon. member for Albert last year apply to the motion now before the House. Until the negotiations now going on prove to be abortive, I regret that any such Bill as this should be brought before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It appears that there is a motion for the adjournment of the House before the Chair, and as the hon. gentleman desires to withdraw it, I presume the House will allow him to do so, in order that I may move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. LAURIER. I think we had better adjourn now. It would make a bad impression if we adjourn the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it would make a bad impression if we did not adjourn the debate.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

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

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Before that motion is carried I should like to ask that the next Order be called. It is only a very short Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I intended, if that order were reached, to ask the hon. gentleman to allow it to stand, as there will no doubt be legislation on that subject brought down by the Government, and it will be better to consider it then.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. If the Government will include my Bill in theirs, I am quite willing.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government are still considering that subject, and I am not able to give the hon. gentleman an answer, but I will give him an answer later on.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:15 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 23rd February, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved:

That the first report of the committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates, be adopted.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If I read the report rightly, it recommends that the Government Printing Bureau should appoint a special proof-reader for the *Hansard*. The Government have no objection to that, but I am at a loss to know whether it would not be better for the Debates Committee to ask authority to appoint that officer themselves, so that he might be completely under their control, instead of being an officer of the Printing Bureau. Of course, if the suggestion of the Committee be carried out, so much will be added to the expenditure of the Printing Bureau, and I shall be obliged to ask a vote of the House for that appointment.

Mr. ELLIS. I understand the report to mean that the proof-reading, being a mechanical thing, should be done by the office itself. I do not understand it to recommend the appointment of a special officer to do the work.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The report reads:

"Whereas complaints have been made to the effect that the revised edition of the French edition of the Debates is not correctly printed—"

Mr. ELLIS. The Committee do not say so. They merely say that it is reported to them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Committee would not ask the House to remedy defects if they did not recognise that defects existed. They recommend that, as the work is now done at the Government Printing Bureau, the head of the Department be requested to take the necessary steps to secure the services of a competent proof-reader.

Mr. INNES. The action which the Committee took was taken on a communication which was sent to them complaining that the proof-reading was not correctly done. That is the true position of the case, and it was on that communication that the Committee considered the matter and framed their report. The majority of the Committee agreed with what the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) has said, that it was mere mechanical work, that the first correction of the proof in English was done at the Printing Bureau, and the same should be done in regard to the French proof. That was all we recommended, our desire being to have an accurate correction of the first proof in French in the same way as in regard to the English proof.

Mr. LAURIER. I think there is some misapprehension as to the nature of the report of the Committee. As far as I understand, the Committee recommend that the head of the Department should take steps to see that certain errors in the printing should be remedied. My hon. friend the Secretary of State comes to the conclusion that this authorises him to have another proof-reader added to the staff of the Department. I do not know that that is the conclusion to which the Committee came.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The only fault of the Printing Department is, that they have printed too correctly what was incorrectly sent to them.

Mr. LAURIER. As to the recommendation which has been made by the Committee, there seems to be some difference of opinion as to what is intended, and perhaps the report had better stand over until we can understand better what is intended.

Mr. DESJARDINS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I think this is a portion that concerns somewhat the French language, and there seems to be some misunderstanding as to what it is all about. Here are the facts of the case: Complaints were made to the effect that the general correction of the French edition was not made in such a way as to comply with what is required, in order that the volume containing the French version should be a document giving the correct idea of the French language, such as it is spoken or written in this country. Now, what some members asked for, was, that steps should be taken to secure the services of a competent person to do the proof-reading so as to make the phraseology perfect. That is what is asked for by the resolution as passed by the Committee, and by reading it, the hon. leader of the Opposition will see the object of it:

"Whereas complaints have been made to this Committee to the effect that the revised edition of the French version of the Debates is not correctly printed after being translated. Your Committee would recommend, with a view of remedying such defects, both in the present and future issue of that edition, that as the work is now done at the Government Printing Bureau, the head of that Department be requested to take the necessary steps to secure the services of a competent proof-reader."

That is all the resolution.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The thing is very easily understood. The correction of the revised proof of the *Hansard* is left to the translators themselves. They have their work to do, and everyone who is experienced in that kind of work knows that a man who does the work of translation, if mistakes are made, will fall into the same mistakes in reading the proof. The necessity is that some one should be there to look over the whole of the proofs and revise them, outside of the translators themselves. The ordinary proof-readers of the Printing Department are not such as would do that kind of work. If there was at the head of the Translators' staff of the *Hansard*, a man who would have charge of that work, it would be all right, and it could be done well; but it has not been done as well as it should have been done. The Committee require that officer, but I suppose they do not want to take upon themselves the responsibility of asking the House to make that expenditure, and, therefore, they ask the Printing Department to undertake it. I say that what has been sent to the printing office has been correctly printed, but there were a number of errors in the phraseology, in the French, in the way in which it was translated, and these errors were well printed at the office, but the work was not well done before it went there.

Mr. LAURIER. It is manifest that, if this report is adopted, my hon. friend the Secretary of State concludes that he is enjoined to have a new proof-reader added to his staff. This is not the way in which the report is understood by the members of the Committee.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I want them to find him.

Mr. LAURIER. There seems to be a misapprehension, and, therefore, the report had better stand over until we understand what it does mean.

Mr. DAVIN. We discussed this question very fully, and there are four or five gentlemen on the Committee who may be regarded as experts in regard to a matter of this kind. We had no idea of recommending that any new officer should be added to the printing establishment, or to the revision of the printing. What we said was, that a competent person should be employed to do this work. That might be taken—although I do not think it could possibly bear that construction—to be a positive instruction to employ a new officer, but it might also be taken to imply that a new officer would not be necessary, but that the person who now revises the proofs is not competent, and that, instead of him, a competent person should be employed. The view we took, whether just or unjust, was that it was not our function to deal with this matter, and that it properly belonged to my hon. friend who is at the head of the Department. While speaking on this subject, I may say that on the whole the proof-reading in English has

Mr. DESJARDINS.

been done very well, but some proofs have come in which the proof-reading had not been done well. These are called first proofs, and what printers call literals—that is to say, letters—were in a very demoralised condition. For example, you would find "o" where "e" should be, and "u" where "n" should be, and some of the words might have been worshipped without idolatry, because they were like nothing in Heaven above, on the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth. It is just as well that this matter has come up, because I am sure that, as the attention of the Secretary of State has been directed to it, he will give direction that no first proofs shall come up here to be corrected by an hon. member, in such a condition as to put the hon. member in the position of breaking one of the commandments. I hope the proofs will come up in such a condition as to show that the printing is well done. The corrections of unavoidable mistakes of reporters, or of mistakes made by members speaking extemporaneously, which may be made in these proofs by these members or by Mr. Boyce, are another thing, but certainly we should have nothing to do here with the technical or mechanical work which belongs to the printer.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Two or three years ago, complaints were made to the Committee that the French translation was not properly attended to, that there was no uniformity in the translation; and the Committee, having taken the matter into consideration, relieved the chief translator of the duty of performing the ordinary work of translation, and appointed him to perform the duty of supervising the work of the translators so as to make it uniform, and to make the translation what would be considered a good translation by the French members of the House. Now, this year, application was made to the *Hansard* Committee that a proof-reader should be appointed to supervise the proof-reading of the French translation. The Committee contended, and justly, I think, that the proof-reading of the French translation ought to be done by the proof-reader in the Bureau; that there ought to be a competent proof-reader there to discharge the duties, not only of reading the proofs of other matter, but of matter containing the official reports of the House. The proof-reader is not supposed to change the translation, to change the wording, or the sense of the translation, at all. The proof-reader is a mechanical operator, and when the manuscript is handed to the printer from the translators, it is supposed to be in perfect condition, the translation is supposed to be perfect, and all the proof-reader has to do at the Bureau is to see that the printing is in accordance with the manuscript which has been handed in to him, and which is supposed to have been perfected by the supervision of the chief translator who looks after the work of all the translators. I think the matter is a very simple one, that it is a matter which can be attended to in any ordinary printing office, and I must say that no ordinary printer would expect that a special expert should be appointed to look after the proof-reading of this particular work which is printed at the Bureau the same as any other work. I think the matter is quite plain, and that it is the duty of the head of the Printing Bureau to provide this proof-reader; and certainly any ordinary proof-reader ought to

be competent to read the proofs of the French translation of the *Hansard*. With regard to the English edition, I will say that I think that the proof-reading is done very well, indeed. I have had occasion during this Session to read the proofs of a number of speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen in the House, and I have found that in many cases the typesetting was extraordinarily correct, that it was admirable, and I want to give the chief head of the Bureau credit for having done so well in this respect; so that I think, taking all in all, the English proof-reading is very well done. Of course, I cannot speak for the French proof-reading, but if the French proof-reader sticks to his copy and sees that the proof is in accordance with the translation, then he discharges his duty, and I have no doubt that no fault will be found with him. If any fault is to be found with the translation, then we must go back to the translators; if the work is not correctly turned out to the Bureau, it must then be the fault of the translators, because they are supposed to furnish a correct copy to the Printing Bureau, and it cannot be the fault of the proof-reader if he follows the manuscript just as it is furnished to him. I think the matter is a very simple one. If the Bureau provides a good proof-reader and the translators discharge their duty perfectly, there can be no difficulty whatever. It is supposed the translators do their duty, because, as I said before, we appointed, two Sessions ago, a chief translator to perform the task of supervising the work of all the different translators that are employed on the *Hansard*.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is where the mistake was. My hon. friend is excusable, because he did not probably see where the error was and what the complaint was. The complaint was not about errors in printing that might be attributed to the proof-reader in the printing establishment; the complaint was about the revised proofs; the work of finishing the revises to be sent to the printing offices had not been properly attended to. My hon. friend says that then it must be the fault of the translators. I do not think so. The translators do not see the revises, and I think there should be a man specially charged, as Mr. Boyce is for the English part of the *Hansard*, to look over the work before it is finally sent to the printing office. There is no need of a proof-reader, but there is need of a man to read over the proofs here after the translation is completed and printed, and ready to be put into the book form of the *Hansard*.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is just what we did two years ago. We appointed a chief translator to do the work which the Secretary of State says now should be done by some one. We then relieved one of the translators from the duty of translating, and we appointed him to supervise the translations of all the translators who were engaged in translating the *Hansard*. He is now performing the duties which the Secretary of State says ought to be performed by one particular individual; and that individual we now have in the person of the chief translator.

Mr. BLAKE. I think this might be settled by some communication between the two conflicting parties. The *Hansard* Committee insist that they have established proper arrangements under which a good translation in proper form is furnished to

the Printing Bureau, but they say that it is not well proof-read. The Secretary of State, on the other hand, stands up for his Department, and says that it is too well proof-read, that it is accurately reproduced, and that the difficulty is that he does not get it in proper shape from the staff under the control of the *Hansard* Committee. I think, under these circumstances, it is impossible for the House to solve the difficulty. It certainly will not be solved by another proof-reader, because the step which has been taken, as explained by my hon. friend who has just spoken, is one which exactly meets the condition which the Secretary of State required, namely, the chief translator was relieved from the duty of original translation and was assigned to the duty of taking up and putting together the finished translation, and making it ready for the printer. Well, when that is done, if the Secretary of State's officer is a good proof-reader, and the work is perfectly reproduced, then we will have to go further back and find that the mistake was in the original speaker.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The report makes only a recommendation, and there is no action to be taken by the House. The recommendation is, that the printing establishment ought to do the proof-reading correctly. I think the position taken by my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) is exactly what the Department understood, that is to say, that the Department should secure a good proof-reader, because we have already secured a good translation, so far as we were able to do it.

Mr. LAURIER. We want to get at the real recommendation of the Committee. The Secretary of State understood that the Committee recommended that a new proof-reader should be appointed and added to the staff.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand it, the Committee does not recommend anything of the kind, but they recommend that the Secretary of State should provide them, with the means now at his disposal, some one to do the proof-reading properly. The two things are quite dissimilar. It is important to know what we want. If the report simply means that the Secretary of State is to see that the officers of his Department do their duty properly, as they can do it now, I am quite ready to adopt the report; but if the report means that a new officer is to be added to the staff, then that is another thing, but I do not think that is the meaning of the Committee. Therefore, it is absolutely important to know what is really wanted by the Committee. If the Committee recommend that there is ample material in that staff, as now constituted, to do the work, but that the work is not properly done, and that the Secretary of State ought to see that it is properly done, then I am quite willing to adopt this report, but not otherwise.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that as there is a difference of opinion in the Committee itself, the matter should be allowed to stand over for to-day. We are taking up a good deal of valuable time.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There is no difference of opinion in the Committee; the Committee are unanimous.

Mr. FOSTER. It is impossible for the House to come to a decision at present, and I think it may be as well to let the question stand over.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Committee were unanimous in the opinion that they had discharged their duty in the matter of furnishing correct reports and correct translations. They say that if there is to be any other proof-reader appointed, it is not for them to appoint him; that they furnish the manuscript translation to the Printing Bureau in a perfect state, and that it is the duty of the Printing Bureau to turn that manuscript out perfectly printed. The Committee do not want a proof-reader; all we want is that the Printing Bureau shall do the work in a workmanlike manner.

Motion allowed to stand.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Compensation to Pensioners in lieu of land. \$1,800

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I should like to know from the Minister of Militia, whether he has taken any action in the matter of the pension to the family of Sergeant Valiquette, which, we contend, was improperly granted. The First Minister promised, when the matter was brought before the House during the temporary absence of the Minister of Militia, that it would be looked into; and he said there evidently had been some mistake.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The matter was discussed last Session to the fullest possible extent; and I gave the hon. gentleman all the information I could obtain. We discussed it from the standpoint of the statute, and from the standpoint of the regulations, and I do not see what further information I can submit to the House.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman certainly gave us all the information he appeared to possess. He did not satisfy the House, however, that the family of Sergeant Valiquette should receive a larger pension than would have been coming to him if he had lived; and he did not satisfy the House that pensions should be given to father, mother, brother and sister. It was an utter and gross violation of the intentions of the Militia Act; and neither the hon. gentleman nor any hon. gentleman opposite could defend it on the ground that it was in accordance with the Act. The leader of the Government, when the matter was brought to his notice, expressed the view that it required explanation; that it did appear to be a rather unusual payment, and it should be looked into.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am prepared to repeat to the House the explanation I gave last year, and I have no other means of doing so than by laying before the House the statute, and the regulations, and the facts, as they were submitted to the Department of Militia, when the pension was discussed and passed. Sergeant Primat Valiquette, No. 4 Company, 65th Battalion, entered the Active Militia at about the age of eighteen years, and was twenty-two when he left with his battalion for the North-West, 2nd April, 1885. Was most robust. Had never been sick. Wages between \$1.50 and \$2.00 *per diem*, all went to his father. On the march from Beaver River to Fort Pitt, thirty-seven miles, marched in one day, 25th June, 1885; took sick with gastric enteritis, of

Mr. FOSTER.

which he died on the 4th July, 1885. His father, Antoine Valiquette, is fifty-eight or sixty-eight years old. He is unable to work since twenty years on account of chronic asthma. His wife is fifty years old, manages all the affairs of the family, and works outside for their living. Children: four girls, sixteen, eighteen, twenty and twenty-two years; two boys, twelve and fourteen years. All, with the father and mother, working the best they can, but family is poor, and, at times, has been depending upon public charity. Board (4th March, 1887) recommend pensions as per sections 15, 16 and 17 of Order in Council of the 8th July, 1885. Father, half widow's pension, that is, \$51.33 per annum, and a pension at the same rate to the two boys until they attain the age of 18, and a pension, at the same rate, to the three youngest girls until the age of twenty-one. Then, in regard to the case of Ryan, I have this:

"Gunner John F. Ryan, No. 2 Battery, Montreal Brigade Garrison Artillery, enjoyed good health up to 23rd May, 1885. When at Regina, he was seized with symptoms of acute bronchitis, which resisted treatment owing to unfavorable weather. The patient growing worse, was admitted to the hospital on the 13th June, 1885, improved there, returned to camp and fell ill again. He was discharged and arrived in Montreal on the 29th June, 1885. He is now permanently disabled—tubercular disease of the lungs. Cannot follow his ordinary occupation as a moulder nor any heavy work. Was paid up to the 31st July, 1885. Has no means of support except his parents. Married man, wife twenty-six years old; he is now twenty-eight years old; no children. His salary was \$10 to \$12 per week when working. The Board (26th October, 1885) recommended that he be put in the second class, Regulation Orders 1,009. By Order in Council of the 21st January, 1887, the widow was granted an annual pension of \$68.44, being the three-eighths of a daily pay of a gunner during twelve months, and, as it was afterwards found that she had a daughter, the Minister of Militia and Defence had an Order in Council passed (23rd August, 1887) granting to Mary Elizabeth Ryan, the daughter in question, a pension of \$14.60 per annum, being calculated at the rate of one-thirteenth of a pay of a gunner. Paragraph 7 of General Order No. 14 of the 19th July, 1885, contains two scales of pensions: 1st, in the case of a soldier killed in action or who died from wounds received in action; and 2nd, in the case of a soldier who died from illness which can be traced to exposure in active service. This last scale is the lowest, and applies to both Valiquette and Ryan, but Mrs. Ryan's question was calculated upon the rate of pay of a gunner, whilst that of Valiquette's father on sergeant's pay, at the rate of half the pension given to a widow; and the brothers and sisters of Valiquette received the same rate of pension as per Paragraph 16 of General Order 12,214."

My hon. friend will see that in one case, the pension is calculated upon the pay of a gunner, and in the other case the calculation is made upon the pay of a sergeant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will my hon. friend tell the House what was Sergeant Valiquette's pay, all told?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Seventy-five cents per day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Exactly. Now, the hon. gentleman will note that he has committed the House to this extraordinary course, as I understand the case: Sergeant Valiquette's pay amounted to 75 cents *per diem*, or a little less than \$300 a year, and, if I understand correctly, the pensions assigned to Sergeant Valiquette's collateral relatives amount to \$355 a year, being \$55 a year more than the total pay of the sergeant. Now, I have never heard before of a pension system which has granted pensions to the surviving relatives on a larger scale than the actual pay which the deceased enjoyed in his lifetime. It

is very difficult to say how that principle can be maintained.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman knows that when the pension list was prepared, it provided in certain cases for the children or for the parents of the man who died. The basis upon which every calculation was made, was upon the pay of the deceased, because we had to establish one universal rule upon which all the pensions would be calculated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite so.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It was also provided that in certain exceptional cases, the children, and father and mother of the deceased would be entitled to some pension for the loss of a person upon whom they depended absolutely for a living. It was also stipulated that when the children came of age, or if they could do for themselves after a certain time, that the pensions would cease. I can give no other explanation, because that is the explanation that was given to me by the Board. My recommendation to Council was simply laying before Council, as a matter of course, the report of the Committee appointed for the purpose of investigating every one of those individual cases, which were adjudicated upon. In making up the pensions, I knew no more of the facts of Valiquette's case than I knew of Ryan's case, but I took the facts as laid before me, and verifying that his rank in the service had been as reported to me, I had no other option than to lay the report of the Committee before Council, and to have the Order in Council passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman does not exactly answer the point which I took, namely, that we are now granting pensions considerably in excess of the total income paid by the Government to the man when alive. This is, I submit, a thing unknown and unheard of. I have never yet heard of a case in which a pension had been granted to the relatives of the deceased, larger than the pay received, but that is what has been done in Valiquette's case. I think the decision, on the face of it, is one which appears to be absurd. The pay of a man is \$300 a year while he is alive, yet you grant to his collateral relatives—neither son, daughter, nor wife—pensions collectively larger than Sergeant Valiquette received during his lifetime as his pay. As to the other point which the hon. gentleman has alluded to, if the Government, or if any Government could venture to lay down the principle that they were going to compensate a family for the loss sustained by the death of a relative, it is quite clear it might lead to very remarkable consequences. There is no doubt that cases have occurred, in which volunteers in particular, who have lost their lives, inflict a loss on their families perhaps double, or treble, or quadruple the pay they receive in their lifetime would amount to. But no Government has ever felt itself safe in adopting a principle like that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is, however, a distinction between the general principle and the practice as admitted in this case of Valiquette. If Valiquette had been a soldier in the regular service, or in any of the permanent corps, then the rule would properly apply. But this man

was, as I understand it, a tradesman in Montreal, and a volunteer in the regiment of which Mr. Speaker was colonel. Seventy-five cents a day was his pay as sergeant only.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was, I take it, but a small portion of his income.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite possibly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he had been a soldier, and if his pay were the whole sum which he received for the support of his family, it would certainly look rather extraordinary to give a larger pension to the family than he earned himself, and out of which he supported his family. Sergeant Valiquette, from the fact of his being a sergeant, must have been an educated man, and most likely a tradesman of some standing whose income would be much larger than 75 cents a day. I take it that upon that ground the Commission, which settled all these matters, awarded the sum which the Minister of Militia sanctioned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has laid down a principle which is far-reaching, and which the House should understand. He has laid down the principle, in defence of the large pension granted in the case of Sergeant Valiquette, that the Government are to consider the losses sustained by the surviving relatives. I am not at all disposed to advise that this House should be stingy in dealing with men who hazard their lives in the public service, but I am informed that there are cases in which it can be clearly and distinctly shown that the losses sustained by the surviving relatives are altogether out of proportion to the pay received by the deceased in his lifetime, and I want the Government to understand how far that rule may carry them. They cannot make fish of one and flesh of another, and if it is good logic in Sergeant Valiquette's case, there may be other cases in which it is equally good, and in which, on the same principle, the rewards given would have to be revised.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not at all inclined to lay down a general rule from this case. I was merely accounting for the fact of the Commission awarding this sum, and the Minister of Militia recommending it. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, that it would not do to lay down any such general rule, which I agree would be too far-reaching in its application.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood that there were rules governing this case, and that the Commission to whom the matter was referred were governed by those rules. Will the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Militia, say that this case comes within the regulations that have been made?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then, they are altogether different from what my recollection of them is. If the hon. gentleman has them, will he please read them to the Committee?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Paragraph 7 of General Order No. 14, dated 19th July, 1885, contains two scales of pensions. First, in the case of a soldier killed in action, or who died from wounds

received in action ; secondly, in the case of a soldier who died from illness which can be traced to exposure in active service. The last scale is the lowest, and applies to both Sergeant Valiquette and Mrs. Ryan ; but Mrs. Ryan's pension was calculated on the rate of pay of a gunner, while that of Sergeant Valiquette's father was calculated on a sergeant's pay. As I understand, there is no discussion as to the rule that applies to the rate of pension which has been decided by the Board and submitted by the Minister to Council, but the discussion arises as to the pensions given to the brothers and sisters of the dead man, making, as I understand from the hon. member for South Oxford, the pension received by Sergeant Valiquette, larger than was his pay when living. As was explained, besides his pay of 75 cents a day, he had a stock-in-trade, from which his family received an income. He was receiving \$1.50 per day when he was working at his trade, and it was, no doubt, considered by the Board, that the family was left without any resource. I am giving the hon. gentleman the explanations which I sought to obtain from the Board, and I think the regulations and instructions received explain the case.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The explanations given by the Minister do not touch this case at all. The power to grant a pension was a conditional one. It is conditional on the fact of the person being the support of a family or the head of a family, or leaving sisters who are dependent upon him for support. In this case the Minister had no right to grant one cent of pension to Sergeant Valiquette's family. He was not the support of the family, according to the meaning of that clause of the Militia Act. His father was alive, his sisters were grown up, he left two brothers, and, therefore, it cannot be said that he was in any sense the main support of the family. I contend that the granting of this pension was a complete and utter violation of the spirit and intention of the Militia Act, and the hon. gentleman has not been able, to-day, or on any previous occasion, to explain satisfactorily to this House the grounds on which that pension was granted to all the members of this family. The hon. gentleman says he was a poor man. He may have been poor, and there are other poor people, but you are not obliged to pension every man because he is poor. How poor was he? Had he a farm or a shop, was he prosperous, and what was his age? The truth is that this is one of the grossest acts of misappropriation of the public funds that has ever come to the knowledge of this House, and the hon. gentleman may attempt to explain it as many times as he likes, and he cannot move me or remove from the minds of the disinterested and fair-minded men of this House, that it is an act of favoritism that cannot be defended.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would not attempt to convince the hon. gentleman, but, as he speaks of fair-minded people, I am prepared to lay my case before fair-minded people. The hon. gentleman has stated that I did not know whether this man had a shop or a farm, or whether his business was prosperous or not prosperous. If the hon. gentleman, instead of making such statements, had asked me to lay on the Table the report which was submitted to me by the Board who took the evidence in every individual case, then it might have

Si ADOLPHE CARON.

been fairer on his part to have read the evidence and consulted the records before attempting to argue his case. The papers are all there, and the evidence was taken by a Board who knew no more about Sergeant Valiquette than they did about Mrs. Ryan, or *vice versa*. The difficulties which resulted from the unfortunate troubles in the North-West are mending and rectifying themselves every year. For instance, this year Valiquette draws only \$54 ; because one of his children is over age, and ceases to receive a pension. I have given, as frankly and openly as possible, all the explanations in the matter, and when the hon. gentleman speaks of favoritism, he is stating what it is impossible for him to substantiate. How could there be favoritism when the whole case was submitted to a Board composed of men, most of whom came from Ontario, and only one from Quebec, and who, after looking into the evidence, agreed in the report on which the Order in Council was based?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman bring down the report?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Certainly.

Mr. BRIEN. I do not at all accuse the hon. the Minister of Militia of any favoritism in the matter, but there cannot be any doubt in the mind of anyone who looks into the Military Regulations, that the Board made a very serious mistake in their report, because the pension given cannot be justified on any pretence whatever under the regulations. To say that we are to grant pensions according to the standing of the men when they went into the service, would be to adopt a principle which would not be fair, and, if attempted to be carried out, cannot fail to land the Government in no end of confusion. I wish to bring to the notice of the hon. gentleman, the case of a man named Hurrell, which has been already before the House. It appears that this man was invalidated on the 14th June, 1885 ; that he was in the hospital until the 7th February, 1886 ; and that, after a long delay, he was allowed \$1 a day from the 1st July, 1885, to the 30th April, 1887. Subsequently, on the 13th November, 1888, he was allowed a pension of 55 cents a day, which he has since received. That would leave a period of 560 days during which he received no pension, but during which time he did receive, as hospital allowance, or allowance on some ground or other connected with the service, the sum of \$199 in gratuities. I say that if the man was entitled to a pension at all, he was entitled to it from the time he left the hospital, and if so, he would be entitled to the sum of \$308 or thereabouts, whereas he only received the sum of \$199. This would leave \$109 to which he is still entitled. If he was entitled to the pension on the 13th November, 1888, the probability is he was—and according to his own statement he was—entitled to it from the time he left the hospital, and it is clear he was in the hospital in consequence of illness he had contracted during service. Therefore, it seems to me, unless special grounds be shown to the contrary, he ought to get the arrears of pension back to 1887.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I would draw his attention to this fact. He knows that in most of the cases brought before the Commission, at first, it was found im-

possible to investigate every individual case sufficiently to be able to decide whether the man who had been invalided on account of his wounds should be given a gratuity or a pension. In most of the cases it was decided to grant a gratuity up to a period of time when the cases could be gone into properly and decided. In the case of Hurrell, an Order in Council was passed, if my memory serves me aright, granting him a gratuity, and paying certain dues to the hospital and the doctor which had been incurred by him, and this was to be in full of all claims on his part against the Government. Subsequently, upon representations made to me, I consented to re-open the case, and to this gratuity was added a pension, which he receives to-day, according to his rank. He now claims that the gratuity and the pension should have run concurrently. I say, no. I say, that he could not receive his pension, until it was determined whether he would get a pension or a gratuity, and he could only receive a pension from the period of time fixed in the Order in Council. That pension he received, and then his gratuity ceased. I have received a long and elaborate pamphlet explaining the case. I only got it yesterday, and have not yet been able to look into it; but, speaking from memory, the facts are exactly as I have stated. Several friends of his and mine came to me on his behalf, and I was anxious to give them every possible facility to urge their case, by furnishing them with the documents, reports, and all the information I had. I have reopened the case on more than one occasion, being anxious to do ample justice, and I have done what I consider the law allows me to do.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It seems to me that this man has been a little hardly dealt with. If, as is evident from the fact of his getting a gratuity, and from the fact of his having been in hospital and receiving medical attendance for which the Department paid, he is entitled to a pension, it would be only fair, once a pension was granted, that it should run during 560 days, from the time he left the hospital until it was granted, if, during that period, he was unable to earn his living. In any case, \$199 was a very small compensation, and I think the hon. Minister would only be dealing fairly by giving this man the same pension he is now getting and dating it back to the time he left the hospital. If entitled to it at all, he was entitled to it all along. The hon. gentleman is certainly not treating this man in the same spirit as that in which the last claim was treated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is his pension?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Fifty-five cents a day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that he is wholly incapacitated from doing anything to earn his own living?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not so. He has been to see me several times.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have been furnished with a little memo. of his, and I am bound to say that the right hon. the First Minister appears to have taken some interest in him. I see a note from him as follows, to the Minister of Militia:—

"I feel much interested in the bearer, Mr. C. J. Hurrell, who has suffered so seriously since Fish Creek. The pension given him is altogether insufficient for his injuries. May

I request you to take a personal interest in the case, and much oblige."

If the statement made on this man's behalf, and which the First Minister has endorsed, is correct, he is unable to earn enough for his own living. If the First Minister, of his own knowledge, says he is, that is another affair.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is less capable than he was formerly, but he is not altogether incapacitated from work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He is not incapacitated from work?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not altogether. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the First Minister states that he is not incapacitated from doing some work, I would not press the question now, but I was informed that he was quite unable to work; and certainly a man who has suffered severely from rheumatic fever is unable to do much, at all events, in the way of manual labor. It all rests upon that. I understand that this man was senior sergeant of his company; and would it not appear rather curious, if it should turn out that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is right and the First Minister is wrong, that the Government should have been paying \$190 or \$200 to this man, supposing him to be incapacitated, while they are paying \$350 to the relatives of Sergeant Valiquette?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in one thing. This man was not a sergeant but a full private when he served in the North-West.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister himself calls him a sergeant in the correspondence.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I understand that he is a sergeant in some of the corps here, but his pension is based upon his pay in the North-West, where he was simply a full private.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister speaks in one of these documents of Sergeant Hurrell, late of the 90th Battalion, and the man himself says he was senior sergeant in some company. Of course, he may have accepted a lower rank, but I judge that the Minister would be acquainted with the rank which he held.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am quite prepared to bring down the papers and lay them on the Table. Mr. Hurrell received the money which was provided by Order in Council. He was paid during the period he was in the hospital. The period during which he was not paid was when he was out of the hospital and was presumed to be well. He was receiving a gratuity when he left hospital, and he was supposed to be all right, and, therefore, he got no pay for that time. He has been paid for the whole period which has been certified to by the medical board.

Mr. MULOCK. To return to the case of Sergeant Valiquette, the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) made rather a serious charge against the Department, and I suppose, from his recognised position in the service, he speaks from knowledge and authority when he says there is no law to justify the rate of pension at which the collateral relatives of Sergeant Valiquette are being paid. I would ask the Minister of Militia to state what are the provisions in the statute or the regulations

which would make this clear ; or, if he cannot do that, I would ask the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) if he can make good that statement which he has made ? Otherwise we have a direct issue. The member for Muskoka declares that these payments are illegal. In the Queen's Regulations, I find that the principle laid down is that pensions shall be based on the rate of pay and not upon the value of the person who may be killed or wounded, that is, his value in his civil capacity.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have given all the explanations which I considered I could give, and I am quite prepared to bring down the regulations and the papers connected with this case.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Queen's Regulations of 1887 contain the authority upon which the payments were made, perhaps the hon Minister, who is so well acquainted with the law, will point out the particular regulation under which they were made.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will send it to you.

Mr. MULOCK. We will have this out in the House. If the Minister is unable to find the provision in the law which will sustain his action in this matter, I will refer him to the regulations which I find dealing with such cases, and I think there is nothing in these regulations to warrant the application made of them by the Minister, and endorsed by the First Minister, that the payment is to be based upon the value of the life of the person, instead of upon the rate of pay he has received in the service. The payment must be either legal or illegal, and, if these regulations are applicable, they are very clear that the payment is in proportion to the pay and nothing else, and in that case the member for Muskoka must be right. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has declared, no doubt from his position as a member of the force, who has served many years in the service, that the Minister of Militia has proceeded illegally. There is a charge made by one of your own friends, and the authorities appear to me to sustain the hon. member for Muskoka. Of course, I may not be able to strike upon the exact law bearing upon what has taken place, and I make my statement subject to correction—perhaps the hon. member for Muskoka will state on what he bases his assertion—but I would point to Regulation 923, which declares that the rates of pension for a deceased officer or soldier who has been killed in action, or died of wounds received in action, within twelve months, shall be : to a widow, a pension annually equal to one-half the pay of the deceased, and to each child an allowance equal to one-fourth the pay of such officer and soldier. Then, Regulation 928 applies to the cases of children. Regulation 932 refers to the rate of pension to the mother, who is to be given half the rate of a widow's pension. Regulation 933 refers to sisters, and the provision is that a pension may be granted equal to half the rate of the widow's pension. So far as these regulations go, the rate of pension is based upon the rate of pay. The hon. member for Muskoka assents to that, and I ask whether there is anything else which warrants the application of the principle of pensions—which the country to a large extent will endorse—to any larger degree than is pointed out in these regulations ?

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. LAURIER. As to the case of Hurrell, I do not know the man ; I met him to-day by accident, and, in justice to him, I must say that he appeared to me to be what we call in French a *rhumatisant*, that is, a man who is suffering from chronic rheumatism. I do not know whether the pension that is granted to him is sufficient to meet his case, but it is stated that he served faithfully at the time of the rebellion, and the Minister now says that his pension was calculated, according to the rule, on the pay which he received. I notice, in the case of Sergeant Valiquette, that his social condition had been taken into consideration when the present pension was allowed. The pension was not calculated simply on his right as a soldier and a sergeant, but consideration was also take of the fact that he had previously occupied a certain position, and the Prime Minister said he had some education. This shows that you apply the rule in one case and not in another. All these pensions should be granted upon certain stated regulations. The Minister says that he followed the regulations in the case of Hurrell, but that he did not follow the regulations in Valiquette's case, but he followed a new set of rules. As my hon. friend from Oxford stated a moment ago, if we deviate from the rules, we are opening the door for consequences which may be damaging and far-reaching.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman himself considers, as I understand it, that the cases of Hurrell, Valiquette and Ryan were decided exactly upon the same regulations as those contained in the Regulation Book of 1887. Other individual cases came before the Board and were reported upon, and the rate of pay in every one of these cases was based upon the Order in Council providing for pensions for wounded men and the families of men who had been killed in action. Paragraph 17 reads :

"In instances which the regulations do not meet the circumstances of the individual cases, they may be specially considered by His Excellency the Governor General in Council."

Mr. MULOCK. Does that apply to privates and non-commissioned officers ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It applies to everybody.

Mr. MULOCK. Did you read the whole book ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I did not read the whole Order in Council, because it contains ten pages, but I read the whole paragraph affecting this question. In the case of Valiquette, his family were left in very straitened circumstances. I am not in a position to say whether Hurrell has a family or not ; that is a matter that can be easily ascertained from the report which was submitted by the Commission who investigated the cases, and made their report to me, and upon which report I made a recommendation to the Council.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand the Minister of Militia to allege that after having had his attention called to this subject last Session, or the Session before, he remains of the opinion which he then stated, that these pensions which were assigned in the case of Sergeant Valiquette, were within the regulations.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not at present prepared to argue the point ; I will only say that my impres-

sion, gathered from the discussion at a former time, was quite in accordance with the view of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). It appeared to me—though, of course, I do not venture to say so after what the Minister has said—very clear that these pensions were mistakenly in excess of what the regulations allowed. Now, such things may happen by error or otherwise, and they may pass unobserved by the Minister; but we are face to face with the question now, whether a mistake was made by the Board of whose report the Minister now avers the accuracy and the regularity of whose transaction he affirms. It seems to me that the better course would be for the Minister to carry out at the earliest moment what he has expressed his willingness to do, namely, to lay upon the Table all the Orders in Council, and every other papers relating to this matter. I would recommend, for the convenience of the House, that he also furnish us such regulations as he deems, will apply to and cover the case; and then let us dispose of it. I do not know whether he has sought counsel of the Department of Justice as to the legal effect of this transaction, or whether it has been settled purely as a departmental matter, in which he now reaffirms the view that the transaction is a legal one. Let us have all the materials upon which we can discuss the matter, and with those materials before us, if any member is prepared to challenge the view of the Minister, he will be able to do so in a definite form.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am quite willing to bring down all the papers at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not think the report justified the action of the Department. The hon. gentleman read, or pretended to read, the Queen's Regulations in regard to this subject. In No. 932 of the Regulations it is provided:

"The mother of an officer or soldier killed in action, or dying of wounds received in action within twelve months after such wounds shall have been received, without leaving widow, or legitimate child, such mother being herself a widow."

Well, the father of Sergeant Valiquette was living at the time, consequently he did not come under that regulation. Then the next regulation applies to sisters:

"The sister or sisters collectively of an officer or soldier killed in action, or dying of wounds received in action within twelve months after such wounds shall have been received, without leaving widow, legitimate child, or mother, and provided she or they be an orphan or orphans, without surviving brother."

Now, in this case his father was alive, his mother was not a widow, and his sisters were not orphans, and they had surviving brothers; therefore, I cannot see under what clause of those regulations the hon. gentleman can justify his action.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the Minister ought to read this pamphlet that has been placed in the hands of members, with regard to this officer who was permanently disabled in the North-West. He ought to have read it before this item came up for discussion, because the charges made in this pamphlet are very serious. Mr. C. J. Hurrell, late hospital sergeant and night nurse of the North-West field force at Saskatoon, North-West Territories, says many hard things of the Minister of Militia. If the hon. gentleman has not perused the pamphlet, I will make a few

quotations from it to enlighten him with regard to the charges that are made. Now, this volunteer, who seems to have served his country faithfully, gives us, in this pamphlet, a detailed account of the course of the Minister of Militia towards him. It appears he must have been treated harshly by the Minister. He says in one paragraph:

"That in order to show his animosity to me personally, he, for nine months after my return from the North-West, refused to pay me a cent for sitting up at night in charge of the hospitals of the North-West field force, as nurse and hospital sergeant, although I held a requisition from the Deputy Surgeon General Roddick, and a letter from Dr. Bell, backed by Dr. Bergin, M.P. The Surgeon General said it was I who washed and carbolized the killed and confined them prior to their transportation and final burial east. That on one occasion, after being three weeks in bed ill with inflammatory rheumatism, I was able to call at the buildings to see him, with the assistance of two sticks, as I could hardly walk. I sent in my card at half-past nine and waited outside till two o'clock, suffering severe pain. He would not see me then on business, but insultingly told me: Go home, you can't walk, you are drunk; which he well knew was not true."

These are certainly very serious charges made by a sergeant against the head of the Militia Department of the country. He goes on, at page 7, to say:

"That after the Medical and Military Board had finally reported on my case very favorably on the 1st or 2nd day of August, 1888, the Minister withheld them from the Privy Council till 13th of November following, although repeatedly asked by myself and friends to do so. He still refused to give me a dollar for those months, during which time I suffered from pain, hunger and want of proper shelter. I was confined to my bed."

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am quite prepared to discuss any question on the floor of Parliament, but I am not going to permit Mr. Hurrell to take part in the proceedings from the stranger's gallery; and I consider such is a breach of the privileges of the House, and I, for one, am not prepared to stand it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not know Mr. Hurrell.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He has been taking part in the discussion which is going on here, and, I think, if this is permitted in one case it will be found to be very inconvenient. There are occasionally questions which excite public opinion, and if members who express their views on the floor of Parliament have to answer all attacks made from the galleries, I am afraid we will find it very inconvenient to conduct the proceedings of this House. I draw your attention to this fact, Mr. Chairman. The first time it occurred I took no notice of it, and it has been repeated on two or three different occasions since, and I would repeat again that this offence is one which I consider a very grave one against this House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. It is highly intolerable that anyone in the galleries should interfere with the proceedings of this House, and it cannot be permitted for an instant. If the hon. gentleman wants a precedent for dealing with a very gross offence of this kind, he may recall a certain celebrated case in which J. A. Macdonnell figured, who interfered in the grossest and most disreputable manner with the proceedings of this House, who was hereafter brought to the bar of this House and was cheered by numbers of the hon. gentleman's supporters for his gross disrespect to the House. I agree with the hon. gentleman; but if

he wants a precedent for dealing with this man's case, I suggest the precedent he can follow.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not know that this interruption has anything to do with me.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This matter should be disposed of first.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I wish to say that my attention having been drawn to the matter, I have taken steps to stop this discussion in the galleries, and to prevent our deliberations being interrupted by any such improper conduct. I have, therefore, ordered the Sergeant-at-Arms to see that such proceedings cease.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I hope the Minister of War will feel safe now that this dangerous man has been removed. I will now return to the paragraph I was reading. The writer says :

"I was confined to my bed at the Royal Exchange for a month (October), without care of nursing, and during that month repeated applications were made to the Minister, and I gave written orders for a small amount, but without any effect; not a cent would he allow Col. Panet to send me, so I again sent for Sir James Grant, who ordered me back to the hospital, where I suffered the loss of both legs till December."

I do not exactly know what that means—

"I wrote in November to Col. Panet that I did not think I could survive the winter. He replied to me in the most tender and kind manner, expressing deep regret that my extreme loyalty and patriotic devotion to my country had given me such disappointment, pain and suffering. It was then, and not till then, that the Minister, thinking my days would soon be numbered, would consent to bring my case before the Council for a private pension."

If this man really states the truth, that the Medical and Military Board authorised a pension on the 1st or 2nd August, 1888, and that the Minister persistently refused to bring the matter before the Privy Council until 13th November, I say the man has been very badly treated, and the Minister should offer some explanation to this House. I should judge, from the way the pamphlet is written, that the writer is speaking from the fullness of his heart and is telling the truth, and feels very indignant at the treatment he received. He says in another paragraph :

"That the unkind, ungenerous, and inhuman treatment which I have received as a loyal British volunteer,—" I suppose this means at the hands of the Minister of Militia, because he says all the other officers of the Department treated him with great tenderness and care. He proceeds :

—"crippled for the rest of my life, having offered it up in the service of my adopted country on the field of battle, and gradually dying with a disease contracted, is a great contrast to the liberality of the United States to her citizen soldiery; and at my age, nearly sixty, I think, will not find a parallel in any other civilised country, not even in Russia."

It is the duty of the Minister to offer some explanation in regard to this matter. These are charges of a very serious character, and should be met with some answer, when the hon. gentleman is charged with ill-treating this worthy volunteer.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think the hon. gentleman should give me a chance to answer by pamphlet also. It would not be fair to ask me to explain a case so elaborately put before the House as this has been, and so eloquently read by the hon. gentleman. I am not at all prepared to do so. I have given my explanation, and I am not going to enter into all the case of harsh and cruel treatment inflicted on that unfortunate loyal volunteer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

I have given my explanation. I stated that he was paid exactly what the Board decided he should receive; that he was paid for a period of time for which he was entitled to be paid; and as to the attacks made, and the serious charges, as the hon. gentleman calls them, made against the Minister, I am accustomed to a few of these serious charges. I will postpone my reply until I have had time to read this volunteer's able contribution to Canadian literature.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think we are entitled to some further information in regard to this matter. The writer says :

"That in order to show his animosity to me personally, he, for nine months after my return from the North-West, refused to pay me a cent for sitting up at night in charge of the hospital."

He says further :

"That after the Medical and Military Board had finally reported on my case very favorably on the 1st or 2nd day of August, 1888, the Minister withheld from the Privy Council till the 13th November following, although repeatedly asked by myself and friends to do so."

The Minister should know whether this is a fact or not. If it is a fact, he has treated the man very sadly; at all events, the Minister should be prepared to answer this simple question: Is it a fact or not, that the Medical and Military Board reported favorably on this man's case on 1st or 2nd August, 1888, and the Minister refused to bring it before Council until 13th November? That is a simple question.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have answered.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the answer? I did not hear the Minister answer. If he answered, would he be kind enough to repeat the answer?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will repeat it for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, as I am always anxious to meet his views. I stated that I had answered the questions which were put to me by members of Parliament, affecting the case of this man Hurrell. I stated that I treated his case as I treated every other case, upon the report of the Board appointed for the purpose of investigating all such cases. I stated that he was paid for the period of time which he is entitled to be paid for, that he received the amount of money he was entitled to receive, and that I, therefore, acted according to the law, and have no jurisdiction outside of what the law traced to be my duty in this case.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister has stated that he treated this case as he did every other case. We are told that, in this instance, the Minister neglected his duty for three and a-half months, and inasmuch as the Minister does not contradict this statement, it must be true. I take the one charge that the Board reported on the 1st August, 1888, in favor of this pension, and for three months and thirteen days the Minister made default in bringing that report before Council. In other words, for over three months he withheld from this man the pension he was entitled to. The Minister told us that he dealt with this man as he dealt with every other pensioner, and, consequently, he admits that in every case he has neglected for three and a half months to discharge his duty.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I did not admit it. The hon. gentleman knows that he is making a statement which is incorrect.

Mr. MULLOCK. Will the hon. gentleman have the goodness to say, when he did lay the report before Council? and then we will see whether he is correct or not.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not going to.

Mr. MULLOCK. If the hon. gentleman will not, don't want to press him to-day, as perhaps he has not the information; but I suggest that the item stand over until he gets the necessary information, and until we can have this matter properly discussed. I can conceive no part of the public service in which the country is entitled to a more faithful discharge of the duties, than that which pertains to the head of the Militia Department. In the hour of trouble that is the Department in which, above all others, the best of good faith must be exercised towards those who stand by their country and towards the relatives of those who are sufferers by reason of the faithful discharge of duties by the civilian soldiery of Canada. This matter cannot be passed over lightly. The Minister is now on his trial for this transaction.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. You have tried him already.

Mr. MULLOCK. Yes, he has been tried and found wanting; but he has a force behind him at present which has succeeded, some way or other, in keeping him in his Department. We are trying him on this specific charge now, which may or may not be well founded. The Minister said his conduct in this fairly represents the manner in which he has discharged his public duties. It is now charged that he has been three and a-half months in default in doing justice to this poor man's case—the Minister who has a salary of \$7,000 and perquisites.

Mr. LISTER. And the perquisites are pretty large.

Mr. MULLOCK. Yes, they are. With the hon. gentleman's salary and perquisites, he may be able to afford to ignore the day and the hour of receiving pay, although I believe that even in his case he would consider it a hardship if he were kept out of his salary for three and a-half months. His position, however, cannot be compared to that of a poor person invalided in the public service, who was depending on that service for his daily bread. It is an act of cruelty on the part of any Administration, apart from it being a disgraceful reflection on the public service, that what is due to a poor man by his country shall be withheld from him by a negligent, careless and an indifferent head of a Department. I cannot find words strong enough to do justice to the subject, or to characterise such a transaction as the Minister has admitted on the floor of the House, by his silence and by his attempt to burk an enquiry. I again suggest that this item be allowed to stand over until the Minister can tell us when he made his report to the Government. If he delayed it for three and a-half months, let him offer an explanation if he can. If he cannot offer an explanation, I have not half said what the country ought to say about his conduct. I shall be glad to accept any reasonable explanation, and I hope he will be able to give one; but as one of the people's representatives here, I think it is my duty, and the duty of every hon. gentleman, in the name of our grateful country, to repudiate any act of ingratitude by a Department of

the public service, towards men who have risked their lives and lost their health in the service of their country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not wish to burk any enquiry, nor do I wish to refuse upon this case, or upon any other case, all the information that can be furnished by the Department of Militia. Now, I would ask hon. gentlemen to allow the item to pass, and I am prepared—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Hon. members say "no," before they are aware of what I am going to propose. This does not show a spirit of fair play on their part. I was going to say that, if it meets the wishes of the House, and in order to save time, I am prepared to bring down all the papers, the Orders in Council, the recommendations to Council, and everything connected with the case, and the dates will then speak for themselves. This matter can be thoroughly discussed on concurrence, and we can have the same opportunity to treat it, as if it were now held over.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I fancy that the members of this House will agree with me, that leaving matters over to concurrence is a very poor way of discharging our duties. I have heard that recommended during a good many Sessions, and I have always found that when it came to concurrence, it is generally proceeded with on the last day of the Session, and the items went through like one of the Minister's bomb-shells, and no information was offered on them. If the Minister has not the information, there is his deputy sitting on the floor of the House, and he knows all about the matter. If the hon. gentleman steps over to his deputy and asks for the information, I have no doubt he will be told whether it is a fact that the Medical Board reported on this case on the 2nd August, and the Minister refused to allow it to be presented to Council until the 13th November. In order that this man's case may be more fully presented to the House, I will read an extract from this pamphlet which will interest the Minister himself if he has not read it. It says:

"That, in compliance with the law I handed the Minister four medical certificates in April, 1888, from Sir James Grant, Dr. H. P. Wright, Dr. McDougall and Dr. Chipman, house surgeon, on my discharge from hospital as incurable and unable to earn a living or support myself. He (in the presence of Colonel Panet, the Deputy Minister) denied ever having received them. That was in July, three months afterwards, and in the interval, he refused to advance me a dollar for the purchase of food, or even bring my case before the Privy Council, after the Medical and Military Board's report in August, till the 13th November following, when he heard my end was approaching on a sick bed in the hospital."

There is another serious charge. This man says that he presented the certificates to the Minister, and that the Minister afterwards denied that he ever received them. This poor man stated that the Minister neglected his case; that he refused to listen to him; that he kept this man, who was barely able to crawl about the Department, sitting outside the door from nine in the morning until two in the afternoon, and that when he did obtain an audience he only did so to be insulted by the Minister, and to be told that he was drunk, when the man was not drunk, according to his own statement. And, further, he states that the Minister persistently refused, for three months after the

Medical Board had passed on his case, to recommend his case to the Privy Council. I think the Minister should give the information before he asks us to pass this item. I believe the feeling of the House is that we are entitled to this information before the item is passed.

Mr. LISTER. I believe that the Minister should accept the suggestion which has been made and allow this matter to stand over. During the eight years that I have been a member of this House my experience has been that this suggestion from the Government benches, of letting matters stand over until concurrence, is a delusion and a snare. When we get to concurrence, hon. gentlemen on both sides are anxious to get away, the Estimates are rushed through, and nothing is heard of the matters which were deferred. Now, a specific charge has been made against the hon. minister of Militia, a charge which he has refused to answer, but which he said he is willing to answer if we allow it to stand until concurrence. That charge is: that he received the certificate of the Board in the month of August, and held it in his Department, and did not lay it before the Privy Council until the month of November. If that charge is true, in the face of the fact that the man in question was severely injured, that he was in indigent circumstances, that he was in want of the ordinary necessities of life, that he had volunteered to serve his country and had served it in the hours of danger, the hon. Minister was guilty of a dereliction of duty, if nothing worse. It was an unkind act on his part; if it was not intentional it was thoughtless. If there is anything which this Parliament must regard as a duty, it is to see that the civilian soldiers of the country are properly and fairly and generously treated by those in power for the time being; and the members of this House will neglect the duty they owe to the country if they do not insist on the strictest explanation being given by the Minister in charge of this Department. The Minister, in justice to himself, if he has an explanation to make, and he tells us he has, ought to allow this item to stand until that explanation can be made. I am sure every member of this House will be heartily glad if that explanation is such as to remove from the minds of the public the suspicion that the Minister has not treated this unfortunate man fairly.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Really, all the information and all the explanation I can give must come down in the papers which I have promised to lay on the Table, because my recommendation to Council, the Order in Council, the dates referred to, and everything else must appear in those papers; and hon. gentlemen must give me credit for this. I knew no more about this man than I did about any other man who served in the campaign. I had no personal interest in being harsh to him; there was no reason why I should be, and I am quite prepared to say that every one of the charges which have been made should be explained, and can be explained. But it is impossible for me to speak from memory about the proceedings of the Department of Militia, extending over an agitated period from 1885 to the present day; and the only way in which I can possibly hope to give the information to the House which I want to give is by producing the papers, and leaving every hon. gentleman to judge for himself. If I am guilty,

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

then I can be attacked; if I am not guilty, as I assert I am not, then hon. gentlemen will see that the charges which have been made are the result of a little irritation on the part of this man.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not think it was possible for this man to keep up his irritation from 1888 to the present time, and it looks to me as if he means everything that he states in this pamphlet. I will read to the hon. Minister another paragraph, which I think should be on record:

"I have asked for, and have been refused, either to read or obtain copies of any reports of the Medical Board appointed to examine me, which I desired to have for my own guidance in regulating my future mode of living, as to diet, &c."

It appears from this paragraph, that the Minister did not want to give this man a pension, but actually wanted him to die, because he took the proper course to bring about his death by refusing to listen to his appeals, or to let him see those reports, in order to guide his mode of living. This man winds up his appeal in these words:

"Out of my small pension of 55 cents per day, my rent costs 15 cents, with the use of a stove to cook my own food, as no one will board me for the full amount of my allowance, and my ailments require bandages cleaned every day, besides the cost of medicines and medical attendance when required, which is very often, leaving me the balance of about 20 cents a day for the rest of my life to feed and clothe myself."

Now, it may be all very well for the hon. Minister of Militia, who enjoys a salary of about \$8,000 a year, and who revels in luxuries every day of his life, to treat a poor soldier belonging to the ranks in this contemptible way; but I say it is not creditable to the head of the Militia force of this country to treat a private in such a way, and I think it is due to that force, and due to this House, that this item should not pass until the hon. Minister gives us the necessary explanation. I think he will find that it will be easier for him to let the item stand over until he brings down his explanations, than to attempt to force it through the House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As a rule, I try to avoid taking up the time of the House, and I suggested that it would be far better not to go into these irresponsible charges without the papers. Now, I can tell the hon. gentleman—and I make the statement upon my responsibility as a member of Parliament—that this same man Hurrell told two highly respectable and highly responsible people, who considered it their duty to come and disclose the fact to me, that if he met me on the street he would shoot me on sight. Hon. gentlemen laugh at what I am saying, but they believe the statements of Hurrell, of course. The gentlemen who came to me begged me to have him arrested. I said: "It is all nonsense; Hurrell would do nothing of the kind; he was, perhaps, a little excited." The two gentlemen who made that statement to me are still living in the city of Ottawa, and they can be called upon at any moment, if necessary, to repeat the statement. Now, why should hon. gentlemen go on reading that pamphlet of Hurrell's, and charge me with having done everything that Hurrell says I have done, and when I make a statement, why should the hon. gentleman laugh it off in the unceremonious manner he has done? I think it is unfair.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to this fact: that although

he has listened to all the charges which are made by this man Hurrell, he has not denied or attempted to deny the truth of a single statement. There is, therefore, all the more reason why the item should stand.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not rise to make any accusation against the hon. the Minister of Militia. For my part, I was living in Lindsay when the Midland Battalion went to the North-West, and knew the officers very intimately, and I have never heard from any of them but the highest praise of the Minister of Militia for his conduct during the outbreak. I do not know anything about this man Hurrell's complaint, but I think it is only fair play to the hon. Minister to give him an opportunity of putting this matter in its true light. I have read very carefully this man's statement, and I would not be inclined to place the most implicit reliance upon it. It is hardly fair to the hon. the Minister to take an *ex parte* statement made by this person, who has behaved very unbecomingly in the gallery, without giving him an opportunity of bringing down the papers and meeting the charges. While this matter is up, I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to a petition from a young man in Lindsay, Wm. Henry Veitch, which I sent to the Governor General in Council at the opening of the Session. This young man is twenty-eight years of age, and has one child. He went to the North-West with the Midland Battalion on the 1st April, 1885. He served during the whole campaign, and with regard to his conduct, I cannot do better than read the statements made by Col. Deacon of the Midland Battalion:

"LONDON, 10th Feb., 1890.

"ADAM HUDSPETH, Esq., Q.C., M.P.

"SIR,—I think it is a matter of simple duty which I owe you to bring to your notice the case of young Veitch, in whose behalf a petition was sent you last week. In March, 1885, the riding which you represent had four full companies under arms, and willing to proceed to the North-West, on the news of the trouble on the Saskatchewan. Only one company was required from the 45th to complete the Midland Battalion then placed under the command of the late Lieut.-Col. Williams. Among the young fellows who formed "C" Company of the Midlanders was young Veitch. I watched his career during the expedition. He stood the fatigues of the crowded and cold cars, marches through the gaps, and never for a moment left the ranks. I know that he suffered a good deal, but was kept up by his pluck and desire to do his duty. He is now suffering from the effects of the fatigue and exposure which he endured. I feel certain that the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence, who so generously provided for our wants while serving in the North-West Field Force, who worked so hard in our interest while away, and who met and cheered us on our return, will not hesitate to take the case of Private Veitch into his careful and favorable consideration, and that he will recommend that a brave young fellow who lost his health in the service of his country may receive either a permanent or temporary pension, an act in which we all feel interested and for which we will feel thankful. The company to which young Veitch belonged was one of the two companies under command of Col. Williams at Batoche.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) "J. DEACON,

Lieut.-Col. late Midland Batt."

I hope that the hon. the Minister of Militia will not overlook this case. A considerable time has elapsed since the volunteers went to the North-West, but that is no reason for not granting the pension asked for, if it be proved satisfactorily that this young man did contract this rheumatic complaint while serving through the rebellion, and is now incapacitated for work during three or four

months every year. The fact of the matter is, the young fellow would never have asked for anything, expecting that his health would improve, but I have a certificate from the doctor to show that there is not much hope of his recovery. The facts of the case are simply these: He left Lindsay in April, 1885, and was through the whole campaign, and at Batoche. In May, 1885, he first felt the pains of rheumatism in his legs. He had been lying on the damp ground and got wet marching. He never had rheumatism before that. In 1888 he was laid up over three months with chronic rheumatism, and his lungs became affected. He did not work, owing to this rheumatism, for over three months in 1888 and 1889; was nine weeks in bed, and tried to work, but had to quit, and was laid up for three weeks more. He is entirely changed in his state of health, is weak and not able to work as he did formerly, and has a poor appetite. He is a carriage painter by trade. Dr. McAlpine, his medical attendant, says there is very little hope that he will recover. I know him to be a very temperate young man, and I have known him all his lifetime, as he was born and brought up in Lindsay. The petition I presented to the Governor in Council is signed by many respectable persons in Lindsay, on both sides of politics, as all desire that this young man should receive some consideration at the hands of the Government. I have here a certificate, signed by Dr. McAlpine, which reads as follows:—

"This is to certify that I knew William Henry Veitch as a healthy and vigorous young man prior to his service in the North-West rebellion as a volunteer. While on service he contracted rheumatism, from which he is still suffering, and as his heart has been affected thereby he is not likely ever to be strong again. I am convinced that the cause of his ill-health is due to his exposure and hardships during the campaign.

(Signed) "M. J. McALPINE, M.D.

"LINDSAY, 30th December, 1889."

This young man has no means of living except what he earns by his trade. His parents reside in Lindsay, but his father is not able to support more than his own family, so that this young man has to depend entirely on his own efforts to keep himself and his wife and child, and, being incapacitated during three or four months every year, and his health being broken down by his service in the North-West, his case is one that I think the Minister should favorably consider. I only ask justice. I am not asking that he be treated as a pauper, but as a young fellow who did his duty to his country, and, now that his health is shattered, has a claim on his country. I am prepared to prove all that I have said if I be given the opportunity, and I hope that the hon. gentleman will see that this case is attended to.

Mr. WATSON. I suppose the case the hon. gentleman refers to is another one which has been standing for five years, as the case of this man Hurrell has. I have known Hurrell for the past nine or ten years, and I know that previous to his engagement in the North-West he was in good health, and that since then he has been in poor health, suffering from a very painful disease contracted during the rebellion. I believe the statements made in this pamphlet are perfectly true, and, that being the case, I am not at all surprised that Mr. Hurrell, suffering as he does from a painful disease, having been almost at the point of death, and maddened by the treatment he has re-

ceived at the hands of the Minister of Militia, should have threatened to shoot him at sight. I do not suppose that Hurrell, suffering as he was, and indignant under the treatment he had received, cared whether he lived himself or not. The letters attached to this statement are signed by hon. gentlemen whose representations ought to be taken into consideration by the Minister. This man Hurrell was living, in my county, on a farm, and was just getting things into shape when he joined the 90th Battalion. I see that letters are here signed by a number of gentlemen, one of which I may read, as it will testify to the standing and character of Mr. Hurrell. It is addressed to the Minister of Militia, and says :

"The bearer, Mr. C. T. Hurrell, I have known for over twenty-five years, and he has been a strong and active friend of our party. He tells me he was in the last rebellion in 90th Regiment, and is suffering severely from disease and exposure in the service of his country. May I ask you to take his case into your favorable consideration, and much oblige.

Yours truly,

"K. McCALLUM."

I do not know who this K. McCallum is, but probably it should be L. McCallum, the present Senator, because Mr. Hurrell comes from his section of the country. This request is also signed by Thomas Scott, M.P.; James Beaty, M.P.; W. Wood, M.P.; Dr. Ferguson, M.P., and J. H. Bell, M.P. As to the services rendered by Mr. Hurrell, I would call in the evidence of Mr. William Clark, captain in the 90th Battalion, a very good man, and one of those who bore the brunt of the fight in the North-West. He says :

"DEAR HURRELL.—In parting from you on our leaving hospital, I wish to express to you my very sincere thanks for the care and kindness bestowed by you over the wounded since our engagement at Fish Creek. In your position at Saskatoon, in the night charge of the hospital, you were able to be of good service to the wounded; you understood the responsibility of your position, and I am sure all will long remember your great kindness during those weary weeks. Personally I feel your efforts in the interest of all the men to be a kindness done to myself.

Yours truly,

"WILLIAM CLARK,

"Captain, 'F' Company, 90th Battalion."

There are two letters that testify to the services of Mr. Hurrell, and I think he has been harshly treated by the Minister of Militia. I am not surprised at his having threatened to do some very severe things to the Minister of Militia, and, as the Minister of Militia has stated that he is quite prepared to justify his course in this by bringing papers before the House, this item should be allowed to stand until the Minister can explain the whole thing. This is only one case of harsh treatment. I know of two or three myself in which the treatment by the Minister of Militia has been very harsh. He should be careful to do justice to our volunteers. They go to the front in cases of danger, they receive very small pay, and, when they are disabled, they should receive consideration from the Government. I have seen Mr. Hurrell here for three or four Sessions, and I know he is in a very feeble state. When a man has rendered services to his country, not only in the North-West rebellion, but in his past life—and he is now 55 years of age—I think he is entitled to the care and protection of the Government, who should see that he does not end his days in starvation, suffering from diseases contracted in the service of his country.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I heartily agree with the last speaker as to the duty of the Government to look into the case of those volunteers who have been disabled in active service, and also the families of those who have been removed by death. In the past, this Parliament has been very generous in this matter. In one or two instances connected with the North-West rebellion, I think this Parliament has been more than generous. I do not know anything about the merits of the present case. I have known Mr. Hurrell by sight for a number of years, but I have no acquaintance with him to speak of. Still, the Minister of Militia, as a member of the Government, is responsible for the honor of the country. The Government are the custodians for the time being of the honor of the country, and its good name, and Parliament, which supports them in that position, is also responsible for the honor of the country. I do not for a moment pretend to say whether there is any truth in the charges brought by Mr. Hurrell or not. I know nothing about the case. I come to it entirely unprejudiced. But, whether these charges are true or false, it is a duty the Minister of Militia owes to the country, to give the fullest and fairest explanation in regard to them. If these charges are true, it is a reflection upon the honor and the justice of this country. If they are untrue, they ought, in the interests of the country, to be refuted, and, if they are true, the injustice should be rectified. I, therefore, hope the Minister will allow this to stand over until he has given the fullest and fairest explanation.

Mr. CASEY. It may be very easy for the Minister of Militia to pooh-pooch the complaints of this individual, when he goes to him personally and sits like Lazarus at the gate, outside his office, from nine o'clock in the morning till four o'clock in the afternoon, waiting to see him, and is then ordered off on the ground of being drunk. It may be easy to pooh-pooch the complaint when presented in that way, but the Minister cannot so pooh-pooch a complaint preferred in this House, and a demand made by members of this House. He cannot be allowed to do it, and this item cannot be allowed to pass until the explanations which he says he can give, are given to the House. He says there is nothing but the unsupported statements and threats of this Sergeant Hurrell, who, it appears, made dire threats against the Minister, personally. The Minister is mistaken. Here is proof of his services, of his injuries, of his inability to support himself, and of the insufficiency of the pension that has been allowed him. It is for the Minister to show why an insufficient pension was allowed to him. The leader of the Government was satisfied that it was insufficient, for he says in a letter given to Mr. C. T. Hurrell :

"MY DEAR SIR ADOLPHE.—I feel much interested in the bearer, Mr. C. T. Hurrell, who suffered so severely since Fish Creek. The pension given him is altogether insufficient for his injuries. May I request you to take a personal interest in his case, and much oblige,

Yours very sincerely,

"JOHN A. MACDONALD."

If the head of the Government was satisfied that the pension was insufficient, surely that was sufficient reason for the Minister to investigate the case. The Premier might have been wrong in his opinion as to the insufficiency of that pension, but his expression of opinion was sufficient to reopen

the case and to secure further consideration. We want to know whether the case was reopened, whether a second investigation was had, and whether, and on what ground the Department was satisfied that the pension was sufficient. It is quite patent that 55 cents a day is not the pension allowed by the regulations to a man under these circumstances, and that men who were much less incapacitated for work have received very generous pensions indeed. I do not say they were more than they should receive. I know very well the person referred to by Mr. Hurrell—but there is no occasion to drag his name into the discussion—as receiving a pension of a thousand dollars a year. It is true that he lost an arm, but he is still able to pursue his duties as architect, notwithstanding that. I do not say that he received too much. On the contrary, I think he was fully entitled to what was granted to him, but I think that this man, who appears to have had a higher standing in society at one time than now, which he gave up in order to serve his country, should have a great deal more than has been given to him. Now, if we go outside the militia service, we find gentlemen receiving pensions from the Government who are still actively engaged in other occupations and obtaining large salaries. We find an hon. Senator receiving \$1,600 as a pension for past services as a judge, although he is still sitting as a member of the Senate and getting a sessional indemnity. We find another gentleman, Mr. Clark, formerly a county judge, receiving \$1,600 pension from the Government, while he is also receiving a large salary as solicitor for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Yet here we find a poor man, utterly helpless, incapacitated for work, and I think he ought to receive not only the largest pension allowed by the regulations, but some consideration over and above. As the regulations point out:

“In instances where the regulations do not meet the circumstances of individual cases, they may be specially considered by His Excellency the Governor General in Council.”

That is paragraph 934 of the Regulations. So that the Minister had it in his power to give Sergeant Hurrell even more than the regulations allowed. As to the threat said to have been made, there may have been something in it, or there may not; we only have it on hearsay evidence. But supposing it were true, we all know—though I hope we may never know it personally—that in cases of inflammatory rheumatism the disease affects the whole system, and sometimes even the brain, so that a man should not be held responsible for what he says under those circumstances. But this threat reported to have been made against the Minister—if it really was uttered—was made long after Hurrell had been subjected to the treatment which he complains of, which appears to be unjust on the face of it. But it would be equally unjust to the Minister to condemn him without giving him a chance of producing the official papers; it would be unjust to Mr. Hurrell, unjust to ourselves, and unjust to the militia force of this country, if we allow this item to pass until the Minister has brought down all the papers relating to it in his Department. Let him bring down the reports of the different boards of examiners, and all the official papers connected with this case, and then we will be in a position to clear him, if the papers show that he ought to be cleared, and we will be

in a position to do justice to Sergeant Hurrell, if the papers show that he has not received justice. For these reasons I urge that this item be laid over until these papers are produced.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the Minister had better consent to let this item be postponed.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be so determined to have these explanations, that I think we had better let the item lie over in order to appease them.

Extra allowance to W. Wallace, ex-
Postmaster at Victoria, B.C. \$240

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not rise for the purpose of criticising this particular item, but I do think that the attention of the House ought to be called to the enormous charge that is being made to the superannuation fund, now amounting to nearly a quarter of a million dollars, as the service for 1890-91 asks for \$240,000. Now, it is utterly impossible for us; I think, to acquiesce in the way the superannuation system is managed, without some criticism. It appears to me that in a great many cases which are recorded in our Public Accounts and in the Auditor General's Report, superannuation allowances have been granted without due consideration; that men who are quite able to serve the country for many years to come, have been put in the receipt of large sums of money from the public chest. I am very much inclined to believe, for my own part, that the prodigal abuse of this system, whatever might have been said for it in the commencement, is likely to stir up a feeling in the minds of the public which will lead to the total abolition of the superannuation at present granted to public servants, and the cause of that will be that the superannuation system is being very gravely abused. I do not want particularly to criticise this special item, but I do want to enter a protest, and I think we will have to enter it in the most formal manner possible, against the mode in which the Government are dealing with the superannuation allowance, which appears to me to have attained proportions far in excess of the needs of our service.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think before this item is passed we should have some information. In the first place in regard to the amount of the superannuation allowance to Mr. Wallace, and also with regard to the reason why it was necessary to place him on the list? Now, it is well known that an hon. member who once sat in this House has been superannuated by the Government in order that he might get a permanent position. I notice by the Postmaster General's Report, that the man who has been put in Mr. Wallace's place as postmaster at Victoria, gets \$2,286 a year. Now, when we add to that the amount of superannuation allowance that is allowed to Mr. Wallace, we find that it amounts altogether to a considerable sum that we are paying for a Postmaster at that point. At the time the superannuation was made, I asked what allowance was to be granted to Mr. Wallace? The Government replied that although he had been placed upon the list, they had not yet decided as to the amount he would receive. I quite endorse the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The superannuation system has been grossly abused for the purpose of making room for

men who have been pressing their claims upon the Government; and instead of legitimately using the system for old and worn out servants, who had performed arduous and responsible duties in the service of their country, and were getting too feeble to hold it any longer, the Government have used the system to give soft allowances to their servants, in order to get them to retire to make room for men who are pressing their claims upon the Government. We have now something like 450 names upon the superannuation list, and this year we are asked to pay something over \$240,000. We see by the returns brought down to the House within the first fifteen days of the Session, as provided by statute, that the increase of that fund this year is something like \$30,000. I think it is time that a complete change should be made in this system. When it was first introduced there may have been some reason for it, simply because we had not at that time the opportunities for Government servants to take advantage of life insurance, as they can do at the present time. When it was first introduced in England—and our Act was largely copied after the English Act—there was not the advantage of life insurance that they have to-day, or at least not in the same form. I hold that any servant who wishes to provide for old age and infirmity, if, in place of deducting the small pittance which is taken from his salary, he applied that amount in payment for a policy of life insurance, it would be more satisfactory to him, and this superannuation allowance would be completely wiped out. We cannot afford to continue the system as it has been carried on for a number of years. We have to-day on the pension list men who are as capable of performing the ordinary duties of life as is any member of this House, and yet many of these men are drawing superannuation allowances and living at the expense of the country. Very many of them are living in other countries, in France, England, and elsewhere, and they are drawing money from this Dominion for their support. I have brought this whole question of superannuation before the House on many occasions, and I have endeavored to impress on hon. members the necessity of wiping out the whole system. The Session before last the then leader of the Opposition submitted a resolution to the House, suggesting a complete change in the superannuation system, if we should continue it in any form. The Government, backed by their supporters, rejected that proposition. It was, in brief, that 2 per cent. should be deducted from the salaries, and that this amount should go into a fund, which would be held in reserve as a guarantee for the faithful and efficient service of the officials, and when it became necessary for any of them to withdraw from the service, that money, with the accumulated interest from the time they entered the service, would be paid over to them. In this way the country would not be called upon to pay a cent. I cannot understand why it should be otherwise. The average salary of a civil servant is equal to that obtained in other walks of life, and it will average about \$100 a month, which should be quite sufficient to support a man and enable him to put away a small sum in the way of providing life insurance or in some other way, so that he may not become a burden on the country, as is the case at the present time. This particular

Mr. McMULLEN.

case before the Committee at present is a most aggravated one. Mr. Wallace was superannuated on no justifiable ground whatever. I can easily understand that when vacancies are required, the Government may represent to a man holding a position that he had better apply for superannuation. It is hinted that his place is wanted, and rather than subject himself to the possibility of being removed, or of having unpleasant relations with the Government, he is driven into making application to be placed on the superannuation list. The result is that he is superannuated, and another man is placed in the position. It has been the rule that the man appointed in the place of the superannuated officer did not receive a salary equal to the superannuated one; but we find that Mr. Shakespeare, the new postmaster at Victoria, receives the same salary as his predecessor, \$2,000, and also \$286 for extra services. In past years the Government have endeavored to show that advantage accrued by the operation of the Superannuation Act. They would superannuate a man receiving \$2,000 a year and appoint a successor at \$1,200, and adding the salary and superannuation allowance together the amount scarcely exceeded that of the original salary. In this case they have violated that principle. It is wrong that superannuations of this kind should take place; it is a gross fraud on the people that the Act should be so abused; and, under these circumstances, it is the duty of the Opposition to draw the attention of the House and the country to these cases, in order that the Government may be compelled by the force of public opinion to terminate the abuses which have taken place, and are taking place under the Superannuation Act. I contend that we should abolish the whole system; it is wrong, and it can never be used to the advantage of the country. We should have a change, and that change should take place now. This case in question is one which shows conclusively that this system is abused, and will be abused so long as the Act remains on the Statute-book. We have evidence of that fact here with regard to the clerks of this House. We have the clerk, to whom we are paying a respectable salary, and we have an ex-clerk who is drawing \$2,300 a year. We pay a deputy clerk a superannuation allowance of \$1,400, and another deputy clerk is drawing \$400 a year; so that for the clerk, and the deputy clerk, and the three clerks who have allowances, we are paying \$10,000 a year under the superannuation system. The resources of the country are being strained to meet the requirements of a system which should be wiped out. This year there have been more additions than there were last year or the year previous. I cannot tell how this has come about. I suppose there have been more applicants for the service, and, consequently, more pressure has been brought to bear on the Government, and accordingly more pressure has been brought to bear on those holding office to make application for superannuation. Before this item is carried, we want to know what amount of superannuation has been granted to Mr. Wallace. Last year the Government were not in a position to answer this question, for it was stated that while the order had been drawn it had not been passed.

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

After Recess.

ORANGE INCORPORATION BILL.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Grand Orange Lodge of British North America (Mr. Wallace) was considered in Committee and reported.

Mr. WALLACE moved that the Bill be read a third time.

Mr. CURRAN. I beg leave to move, Mr. Speaker :

That it be an instruction to the said Committee to provide that this association shall not hold public processions in any Province where Party Procession Acts are now or may be hereafter enacted.

In making this motion, I wish to state that I do so, feeling the responsibility that is incumbent upon me, and nothing but an imperative sense of duty would cause me, at this moment, and under existing circumstances, as manifested since this Bill was introduced during the present Parliament, to bring forward the amendment which I have now placed in your hands. I take this course as a measure, which I consider to be a precaution for peace in the community. I have no desire at this moment, and, in fact, it would be out of place, to discuss the underlying principles of the Bill now before the House. The change that has taken place with reference to this measure of incorporation since the year 1883, when it was first introduced into the House of Commons of Canada, and since 1885, when it was introduced a second time, and on both occasions defeated by very large majorities, is indeed a marvellous one. The discussion on both these occasions revealed the fact that we were being asked to incorporate a society, which is well known to be extremely distasteful to a large section of the people. It showed also that it was proposed, as it is now proposed by this Bill, to repeal a statute of Lower Canada, chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes of that Province, which has been in force there for a long time, even previous to Confederation, and by which no secret association whatever (with the exception of the Masonic Society) is a legal association in that Province. We must remember that it is proposed to repeal that statute without the consent of the Local Legislature of the Province of Quebec, and without the consent of the majority of the members from that Province, in this House—I may say, in fact, that only a very small, indeed an insignificant minority from that Province, has voted for the second reading of this Bill. The circumstances now are, that all the old adherents of the Bill still support it, whilst a number of those who formerly opposed the measure are found voting for it, and a number of others feel, that while they cannot vote for it, they prefer to abstain altogether from voting, on the ground that it is far better that the grievance which this association has complained of, in not being able to get an Act of incorporation—whether that grievance be real or imaginary—had better be removed. That is the feeling of a very large number of members in this House now, and although a large number still feel that this obnoxious legislation should not be enacted here, we have existing, the changed circumstances which I have just referred to. This Bill will inevitably become law ; but before it does, I should like to have this motion carried as a pre-

cautionary measure ; and to justify my action, I feel that I cannot do better than refer to a few facts which, though well known to most of the members of this House, may very well be brought back to their memory when we are about to enact so important a measure. Until the year 1877, although I was born and brought up in the city of Montreal, I never heard of any such thing as a procession of Orangemen in that city, nor any attempt at a display on the part of that body. Along towards the 12th of July in that year certain letters appeared in the public prints of the city, calculated by their tone to arouse hostility. Those letters announced that it was the intention to have a 12th of July procession there. Naturally—because such is the history of this association, and those opposed to it—those letters begot others, and before the day for the display had arrived, we found the two parties arrayed in armed hostile camps. The doings of this organisation had caused a hostile organisation to spring into existence, and on the day in question a tragedy took place in the city of Montreal, which was followed by a series of most regrettable events. Nearly every man, and I may say nearly every boy, armed himself with a revolver, and shooting and wounding were the order of the day. The peace of the city had disappeared ; it was, in fact, in a state of siege. Things went on thus, not for weeks, but for months, until finally on the 28th of April following, another terrible tragedy took place, in which life was lost and several persons were wounded. The man who was killed was entirely disconnected, I believe, with the cause of the trouble. Some women also were injured by bullets. So much was the peace of the city disturbed, that the Board of Trade and other public bodies called public meetings and demanded the most stringent legislation in order to protect the commerce of the city and re-establish law and order. The consequence was that a measure entitled “The Crimes of Violence Prevention Act,” was brought before this House by the present member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), on the 1st of May, 1878, immediately after the last painful circumstance to which I have just referred. In presenting that measure the hon. member for West Durham said :

“He believed that from whatever part of Canada they might hail, they were all proud of the city of Montreal. They were proud of its situation, placed as it was in a commanding position at the junction of an unrivalled system of ocean and inland navigation. They were proud of the zeal, the enterprise, the public spirit of its citizens, and the beautiful city they had made for themselves. They had been proud of the cosmopolitan character of its population, in which different nations and creeds have mingled together, co-operating for the general good.”

But, said the hon. gentleman :

“For nearly a year past the city had been the scene of frequent violent attacks in the streets by different parties, in which fire-arms had been used with the utmost recklessness. Excepting the other night, little loss of life had resulted from those difficulties ; but there might have been serious loss of life. But the events of the other evening were premonitory of far more serious events in the future, unless some steps were taken to repress those circumstances. He was not called on at this time and under these circumstances—perhaps he would not be called upon at any time and under any circumstances—to weigh the merits of the contending parties. All the disorder, all the violence and use of fire-arms, were not to be attributed to those classes, since it was obvious there existed a degree of lawless use of fire-arms

in that city entirely irrespective of the circumstances to which he had alluded."

He pointed out the danger of that practice and its fearful results going on and spreading, and proceeded :

"As a Canadian of Irish descent it gave him an additional pang of humiliation that his own fellow-countrymen of both creeds should be prominently concerned in those troubles. He would only say that if his feeble voice could reach beyond the limits of this hall, and he could hope that it would have any weight, he would ask them to remember that, although belonging to different forms of Christianity, the cardinal principle of that religion is love and charity, forbearance and self-sacrifice."

He went on to explain that the measure was one of great severity, and that its severity was justified by the circumstances and by the events which had just taken place. The present hon. Minister of Public Works also spoke of it as a very severe measure. He said :

"It interfered to a great extent with individual liberty ; but, on the other hand, the intention was to strike terror into the minds of those who were disposed to trouble society, break the peace, and perhaps commit such violence as might lead to bloodshed and perhaps loss of life. Under these circumstances it was with the greatest reluctance he consented to this Bill."

There were various speeches at different stages of the discussion on that Bill, and amongst others who spoke was Mr. John White, a member of the organisation which is now seeking incorporation. Appalled at what had taken place, and struck, no doubt, with the magnitude of the difficulties which this attempted procession had originated, he said :

"He would unhesitatingly say that when any Orangemen walked in Montreal, and the band played, or the Orangemen encouraged the playing of such tunes as 'Kick the Pope' and 'Croppies Lie Down,' it was injurious to the institution, to society, and unbecoming, and he condemned such conduct in the strongest terms. He did not blame parties for being annoyed at it. If they professed to be liberal-minded and Christians, why should they wish any party kicked?"

Well, that law was passed, and was rigorously carried out, and it required, I think, a year or more of the most stringent enforcement of that law to restore peace and order and harmony in the city of Montreal. So serious was the condition of matters that the Legislature of Quebec felt obliged to introduce legislation in connection with this matter, and they passed the law to which I am about to refer. It will be found in the Revised Statutes of the Province of Quebec of the year 1888, intitled : "The Party Processions in Montreal." Article 2,940 of the Revised Statutes provides that :

"No assemblage of persons shall parade the streets of the city of Montreal, or march in procession therein, to celebrate or commemorate any political anniversary or event having reference to religious or other distinctions existing between any class of the subjects of Her Majesty, or to make any demonstration of such religious or other distinctions."

And it proceeds further :

"No one shall carry and display banners, flags, ensigns, or emblems of a nature tending to create animosities between subjects of Her Majesty of different religious beliefs, or be accompanied by any band of music tending to excite feelings of such a nature."

It goes on to provide for power to justices of the peace to enforce the Act, and penalties for disobedience of its enactments. By the passage of this Act through the Legislature of Quebec, peace and harmony were at length restored, and since then we have had no trouble and no hostile feeling

Mr. CURRAN.

in the city of Montreal. Although this organisation is under the ban of the law, they have met in their lodges and transacted their business without being troubled by anybody, and no doubt they will continue to do so, so long as no public exhibition is made in the streets offensive to the overwhelming majority of the people. My motion now asks that this association shall not hold any such public procession in any Province where a Party Processions Act, such as the one I have just read, now exists, or where such an Act may be enacted at any future period. I may be asked, since we have this law upon our Statute-book in Quebec, why seek to have it confirmed here? I reply, because we ought to legislate here upon the basis best calculated to promote the peace and order of the community at large. We have to deal with this subject in the light of events that have taken place within the memory of everyone in this House, and if we are to remove from this association the ban under which it has labored in the Province of Quebec for so many years, and grant the demands they have been making year after year, certainly we ought not to do so without imposing such conditions as will ensure that the granting of those privileges will not entail disorder, damage and loss to property, and perhaps life, in any part of the Dominion. If this association are going to obtain all that they ask for now, there can surely be no objection to this House confirming the legislation I have referred to ; there surely cannot be any objection to our taking these precautionary measures which are deemed an imperative necessity in the opinions of those best entitled to respect. Otherwise there will be, I am satisfied, members of this organisation over whom the hon. mover of this Bill or his colleagues in this House cannot hope to have any control, who will be liable to be carried away by their desire to parade ; and this society, which is declared to be a benevolent society, an insurance company, an educational society, will surely not insist upon retaining their right to parade in our public streets, when such parade can only lead to disorder, and when all the disabilities in other respects under which they labor, are removed. No one will contend that the motives which appear in this Bill as those that animate this body, in seeking this legislation, are not good ones, namely, to unite fraternally all persons entitled to membership, to give material aid to distressed members, to educate the members socially, morally and intellectually, to inculcate loyalty to the Queen, and to enable the association to establish a fund for the relief of the sick, and to enable the association to establish an insurance fund out of which to pay a sum not exceeding \$3,000 to the widows, orphans and the other beneficiaries designated. All these are very good things if we could disassociate them from the history of the association in the minds of many of our fellow-subjects in Canada. It is our duty to provide against what may be the rash conduct of some uncontrollable members—not necessarily the members of the senior organisation, but of the organisation which figures occasionally under the wing of the parent society, and is known as the "Young Britons." These and kindred spirits will certainly endeavor, under the pretences I have set forth, to hold processions, which will be productive of results we must all deplore. These are not merely my opinions and

views—and I know something of the state of feeling in the part of the Dominion from which I come—but they are the opinions and views of many others more competent to speak authoritatively. I have received, within the last forty-eight hours, from a venerable clergyman, a letter, in which he states that if we have Orange processions in the Province of Quebec, we shall most certainly have bloodshed, and in which he asks me to see that, in the Bill incorporating the Orange body, the possibility of Orange processions is provided against. The clergyman, whose letter I have just read, is one whose opinions deserve to receive consideration at the hands of the people of Canada. He is one who has now reached his seventy-fifth year, who has devoted the greater part of his active life to the benefit of this Canada of ours, and who is recognised on all hands, by all persons of all creeds, as a peacemaker in this country. I will, therefore, read his letter, in order that it may have its effect upon those who may not believe that bloodshed and violence will be the result if these processions are not provided against, in those quarters where they have already given so much trouble and caused so much loss to life and property in the past. We have in this Bill the principle enunciated that the association is essentially a loyal one, and that one of its objects is the inculcation of loyalty. Now, what is loyalty if it be not respect for the law more than anything else? The word loyalty is derived from the word *loi*, and respect for the law is the best means of showing our loyalty. The hon. mover of this Bill, who has managed so skilfully, and without whose singular diplomacy and great influence and hard work and perseverance, this Bill never could have reached the stage it has now reached, will not, I am satisfied, be slow to show how loyal is the association to which he belongs. He will say: We are anxious to show that we are loyal; here is an opportunity to show it; we are asked to make provision that the laws of the Provinces shall be respected in connection with party processions, and we are only too anxious and we seize this opportunity of showing that we are only too delighted that this motion has been made in order to give us an opportunity of manifesting that we are anxious to obey and respect the law, to demonstrate that our loyalty is not merely printed in our bill or uttered by our lips, but is in our hearts, and that we will inculcate on all those who are connected with us a desire to obey the laws by having this clause inserted in the Bill. I shall be very much surprised if my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) does not avail himself of this opportunity to show his respect for the law. I have, at all events, endeavored, without passion and without exciting anybody's prejudices, without attempting any oratorical effort, but, in plain words, to do what I consider to be my duty. I have presented this motion, knowing the circumstances of the case, knowing exactly the nature of the great evil that I am endeavoring to deal with. Certainly we have had a great deal of trouble with the attempts at legislation of this kind which had been made in the past. The excitement attendant upon that legislation seems now to have passed away. The question which now presents itself to my mind, and which I have endeavored to lay before the House, is this: Are we, with the history of the

past before us in regard to this branch of the subject, going to take the necessary precautions to prevent the recurrence of the terrible results of attempts at processions which have been made in Montreal before? Under these circumstances, I submit that, in view of the Act of 1878, just referred to, and the Party Processions Act in the Province of Quebec—in view of the fact that it may be necessary in the future, in other Provinces, to enact similar measures, it is not necessary for this House to provide that, wherever it is or may be necessary to pass such legislation, this association, which now receives its charter from us, shall not attempt to hold public processions. I leave the matter in the hands of the House, satisfied that they will deal with it as men who feel that a great deal of responsibility rests upon them.

Mr. WALLACE. I desire to say a few words before the vote is taken. In listening to the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), I was wondering whether we were living in a free country like Canada or were living in the Middle Ages. This Bill proposes to incorporate an organisation which is "to give all material aid in its power to distressed members and those dependent upon them; to educate its members socially, morally and intellectually; and to inculcate loyalty to Queen and country; and to enable the association to establish a fund for the relief of sick and distressed members." That a measure with such an object should receive the opposition of the hon. gentleman, and a proposition that such a totally unnecessary amendment as this should be asked to be added to it, is what we could never expect. I would prefer that the Bill should be defeated rather than that such a humiliating provision should be added to it. The member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) told us that one of the reasons why the Bill should not pass is that the organisation is distasteful to a large portion of the people of Canada. Does not the hon. gentleman know that we have incorporated bodies of every religious denomination, and that Parliament has never asked whether the organisation was distasteful to members of this House or not, but simply whether it was right that incorporation should be granted? Why should a different argument be applied to the Orange Association of British America? We do not interfere, or attempt to interfere with the rights of others, and there is no body of men more tolerant of the opinions of others. Their obligation teaches them toleration of the opinion of all who may differ with them in religion or in any other way, but, while we have been tolerant in our views, in our feelings and our good intentions, in regard to our fellow-citizens of different religious beliefs throughout Canada, we will not accept any amendment of this kind. The hon. gentleman refers to the proceedings in Montreal in 1877 and 1878. I did not wish to refer to those proceedings, and I am really surprised to find that the hon. member for Montreal Centre should refer to them. They are of such a character as I will not characterise in this House, but the hon. gentleman's co-religionists in the city of Montreal have certainly no reason to pride themselves upon the Hackett murder and the subsequent events, when freedom was denied—a freedom to which we are all justly entitled in

Canada—to people who were exercising what they considered to be the rights of Canadian subjects in a free Canadian city. The Act passed by the Quebec Legislature has been referred to. I do not know whether that is good law or not, and I do not care; but we claim that we are entitled to all our rights by the Act as it stands now, and we ask that these should be accorded by the Parliament of Canada, not as a favor, but as a right. We have had a second reading of this Bill, and, after a strong discussion, we have passed it in the Committee, and I hope it will be made the law of Canada.

Mr. KENNY. I have only a very few remarks to make. I see the House is impatient, but I was not here when the Bill was under discussion, and this may be the only opportunity I may have of making a reference to it. My hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), in introducing this amendment, has given as his reasons for doing so the history of certain events which occurred in the city of Montreal, which every well-wisher of Canada must deplore. Therefore, I consider that the member for Montreal Centre was only discharging a duty which he owes to this House, to lay before the House the incidents which had happened in his own city, of which he was cognisant, and which, as I said, every citizen of Montreal, every tolerant man in Canada, must regret. As regards my own Province I may say, for the information of the House, that, in 1875, the Legislature of the Province of Nova Scotia passed an Act incorporating the Orange body; and I may say further that since that date, so far as the Orangemen in Nova Scotia are concerned, or at least those of the city of Halifax, they have not given us any trouble. But ours is a model Province, and the city from which I come is a model community. We may differ politically in that community, but I am happy to say that a great spirit of tolerance exists there. We boast that our civilisation comes from the east, and I think it would be well for the western Provinces in this Dominion occasionally to look to the east for a lesson in that particular. No matter what my opinions may be about this Bill—I am certainly not in favor of it, yet I recognise the fact that there are a vast number of men in Canada who differ with me, and that they are fully entitled to hold their opinions as I am to hold my view of it. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Wallace) just now accused my hon. friend from Montreal Centre of "intolerance" in introducing his amendment. Now, the hon. member for Montreal was exceedingly careful—I heard that portion of his speech where he reviewed this Bill—he was careful to tell the House that in the Bill itself, there was nothing so very objectionable; and, Sir, if we could be sure that this organisation would be always led by a gentleman of the moderation and tolerance of my hon. friend from York, I have no doubt that we would have more confidence in the future with regard to it. But the hon. member for Montreal has placed before this Legislature the simple statement that there is great risk; that in a certain city in the Province from which he comes, if processions of this organisation take place, violence and bloodshed may ensue. Therefore, instead of blaming the hon. member for Montreal Centre, I consider that he simply discharges a duty

Mr. WALLACE.

which he owes to this House, to place plainly before them the facts, and then allow the House to deal with the question. Now, I am not a lawyer, but I have heard it said by lawyers—and we know that lawyers differ—that these party processions are a matter that each Province in its own Legislature can deal with. Of that I know nothing, but I simply rose to say that I hardly thought it was fair in the hon. member for York to accuse the hon. member for Montreal of "intolerance" in proposing this amendment, and also to point out to this House that in the Province from which I come, we gave this body an Act of incorporation without disturbing the peace and harmony of our community. I feel bound to support the amendment, and I do hope that it will be possible so to regulate the Bill, that there can be no repetition of such deplorable events as occurred in the city of Montreal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I regret that the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) should have deemed it his duty to propose this amendment at all; I regret it, because it seems to me that the amendment is not only totally unnecessary, but it is pernicious. The House in its wisdom has seen fit to pass the second reading of this Orange Bill. It has come up here year after year, and has created a good deal of excitement and a good deal of feeling; but there appears to have been this year a general and a widespread desire on the part of members of this House, that this organisation should receive that for which they have been asking for a good many years—that is, an Act of incorporation. We have assented to the principle of the Bill, and I have not heard in this House, although I did hear in the Committee to which the Bill was referred, any objection to the details of the Bill; so that as far as the principle and details are concerned, the hon. gentleman raised no objection. Now, what did he say? This Bill does not give the Orange body a right to walk in the streets of Montreal or in any other place; it merely incorporates a certain body known as the Orange body for the purposes contained in that Bill. If they choose to walk in the streets of Montreal, and the municipal law of that city, or the local law of that Province enables them to do so, well and good. If the municipal law of that city or a local Act of that Province prohibits them from walking in procession, they will not be allowed to do so, and this Bill does not confer upon them the power to do so. Therefore, I say that it is no use throwing down this bone of contention, which can only have the effect of raising up bitter feelings and dissensions. It rests entirely with the Province of Quebec to say whether they will allow these Orangemen to walk or not. All we do is to incorporate the society, and although the Local Legislature cannot pass any law which will infringe upon a right we give the society, still a city can pass municipal laws regulating the manner in which their streets shall be promenaded, and everything of that kind; and we do not pretend to confer any power upon the Orange Society by this Bill, to walk in the streets of Montreal or anywhere else. I think the hon. gentleman will see that it would be a very bad precedent for us to insert in a Bill of this kind any such clause as he proposes, and it will be legislating in the best interests of those whom he represents, if he withdraws the amendment entirely.

Mr. LISTER. I listened with a good deal of interest to the speech of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). I believe that hon. gentleman and myself had the honor of coming into this House together for the first time in the last Parliament. On one occasion when a Bill involving the same principles as the present measure was offered to this House by gentlemen who are promoting the present measure, I remember the zeal, nay, I might almost say, the bitterness, with which that hon. gentleman opposed that measure. Sir, I was not a little surprised to see that hon. gentleman to-night rise in his place and take it for granted that the Bill now before the House is to become the law of the land. One is forced to the conclusion, one is driven to the conclusion, that an arrangement has been made by the Government and members promoting this Bill, for the purpose of satisfying the Orange body in this country who are now opposed to the Government on account of their action in the Jesuit matter. Now, we find hon. gentlemen upon the Government benches apparently opposing this Bill, but in reality consenting to it. It is a part and parcel of the compact which has been entered into by the leaders of the Government and their Orange Protestant followers in the country. They say to the Orangemen who are opposed to the Government—or many of them who are opposed to the Government; because they believe the Government did wrong in not disallowing the Jesuits' Estates Act—they say to these Orangemen: Do not blame us for that, and we will give you Orange incorporation. Sir, the leader of the Government for years has trifled with the Orange body of this country; an Orangeman himself, he has trifled with the body of which he is so distinguished a member. You know that long ago he promised the Orangemen of this country that, in consideration of their support, he would give them incorporation; and we know how he carried out that promise, by voting for it himself and letting his followers vote against it. The whole country knows that if the leader of the Government was sincere in his promise to the Orange body, this measure would have become law years and years ago. The people know perfectly well that if the Government was honest in its representations to the body, there need be no question as to this being the law of the land in the way the Orangemen want it. They know it would not be necessary to come and ask for incorporation in the shape of a benevolent association, as they do in this Bill, but they would have had incorporation as they wanted it on several occasions before this, being incorporated as an incorporated body without the benevolent provisions in the present Bill. They know that if the right hon. gentleman was honest in his statements to them, if he was honest in his promises to them, all he had to do was to have introduced this measure as a Government measure, and the members who sit behind him would have supported it, and it would have become law. He knew he could do it, but he would not do it. What he told the Orangemen was: Why, bless your simple hearts, I voted for the Bill. Look at the division lists, time and time again, and you will see the name of John A. Macdonald voting for the affirmative; but Sir Hector Langevin voted on the other side. Sir, the right hon. gentleman has

trifled with the Orangemen for years, and now when he finds he has got into a little scrape over the policy of his Government on account of the Jesuits' Estates Act, he says to his amiable and almost blind follower, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace): We will make it all right with the Orangemen, and I will allow the Orange Bill to go through. And the hon. gentleman allows it. When the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) told the people that the Orangemen are a unit in asking for incorporation, under the circumstances as they exist, he is not aware of or does not state the true facts of the case, because there is a large division and a great difference of opinion among Orangemen of the Province of Ontario, as to the propriety of accepting incorporation from this Parliament. They know it is a sop thrown out by the sagacious leader of the Government. They feel they are demeaning and humiliating themselves under the circumstances to ask for incorporation, and the very day I left home for Ottawa, an Orangeman said to me: "Whatever comes up, do not vote for that Orange Bill; vote against it, if introduced." It appears to me that some strange influence has come over the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). I wonder if we will see the hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches before long, in view of the very moderate speech he made to-night. In order to show his consistent record, he presents to this House an amendment making a certain provision, if the Orange Bill becomes law—which he concedes here to-night, as he says it is to become law—but he says: For goodness sake, do not let them march in the Province of Quebec. I say, that if the Orangemen are to have incorporation, we have a right to give them every power which any other association in this country possesses. It is childish to say to these people: We give you incorporation, but you shall not exercise the rights that other societies have in the Province of Quebec. If they get incorporation, they have a right to walk where they please, so long as they do not break the law, and commit a breach of the peace; and the amendment of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), is utterly unnecessary. It was moved, as lawyers say, to give color to the pleadings; it was to impress his friends in Montreal with the impression that he was doing something for the Catholics of that city, that he was facing the inevitable, but was struggling to the last to help his co-religionists in that section of the country. Why, he will say, I introduced an amendment asking that Orangemen should not be allowed to walk in Montreal; I supported it by a powerful oration; I did all in the power of mortal man to protect you from what you consider to be an invasion of your rights, or, at all events, an Act offensive to you as citizens of Montreal. The hon. gentleman has adopted this course for the purpose of giving color to the position that he was opposing this measure, when in the same breath he admitted that it is to become law. How does he know it is to become law? Is it because he is aware that this matter has been fixed by the Government with their supporters? While some of them are pretending to oppose the measure—and they will, perhaps, vote against it—they have not arrayed against it the powerful influences of members of the Government. They have agreed, for the purpose of leaving them in the fat positions they have occupied so long, to swallow this obnox-

ious measure. The Minister of Public Works, a man who prides himself on being the defender of his race and religion, sits quietly in his seat. There is no man in this House who appreciates the honorable and lucrative position which he occupies more than he does, and if it is necessary that the Orange measure should pass, if it is a question as to whether the Orange Bill should pass or he should lose his office, he helps the Orangemen. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen opposite believe they are so firmly entrenched there, the seats are so soft, the positions are so nice, that it would take a hand-spike and many men to get them out. They will not go. They will swallow principle or anything else if they can hold those positions; yes, they will swallow an Orangeman if they can hold on to the position they like so well. I am sure the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has not given this matter consideration, or he is not acting with perfect frankness. If he had given this matter consideration he would know this: That the fact of the incorporation of this society by the Dominion Parliament does not over-ride the laws of the Province of Quebec. He is too astute a lawyer not to have seen that point. The Province of Quebec has a perfect right to say what societies and bodies of men shall march in the streets of the Province, shall carry flags, regalias and banners, and the passing of this Act does not confer on the Orangemen any greater rights than they have by the laws of Quebec as regards marching in the streets. As he is a clever lawyer, what can we think of the hon. gentleman who has introduced such an amendment? Is he throwing dust in the eyes of this House? What can be his possible motive in moving such an amendment, when he knows as a fact that the laws of the Province of Quebec—against party processions—and he knows as a fact they have a right to pass those laws—must over-ride this Act of incorporation, I say again, so far as the Orangemen of this country are concerned: if this House makes up its mind, that that body shall be incorporated, then I unhesitatingly hold they are entitled to every right, and to every privilege which any incorporated body in this country is entitled to. There should be no distinction, and there should be no exception. If the Legislature of the Province of Quebec thinks proper to say: We will not permit the parade, and marching, and exposure of banners and flags in party processions upon the public streets, that Legislature has a perfect right to say so and this Parliament has no power to enforce upon them in that regard, laws contrary to the laws they passed themselves. That being the case, it is amazing that the hon. gentleman should have introduced this resolution. The only conclusion I can draw from his action in this matter is, that he is pretending to be what in fact he is not. He is pretending to be opposed to this Act of incorporation, when in fact from the considerations I have offered he is not opposed to it. His opposition is colorable, not real. For these reasons I will oppose the amendment of the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. LAURIER. The time has passed, Mr. Speaker, to further consider this matter.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LISTER.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COOK. I beg to call the attention of the House to a question put by me on the 12th February, to the hon. Secretary of State, and his reply thereto. The question and answer were as follows:—

“Mr. COOK asked. Whether the P. LeSueur who draws \$1,024.30 for annual superannuation allowance is the same person who enjoys the combined offices of Civil Service Examiner and Secretary to the Examiners at a salary per annum of \$1,258.33? If so, is the arrangement to be continued?”

“Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. LeSueur is a superannuated officer, and therefore, cannot, by law, be compelled to do official duty except at a salary not lower than he received in his former position. He receives \$1,024 of superannuation, \$400 as a commissioner and \$700 as secretary of the commission for the Civil Service examinations. He receives a lower salary than he received when he was in office.”

I wish to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Secretary of State in this answer attempted to mislead the House, and to mislead the country. Mr. LeSueur does not receive as much now as he did before he was superannuated, by the sum of \$117.37. His salary before superannuation amounted to \$2,400, but there has been another Mr. LeSueur, whether a brother or a son I do not know, appointed in his place at the same salary of \$2,400. The country is, therefore, the loser to the extent of \$1,034.30. I hold that if this Mr. LeSueur, who has been superannuated, is fit to perform the duties assigned to him at the present time, he is quite able to perform the duties which he did before he was superannuated. He now receives a salary of \$2,282.63, and the whole thing shows that there is an attempt on the part of the Government to deal unjustly in this matter. I wish to cite this question particularly, because it is supposed that if a gentleman who was in the public service is superannuated, he is no longer fitted for his employment. We know that the present duties of Mr. LeSueur are more onerous than before he was superannuated, and that it requires a more capable and a stronger man to discharge them. This superannuation fund has largely increased since last year, and has reached such enormous proportions that the country is pretty sick of it. There was set apart, last year, \$240,240 for the purpose of superannuating men who are quite able to discharge their duties if they were not disturbed. I believe that the system is a pernicious one, and I for one would like to see it abolished. There are many men in the country who are working for far less salaries than these Government officials have, and who have to support large families, but not being Government employés, they have to do without a superannuation allowance. I wish particularly to draw attention to the fact that the intention of the Secretary of State, as shown by his answer, was an attempt to make the country believe that the services in this case were performed much cheaper than before this gentleman was superannuated, whereas the gentleman who occupies the same position as Mr. P. LeSueur is getting the same salary, and at the same time we have to pay the superannuated Mr. LeSueur nearly the same salary as he obtained before. The fact is, that by this change the country has to pay the salaries of two men instead of one, as previously.

Mr. McMULLEN, When the House rose at six o'clock, I was pointing out some reasons

why I considered it necessary that a change should take place in the superannuation system. I was drawing attention to the fact that Mr. Wallace, of Victoria, had been superannuated for the purpose of making room for a man who had been previously a member of this House. Now, I contend that this system of superannuating officials, in order to make room for others who are anxious to get offices, has been kept up too long in this country. I hold in my hand a statement showing the additions which have been made to the superannuation list during the last ten years. I find that in 1878 the number on the list was 272, while in 1888 it was 484, an increase in the ten years of 212. The amount paid for superannuations in 1878 was \$106,588.91, and in 1888, \$218,933.65, showing an increase in the ten years of \$112,344.74. It is quite clear that if this expenditure should continue to increase in the same proportion in the future, the drain on the resources of the people of this country will be very seriously increased year after year. I also hold in my hand a list of some of those who have been superannuated by hon. gentlemen opposite within the last ten years, and I will mention a few of them. Mr. William Agnew was 59 years of age when he was superannuated; he had a salary of \$1,200; he drew altogether for his services over \$30,000, and he receives a superannuation allowance of \$588 a year, having drawn from the superannuation fund altogether \$5,880. Mr. Bramley was superannuated when he was 68, he drew a salary of \$2,200, and is now drawing a superannuation allowance of \$1,121 a year, and he has drawn altogether \$11,211 of superannuation money. Mr. F. M. Passow was superannuated when he was 67 years of age; he had a salary of \$2,200, he drew altogether in salaries \$4,000, and he has drawn \$15,400 of superannuation money. Mr. Norris Godard was superannuated, in 1880, when he was 64 years of age, he received a salary of \$2,400, and he has drawn since 1880 \$16,800 of superannuation money. Mr. John Howe was superannuated in 1880 at the age of 62, he was drawing \$2,000 a year, and he has since drawn in superannuation money \$13,999. Mr. Joseph Lesslie was superannuated in 1881; he was formerly postmaster of the city of Toronto, and was superannuated to make room for a gentleman who was then on the editorial staff of the *Mail*, Mr. Patten, and since his superannuation he has drawn \$24,500. Mr. W. H. McRae was superannuated in 1881, when he was only 39 years of age, and since then he has drawn altogether in superannuation money \$5,050. Mr. Patrick, a person to whom I alluded before, who was formerly Clerk of this House and was drawing \$3,400 a year for a great many years, although he never paid a cent to the Superannuation Fund, has drawn from it since 1880 \$23,800. Mr. Leprohon, who was once deputy Clerk of this House, was superannuated in 1882, and since then he has drawn from the superannuation fund \$15,439, and I understand that he is still quite an active man. A great many of these men have been superannuated, not because they were incapable of performing their duties, but simply because there were some other persons pressing for the positions they occupied. Therefore I contend that as this system has been abused, it is the duty of this House to make a move towards doing away with it altogether. A system

of this kind is a source of political corruption and debauchery, as it is not used for the purpose it was originally intended, but is only abused. I considered it my duty to bring these cases before the House, and I think they contain sufficient evidence to convince any reasonable man that it is wrong to continue this system any longer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It does appear to me that something should be done with the superannuation system we have in this country. I, for one, as a Canadian, born and living in this country, do strenuously oppose, and will continue to oppose the superannuation of any person who resides out of this country. I think that is one of the greatest outrages in connection with the superannuation system. I believe it creates, on the part of the people, a good deal of heart-burning and discontent and envy towards the system. I feel certain that the people who live in this country and subscribe to its revenues will not be satisfied to superannuate people who leave the country to live in France, in the United States and other countries, and spend, in those countries, the money that belongs to the people of this country. I think it is high time that the Government should look to that branch of the superannuation service at any rate, and if those people who receive superannuation money cannot remain and live in this country, we should cease to grant the superannuation allowance to them.

Mr. KIRK. I agree with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this side with reference to the corrupt manner in which the superannuation system has been applied. I do not know upon what principle the Government apply the system, but this I do know, that it is applied very unfairly. It appears to me to be applied without rule or regulation at all, and simply with the view of finding positions for friends of the Government. A few years ago, I think in 1875, the Province of Nova Scotia was set apart as an inspection district for the purpose of fish inspection, and an inspector and a deputy inspector were appointed for that Province, including Cape Breton. The inspector received a salary of \$1,400, and his deputy \$800. Now, that inspector did his work faithfully and well until 1879, when he was dismissed, and no reason given for his dismissal but that of economy, the Government claiming that it was unnecessary to have an inspector for Nova Scotia. I maintain that, after having served in the office four years and faithfully performed his duties, if there was no use for an inspector he should have been superannuated, and given the benefit, at least, of the money that was taxed on his salary during those four years. But this was not done, and fair play was not meted out to him. But what became of the plea of economy? Within two years after, the Province of Nova Scotia was divided into two sections; Cape Breton was set apart, and an inspector appointed for Cape Breton at a salary of \$500, and one appointed for Nova Scotia at a salary of \$1,800 a year. Where is the economy? I have no fault to find with those inspectors who, so far as I know, have well and faithfully performed their duties; but I find this year that the inspector of Nova Scotia has been superannuated. I do not know whether it was because he was too old to perform his duties, but I doubt very much if that was the reason. I believe the true reason was because he

made a report to the Government on the question of sawdust which did not agree with the ideas of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—a report which that hon. gentleman suppressed. I believe, although I do not say it for a fact, that Mr. Rogers, after he made that report, was requested by the Government to resign or to accept a superannuation allowance, because in his report he claimed that sawdust did not kill fish. He was superannuated, and returns which have been laid on the Table so far do not show what amount of superannuation he received. But the Province has been again divided, and instead of one inspector for the whole Province of Nova Scotia, we have now two inspectors. The superannuation of Mr. Rogers made places for two played-out politicians supporting the Government, one of whom sat in this House for four years, and the other in the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia, and as they could no longer find seats they were given positions at the expense of this country. I suppose those two gentlemen will now report that sawdust does kill fish, and will continue to be an additional burden to the Dominion, so long as they agree with the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. This superannuation system ought to be abolished altogether, or else some rule should be laid down which would prevent any partiality in its application.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This superannuation system is assuming very serious proportions. In the case of persons who have been in the service of the Government and have become incapacitated by age or disability, there can be no objection to a reasonable allowance being given them during their declining years; but the mode in which the system is carried out is open to great objection. We find continually parties put on the superannuation list who are well competent to discharge their duties and others put in their places, thus entailing additional burdens on the country. In the Auditor's Report, we find that persons have been superannuated who are perfectly capable of performing their duties for years yet, and who are in fact doing work in other capacities just as onerous as those they filled under the Government. We find one gentleman who was pensioned off as a judge, and then appointed to the Senate, he being supposed to have sufficient ability to legislate for the people, but not sufficient to perform the duties of a judge. There are many instances in the Province from which I come of capable people being superannuated in order to make room for political adherents whom the Government wished to reward for political services. We all know the case of Mr. McNab, a young man, who, ten years ago, was pensioned off at a pension of some \$1,700 or \$1,800 a year, and who to-day is one of the engineers constructing the canal between Manchester and Liverpool, occupying a position which no one but a person of considerable ability in his profession would be allowed to fill. Instead of this system being applied, as it was intended, to make provision for those who may be incapacitated by age or infirmity, it is used as a means of providing places for Government supporters, and thus the country is saddled with the pensions of men whose services could have been retained with advantage and with the salaries of political supporters who are put in their places.

Mr. KIRK.

Mr. PERRY. I have the same complaints to make with regard to the manner in which the superannuation system is conducted in the Province from which I come, as hon. gentlemen who have preceded me have made with regard to their Provinces. I know of a man, Colonel John Duvar, the late Inspector of Fisheries for the Province of Prince Edward Island, than whom a more capable man for the business could not be found through the whole Dominion, who was superannuated without just cause. In fact one of the Ministers himself stated that he was a most competent official, and knew more about the fisheries than any other man in the service, and I believe the Government made use of his knowledge in establishing their hatcheries; yet this man, who was in full vigor, who travelled over the whole island in the discharge of his duties, who attended the courts to enforce the laws, and was a most active man in every respect, and who, when I saw him a few days ago, seemed in full health and vigor, was superannuated in order to make room for another gentleman. I believe that Colonel Duvar is now drawing a pension or a superannuation. If he is not, he ought to be. He is entitled to superannuation. I have yet to learn that the Government can show the House that Colonel Duvar was not able to perform his duties. I know he was capable, and that he did his duty well. He was dismissed simply to make room for a defeated candidate. He was shelved to gratify—I will not say what—but it is well known that Colonel Duvar was not removed from his office for incompetency. I suppose he was getting about \$1,200 a year, and, therefore, I suppose he is receiving a superannuation of \$400 or \$500. I condemn the system of superannuation altogether. It is a rotten system, and I find we are asked to vote \$220,000 a year of public money for the superannuation allowances of men who are for the most part well able to perform their duties. A few years ago, we found an official on the Prince Edward Island Railway, a young man of 38 years of age, who, on the statement that he had wrecked a train, through the negligence or parsimony of the Government, was superannuated, I suppose for fear that he would disclose some secrets against the Government, and he received a superannuation allowance of \$1,600 or \$1,800 a year. Is it right that the people should have taxes wrung from them to pay superannuations of this kind? How many farmers or tradesmen are superannuated, though they are men who have spent their time and worked hard to develop the resources of this country? The system is rotten. If the civil servants do not receive enough money to enable them to live and provide for the future, in the name of common sense increase their salaries; but do not adopt a system of superannuation which is got up simply for the purpose of enabling the Government to make room for defeated candidates—hungry seekers after office—and for that purpose they get rid of those who occupy the places, and make them these allowances for fear they might tell the secrets of the Government. The system is a bad one; and in a few years, instead of voting \$220,000, he will have to vote half a million for this purpose. This country should not be called upon to pay this amount or any of it, and I hope the system will soon fall to the ground.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It was my intention during the Session to move a resolution on going into Committee of Supply in order to obtain the view of the House on this question. I did not suppose that this would be reached so soon, but, as so much has been said on the subject now, it is just as well that we should express our opinions on this occasion instead of having to go over the subject again when the time comes for moving the resolution to which I have referred. In 1878, when Sir Charles Tupper did us the honor of attending a public meeting in Halifax, he occupied a considerable portion of the time in pointing out the extravagance of the Mackenzie Administration in adding \$10,000 or \$15,000 to the Superannuation Fund, and he read over the names of those who had been superannuated, and pointed out that, although nearly all of them were over sixty and most of them over seventy years of age, they could still do their duty, and it was, therefore, an outrage upon the taxpayers that they should be called upon to pay this amount. Well, the amount which the Mackenzie Administration placed upon the taxpayers of this country was very small indeed, in proportion to that which has been imposed upon them since. This item has now grown to such proportions, and the system has been abused in so many ways, that it is necessary that it should be placed fairly before the country so that they may realise in which way we are drifting. When the Government desire to obtain a situation for a political supporter or hanger-on, they are not, by any means, choice in the mode by which they seek to obtain it. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) has pointed out the means adopted in the case of Mr. Rogers, the fishery superintendent of Nova Scotia. He had been there for a long time, he was a very efficient officer, and he was at a time of life when, from his matured judgment and his experience, he was likely to be of great value to the fishing interests of that Province. But it happened that at that time there were two defeated candidates in Nova Scotia. One had occupied a position in this House at one time, Mr. Kinney of Yarmouth, and one had been a member of the Local Legislature, Mr. Hawken of Pictou. These had to be provided for, and the Government thought the best way to provide for them was at the public expense, by superannuating Mr. Rogers, and placing those two utterly untried, completely incapable men in these important positions. I say they were utterly incapable. They had no training or knowledge to fit them for the position. Even from their previous business or occupation, they had nothing to qualify them in any respect whatever for the position they filled in succession to Mr. Rogers; but the country, for that little exercise of Government patronage, had to bear the expense of Mr. Rogers' retiring allowance and the increased amount paid to these people. I have no doubt that, if hon. members were in the House to-night attending to the Estimates—and I am sorry to see the practice coming into use so much here that, when the Estimates come up, members think there is no necessity to attend here and leave the Chamber, though the Estimates are the most important part of our political duty here in guarding the interests of the country, and watching the disposition of the funds of the people—I have no doubt, I say, that,

if the members were here, everyone could turn over in his own mind some half dozen illustrations which would be applicable to the question under discussion. In my own experience I know of a considerable number. Reference has already been made to Mr. McNab, an engineer on the Prince Edward Island Railway, a very efficient man of 38 years of age. It was very well known in Nova Scotia why Mr. McNab was superannuated. There was never a doubt in the mind of anyone who took an interest in public matters there as to what was the reason which induced the Government to superannuate Mr. McNab. Mr. McNab had been engineer of the Pictou Railway at a time when the present High Commissioner, by a most arbitrary act, took it out of the hands of the original contractors, and for which he was denounced, in terms so strong, by the present member for Colchester (Sir Adams Archibald) in this House, and by the late member for Colchester as well, in terms which are familiar, no doubt, to almost every hon. member of this House. I say that Mr. McNab was engineer of the Pictou road, and it was very well understood that his connection with the road under the direction of the High Commissioner had been of such a character that it was eminently desirable that he should be out of the country, it was eminently desirable for Mr. McNab's connection with the High Commissioner in that direction, that he should be provided for elsewhere at the country's expense; so he was superannuated and went to London, and, as has been mentioned by the hon. member for St. John to-night, he is now consulting engineer on the canal between Liverpool and Manchester. Now, if there can be pointed out in this country a more glaring abuse of the powers of the Government than in superannuating Mr. McNab at the age of thirty-eight, and giving him \$1,600 a year for the term of his natural life, to be paid by the taxpayers of this country, I would like any hon. member to point it out. It is a thing that will live in the memory of everyone who takes an interest in public affairs, and it will live because of the circumstances associated with it to which I have referred, and which have given color to it. I may also say that in my own Province there are other cases of superannuation of an equally objectionable character. There was the collector at Weymouth, in the county of Digby (Mr. Stearns Jones). He was collector at \$600 a year, a man of about my own age, some ten or fifteen years younger than the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government; and I have no doubt that if the right hon. gentleman is able, as we are glad to see he is able, to discharge the high and responsible duties of his position, a man who was ten or fifteen years his junior at that time should have been able to discharge the not very onerous duties of collector at a very small seaport town. But his office was required for a political friend and he was superannuated, and another young gentleman of the same name, but belonging to the opposite side of politics that supports my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, was appointed in his place. The old collector is living, a hale and hearty man, and likely to remain so for many years. Then, again, there is Mr. Sydenham Howe, of Halifax, son of the late Hon. Joseph Howe. Mr. Howe was superannuated on the abolition of his office in connection with the Receiver General's Department. I do not object to Mr.

Howe, by any means, having his salary, or being given employment in the Government service; but what I object to is the fact that Mr. Howe was not transferred to some other branch of the public service in Halifax, where his services, which were valuable, would have been utilised. Mr. Howe was a young man, probably about forty or forty-five years old—although I do not know much about his age—and he has \$1,200 a year superannuation. Since that time there have been a great many vacancies in the custom house, post office, and other public departments in Halifax, in which the Government could have placed him, and saved the country the superannuation which they are now paying him. In addition to his \$1,200 a year, I find by the Public Accounts that he is now getting \$600 as an extra clerk in the post office. I do not object, I repeat, to his getting any salary that his services entitle him to, but I do object to that superannuation being given him at his time of life, when he could have been transferred to any other branch of the public service in Halifax, many of which branches have become vacant. But that would not satisfy the Government, or, I suppose, their supporters in that city. They wanted all these offices for their hangers-on, for the people that were pressing them for appointments, and the Government were, I will not say compelled, because they were willing instruments in this matter, the Government gave Mr. Howe his \$1,200 a year, and appointed some other person in his place. Now, we will take the case of Judge Gowan. Judge Gowan was an old judge of the county courts here. I have no doubt he was entitled to a pension for his services if he desired to retire, but if it has come to this, if the Senate is brought down to that position, that a person who is incapable of performing his duties in the position he had occupied is good enough for a Senator and a legislator, one of the men of this country who is to make our laws, one of the men whom people ought to look up to, then I think the Senate will fall very much indeed in the estimation of the people of this country. Then again, take the superannuation of County Court Judge Tremaine, of Cape Breton. Mr. Tremaine was a comparatively young man, and he was able to perform his duties, but when he was given to understand that if he would retire he would get \$1,600 a year for life without moving out of his little country village, he considered whether it would not be better for him to accept that annual sum and make way for another former member of this House, the present Judge Dodd, of Sydney, who, I have no doubt, makes a very good judge. These cases were all matters of arrangement, they were all so arranged that one might step out and another might step in, but the country had to pay the expense of it, in this case as in the others; and unless the people fully realise the abuse of this system they will never awaken to its enormity. Then again we have in this category the salary of \$1,600 a year to Judge Clark. Judge Clark was also a county court judge, a very able judge, I have always understood he was—I have not the pleasure of his acquaintance—but it seems he was required to fill a more lucrative position as legal adviser to the Canadian Pacific Railway, where report says he has a very handsome income of some \$15,000 or \$20,000 a year. Be that as it may, it is well known that he has a very large income as legal

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

adviser to that company. Now, would it be thought possible that under these circumstances a man in the prime of life, a man of his ability, knowledge and experience, who desired, not to retire on account of his health, not to retire on account of long services, or anything of that kind that the Government should have consented to the retirement of Judge Clark merely to enable him to take the position of legal adviser to the Canadian Pacific Railway at a much larger salary? I do think that every reasonable man in this country, when he comes to look at it, when he comes to see the Government a party to a transaction of that kind, cannot but feel indignation at this abuse of Governmental power and use of superannuation. If Judge Clark had been a man in ill-health, or an old man and required to retire, that would be a different matter. I repeat, without knowing very much about it, that his time of service may have entitled him to that favor, but when he asked for his retirement on the ground that he might take a more lucrative position, I do not hesitate to say here, that it was an abuse, a shameful abuse, of the powers which Government possesses in regard to this superannuation. The time will come when the people of the country must regard it in that light. I repeat, that on a later occasion, in Supply, we propose to offer a resolution condemning this system, and pointing out the abuses which have arisen under it. The discussion which has taken place to-night will obviate the necessity of any repetition at that time; but the House will see the ground on which we propose to base our resolution, and we will let the country see how the Government are increasing this amount and how they are abusing the power which the people have entrusted into their hands.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am very glad to hear the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), give notice that he intends, at a future day, to bring this matter before the attention of the House. It is one of the most important subjects that can engage the attention of hon. members, and it is a very proper one to bring forward. I have no doubt whatever that the question of superannuation is becoming a very important question to the people of this Dominion. The increase that has taken place within the last few years has been very alarming indeed, for the amount paid for superannuation has more than doubled in the last ten years, and it has now assumed such large proportions that it behooves us to see if we can adopt some system by which this large expenditure can be avoided. I do not intend, at this moment, to bring any charge particularly against this Government, because I think it is a system which has grown up gradually; but I hold that the time has arrived when some solution of the difficulty should be arrived at. When the superannuation system was first introduced it was supposed that the amount received from the civil servants would almost equal the sums paid out to them; but we find that during the last few years the amount has reached \$240,000 a year. That is a very serious expenditure. When we look over the public accounts and find name after name of men in receipt of large superannuation allowances for a few years' work in the public service, it must strike every well-wisher of this country that there is something altogether wrong in the system. If the case was

that of a man in receipt of an ordinary salary, who was disabled and not fit to perform his duties, it would not be so bad to give him a certain amount after many years of work to maintain him in his old age. But when we find comparatively young men, energetic men in the prime of life, who are still well able to perform all the duties devolving upon them, superannuated and other men appointed in their places, it points to a system that should not be tolerated a moment. I find, for example, that in 1887 G. W. Wicksteed, in receipt of a salary of \$3,400 a year, was superannuated at \$2,379 a year.

Mr. BOWELL. He is only about 90 years of age.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Again, J. B. Cherriman, who during many years drew a salary of \$4,000, was superannuated in 1885, and now draws \$1,759 for the rest of his life. Then there is J. W. Dunscomb, who was superannuated in 1883 after he had received for many years a salary of \$3,540. He now draws \$2,478 from the public chest. Then we find W. R. Mingaye, superannuated in 1887. He was only sixty-three years of age, and had been in receipt of a salary of \$3,800. He draws a superannuation allowance of \$2,508. Another, Lindsay Russell, who was superannuated in 1884, at only 43 years of age. He was receiving for a number of years \$3,200 a year, and he now draws a superannuation allowance of \$1,549. Reference has been made to Joseph Lesslie, late postmaster at Toronto. He was receiving a large salary for many years, and he now draws a superannuation of \$2,449. And so we might keep on reading name after name from the public accounts and might give instances of men who have been superannuated at thirty, forty, forty-five, fifty and fifty-five years of age and are now a burden on the people of the Dominion. As the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) intends to bring the subject forward at a future date I will not say more than this, that the time has arrived when the Government and this House should take a stand upon this question and should abolish superannuation. I see no reason whatever why men in the public service receiving large salaries should subsequently be saddled on the people and draw large superannuation allowances. No such system prevails in the business community, and if it is not adopted by our bankers and other business men, there is no reason why it should be pursued by the Government of this country. I sincerely hope that some step will be taken to arrive at a solution of this question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I desire to add a few words to what has been said on this question. I look upon the superannuation system as a very bad one, and the more I examine it the more I am convinced that the system should be abolished. Instead of the system having been curtailed during recent years, it has been extended; last year it was extended to the North-West Mounted Police and also to the lumber cutters in the Province of Quebec. In fact I believe, that if we obtained the private opinions of the majority of the members who support the Government, we will find that they desire to return to the system which obtained previous to 1871. I was told last year by a Conservative member, that he knew about thirty members of the party who would like to vote for

the abolition of the superannuation fund, if they only had liberty to do so. Permit me to give an instance or two, of the abuse of this system. I do not wish it to be understood that I contend that the present Government has been the only guilty party, because the system is of such a character that if used by any Government, there would be such influence brought to bear upon it by outside parties interested in getting positions, that it might be constrained at times to act against its own judgment. I know a gentleman, named John Gordon, who was superannuated from the London Post Office, when he was only fifty-six years of age. He was in the post office, according to his own statement, for thirty years, and he was as sprightly, as lively, and as capable of discharging his duties when he was superannuated, as he was thirty years ago. He is at the present time engaged in another business in the city of Toronto, and he was superannuated for the purpose of making room for another person to take his place. Since his superannuation, he has drawn between three and four thousand dollars, at \$600 a year, and he is just as capable to-day of discharging his duties in the post office in the city of London, as he was at any time during his service. We all know something about Mr. Joseph Lesslie, of Toronto, who held the important position of postmaster of that city for thirty-five years, and who, when he was superannuated, was a robust, healthy and vigorous gentleman of sixty-four years of age. In fact, he said himself, when he was offered superannuation, that he was just as capable of discharging the duties devolving upon him in the post office, as he was at any time during his life. However, an outside gentleman, who was making application for the position, brought such pressure to bear on the Government that it superannuated Mr. Lesslie, and opened the position for him. That gentleman was a strong political supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. He was at one time a journalist, and he wrote very strongly for the Government, and thus he got his reward. Mr. Joseph Lesslie is living at the present day, in good health and well able to attend to his business. Since he has been superannuated, he has drawn nearly \$20,000 from the Government, and the Postmaster appointed in his stead has drawn \$30,000, making the expenses of that post office, during the last nine years, about \$50,000. Let me give you the case of Mr. Gilbert McMicken of the city of Winnipeg. He was sick some years ago, and was superannuated on account of his sickness. Afterwards he got well, ran successfully for a constituency in Manitoba and was elected. He was appointed Speaker of the Local House. Then he was drawing three salaries. One of \$1,579 for superannuation, \$1,000 as Speaker of the Assembly, and \$500 for his indemnity, and all because he was too sick to discharge the duties of the office he held under the Government. I ask, is not that an abuse of the superannuation system? I see the hon. Minister of Customs taking a note, and he will, in all probability, tell me that Gilbert McMicken was superannuated under the late Government. I do not care a fig under what Government they are superannuated, for it only shows that the system is bad which will enable any Government to superannuate persons who are not entitled to superannuation. Again, we pay \$4,300 for the superannuation of Clerks of this House. Mr.

Alfred Patrick receives \$2,400 a year, Mr. Leprohon \$1,558, if I remember aright, and there is another superannuated assistant clerk receiving \$400. That is \$4,300 for which this House receives no value whatever. I believe it would be in the interest of the Government, as I am sure it would be in the interest of the country, to have this Act repealed, and to allow these men to earn their money as other people do. If they fail during their service to provide a competency for their families, they are only placed in the same position as other clerks engaged in the various departments of business life. The farmers of the constituency which I have the honor to represent are every day working just as hard in the interests of the country as any civil servant, and if at the age of forty, fifty, or sixty years they fail to make a competency for themselves, is the Government going to come to their rescue and say that it is prepared to maintain them and their families during the balance of their lives. I do not think the Government is prepared to say so. The whole system is wrong, and the sooner we set it right the better for the Government themselves, and the better for the country. I am very glad that my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) intends to move a resolution in this direction. I shall support it by my vote with the greatest degree of satisfaction.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What pension does Mr. Wallace, the late postmaster at Victoria, receive altogether?

Mr. HAGGART. His superannuation is \$672, and \$240 added. He was superannuated on the 1st January, 1887, on the recommendation of my predecessor, Mr. McLelan. He had fourteen years' service, and his salary was \$2,400 a year. The allowance on that would be \$672, and he was recommended, I think, to have five years added.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What age is Mr. Wallace?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know at present, but you will find it in the Auditor General's Report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Auditor General's Report fails to give the age, which it would be desirable it should do.

Mr. HAGGART. Last year it gave the age.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to call attention to this, because it is inconvenient not to have the ages given. What was the cause of Mr. Wallace's superannuation?

Mr. HAGGART. All I know is that he was recommended for superannuation by my predecessor, on 23rd November, 1887, after fourteen years' service.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Who is the present postmaster of Victoria?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Shakespeare.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). A former member of this House.

Salaries, Militia Branch and District Staff.....	\$12,400
--	----------

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason of the decrease of \$1,700?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The decrease was caused by the fact that one of the deputy-adjutants general was not replaced. The vacancy was created by the death of Colonel Lamontagne, and Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

I followed the practice in that instance, which I had followed in regard to other districts, in putting it under the control of the commandant of the Military School at St. John's, Quebec, charging him also with the administration of Military District No. 6.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that case, what allowance is made to the officer who discharges the duty?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. About \$300 a year. In these cases I allow what is considered to be the allowance which the Deputy Adjutant would have been entitled to for travelling, inspecting, &c. In that way we save a whole salary.

Ammunition, Clothing and Military Stores.....	\$200,000
---	-----------

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I noticed in a paper lately, a synopsis of some of the reports from the different military districts, several of which found fault with the ammunition. In one district it was said the ammunition would not reach half the way to the target, and some other very strong expressions were made use of with reference to it. That is a very regrettable condition of affairs. I should like to ask if it has been brought to the notice of the Department, and, if so, whether any steps have been taken to remedy it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The expressions were very strong; I have seen some of them, but they were not warranted by the facts. The results of the last meeting of the Dominion Rifle Association here, showed that the Quebec Cartridge Factory is a success in every respect; and I can tell the hon. gentleman that I have received, privately and officially, from several officers who take a prominent part in Rifle Associations, letters stating that they were thoroughly satisfied that we had arrived at such a state of perfection that our Canadian cartridges might be said to be equal to any that had been imported.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. Minister's statement is not very complimentary to the commanding officer of the district who made the complaint, because he implies that the commanding officer did not know what he was writing about, or was entirely in error. Does the hon. Minister mean to say that the officers who made that complaint were not competent judges of the value of the ammunition furnished to them when they were conducting their usual target practices? Seeing how strong the expressions were, and coming from the source they did, I supposed the hon. gentleman would hardly have applied to them the words he has. I would hardly like to think that he has in his service commanding officers so incapable of judging the ammunition supplied to them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is difficult for me to know, unless the hon. gentleman specifies the commanding officers he refers to. If he can point out to me any commanding officers in the service who have expressed strong opinions on the cartridges manufactured at Quebec, I am ready to take up the case and discuss it with him; but when he speaks of commanding officers and asks me whether I have confidence in them, I cannot answer him unless he specifies them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can mention one case. I see on page 22 of the hon. gentleman's

own report that Capt. McLean, musketry instructor, reports as follows:—

“The poor quality of the ammunition also interfered with accurate shooting; 2 per cent. of it was worthless, it being impossible to explode it, and 5 per cent. dropped short.”

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He must have been unfortunate in falling upon some old cartridges, which must have been served out instead of those which have been manufactured at Quebec, and which were considered so good at the last meeting of the Rifle Association. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there have been no complaints except possibly a few; the consensus of opinion being that the cartridges manufactured in Canada are equal to the English cartridges, and I think we have a report stating that they are superior to any that we have imported from England. But it very often happens, as the hon. gentleman knows, that old cartridges get mixed up with the new ones in the stores, or while being sent from one district to another.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The subject of clothing is one which, I think, the House should ventilate again. We had a pretty full discussion of this subject last year, when it was shown by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that we were paying 55 per cent. more for the clothing made in Canada than the army clothier in England offered to supply it for. It also appeared to be a fact, which was well known before, that the Imperial clothing, on the whole, was very much better than the Canadian clothing, as regards material, style and color. The hon. Minister reported that the supply of clothing by Canadian contractors continues to give satisfaction; and then he added, with charming *naïveté*, that the extension of the contracts for three years, had had a good effect. A good effect, I suppose, for Messrs. Sanford & Co., O'Brien & Co., Shorey & Co., and two or three other Canadian firms, who, by the continuance of this system, have taken just \$50,000 out of the Government of this country. We are asked to-night to vote \$90,000, and if the hon. gentleman will calculate 55 per cent. on that amount, he will see that \$50,000 is what he is paying Canadian manufacturers in preference to importing the superior article from the mother country. I think the country will recognise that this is rather an expensive operation to the taxpayers, and though the system will no doubt continue while the present Administration occupies the Treasury benches, I think the people will, when given the opportunity, express their disapproval of this system of paying so large an amount to the manufacturers in this country, when we can import better clothing from the army clothiers of England at fifty-five per cent. less. I need not emphasise that point any more. The fact was admitted before the Committee, and cannot be contradicted now, that as regards style, material, color and cheapness the Imperial clothing is far preferable to that contracted for. When, therefore, the hon. gentleman said that the extension of the contract for three years has had a good effect, he must mean it has had a good effect on those manufacturers who are known to be so ready at election times to contribute to election funds.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman has spoken of admirable *naïveté*, and he has

shown himself possessed of that quality to a very great extent, when he expects this House to put faith in the statements he has made concerning what took place last Session. This matter was thoroughly ventilated last Session, and ventilated in such a manner that the witnesses brought forward by the gentlemen who were attacking the administration of the Militia Department, stated themselves that the Imperial goods were nothing else but rubbish as compared with the goods manufactured in Canada.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, and the hon. gentleman was present in Committee when this evidence was given by the very witnesses who were brought forward to run down Canadian goods. This is no time to discuss the advantages or disadvantages of the National Policy, and I do not wish to be drawn into a discussion of that subject, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that a three years' contract is a great advantage. The hon. gentleman was not long enough in the Department to see the advantages of a three years' contract. That system was adopted upon the report of such men as Col. Macpherson, and men of vast experience in the stores of our Canadian service. These men stated that if we changed our contractors every year we would be taking each year men who had no experience and had not all the machinery required for the purpose. The reports show, and these reports were submitted to that great Committee of investigation, which was going to destroy the utility of every officer in the Militia Department, not excepting the head of the Department, that since the three years' contract system had been introduced the goods were far superior to what they were before; and the reason is quite obvious. If, for instance, you were to give a contract for ten years, it would become the interest of the manufacturer to improve his machinery and make it as perfect as possible, just as in Pimlico you find the most perfect machinery, because the manufacturers there manufacture not only for England but for the continental armies also, so that, having standing contracts all the time, they can afford to make every improvement. This applies also in a lesser degree to the system we have introduced into Canada. This system permits a man who is desirous of doing justice to his contract to lay out a certain amount of money to purchase the machinery required to carry it out to the best advantage; and I can tell the hon. gentleman that every manufacturer with whom I have discussed the system has told me that the vicious side of our system was that we gave contracts only for one year. We had such a long discussion on this subject last year, and the circumstances not having changed since, I will not take up the time of the House by entering further into the question.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has not touched the question of cost. He has merely referred to that portion of it relating to the quality. I admit frankly there was a discrepancy of opinion with regard to the quality of Imperial clothing as compared with the Canadian clothing, but on the whole the preponderance of testimony was in favor of the Imperial, as it naturally would be. The hon. gentleman will remember that evidence was given by the officers of the Queen's Own, the crack re-

giment of Toronto, to show that they would not take the Canadian clothing at a low price, but imported their own clothing from England, because it was a better material and a better fit, and the hon. gentleman will remember also that on that occasion it was shown that there were eleven military boards held in different parts of this Dominion, and that all of them condemned his clothing. Now, those military boards surely had no object in view in condemning the clothing supplied by the Government, if it was good. The hon. gentleman cannot pretend that these military boards, consisting of military men, doubtless of both political parties, were animated by any desire to destroy the reputation of Canadian clothing. I have no doubt that the vast majority of the officers composing them were supporters of this Administration; still with an unanimity unparalleled they condemned the Canadian clothing. If such was the opinion of these gentlemen, the fact remains beyond doubt that we are paying \$50,000 a year for the advantage of getting this clothing in Canada. Even admitting, for the sake of argument, that it was as good as Imperial clothing—which I think will hardly be contended—I would ask is it worth while to continue paying \$50,000 a year for the benefit of two or three clothing firms in this country. The hon. gentleman says the question was discussed fully last year. I admit it; but the hon. gentleman made a statement last year which was entirely inaccurate, because he said, in his speech in reply to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that the Imperial army clothiers only gave a quotation, and did not offer to furnish the goods at that rate. The hon. gentleman will remember.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not remember that.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Probably not.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman what I did say.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman stated in his speech that they only gave a quotation but did not offer to supply the goods at that price, and yet I have the letter before me in which they say: "We shall be happy to receive your esteemed orders at the price we have given." It comes down to this: that we are paying \$50,000 a year to put that money into the pockets of a few Canadian manufacturers, and that is what I want the House and the country to understand.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I cannot speak as to the price of the clothing. That should be settled by the Minister or his assistants as to the difference between the price of the clothing manufactured in this country, and the English clothing, to which, I think, in fairness to the Canadian manufacturers, should be added the duty with which the Government should charge themselves. But, as to the quality of the clothing, I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones, Halifax) when he speaks of the quality being condemned by the boards, refers to issues of some years ago. The clothing was condemned at that time, and it was of an inferior quality, but a marked improvement has taken place, and, speaking as a volunteer officer, I do not think there is any complaint whatever now in regard to the clothing. In fact, everyone who has anything to do with it is very well satisfied with
Mr. JONES (Halifax).

it. It is quite up to the standard of the clothing we used to obtain from England. The cloth is of an excellent texture—strong and good. The scarlet dyes, which were so difficult to get at first, and which it was so difficult to put into the cloth, have been obtained at considerable expense, I believe, to the manufacturers, and I do not think the coloring now compares unfavorably with that of the English goods. When the samples were shown here last year, the representatives of the Queen's Own were satisfied, and their master-tailor who was here at the time, admitted that, if that was a specimen and if that was to be the Canadian tunic in future, he had no complaint to make. That is owing to the fact that a trial has been given to the Canadian manufacturers, and that they have succeeded should be a source of great satisfaction to the people of Canada, as we know that the money is expended in this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say that it is the most preposterous thing I ever heard, to state that the Government of Canada are bound to charge duties for the clothing imported for the use of the volunteers of Canada. It is important that the best clothing possible should be issued to the volunteers, but there is no possible ground for charging a duty upon it unless for the purpose of putting money into the pockets of Sanford & Co., and others of that kind, who send the money back again to the Government for corrupt purposes.

General LAURIE. I was for some time on the militia staff, and, therefore, know something about this matter, and, when I hear a charge brought against the Militia Department that the clothing boards condemned certain clothing and, therefore, the Department is to blame, I think the charge is most unfair. These boards must have been assembled under the instructions of the Minister of Militia. Without instructions from headquarters they would not assemble, so this shows that the Department was exercising a proper supervision in asking these boards to meet and pronounce upon the quality of the clothing. Instead of deserving blame, the Department deserves credit, as it has, in this way, protected the interests of the country.

Mr. DENISON. In my corps, the clothing has always been good, and we have no fault to find with it. I have much pleasure in saying so.

Drill Instruction.....\$40,000

Mr. CASEY. This item has been discussed year after year, and the Minister has admitted that it is an improper and absurd one. He knows very well that the cheques which are issued nominally for drill instruction are issued to the officers of companies, who do not instruct their men at all except when in camp, and that the amount, instead of being paid for drill instruction, is handed over to the band fund or to some other fund for regimental purposes, unless the officer chooses to pocket it himself without having rendered any service for it. This is the sixth year that I have referred to it. What I contend is that the amount should be charged to the band fund or the extra care of armories, or anything of that kind to which it is devoted, and should not appear under the head of drill instruction.

Public Armories and care of Arms, &c. \$60,000

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I should like to ask the Minister what preparation he or the Gov-

ernment is going to make in reference to the drill shed at Kingston. The one there now will pass away from the possession of the Government on the 1st July next, and no arrangement has been made, as far as I know, to provide any place for the local volunteer corps to drill in or to provide armories for them. I called attention to this matter last year, and I hope that, in the Supplementary Estimates, we will find a vote to provide for this. It is a very small encouragement to officers and men if they do not find suitable accommodation, and if the Government do not provide armories and drill sheds for volunteer battalions, those battalions must go down. I understand that the city of Kingston has offered to give a very suitable piece of land adjoining the Artillery Park, in exchange for a piece of land which is not of much value adjoining the Central School. I do not know whether that offer has been accepted or not. We have had no public intimation of what steps have been taken by the Government, but I now ask the Minister to tell us, and I hope he will be able to give a satisfactory answer, and to state that a suitable place has been found for the volunteers of Kingston.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This question is one which has already engaged the attention of the Government. I cannot exactly say what will take place, but, probably, my hon. friend will see the result of our deliberations when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What does the Minister intend to do with the drill shed and armory in the town of Chatham? He will remember that last year when the Estimates were voted, he promised that he would fix up the armory and the drill shed in the town of Chatham, which are in a very bad state and quite untenable. The armory has fallen to pieces and is no place for keeping arms or clothing in at all; they would be utterly destroyed if left there. I think if it is the intention of the Minister to keep up the battalions throughout the country, at least a place ought to be provided wherein they could drill, and where they could keep their clothing and arms properly. I would also like to ask the Minister about another matter to which I have frequently called his attention, and that is the claim of Capt. Coogan of the 24th Battalion. The Minister will remember the case. Capt. Coogan, finding that the armory was utterly unfit to keep the arms and clothing in, two years ago rented a building to which he removed all the clothing and arms of the battalion. For this building he has been obliged to pay a rent of \$40 a year; he has put in a claim to the Minister, and I think the Minister ought to entertain it. It is a trifling matter, but it is a just claim, and the man ought to be reimbursed for the amount of the rent. If he had not rented this place, of course the clothing and arms of the whole battalion would have become utterly unfit for use.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. About the claim of Capt. Coogan, I may state to the hon. gentleman, that it has engaged the attention of the Department. It is true that it was represented to the Department, that Capt. Coogan had rented a place for the purpose of securing the clothing and arms of his company, but the hon. gentleman must remember that he is getting from the Government \$40 a year for that purpose. Each company

gets \$40 a year for the identical purpose for which Capt. Coogan rented that place and paid \$40. I think he was merely doing his duty and nothing more. The question of the drill shed is an important one from the standpoint of the force in the hon. gentleman's constituency. I can say that there is an estimate this year to make the necessary repairs in the drill shed, so that it may become a fit place for storing clothing and arms. I would not like to be discourteous to my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) in not referring to the question he has asked. He and I have already discussed that point. He says five years. I would not be sure about that. We have discussed it more than once, but the hon. gentleman admits himself that it is more technical than anything else. From his experience of military matters, I know he would be very loth to withdraw the \$40,000 from the force. If I understand his argument it is merely a question of putting it under a different heading. The deputy has taken a note of it, and it is possible that we may change some items, but not many. There are some items that cannot be changed, as the hon. gentleman will understand. Now, this \$40,000 is used for several purposes: drill instruction, allowances to officers commanding corps of active militia under the Militia Regulations of 1887, paragraphs 390 and 395, 18 batteries at \$200 each, making \$3,600. That is for real drill instruction. Then 650 companies of garrison artillery, infantry and cavalry, receive each \$40 a year. I know it to be a fact that, in some instances, some portion of that \$40,000 may have been utilised for bands. The hon. gentleman knows the difficulty and trouble encountered by officers who wish to keep their force up properly, and I think a small encouragement of that kind can be allowed. Our force is always very ready to turn out whenever the citizens require, and I think we cannot refuse them this small amount. There is an allowance to commanding officers of rural battalions for battalion instruction, 416 companies at \$25 each.

Mr. CASEY. They do not give the instruction.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. They get a great deal of instruction. In other countries the instruction which our men get would cost a great deal more than it costs in Canada, and the corps which do not get annual drill are entitled to only one-half the allowance for drill instruction. I have told the hon. gentleman how it is made up in our estimates, and it is a matter that may be easily adjusted. If the hon. gentleman would suggest the changes which he considers could be properly and conveniently made, I have no objection to it, provided the \$40,000 will cover the expenses.

Mr. O'BRIEN. On several occasions I have called the attention of the Minister and the House to this particular item, and suggested a way by which I think justice might be done. I contend that this money being given properly for drill instruction, ought to be so given that the lazy man who does nothing should not be in the same position as the active man who does a great deal. Speaking for myself and from my own knowledge of the force, I know that of the captains who have been under my command a certain number have steadily and regularly devoted their attention to keeping up their companies, and have always given as much instruction as it was possible for

this small sum. On the other hand there are many others who, whenever they do anything, do as little as they can. I, as the officer commanding a battalion, have no power over these men; under the present system I can do nothing. I have no check over this allowance, and have no power to deal with the lazy man, or to make him do his work and earn his money as the other man does. I have suggested to the Minister on two or three occasions, so often, indeed, that I am almost ashamed to mention it again, that if he would only adopt a system, which could easily be carried out, of giving this grant according to efficiency, we would stand on a very much better footing and we would get rid of a great many officers of the force who seem to remain in it for the sake of this small fee, and whose only sacrifice is the time of going to camp. Now, if such officers were compelled to give to their companies the care and the attention which others give to them voluntarily, they could either do their duty or we could get rid of them. When the regiment comes to camp, all we have to do is for the officer commanding the brigade or battalion to appoint a board of two or three officers to go through the different battalions and inspect each company in rotation. One company could be inspected in this manner in twenty minutes or less, so many sections of company drill, so many sections of squad drill, so much manual exercise and firing exercise. The men should be tested that way, and if a half or one-third of the men were found to reach a certain standard of efficiency the officer should have a certificate and get his money, and if he had not done his duty efficiently then he should not get it. Every time the regiment goes to camp that system could be carried out without any difficulty. We would then get rid of what is an unpleasant thing, the knowledge that careless and lazy officers stand on the same footing as those who are efficient. Of course it could be done much better if the whole force was drilled every year, as it might be, I think, if the Government would only make up their minds to ask this House and the country for the small additional sum necessary to drill the whole force. There are members of this House who occasionally speak sneeringly of the militia, but the best test of the popularity of the force is to be found in the fact that if the Minister, even in the discharge of a public duty, finds it necessary to interfere with the existence of a rural corps, he soon finds a hornet's nest round his ears. Why? Because the force is so popular, and because each county has so much interest in its own regiment that it will not allow the regiment to be interfered with even, although it may appear to be necessary. This is evidence which should convince the Minister that he should ask the House to vote such additional sum as may be necessary to drill the whole force every year, and that such sum would be readily granted and the country would never grudge it, and, therefore, no man need be afraid to vote cheerfully for such appropriation. I think the Minister will admit that such a measure would be cheerfully voted by this House, and I can assure him that the country would back him up in submitting such a proposition. It would relieve us from a very great difficulty that stares us in the face. If a man is enrolled during a year his regiment is not going to camp, his three years' service would have expired and he would have attended only one drill. So

Mr. O'BRIEN.

the money is practically thrown away. Another suggestion is this: additional pay should be given to men who have served three years. At present a man who attends one drill is on the same footing as a man who has been ten years on the force, and is a thoroughly efficient man. Some little alteration in this particular, which would cost a comparatively trifling sum, would immensely increase the efficiency of the force. I wish to say a few words in regard to the clothing, as I did not happen to be present when that item was passed. Without any reference to past transactions or complaints, I am satisfied, from a careful inspection of the clothing now in use, that the clothing department is as good I think as it is possible to make it, and the Minister need not be ashamed of the clothing of the force. I desire to call attention to another very important matter. Every one acquainted with the force is aware that there is not a single regiment now equipped for active service. What I would suggest to the Minister is, not that he should go to any great expense in this direction, but that he should set aside \$5,000 a year, and in three or four years he would be in a position to obtain proper equipment. He could obtain an equipment either made in this country or an equipment in use in the Imperial service, and \$5,000 a year for a few years would make a good beginning, and in the course of some years the force would be well equipped. As the matter now stands, the force is not in possession of proper means to go into the field, especially in view of our rifles. There is no proper method of carrying ammunition by the men of the force, and it is no use to give men even Sniders unless you have a proper method of carrying ammunition. I wish the Minister would make up his mind to adopt these two suggestions: first, to ask the House for a sufficient sum to drill the force every year; and, second, to set aside a small sum each year for the purpose of procuring the necessary equipment. On examining the clothing the other day, I found a new pattern patrol jacket for some of the permanent corps. The hon. gentleman would save a good many thousands of dollars if he would supply the force in future, at all events to a certain extent, with that class of clothing. This new jacket costs one-half the sum charged for the regulation tunic, and it would be very much better for our service to have this new garment introduced, and not only would a great saving be effected, but it would contribute to the convenience and comfort of the men. There is one point of equipment remaining a difficulty, and that is the head-dress. We have no proper one at present. The forage caps may be good in England, but they are unsuitable either in barracks or in camp here, and considering that a good helmet can be got for \$1.25, I think the Government should make a commencement of the issue of helmets. All these suggestions mean money, but it must be expended if we are to have a force in reality and not in name, and if we are to make the service one which the country will heartily support.

Mr. DENISON. I desire to add a word in regard to the drilling of the militia every year. I agree that the Minister of Militia should take this subject into his serious consideration. The present custom is to drill the city corps every year and the rural corps every other year, or, as the member

for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien said, every third year, which frequently happens, I believe. This, of course, places the rural corps at a great disadvantage. Of course, as I represent a city corps, we are not affected by it; but taking an interest in the whole militia system, I think it is most trying to the officers commanding the rural corps to keep up their corps when drill comes only every other year. I hope the Minister of Militia will impress this matter on the Government, and the Government will see fit to increase the Estimates this year to a sufficient amount to ensure that all the militia of Canada be drilled this year. In order to show that this would be a popular movement, if that has any weight with the Government, I may mention that in many parts of Ontario we find the county councils voting sums of money to assist in maintaining the county battalions. That shows the great interest they take in those battalions, and their readiness to aid in a popular movement, because if they did not think it was a popular movement the county councils would not assist the corps. I can instance the case of the county of York, within which my constituency lies, and notwithstanding the character that attaches to that council of being the meanest and richest county in Ontario, the members have more than once granted money to the county battalion. It is the best proof that can be given that such a change would be popular, and that the expenditure would be approved by the people. I hope this year, and if possible next year, the Government will place a sufficient sum in the Estimates to drill all the militia force in Canada.

Mr. BARRON. Unlike my hon. friend who has just spoken, I represent a constituency where there is a rural battalion, and I can tell the Minister that there is intense dissatisfaction among the volunteers in my district on account of the fact that they are not called out annually. We might as well dispense altogether with the expenditure on the rural corps if we are not going to call them out yearly. The result of the present system is, that when they are called out the officers have to go around the country to get recruits to attend the drill. Before the next time for drill comes round those who were in the ranks have left and a new set of men have to be got, and the result of this is that discontent is caused among the rural battalions. I feel sure of this, that if we are not going to have the rural battalions called out annually, or every two years at all events, the money expended is just so much wasted and might as well be thrown into the sea.

General LAURIE. I cannot agree with my hon. friend who has just addressed the Committee. I consider the rural battalions are marvellously efficient for the time they are able to give to the service. I do not hesitate to say it; but at the same time it is very unfair, to both officers and men, that the rural corps should be only called out once every second or third year, thereby placing them at an immense disadvantage compared with their comrades of the city corps. An examination of the Estimates show that \$1,288,000 are spent in all on the militia, of which only \$250,000 are expended on the men of the force, the balance, practically one million, being required to work the machine by which the men who receive \$250,000

are drilled. That is the position of affairs. For that sum we get 20,000 men drilled. Give another \$150,000 and you can drill 40,000 men. You can double your force by simply adding that small amount to the large expenditure—that is comparatively large as to the number of men drilled—which we make on the militia. I, therefore, feel bound to add my voice to those of the hon. members who have spoken, urging that the rural battalions shall be trained every year. I believe it to be of excessive importance to the country that these battalions, so ready as they proved to be in 1885 and previous years, shall be made as efficient as possible.

Mr. HESSON. I fully concur in all that has been said on behalf of the rural battalions, for I think that it is of very great importance to Canada that they should receive the countenance and support of the Government. As has been pointed out by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, much more is expended on the machinery than in preparing the men for the patriotic work which may devolve upon them in discharge of their duties as soldiers in the field. As has been pointed out by some hon. gentlemen, there is very great difficulty indeed in getting young men to enter into the spirit and enthusiasm which should actuate a successful corps, in consequence of the fact that they are simply sent out for a few days in the year, and then not treated as liberally as they should be. I believe that the increased expense would be amply repaid to the country by a more generous treatment of our volunteer forces. I know that the feeling of the counties in western Ontario is, pretty generally, that the volunteers are badly paid, and in many of the counties they contribute something in addition to the Government grant. That principle has not extended to all counties, as some are not so liberal as the others, but I regret that it is not the custom everywhere, as I also regret that the Government do not pay the men better. We should remember that it is purely from patriotic feelings that these young men abandon in many cases lucrative employments, to pursue their drill for twelve days of the year. The country battalions suffer under many serious inconveniences, and I hope that the Government will put the Minister of Militia in possession of sufficient funds to improve their condition. It has come to be a question whether or not the training of some half of the battalions should not be abandoned, but I believe it would be a most injudicious course to reduce the force for the purpose of saving a small sum of money; \$100,000 may seem a large sum, but when we consider that it is to build up in this country a force necessary to protect its honor, and to form the nucleus of a great national militia, I do think it is the duty of the Government to provide sufficient funds to keep the force already enrolled in active existence. I am satisfied that the best portion of our militia will be found among the country battalions, when they are called into service. They are composed of men who have immense endurance, great fortitude, and a wonderful ability to undergo fatigue, and their experience of country life suits them beyond all others for the duties of volunteers. I think that, to be niggardly with our militia force, would be a very unwise policy for the Government to pursue. I am sure the sympathy of the Minister of Militia must be with the

rural battalions, and I trust the Government will supply him with the means of placing them on a proper footing.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am glad that the Minister of Militia has proposed an estimate for repairing the armory and drill shed in the town of Chatham, and I am sure that in doing so he is acting not only in the interests of the battalion but in the interests of the whole country. In reference to the claims of Capt. Coogan, I may say that I am aware that \$40 a year is allowed to the captain of each company, but I understand that this is given to be expended on the cleaning and taking care of the armories. The Government is, in addition, supposed to provide a place for the company to drill, and where their arms and accoutrements can be stored. In the town of Chatham there has been no place provided by the Government. The armory was in such a state that, for the last two or three years, it was impossible to keep the arms and clothing there; and, therefore, the captain either had to remove the arms to another place or allow them to be destroyed. It was for the purpose of storing the accoutrements that Capt. Coogan rented this building. He did it at his own expense. He has been in the habit of drilling his company there, and now he only asks that the Government should recoup him the very moderate rent of \$40 a year. I think that, under these circumstances, the Minister should not hesitate to pay this small claim. Capt. Coogan is one of the most efficient and patriotic officers in the service. He has been a long time in the volunteer force, and I believe that previous to that he was for a number of years in the British Army. He is one of the most faithful and enterprising officers in the militia service. He has taken good care of the arms and clothing; he has kept his company together, and he has drilled them frequently, and as a result of his energy the company has been a credit to the volunteer force whenever they have been called out for duty. I think it would be a very great hardship indeed if the Minister of Militia would not recoup him for the rent of that building. He provided this place for the comfort of the men and for the safe-keeping of their accoutrements, and his enthusiasm should be acknowledged. I do not believe there is another company, in Ontario so situated as the 24th Battalion.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Lots of them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. gentleman knows better than I do, but if there is any battalion so situated as the 24th, I must say that they ought to be better treated by the Government and by the country. It is unfair that Capt. Coogan should be expected to supply a place in which the arms and clothing of the battalion should be safely kept. This claim to which I refer to is a very small matter, and I sincerely hope that the Minister of Militia will see the necessity of making a small allowance for that purpose.

Mr. ELLIS. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to what appears to me to be a very great lack of competency on the part of the persons who control the camps. The matter came to my attention specially in consequence of a serious outbreak of illness at the camp at St. Andrews. In looking through the militia reports I find that there has been a great deal of mismanagement or carelessness on the part of those persons, which has resulted in

Mr. HESSON.

a great deal of sickness among the men. While we hear much about calling out the country militia once a year, it seems to me that the damage which is likely to be done to the health of the country, if these reports are of any value, should be taken into account as largely counterbalancing the benefit of the camps. For instance, the medical officer of the Loudon camp says:

"A digest of the daily sick reports shows that a total of 77 cases were reported, chief ailments being diarrhoea, colds, sore throat, rheumatic pains, chest pains, measles and mumps. Of these 12 only were really serious and required admission into the brigade hospital tent for special treatment—the remainder being cases not requiring any such measures. * * * The supply of some of the medicines furnished in the chest served out, as usual ran short, and I was obliged to obtain a fresh supply under requisition."

The officer in charge of Military District No. 2 says:

"Surgeon-Major Maclean reports the necessity for an issue of rubber sheets to the men and a supply of camp beds, splints, instruments, &c., for field hospitals, in all of which recommendations I most fully concur."

I notice that at that camp, as well as at two or three others, there were deaths from drowning. I do not know whether the men are trained in swimming or not. The officer in charge of Camp Niagara reports:

"The men have generally suffered great discomforts from lying on damp ground, and I cannot too strongly urge the issue of a rubber sheet to each man during the encampment. It should not be forgotten that these men are entirely at the mercy, and completely and absolutely dependent upon the supply furnished by the Department, not only for their comfort in camp, but to protect them against future suffering and disease from unnecessary exposure while doing their duty. The immediate effect of such exposure as the men have just gone through is, in a large number of instances, not sufficient to compel men to go off duty, and yet the ultimate effects may be serious. The issue of a rubber sheet might also be urged on economic grounds, as it will not only protect the men from dampness, but will save the woollen blankets from contact with mud in many instances. Many of the tents in use are too old and thin to resist rain, and should be condemned."

Then he recommends that among other things the camp hospital should be supplied with—

"Twelve camp beds, or stretchers, for the use of sick in hospital, as it is absolutely inhuman to place men suffering from sickness on damp ground without other protection than a woollen blanket affords."

The officer in charge of Military Districts Nos. 3 and 4 at Camp Gananoque, which the Minister himself seems to have visited, says:

"Owing to the bad state of the weather, the Honorable the Minister authorised the issue of an extra blanket and waterproof sheet to each man, which added much to their comfort."

"The instructor of musketry and sergeant were most assiduous in their arduous duties, and many of the officers informed me that they had never received such good instruction in any camp before."

"The Honorable the Minister of Militia and the Major General Commanding inspected the camp, but were unable to have the corps out for drill, owing to the wet state of the ground, which was, in places, under water."

The medical officer at Kingston reports with reference to the Gananoque Camp:

"The promptness with which rubber sheets were issued immediately after the storm of 21st June added much to the comfort of the men, and I have no doubt contributed materially to prevent any ill-effects from their being compelled to sleep on the wet ground. I would suggest that in future a supply should always be in store, to be issued if occasion arise for them. The issue of two blankets to each man instead of one, as in former years, was also a great improvement, and should always be adhered to."

"I desire to call attention to the present unsatisfactory method, or rather want of method, of supplying the medicine chests."

He goes on to point out what the trouble is, saying

"There should also be a few minor surgical instruments supplied for the use of the hospital, for the proper care of which the principal medical officer should be personally responsible, and which should not be allowed to be removed from the hospital. At present none are supplied, and many surgeons come to camp unprovided with them, being unwilling to expose their own property to the risk of damage or loss."

The officer in charge of the camp at St. John's, P. Q., says :

"On my arrival in camp on the 25th June, I was much disappointed at finding that a great portion of the long meadow grass was still standing on the ground to be occupied by the troops, both for camping and drill purposes, and my Brigade Major, Lt.-Col. Mattice, who had preceded me by a couple of days, with a view to getting everything in order, reported to me that he had been unable to get anyone to cut it, the man (M. Bourgeois) who had undertaken to have this work done a week previously, having failed to carry out his agreement, cutting and removing only such portions of the meadow as were most profitable to himself. This proved all the more detrimental in its effects upon the camp from the fact that it rained in torrents all that night and part of the next day, reducing the whole camping ground to little better than a lake, completely drowning out the 50th Battalion, and compelling both officers and men to seek shelter where best they could, principally in the tent of the Young Men's Christian Association, which was fortunately in their vicinity, and placed at their disposal by the kindness of Mr. Corbett, in charge. All the troops in camp spent a miserable night, but bore it with the greatest good humor, starting to work in the most cheerful manner possible to try and drain their tents and camping ground as soon as the breaking of day permitted them to see what they were doing. The whole of the second day (26th) was taken up by this work, as the long grass and spongy, saturated level ground made drainage a most difficult and tedious matter, and in many situations I was obliged to have the tents removed to dryer spots, wherever they could be found, without regard to the uniformity or appearance of the camp. By evening the camp was in a pretty fair condition, and I had a ration of straw served out to the men, the rubber sheets for which I had telegraphed the previous evening at the request of the principal medical officer, not having yet arrived, though they subsequently did so, about midnight, and were of great service during the remainder of the camp."

He adds :

"I beg to call attention to the report of the principal medical officer herewith attached, marked Appendix A, more particularly in reference to the state of the camp on the night in question, and the necessity for waterproof sheets for the men on all occasions when going under canvas, with which, I beg respectfully to state, I fully concur."

As will be seen from the reports of the principal medical officer, above referred to, the general health of the camp was good, notwithstanding the state of the ground and the inclemency of the weather, and this, I think, may be in a great measure attributed to the supply of rubber sheets which, as before stated, arrived in time to be used on the third and subsequent nights of the encampment.

I would strongly recommend that the entire Government property outside of the barracks be turned into a pasture, and no longer retained as a meadow; the nature of the ground would thereby be greatly improved for camping and drilling purposes for which this year it was quite unfit. It should also be subjected to a complete system of thorough drainage, for which there is every facility, and it would then be a first-class camping ground indeed."

He also says that the bread and meat supplies were not satisfactory, but he had them improved. The medical officer at that camp says :

"On the 24th June I visited the camp ground, and found it in the worst possible condition for a camp. The ground was meadow land, from which the hay had just been cut (in fact, some portions were still uncut). It was all damp and sodden; some of it actually very wet. On enquiry I ascertained that rubber sheets were not to be issued, and considering that the health of the troops would be seriously endangered by their camping on this ground without them, I at once wrote you on the subject, and you communicated my views to the Government who

promptly ordered them forward. Unfortunately, before they arrived heavy rain set in and the men suffered greatly. The troops were nearly all in camp by the afternoon of the 25th, and the camp quartermaster and myself urged the necessity of promptly trenching the tents, especially as the weather seemed threatening. This was done to a certain extent, but some were so occupied with other duties that the order was not fully carried out. Early on the morning of the 26th rain fell in torrents, and continued to do so for hours. As you are aware, accompanied by yourself, I visited the camp between 4 and 5 a. m., and found it in a terrible condition. It was impossible to move about without sinking ankle deep in mud and water. Many of the tents contained from 4 to 6 inches of water, and were positively uninhabitable. Many men had not had any sleep, having had to stand up all night, the quantity of water in their tents making it impossible to lie down. Prompt measures were at once taken to drain the ground, and so far as it was possible to have it done with tools at command—it was done. Fortunately this morning was succeeded by a very warm day with strong wind, and by the evening matters had improved considerably. Had the rubber blankets or sheets been on hand, the men would have passed a good night. They did not, however, arrive till the morning of the 27th (following morning). Straw was issued to such tents as seemed to require it, and the men good naturedly made the best of the situation. Early next day the rubber sheets were served out, and for the rest of the camp the men were reasonably comfortable. Before leaving this part of my report I desire in the strongest possible language to draw the attention of the Militia Department to the necessity of always having rubber sheets form part of the equipment of every camp. They are an actual necessity. I have had many years' experience in camping, and would as soon think of going without my tent as without my rubber blankets. Their issue would surely save the country money. Their use preserves health, and in this way would reduce the possibility of claims for compensation. * * * The supply of medicines was, on the whole, ample, and the medical staff expressed themselves satisfied. To obtain this result I was, however, compelled to draw to a very slight extent upon the local drug store."

At Camp St. Andrews, after the camp broke up, typhoid fever made its appearance in several parts of the Province, and several men—I do not know how many, but three or four at any rate—died. There was considerable discussion in the local papers over the question, and the militia officer endeavored to prove that the fever had existed before the camp was formed, and that the men had brought the fever to it. He said :

"Owing to the presence of typhoid fever in different parts of the Province during the months of August and September, and some men who had previously attended the camp having unfortunately contracted the disease, the opinion prevailed in some quarters that this disease had been contracted in camp, in consequence of alleged impurity of water in the vicinity of the camp (no one seems to have doubted the purity of the water in the camp wells), and also as to the absence of straw in some tents. I, of course, lost no time in calling the attention of the principal medical officer to the newspaper reports expressing this prevalent opinion."

From the discussion in the local press it appeared that while there was a pure spring of water where the camp was situated, there was a large amount of impure water surrounding the camp, and there was no straw for the men and no preparations made to provide them even with beds of spruce or other green boughs. The officer commanding this battalion reported :

"The supplies afforded by the camp medicine chest were lamentably deficient in many respects, and in none more so than in the lack of bandages, splints and surgical appliances generally."

The officer commanding the camp in Aldershot, N. S., says :

"As usual, the medicine chest was meagrely and inefficiently supplied, though containing from year to year a good many articles which are never needed."

I do not want to read the whole report through, but if any hon. gentleman is at all interested in finding

out whether this service is efficiently done or not, I beg to refer him to the reports of these camps. Therefore, I cannot concur in the suggestion that it would be in the interests of the country to have the rural corps drilled oftener. In our Province these camps caused a great deal of disease. I do not like to find fault with the hon. the Minister of Militia, for I have usually quite an admiration for the way he carries on the service, but he should look after the officers who have charge of the camps.

Contingencies and general services not otherwise provided for, including Grants to Artillery and Rifle Associations and Bands of efficient Corps.....	\$38,000
---	----------

Mr. CASEY. In regard to this item, I think the grants to rifle associations should be estimated for and not put under the head of contingencies. The Department must know now pretty well what they will have to pay the rifle associations, and even to efficient bands, and so on each year, and should estimate for these items separately. I cannot find anywhere in the Auditor's Report a list of the rifle associations which have been aided and the amounts paid to each.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will give the figures to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CASEY. I find a very large part of these contingencies is made up of cab-hire and travelling allowances. For instance, I find that the Major General charges for hotel allowance, ninety-four days, at \$5, and for cabs \$109, and Pullman's \$86. I find that about \$800 altogether are paid for his cab-hire and Pullman's, exclusive of railway fare, and for hotel allowances, &c. He also charges for charger hired for parade, which, I think, is small on his part, as I should suppose he ought, as Commandant of the Canadian Militia, to keep a horse. There are also considerable contingencies for Capt. Wise, in the way of cab-hire, Pullman and hotel allowances, &c., and for Col. Murray and Col. Otter and others. These items ought to be separated, and charged under different headings, such as \$14,975 to rifle associations, \$7,625 for efficient bands, \$2,000 for transport, and so forth, instead of them all appearing under contingencies. The contingencies themselves are excessive—\$800 to the Major General, in addition to travelling expenses over the railways, is excessive.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the hon. the Minister of Militia replies to my hon. friend, I will draw his attention to an item which I think the committee and the country would be glad to see under the head of contingencies. In the North-West we have rifle associations. We have the Assiniboia Association, whose headquarters are at Regina. We have rifle associations at Moose Jaw and on the Saskatchewan; and if the Minister's attention were directed to the shooting of these bodies, he would see that we have many first-rate shots among them, and these associations are in a high state of efficiency, although the members have to pay all the cost out of their own pockets. I think the country will be quite willing to see some encouragement given to such efficient men as these have proved themselves to be. When His Excellency the Governor General visited us, he shot with our rifle association, and I believe he expressed his pleasure at witnessing the high state of efficiency in which our rifle association is. I

Mr. ELLIS.

would urge upon the Minister that he should give them rifles. If he will not give them rifles, let him lend them rifles. We have only a few rifles, and we get no encouragement whatever. There is another thing which I would like the Minister, when he is replying, to deal with. Our association has an idea that the Prince Albert Association gets a grant from the Government, whereas ours gets none whatever. Whether that be correct or not, I think the Committee will see that the rifle associations at Prince Albert, at Battleford, the Assiniboia Association, whose headquarters are at Regina, and the association at Moose Jaw, should at all events be equipped with rifles. I am told that the rifle associations, and the volunteers in other parts of the country, are not only equipped with rifles but with clothing as well.

An hon. MEMBER. No; not the rifle associations.

Mr. DAVIN. But the volunteers are. Our rifle association is also composed of the Regina volunteers, and we never got any clothing. We got rifles during the war, and we had to give them up afterwards, and it was doleful to see those North-West warriors going with their weapons to lay them down at the feet of their commanding officer. I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Militia will adopt the suggestion I have made and will give them rifles, or if he will not give them, that he will lend them rifles. Surely it is necessary that these men should be able, in case of a disturbance in that country, to settle the difficulty without calling upon the chivalry of the East to suppress it.

Mr. DENISON. If you once admit the proposal of the hon. member, we would have civilian rifle associations all over the Dominion, in every town and village.

Mr. WATSON. The Minister of Militia might consult Commissioner Herchmer in regard to arming the Regina volunteers. I do not know whether Commissioner Herchmer would trust the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) with a rifle or not.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) enquired what amounts the different rifle associations received from the Government annually. The Province of Ontario Rifle Association receives \$1,800; the Quebec Association, \$1,700; Nova Scotia, \$1,500; New Brunswick, \$1,300; Prince Edward Island, \$500; Manitoba, \$750; and British Columbia, \$500; making a total of \$8,050. Local and battalion rifle associations number about 80, at an average of \$75 each, making \$6,000 in all. In reference to what my hon. friend, the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has just stated, I believe I could not answer his application in a more practical way than it has been answered by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Denison). The great difficulty in dealing with rifle associations is that the association must be under the absolute control of the Department of Militia. Otherwise, in every village in the Dominion there would be applications for rifles for the purpose of organising rifle associations which would not be under the control of the Department. I should feel disposed to lend the rifles; but, as the law now exists, I consider I have no power to do so. The Militia Act makes it imperative that the arms shall only be placed in the

hands of an organised force under the absolute control of the Department of Militia. If we were to lend our rifles to one civilian organisation, any other civilian association would have the right to apply to us and claim the same privilege. I have taken particular interest in the organisations to which the hon. gentleman refers. I know their members are good shots, and that they have shown great zeal and energy in forming these associations; but, unfortunately, I am tied down by the regulations of my Department. However, I am prepared to take up the matter, and to see if by any possibility we could not, by associating these rifle associations to some military organisation in the district, find the means of providing them with arms. I cannot say how much I would like to meet the views of the hon. gentleman in regard to this. I think we cannot develop too much the practice of rifle shooting in this country, and anything which will encourage it should receive the consideration of the Government.

Mr. CASEY. I agree with the Minister of Militia, and I think he may find it possible to organise these bands in the North-West after their loyalty has been duly certified to, or at all events to give them a grant as rifle associations. Rifle shooting is the essence of warfare in these days. A good shot can do wonders even without discipline. We cannot have any doubt about that, after the example of what was accomplished by the Boers in South Africa against the British troops. They had no discipline or training, but they went out and shot down the British soldiers as if they were blesbok or springbok, or any other bok that might be found in that country. There is no doubt they shot very successfully, and routed the pick of the British army. The same is very true in reference to those poor men, who were very poorly armed, in the North-West, who inflicted very much more damage upon our troops than they should have, according to their numbers. So far from finding any fault with these figures of the Minister as being too large, I should be inclined to say they are too small, as I think more encouragement, and better distributed, should be given to rifle shooting. It should not be confined to associations connected with the volunteers, because a man who is a good shot and who does not belong to the volunteers is very apt to go to the front when required. I hope the Minister is giving satisfactory grants to the associations, and that he will see that next year they are published separately, so that we will not have to ask for this information across the floor. In regard to bands, there is a large item—\$7,635, all in a lump sum; and while we find sums as small as \$2.50 accounted for separately in other parts in the contingencies, no details are given of this large sum. These amounts to bands and rifle associations should be accounted for separately.

Mr. BRIEN. I must totally dissent from the view expressed by the hon. member for York. I do not see why, if rifle associations are to be encouraged at all, they should not receive aid, no matter in what section of the country they are. I presume that it is desired to confine them to the cities, but in the rural districts we have a right to have associations. There is one in my constituency, whose range has cost them about \$250, and so far they have received no aid from the Government. I think that is unfair and unjust. Certainly it is a

practice that should be encouraged. If the volunteers are no good at shooting they cannot be of much service for any other purpose. I would like to see the associations encouraged and receive assistance. I think it would add very much to the efficiency of these battalions if the drill would take place every year. With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for St. John, certainly the man who made up the report with regard to the diseases that were prevalent did not know what he was talking about, because the men do not remain long enough in camp to propagate typhoid fever. It must be an entire misunderstanding on his part. As to the efficiency of the rural battalions, I may say that the one in the county of Essex, the 21st Battalion, is second to none in the Dominion. The colonel deserves a great deal of credit for the care he has taken of the corps, and he does everything in his power to promote the welfare of the battalion, and certainly feels very proud of it. His officers are efficient as well as the men, and the county feels proud of the battalion. I hope they will receive every encouragement as regards their rifle range. I think they have made an application to the Department for some aid, and it is only fair and just that they should get it.

Mr. WATSON. I think it is of the utmost importance for the Minister to devise some means whereby rifle associations in local districts can be recognised. I think they should be allowed to receive rifles on giving a satisfactory guarantee that they would take care of them, and they should receive their ammunition for practice at the lowest possible price. With regard to the remarks from my hon. friend beside me in reference to loyalty, I do not think his suggestion necessary. So far as the people of Manitoba are concerned, I can certify to their loyalty, and I have no doubt that the member for West Assiniboia will certify to the loyalty of the people in that district, even though he and the Commissioner at Regina do differ occasionally. With regard to rifle associations and camp drill, the Minister has had some battalions in the Province of Manitoba ever since 1885, and they have not had a camp drill yet. We have the 91st and 95th Battalions, and for want of drill they are becoming disorganised; it is impossible to keep the men together when they do not drill at least once in two years. Now, if there can be some system devised whereby these associations can be kept up in local districts, I think they will be greatly benefited, and if occasion requires again—and we all hope that it will not be required—that these troops should be called out, they will then be good marksmen, and be able to render efficient service in the field.

Mr. TYRWHITT. My idea of the best way to assist the different rifle associations, would be to incorporate them with the militia, and allow the rifle associations who wish to enjoy the same benefits that are enjoyed by the militia to join the force. With regard to the remarks made by some hon. members as to the best means of protecting the volunteers from damp during their residence at the annual camps, I would say that, in my experience, flooring, such as was provided a good many years ago, would be much preferable for the annual camp. It could be put in store and used for a good many years, and not only would it protect the volunteers from damp, but would afford a

better flooring for them, even in dry weather. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, with the very best intent, has recommended straw to protect volunteers from damp. In my experience that is one of the very worst things that can be selected, for the reason that it requires to be changed every day, whereas the floor would be permanent, and last a great number of years. I must also dissent from the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) with regard to reducing the allowance to company officers. I consider that the company officers require all they get, and I would prefer rather to see the allowance increased than diminished. It would be necessary that the allowance to commanding officers should also be reduced, from the fact that they receive an allowance for every efficient company. I believe that rule would hold good in all the higher grades. We know that the captains of companies have a great deal to do, and in addition to drilling their men we know that they have many ways of disposing of their money, and this small allowance which they receive goes but a little way in providing the men with proper uniforms. I entirely agree with what has been said by several hon. members as to the desirability of drilling the corps oftener than at present. It is impossible to keep our men in an efficient state when they only meet once in two or three years, and I hope that some means will be devised by which rural corps can go into camp oftener in the future than they have done in the past.

Improved Rifled Ordnance..... \$2,000

Mr. CASEY. How many guns will the hon. Minister get for this amount each year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We get a couple every year. Sometimes we can get only one; it depends altogether on what kind of gun we get.

Mr. CASEY. Are they new guns?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Is that conversion of cannon going on also?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; it has been abandoned.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What size?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They are two 54-pounder rifled guns—breech-loaders.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Where are they placed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They have not come out yet. These guns are intended for fortifications, and we are annually devoting a certain amount towards these guns.

Military Property, &c..... \$97,000

Mr. KENNY. I call the Minister's attention to the fact that, last year, I expressed the hope that he would authorise some expenditure on the drill shed at Halifax. I observe by a recent newspaper that it is in a very bad condition. I do not know what information the Minister may possess from his officers, but it is stated publicly in the press that the floor is positively rotten. I hope the Minister will see that the drill shed is put into proper repair, and that proper accommodation is given to the armaments, for I know that commanding officers complain of the difficulty of keeping arms in proper order.

Mr. TYRWITT.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman's information is perfectly correct. The drill shed is in a very bad condition, and it is the intention of the Department to devote such sum of money as is absolutely necessary to place it proper order, but to expend as little money as possible, as I believe, within a comparatively short period of time, it will be necessary either to increase the present drill shed or to build a new one.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice in the Auditor General's Report that one or two of the drill sheds have been sold. One was at Clinton and another at Mono Mills. Why were these sold—have the companies been disbanded?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Drill sheds are being constantly sold. Sometimes the headquarters of a company change from one place to another. Generally the site is given by the municipality, and upon that site the Government build a drill shed. When the drill shed is sold the price is divided between the municipality and the Government proportionately to the amount contributed by each. I cannot state the precise reasons why the two drill sheds in question were sold; but reports are sent to the Department by the officers of the company, giving reasons why the drill shed should be disposed of, and if those reasons are considered satisfactory, an Order in Council is passed and a sale takes place.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have you a volunteer company in Clinton now?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I could not tell the hon. gentleman now, but I can bring the information down at the next meeting of the Committee.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Surely it is not due to the treatment of the soldiers by the Department that these drill sheds have been closed up. We had a little discussion this afternoon as to the treatment a soldier received. Is it due to the crushing out of the martial spirit of the community, that the volunteers are going out of the military business and the drill sheds are being closed up? Is that the result of the management of the military affairs? If such treatment is meted out to the volunteers, as appeared in the case discussed to-day, I do not wonder at drill sheds being sold. To-day I visited a law office in this city and made an affidavit in regard to a soldier who served in the American war, and who is now applying for pension, and, although that service occurred twenty-five years ago, I believe he will get the pension. I do not believe his injuries are so severe as those of the volunteer whose case was before us to-day. It is all very well to talk about training our force every year, but if our volunteers are not fairly treated by the Department such drilling would be useless. I do not know why the Minister, who has not evinced such spirit before, should have so forgotten his high position and have so treated, on personal grounds, any one who has served his country and carried his life in defence of this Dominion. It is enough to cause the force to disband, and, if continued, it will eventually close up a great many drill sheds.

Mr. WATSON. The 95th Battalion is one of the finest battalions which went to the front in the rebellion in 1885, and its headquarters are at Portage la Prairie, a very convenient place and railway centre. They are a very fine body of men

and of officers, but they have no drill shed. If it is intended to encourage our volunteers, this want should be supplied, so that they may have a place in which to drill and to store their arms. Last year I was surprised that the Minister of Militia should have formed the 91st Battalion, with Mr. Bedson as colonel. That was no more needed than it is to-day; in fact, they have not met, and the battalion has not been formed. The 95th, on the other hand, are in existence; it was unnecessary to form another battalion. That new battalion was only formed for the purpose of giving honorary positions to some men as officers. I hope the 95th Battalion will receive some attention at the hands of the Militia Department and be allowed to go into camp, and in the near future will have a proper drill shed, so that the corps may be encouraged and kept together.

Military College, Kingston..... \$77,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to call the particular attention of the Minister of Militia to certain statements that have been made to me with respect to the promotion of a couple of officers who were lately cadets of that college. I will state what I have been informed, and then the hon. gentleman can give what explanation he can offer, if there is any explanation to present. I am informed that a couple of cadets, who, I am sorry to say, were unable to pass their examinations, were lately promoted to positions in one or other of the permanent corps. Is the hon. Minister aware whether that is the fact or not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a fact?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I do not want to say anything against these young gentlemen themselves, but I do want to impress upon the Minister, and I want to impress upon the House, that if you wish to render the large expenditure which is now going on in the Royal Military College worse than useless, you cannot take a better plan than to promote, under any circumstance whatever, gentlemen who have been unfortunate enough to fail in passing the examinations. That is a distinct discouragement to every young man who is there, and who expects to qualify himself for a position in our service, or in the Imperial service, by good conduct and attention to study. If they find that, under any conceivable circumstance, the Government of Canada will appoint to commissions young men who have failed in that examination, the Government inflicts as grave an injury as it is possible to conceive on the discipline and *morale* generally of the cadets of that college. I am sorry indeed to find such a thing has occurred, and I think explanation is due to the House of the reasons which have induced my hon. friend to have made these recommendations. It appears to me that there is a very grave error of judgment in doing this, and that the college has sustained a serious injury.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am rather disposed to agree with the hon. gentleman as to the principle which he lays down, that every possible effort should be directed by the Department to giving every encouragement to the cadets who are successful in passing their examinations. But my hon.

friend knows that the system is not universal to appoint to the permanent corps only cadets of the Royal Military College, and if this system be not universal, as I have just stated, these gentlemen who had belonged to the force already, and had to qualify to take their certificate, were placed exactly in the same position as any other member of the militia force, who would have been selected outside of the Royal Military College to be given a commission in our permanent corps. One of the young gentlemen referred to was appointed to our permanent force, and the other to the Mounted Police. I think the hon. gentleman will give me credit that, ever since I have had control of the Department, I have done everything within my power to give to the cadets all the chances that could possibly be given them. The number of appointments which have been made by myself as Minister of Militia to the permanent corps selected from the cadets, indicates that in very many cases I have given them the preference. Of course, it may be better to establish a different system, and to say that none but cadets will be commissioned to these permanent corps; still, I think it would be wrong not to recognise the services of the militia force of Canada who have devoted a great deal of their time to militia matters, and shown their loyalty and their zeal in answer to the call of duty whenever they have been required. I think that we should not leave them in the cold altogether, but that we must try and work the two different classes so as to make our force as efficient as possible. The cadets have got great advantages over the others, and I think that the system we have adopted so far has worked well. I do not believe that it would be right or proper to build up an exclusive class composed of the cadets, who would alone receive the positions we can give in our permanent corps.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman does not quite take the point I made, which is one of great moment to the future of this military college. I am not disposed—and I want him to understand this distinctly—to lay down the principle that none but cadets should receive appointments. I do not think that this can be done in the present state of public feeling, and in view of the fact that we have to rely on the voluntary exertions of many militia officers, who take great pains to my own knowledge to qualify for the proper performance of their duties. I do not insist at all that none should be appointed who are not cadets. That is not my point. The point which I made, and which I am sure the Minister must see himself, is this: here were two young gentlemen who had entered that college, and who failed in obtaining the requisite number of marks to qualify themselves in the various examinations. Their position is wholly and entirely different from that of ordinary militia officers, for they were members of the college. I dare say they were both of them naturally of good abilities, but I am afraid they were not diligent enough to qualify. The Minister, and the House must see, that to take men who had served two or three years in the college, and had failed to qualify themselves, and to give them commissions, is a direct discouragement to all others who have been diligently striving to qualify themselves. I may tell my hon. friend that so far from desiring to say anything against these young gentlemen, it is

quite the contrary. One, at any rate, I took rather a fancy to, for various reasons; but notwithstanding this, I think that a grave injury has been done to the discipline of the college, and I felt it my duty to call the attention of the House, and the attention of the Minister, to the mischief that will assuredly ensue. I think it ought to be distinctly understood that any cadet who enters that college, and who will not take the trouble to qualify himself to pass the examinations, should not be promoted to a place in our permanent corps, so long as there are other cadets well qualified, and diligent students, who have received the approval of their professors and of superior officers, who are able to take the places. This is a reasonable and sensible proposition, and I am quite sure the hon. gentleman knows that I am right in laying it down. It is only due to the hon. gentleman, who has received a good deal of sharp-shooting to-day, that I should say that in my opinion since he became Minister of Militia he has taken much more pains than his predecessors to appoint cadets whom he found suitable to fill such positions. I frankly say that the claim he has put in on his own behalf I believe is just, but in this particular instance I must say that in my opinion a serious error has been committed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not suppose the case is likely to occur again.

Mr. DENISON. I should like to call the Minister's attention to a complaint which has been made to me, that the young gentlemen going to the college are not fed as well as they might be. I believe it is done by contract. I would suggest to the Minister that some plan might be adopted under which a person would be employed to purchase food supplies for the cadets in some such way as a mess is conducted. Under the contract system, if a contractor is not generous or fair, he may make a very exorbitant profit out of the matter. The General might be asked to report upon it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I shall be glad to consider the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am glad to hear the hon. Minister say that this occurrence is not likely to happen again. I think it would be very regrettable if it should. The military college was established with the idea of securing a class of trained officers in this country, in the hope that they might be absorbed into the various services of the country. It was expected at that time that our railways and telegraph departments would afford suitable positions for these young men in the country, so that the country would retain the benefit of their services in case they were ever required. I am glad to find that the Minister has in several instances appointed to positions in the college officers who held commissions in the Imperial service, and I think the same rule might apply to the permanent force. With all due respect to the militia officers, who no doubt take great interest in their work, they do not give that length of time to their profession which is required at the college to teach the cadets their profession, and, therefore, if we are to have an effective service I think the officers of the outside permanent corps should be taken from the college, when they are available.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to emphasise two points in connection with this subject. The first is,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

that we have a very large expenditure in proportion to the number of cadets educated. The staff is quite sufficient to educate a much larger number. I think it would be true economy to enlarge the college buildings, though not expensively, so as to turn out a much larger product with a very slightly increased expense. In the second place, every possible inducement should be held out to these cadets to remain in Canada after they have been educated. I think it has been shown by the returns that most of them are now living out of Canada, and giving other countries the benefit of the education they have received at our expense. There is no common sense at all in educating cadets at the public expense, or in any expenditure connected with this college, if we are not going to keep them at home and get our money's worth out of them. To this end I would urge, as my hon. friend has urged, that cadets should be appointed to some position in the outside service, which need not necessarily be the military service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not being a military man, I very rarely take part in the discussion of the militia estimates, and I merely wish to say one word with reference to a remark made by the hon. member for South Oxford. I suppose if there is one branch of the service of Canada from which all parties agree that political or other influences other than merit should be excluded, it is the Militia Department; and if those influences creep in in connection with the promotion of any officers, either cadets or others, it will be a bad day for the service. I am very glad to hear the Minister say that the evil which has occurred will not occur again, because by promoting young men, who, from whatever cause have failed to take their degrees, over the heads of other young men who have attended assiduously to their studies, you take away every incentive that should be offered to those cadets to apply themselves assiduously to the study of the military matters which they go there to learn. To do that means simply to introduce political, or social, or other outside influences, which should never be allowed to interfere with the promotion of any officer in the militia service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to enquire of the Minister whether this charge of \$77,000 is exclusive of the fees paid by the students, or whether the sum they pay is to be deducted from it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The whole of what they pay is to be deducted and paid into the hands of the Receiver General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that, practically speaking, the college costs us about \$50,000 a year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What number of marks are assigned to the various grades of corporal, sergeant, brigade-sergeant and major? I believe there are four different grades.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will bring down the information to the hon. gentleman on Monday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are those marks included in the aggregate of marks according to which commissions are given?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these commissions, as we may call them for convenience sake, although the officers are non-commissioned officers, given according to the standing of the men in their classes or at the pleasure of the commanding officer?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is a matter of regimental discipline. I cannot state now how they are selected, but the selection is not according to points. I think it is made by the adjutant of the college.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman cause to be prepared a memo. stating in what way these various grades are conferred? He will see the importance of this from the fact that if as much as 1,400 or 1,500 marks are given to whomsoever is appointed sergeant-major, or brigade-sergeant, &c., and if the commissions are distributed according to the number of the marks, some of the men who are running closely are exceedingly badly handicapped. For instance, out of two competitors who in three or four years' service had within two or three marks of each other, one might be handicapped by an addition to the other of nearly 1,500 marks in this way, and it is worth knowing on what principle these marks are given.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will bring down a full statement.

Permanent Forces—Pay and maintenance of "A," "B," and "C" Batteries, Schools of Artillery at Quebec, Kingston and Victoria, B.C., and Cavalry and Infantry Schools at Quebec, Fredericton, St. John's, P.Q., Toronto, London and Winnipeg,..... \$484,000

Mr. CASEY. I see that Sergt. Kinsella, in British Columbia, has multiplied considerably, but I cannot gather to what extent.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There are one hundred Kinsellas.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

STATIONERY AND CONTINGENCIES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. SPEAKER read the following Message from the Senate:—

Resolved that a Message be sent to the House of Commons to inform that House, in answer to its Message requesting the Senate to grant leave to the officers in charge of the stationery and contingencies of the Senate to attend before the Select Standing Committee of the Commons on Public Accounts, at their next meeting, to give information respecting the distribution of such stationery and the expenditure for contingencies, as set out on pages D-17 and 18 of the Report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts for the year ended 30th June, 1889; and to bring with them all records relating to such items;—that all matters in relation to the internal economy of this House are under the control and supervision of its Committee on Contingent Accounts, subject to approval of the Senate; that the said Committee is now engaged in examining the accounts and vouchers of the Clerk, including the distribution of stationery and expenditure referred to in the said Message, and that as soon as the Report is submitted by the said Committee to this House it will be transmitted to the House of Commons for the use of its Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In this matter this House is evidently, in the opinion of the Senate, to have no control over the expenditure at all. Here is a case in which this House voted \$5,300 for certain services of the Senate, and yet, although we have control over the expenses of every Department, that vote has been exceeded without our authority, the

Senate expenditure amounting to \$12,000. That matter was brought up in the Public Accounts Committee, and it was suggested by a member of the Government that an explanation should be called for from those who have control of the expenditure. The Committee requested that those gentlemen who had spent more than double the sum voted by this House should appear before the Committee on Public Accounts, and explain their course, in order that the Committee might report to this House how it was that the vote of this House had been so flagrantly abused. If every official in the Senate can spend what he pleases, irrespective of the checks this House puts upon him as to the amount, there is an end to our control of the expenditure altogether. I do not think this matter should be allowed to drop quietly, and that we should submit to this indirect refusal of the honorable Senate to comply with our just request. If we have the control of the expenditures of every Department we must take steps to see that that control is efficient, and that irresponsible officers of any other Department do not laugh this House to scorn and spend what they like.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend is a little hasty. The Senate has been asked for certain information. They have chosen their own way to send that information in a very respectful manner, and when it comes this House can send it to the Select Committee on Public Accounts. It will not come in the manner my hon. friend wishes it to come, but he cannot say that it is not in process of preparation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Committee on Public Accounts did not ask for information, but they asked that the officers of the Senate, under whose control this expenditure was, should appear before them to explain their reasons for spending 50 per cent. more than the House of Commons authorised them to spend.

Mr. FOSTER. What the Committee wanted was the information, and they were not so particular about the officers coming before them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another point which the hon. the Minister of Finance must bear in mind. We require also, in the Public Accounts Committee, to know by whose authority our vote was exceeded. On that point, as I understand, no information or satisfaction has been given. I know of no authority other than a Governor General's Warrant under which this money could be properly expended. It appears to me there is a serious abuse here.

Mr. FOSTER. I have heard a partial explanation, but I will not give it here, until we see what may come down from the Senate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it should come down very promptly, because there are only two ways by which money can be expended—one by a vote of the House of Commons and the other by a special Warrant of the Governor General issued under peculiar circumstances, which are prescribed by Act of Parliament. It is not within the discretion of the Senate, or of anybody, to spend even a few thousand dollars over the vote granted to them.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 3rd March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Minister of Railways and Canals for the past fiscal year, from the 1st July, 1888, to the 30th June, 1889, on the works under his control.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 104) to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Provincial Proident Institution of St. Thomas, Ont.—(Mr. Ward.)

FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 108) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. He said: At the last revision in the Province from which I come, when the lists were finally revised, some 200 or 300 notices were given to strike out names from the list, and, when the hearing of these notices came before the judge, it appeared that the reason why they were objected to was that, having been resident in one polling division, they had moved across the street to another polling division. They were not in the polling division where their names appeared on the lists. Therefore, an attempt was made to strike them off the list altogether, and an application was made to the judge asking him to hear evidence to the effect that they were qualified voters, although they resided in another voting division than that in which their names appeared; but the judge declined to hear those applications, alleging that he had no power to put any voter's name in a different polling division, unless a special application had been made to do so fourteen days before the Court. An application was then made for a *mandamus* to the Supreme Court to compel him to hear evidence, and the Supreme Court, by a majority decision of two to one, determined he was not bound to receive evidence. The only object, therefore, of this amendment is to provide, that when application is made to strike off a voter from the list on the ground that he is in his wrong polling division, if it appears to the revising officer that he is a properly qualified elector within the revision district then being revised, the judge shall put his name on the proper polling division, and not strike it off entirely, making him pay such costs as he thinks fair. In the case to which I have referred there were over 200 voters, who had been voting, some of them for the last 20 years, struck off the list because they did not give the notice required by the statute that they had changed their polling division. The hon. gentleman will see that the law requires that notice be given fourteen days before the court meets. The notices objecting to their names were given on the night of the fourteenth day, and these electors only received their notices the following day, which would be thirteen days before the revision court, and too late for them to make application to have their names put on. Hon. gentlemen will see that the Bill is one to
Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

carry out the real object and intention of the Franchise Act, that is, that qualified voters should be placed upon the list in the polling divisions where they reside. Some revising officers take a generous view of the law, and, I think, carry out the spirit and intention of the law by themselves making these necessary changes; and I have heard from some hon. gentlemen who sit near me that the revising officers in their districts make the alterations themselves from the assessment lists and otherwise, so that when they came to revision there was hardly any work to do. In my district the returning officer took a different view. He made no changes excepting those where application had been specially made by the voter, or on behalf of the voter. He did not take the assessment lists and make the changes, and the consequence was that hundreds and hundreds of voters who were in the wrong division, were not changed; and the further consequence was that immense delay, labor and expense were unnecessarily thrown upon those who had the management of the lists. I think the Bill I have introduced will meet the difficulty without doing injustice to anybody.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). A similar difficulty has occurred in my constituency. In the city of Portland the Canada Temperance Act is in force; a petition has been presented to repeal the Act, and the election is to be held during the present month. During the last year the city of Portland was united to the city of St. John, and in the revision of the lists this year, many parties were placed in the different polling districts where they reside. The result is that persons who are non-resident voters and had a right to vote upon the Canada Temperance Act, cannot now vote because they are on different lists, and two or three hundred voters, who were entitled to vote in this election, are disfranchised. In the outcome a very serious question might arise as to whether the Act was properly appealed, in case a majority votes against it. I think a provision should be made by which those parties should have a right to vote as non-residents. For instance, my colleague and myself are voters in Portland and entitled to vote as non-residents, but we are now disfranchised because we are registered in districts in the city of St. John. There are two or three hundred persons who are disfranchised by reason of this annexation of Portland to St. John, and I would like to see some arrangement made by which similar difficulties may be avoided in the future.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVILEGE—HALDIMAND ELECTION.

Mr. TISDALE. My attention has been called to a communication published in the *Toronto Globe* of the 26th instant, in which the writer, speaking of the late contest in Haldimand, alluded to myself as follows:—

“In the Indian Reserve the corruption during the day was most barefaced. The polling took place in a private house. Within ten yards of this was a small log shop, provided with lock and key, the latter being in custody of the Conservatives. Into this Colonel Tisdale, M.P., would take an Indian voter, lock the door, and try and persuade him to vote for Montague.”

Now, Sir, where I am known it will be unnecessary to contradict this vile slander, but for the information of those who do not know me and in self-vindication, I desire to say that these allega-

tions are wilful, malicious and deliberate falsehoods, written by some coward who dare not sign his name to the letter. There are reflections in the same communication about another hon. member of this House who is not present, that is, Dr. Montague, which are equally untrue, and I desire to say that to-morrow he will be introduced to the House, when, I have no doubt, he can defend himself, if a majority of 227 is not a sufficient defence. I wish further to add, with the permission of the House, that during the four days I stayed in the riding I neither did nor saw any illegal, corrupt or improper act on behalf of Dr. Montague.

ORANGE INCORPORATION BILL.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Wallace for the third reading of Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Grand Orange Lodge of British America, and the motion of Mr. Curran in amendment thereto.

Mr. BARRON. I confess to some little disappointment that the time allowed for discussion of the Orange Bill does not admit of my proceeding to answer, in my feeble way, as well as I can, some of the arguments which were adduced to the House on former occasions, in 1883 and in 1885, against a similar measure. I confess to disappointment, owing to the circumstances which were referred to by my hon. friend for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) himself, and which took place on those two occasions. It is true, Sir, he did not enlarge upon those arguments, but he brought them out and was successful; he intimated, with others, in convincing the hon. gentlemen then in the House, that it was advisable to vote against Orange incorporation. Sir, I am rejoiced to know that time has done that which arguments failed to do on that occasion; time has resulted in convincing the majority of hon. gentlemen, I think, that it is desirable and advisable in the interest of justice, and only proper and fair, that the Orangemen of the country should receive incorporation. I need only refer to the fact that the hon. member for Montreal Centre himself, although he was foremost in opposing the Bill on the two occasions to which I have referred, has shown himself willing, the other night, to concede the principle of the Bill now before the House. I am glad that it can no longer be argued in this House, that this House itself has not the inherent right to grant incorporation. I am rejoiced that no longer can those difficult words "property and civil rights," as found in the British North America Act, be looked upon as forming an obstacle to incorporation by this House. I am also rejoiced to know that no longer is the argument made in this House that the Orange Society is an illegal society. Still more am I rejoiced to know that the word "secret," which was applied in an obnoxious manner in the arguments addressed to the House in the years mentioned, is no longer used as an argument against the incorporation of this society. I am further rejoiced to know that it is not said on the floor of this House, on this occasion, that the fact that the Orange Society is a society for the advancement of the Protestant religion is, therefore, a reason why incorporation should not be had. I want to take this opportunity of saying that I, for one, and I know

there are many others like me, would not for one moment longer belong to the Orange Society if we felt and knew that its Protestant principles in any way interfered with the dealing out of justice to those who happen to be Roman Catholics or opposed to us in our religious views. I have said that the hon. gentleman who spoke against the Bill the other night and introduced an amendment, himself admitted the principle of the Bill. But what did he do? He introduced an amendment which I am glad to know the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill, who has so skillfully managed it, and who has done so in a fair and candid way, speaking for the Orange Society, refused to accept, and it is an amendment which I think is a most insulting one. I desire to refer to the argument used the other evening, that the effect of incorporation by this House passing this Bill would be to repeal to a certain extent, if not entirely, a statute known as chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, which makes certain societies illegal. Let any hon. gentleman read the Bill now before the House, and he will see there is nothing whatever in it—and the Bill is also a fac-simile of the Forsters Bill—repealing in any way possible the Act to which I have referred, namely, the Act declaring certain secret societies to be illegal. But there is nothing in this Bill which will in any way incorporate this society, except for benevolent purposes, and it is obvious that this House can pass this Bill without in any way interfering with the laws of Lower Canada. Let me refer to the case of *Loranger vs. Colonial Building and Investment Association*, which goes to prove the position I have taken. It was a case wherein the Colonial Building and Investment Association was incorporated by this Parliament. It was granted power to hold lands and buy and rent houses, and so forth. The Attorney General of the Province of Quebec petitioned against the society, arguing that it was an illegal one, inasmuch as it should have been incorporated by the Province of Quebec, and contending that this Parliament in granting such powers to the society was doing that which was illegal. The case was taken to the Privy Council in England. I will read to the House part of the judgment rendered:

"It was urged that the operations of the company contravened the Provincial law, at the least in two respects, namely, in dealing in land, and in acting in contravention of the Building Acts of the Province. It may be granted that by the law of Quebec corporations cannot acquire or hold lands without the consent of the Crown. This law was recognised by this board, and held to apply to foreign corporations in the case of the *Chaudière Gold Mining Company vs. Desbarats*. It may also be assumed, for the purpose of this appeal, that the power to repeal or modify this law falls within No. 13 of section 92 of the British North America Act, viz., property and civil rights in the Province, and belongs exclusively to the Provincial Legislature; so that the Dominion Parliament could not confer powers on the company to override it. But the powers found in the Acts of incorporation are not necessarily inconsistent with the Provincial law of mortmain, which does not absolutely prohibit corporations from acquiring or holding lands, but only requires, as a condition of their doing so, that they should have the consent of the Crown. If that consent be obtained, a corporation does not infringe the Provincial laws of mortmain by acquiring and holding lands. What the Act of incorporation has done is to create a legal and artificial person with capacity to carry on certain kinds of business which are defined, within a defined limit, viz., throughout the Dominion."

That is what I say this Bill does.

"Among other things, it has given to the association power to deal in land and buildings; but the capacity so given only enables it to acquire and hold lands in any Province, consistently with the laws of that Province relating to the acquisition and tenure of lands."

Further on the decision says:

"The object was merely—"

Speaking of the judgment in a previous case—

"—to point out that a corporation should only exercise its powers subject to the law of the Province, whatever it might be in this respect."

So I say that by the incorporation of this society, as it is proposed to be done, this Parliament will incorporate it subject to the laws of the Province, and only to such an extent can a corporate body carry on its business. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) is, as I have said, one not acceptable to the Orange body in this country. It is to add a clause restraining them from holding processions in any Province where there is a law against processions, or where there may be a law hereafter against them. There is nothing in this Bill whatever authorising the Orange Society to hold processions, and so it is entirely unnecessary for the hon. gentleman to propose the amendment. There is a law in the Province of Quebec, affecting Montreal only, providing that a society such as this cannot hold processions. That provision will not be interfered with in any way by this Bill, and I assert without fear of contradiction—and I do so for the benefit of those who have been asking my opinion on this question—that that law will still remain the law; and when the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) asked us to attach to this Bill his proposed amendment, he was only proposing to duplicate what is the present law as regards the Province of Quebec, because the provision which he seeks to have inserted by this House is that which is already the law, and that which will remain the law in the Province of Quebec. I say, therefore, that his amendment is entirely unnecessary and uncalled for, and should not be attached to the Bill now before the House. The hon. gentleman referred to the Crimes of Violence Prevention Act, introduced by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), which is a Dominion Act; but I think the hon. gentleman was a little unfair in the inference he drew, when he sought to make it appear that the Orange body was responsible for the introduction of that Act. On the occasion to which he referred—and I am sorry he referred to it, because there was no necessity—the Orangemen were not the aggressors; but, on the contrary, they were acting on the defensive from the beginning to the end, and were in no way whatever responsible for the sad event which took place at that time. I desire to refer to another matter by way of privilege, and I do so because the hon. gentleman who spoke a few minutes before me referred to another matter concerning himself by way of privilege. I refer to an article which appeared in the *Empire* of Saturday last, in which there was stated that there was a clique on this side of the House whose intention was, and whose efforts were directed to defeat the Bill by pressing it to a vote on Friday night. I say that, so far as I am concerned, that accusation is utterly false and untrue from beginning to end. I know that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, at all events, will know how anxious I have been time and again to have this Bill pass the House, and it was most

Mr. BARRON.

unjust and unfair, and I would use stronger language, if I were permitted, in denial of the statement which, so far as I am concerned, or any hon. gentleman is concerned, is absolutely false and untrue. In conclusion, I wish to say to my friends in this House, who may in any way be guided by what I may say, that this Bill is nothing more nor less than a benevolent Bill. You might have any other name attached to the Bill than that of the Orange Society, so long as you have the names of the gentlemen who are there set down as incorporators. I say, Sir, that the object is simply the same as the Bill which was before this House in the case of the Foresters Society, entirely and exclusively a benevolent one. As the hon. member for Montreal Centre said, there was nothing objectionable in the Bill itself. I hope, Sir, it will not be said that this society, which, as the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) stated the other night, was a loyal one, will not be refused a measure of a benevolent nature such as is now before the House, inasmuch as other societies have been allowed to have similar Bills passed in their favor.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not intend discussing the merits of the Bill, because they have been fully discussed before. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Barron) says, that any other name might have been chosen than that of the Orange society; and I believe that it would be well if another name had been chosen, because in the minds of many inhabitants in this Dominion the word "Orange" means aggression against the Catholics. However, as I said before, I will not go into details. I will vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), for the following reasons: 1st. This amendment, establishing an exceptional provision, virtually admits the principle of the whole Bill, and I cannot accept any part of a Bill which I believe unconstitutional, infringing upon the exclusive rights of the Provinces, and which seeks to give legal existence to a secret society. The Catholic Church, to which I belong, condemns all secret societies, for reasons of public order, safety, and welfare. 2nd. I believe that this amendment tends, itself, to infringe upon the rights of the Provinces, which alone have the right of legislating as to who shall or shall not hold processions, &c. It is a municipal and police matter, exclusively belonging to the Provinces. At least the amendment throws a doubt as to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provinces in the matter, and uselessly affirms a right created by a Royal statute in favor of each Province. 3rd. The amendment is useless, as far as my section of the country is concerned at least—a Provincial law duly in force already settling the matter involved; and 4th. It contains a standing and dangerous provocation, of a nature to perpetrate agitation and to cause new trouble. The situation to my eyes is very clear. Either this Bill is constitutional or not. If it be unconstitutional, it will confirm no incorporation at all. If it be constitutional, every lodge created or existing in any Province will receive by it a legal standing, will become a moral person, subject, as all others, to the laws of the Dominion, but also of the Province in which it will operate. I will not accuse the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) of making a political dodge, because I am afraid it would not be parliamentary,

but I will say that it looks very like it. He supports most faithfully the hon. leader of this House, although he knows that that hon. gentleman would have only one word to say, or one finger to raise, to prevent that Bill from coming into law, I presume the hon. member will go on supporting his chief; but, to redeem his position, to give change to public opinion, he wants to throw some golden sand in the eyes of the Catholics of the Province of Quebec. I do not think that will prove a very successful trump card.

Mr. LAVERGNE. It seems to me that the amendment of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has reference altogether to powers which should be exercised by the Local Legislature. It appears to me that it does not condemn the principle of this Bill, but is intended only for the purpose of catching votes, and trying to please everybody. I do not discuss the merits of this Bill, because they have been already thoroughly discussed in this House on several occasions; but, to comply with my own wishes on this question, and with the wishes of many of my hon. friends, I beg to move as an amendment to the amendment:

That all the words after "That" in the main motion be omitted, and that all the words in the amendment be struck out, and the following substituted therefor: the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be read a third time this day six months.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. Lavergne to the amendment:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Gillmor,
Bain (Soulanges),	Godbout,
Béchar, d,	Grandbois,
Bergeron,	Guay,
Bernier,	Holton,
Blake,	Innes,
Boisvert,	Jones (Halifax),
Borden,	Kenny,
Bourassa,	Labrosse,
Brien,	Langvin (Sir Hector),
Burns,	Laurier,
Campbell,	Lavergne,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Lister,
Cashey,	Loyitt,
Casgrain,	Mackenzie,
Coughlin,	McIntyre,
Coulombe,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Couture,	Massue,
Curran,	Meigs,
Daoust,	Mills (Bothwell),
Desaulniers,	Montplaisir,
Desjardins,	Neveu,
Doyon,	Paterson (Brant),
Dupont,	Perry,
Edgar,	Rinfret,
Ellis,	Robillard,
Fiset,	St. Marie,
Fisher,	Somerville,
Flynn,	Thérien,
Gauthier,	Thompson (Sir John),
Geoffrion,	Trow.—63.
Gigault,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald (Sir Adams),	McDougald (Picton),
Barnard,	McKay,
Barron,	McKeen,
Bell,	McMillan (Huron),
Bowell,	McNeill,
Borje,	Madill,
Brown,	Mara,
Burdett,	Marshall,
Cargill,	Masson,
Carling,	Mills (Annapolis),
Charlton,	Moneriff,
Cochrane,	O'Heir,

Cockburn,	Perley,
Corby,	Porter,
Davies,	Prior,
Davin,	Putnam,
Davis,	Robertson,
Dawson,	Ross,
Denison,	Rowand,
Dewdney,	Rykert,
Dickey,	Scarth,
Dickinson,	Scriver,
Earle,	Shanly,
Eisenhauer,	Skinner,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Small,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Smith (Ontario),
Ferguson (Welland),	Sproule,
Foster,	Sutherland,
Gordon,	Taylor,
Guillet,	Temple,
Haggart,	Tisdale,
Hesson,	Tyrwhitt,
Hickey,	Wallace,
Hudspeth,	Ward,
Jamieson,	Watson,
Kirkpatrick,	Weldon (Albert),
Lang,	Welsh,
Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),	White (Cardwell),
Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Renfrew),
Macdonald (Huron),	Wilmot,
Macdowall,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
McCulla,	Wilson (Lennox),
McDonald (Victoria),	Wood (Brookville).—86.

Mr. TAYLOR. The members for Inverness, Northumberland, Kent and Pontiac have not voted.

Mr. CAMERON. I am paired with the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Carpenter). I am in favor of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I paired on Friday last with the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) —a time pair. I am in favor of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. LANDRY. I am paired with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I am in favor of the amendment.

Mr. BRYSON. I paired with the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) on Friday evening. I am against the amendment to the amendment.

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I wish to state that I am opposed to the amendment, because by voting for it I should be admitting the principle of the Bill, to which I am strongly opposed. I am sure that during the course of my life I have never had a feeling of personal animosity against any man because he was an Orangeman. Since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, I have become acquainted with a number of gentlemen belonging to that order, and I have had no reason to complain of my relations with them; and I must say of some, with whom my relations have been familiar, that I have learned to appreciate them as honest and honorable men. But, notwithstanding that consideration, I object to the Bill now before the House, on the ground that it provides for the incorporation of a secret society. On principle I am opposed to all secret societies, especially in a country like Canada, where the greatest political and civil liberty is enjoyed by every one, and where the existence of a secret society is uncalled for.

Mr. CASEY. My reason for voting against the amendment is, in part, the same as that of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I consider that in voting for the amendment, I should be taking for granted that the Bill was going to pass, thus destroying my protest against the Bill in any form. But there is another reason. I do not believe we have the power in this House

either to prohibit or to allow processions in any of the Provinces of Canada. That, as I understand it, is a matter of civil rights with which the Provinces alone have power to deal. If any of the Provinces have Acts against party processions, those Acts will be enforced whether we tack this amendment on to the Bill or not; if they have no such Acts, and choose to allow party processions, that is their own business, not ours. I must say, however, that if we had the power, I should be glad to see processions of this kind prohibited in all the Provinces of the Dominion. I believe that processions of this sort, which are necessarily irritating, not only to religious feelings, but to race feelings—I do not refer to the French race alone, but to the Irish race as well—should not be allowed, as they are not allowed in Ireland, where this order originated.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes; they are.

Mr. CASEY. They may be now, but they were not a few years ago, and I believe that these processions, which are necessarily insulting to certain members of the community, should be disallowed. But I do not believe that we are justified in using words which are either meaningless or mischievous. If the words of this amendment have any meaning at all, they assume that this House has the right of prohibiting processions in the different Provinces. If they do not mean that, they mean nothing, and they form a useless addition to the Bill. In reference to the Bill itself, the changes which have been made in it this year have not at all removed the objections which I, as well as most of the gentlemen around me, have had to the Bill in former years. The addition of the clauses referring to mutual insurance does not change in any respect the nature of the Act itself. It remains an Act incorporating a society which, to me at least, seems to be mischievous and unsuited to the conditions of this country. We know well that the Orangemen do not come here with this Bill for the sake of the mutual insurance scheme. That is not what they want; what they want is a recognition from this House of their corporate standing in this country, and the mutual insurance scheme has been just tacked on to it to make the constitution of this body resemble those of societies which are purely benevolent in their nature, and nothing else. A comparison has been made with the Foresters Bill, which we passed last year, and it is held, and apparently admitted by many hon. members, that, because we gave the Foresters an Act embodying a scheme of mutual insurance, we ought to give the Orangemen a similar Act. But, look at the difference in the nature of the two societies. The Foresters are a mutual benefit society; their object is benevolence, mutual insurance, and a little harmless jollification once or twice a year, when they have their picnics. Can anyone compare that society with the Orange society? The Orange society in its nature is essentially a politico-religious society, and the mutual insurance scheme is a mere *addendum* tacked on to make it resemble benevolent societies like the Foresters. The two societies are as different from each other as the society of Jesuits is from a Methodist class meeting, and they cannot be made to resemble each other by anything you can put into this Bill. If you should take something away from the objects of the

Mr. CASEY

Orange Society, you might assimilate it to the Foresters, but not otherwise. I would ask my Orange friends to consider this: Suppose the Jesuits were not satisfied with their incorporation from the Legislature of Quebec, and applied to this House for incorporation throughout the Dominion. Of course my Orange friends would oppose that application; but suppose a Bill for that purpose had been presented here for two or three Sessions and defeated, and it had been decided to add to it a mutual insurance scheme, would my Orange friends consider that that changed anything in the nature of the Bill? Would they, having voted against it for two or three Sessions, vote for it because of the addition of such a scheme? I call on any Orangeman in this House to say whether he would vote for the incorporation of the Jesuits because a scheme of mutual insurance was included in it? I do not believe that one of them could honestly do so, and I oppose the incorporation of the Orange Order for the same reason that they oppose the incorporation of the Jesuits, because I consider it a politico-religious body, which it is not at all desirable to establish in the Dominion of Canada. When I say it is a politico-religious body, I am borne out by the facts. That order originated in Ireland after the conquest, and in Ireland it has always been a badge of distinction, not only between religions, but between races—between the Anglo-Saxon race inhabiting the north of Ireland and the Celtic Catholics; it has been a sign of conquest, a necessarily irritating and insulting organisation, even in the country where it originated, and where there was possibly some excuse for its formation in the angry passions then existing. But, Sir, when it is transplanted here and worked in the interests of politics largely, when its promoters go so far as to organise lodges among our Indians on the reserves, it has ceased to have any character as a benevolent or a friendly organisation or as a merely loyal organisation, but has become a machine to be used for political purposes, at the bidding of whatever party may happen to have control of it. That has been proved by the vote we have just had. Large numbers of gentlemen who have voted against the six months hoist-to-day voted for it on former occasions. What a change! It is a change not to be accounted for by any change in the Bill itself, for no rational man would say that was a reason; but it is evidently because these hon. gentlemen feel that they must do this to counteract the effect of their vote last year on the Jesuit Bill. It is a bargain and sale, which has been carried out faithfully by the supporters of the First Minister—by those Protestant supporters of his who did not formerly support the Orange Bill. They have all now fallen into line, and the result will be, what it is intended to be, that no Orangeman will dare, henceforth to lift up his voice in opposition to the course pursued by those supporters of the Government, who refused to disallow the Jesuit Act last year. The scheme has been well arranged and has succeeded admirably. The wind has been completely taken out of the Orange agitation on the Jesuit question, and, having received their *quid pro quo*, these men will say no more about the Jesuits, but will fall again into line, and be, as they have hitherto been, good loyal supporters of the First Minister, in the

first place, and of the Orange Order, in the second place.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Curran :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but be re-committed to the Committee of the whole House for the purpose of amending the same, by providing that this association shall not hold party processions in any Province where Party Processions Acts are now, or may hereafter be enacted.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Gigault,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,
Boisvert,	Kenny,
Barnes,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Casgrain,	Massue,
Coulombe,	Meigs,
Curran,	Mills (Annapolis),
Daoust,	Montplaisir,
Desaulniers,	Thérien,
Desjardins,	Thompson (Sir John).—23.
Dupont,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Archibald (Sir Adams),	Laurier,
Barnard,	Lavergne,
Barron,	Lister,
Béchar, d,	Lovitt,
Bell,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Bernier,	Macdonald (Huron),
Blake,	Macdowall,
Borden,	Mackenzie,
Bourassa,	McCulla,
Bowell,	McDonald (Victoria),
Boyle,	McDougald (Pictou),
Brien,	McIntyre,
Brown,	McKay,
Burdett,	McKeen,
Campbell,	McMillan (Huron),
Cargill,	McNeill,
Carling,	Madill,
Casey,	Mara,
Charlton,	Marshall,
Cochrane,	Masson,
Cockburn,	Mills (Bothwell),
Corby,	Moncrieff,
Couture,	Nereu,
Davies,	O'Brien,
Davin,	Paterson (Brant),
Davis,	Perley,
Dawson,	Perry,
Denison,	Porter,
Dewdney,	Prior,
Dickey,	Putnam,
Dickinson,	Rinfret,
Doyon,	Robertson,
Earle,	Ross,
Edgar,	Rowand,
Eisenhauer,	Rykert,
Ellis,	Ste. Marie,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Scarth,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Scriven,
Ferguson (Welland),	Shanly,
Fiset,	Skinner,
Fisher,	Small,
Flynn,	Smith (Ontario),
Foster,	Somerville,
Gauthier,	Sproule,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
Gillmor,	Taylor,
Godbout,	Temple,
Gordon,	Tisdale,
Gnar,	Trow,
Guillet,	Tyrwhitt,
Haggart,	Wallace,
Hesson,	Ward,
Hickey,	Watson,
Holton,	Weldon (Albert),
Hudspeth,	Welsh,
Innes,	White (Cardwell),
Jamieson,	White (Renfrew),
Jones (Halifax),	Wilmot,
Kirkpatrick,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Labrosse,	Wilson (Lennox),
Lang,	Wood (Brockville).—124.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), Kent (Mr. Landry), and Pontiac (Mr. Bryson) have not voted.

Mr. CAMERON. I paired with the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Carpenter). I am in favor of the amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. As I have already explained, I made a time pair with the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy).

Mr. CASEY. Do you know how he would vote ?

Mr. MITCHELL. No ; but I know that I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. LANDRY. I would have voted with the minority, if I were at liberty to vote.

Mr. BRYSON. I am in favor of the Bill and against the amendment.

House divided on motion of Mr. Wallace for third reading :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Archibald (Sir Adams),	McDougald (Pictou),
Barnard,	McKay,
Barron,	McKeen,
Bell,	McMillan (Huron),
Bowell,	McNeill,
Boyle,	Madill,
Brown,	Mara,
Burdett,	Marshall,
Cargill,	Masson,
Carling,	Mills (Annapolis),
Charlton,	Moncrieff,
Cochrane,	O'Brien,
Cockburn,	Perley,
Corby,	Porter,
Davies,	Prior,
Davin,	Putnam,
Davis,	Robertson,
Dawson,	Ross,
Denison,	Rowand,
Dewdney,	Rykert,
Dickey,	Scarth,
Dickinson,	Scriven,
Earle,	Shanly,
Eisenhauer,	Skinner,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Small,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Smith (Ontario),
Ferguson (Welland),	Sproule,
Foster,	Sutherland,
Gordon,	Taylor,
Guillet,	Temple,
Haggart,	Tisdale,
Hesson,	Tyrwhitt,
Hickey,	Wallace,
Hudspeth,	Ward,
Jamieson,	Watson,
Kirkpatrick,	Weldon (Albert),
Lang,	Welsh,
Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),	White (Cardwell),
Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Renfrew),
Macdonald (Huron),	Wilmot,
Macdowall,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
McCulla,	Wilson (Lennox),
McDonald (Victoria),	Wood (Brockville).—86.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Gillmor,
Bain (Soulanges),	Godbout,
Béchar, d,	Grandbois,
Bergeron,	Guay,
Bernier,	Holton,
Blake,	Innes,
Boisvert,	Jones (Halifax),
Borden,	Kenny,
Bourassa,	Labrosse,
Brien,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Burns,	Laurier,
Campbell,	Lavergne,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Lister,
Casey,	Lovitt,
Casgrain,	Mackenzie,

Coulombe,
Couture,
Curran,
Daoust,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Doyon,
Dupont,
Edgar,
Ellis,
Fiset,
Flynn,
Gauthier,
Geoffron,
Gigault,

McIntyre,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Massue,
Meigs,
Mills (Bothwell),
Montplaisir,
Neveu,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Rinfret,
Ste. Marie,
Somerville,
Thérien,
Thompson (Sir John),
Trow.—61.

Motion agreed to, and the Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), Kent (Mr. Landry), Pontiac (Mr. Bryson), and Glengarry (Mr. Purcell) have not voted.

Mr. CAMERON. I have paired with the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Carpenter). I am opposed to the Bill.

Mr. BRYSON. I have paired with the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). I am in favor of the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. I give the same reason for not voting as I did before. I am against the Bill.

Mr. LANDRY. I am against the Bill.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Summerside Bank.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Bill (No. 59) to change the name of the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company to the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil.)

Bill (No. 36) to confirm an agreement between the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Steamboat Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Brandon and South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Scarth.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Owen Sound and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the Louisburg and Richmond Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

INVERNESS RAILWAY.

Mr. SMALL moved second reading of Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Inverness Railway Company.

Mr. CAMERON. The introduction of this Bill in this House is, I have no doubt, a great surprise to the people of Inverness. This, however, is not the stage at which the Bill should be opposed. There is no great reason why the Bill should not be read a second time, though I consider it is not only an infringement on Provincial rights, but is also a violation of vested rights. In 1882, a Bill was passed by the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia, covering the ground which this Bill proposes to cover. A Bill was also passed in 1886 by the Local Legislature covering the same ground. Two Bills were passed in 1887 also covering the same ground, and in 1887 power was given to the

Local Government of Nova Scotia by an Act of Parliament to grant an Act of incorporation to any railway company that would propose to build a railway over the same ground. The section which refers to this power is section 7, of chapter 1, of the 49th Victoria. It proposes to give the Local Government power to this effect. Section 7 provides:

“A charter may be granted, if satisfactory proposals for the construction of railways mentioned in this part be made to the Governor in Council by persons who are not incorporated; the Governor in Council may grant to such persons, under such corporate name as he shall deem expedient, a charter confirming upon them, in whole or in part, the franchises, powers and privileges granted under any existing laws of this Province to any company, as respects the construction or operation of lines of railway or steamships, and such charter, when published in *Royal Gazette*, by order of the Governor in Council, shall have force and effect as if it were an Act of the Legislature of Nova Scotia.”

Now, Sir, there are not only four charters passed in the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia over the same ground, but this extraordinary power is also given to the Local Government to grant similar charters over the same ground. I hold, therefore, that it is an infringement on the rights of the Local Government of Nova Scotia to pass charters over this ground. It is altogether an anomaly, and during my experience in Parliament I do not know of a single charter which has been passed by this Parliament to two companies over the same ground. It is a principle which has governed the Railway Committee since I have had the honor of being a member of that Committee; and I am not a little astonished at this Bill being introduced here. I am aware that its introduction here has been for the purpose, I am sorry to say, of making confusion worse confounded. A very large number of charters already over the same ground seem not to have been sufficient to prevent the construction of a railway over it; but this one is also introduced here, as I apprehend, for the purpose of making me express an opinion relative to it. I have no fears in doing so; I am opposed to the Bill just because there are surely a sufficient number of charters over that ground already, and also because it is not necessary that any railway company should secure a charter from this Parliament in order to enable them to build a road, if necessary.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT PETERBORO'.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What amount of money has been paid to the following legal gentlemen respectively, namely: W. H. Moore, A. P. Poussette, Q.C., John O'Meara, John Green, E. A. Peck, and John Burnham, Q.C., all of Peterboro', on account of legal services or otherwise, rendered by those gentlemen, or any of them, on account of, and in regard to, the following works, or any of them:—1st. The purchase of the site and the construction of the Peterboro' Post Office; 2nd. The purchase of the site for the construction of the Custom house at Peterboro'; 3rd. On account of the Trent Valley Canal, distinguishing if paid on survey or construction, or damages to land consequent on construction?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can only answer the third question to-day; I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the other two questions to stand until to-morrow. In answer to the third

question, Mr. Moore has been paid \$1,539.77; Mr. O'Meara, \$153.82; both chargeable to damages to land consequent on construction. The other gentlemen have received nothing in connection with the work.

WHARF AT ILE AUX NOIX.

Mr. BOURASSA asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Supplementary Estimates this year a sum of money for the construction of a wharf at the end of the road leading to Ile aux Noix, in the parish of St. Valentine, county of St. John's, on the Richelieu River, in order to facilitate the approach to Ile aux Noix and the trade of the adjoining parishes?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not possible for me to give the hon. gentleman an affirmative answer at present. He will have to wait until the Supplementary Estimates come down, when, if he finds an answer in them, it will, I believe, be in the affirmative.

WORLD'S FAIR AT CHICAGO.

Mr. INNES asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make an appropriation in order to secure a proper representation of the manufactures, arts, natural and other products of Canada at the World's Fair, which, by vote of the United States Congress, is to be held at Chicago in the year 1892?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Whenever it is ascertained beyond a doubt that the World's Fair is to be proceeded with, it will be the duty of the Government to call the attention of the House to it.

REVISION OF THE DOMINION VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. INNES (for Mr. PLATT) asked, Whether the Dominion voters' lists will be revised during the year 1890?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By the law the Dominion voters' lists must be revised this year.

I. C. R.—RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES.

Mr. LAURIER (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, What are the receipts and working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for the seven months ending 31st January, in the years 1889 and 1890, respectively?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In 1889 the receipts were \$1,771,684.85, and the working expenses, \$2,064,701.58. In 1890 the receipts were \$1,745,786.79, and the working expenses, \$2,161,082.03.

I. C. R.—PAYMENT OF EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Whether it is the intention of the Minister of Railways to pay employés of the Intercolonial Railway more frequently than once a month? If not, is it his intention to authorise a deputy, in the absence or illness of the General Superintendent, to sign the pay-roll, so that the employés may receive their pay at an early period of each month?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention to pay the employés of the Intercolonial Railway more frequently than once a month.

When the Chief Superintendent is unwell and unable to attend to business, and when he is to be absent for any length and period, arrangements are made for a deputy to sign the pay rolls. The men, as a rule, are paid with great regularity about the middle of each month.

"A" BATTERY, KINGSTON.

Mr. INNES (for Mr. PLATT) asked Whether rooms or quarters originally set aside for the accommodation of officers joining "A" Battery, Kingston, for instructional purposes, have since been allotted to permanent officers of the battery by authority of the Minister of Militia and Defence? If so, have other rooms or quarters been accorded such joining or attached officers, or will compensation be granted in lieu of quarters to such officers as may hereafter be attached to "A" Battery for instructional purposes?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The quarters set aside for the accommodation of the officers joining "A" Battery for instructional purposes will be available for those officers, and there will be no occasion to grant compensation to anyone in lieu of the quarters.

BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS.

Mr. LISTER moved:

That a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the claims of the Bresaylor Half-breeds for losses sustained during the rebellion in the North-West, and also in reference to furs taken from Charles Bremner, a half-breed residing at Battleford. That the said Committee consist of Messrs. Barron, Watson, Denison, Landry, Macdowall and Lister, and that they have power to send for persons and papers, and employ a stenographer, and report from time to time to this House.

He said: The matter involved in the resolution has already been brought before the attention of this House on at least two occasions; but the hon. gentlemen who made the motions were actuated by a desire simply to bring the attention of the Government to the fact that these claims were in existence and were unsettled, and to urge the Government to take such steps as might be necessary for the purpose of having an adjustment of the claims made, if, in fact, the claims really existed. I may say that in bringing the matter now before the House in the way I do, I am animated simply by a desire to have the claims of these people investigated, and if, upon that investigation, it turns out that they are entitled to compensation, if it turns out that they have not been properly dealt with by the Government, or if the officials of the Government have acted in an improper way whereby these people have sustained loss, then it will be the duty of the Government to do what is right under the circumstances. In going over the facts connected with this matter, the names of eminent men are necessarily brought in. The name of General Middleton, an officer of Her Majesty's army and commander of the Canadian forces, the commander of the forces at the time of the half-breed rebellion, must necessarily take a prominent place in remarks which I have to make. The names of other officials of the Government—Mr. Hayter Reed, a Commissioner of Indian Affairs in the North-West, and Mr. Bedson, the keeper of the Manitoba penitentiary—must also appear, and, if, as I am instructed, and I believe it to be a fact,

and I state it upon my responsibility as a member, I am able to establish that the conduct of these men has been unbecoming that of an officer, and unbecoming that of the officials of the Government—in other words, that the conduct of the general in command amounted to nothing more and nothing less than a looting of the property of the half-breeds; he can be no longer fit to occupy the position he occupies, and the other officials of the Government ought to be dismissed. It is a surprising fact, that this claim and this charge made against these high officials in the employ of this Government, should have been permitted to be made Session after Session for the past three or four years, and no attempt have been made to satisfy the public mind that they are foundationless, and, in fact, do not exist. If these charges are foundationless, then it was the duty of the general to have investigated them, and, for the purpose of satisfying the public, an investigation should have taken place, in order that his character and reputation should be cleared from the aspersions which this charge makes upon it. The Government have stood quietly by, and, so far as I know, the general has not asked for an investigation, but has allowed the charges to be heralded, from one end of the country to the other, without any utterance on his part. In order that the House may properly understand the position of matters and the facts as I have them, it will be necessary to go back to the close of the rebellion of 1885. At that time, General Middleton was in command of the Canadian forces in the North-West, there was a settlement there known as the Bresaylor half-breed settlement, which consisted of Scotch half-breeds and French half-breeds. Immediately on the breaking out of the rebellion, the Scotch half-breeds, taking all their movable property, went to Battleford, leaving the French half-breeds in the settlement. It is said that the French half-breeds did not go to Battleford for the reason that their horses were some thirty or forty miles away from where they were living, and that it was impossible for them to go, in consequence. They consequently remained where they were; but if the investigation is granted it will, I believe, be shown that the French half-breeds sent a messenger to Colonel Morris, who was in command at Battleford, telling him they wanted protection. The messenger was arrested and kept under arrest by the Commandant, and no word was sent back to the half-breeds by the military authorities; subsequently, and before the battle of Cut Knife, a messenger was sent, in the night time, to the fort at Battleford, telling the military authorities that the French half-breeds were loyal to the Government. They sent word by this messenger that they had been compelled by the Indians to go on to the reserve. I may say, that in the meantime, the story of Bremner and others is that the Indians surrounded them and threatened them with violence to such an extent that they compelled the French half-breeds to go on the reserve. After going on to the reserve they sent a messenger to the military authorities at Battleford, telling them that they had been compelled to this course, and also telling that their tents were of white canvas, that they were not along with the Indians, that they were loyal to their Government, and that the military authorities would know when they made an attack

Mr. LISTER.

where their camp was, on account of the distinctive color of the tents, in addition to which means of recognition they would hoist a white flag. Now, that was the message sent by these French half-breeds to the militia authorities at Battleford; but, as I am informed, when fire was opened, instead of striking at the Indians, the military authorities directed their fire upon the encampment of the half-breeds, notwithstanding the fact that the white flag had been hoisted in accordance with the message they had sent. I believe, Sir, it is true that when the half-breeds found that their flag of truce, as they considered it, was not respected, two or three of them joined the Indians and resisted the attack made by the military. It may be said that it was the duty of the French half-breeds to have gone to the fort when the Scotch half-breeds went, but the answer that these men make to the charge is, that it was impossible for them to go, inasmuch as their horses were a long distance away from the camp; and they say, moreover, that after the Scotch half-breeds had gone into the fort, there being two reserves to pass between their settlement and Battleford, and the Indians being hostile, that it was dangerous for them to have crossed these two reserves for the purpose of getting into Battleford. For this reason, they sent a message to the fort for protection, and, subsequently, they sent a message that they were loyal to the Government, would take no part in resisting the military authorities, and indicating where they were encamped, so that the military authorities would know they were not resisting the Government. On the surrender of Poundmaker, the French half-breeds went to the fort at Battleford and Charles Bremner, one of these half-breeds, a fur-dealer in his business, whom, I am told, had four or five stations and who had gathered his whole winter's catch, brought down all his furs along with him to the fort; he erected his tent at the fort, and shortly after doing so some of the soldiers commenced to take away his furs. General Middleton himself came upon the scene, and Bremner appealed to him to protect him against the volunteers or soldiers who were taking his furs; and that by order of General Middleton the furs were taken into the fort. The Government took control of the furs, by taking them out of his possession and taking them into theirs. Having assumed the control of that property, it became the duty of General Middleton and the others officers in command to take care that the man was not despoiled of his property; but, according to the statement which I have received, such was not the case. The furs were taken into the fort and Bremner was immediately arrested. He was sent to Regina and lodged in jail, and the military authorities took his stock of silver fox and others of the most valuable furs which the North-West produces, and worth from \$4,000 to \$6,000. Bremner was released, afterwards, without even the form of a trial. He and the other half-breeds, who had been arrested for complicity in this rebellion, were released on their own recognisance to appear when called upon; but from that day to the present moment they have never been summoned to answer the charge of disloyalty made against them by the military authorities. After Bremner was released he went to Battleford to see about his property, and great was his astonishment, when arriving

there, to find that the officers of the Government, the officers in command, instead of keeping the promises which had been made to him to take care of his furs, informed him that these furs were disposed of by order of General Middleton. Bremner went to Winnipeg, when the Minister of Militia was there, as we all know, and he interviewed the Minister, who told him that he had nothing to do with the matter. This poor half-breed, then saw General Middleton, and General Middleton disclaimed any knowledge of the furs, and further said that he had never ordered Bremner's arrest. General Middleton was the officer in command. Bremner says he was arrested by order of General Middleton, and he says further that it was by order of the General that the furs were taken from the camp and carried into the fort. There was a large quantity of furs of a most valuable character; and if this House gives me a committee, I pledge my word upon my responsibility as a member, having investigated this claim, that I believe I shall be able to prove that the furs were taken by order of General Middleton. Now, the question is, what became of those furs? I have evidence to show that from time to time friends of the officers in command received letters or notes to the men in charge of the furs, authorising them to let those persons take the furs, and they would go and select for themselves a valuable fur and carry it away. I think I shall be able to prove that when General Middleton was leaving the North-West to go to Winnipeg, all that remained of that large quantity of furs were put up in four boxes, of which, by order of General Middleton, two boxes were for himself, one box for Mr. Hayter Reed, and one box for Mr. Bedson, of the Manitoba Penitentiary. I know that I shall be able to prove that they were put up in compliance with a letter of which this is a copy:

"DEAR WARDEN,—General Middleton has instructed and authorised me to send you the present letter, desiring that you put up bales of furs for the undermentioned: two bales for General Middleton, one for S. L. Bedson, and one for myself. Please select the best and pack them down, as we will be down there to-morrow by boat.

"HAYTER REED,
Assistant Commissioner of Indians."

I can prove that, in accordance with this letter, those four boxes of furs were put up, and that two of the boxes were addressed to General Middleton, one to Mr. Bedson, and one to Mr. Hayter Reed, and that those boxes were put on the boat that took General Middleton and Mr. Hayter Reed down to Winnipeg. What became of the furs afterwards it is impossible to say, and it is for the purpose of ascertaining what has become of them that I ask the House to grant this Committee. The Government appointed a commission to investigate the claims of the Bresaylor half-breeds, and the payment of the claims of those poor miserable half-breeds was refused. The commission refused to consider them, and refused to take evidence under oath, accepting the unsworn statement of men to whom they went to talk about the matter. Moreover, I am directed to say that if payment of the losses of these half-breeds depends on their loyalty, they are willing to make that the test, and unless they can show that they have been loyal from first to last, they are willing to forfeit their claims. They claim that they were and always have been loyal, and,

therefore, they ask to be put in the same position as the other half-breeds of the country, and to be paid some compensation for the great losses they have sustained. Now, Sir, it does seem to me extraordinary, under these circumstances, that the Government should refuse to investigate their claims. If it is within the range of possibility that a wrong has been done to those men, surely it is the duty of the Government to take whatever steps may be necessary for the purpose of having that wrong righted. Now, Charles Bremner makes this statement:

"I had been trading during the winter of 1884-85, and had secured fur to the value of \$8,000. It is not necessary here to go into detail as to my imprisonment and attending losses. At the time of Poundmaker's surrender, he also surrendered his prisoners. I with others, was permitted to camp near the barracks of the North-West Mounted Police. I was arrested the same evening, without any knowledge of any indictment. General Middleton came into our camp the same evening, and as the soldiers were endeavoring to take my furs by force, Mr. Caplette (my clerk) asked General Middleton if he had given the men authority to take the furs. General Middleton replied, that no such order had been given. He asked to whom the furs belonged, where they had been got, and other questions. Caplette explained their existence. The General then said that he would send some men to protect the furs. He sent three men and team, and removed the furs without permission to the barracks. Later on we were tried at Regina, and were let off on our own recognisance. On my return to Battleford, I went to Inspector Morris of the North-West Mounted Police, who had been in charge at the time the furs were taken, and demanded my furs. He replied that they had been disposed of, by order of General Middleton, whose instructions were in his possession. I then went to Winnipeg, and with Mr. Howell, a lawyer, met the Minister of Militia. In reply to my request for information *re* furs, he stated that he had nothing whatever to do with the matter, and in reply to another question, he said that I should apply to General Middleton for information. I saw General Middleton. He denied any knowledge of the furs or of having any connection with them. He also stated that he had never ordered Bremner's arrest or any of his party. Getting no satisfaction, I returned to Battleford. I again saw Morris, who repeated his assertion that Middleton had given instructions as to the disposal of the furs. I made a claim to the Government for the furs, charging less than they cost me: and although I have frequently corresponded with the Department at Ottawa, I can get no satisfaction from them."

Now, Sir, I have in my possession petitions from the people of that country—from men of the highest standing and respectability—who represent that this man Bremner is a respectable man, and that his claim ought to be paid by the Government. When the late Hon. Mr. White was in the North-West, a deputation waited upon him, and he promised that this matter should be investigated, and that the wrong should be set right. Shortly afterwards, however, as we all know, Mr. White died, and so far as he was concerned, nothing more could be done. About that time, a petition to the following effect was forwarded to the Government:—

"To the HON. THOMAS WHITE,
Minister of the Interior.

"SIR,—We, the undersigned, by this our petition, humbly represent—

"That we settled in the neighborhood of Battleford, at a place known as the Bresaylor Settlement, in the years 1883-4. That having sold our property in Manitoba at the time when property was very high, we brought with us here considerable horses, cattle and cash, and were in a very prosperous condition until the rebellion broke out.

"That at the beginning of said rebellion we were made prisoners to the Indians, left destitute, and forced into their camp.

"That since rebellion the Government has paid or indemnified all the settlers for the losses they sustained on account of said rebellion.

"That on the supposition that we joined the Indians of our own free will, and that we acted as rebels in connection with them during said rebellion, payment for our losses has been so far withheld unjustly, without enquiry of any kind, and on mere suppositions which have no foundation whatever.

"Your petitioners strongly protest against such a course. We are British subjects, and as such we should be considered innocent until we are proved guilty; and we consider it arbitrary and unfair to be thus condemned without a trial.

"Although the *onus probandi* does not, or should not rest on us, we have always been ready, and are still ready to appear before Government Commissioners or a jury of our fellow-citizens and prove to their satisfaction that we were forced to follow the rebel Indians as their prisoners, and never ceased to be loyal to Her Majesty's Government.

"To better satisfy you as to the genuineness of our pretensions, your petitioners take the liberty of herein stating a few of the leading facts relating to doings and movements during the late rebellion which will help you to form some idea of the circumstances of our case.

"As our settlement is twenty-five miles from Battleford, with no other settlement between us, we were not made aware of the movements of the Indians until a large number of them were assembled at Battleford on the south side of Battle River, and when Payne and Tremont had already been murdered.

"That as two Indian reserves were between us and Battleford at a spot where the Battle and Saskatchewan Rivers are only about three miles apart we could not avoid passing through these reserves without considerable risk to our lives. As soon as informed of the movements and warlike attitude of the Indians we sent for our horses, which were herded twenty-five miles west of our place, and made ourselves ready to start for the barracks, when Indians appearing to be friendly came to us declaring that we were watched by the Indians and that if we attempted to move towards Battleford we would be all killed, but would not be troubled or interfered with if we remained at our homes.

"On this information we wrote a letter and sent couriers to Capt. Morris, the commanding officer at Battleford, explaining our position, our desire to reach the barracks, and asking assistance to help us to make our way to Battleford. No answer came, and as we learned later, our communication was looked at with distrust, and our messenger put in jail.

"About one week after the sending of our letter to Capt. Morris, one Angus Miller and Edward Spence obtained a pass from Capt. Morris and came to our settlement to look after their property. On being asked why the help asked for had not been sent, Miller replied that they could not have spared any of their men, and that some were suspicious about our designs. Miller and Spence did not know if we could follow the road safely with our families, as they themselves had not thought safe to follow; yet after some discussion we decided to attempt going to Battleford with them. We had our horses hitched up ready to go when seven or eight Indians suddenly broke on us, followed by about two hundred and fifty others. Miller and Spence left at once full speed for the barracks.

"The Indians surrounded us, took possession of our cattle, and ordered us to follow them or be shot. We were also ordered to deliver up our arms, but as we persistently refused, and declared that we would fight before doing so, were finally allowed to keep them. We followed them, surrounded all the way to their general camp at Poundmaker's Reserve.

"Towards the 18th of April, a few days before the battle at Cut Knife Creek, we sent during the night one Samuel Denison, with instructions to proceed to the barracks and inform Capt. Morris that we were prisoners of the Indians; that if they were to come to fight not to shoot at us; that our camp would be at one side and could be easily recognised by our square canvas tents while the Indians had tepees; that if a favorable occasion offered during the battle we would join the troops and fight the Indians.

"On the following day the Indians, taking notice of Denison's disappearance, became suspicious about our intentions. They held a council and decided that we should remove our tents to the centre of the camp. On our refusing to comply with this order they rode around in a threatening attitude, yelling and firing, Indian fashion. We showed that we were determined to fight them rather than comply, and seeing that we could not be intimidated we were finally allowed to remain where we were encamped.

"On hearing the firing of the cannon on the morning of

Mr. LISTER.

the battle Charles Bremner put up a white flag to indicate to the troops the position of our camp. The Indians wanted us to pull it down, but we resisted, and to avoid a possible conflict we had to assure them that it meant nothing.

"Notwithstanding our message to Captain Morris, through our messenger Denison, firing was kept up at our camp by the troops during the battle. Incensed at what was considered a breach of faith or an unpardonable distrust, a few amongst us—two or three—decided to take part in the fight against the troops, saying: "Since the Police do not take any notice of our letters and messages, we are not to remain exposed to be killed by both the Indians and the Police."

"Your petitioners are ready to substantiate these facts before a court of enquiry, and we feel that if such an opportunity is offered to us we will be able to dispel all doubts about the loyalty of our intentions; and prove besides that our firm attitude and our influence over the Indians has been instrumental in saving lives, and in preventing cruelties of any kind on prisoners and on the bodies of the soldiers left on the battle-field.

"Wherefore your petitioners pray that an investigation be opened, and, if practicable, before men acquainted with the country and our circumstances, to hear any evidence for or against our pretensions, with the ultimate object of being paid and indemnified for our losses on account of the rebellion, if we succeed in proving our allegations and our loyalty to the satisfaction of your Government.

"And your petitioners will never cease to pray.

"Battleford, 25th August, 1887.

"CHARLES BREMNER, HENRY SAYERS, DAVID POITRAS, BAPTISTE POITRAS, L. COCHIN, Ptre, O.M.I., J. WILLS, ALEXANDER H. SAYERS, JAMES BREMNER, S. MILLS, C. SAYERS, W. TODD, J. POITRAS, P. CALETTE, G. PICHETTE, LOUIS SAYERS, C. PRUDEN, WILLIAM VILLEBRUN."

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

After Recess.

Mr. LISTER. When you left the Chair, I had read the petition of the Bresaylor half-breeds. Attached to that petition was the following writing:—

"To the Hon. THOMAS WHITE,

"Minister of the Interior.

"SIR.—We, the inhabitants of Battleford, take the liberty of recommending to your favorable consideration the within petition of the Bresaylor Settlement.

"Though we looked with some distrust at the doings of the petitioners during the rebellion, we firmly believe them to have been led astray owing to the intense excitement and general distrust then prevailing, and we do not hesitate to admit that subsequent developments and a better understanding have dispelled the erroneous impressions we had formed on their loyalty. Though some may still retain the belief that a few amongst them took part and acted as rebels, we are fully convinced that the greatest number never ceased to be loyal in mind and in action.

"That the facts as stated in the within petition are in substance true, and that the granting of the conclusion of their petition would be an act of justice to which they are entitled; and your petitioners will never cease to pray.

"J. McDONALD, R. C. MACDONALD, D. L. CLINK, ED. RICHARD, T. CLOUSTON, C. WILLIAMSON, B. A. LAWSON, M. YOUNG, C. GALLAGHER, EM. RICHARD, E. BOURASSA, D. ARCAD, A. B. MACKAY, A. SETTEB, J. MCGINNIS, R. LYNNE, B. PRINCE, J. BELLIVEAU, W. SKELTON, J. M. SKELTON, J. H. SULLY, JOHN HOGG, Presbyterian minister, W. WILLIAMS, J. CRAIG, J. CLINKSKILL, W. PETERSON, W. J. BARKER, W. NELSON, W. MCKAY, J. C. SKELTON, C. AUCHERSON, T. E. MAHAFFY, A. H. BIGONNESSE, O.M.I., L. COCHIN, O.M.I., A. P. FORBET, H. H. MILLIE, A. C. SCHNEIDER, J. F. PRITCHARD, Missionary, P. C. PAMBRUN."

Now, that petition was forwarded to the Government, and it has been in the hands of the Government ever since. And the half-breeds complain that, notwithstanding their petition, notwithstanding

ing its endorsement by the most reputable settlers in that country, the Government have failed to take any action to investigate in any particular the claims of these unfortunate people. I hold in my hand a letter, dated 15th February, 1887, addressed to myself, from a prominent resident in Winnipeg, in which he says :

"During the rebellion the people in the barracks, amongst whom were my brother and six cousins, not knowing the circumstances which made the Bresaylor settlers to follow the Indians, were all under the impression that they had done so of their own free will. When the rebellion was over, these circumstances were explained, and I don't believe there is one man in Battleford to-day who still entertains the idea that they were rebels.

"Their settlement is twenty-five miles from the barracks. The Saskatchewan and the Battle Rivers are nowhere more than four miles apart within this distance. Between Bresaylor and Battleford proper, between the two rivers, there are three Indian reserves. To escape meant fight with these Indians. They held council many times and decided to go to the barracks if the police would protect them. They sent a courier with a letter, who was at once put in jail. The Indians came and they were forced to follow them. A few days before the battle at Cut Knife they sent another courier (Denison); he was also put in the lock-up. The Indians saw the next day that he was missing, suspected treachery, and a fight between the Indians and these settlers was very near being had. Captain Morris never let us know that these couriers were such; he treated them as spies, and nobody thought otherwise until the rebellion was over and everything explained.

"During the two years after the rebellion I did my best to investigate the matter for my own satisfaction, and I have no doubt whatever these people were loyal.

"When Hon. Mr. T. White came to Battleford, I drew two petitions, one for the settlers and one for the citizens. The last one was signed by everybody, and it expresses the facts and belief that these people were not rebels. I presented these petitions to Mr. White, who told me that there was such an appearance of truth in the case, that he would recommend to the Government to grant an enquiry. He told me also about Bremner, that, rebel or not, he had a right to be paid the value of his furs. I have no doubt he would have acted that way had he not died soon after."

On 17th December, 1888, at the annual meeting of the Battle River Agricultural Society, the following resolution was carried unanimously :—

"On motion of Mr. R. G. Speers, seconded by Mr. Chas. Smith, it was resolved to petition the Dominion Government to have dues on hay reduced, scrip granted to Home Guards, dues abolished on fence rails and dead wood used for fuel, rebellion losses claims re-opened, payment of rebellion losses to the Bresaylor half-breeds, payment to Mr. Chas. Bremner for furs taken by General Middleton.

"That the officers of this association be, and are hereby instructed to have said petition prepared and forwarded to the hon. the Minister of the Interior."

This is signed by J. M. Skelton, Secretary-Treasurer of the Battle River Agricultural Society. In accordance with that resolution a petition was forwarded to the Government bearing date 7th January, 1889, and amongst the allegations in the petition I find the following :—

"That, on the arrival of General Middleton in Battleford he took over a large quantity of furs from one Charles Bremner, representing that they would be kept safe for him.

"That we are informed, and can substantiate, that said furs were at General Middleton's request shipped to his address, and we are informed, and verily believe, that said furs were appropriated to said Middleton's own private use.

"We would, therefore, request that the Government give this matter their earnest consideration and have justice done Mr. Bremner."

Then I find that, at a public meeting held at Battleford on the 30th December, 1889, a petition was prepared and signed, and forwarded to the

Government, and that petition contains the following statements :—

"With reference to the position of the Bresaylor half-breeds during the rebellion: From all that can be learned, it was the intention of all the settlers of that district to remain at their homes and protect their property, not anticipating so serious an outbreak, and it was only by pressure being brought to bear on one of their number who happened to be in town on the day previous to the outbreak, that any of the Bresaylor people came to the barracks.

"The Indians then being on the warpath, these people sent a messenger to the officer in command of the North-West Mounted Police fort here to say they wanted to go into the barracks, and requested that an escort be sent to protect them and their families on the way.

"The messenger was kept a prisoner at the fort, and no answer was sent to them.

"Poundmaker's men then took them into their camp, where they remained till the surrender to General Middleton. With the exception of three or four, the whole settlement took no part in the rebellion, but rendered assistance to most of the prisoners taken by the Indians; and in some cases saved their lives.

"We believe that it was through their persuasion that Poundmaker's men were prevented from following Colonel Otter's troops on their return march from Cut Knife Creek, to a large ravine, where in all probability a large number would have been massacred.

"When the Minister of Justice quoted, in one of his speeches, the allegation that when the Bresaylor half-breeds came to Battleford (after the surrender of Poundmaker) they brought with them their flocks and herds, he doubtless quoted what he conscientiously believed to be the fact; however, if an opportunity be given them, the settlers in the locality can prove that such was not the case.

"These people came before the late Hon. Thomas White on his visit to Battleford and requested to be treated as loyal men, or to be placed on trial and given an opportunity of proving that they were loyal. They are willing to rest their case on the fact that they were loyal, and say that if given an opportunity, if they cannot establish the fact that they took no part in the rebellion they will ask no indemnity for their losses.

"It is a fact that their cattle were taken and slaughtered by the Indians in common with all other cattle. Some of their cattle rescued from the Indians at the close of the rebellion were slaughtered and used by the North-West Mounted Police. Some of their horses were taken by General Middleton's officers for scouting purposes, and have never been returned, and they have had no indemnity for either horses or cattle.

"The present Minister of the Interior in his report to the House at the last Session said that the reason these claims were not paid was because these people were a party to their own losses.

"We beg to inform the Minister that claims have been paid to men who went into Poundmaker's camp and offered their services to fight against the loyal forces, claims have also been paid to men who remained out of the fort, bearing arms, until taken prisoners and were kept in close confinement till the close of the rebellion. The claim of Father Cauchon upon whose advice the Bresaylor people remained at their homes, and who remained with them, was also paid.

"The taking of Bremner's furs by General Middleton, and the refusal of the Government to give him (Bremner) redress in the matter is an injustice that is keenly felt by every right-thinking man in this district. We have the proof that General Middleton took these furs under the pretence of keeping them safe for Bremner.

"We have the proof that these furs were shipped by General Middleton's orders to himself and others, and when a deputation brought that matter before the Minister of the Interior we were assured that Bremner would be paid for his furs, whether he would be paid for his other losses or not."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. By whom was that written?

Mr. LISTER. It is signed by James Clinkskill, member of the North-West Assembly, chairman, and J. M. Skelton, secretary. Such are the statements which are made on behalf of these people, and which are supported, in the main, by the testimony of residents of that locality who are intimate with the facts and circumstances, and about whose credibility there can be no doubt.

James Clinkskill is a member of the North-West Assembly, a leading and prominent member in that section of the country, and the names which are here, endorsing the petition which I have read, I can say with perfect safety, are the names of the leading people in that section of the country. They pledge their word to the Government and to the public at large that the statements which have been made by the Bresaylor half-breeds have been true in every particular. I ask the Government to-night whether the statements contained in these petitions do not demand an investigation. Is it not the right of the humblest subject of this country who has been wronged, or who thinks he has been wronged, to demand an investigation of his claims? How are these half-savage men, removed thousands of miles away, to understand how these wrongs are to be rectified? They look upon the First Minister as representing the Great Mother, and when he goes on their reserves, he is the Great Father; and, after shaking hands with them, he coaxes them to vote for him. Why, then, should he not do as much justice to them as to any other portion of the people of this country? I say that, if any portion of our people is more entitled to consideration than another, it is the half-breeds of the North-West Territories. Whether their complaints are well founded or ill-founded, the least consideration which this Government can show them is to say: We will investigate your claims, and, if they are just, and right, and lawful, if they are claims which this Government can recognise, we will pay you to the uttermost farthing. The Government of this country, in view of the history of the past few years, cannot afford to ignore the rights of these unfortunate people. This Government has already spent millions of dollars in putting down a rebellion, which originated simply because the claims of a few unfortunate half-breeds in the North-West were disregarded. If those claims had been properly considered, that rebellion would never have happened; and, I think, the Government owe it to every section of the country, to consider these half-breeds' claims and settle them if they prove to be just. It will not do for the Minister of the Justice to say that he left this to a commission. I tell him here to-night that the commissioners appointed to investigate the half-breed claims refused, so far as the Bresaylor settlers were concerned, to take evidence upon them, refused to listen to the evidence that was produced by these people, and instead of that evidence, if they reported at all, it was upon statements made by certain people to the commissioners, but not under oath. So far as the claim of Mr. Bremner is concerned, it is not a question of loyalist or rebel. That question is not involved in his claim. Whether he was a rebel or whether he was a loyalist, his right to be paid for his furs exists just the same. The Government took possession of his furs by their officers in the North-West, by the military commanders there, and they took them under pretence that they would take care of them for this half-breed. Having taken the possession of the furs they are bound in law, they are bound in equity, they are bound by everything that men cherish as good and right, to recompense that man for those furs, if they were lost while in the custody of the Government by those officials in the North-West

Mr. LISTER.

Territories. There is no question but that this man's furs were taken possession of. There may be a doubt as to the value of the furs, it may be contended by the Government that he over-valued the furs, that he has stated there were more furs than there were in fact, but that is not the question. That there were furs is beyond any doubt at all. It is not denied but that there were furs, and that they were taken possession of by General Middleton. What became of them? Does the Government pretend for one moment to say that Mr. Bremner ever got one single skin back that had been taken possession of by General Middleton and taken into the fort? It is not pretended that such was the fact. Then what became of the furs? The man himself has searched in vain, he has enquired from the Minister of Militia, he has enquired from General Middleton, he has enquired from the man who was in charge of the fort at Battleford, he has enquired at every point where it was necessary to make enquiries, where he thought he could get information, and at every point he has been cruelly replused. General Middleton, the man who ordered him to be arrested, the man who said that he would send and take his furs, and who did it, answers by the statement that he knows nothing about it, that he never ordered his arrest—poor satisfaction for an unfortunate man arrested and imprisoned for weeks at Regina, and turned loose upon the public highway without a trial, charged with being a rebel, and for that reason deprived of the compensation which the meanest subject of Her Majesty is entitled to. So then I say, so far as these furs are concerned, it is a matter of no consequence whether Bremner was a rebel or loyalist. If the furs were taken in the way indicated, the Government is bound to make compensation for them; it was as Mr. White stated, when there. Mr. White said it made no difference, he told the delegation who waited upon him that it made no difference whether Bremner was a rebel or a loyalist, that having taken the furs the Government was bound to pay for them. What became of the furs? It is not pertinent to this motion to say what has become of the furs, but we do know, I state it here again to-night, that I am prepared to prove that the furs were put up into four boxes and Mr. Hayter Reed writes a letter in which he states that it was written by command of General Middleton, that upon the strength of that letter the four boxes of furs were put up, two of them were addressed to General Middleton, one to Mr. Bedson, the Penitentiary Warden, and the other to Hayter Reed, and that these furs were put upon a boat, and carried by the same boat that carried General Middleton down the river to Winnipeg. I ask any man: Is it difficult to draw a conclusion as to where the furs went? Under these circumstances, is there any hon. gentleman in this House who is not ready to draw his own conclusion from those facts? If that letter was written by command of General Middleton, and those furs were shipped on that boat, is there any doubt at all that they were shipped in accordance with the instructions given by that letter, and that General Middleton got the benefit of the furs? Sir, other half-breeds in that settlement sustained damages, and the Bresaylor claim is only one. If the Government appointed a commission to investigate what took

place during that rebellion, the wrongs and the injuries that were perpetrated upon the half-breeds during that rebellion, it would astonish the people of this country. Other half-breeds in that settlement have claims against the Government. They contend that their horses were taken, that their cattle were taken, that their waggons were taken and appropriated, and they say that they, in common with those who have been settled with, are entitled to compensation for the goods and property taken by the Government troops during that time. Their claim is not different from the claim of Mr. Bremner, and I agree with the Minister of Justice that if these men joined in the rebellion and were assistants in their own losses, they are debarred now from coming to Parliament, or any other authority, and asking for compensation. But they say they are willing to let their claims stand upon the test of loyalty or no loyalty, and that unless they are able to prove that they were loyal they will forego their claims against the Government. But they say: We were loyal, and we can prove our loyalty, and we should not be treated in an exceptional way; we should not be treated as we have been, our claims rejected, while the claims of others have been paid who are no more just than our own. Now, let us look for a moment to the position of affairs. I do not charge General Middleton with having taken those furs. I state the facts, and let the House draw its own conclusion. Here we have General Middleton, the commander of the forces in this country, a general in the British army, a man honored by the Queen for the part he took in that so-called rebellion in the North-West, and in addition, a man to whom the people of this country have given \$20,000—I say that if he has been guilty of this conduct, if he has been guilty of taking the furs of this unfortunate and wretched man, he has been guilty of an act which, for all time, will cast a dark blot upon his character and reputation. If General Middleton is not guilty of this charge, if it is foundationless, then I say you owe it to General Middleton to have an investigation. You are doing a wrong to him to allow his character to be besmirched for all time by a charge of this kind. It is his duty to demand from you, and it is your duty to him, as the head and commander of the forces of this country, to see that a man against whom such a charge as this is made is either proven to be innocent of the charge, or, if he be guilty, that he cease to occupy the high and distinguished position which he holds in this country. I say that whether General Middleton took these furs or not, I care not; they were taken in possession by the Government and it was a wanton act of spoliation on the part of the Government officials to take those furs and appropriate them to their own use. Unless the Government grant the Committee that has been asked for, they are making themselves a party to this, and I say in justice to all concerned, to the Government, to Mr. Bremner and the other half-breeds, it is the duty of the Government not to refuse the investigation that is asked for by this motion. It may be said, and with some show of reason, that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) should have brought this matter up. That hon. gentleman, to my knowledge, has been in this House for four long years, and according to my

recollection this matter has been brought up not by him but by other hon. members in this House. As the representative of that constituency, and as a gentleman having peculiarly the charge of the interests of the people of that section of the country, I say unhesitatingly that it was his duty to have brought this matter before the House, and I would have been glad had he done so. But it has been going on these three or four years, and that hon. gentleman has made no movement in the way of bringing the wrongs of his constituents before the attention of this House. What he may have done privately, working under the surface, of course I do not know. There is an underground way between members supporting the Government and the Government itself; perhaps he has been working there, but so far as we have been able to see there has been no work done that we can discover on the part of the hon. gentleman. I ask him to raise his voice to-night in defence of that petition of his portion, the poorest portion of his constituents, those who most require his advice and help at this time, and I ask him to assist me and to use his powerful influence with the Government in asking the Government to yield to the request we make to-night for an investigation of the claims of these unfortunate people. These people appeal to the sense of justice in this House to see that their claims are investigated, and I feel that in asking for this investigation, I am asking for that which is to the interests of those gentlemen charged by those people with having appropriated their furs, it is in the interest of the men charged that this investigation should take place, and we would not be doing justice to the position we occupy in this House did we refuse to appoint the Committee asked for. Its investigation will result in a knowledge of the facts being obtained, and a conclusion reached as to whether they are entitled to compensation or not, and it will also be the means of either clearing General Middleton or of proving his guilt, if he has been guilty of the foul charges which have been made against him.

Mr. MACDOWALL. After the challenge that has been offered to me by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), I could scarcely restrain myself until the hon. gentleman had resumed his seat. I have always looked after the interests of my constituents, and I challenge him, or any other hon. gentleman, to point to any occasion when any of those interests have been neglected, whether it was the public interest of the district as a whole, or whether it was the individual interest of any man, however poor, within the district I represent. I do not wish to find special fault with the hon. gentleman for the manner in which he has brought this matter before the House. He had facts laid before him, no doubt, which he considered justified him, as a humane man, in taking action, and far be it from me to find any fault with him for having taken this action. I consider it is the duty of every representative in this House, who considers his country's interests are worthy of attention, to look after the interests of the poor and oppressed, even in a district he does not represent. But the hon. gentleman has been misinformed or mistaken in some particulars. The hon. gentleman has appealed to our French *confères* in this House for their sympathy,

because, he said, these were French half-breeds, who resided a few miles from Battleford. I can correct him on that point, and I tell him that the settlement was called Bresaylor because it was founded by three families of Scotch half-breeds, the Bremners, Sayers and Taylors; they mixed the three names and called it the Bresaylor settlement. These were Scotch half-breeds, and I believe the House will agree with me when I say that, having the blood of Scotch forefathers, that was enough to protect them against improper influences or discouragements. I have very great sympathy for those half-breeds, and indeed for the half-breed race throughout the North-West, because I have learnt in a very peculiar manner their interests. I have recognised that they were the original people of the North-West, who, before the white man came in to take possession, lorded it throughout the whole country. I know they were the princes of that wilderness, that the Indians never dared to meet the half-breeds in battle, and the half-breeds were always the bravest of the brave throughout that country. In the olden days when the country was full of game and they could pursue their sport and make their living by hunting which they learned from their forefathers, they were *facile princeps* among the people of the country; but nowadays civilisation has come in, the ways of civilised man have come among them, and they find it difficult to make a subsistence. I have seen them in the old days when they were proud men, but to-day they find it difficult to struggle against the effects of civilisation. I maintain, therefore, I am capable of having a just and proper sympathy for those poor people. But, I must say, that in listening to the remarks by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister), the whole tenor of his remarks appear to be directed against a man for whom I have the very highest respect, General Middleton, and also against Mr. Hayter Reed, whom I believe to be a thoroughly good servant of the Government. I consider that I should be equally wrong if I did not endeavor to maintain the uprightiness and honor of those men in whom I believe, as I would be considered wrong if I did not maintain what I believe to be the just rights of my constituents. The hon. gentleman said, that Mr. Hayter Reed, among others, had taken furs from the Bresaylor settlement, or from the Bremners'. I think he will find it very difficult to prove that those furs were taken. I do not believe Mr. Reed ever took a fur from that settlement, and, I do not believe he ever took one of Charles Bremner's furs; but, at the same time, I quite agree with him that Charles Bremner has a claim against the Government for payment of furs taken from him, supposing that he can prove his loyalty, and that he was not a party to his own loss. I remember well, at the time the rebellion took place, that after the troops returned from Battleford, there never was such a large fur trade driven as was carried on at Prince Albert. There was scarcely a man from any part of Canada who took part in putting down that rebellion who did not, when passing through Prince Albert, have a little bundle of furs to sell to the fur dealers there.

Mr. LISTER. Where did they get them?

Mr. MACDOWALL. That is the question. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) says General Middleton took those furs.

Mr. MACDOWALL.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Where did they get them? Probably they got them from Chas. Bremner's stock. I may say that although the hon. gentleman says that I may have been working in an underground course, I believe I have been working in the best interests of my constituents; at all events, I did not work in any underground course, but I simply represented the case to those who had the means and power to relieve it. I represented the case of Chas. Bremner to them, and I got from Chas. Bremner a list of furs he had lost and the claim he puts in. I took this list of furs to various fur dealers here, and I had the list of furs priced, and when this had been done I found the claim was for a very much less sum than was demanded. And I, therefore, in urging his interests, would never exceed the sum which I think justly due to him. Another question occurred, and it is one which the hon. gentleman omitted, and that is, how many furs are usually taken in the district in a year. If you take the returns of the Hudson Bay Company, which is the largest and most powerful fur-trading company within that district, you will find that that company during the winter preceding the rebellion did not claim they had taken as many furs as Chas. Bremner claimed, and it is unreasonable to suppose that an humble trader, who is said to be a poor man, was likely to obtain as many furs as the wealthy Hudson Bay Company, the principal fur-trading company throughout the North-West. This being the case, it would be just to make some reduction from the account that Chas. Bremner has sent in. I think that if that were allowed for, and if the Government would consider the claim of Charles Bremner and place in the Estimates a sum that would cover a fair amount for the loss, it ought to meet the requirements of the case.

An hon. MEMBER. We should find out the thieves.

Mr. MACDOWALL. An hon. member says we should find out the thieves. Well, Sir, I can tell him that there was hardly a single soldier who came down from Battleford who had not some furs to sell when he got to Prince Albert. Does he mean to say that the whole of Canada are thieves? Does he mean to say that the gallant 65th Battalion, and the Queen's Own, and the 90th were thieves? Does he mean to say that the men who went at the call of duty to shed their blood for the country were thieves?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was you said that.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I said no such a thing.

Mr. LISTER. You said all the soldiers had furs when they came to Prince Albert.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I say it is a fact that the furs were disposed of in that way, but I do not think that the hon. gentlemen have any ground whatever for attacking General Middleton, or Mr. Hayter Reed. I understand that General Middleton has been served with a summons to appear in court to answer this charge. I believe he is an honorable man, and I believe that when he appears in court he will be able to defend himself, and to maintain the honor which he has won, and which he deserves. At one time Mr. Bremner wished to have this question settled, and he believed that I would do what was right and just on his behalf. I

do not know whether he now thinks he has had any cause to alter that decision, but I have in my hand a paper which Bremner addressed to James Clinksill, the gentleman already referred to, and it reads as follows :—

“24th Mar'ch, 1889.

“**SIR**,—I hereby authorise you to telegraph to D. H. Macdowall, M. P., to accept \$3,000 in payment of my claim for furs lost during late rebellion,

“I have the honor to be, Sir,
“Your obedient servant,

his
“**CHARLES x BREMNER.**
mark

“Witness : G. H. GIBSON.”

It would, therefore, appear that although Charles Bremner put in a claim for \$6,000 for the furs lost, yet he is willing to accept \$3,000. I do not know whether this argument should be accepted to show whether his claim is just or not. I believe he had a claim for a certain amount, but I do not believe it amounts to \$6,000. I think he could justly claim about \$3,500, and I hope that sum will be put in the Estimates. In the remarks which I have made I do not wish it to be understood that I am attacking the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister). It is true that the Bresaylor settlement is within my district, and if the hon. gentleman knew me, he would probably not bring the charge against me, that I am neglecting the interests of my constituents.

Mr. LISTER. I am not bringing any charge against you.

Mr. MACDOWALL. You did. I have not neglected the interests of my constituents whose confidence I possess and whose confidence I still believe I possess, and I think this itself is an evidence of that. Mr. Bremner, however, appears to have been advised otherwise, by whom I know not. I telegraphed to him when I came down this Session to ask him if I should continue to do the best I could for him, and I received the following reply :

“BATTLEFORD, N.W.T., 24th February, 1890.

“D. H. MACDOWALL, M.P., Ottawa.

“Telegram received; claim is now in my solicitor's hands for collection.

“**CHARLES BREMNER.**”

If he chooses to go to a solicitor, he may, but I do not think he will receive one cent more than his just due, which I believe he would have received if his claim had been left in my hands and submitted to this House. He will doubtless incur much more expense besides, if his solicitor takes the course that has been adopted in this House by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) and by certain members. Bremner appears to think that he can do more than to take an action to recover his just rights, and that he should also endeavor to blacken the character of a distinguished and an honorable man, who did his duty to Canada when he was called upon, and who, I think, will be able to withstand these charges, and to come out with all the honor which a straightforward and honest man is entitled to.

Mr. WATSON. As I took some interest in the debate on this question, when it was before the House two years ago, and as I have information of some other facts connected with it, I feel it my duty to occupy the attention of the House for a short while in this discussion. The hon. member

for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), who has just taken his seat, states that the member who brought this matter in the House made an attempt to blacken the character of an honorable gentleman. The member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) simply asks for a committee to make enquiry, and he stated on his responsibility as a member of this House, that he could prove that the hon. gentleman referred to by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), as well as others, had been guilty of possessing themselves furs which did not belong to them. The member for Saskatchewan states that all the soldiers who took part in that rebellion had furs to sell at Prince Albert; and he says that he has no doubt that a great portion of the furs now in question were the furs which these soldiers had to dispose of to the merchants of Prince Albert. The hon. member has not attempted to deny that General Middleton took possession of Mr. Bremner's furs and had them brought into the fort at Battleford. If the General took possession of the furs, how did the volunteers get them, if not by order of General Middleton? It is one of the charges made by the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), that these furs were dealt out to the General's friends, by the order of the General himself. The member for Saskatchewan also states that he had taken the trouble to examine the list of furs, as presented to the Commission, by Mr. Bremner, and he has gone to all the fur dealers he could find, for the purpose of lessening the claim of one of his constituents.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I must call the hon. gentleman to order. I certainly would never do that. I simply wished to ascertain the real value of the furs; and if the hon. gentleman imputed anything else to me, he is imputing something that is most utterly false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WATSON. I do not know that such language should be used on the floor of Parliament, and as a point of order I ask if the hon. gentleman is entitled to use such language?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not entitled to use that language.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I say if he has imputed any such thing to me, it is utterly false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. WATSON. When I was addressing the House before the interruption, I was simply using the language used by the hon. member for Saskatchewan himself. I will repeat what I did state, if he misunderstood me, that he informed the House that he had taken a list of the furs as presented to the commissioners, and had taken it around to the furriers to ascertain their value, with the view of reducing Bremner's claim. Then, he states that Bremner is a poor man. No doubt he is poor, after having lost his furs, and after having been used in the way he has been. The hon. gentleman also speaks of him as a small fur dealer. Well, he had six outposts for the collection of furs, and he probably does as much as the Hudson Bay Company at that point, who trade with the people when they come to the stores of the company. Now, it might be well to put the House in possession of the list of furs for which Bremner claims compensation. The claim he presented to the Commission included the following furs: badger,

21, \$16; bear, 54, \$540; beaver, 479, \$1,916; fisher, 10, \$100; fox, silver, 3, \$150; do, cross, 6, \$30; do, red, 200, \$250; lynx, 377, \$1,131; marten, 19, \$48; mink, 604, \$604; muskrat, 1,836, \$156; otter, 8, \$80; skunk, 239, \$179; wolf, 20, \$25; wolverine, 35, \$140; making a total of \$5,365. Besides that, there is a long list of implements and stock which Brenner lost, making his total claim against the Government \$19,859. There are other matters which might be brought before this Committee if it is granted. Amongst other things, I am credibly informed and believe that evidence can be produced to prove that horses were taken by the officers, that the officers refused to deliver those horses to their owners, that some of the horses were taken to Toronto and some to Quebec, and that some of those horses can be found to-day in the Quebec Cavalry School. I am also informed that one of the Battleford settlers saw a pair of his ponies driven on the streets of Toronto, and on his enquiry of the man who was driving where they came from, the man informed him that he had purchased them from an officer who had come from the North-West. The hon. member for West Lambton omitted one point with regard to the position of the Bresaylor half-breeds while they were in the custody of Poundmaker. At that time they went to Captain Morris and informed him as to their position as prisoners in Poundmaker's camp, and stated to him that if an attack should be made on Poundmaker's camp, they would on the first opportunity join the loyal forces; but they did not get that opportunity, because their messenger was taken prisoner at Battleford and retained as a spy. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) has not attempted to answer the charges made by the hon. member for West Lambton. That hon. member has stated, and I feel satisfied from information in my possession that, if a Committee is granted, he can prove that furs were shipped to General Middleton, Mr. Hayter Reed and Mr. Bedson. Those furs were taken from the stores at Battleford, and they were packed in four saddle boxes, which, I believe, were about four feet square, and any hon. gentleman who has a knowledge of furs knows that a very large quantity of furs can be packed in a space of four feet square. One of those boxes was addressed to Mr. Hayter Reed, one to Mr. Bedson, at Stony Mountain Penitentiary, and two to General Middleton, and they were brought down on the boat as far as Winnipeg; they were traced that far. In addition to those furs, a large quantity were taken possession of at Batoche, which, I have been informed, by men on the ground, were put on the boat at Prince Albert and brought down to Winnipeg. I am also informed that a large quantity of furs, which were taken at Batoche, were shipped on the Canadian Pacific Railway at Qu'Appelle Station and addressed to General Middleton at Ottawa. The people up there have another claim, which, I think, is a just one; that is, that while many of the rebels who took up arms against the Government have received compensation at the hands of the Government, many men of undoubted loyalty have not been paid for their losses; and one reason to which I attribute that fact is that those poor people had not as much influence as some of the disloyal people had. I am informed that at the time of the outbreak the

Mr. WATSON.

Hudson Bay Company, which had had experience of previous rebellions in the Red River settlement, and which had claims against some of the French half-breeds, took an order on the Government for the amount of their claims, and used their influence with the Commission to get them paid, although the men making them had actually taken up arms against the Government. At the time Poundmaker was taken prisoner, he had pillaged the settlers' houses for miles around, and had taken possession of everything he could find, amongst other things firearms; and in that country almost every man is possessed of a good firearm. Those arms were taken to the stores at Battleford when Poundmaker surrendered. There were 250 stand of arms. I believe a considerable number of them belonged to loyal settlers, whose houses had been pillaged by Poundmaker and his followers. Those arms were stacked in the barracks, at Battleford, and they were given out by order of General Middleton, to friends of his who wished to bring back a trophy or souvenir of the rebellion. Those persons were allowed to go in and select any arm they saw fit; and you can easily understand, that instead of taking an old flint musket, they would select a breach-loader which had probably cost the settler \$50 or \$100; and the people who owned those arms have not been settled with to this day. Now, I think it is of the utmost importance that a committee of this House should be appointed to investigate these matters. The members of this House should consider whether it is well to allow charges of this kind to be made against the highest military officer of the land, against the warden of a penitentiary, and against an officer who holds a very responsible position in the North-West. I say it is due to these gentlemen that a committee should be appointed so that they may be allowed an opportunity to prove their innocence. I am credibly informed that Major Bedson has in his possession a pool table which had belonged to Batoche; that another pool table which belonged to Gabriel Dumont, is now in Toronto, in the possession of a gentleman who received it as a present from an officer who was in the North-West; also that a number of horses were taken forcibly from the settlers, and that certain officers benefited by the sale of those horses. One instance, I believe, is well known to gentlemen in this House, who were on the ground. One of the Queen's Own, of Toronto, though I will not mention his name, had captured a white horse, a race horse, which belonged to Batoche, and he was riding past on this horse when the General hailed him, and asked him where he got it. He said he got it on the prairies. The General said: "Take that horse up to my camp, and stake it there." Accordingly it was taken to the General's camp and staked there. I understand that it was afterwards put on the boat, and I believe it was brought to Ottawa; and then, as the rumor got about that certain horses had been taken by officers in the North-West, I believe it was sent back with a circus that was going to Winnipeg, and was given to Major Bedson. If these things are true, and I believe they are true, it is only due to these gentlemen, if they are innocent, to give them an opportunity to prove their innocence. For my part, I will not believe them to be innocent until a committee of this House has been appointed and has made a thorough investigation. I have had

information from various sources, from men who were on the ground, in regard to the pillaging and the most outrageous conduct which was carried on by officers high in military rank, and which was a disgrace to any civilised country. I hope the Government will allow this committee to be appointed.

Mr. EDGAR. A very large question has been opened up by the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Watson), which I have no doubt will receive the attention of the House and of the Government on another occasion; but it is not possible, under the motion we are now considering, that we could enter into all these questions which have been mentioned by my hon. friend. My object is to confine myself to a brief consideration of the points which have been raised to-night. A couple of years ago, I brought before the House the questions which have been raised by this motion for a committee. I did not ask for a committee because I thought, when these matters were brought before the attention of the Government, that they would be sufficiently and properly dealt with by the Government. I found that these Breslayor half-breed claims were naturally divided into two classes. There were certain claims for losses during the rebellion, when the goods and chattels of these people were plundered by the Indians. That subject was investigated to a certain extent by the Commission which was appointed to enquire into the rebellion losses in the North-West. I took the trouble, at a great expenditure of time, to look through the evidence taken by that Commission on the subject of these rebellion losses, and I must say that, if I had been in a judicial position as these gentlemen were, I do not think I could have come to the same conclusion as they did upon the evidence. I do not think that I could have believed that these Breslayor half-breeds were rebels; I do not think it was clear at all that they willingly joined Poundmaker's forces; and especially what has occurred since, the evidence which has been given by their neighbors and friends which was not before the Commission at the time, but has been made public since, would absolutely convince me that the Commission was wrong in finding that these men were rebels and were therefore not entitled to compensation for the losses they incurred during the rebellion. Therefore, I am inclined to think that, although there was some evidence upon which the report was founded, still I do not think the commissioners made their report against those half-breeds according to the weight of evidence; and I think, if the Government had looked over that evidence and had considered what has been brought forward since in favor of those people, they ought to accede to a further enquiry being made on that point, and ought to allow those half-breeds to prove their loyalty on that occasion. I think, when British subjects claim that they are loyal and that they can prove it, the least that can be done is to give them full and ample opportunity to do that. I think it is only British fair play to allow them to do so. That is the first portion of the motion of my hon. friend, and I think it ought to prevail on that ground. I do not say that the Commission had no ground for making their report. I do not claim that they had not some evidence to show the disloyalty of this people, but I think

they had not enough. Then, coming to the other branch of the case, the question as to these furs of Bremner's, it is clear the rebellion has nothing one way or the other to do with that. Whether these men were rebels or were not, a large quantity of valuable furs were brought into Battleford when Poundmaker surrendered. These furs belonged to Charles Bremner and they were delivered into the custody of the Government, into the custody of the Mounted Police, or whoever was in charge at Battleford after the rebellion. This was in July, 1885, and whether these men were or were not rebels, the Government were trustees for them, or for the country, or for somebody, in regard to these furs. If these men were rebels, and a law had been passed confiscating their goods and property, that would not justify the Government for refusing to account for these furs. In that case they would be the property of the state and should be accounted for. But no one claims that they were confiscated. They were the property of the Bremners, and they or their value should have been returned by the Government, who get them from the Bremners. There can be, therefore, no answer to the claim that restitution should be made to these people. Two years ago the Minister of Justice promised the House that this enquiry should be made. The lamented death of the then Minister of the Interior has, I believe, delayed the progress of the enquiry. But there is no excuse to-day that the Government can possibly make for not having had some enquiry. They may, however, have had an enquiry. I hope they have. I hope we will hear from the Government that they have made an enquiry, and that they have traced up those furs and found where they went, and who got them. If they have not done so, if they cannot explain to the House and the country who got these furs, so that these charges which have been so freely made may be cleared up, then it is undoubtedly our right to have this Committee of enquiry. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), who spoke to-night, referred to charges which have not only been made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) but myself two years ago against Gen. Middleton. On that occasion I read a letter which most distinctly and positively implicated General Middleton; and unless General Middleton and his friends have thought fit to press for an enquiry and to give evidence exculpating themselves, General Middleton cannot, nor can the hon. member for Saskatchewan, complain of that accusation hanging over the General's head so long. These poor half-breeds have been kept for nearly five years out of the value of their furs, and we have yet no satisfactory explanation of the reason why. General Middleton has been publicly accused in this House of having taken part of those furs, and no satisfactory explanation has been given to exonerate him, and I think it is high time that we should have a committee to enquire into the matter. I did not bring in General Middleton's name from hearsay, for I would have been exceedingly sorry to do that. I would not have brought a charge against him unless I had the documents placed in my hand on which I based it; and, in case there should be any doubts in the minds of hon. gentlemen as to why I made that charge, I take the liberty of reading again the letter which, two years ago, I read to this House. On the 5th July, 1885, the following

letter was received by A. Warden, Quartermaster-Sergeant of Police in Battleford. It was dated Fort Pitt, 4th July, 1885:

"DEAR WARDEN.—General Middleton has instructed and authorised me to send you the present letter, desiring that you put up bales of furs for the undermentioned:—two bales for General Middleton, one for S. L. Bedson, and one for myself.

"Please select the best and pack them at once, as we will be down there to-morrow by boat.

(Sd.) "HAYTER REED,
"Assistant Com. of Indians."

Now, this letter was publicly read in the House by me, and I stated that it had been shown to several parties, that the bales were packed up, and that the furs were chiefly Charles Bremner's; and I have never heard from anybody interested that that letter was not absolutely genuine. In fact, I heard it was absolutely genuine. I hope, therefore, the hon. member for Saskatchewan will understand, if he did not know before, why General Middleton was brought into this matter. I also stated then that on the 6th July the boat arrived with General Middleton on board, that the furs were packed, but that there were not enough, that they got some boxes filled with bear and other choice furs, and that those bales and boxes were sent on by that boat. I am not going into the question of other furs, horses and arms, but will confine myself to the simple point that those furs, which were chiefly Charles Bremner's, were taken out of the custody of the Government by General Middleton, or somebody else, that Bremner never got the value of them since, and that the matter should no longer be allowed to stand, but that the fullest explanation should be given, and the result of the investigation, if any were held, given to this House, and if the investigation held was not most ample and complete, this committee should be granted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has very properly called the attention of the House to the fact that the observations made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) have no relevancy to the question under discussion, in so far as they relate to other charges than those connected with the Bresaylor settlement. We have had the case of the Bresaylor settlers brought to our notice this afternoon, not for the first time, but with more than usual warmth and zeal by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister). I think that I had reason to complain once before, when the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Edgar) presented this case to the House, that the statements then made were somewhat highly colored. But the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) this evening has been carried away by excessive zeal far beyond what the facts of the case warrant. He has doubtless been misinformed as to some of the particulars connected with this case. He was surely misinformed when he presented this as a case in which enquiry could not fairly be refused—as a case under which a number of humble people in this country were simply asserting the right of petition, and asking that their petition should be heard. He was surely misinformed when he thus put the case to the House. He said that these people have had their claims refused on the ground that they were disloyal, and they are willing, if opportunity be given them, to withdraw their claims, if they are not in a position to prove their loyalty.

Mr. EDGAR.

I say that the hon. gentleman must have been misinformed when he put the case upon these two grounds, for I am able to inform the House that the case has been fully investigated, and that these people have had the same opportunity of proving their claims as every person in that country has had who presented a claim for rebellion losses. Now, Sir, let me call attention to the two divisions into which this claim must be classed. We have, in the first place, the claims of the Bresaylor half-breeds generally, and these claims are in the nature of rebellion losses. I may here remind the House of a fact which is amply known. I am sure everybody who has followed the course of these enquiries knows that persons who suffered losses during the course of the insurrection in the North-West had no legal claim upon the Government or the country for redress, but that it was conceded, as a matter of grace and of liberality, that those persons in that country who had sustained losses by reason of the rebellion, and who were not guilty of complicity in the rebellion, should be indemnified at the public expense. I need not explain how necessary it was that that limit should be made. I need not explain the principle that those people in the North-West who had aided in the rising, had helped to contribute to the losses of others, and must be held to have contributed to their own losses, and must not be deemed to be deserving of the liberality of the Government. What followed the recognition of that principle? The issue of a Royal Commission constituted of Mr. Mackay, Mr. Ouimet—now Judge Ouimet—and Mr. Muma. All the claims presented to them in that wide country were fully investigated, and a large number of those claims were compensated for. The claims of these half-breeds—and I am distinguishing now between the claims of the Bresaylor half-breeds, generally, for rebellion losses, and the claims connected with these furs—were fully investigated; and the result arrived at and reported on by the Commission was that they ought not to be paid, because the claimants had been participants in the rebellion, and had contributed to their own losses, and had contributed likewise to the losses of other people, as I shall presently show. Under these circumstances it was the plain duty of the Commission to report that they came to that conclusion; and yet the hon. member has put the case to the House this evening as a case of humble claimants who have long been denied an investigation and who are now seeking to get it for the first time at the hands of a committee of this House.

Mr. LISTER. I did not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member may not have intended to state that the claim had never been investigated before. If he were informed of the fact that those claims had been presented to a Royal Commission and adjudicated upon, I am sure it would be far from him to assert to the House that the claims have never been investigated; but I put it to the House that his argument that these people should have an opportunity of proving their case, and should be allowed to prove their loyalty, implied that they had never had that opportunity. The substance of the evidence that was presented to that Commission, I detailed on the 17th May, 1888, when this matter was brought before the House very forcibly and very fairly by the hon. member

for Ontario (Mr. Edgar), who has spoken this evening. What was the case on which the Commission reported against these half-breed claims? I do not want to weary the House by reading long passages from the *Hansard*; I will, therefore, trust my memory to repeat it in substance. That Bresaylor settlement, as was stated by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) consisted of two classes of people—the Scotch half-breeds and the half-breeds of other races; and when the warning came to these people that they were likely to be molested by Poundmaker's band, that they would probably be despoiled or driven into the enemy's lines, they were urged to go to Battleford, where they could not only secure ample protection for themselves and for their property, but aid in the defence of the other inhabitants of the country. A portion of those settlers complied, and a portion of them went loyally to Battleford in accordance with that summons; they entered into the defence of their country, and the result was that their property was pillaged, burned and destroyed. The remainder of that settlement, the people whose claims are now being pressed for the consideration of a committee of this House, preferred to take the chances of war, they preferred to remain where they were—the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) says, because they had not their horses with them and could not be removed; but I have a letter before me signed by Mr. Remner and by Mr. Sayers, two of the principal claimants, in which they assert, as late as 9th April, 1885, that "they have all their horses and cattle, 300 in number, and intend to remain where they are, and have no fear of molestation from the savages." At a subsequent date they were found in Poundmaker's camp; their houses were not burnt and destroyed, their goods were not pillaged; but when, at the close of the rebellion, peace was restored, they returned to their habitations with long trains of animals loaded with their personal property, and with the personal property of other people, too. Sir, one of the most striking circumstances connected with all this was that they were proved to have accompanied the rebel scouts from time to time, armed and mounted, miles from the camp, those persons who were asserted this afternoon to have come into Poundmaker's camp under terror of the savages; they were found in the capture of loyal prisoners on whom they fired while in pursuit; they captured and seized Government and private property. Some of them, according to their own admission, took part in the battle of Cut Knife Creek, and were fully recognised as firing on the troops at 30 paces distant. They were present in the Indian Council; they followed the trail with the Indians, and among the property which was found was some of the property of loyal officers of the Government who were killed in the attempts to put down that rebellion. Now, Sir, this being the evidence before the Commission, what are we told by the hon. gentlemen who are supporting this motion? We are told by the hon. member for Ontario who has spoken to-night—candidly admitting that there was evidence on which the Commission had come to that conclusion—we were told that if he had sat on judgment on the evidence, scrutinising it as he has no doubt done, he would have found difficulty in coming to the same conclusion. That may be so; it may be that I might have

found difficulty in coming to that conclusion too. But we were not the judges, and they were. They saw the witnesses, they were in the North-West, they knew all the circumstances connected with that investigation a great deal better than we do. Surely their integrity, their fairness, their liberality in dealing with these claims, have never to this hour been impugned; and we have reason to believe, from the cases we have revised, that they were most liberal and generous in dealing with these rebellion losses. But, Sir, the curious circumstance is this, that while that case has remained upon record, doubtful as one member or another may consider it to be, but stamped with the decision of these commissioners, the half-breed claimants of Bresaylor, although they have never ceased to press their claims upon a committee of the House, have never presented to the Government, or to the Department of the Interior, one tittle of evidence that had not been presented to these commissioners, or have asserted that there was a tittle of other evidence that could be produced before a committee of this House. Now, what is the obvious conclusion to be drawn from this? The obvious conclusion is this, that the investigation which was made by the commissioners was a thorough investigation, and I submit it to the House, as a fair presentation of the case upon which this motion stands for an investigation for the claims of the Bresaylor half-breeds, and I think this motion ought not to be granted by the House unless some evidence is upon the Table, unless some evidence can be produced by the hon. gentleman who introduced the motion, to show that that investigation was not a thorough one, to show that it was not a fair investigation, to show that new evidence has come to the knowledge of hon. gentlemen, or to show some reason for re-opening that investigation, which must be assumed to be fair, and which ought otherwise to be considered closed. The hon. gentleman, it is true, has brought to the notice of the House this afternoon a petition in favor of these claims by two gentlemen, one of them Mr. Clinkskill, and another whose name I forget, and that petition asserted that the claimants can prove their innocence. A great many other assertions are made, but it is obvious that these gentlemen know nothing more of the facts connected with the claim than we know ourselves. They presented their petition as that of the officers of an agricultural society in the North-West; they are very desirous, from motives of kindness and sympathy, no doubt, that this claim should be paid; but they do not profess to have any knowledge whatever of a single fact which was not before the commission which made the enquiry, and they do not pretend there is any evidence forthcoming in support of the claims, that was not presented to that commission. I say, therefore, to the House that it is to be regretted that those who claim to re-open an investigation, judicially conducted by fair and honorable men, on which a report was made two or three years ago, and before we are asked to open it all up again, it ought to be shown that some new evidence can be adduced. I do not hesitate to recognise the fairness of the argument presented by the other side thus far, that the claim ought to be re-opened, and the Government I am sure will re-open it when they can present to the Government or to the Department of the Interior any evidence to show that the conclusion was wrong, or that something

has transpired since the investigation closed. Until they have done that, I think no case has been made out on which this House ought to grant a committee. Coming to the other branch of the case, the question as to these furs, I agree perfectly with what was said a few months ago, that it stands in an entirely different position. It has nothing to do with the rebellion, it has nothing to do with the rebellion losses, it stands on a different principle. This claim is made by Bremner as the owner of a large quantity of furs, which he alleges he put in the custody of the Government officers after the rebellion closed. The question does not, therefore, stand on the footing of rebellion losses; nor is it, I conceive, in any way affected by the question as to whether Bremner was participating in the rebellion or not. If the rebellion had then closed, before we could confiscate or lay our hands on his property we had to convict him of felony, and after conviction, if his goods were forfeited, they would be forfeited to the Crown and not to any military or civil officer. That being so, I realised the fact, in 1888, when, in consequence of the death of the late lamented Minister of the Interior, which had taken place a few weeks before I was called on to speak to this question, on a memorandum handed to me from one of the officers of the Department of the Interior, I realised that fact distinctly, and I was aware, from personal intercourse with the late Minister of the Interior, that he had made enquiry into Bremner's claim, and was desirous of pursuing it further at the time of his death. I informed the House that the enquiry would be proceeded with further. It was proceeded with further. We obtained all the information we could secure in regard to the question, and it was only last summer that we were able to ascertain, assisted by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), what the probable value of the furs was that had been deposited by Bremner in the custody of the Government officers. The claim had varied all along from \$7,000 down to \$3,000, and, as the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) has said, the nearest approach we could obtain was that the furs would be probably worth \$3,000. As to the circumstances under which those furs were taken, as to how many of them were taken, and into whose possession they came, the House will understand from what my hon. friend has said, that it was very difficult to arrive at a conclusion; and the Government was unable to pay the claim at that time, because it had no vote of Parliament at its disposal from which the money could be paid. The matter, therefore, had to stand until Parliament met, and the question which was before the Government when this motion was made, and which is before it still, is whether the actual value of the furs which were deposited by Bremner should be provided for in the Supplementary Estimates to be submitted for the consideration of this House. A preliminary question had to be considered in dealing with that one, and that preliminary question was this: Whether we should pursue the enquiry for the purpose of ascertaining what persons should contribute to the loss or whether we should leave Mr. Bremner to his remedy at law against the persons and the officers who have been named to-night, who, Mr. Bremner says, were guilty of having taken his property. While that question was under consideration, and it has not been de-

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

ecided yet, for the simple reason that the Government has not yet come to a conclusion as to the Supplementary Estimates which are to be submitted to Parliament this Session, Bremner made his choice, and within the last few days, he has preferred, instead of pressing his claim against the Government, to bring a suit at law against those parties who have so deprived him of his property. For my own part I am inclined to think that Bremner was not well advised in that respect. He might, perhaps, have been better advised if he had chosen to press his claim on the liberality of the Government, and have asked the Government to make good his damage, not only for the amount which he may have been able to prove he lost by the acts of the particular officers, but likewise for the value of the furs which were lost through negligent keeping, the end of which was the dissipation of the property in the way described by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall). But within the last few days, perhaps advised in consequence of circumstances of which I am not aware, Bremner has chosen to bring his action against those officers. If the claim should be recognised by the Government and be presented to this House for payment of the actual value of the furs which he left with the officers of the Government, it would no doubt be the duty of the Government, and their duty in the interests of those officers themselves, to cause a strict enquiry to be made on the statements which has been presented to the House this afternoon as to the treatment of Bremner's property by officers of the Government. If, on the other hand, it should be considered proper that he should be allowed to take the course which he has preferred to take, of bringing his action against the officers themselves, in the course of the trial all the facts will transpire, all the evidence will be laid before the court, accompanied as it will be for the first time, so far as the public is concerned, by the answers which those officers have to give in their own defence, and it will be for the Government and the House to consider, at a subsequent period, whether, if Bremner should not recover the full amount properly due, it may not be proper to supplement any sum he may have recovered, for the purpose of making good his entire loss at the actual value of the furs. But, under these circumstances, careful enquiry, pursued to the fullest extent, with the assistance of the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), without whose assistance I must say it would have been exceedingly difficult to conduct it, showed the value of the property. With all the facts placed in the hands of the Government, and the Government not denying justice to Mr. Bremner, but willing to consider the matter favorably and fairly, I think the case is not one which the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) would have been disposed to press to a division this afternoon, if, at the outset, he had been fully aware of the circumstances I have intimated. It is not my duty, and it is certainly not my inclination to make here any defence of the officers whose conduct has been impugned. Enough has been said to put them on their defence; and as I assume them to be men of honor, who value their reputation in this country, I leave them to make their defence for themselves. I have said enough to show that no enquiry is necessary by the House,

because the facts have been fully investigated. In so far as the settlers' claims are concerned an investigation by the House ought not to take place, and the Government should not be required to make further investigation unless some further subjects for investigation beyond those already investigated be revealed; and as regards claims for the furs, the Government is in possession of all the facts with respect to the disposal of the property in the hands of officers of the Government, and also with regard to the actual value of the property disposed of, and the question remains before it whether that matter should be brought to the attention of the House at a later period of the Session, or, whether in consequence of what Bremner himself has done within the last few days it may not be better in the public interest, in his own interest and in the interests of those officers whose conduct is impugned, to allow the matter to go to the legal tribunals of the country for investigation.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), in view of the declaration just made by the Minister of Justice, has every reason to be satisfied with the result of the motion which he has to-day submitted to the House. This is not a new question, but it is one which has been brought on on one or two occasions to the attention of the House, and at last we have the admission by the Government of the fact, which has been affirmed time and time again on this side of the House, that Charles Bremner had been despoiled of his property. This is a fact which has long been an issue between the two sides of the House, and at last we have it admitted. I am of the same opinion as the Minister of Justice that Charles Bremner would have better consulted his own interests if, instead of taking legal proceedings, as he is alleged to have recently commenced, against the parties who are said to have appropriated his property, he had continued to hold the Government liable, because, undoubtedly, if this man has been despoiled of his property by the officer commanding the troops at the time they were in the North-West Territories, who, at that time, was holding a high position under the Government, undoubtedly the Government and the people of Canada are responsible to Bremner for the losses incurred. He would no doubt have served his interests better if he had continued to ask his remedy, not in a private way, as he has now done, but in a public manner, as he had done before. But the fact that this man has sought to obtain in the courts a private remedy for the injury done him, does not in any way alter the other fact, that the people of Canada are interested to know what may be true about this matter, and whether or not the complaint of Charles Bremner is as he states it, because there has been committed not only a private offence, but a public offence as well. Charles Bremner, as we are now told by the hon. Minister of Justice, is seeking his remedy for the private offence which he has suffered, but the people of Canada, I submit, have a duty to perform, to see whether or not there has been such a public offence committed as is now stated has been committed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the motion.

Mr. LAURIER. The motion requires that there should be a committee to investigate.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. To investigate a trial?

Mr. LAURIER. The investigation is asked as to whether a public offence has been committed, and that is why a committee should be granted. A great wrong is alleged to have been perpetrated by an officer of our army, discharging a great public duty, and I submit to the fairness and to the spirit of justice and equity of every man, that if there has been such a wrong perpetrated, it is the duty of the people of Canada to see that this man, poor as he is, should be indemnified not only by the court, but out of the exchequer of the country. Since the facts are these, and in view of the admission made by the Minister of Justice, that indeed this man was despoiled of his property, I see all the more reason at this moment, to prosecute the enquiry which is demanded by my hon. friend; to see who are the guilty parties; to see who are those who have prostituted their uniform, and brought shame to the British name in this manner, and further to see that when they are known, they shall be dealt with as they deserve. Canada has not been sparing, nor stingy in the distribution of rewards to those who have quelled the rebellion, but I submit, that, on the other hand, Canada should also see that justice should be done against any offender whoever he be, great or small. Now this disposes in my opinion of the second branch of the case. The other branch which refers to the claim of the Breslayor half-breeds, is of a little more difficult nature. That these half-breeds have suffered in the rebellion, and in consequence of the rebellion, and that they have lost property, is out of the question and cannot be doubted. That they have made a claim, and that their claim has been rejected for no reason, than that it is alleged that they were rebels, and had been participating in the rebellion, is also certain, and, of course, if they had been participants in the rebellion, they had no claim upon the mercy or upon the justice of this Government. I do not admit altogether the principle laid down by the Minister of Justice, a moment ago, that in settling for the losses sustained by the people of the North-West, in consequence of the rebellion, the Government was not discharging a principle of duty, but simply exercising an act of grace. I do not admit that principle. It was more than an act of grace; it was, I think, a principle of abstract justice that if, in consequence of the rebellion, any subject of Her Majesty had lost anything, the people of Canada should make that loss good to him. We have precedents of a celebrated nature among us to confirm this opinion which I now express. The Government, in sending a commission to the North-West, to investigate the claims and determine the losses of those who had suffered, was not, therefore, exercising an act of grace, but simply exercising a duty which devolved upon them. It is said that these men who presented their claims to the commissioners and whose claims were refused, were so refused because they had been participants in the rebellion. That may be or it may not be the case; but to some extent the evidence is against them. There is the fact against them, that notice had been given to the half-breeds in that settlement, and some of them had withdrawn to Battleford, and others remained. Those who withdrew to Battleford, as the hon. Minister of Justice has stated, had their property pillaged, and they were indemnified by the Government. Those who remained, also lost

their property, and it was natural, perhaps, under such circumstances, that they stayed at home, to protect their property. Most certainly, in my opinion, no imputation can be made against them, because they chose to remain to defend their homes. That, however, is the only imputation that can be made against them. Be this as it may, they made their claims and their claims were rejected by the commission. The Minister of Justice says that the judgment of the commission upon this point must be final and cannot be re-opened again. I am happy to say that I have no reason to believe, nor do I for one moment believe, that the commission did not do justice to the best of their conscience and judgment. I have no reason at all to impugn the conclusions at which they arrived; but because they have discharged their duties fully, and to the best of their intelligence and conscience, surely the Minister of Justice will not presume to affirm that the verdict which they gave was the only verdict which might have been arrived at. He will surely not affirm that they did not make any error when it is possible that they may have made an error, nor is it extraordinary that judicial investigation should not satisfy a litigant, and that he should claim to be heard a second time in his defence. That is not anything extraordinary, it is a matter of daily occurrence. In this present matter, the half-breeds, who have been stigmatised with the stigma of rebellion, come before this Parliament and ask to disprove the charge made against them. They ask to be given another hearing; they say they are able to prove, and to justify their pretension that they were loyal, that they were the victims of fatal circumstances, and that they did not participate in the rebellion. Under such circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I put this question to the fairness of every member of this House: Is there a man in this House, at this moment who is disposed to refuse to these people the privilege which they ask of proving their innocence? Is there a man who is disposed to act with severity against them and to say: "No; they have been heard once, they shall not be heard once again." It seems to me that that would neither be justice nor fairness. Such a conclusion must be repugnant to the sense of right of any man. When people in such condition—especially, poor people, the victims of recent losses, uneducated, possibly unable to defend their own rights, probably unable to present their own case as it might have been presented—have been the victims—because in my judgment they were the victims of circumstances—and are stamped with the stamp of rebellion against them; when such people come before Parliament and ask justice, should not justice be quickly rendered them? This is the time to give these poor people an act of grace, and that is an act of grace which they ask of the Parliament of Canada. It may not be strict justice, but it is an act of grace when they ask to have the privilege of disproving the charge brought against them, and confirming their innocence. It seems to me that in a sense of right and in a sense of fair play, there should be no objection to give them the privilege they claim, of affirming their innocence, and that is all they ask at this moment. At all events, the committee should be granted, for the first reason I have stated, to investigate the charges of Charles Bremner, and to enquire into the public offence which was done against him on

Mr. LAURIER.

that occasion; and also to afford to the half-breeds of Bresaylor the opportunity of proving their innocence and enjoying all the results to which their innocence may entitle them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, Mr. Speaker, a commission was appointed to enquire into the claims of these Bresaylor half-breeds. The hon. gentleman does not deny that it was a fair commission. At the head of it was Mr. McKay, one of themselves, a well-known man, who stands very high among the half-breed people of the North-West, I suppose as high as any one there; the other commissioners were Mr. Ouimet, a man of equally high character, and Mr. Muma, whom we all know as a trusted appraiser and arbitrator in all Government matters. They went to the spot, heard all the evidence, gave every opportunity to parties to prove their claims, and decided against these men; and now the hon. gentleman asks that we should set aside their judgment, and have a committee sitting down here in a committee room, when every man who has a claim will come down here and press it. Are we going to have a re-trial, under circumstances which are certain to be unfavorable to getting a correct judgment? There is no reason to suppose that these three men have not given a good judgment. They were carefully selected by the Government; their very names show that the Government took every care to get men who would be without any prejudice at all, who would be rather favorable to the claims than otherwise; and that that judgment should be set aside, and this matter brought down here and made a football for political parties to fight about in this House is, I think, abhorrent to the idea of fair and impartial justice. That is my opinion. Then, the hon. gentleman speaks about this case of Mr. Bremner. As regards that, the Government have no desire to protect any person who has injured Mr. Bremner; it is not their interest, nor is it their wish to do so. Mr. Bremner has taken his own course; he has brought his action before the court, and will be able to present his case on oath there; and if he establishes his case he will not only get a judgment for any losses he may have sustained, but the evidence will enable the Government to deal with any parties in the employment of the Government who have acted improperly, and who may be deserving of censure at the hands of the Government of Canada. There is no case or ground for this committee. It will be, as I have said, simply a political committee obtained for the purpose of making some little political capital out of the matter. I say that the commission was a fair one; it was well selected; the evidence was taken on the spot; every man who had a claim had an opportunity of proving his claim; judgment was rendered against these men upon the evidence; and this attempt to re-open the case is, I think, most unfortunate, most unjust, and ought to be resisted. As regards Mr. Bremner, he has taken his own course, and, I think, he must be governed by it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am rather surprised at the position taken by the hon. First Minister with reference to this case, at this period. The hon. gentleman will remember that I brought Mr. Bremner's case to the attention of the House early

in 1887, and the Government have had from that day to this to enquire into this claim. The House is aware that Mr. Bremner was committed to prison as a participant in the rebellion. It was open to the Government to establish his guilt on that occasion. The Government, however, came to the conclusion that there was not evidence to convict him, and he was discharged without a trial. Under these circumstances it would have been an extraordinary proceeding for the Government to authorise a commission to enquire into the loyalty of Mr. Bremner's conduct. The House will remember very well two very important historical cases in this country in which indemnity was given to parties who had sustained losses in rebellions. In one case indemnity was paid by a government of which the hon. Premier was a member, and in the other by a government which he very strenuously opposed, but both governments acted on the same principle. They authorised a commission to enquire into the character of the losses, and instructed the commission to be governed in every case by the decision of the courts with reference to the guilt or innocence of the parties. In cases where no legal proceedings had been taken against the parties and no guilt or innocence had been established, the commission was not to enquire into the guilt or innocence of the claimants; their duty was simply to enquire into the character and extent of the losses sustained. I have not looked at the instructions given to this commission, but I apprehend that they would not differ from the instructions given in the two preceding cases, and that the commission would have no authority to act as a court of justice for the purpose of establishing the guilt or innocence of the parties making claims. Now, the hon. Minister of Justice has undertaken to draw a distinction, which in one respect is well founded, between losses sustained during or preceding hostilities, and losses sustained subsequent to hostilities. It is a well established rule that it was not open to any officials of the Government to destroy or use any property existing after the rebellion was put an end to; but it was their duty to protect it and to see that it again went into the possession of the legal owners. Now, so far as the furs in question are concerned, it is stated that they were put into the hands of the North-West Mounted Police. I have a short memorandum which I made in 1886, a year after these losses were sustained, from information given to me at the time by a merchant at Winnipeg, a Mr. Macdonald, and by his factor who resided at Battleford, and who stated what was within their own personal knowledge. And the statement was that the furs were taken by order of Gen. Middleton, and placed in the stores of the Mounted Police at Battleford, that they remained there until after the surrender of Poundmaker, until Gen. Middleton returned from Fort Pitt, that they were placed in the charge of one Stephen Warden, who was the Quartermaster of the Mounted Police, that he was ordered to place them in the charge of Mr. Hayter Reed for the purpose of shipment, that they were shipped in boxes in which saddles had been sent to the North-West, that two of the boxes were marked as the property of Gen. Middleton, that one was marked as the property of Mr. Bedson, and one as the property of Mr. Hayter Reed. Now, here was an appropriation by officers of the Government of

property which belonged to another party. The question whether Mr. Bremner was guilty or innocent of being a participator in the rebellion is wholly without the question. That is not a question of any importance in this matter. Mr. Bremner may have been a participator in the rebellion. He denies that, and his friends deny it, and his friends say he could establish his innocence if the evidence had been received, but that the evidence he submitted to the commission in this matter was not taken, that the witnesses were not examined, and that he is prepared to produce those witnesses before the committee and establish his innocence, if it is a matter of importance that he should do so in order to acquire possession of his property. But there were other properties existing after the rebellion was over which were appropriated to the use of the Government—cattle, horses, &c.—and it seems to me that he has a legal claim to these also, whether he was guilty or innocent, so far as the rebellion is concerned. The First Minister assents to that proposition. I think it is too well established to admit of question. With regard to these furs, what right had General Middleton to them? He was there for the purpose of protecting property and life, and not for the purpose of robbing any one of property which he owned, and confiscating to his own use such property. That was not his mission; he was not there for services of that sort. It was not for services of that sort that this House voted to him \$20,000 in addition to the amount he was receiving from the Government as a commissioned officer. Well, that property was taken. Those parties say it was taken; they say it was appropriated by these three individuals; they say they are ready, if a committee be granted, to establish that proposition. I mentioned this matter in the beginning of 1887, and the Government promised to investigate it. Have they investigated it? Have they ascertained whether General Middleton took any of this property or not? Have they instituted any enquiry? What steps have been taken for the purpose of bringing these parties to justice? For it was as much the duty of the Government to enquire into the misconduct of those whose duty it was to protect life and property, as it was to enquire into the extent or character of the losses which were sustained. Now, this is the question we ask, and there is no tribunal in the world more appropriate to enquire into the matter than a committee of this House. Who are these officers against whom these charges are made? Are they not officers paid by the people of Canada? Is not the money they receive yearly for their services money which was appropriated by this House for the purpose of paying them for these services? I would like to know who has a better right than this House to enquire into their conduct or misconduct, and what more appropriate way there is of making that enquiry than by the appointing of a committee for that purpose? The right hon. the First Minister and the hon. the Minister of Justice will observe that this resolution is not confined to enquiry with reference to the losses sustained by Mr. Bremner or to losses sustained by other half-breeds of the Bresaylor settlement. The motion is this:

“That a select committee be appointed to enquire into the claims of the Bresaylor half-breeds for losses sustained owing to the rebellion in the North-West, and also with reference to the furs taken from Charles Bremner.”

In that enquiry it will be very important to know by whom and how they came to be taken. It is not merely an enquiry for the purpose of ascertaining the amount of Mr. Bremner's losses, but it is also to ascertain how those losses were sustained and through whose agency. Why, the right hon. the First Minister and the hon. the Minister of Justice are as much interested—in fact, ought to be more interested—than we, on this side of the House, to ascertain how those losses were brought about. There is no doubt that the property was placed in the care of the North-West Mounted Police, that that care was not properly taken, that the property was taken out of the custody of the police, and that it was appropriated by somebody; and it could only be appropriated by officers connected with the public service, or by persons who succeeded in conquering and taking possession of the property. Had there been any hostile possession?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is there any evidence that the North-West Police Force, or any military force at Battleford, were compelled to retire, and that the property in their possession was taken by the enemy? Every person knows that is not the case, but that, on the contrary, the property was put in the possession of men who were masters of the situation from the time they got it until peace was restored, and that although that property was put in their possession it has never been accounted for. Mr. Bremner has sustained the loss and at the hands of the officers of the Government of this country. There is no doubt about that. The right hon. the First Minister says that Mr. Bremner ought to be left now to his remedy in the courts. I do not think he should. If Mr. Bremner has sustained the loss by private parties, and we did not know how that loss was sustained, I say that then that proposition might be a reasonable one; but this property was put in the hands of the Government officers, who remained masters of the situation, and it is not forthcoming. It does seem to me that, under these circumstances, it is the duty of the Government and this House to ascertain the amount of the loss, so far as those furs are concerned, and to take proper steps against the parties through whom the loss was sustained. It is upon them the burden should fall, and not on Mr. Bremner. We have this further question: Do the Government want to screen those parties against whom those charges are made? Have they any special interest in the matter?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not the slightest.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The right hon. the First Minister says, not the slightest. I have no disposition to charge that they have; but I say it is very important now that the First Minister and his colleagues should make that point perfectly clear, and they can do so by granting this committee, and furthering this enquiry, at all events so far as those men are concerned. Give them an opportunity of establishing their innocence, or give those who make the complaint an opportunity of establishing the guilt of those complained against; and if their guilt be established, let the Government take proceedings against them for the purpose of making them pay for what they have improperly taken, and dismiss them from the public service. That would be a perfectly straightforward, honest, common-sense proceeding. That

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

is a proceeding which the country can stand, and it will have a very wholesome effect upon the public service when it is known that those who were employed to protect life and property are compelled to discharge that duty efficiently and honestly, and will not be allowed to appropriate the property of others to their own use.

Mr. DAVIN. The speech made by my hon. friend from Bothwell is a speech which would be suitable to support a different motion from this. This motion asks for an enquiry into the losses sustained by certain half-breeds, and also with reference to furs taken from Charles Bremner, a half-breed residing at Battleford. It would be a very important thing to know whether those half-breeds ever asked for an enquiry. I believe as a fact they have never asked for that enquiry, and that my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister), comes forward gratuitously to ask for an enquiry on behalf of people who never said they were aggrieved.

Mr. LISTER. That is not so. I am asked to make this enquiry.

Mr. DAVIN. By whom?

Mr. LISTER. By Mr. Bremner.

Mr. DAVIN. There are two parts in this resolution. The first alludes to the half-breeds generally, and the second to Mr. Bremner. I am not dealing with Mr. Bremner. I am simply dealing with the Bresaylor half-breeds. I repeat that the hon. gentleman has not been asked by them to propose this motion, and he comes forward to demand an enquiry into their losses gratuitously. What the Prime Minister said is quite cogent, that to appoint such a committee would be to appoint a fishing committee in order to get something up for political purposes. The speeches of my hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition were couched in that logical form and embellished with that charm of language which always distinguish those hon. members, but they would have been more to the point if they were supporting a wholly different resolution from that which is before the House. The leader of the Opposition asked for an enquiry into the conduct of men who had "prostituted their uniforms," and the member for Bothwell demanded the same thing. But, if my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) who is a distinguished lawyer wanted an enquiry into these men's conduct, he should have put it on the paper, and should not have asked us to support a motion in one set of words, and then, with those who support him, stand up and speak in a sense which would support a wholly different resolution. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) does not seem to see the point of the Prime Minister's remark that Mr. Bremner had gone before the court. If Mr. Bremner has gone before the court, Sir Frederick Middleton and Mr. Hayter Reed will be defendants in that court, and, as these hon. gentlemen are so anxious to have an enquiry into the conduct of these gentlemen, it would not be right to do anything unfair to them, or to prejudice their case, as any action taken by the Government now would do, especially after the speeches which have been made, in which charges of a very grave character have been preferred against Sir Frederick Middleton and Mr. Hayter Reed. I consider that hon.

gentlemen have taken up a very illogical position here to-night, one which they cannot justify.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Their course cannot be defended before the country. You cannot say that Mr. Bremner can eat his cake and have it. He cannot go before the courts and remain in the same position as he was before. The hon. and learned gentleman the Minister of Justice has made a plain and unvarnished statement of the case. He has shown that the Government had it before them, and my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) showed that he was pressing it upon the Government and that they were considering it. Coming from the North-West, I may say that half-breeds and others who have any claim upon the Government never lessen their claim, and it would be simply traitorous on the part of the Government to at once jump at a sum named by Mr. Bremner and give him that amount. Every one in this House and every one in the North-West knows that my hon. friend who represents the Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) represents it with great benefit to the Saskatchewan, with great credit to himself and with pleasant associations in this House, because, however strongly he may press his claim upon the Government and upon the House and however strong may be the stand he takes, it is always taken with the demeanor of a gentleman and the charm of a kindly nature. My hon. friend said he had gone around to price furs; he had got a list of furs and had priced them in order to ascertain what was the exact claim that Bremner could have. He read a letter which showed that Bremner was willing to take \$3,000. If that is so, from what I know of the North-West it is morally certain that that was the butt and sea-mark of the utmost sail that justice could take. If Bremner made his first claim lower than he should, he stands unique amongst half-breeds, and I must say he stands unique amongst North-West men. My hon. friend from the Saskatchewan, after making his enquiries, came to the conclusion that Bremner was entitled to \$3,500. He was then in a position to go to the Government, and press Bremner's claim, and I re-echo the statement of the leader of the Opposition that Bremner's wisest course would have been to have left the matter in the energetic hands of my hon. friend from the Saskatchewan. But my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) tried to show that my friend from the Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) went round to these places in order to lessen the amount of Bremner's claim. Now, it is evident that my hon. friend took that course with a view to fairness and justice. It would be monstrous that any member of Parliament should urge a claim on behalf of any of his constituents which was greater than they were justly entitled to. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson)—of course unconsciously—misrepresented the position of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall). I cannot vote for the motion which is before us—because I learn that, if Bremner had not taken the course he has, and even though he has taken that course, the Government will do justice in this matter. They have enquired into it. They have all the knowledge which is necessary to enable them to come to a just conclusion upon it, and, therefore, I cannot vote for the

second part of the resolution. As to the first part of the resolution you ask the half-breeds who have never themselves asked for an enquiry, to come down here and then do—what? I suppose they are to state under oath that they were never engaged in the rebellion. Suppose that men were engaged in an act of treason, suppose they were engaged in committing one of the gravest crimes known to the law, according to any knowledge we have of evidence, what weight could be placed upon their testimony, and what sort of testimony would they bring in their favor if they did not give testimony themselves? They would bring other half-breeds who would be in the same suspicious circumstances as themselves. I know Thomas McKay and some of the other members of the commission. I have often talked with Thomas McKay in the North-West and I know that, instead of leaning towards the Government, he had the greatest possible leaning in the other direction. He had the greatest possible sympathy with these people, and I am sure that, if Thomas McKay put his name to a report and did not give a half-breed—and especially a Scotch half-breed—what he claimed, it was because he could not conscientiously do it.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend who has just sat down has not added a great deal of light to the subject, nor did the right hon. Premier, because he only passed over part of the ground that had been previously travelled over by the Minister of Justice in a thorough and able manner. Still, I must dissent strongly from most of the conclusions that that hon. Minister drew. In the first place, as to the general claims of the Bresaylor settlers—he says that they did not prove their loyalty before the commission. Now, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has shown by precedents, one, at least, in which the right hon. Premier is personally implicated as having been a member of the Government who set that precedent—that it is not usual to authorise any commission to enquire into the loyalty or disloyalty of people who make claims. On the face of it, it would be outrageous to do so. When a man is to be tried for treason, he must be tried before a competent tribunal accustomed to taking evidence, accustomed to sifting evidence, and before which counsel is heard for the accused as well as for the Crown. That is the only tribunal which can legally or properly decide that a man was disloyal in any case of this kind. These men had no authority whatever to decide that this or that man was loyal or disloyal; they were directed, no doubt, not to give compensation to disloyal half-breeds, but I do not think there was anything in the commission or if there was it certainly should not have been in it, it was utterly unconstitutional that there should be anything in the commission, to authorise them to decide, on evidence brought before themselves, whether a man had been disloyal or not. To authorise the commission to do that was to take away all the safeguards for a man's character, though, of course, it could not affect his life or property at that time on account of the amnesty; but it took away every legal safeguard, and those poor half-breeds have just as good a right to the protection of their character as the Minister of Justice or General Middleton, whose character has been at-

tacked in this connection. Each one has as good a right as the other to protection from the imputation of disloyalty. However, granting for a moment the ungrantable, admitting that which cannot be admitted, that this commission had some authority to enquire into the loyalty of these half-breeds, it does not at all follow that they had a fair trial before that commission. The commission may have meant to do all that was fair, but after hearing a few half-breeds, quite ignorant of legal proceedings, not knowing how to present their case, without counsel to enable them to present it, it does not follow that with the best intention on the part of the commission, the case was fairly stated before them, that everything possible was advanced in favor of the loyalty of these half-breeds. The fact remains that the Government have assumed on the report of this commission, that the men were disloyal, though, as the member for Bothwell has pointed out, the Government were not able to prove, and did not attempt to prove, that Mr. Bremner was disloyal when they had him in their custody, and could have brought him before the court. Nevertheless, they have overridden their own action in that matter, by accepting the report of the commission, and now they say that the matter must not be reopened. The Minister of Justice says, if there is any new evidence offered he will reopen it; but he says, no evidence is offered. Why, Sir, in the petition laid before the House, these men said that they could bring new evidence. You do not expect they will put all their evidence in the petition, that is not the place to put their evidence. They ask for a tribunal before which they can produce evidence to show their loyalty, they say they are now in a position to prove it. That, I think, is a very good reason for asking for a committee in regard to that part of the case. But as regards the looting of the furs, the stealing of the furs, I think there is no doubt the committee should be appointed. The Government admit that they have discovered, at last, that the furs were taken by somebody—they say it is difficult to find out by whom, or what they were worth. I think that there would not be much difficulty in finding out by whom they were taken. It has been a matter of public notoriety, and not denied since the year 1886, that they came into the possession, at all events, of the three parties named, Sir Frederick Middleton, Mr. Hayter Reed and Mr. Bedson, Warden of the Manitoba Penitentiary. This has been asserted in the press and in the House, time and again, for four or five years back, and never denied by anybody. Yet the Minister of Justice says there is a difficulty in finding out by whom they were taken. Sir, they have had plenty of time to find out. I moved a resolution in this House in 1886, calling for a return relating to those furs, and a return of the ponies, cattle of all sorts and other property belonging to the half-breeds, disloyal or otherwise, that had come into the hands of the expeditionary force, for an account of what became of them, whether they had been sold and the proceeds returned to the Government, or what had been done. In answer to that order of the House I got one sheet of foolscap containing an order from General Middleton to some parties at Edmonton, I think, in regard to the furs stored there. They absolutely refused to give any information about it at the time, although they must have had

Mr. CASEY.

information, as it was the year after the rebellion. If they had no information in their hands then as to the disposal of this property, they must, at least, have had the means of getting it, and they have refused to produce it from that day to this. It appears to be only now, within the last year, according to the statement of the Minister of Justice, that they have taken steps to make enquiries about the matter. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) thinks that Mr. Bremner is greatly mistaken in taking this case out of the hands, out of the energetic hands, of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan, (Mr. Macdowall). Well, I am inclined to agree with him as to Mr. Bremner's course, but I can hardly agree with the epithet used by my hon. friend from Assiniboia, hardly agree that the energy displayed by the member from Saskatchewan in pressing this claim was such as to justify Mr. Bremner in leaving the case entirely in his hands. I cannot admit, either, that the action of the Government in postponing the investigation of this matter for more than four years, was such as to impress Mr. Bremner and the half-breeds generally at Bressaylor, with the idea that they were going to get prompt and sufficient justice in the case. I am not at all sure, either, but that Mr. Bremner felt himself driven, as a last resort, to sue the individuals whom he charged with this theft instead of pressing his claim upon the Government who seemed to be so tardy in taking cognisance of it. But supposing he was misguided in taking this course, supposing it was unwise for him to take a private remedy instead of pressing his claim upon the Government, does that relieve the Government of their duty in the matter? I think not. The duty of the Government remains the same, no matter what private remedy Mr. Bremner may seek. The Government are the parties responsible, in the first instance, for any damage done by our troops, or by any officers of this Government. It is their business, after having settled such claims, to seek out and punish the individual who has brought this loss upon the Government. The fact that the party aggrieved has taken a mistaken course in prosecuting in the courts the actual instrument of his wrong, instead of continuing to hold the Government responsible, does not relieve the Government in the slightest degree of their responsibility and their duty to see justice done in the matter. And if they refuse to go on and enquire into this matter and do justice to Mr. Bremner for the simple reason that he had another action in the court, I say it is a proof that they are anxious to postpone the matter, anxious to avoid a parliamentary discussion of the matter, anxious to avoid a parliamentary enquiry into the matter, and anxious to shield the individuals who have been accused in this case. They are doing injustice to those parties as well as to Bremner in refusing to go on with this enquiry. The Government owe it to the country and to this House, as well as to Bremner, to have this investigation conducted immediately, no matter what course Bremner may be taking, and an investigation should be made into the action of our own officers, and this could be carried on here as well as in the courts and as well now as at any future time. I consider, therefore, that both in regard to the general question and the question of loot there are grounds for the motion. If the principle is to obtain that no

enquiry is to be made into what has become of the property of insurgents because they happen to be such, then this House will admit the principle known as loot, that our troops have a right to loot the property of insurgents wherever they come across it, and give no account. The House does not want to recognise that principle, and it must, therefore, in order to sustain its own dignity, the dignity of the Government, and the reputation of the parties accused, proceed immediately with this enquiry.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not propose to go over any of the grounds traversed by those who have preceded me. With respect to the motion for a committee proposed by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), I think the reasoning of the Minister of Justice and the leader of the Government is conclusive as to whether we should or should not grant that committee. What I wish to say, however, is this: the claims for compensation can easily be met by money grants, and they can be disposed of in a manner which will not bring about any injury to this country; but the serious charge made by members of the House against a gentleman who occupies the high position of commander of Canadian forces, is one that cannot and ought not be passed by in silence. It is one which ought either to be withdrawn, or those who make it should be compelled to establish it. We in this House resent any charge made against any member or any officer of this House by any one, either inside or outside of it, and the officers and members of the active force should be equally jealous of the honor of that force; and I, as an officer in that force, feel bound to say that I cannot permit charges of this kind to be made in this House and allowed to pass without notice, because the effect is not confined to the individual against whom the charge is made, but it is reflected on those who hold command under him. Were this motion simply to enquire into the conduct of General Middleton and the other officers, who with him are charged with an offence, which, if it is not a felony, is certainly a very gross breach of trust, for the charge I understand to be that this officer took out of the possession of Government officials property and converted it to his own use, and what particular species of crime this is held to be by law I am not prepared to say, but if it was done, and done in the way it is alleged to have been done, it was a matter which the House should deal with vigorously, and in a manner in proportion to its enormity, there would be reason for the appointment of this committee. But as the case is now apparently before the courts, and as General Middleton and the others concerned will be called upon to answer these charges, or I would prefer to say will have an opportunity to answer these charges, which they have had no opportunity hitherto of answering, that fact of itself entirely deprives this motion of any force as regards the appointment of a committee. But what I particularly wish to say is, that the lesson cannot be too seriously and too soon impressed upon members of the active force of this country, whether officers or privates, that the system of looting, which certainly did prevail to a very great extent in the North-West, is one disgraceful to them as subjects and also disgraceful to them as soldiers. It is a practice and a doctrine unknown to the earlier traditions of the

British army, and it was because this would not be permitted that Wellington gained his great victories in the peninsula, and it was only in the Indian mutiny and the Chinese war we ever heard anything of the practice, which I am sorry to say has prevailed to a very great extent on several occasions since. I trust that the force in the beginning of its career will not allow any such imputation to rest upon it, as now rests upon it in regard to the troubles in the North-West. I have no doubt, and there is no doubt, that a great many things were done during that affair which had much better have been left undone. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) has said that every man who came into Prince Albert from Battleford had a package of furs with him. If that statement is true, and no doubt the hon. gentleman made it believing it to be true, although I cannot believe such a thing is possible—it was practically impossible—but, if it were done, it certainly argues a very great want of discipline in those commanding the force, and a serious lack of duty on the part of those constituting the force. What I particularly wish to impress on the House and the country is, that there should be a very strong expression of dissatisfaction at any such practices as those alleged to have prevailed during the campaign in the North-West. I should like our men distinctly to understand that the Government and the people of this country, both in this House and out of it, on whatever side they may happen to sit, will in the most strenuous and emphatic terms condemn—and, if necessary, punish—any practices similar to those which are alleged against gentlemen in high positions in the force of Canada. For my own part, I think nothing can be worse, and certainly nothing can be worse in a military point of view, than that sort of insubordination or want of discipline which will permit such acts to be done with impunity. I hope an expression will go forth condemning any such practice, no matter by whom it is carried on, and that the young men now in the force, or those who may join it hereafter, will remember that this practice of looting is one that must be strongly condemned, and if followed, must be as severely punished.

Mr. LISTER. The Minister of Justice and other speakers have taken exception to the motion before the House on the ground that it was too wide. I say to the Minister that so far as the motion is concerned, I am willing that it should be confined to the question of furs alone, and I say that so far as we are concerned, it is our duty not only to investigate the value of the losses that Bremner has suffered, but it is our duty further, in view of the charges made, to proceed and see whether an officer occupying a high public position in the country has been guilty of appropriating the property of this half-breed. If General Middleton has been guilty of this charge, if Hayter Reed and Mr. Bedson are guilty, they are unfit to occupy any public position in any civilised country; and it is a most suspicious circumstance that the Government are attempting to defeat the motion as regards General Middleton. If that man's honor were perfectly clean he would be the first man to invoke the power of Parliament for the purpose of sweeping away and clearing up what to him, if he is innocent, is the greatest slander that can be

offered against an officer. And the mere fact that he remains silent under the charge made, and that the Government are attempting to burke this investigation, is, to the mind of every independent man, ground for suspicion as to the guilt of General Middleton and the other men charged. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) has told us that so far as Hayter Reed is concerned he got none of the furs. Probably that hon. gentleman has heard the same story that Reed has told to other people, that when he wrote that letter at the instance of General Middleton he felt convinced he was doing something wrong in taking the furs, and that so far as he was concerned he would not take any of them. But, if the box of furs nailed up for him was not taken by him, it was taken either by General Middleton or by Bedson. I have this offer again to make to the Minister of Justice: If his objection to the motion is that it is too wide, I will content myself with an investigation as to the charges against General Middleton, Hayter Reed and Bedson; and if the Government do not accept this proposition, they are placing themselves in the position of confessing that those men are guilty of the charges made against them, and I repeat that I believe I can prove, if this committee is given, that these men did take the furs as has been charged. It is a very disgraceful thing to think for one moment that men receiving large salaries from the Government and occupying high positions have been charged with looting these wretched miserable half-breeds in the North-West of their wordly possessions. This is a disgraceful charge, and one the Government should not allow General Middleton to rest under. If he is an innocent man, he should be the first to ask Parliament to have it investigated. The opportunity is now given, and if the Government vote this motion down they are showing that there is something about this which they do not wish to be made public. The responsibility is with the Government. If they vote down this motion, let the blame rest on them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think Sir, that the suggestion made by my hon. friend from West Lambton, ought to be accepted. I have not been able to listen to the entire discussion, and, therefore, I am not in a position to express an opinion as to the first part of his motion, not having heard his argument; but it does appear to me that such statements as have been made on the floor of this House by that hon. gentleman and others with respect to the alleged loss sustained to Mr. Bremner, no matter what private action may be taken by the courts, makes it the duty of this House on the part of the country to investigate. In order to obtain the opinion of the House on this particular question, I move:

That the motion now in your hands be amended as follows:—"That a select committee be appointed to enquire into the statements made in this House in reference to the furs said to have been taken from Charles Bremner, a half-breed residing in Battleford."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a new proposition and involves other considerations. I do not know whether the hon. member who moved this amendment is aware of the fact that proceedings have been taken in the courts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; I was aware.

Mr. LISTER.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, as Sir Frederick Middleton's name has been brought up, I think it would present itself to that hon. member's sense of justice that Sir Frederick Middleton should not be subjected to a trial here, and then to a trial in the courts, and that he should be obliged to defend himself here, and perhaps that his case may be prejudiced before the courts. Such a thing as having two trials going on at the same time, or nearly at the same time, is an innovation, and abhorrent to the principles of justice as it is administered in British courts and under British law. The Government had never any desire, and they could have no desire, to protect any officer, whether civil servant or military servant, who had committed any breach of the law, or who had behaved improperly. I wish, therefore, to move the adjournment of the debate to give Mr. Bremner an opportunity of considering his position, and it may be that he may drop his proceedings in the court.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand no proceedings have yet been taken.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand they have.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, the writ has been served.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that if Mr. Bremner withdraws his suit the committee will be granted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that. I move the adjournment of the debate in order that we may consider the new position as presented in the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). We can consider what the course should be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Your motion was to adjourn, and I presume I have the right to reply.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It must be remembered that this is not the first time this question has been brought up. Year after year these statements have been made, and it does appear to me that this House should cause an investigation to be made at once into the alleged pilferings or looting of a quantity of valuable property in the North-West. There might be some force in the right hon. gentleman's statement if these charges were now submitted to the House for the first time, but as they have been made on several occasions, I see no reason why we should not have an enquiry at once. These charges against prominent officials under the control of the Government have been made as far back as 1886, if my memory serves me aright. They were made again in 1887 or 1888, and the whole country has rung with the alleged scandal that has taken place with reference to this thing. So far from the enquiry being premature, my impression is that it has been far too long delayed. We do not know when this action, which Mr. Bremner is supposed to have taken, will go on. According to the usual legal mode, it may be protracted for a year before anything is done. We have charges made by an hon. member of this House on his own responsibility, gravely affecting the honor and character of two or three important officials in our employ, and I submit that whatever course Mr. Bremner may choose to take, the duty of this House is clear,

namely, to investigate the charges made by my hon. friend, unless he withdraws them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What I say is that the hon. gentleman has changed the question before the House altogether, and, under these circumstances, I move the adjournment of the debate, in order that we may consider the effect of the hon. gentleman's motion. It is a mere matter of fairness.

Mr. EDGAR. I am sure the hon. First Minister has not closely examined the question before the House, or he could not possibly have stated that my hon. friend's amendment has changed the question. The question, as the hon. gentleman will see, refers to two points of investigation: one is the rebellion losses of the Bresaylor half-breeds, and the other is the disappearance of the furs of Charles Bremner. The amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford, as he avows himself, drops the former point, and restricts the enquiry to the latter. The answer of the hon. First Minister is that we should not go on, because Charles Bremner has issued a writ against Gen. Middleton. Why, Sir, is the jurisdiction of this high court to be ousted because one individual chooses to issue a writ against another on a subject which it is of paramount importance we should investigate? It would be absurd if this House could be stopped in an investigation of charges against the highest military officer in this country except the Minister of Militia, of malversation in office, and the hands of this House should be paralysed because Mr. Bremner has issued a writ against that gentleman. Why, Sir, if that suit had gone to trial and the claim had been paid by General Middleton, that would be no answer. How, then, can it be an answer when a writ has merely been issued? The writ might be issued in collusion. If General Middleton might happen to be really guilty, and might be of opinion that the issue of a writ would stop enquiry, he would of course have a writ issued, and as long as he kept that writ hanging, our hands would be paralysed, and enquiry would be stopped. That is no answer, and I am sure that the country will not accept it as an answer.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman the First Minister must see that if we adopt his motion to adjourn the debate, the question would be killed for this Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not a bit.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes; if the debate is adjourned, the motion will be put at the foot of Public Bills and Orders, and it could only come up every Wednesday evening.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will take care that the motion shall have every opportunity of coming up.

Mr. LAURIER. Under those circumstances we will agree to the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURN ORDERED.

Statement showing for each year since 1878:—1. The number of vessels which has passed through the Chambly Canal, and their tonnage. 2. The amount of and the description of freight carried by these vessels. 3. The amount of tolls collected in the said several years on the said canal.—(Mr. Préfontaine).

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to enquire of the First Minister when the revised and expurgated edition of the correspondence between Mr Hugh Macdonald and himself is to be laid on the Table. I must remind him that a very long time has elapsed, and I deferred taking action expressly on his statement that he desired to place that correspondence on the Table of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I got a letter from my son, but it was a letter which he had written without any idea that it would be laid before Parliament. I showed it to his partner, Mr. Stewart Tupper, who has been here, and I said: "This won't do, and when you go home, make my son write me a letter;" and I am expecting it every moment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must remind the hon. gentleman that his statement was an official statement made in this House on a telegram which he had received from Mr. Hugh Macdonald, and a week has transpired since then.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only consequence, if I do not get another letter, will be that I shall have to read some portions of my son's letter, which I have in my pocket, but I should like to have a letter in an official form.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt that Mr. Hugh Macdonald is an excellent letter writer, and I should like to hear the whole of it.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 4th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Walter Humphries Montague, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the County of Haldimand.

AGRICULTURAL FERTILISERS.

Mr. HAGGART moved, That, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide, in respect of the Bill intituled: "An Act respecting Agricultural Fertilisers," now before this House:

(1.) That with every sample transmitted in conformity with section three of the said Act, the manufacturer or importer shall, at the same time, transmit to the Minister a fee of three dollars;

(2.) That the inspector shall be entitled, for each package to which a tag is attached under his supervision, and for each bill of inspection delivered by him, if the fertiliser is in bulk, to such fee in either case as the Governor in Council directs;

(3.) That every person who sells or offers fertilisers for sale shall, before so doing, register his name and address once in each year with such officer as the Minister directs, and shall at the same time pay a registration fee of one dollar;

(4.) That all fees paid and penalties recovered under this Act shall form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

WALTER HUMPHRIES MONTAGUE, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Haldimand, introduced by Mr. Patterson (Essex) and Mr. Tisdale.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 17) to amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. Carling.)

BILLS OF EXCHANGE, CHEQUES AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 6) relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I ask the attention of the Committee to a subject which I called attention to when we were passing section 19. We had some discussion during last Session, and this year also, with respect to acceptances payable at particular places. The provision of the draft Bill, as introduced last year, was that an acceptance to pay at a particular place is a general acceptance, unless it expressly states that the bill is to be paid there only and not elsewhere. That is now the law in the Province of Ontario, and under it a very convenient practice has grown up of persons accepting their bills at particular banks, not with the intention of restricting liability upon the bill, but with the intention that the banks at which they keep their accounts ordinarily, shall pay the bill when it matures, as the banks frequently do, without cheque and without further instructions. I am informed that has been found to be a very convenient practice, and, as a matter of fact, although that was the law in the Province of Ontario only, the practice has been followed in the other Provinces, and in many cases where acceptances have to be procured in country places at a considerable distance from the bank, the bank stamps upon the acceptance "Accepted, payable at the bank of so-and-so," in order that they may not, when the bill matures, have to send four or five miles to present the bill. The feeling of the Committee was very strong last year against the insertion of the Ontario law in the Bill, and I accordingly dropped it from the Bill as introduced this year, but I promised that on account of the importance of the change, which I thought would be effected if we drop that section, I would bring the subject to the attention of the Committee again. I would call special attention now to the importance of the change which will thus be made. The practice, which has heretofore existed, of acceptors making their acceptances payable at a particular place, will have to be discontinued to a very great extent, unless the clause which I now propose is inserted in section 19. Hon. members will see that that must be so, because by a provision of the Bill which we have already adopted, the bank receiving the bill and presenting it is not allowed to take a limited acceptance. If it takes a limited acceptance it is responsible, and serious consequences may ensue, as regards the liability of parties on the bill. If

we do not adopt the section which I am now proposing there will be limited acceptances, and no bank can hereafter take a limited acceptance, and the practice, which I am informed is a very general one, and has grown up in consequence of the existing law, will have to be changed. Although I think I have pretty fully given the necessary information to the House, I will read a letter received by me which places the subject in a very concise form. The writer says:

"I desire to draw your attention to the great inconvenience which will result if section 19, sub-section 2, paragraph (c) of Bill No. 6, 'An Act relating to Bills of Exchange, &c.,' now before the House, is passed in its present form. The custom has long been in force here for the drawer not to designate any bank or place for payment, leaving the drawer in his acceptance to state the bank or place of business at which the bill will be payable. This is a great convenience both to the drawer and the bank which may hold the bill at maturity. The acceptor making his arrangement with his own banker to honor his acceptances, and the holder of the bill being only required to present the bill at bank designated for payment. Again, there are many millers, manufacturers and others, carrying on their business in small places where there are no banking facilities, who have their banking accounts in some neighboring city. On bills being drawn on these parties they are notified by mail to come in and accept the bills payable at their own bank, where, in due course, they are presented at maturity. Of course, it is not to be expected that any bank would undertake the presentation of bills ten or twelve miles in the country for payment. If they did, and bills paid on presentation, how could they collect expenses? If above section is passed in its present shape the above convenient usages will be done away with, as under section 44, sub-section 2, the drawer and endorser would be discharged unless they assented to the qualified acceptance, and the risk of a subsequent assent is something no holder would take. The difficulty would be entirely overcome by leaving the section as it was in the draft Bill before the House last Session."

I, therefore, submit the matter to the Committee for very serious consideration, and I am inclined to think that those who expressed themselves last year in favor of a change of the law and practice prevailing all over the country, had not given due weight to the inconvenient results which would follow. The immediate result of this would be a discharge of the drawer and the endorser by the taking of what will now be a limited acceptance, but what never was a limited acceptance during the continuance of the present law in Ontario.

Mr. EDGAR. I am glad to hear the Minister of Justice express the views he has done on the section now before the Committee. I am sure that the people of the Province of Ontario who are mostly interested, the bankers and the mercantile community, would be greatly prejudiced if the law were changed in the way the Bill proposes. If it is desirable that the law should be as proposed, an exception should be made in favor of the Province of Ontario. I know it is unfortunate not to have uniformity in laws of this kind, but rather than upset the whole custom of the banks and the mercantile community in the Province of Ontario, I think the balance of convenience would be in favor of allowing the exception to remain as it has been in that Province for a number of years.

Mr. BROWN. I am very glad that the hon. Minister of Justice has re-inserted this clause, and I am authorized to state, on behalf of a large number of the mercantile community in my town, that they were very much disappointed at the prospect of the Bill being passed without this provision.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I understand that the hon. Minister wants to provide that an accept-

ance at any particular place is a general acceptance, unless it is understood that the bill is payable there and not elsewhere. It seems to me that that is a great inconvenience. I understand that the English law, which was settled a great many years ago, is that when an acceptance is made payable at a particular place, the bill must be presented at that place. It strikes me that by this provision it must be presented either there or to the acceptor at his office, which would be a great inconvenience.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have provided farther on that the bill may be presented at the place designated.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the party is not obliged to present it there.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). But the difficulty is this: If I presented it at the bank at which it was made payable, I should not feel safe unless I also presented it to the acceptor personally, and at his office as well as at the bank. As the matter stands now, before an action could be brought against the acceptor, the party would have to show that he presented the bill at the bank at which it was payable, and that there were no funds there.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If a bill is drawn, made payable at the Bank of Ottawa, there must be a presentation, either there or to the acceptor himself. If it is presented there, and if the acceptor has funds there, the bill will be paid there. If it is presented to himself, all he has to do is to give a cheque on the Bank of Ottawa, and the thing is done. We do not make a presentation necessary or unnecessary. We leave the law as it is now as to that, but we adopt the principle that, if a man accepts his bill payable at a certain bank, it is a general acceptance, precisely as if he had designated no place of acceptance. By omitting this clause we should be revolutionising the whole practice with regard to these bills in the Province of Ontario. As a matter of fact, in the Lower Provinces—I am not speaking so much of the banks in the cities—take the agencies throughout the country, one of the bank managers who was here the other day informed me that the universal practice—I am referring to the Bank of Nova Scotia—was to require the acceptors to accept, payable at an agency of the bank; and he was not aware that by so doing he discharged all the parties to the bill.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Before it presents the bill, the bank has no right to make it payable at its own bank or agency. It has no right to say where I shall make it payable; but, suppose it is presented to me and I make it payable at the Bank of Montreal, I have the right to do that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The bank cannot take that acceptance from you. It must be accepted according to its tenor.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Does my hon. friend say that the acceptor cannot accept, payable at a particular place?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We provide the contrary by this Bill.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What section?

Mr. IVES. I should say that any change in the law which will disturb the practice in drawing drafts by city merchants on their country customers

will be a very serious thing. In the Province of Quebec the practice is for the city merchant to draw upon the country merchant without indicating the place of payment. Say it is a draft by a Montreal merchant on an Eastern Townships merchant. It is sent to the city of Sherbrooke, where there is a mother bank and where there are two branch banks. The draft is, perhaps, on a merchant residing in Cookshire, twenty miles away, where there is no bank agency. A notice is sent to the merchant that the draft is in the bank at Sherbrooke for his acceptance, and with that notice is sent a power of attorney authorising some official of the bank to accept for him, and it is accepted under that power of attorney payable at the bank at Sherbrooke. The practice has worked admirably. It has enabled the Montreal merchant to make his collections with facility. It is a convenience to the country merchant and is safe to the bank; and if a change were made by which this practice could not be continued with safety, it would be a very serious matter both to the wholesale merchant and his customer.

Mr. MASSON. There seems to be some misunderstanding on the part of hon. members from other Provinces as to the existing law in Ontario on the point under discussion. I think it is clearly admitted in Ontario that if a draft, drawn without being made payable by the drawer at any particular place, is accepted by the acceptor, payable at a particular bank, in order to bind the drawer and the endorsers, that note has to be presented where the acceptor makes it payable, although he does not make use of the words "not otherwise or elsewhere." But if the acceptor is anxious to have it presented there, and to be not liable unless it is presented there, he adds the words "not otherwise or elsewhere." Then it must be presented there, or he is not liable. It would appear that some are under the impression that when it is made payable at a certain bank, not only his endorsers are interested in its presentment there, but he, the acceptor, is. As far as the acceptor is concerned, I understand the law to be clear, that whether it is presented at the bank or not, he is liable if he accepts it payable at a certain place, but does not say "not otherwise or elsewhere," but his drawer and endorser to the bill are released absolutely unless it is presented there. The hardship which has been referred to, of a person making his bill payable at a particular place being sued upon it, I do not think is of much importance. We do not find it so in the Province of Ontario, because, if he wishes to be relieved of that, he has the power to add these words; and, at any rate, it stands to reason, that these bills passing through a bank, the bank will take care not to discharge the drawer or the endorser and will always present the bill where it is made payable by the acceptor, and there is nobody released, even if he is only an accommodation acceptor, because the bank or merchant who holds the bill presents it where it is payable. In fact, we have found it work admirably, and I am happy to hear that the practice has extended not only over Ontario, but over the Provinces where the law was different in that respect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No doubt the question is largely one of convenience. The objection taken

here is that throughout a large proportion of the Dominion the law of Ontario does not apply. It is not necessary in any of the Maritime Provinces. If I accept a bill payable at the Bank of Nova Scotia, that is where it is payable, and you have not to add the words, "otherwise and not elsewhere," and it will take years before the people of those Provinces will understand this new law. Suppose this law declares an acceptance payable at a certain place without these negative words, a general acceptance, you need not present the bill at the place where the man has made it payable before suing him. The acceptor may make it payable at the Bank of Montreal, and may provide funds to pay it there, and yet the holder need not present it there at all, but put it in a lawyer's hands and sue him at once. That seems to your untutored minds, not having the practice the hon. gentleman referred to, most dangerous. There seems to be no reason for the introduction of these negative words. The practice we have hitherto followed has been that where a man makes a bill payable at a particular place, it should mean what it says, and it should be payable there, and when you present the bill there the party should be bound to pay it. I acknowledge that the other practice seems to suit Ontario very well, because it is well understood there, but if it is made to extend to the Maritime Provinces it will not be understood, and a great deal of irritation and discontent will ensue. Perhaps it might be as well to make the Province of Ontario an exception under the law. Let their law and practice remain as it is, and let our law and practice, which is very well understood, remain as it is, and I think everybody will be satisfied. We do not want this provision introduced; I have not met a man in the Maritime Provinces that wants this new law.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think, also, that a good deal of inconvenience would be caused in the Lower Provinces by this amendment. The English Act does not apply to promissory notes; it only applies to bills of exchange.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The present English Bills of Exchange Act does, in section 87.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have not got the last Act, but the original Act applied only to bills of exchange. In England there might be reason for it; but in this country we have bills of exchange and promissory notes drawn by everybody. If I draw upon a man and say that it is payable at the Bank of Montreal, for instance, and he accepts it, then it is to be presented there; but if it is to be payable generally, and he accepts payment at the Bank of Montreal, that is not specified in the bill; and if that clause is put in, it is not bound to be presented there. Suppose a manufacturer in an out-of-the-way place makes a bill payable at his counter in his factory, and he has the money there to pay it, if it is not presented there but presented at the bank, the first thing he would receive would be a lawyer's letter, although he might have the money and be ready to pay it. I venture to say that even in Ontario, outside of the bankers and mercantile men, you will find that the ordinary people throughout the country will never put in those words which the amendment proposes. I think the general public would be satisfied if the bill is made payable where the parties are supposed to have funds.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. DALY. If any exception is to be made in favor of Ontario I should like to see Manitoba and the North-West Territories included, as we have the same practice that prevails in Ontario. I think it would be unfortunate if the amendment of the Minister of Justice is not carried. Bankers, who have met the hon. gentleman in relation to this Bill, have represented that the Bill, as it stands now, is an inconvenience to the public generally. I do not wish to say that the most intelligent people in Canada live in Manitoba or the North-West Territories; still, since the Ontario practice has extended into the western Provinces, as the hon. gentleman admits that it has extended to some of the banks in the eastern Provinces, I think the people ought to be allowed to retain the practice.

Mr. MASSON. I fancy that the trouble the hon. member from Prince Edward Island seems to anticipate, will never be realised. We have found the present practice to work well in Ontario, namely, that if a man was sued who had money in the bank, and ready to pay his bill, his bill not being presented, it would be simply a matter of costs; and if he made the plea that he had money there waiting for the bill, and if he paid the money into court and claimed to be relieved from the costs, I think any judge would relieve him of the costs. It is a mere matter of convenience. All the man would have to do would be to have the money ready in his desk to pay the bill, and the fact that the bill was not presented there has never been found to cause any difficulty anywhere. Why should the maker of a note, or the acceptor of a bill of exchange, be released, because, through negligence or otherwise, the holder of the bill failed to present it at the place where it was payable? There is no reason why he should be relieved.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If you put in the words "not elsewhere" he would be relieved.

Mr. MASSON. He would be relieved if he put it in that way, but he has not done so. In an ordinary mercantile transaction, why should the man primarily liable, be relieved? I can see no reason for it. The other parties are secondarily liable, if the holder does not carry out the strict technical requirements. But the maker of the note, or the acceptor of the bill, is the man who owes the debt and is primarily liable; and why should carelessness or negligence on the part of the holder release him?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The same meaning attaches to the acceptance when it is accepted payable at a bank in the Maritime Provinces; the same legal meaning attaches to it now. But suppose you apply this law to the Maritime Provinces. For the last half century the people have been accustomed to accept a bill payable at a particular bank; now, you propose that he need not present it to that bank at all, but you can sue on it if it is not presented at the bank. If you make an acceptance payable at a particular place a general acceptance, then you cannot sue as against the endorser unless you present it to the drawer. It is to avoid the necessity of presenting it to the drawer that you make it payable at a particular place, but you satisfy the requirements of the law and put the party in a position to sue the endorser, if you present it at the place where the acceptance is made payable.

Mr. TISDALE. As I understand the law, where the bill is payable at a particular place without the limiting words, you can either present it there or to the maker, as you please. As to the hardship of having to make a note payable at a particular place, not otherwise or elsewhere, I think the hon. gentleman misunderstands the idea of this commercial law. The object of the commercial law, which makes promissory notes different from ordinary contracts, is to enlarge the convenience, so as to make those notes a certain kind of circulating medium. I know that, in Ontario, the limited acceptance almost takes a draft out of the category of the ordinary understanding of a promissory note. No one is bound to take such a note, and, I think, the same thing exists wherever the commercial law exists. If you give a note, and you make it payable at a particular place, and not elsewhere, no one is bound to accept it. This would, therefore, change the whole system in Ontario. I agree with the hon. member for Grey, also, that you are magnifying the difficulty in regard to a man not having the money ready. Most men are only too glad to have the money paid. This only brings up one complication, and I do not say what the remedy should be. There seems to be a difference in the law in the different Provinces; and, if the law is to be made uniform, I think the proper principle to adopt would be the greater convenience to the greater number. In Ontario, there is a general consensus of opinion that no change is desired. Many bankers have represented this to me; and every person I have heard speak of it in Ontario has had the same views. I have been asked by a number of solicitors of banks, and bankers, and business men, not to allow the present law to be interfered with in this respect.

Mr. IVES. I do not think the real difficulty has been touched in this discussion. As the Bill now stands, the acceptor cannot fix the place of payment without modifying the contract, and, if he does that, and the bank accepts it, the drawers and endorsers are discharged. Unless we avoid that difficulty, we are going to make drafts impossible in the case of people who live at a distance from a bank. Now, the acceptor cannot say that the draft shall be payable at a certain place, because that modifies the contract. If that could be done without discharging the drawers and endorsers, it would be all right, but, if the acceptor goes further and adds the words "and not otherwise," the bank may refuse the acceptance.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would not that be a modification as much as the other?

Mr. IVES. In that case the bank could protest for non-acceptance; but what I am anxious that the Committee and the Government should see to is that the very general custom which has prevailed, and which has been of the greatest advantage to business men, should not be disturbed, that is, the custom of allowing the acceptor to indicate where he wants to pay, and to do that without disturbing the contract or releasing the endorser or the drawer. As to the other words which have been referred to, let it be left to the bank to accept or refuse as they please, but let the general words "payable at so-and-so" be permitted to be inserted by the acceptor without modifying the contract.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think that does modify the contract.

Mr. IVES. If I understand the Minister of Justice, it does, according to this Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman draws on John Smith and John Smith accepts the draft payable at a particular place, I do not think that modifies the contract.

Mr. IVES. That is the whole question.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, that is not the whole question. The question we have been discussing was whether an acceptance payable at a certain place means what it says as it does in the Maritime Provinces, or whether it means, as it does in Ontario, a general acceptance, unless the acceptor writes in "not elsewhere than" the particular bank where he makes it payable. If the banks and merchants of the Maritime Provinces were educated up to this new idea, it would be easy to carry it out, but I can see that a great deal of difficulty would result there.

Mr. MASSON. The merchants and bankers of the Maritime Provinces are now educated up to that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think not. I have not heard of it. There is the president of one of the leading banks of the Maritime Provinces sitting on the other side of the House; but I have not heard a word in favor of this provision from anyone with whom I have any acquaintance.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). As I understand, a qualified acceptance is taken at the risk of the holder of the bill. If a bill is drawn on me and I accept it, payable, say, at the Bank of Ottawa, that is a qualification of the acceptance. Then, if I accept a bill for my own convenience—and there is no question as to the convenience—making it payable at the bank where I do my business, if that relieves the drawer and endorser there should be some change so as to prevent such a result. I perfectly agree with the Minister of Justice that the practice which at present prevails, and which is a very convenient one for all business men, should be continued. As regards the argument made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), would not an acceptance to pay at a particular place be a qualified acceptance, and one that would prevent the bank from taking the bill as accepted? If so, what convenience will it be to the Maritime Provinces or any of the other Provinces, to let the law stand as in the original draft of the Bill, and relieve the drawer and the endorser of a bill from liability, if accepted in the qualified manner referred to in the Act?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must ask my hon. friends from the Lower Provinces to reconsider the statements made by them in regard to the inconvenience that would result. The bills which are accepted, payable at a particular place, are very rare.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). No.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand they are not more than one in five hundred. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), has stated that five, ten or fifteen years will be required before the public will understand the changes made. I think the hon. gentleman exaggerates

the importance of this objection. This would be the practical working of the measure: Five months will elapse before this Bill will become law. It will surely be understood by every banker in that time; and, as I have said, the bills which do not go into bankers' hands, but are made payable at a particular place, are very few indeed. The banks will decline to take an acceptance payable at a particular place, "and not elsewhere;" and the matter will easily adjust itself, because the transaction, in ninety-nine out of every hundred cases, goes through the banking institutions. I think my hon. friends from the Lower Provinces will likewise see the importance of securing uniformity in Canada in framing an Act like this, with respect to negotiable instruments which are, to a large extent, inter-provincial and international in their character. But hon. members will see this, also, that what I propose is demanded in Ontario, Manitoba and the North-West Territories; and if we say that that shall be the law there, as I propose to do in this section—I will omit British Columbia for the present—it comes down to this: that we shall have one law in Great Britain, Ontario, Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and a different law in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, as regard bills of exchange and promissory notes. Admitting that some inconvenience will result, I think it will be very small, and that we should run that risk, in favor of having uniformity, not only in our own country, but with the mother country as well.

Mr. KENNY. I have never had the advantage of discussing this particular Bill with any person who is a professional banker. I happen to be connected with the management of one of the banks in the Maritime Provinces, but my duties are simply advisory. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), has explained the practice which prevails in the Maritime Provinces in connection with the acceptance of drafts; and as our interprovincial trade is increasing, it is most important that we should clearly understand what we are now enacting. The custom is that a merchant in the Province of Quebec or Ontario draws upon his correspondent in the Maritime Provinces. These drafts invariably pass through the hands of the banks. It frequently happens that the party on whom the draft is drawn lives a distance of from ten to forty or fifty miles from any bank agency, and when the bank sends the draft to the party on whom it is drawn, it has been the habit—and the Minister of Justice tells us it is irregular—to mark on the face of it words to the effect that it is payable at a certain bank. The banks in the Maritime Provinces have been obliged to adopt that custom for their own protection. It would not be possible for them to send a special messenger a distance of twenty or thirty miles to collect a special acceptance. The custom which prevails is one of very great convenience to the manufacturers and merchants of the rest of Canada; and what appears to me to follow, from a remark which fell from the Minister of Justice, is that the clause now under consideration will positively legalise the custom which prevails in the Maritime Provinces—that is to say, that it will now be proper, regular and legal for the bank, when it sends a draft out for acceptance, to make it payable at a particular agency.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). No.
Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. KENNY. There is so much difference between lawyers in this House that there can be no wonder if a layman is puzzled. The hon. Minister of Justice, however, says I am right. If we can legalise the system which has been found convenient to the banks and to their customers, and which is certainly convenient to merchants and manufacturers who are supplying their customers with merchandise, I think we should adopt it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. gentleman has pointed to a practice which prevails in the bank in Nova Scotia, that when the bank receives a draft they stamp it payable at their agency before sending it out for acceptance. I have always entertained doubt as to the right of the bank to do so. But I entirely fail to understand how the Bill would legalise it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The clause says that that shall not be a qualified acceptance, but we leave out that section and it is a qualified acceptance, because section "c" says: "An acceptance is qualified when it is local;" that is to say, an acceptance at a particular place.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose it was from imperfectness of hearing that I could not understand the argument of the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White). I understood him to say that he could not accept the view of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) or myself; and he turns to clause 19 and finds that when an acceptance is qualified it is conditional, that is to say, it makes payment by the acceptor dependent upon the condition therein stated. I think that, if the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice should pass, an acceptance is general, unless it states that it is payable at a particular place, and not elsewhere.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). What I understand the Minister of Justice to propose is, that where a bill is drawn upon me or upon my firm, and no place is specified for the payment, and for my own convenience I accept it, payable, say, at the Bank of Ottawa or the Bank of Montreal, then that is a general acceptance; but under the provisions of this section 19, if my hon. friend looks at clause "c" of sub-section 2, he would find it would be a qualified acceptance, and one that would relieve the endorser and drawer from liability, if the bank accepted it with the condition that it was payable at a certain place. I understand the Minister of Justice to desire to amend this section 19, so as to make such an acceptance as I have referred to a general acceptance, and not one that will relieve the drawer and the endorser. What I wish to point out in reference to the views advanced by the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and St. John (Mr. Weldon), was, that if the Bill stood as it is at present, then a mere acceptance payable at a particular place, would relieve the drawer and endorser, and that the banks would have to take it—if they took it at all—subject to the risk that the drawer and endorser would be relieved. The proposition of the Minister of Justice will, I am sure, confer a great boon upon the commercial community of the Province of Ontario, (whether it does so in the Eastern Provinces, I cannot say), and unless a stronger objection is offered to it, I think we should adopt it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether a qualified acceptance, naming a particular place, is sufficient to discharge the drawer and endorser? It seems to me that would be a very extraordinary proposition, because it is really not such a modification of the contract as to put these parties in any worse position than they were before. The effect of that would be to render a qualified acceptance impossible without the express authority of the parties. I do not think that ought to be the case.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If this section is passed, I think it would be important to make the matter more clear under section 45.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). That is, in reference to the suggestion of the member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), that the presenting of the bill at the place specified, either by the endorser or drawer, would be a proper presentation?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that what before was a particular acceptance with us in the Maritime Provinces is now made a general acceptance, and if we attempt to make it a particular acceptance, we shall not be in the position we always have been in to discharge the drawer and endorser. In the Maritime Provinces when a bill has been drawn on a man, and he has accepted it payable at a particular place, that has been a special acceptance, which did not discharge the drawer and endorser under the common law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it did.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, if it did, all the practice has been wrong for many years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am inclined to think it would, under the common law; but when everybody knows that a bill is accepted with the limitation that it is payable at a particular place and nowhere else, the holder takes it at his own risk.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. In the case of a qualified acceptance, I understand that this Act will discharge the endorser and the drawer; but it is for the bank to say whether it will allow a qualified acceptance. By the proposed amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice, we are practically making all acceptances payable generally, because it is not once in a thousand times that a man adds, "and not otherwise or elsewhere." This is practically never used, and, therefore, what we are doing is to apply to the whole Dominion the law that is in force in Ontario, of making all acceptances general, and providing that those words must be added in order to make a qualified acceptance. So that we are not practically interfering with the practice in the Maritime Provinces. The amendment will not interfere with the security or the practice of the banks in those Provinces.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I understand that, practically, these words are not used at all, and, therefore, we are introducing new ideas, which may be very profitable to the lawyers, but not to the community at large. The hon. Minister seems to say that an acceptance at a particular place discharges the drawer and endorser. I have known all kinds of objections raised to get rid of the liability of an endorser and drawer, but I never

knew that to be raised. The difficulty that presented itself to my mind was that a general acceptance would necessitate the Bill being presented to the acceptor to make him liable. But the Minister says he will make a change to meet that difficulty.

Mr. MULOCK. In the clause which the hon. Minister proposes to add, allowing the acceptor to accept the bill at any place or at any bank, there are no limitations whatever. I ask whether it would not be possible to assign some geographical limits, otherwise a bill might be made payable 3,000 miles away.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If it is made payable too far away, it will amount to nothing; but we are providing for the further convenience of the holder, that he may present it where it is made payable.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). These changes may be understood by bankers and legal men, but they will hardly be familiar to a large part of the mercantile community. It seems to me regrettable that any change should be made which may place a large class of the business community at a certain disadvantage, and throw them into the hands of the legal men who look after the interests of the banks. It appears to me that any change like this should be made as plain as possible to the trading community of the country, who will be the real sufferers in the event of anything being complicated in the new arrangement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the change we are making is in the interest of that class, because we are providing that the drawer and endorser shall not be discharged by taking an acceptance payable at a particular place, unless it is declared on the face of the acceptance that it is to be payable there and not elsewhere. Therefore, we are removing a difficulty, and requiring that a limitation in a bill shall be plainly expressed on the face of the bill itself.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think the hon. Minister has quite removed the objection I raise, as to the latitude allowed to the acceptor to name a place. It appears to me that the acceptor ought not to be at liberty to name a place of payment different from the place named in the bill itself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The clause does not permit him to accept wherever he pleases. Let us see how it will work out. A bill is presented to me to-day by the Bank of Montreal in Ottawa, and I wish to accept it payable at the Bank of Montreal in Halifax. The bank simply refuses to take it if the acceptance is too far away to satisfy it. But this provision is to permit the bank to take it, if a particular place is named, without affecting the parties to the bill.

Mr. MULOCK. It appears to me that the drawer of a bill has discharged his duty if he gives a general acceptance; and, if the holder accepts generally, he has done all he is bound to do at that stage, and the holder of the bill, the bank, would not be entitled to refuse this acceptance. I think the right of the drawee to name the place should be qualified to the extent that he should not have that right where the drawer has specified in the bill a place of payment.

Mr. MASSON. My hon. friend is surely mistaken as to the existing law, or as to what is pro-

posed by this Act. I do not understand that either this Act or the present law requires that where a drawer names the place of payment in the bill, an acceptor has the right to change that to another place. The acceptor names the place, but still makes a general acceptance when there is no place named in the bill, but if there is a place named in the bill, then to make a general acceptance, he has to make the acceptance without naming any place.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Let us suppose that a bill is presented for acceptance payable in Ottawa, and, through perverseness or otherwise, the acceptor accepts it payable at the Bank of British Columbia in Victoria. The bank, under this clause, has the right to disregard that, and present it to the acceptor himself, or it may present it at Victoria, British Columbia. The acceptor, by making a draft payable at a place different from that mentioned in the body of the draft, makes a general acceptance, and the bank can present it to him, as if there was no place named.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Justice if he is going to introduce a clause, referring to bills of exchange or promissory notes, by which, on the words "given for patent rights" being written across the bill, the transferee takes it subject to all the rights that exist in favor of the original holder?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I submit that as this is a Bill relating simply to bills of exchange and promissory notes, it will be out of place for us to deal with the prevention of a particular class of frauds. It is unwise and unnecessary to engraft those provisions on this Bill. We leave them in force, but, if we undertook to say that a particular class of notes, which have, according to past practice, been somewhat affected by fraud, shall, under penal provisions, have certain words stamped on their face, we must take the same ground in relation to all classes of frauds. We must say that, if a promissory note be given for lightning rods, that must appear on the face; if a promissory note be given for family bibles, which fall to pieces the first time a fire is lighted in a room, that must appear; if a promissory note is given for gaudy maps, which fall to pieces before they can be hung; if a promissory note be given for pitchforks, hayforks, ploughs, or for miraculous seed grain, which fructifies five minutes after it is sown, that must appear on the face; and that while we are legislating in regard to notes, we must also legislate in regard to frauds in other contracts.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I cannot agree with the Minister of Justice. This is a Bill relating to bills of exchange and promissory notes. Why should we not incorporate in that those matters which affect bills of exchange and promissory notes, particularly where the bills say that the transferee must take the bill subject to all the sets-off which exist in regard to any part of it. This is the place to make that provision. If we simply put this provision in a law relating to patent rights or in the criminal law, the persons affected will not be aware of it. This is the very place to put it in, where we deal with cases after consideration given for a bill, and where we state that the transferee of a bill is to be liable for it under all circumstances. That is the place where we ought to make

Mr. MASSON.

the exception, if there is to be any exception. But my hon. friend the Minister of Justice proposes to change the law. He says we are not going to change it; but he is going to repeal the present law by the schedule of this Bill. If we are going to repeal the whole of that Act except sections 12, 13 and 14, why should that provision not be placed here? The objection of the Minister of Justice seems to be that this is making a certain offence penal. You might take that provision out and make it part of the criminal law, but it is very desirable to let every person know that anyone who takes a note for a patent right does so subject to all the equities which existed between the original parties. This has been found of great advantage in the country parts of Ontario in the past. It may be right to extend it, but the hon. gentleman has not given us any reason to show that it is not a proper provision in regard to patent rights, though he says that, in that case, we ought to extend it to seed grain and other matters in regard to which frauds are committed. I would be quite willing to see the provision extended even to that seed grain possessing the miraculous powers which the hon. gentleman has referred to.

Mr. SPROULE. There is one very important consideration in connection with this matter which shows that it would be an advantage to have that provision here. That is, that the business men all over the country will probably have this Bill in pamphlet form, and will study it and will carry out their business according to the law as they find it here. Tens of thousands will carry out the provisions of this Act who will never see a copy of the criminal law; so that men who are taking notes, or having notes, or doing a banking business, would become better acquainted with the law under this Bill, and I think, if this provision were inserted here, it would come to the notice of many more than if it were left in the criminal law.

Mr. MASSON. I cannot agree with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I do not think this is a proper place in which to insert penal clauses, or to have legislation as to what notes should be given for. There is a provision that a person cannot give ordinary promissory notes for these articles which have been referred to. If a person is selling a patent right or anything of such a doubtful practical value, and takes a note for it, he is liable to a penalty, but he is allowed to take something which resembles a promissory note, though it must have stamped upon it something which destroys its value as a promissory note. It is no longer a promissory note in the meaning of commerce. It is, therefore, altogether different from negotiable securities. If this Bill is, as my hon. friend says, to be printed in pamphlet form, there might be an appendix giving a reference to the patent right documents, because those are not promissory notes in the sense which is understood by the commercial world. It would be a great disadvantage to this Bill to cumber it with a lot of criminal law and penal enactments. This is a Bill referring to bills and notes, and let it refer to them simply and not to other matters.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is correct in saying that this Bill repeals the present Act, we should

see that it does not repeal those provisions to which he has referred.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I see that I was mistaken in saying it did not repeal those provisions; but I understand that my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Burdett) is proposing to insert some such provisions in the criminal law, and I think it would be better to put them all together.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It seems clear to me that this Bill repeals the former one. I would point out to the Minister of Justice that section 123 of 49 Vic., provides that such notes as have these words written across them are to be taken subject to those words. I understand that to mean that a transferee who accepts these notes should accept them subject to all the conditions between the original parties.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. If you incorporate these clauses in another Bill, you are in effect altering and amending this law by other measures.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We will allow this section to stand over for the present.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. If a bill is drawn upon him in the wrong name and he accepts it in that wrong name, is he liable?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, under this Bill.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. You only say he may accept it in this wrong name, but it does not say that he shall be liable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is a question of identity.

On section 42,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That section stood for the reason that the words "within the customary time" are too vague. I propose that the section shall read "when a bill is duly presented for acceptance and is not accepted on the day of presentation or the next following business day."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the effect only to give two days for the acceptance of a bill?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Suppose the person is not at home, and there is no power of attorney to accept a bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not presented in that case. At present the practice is to leave the bill for acceptance and to leave it until next day. The English Act says "the customary time," and we think that is too vague. There must be some limited time beyond which the bill shall not be allowed to remain without dishonor.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). For instance, in case of a member of this House not leaving at home a power of attorney to accept a bill, and it has to be sent here for his own acceptance—how would it work then? Is a bill not to be considered as presented until it reaches a member here, or is it presented when it reaches his place of business?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not presented in that case. Section 41 regulates the subject: "presentment must be made by or on behalf of the holder to the drawee, or some person authorised to accept or to refuse acceptance on his behalf."

On section 45,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In sub-section 1, I propose to insert, after the word "bill," the words "or acceptance."

Mr. MONCRIEFF. In regard to section 45, I think it might be extended, so that when the place of payment is a township the bill should be presented at any post office in that township.

Mr. IVES. I should object to any such change, for in that case the bill should be presented to the man himself.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The presentment at a post office would not be sufficiently definite; it should be either at the residence or place of business of the individual.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will read an amendment which has been drafted, as follows:—

"Where the place of payment is not specified, as any city, town or village, and no place therein is specified, the bill is to be presented at the drawer's or acceptor's known place of business, or known ordinary residence, and if there be no such place of business or residence, the bill is to be presented at the post office or the principal post office in such city, town or village."

Mr. IVES. I think the presentation to the post office is a mere matter of form, for the purpose of holding the endorser responsible. It is no part of the duty of the postmaster to receive a deposit of money to meet a note, and, therefore, it is simply a bare form. Why not say that if a man has no residence and no place of business, that shall be in itself sufficient? You are not going to arrive at anything more by the compliance with the mere form of presenting the note at the post office.

Mr. DALY. I desire to call the attention of the Committee to section 87, which seems to me to revolutionise the whole law in connection with the presentation of promissory notes. The section now reads as follows:—

"1. Where a promissory note is in the body of it made payable at a particular place, it must be presented for payment at that place in order to render the maker liable; in any other case, presentment for payment is not necessary in order to render the maker liable."

That at present is not the law in the Province of Manitoba, nor in Ontario, though it may be in England as I understand. Particularly in our part of the country, the whole custom of carrying on business by accepting notes would be revolutionised by this section. I will give you an instance of what might occur. The Bank of Ontario at one time had a number of agencies in the Province of Manitoba, and some years ago they withdrew them. One of these agencies was at Portage la Prairie, and a number of machine notes were made payable there, and subsequent to the dates of these notes becoming due the bank had withdrawn its agency. The consequence was that in order to hold the makers of these notes responsible we had to present them before we sued, and there was no bank to present them at. If section 87 remains as it is, the maker could not be held responsible at all in such a case. It does not seem to me at all necessary that a note should be presented at a particular place, if it is made payable at that place, in order to hold the maker liable. It is a fact that, in order to recover from the maker of a note, you must present it before action at the particular place where it is made payable, or to the maker himself.

Mr. TISDALE. It would be a most extraordinary doctrine—and I do not think it can be the intention—to say that if I owe a man money, and give him a note payable at a particular place, I should be free from the debt, if I do not present it at that place on the date mentioned.

Mr. MULOCK. The Bill does not say anything about a particular date.

Mr. TISDALE. We are surely not going to relieve a man from a debt he owes on a technicality like that.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not think the section is at all as clear as it should be, and I think that some words should be inserted, so as to make the intention clear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The stipulation is simply in accordance with the law?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 26,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the case of persons acting in a representative capacity—for instance, as executors, who have to endorse notes—it ought to be made clear that they are only liable in their representative capacity, and no further.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The question is whether we should not adopt the existing law, or whether we should change the law, not only with regard to bills of exchange and promissory notes, but with regard to contracts generally. I think it is simpler to leave the law with regard to these contracts as it is with regard to other contracts.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The difficulty is that persons who sign notes as executors or agents do not suppose themselves to be personally liable, but find out afterwards that they are.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Executors who endorse notes are personally liable under the law, and I do not see what form of endorsement would relieve them.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It seems to me, in reading this clause, that there is no more effective way of describing a man's character as an agent or representative than by using the very words which are mentioned here as not exempting him from personal liability.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The general doctrine is, I take it, that if a man merely puts an addition to his name as an agent or representative, that is merely a description of the man, and does not relieve him of personal liability; and he can only be relieved by using terms which show clearly that he is not signing as John Smith merely, but as the agent of somebody else. But an executor stands in a unique position: if he signs a note, he signs it in a capacity in which he must be personally liable; and I do not think you could use a form of words which would exempt him.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If we had to make the law of contracts from the beginning, we might regard the philosophy of the view expressed by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White). But people often make additions to their names as mere descriptions, and I think there would be great difficulty in changing the law with regard to contracts, especially with regard to bills of exchange, which are contracts of an international

Mr. DALY.

character. It would not do to have the law on this subject here which would be different from that in England, without risk of very great inconvenience.

Committee rose and reported progress, and it being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small.)

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LAURIER. Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I desire to call the attention of the House to the expenditure lately incurred by the Government in connection with the Short Line Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me, I would like to state to the House that the subject of the motion of which he has just given notice is one which affects the Minister of Railways, and for which he is responsible; and I am sorry to have to say that the right hon. the Minister of Railways is quite indisposed to-night and obliged to remain in his room. Under these circumstances, I am obliged to ask my hon. friend if he will postpone his motion until the next time we take up the Estimates?

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry, and everybody will be sorry to hear that the right hon. the First Minister will not be in the House this evening, and, under the circumstances, I will accede to the request of the hon. gentleman. I give notice that the next time the House is asked to go into Committee of Supply, I will make the motion I intended to make to-night, provided the right hon. gentleman be present.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Province of Nova Scotia	\$115,160
--	-----------

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I observe that in all the Provinces there is an increase in the expenditure. We were accustomed from time to time to have a small increase in one Province, but this seems to be such a general system of increase all over the Provinces that we should have a full explanation.

Mr. BOWELL. In Nova Scotia the increase is not very large, \$2,605, and it is due to the following causes: A new port has been established at Spring Hill, in Amherst, which means an additional increase in the Estimates of \$400. There was a preventive officer appointed at Fouchat, at \$100; an additional preventive officer at Baddeck, at \$100; and at Barrington, two preventive officers, for Shag Harbor and Wood Harbor, at \$100 each. At Halifax, the small increase in the expenditure of \$800, in connection with contingencies, has been unavoidable. The hon. gentleman knows that during the winter season the work at the

port of Halifax is much greater than during the summer, and it has been found absolutely necessary to add an additional officer to attend to the vessels which arrive in the winter. At Liverpool, a preventive officer has been added, at \$100, for Matoon; and at North Sydney there is an increase to the collector of \$100. At Pictou, there is an increase to two officers—Mr. Russell and Mr. Johnson—of \$100 each. Mr. Russell was appointed during the term of office of my hon. friends opposite, and has been in the service for ten or fifteen years, at \$500 per year. He was recommended to me for an increase as being a first-rate officer, and I thought he was entitled to it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is he a good Tory?

Mr. BOWELL. No; I believe he belongs to the hon. gentleman's party.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). He is entitled to it, then.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman has no party. The Repeal party is dead.

Mr. BOWELL. I am glad to hear it. I only wish it were dead in other parts of the Empire as well as this. At Shelburne, there is an increase to Mr. Bolman of \$100. He is an effective preventive officer, and entitled to more than \$50, which he was receiving. At Truro, a new landing waiter had to be appointed at \$500. I need scarcely explain that Truro is now the third important port at present in Nova Scotia, and the work is increasing so rapidly there that it was necessary to make this additional appointment. He will have to attend at the railway station. At Yarmouth, there is an increase of \$50 to one officer and \$100 to another, making a total increase of \$2,605. There is a decrease in Annapolis. One man who had a salary of \$500 died, and a new one was appointed at \$400; and there has been a falling off in contingencies at Lunenburg of \$100, making a net increase of \$200. In New Brunswick the outports of Caraquet and Shippegan have been added to Bathurst; so that while there is an apparent increase, there is really no increase, because there is no estimate taken for those outports as ports. At Moncton there was an increase of \$100 which was given to one of the officers. At St. John, owing to changes in the staff and sundry increases, there was an increase of \$450. At St. Stephen, an additional man was found necessary to protect the upper bridge, at a salary of \$500. At Woodstock, the changes in the staff necessitated an increase of \$100, making a total of \$2,810. From this you must deduct the saving by the adding of Caraquet and Shippegan to the port of Bathurst, amounting to \$1,080 in the one case, and \$630 in the other. At Dalhousie the place of one officer who received \$310 has not been filled. At Newcastle, there has been the superannuation of McGruar, who received \$600, and there has been an increase given to Wheeler of \$100, but McGruar's position has not been filled, nor do I propose to fill it, so there is a saving there of \$500. In Richibucto, the collector, who was receiving \$1,100, has been superannuated, and a new man has been appointed at \$800. An increase of \$200 has been made to the salary of one of the preventive officers who performs duties at another portion of that port, making a net decrease of \$100. There is, therefore, a saving of \$2,695, leaving the net increase only \$115.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What was the age of the man who was superannuated at Newcastle?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not remember just now, but he was of an age which justified his superannuation. Mr. Rusk was superannuated at Richibucto, not so much on account of his age as because of his illness. He was unable longer to continue the work, and, when he applied for superannuation, his application was accompanied by doctors' certificates which justified it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Was Mr. Rusk's superannuation voluntary? I have been led to believe that he was practically forced out of the position.

Mr. BOWELL. No; as far as the Department is concerned, he was never even asked to retire. I know nothing of any outside influences that may have been brought to bear. Some four or five years ago, there were applications made to me to retire Mr. Rusk, but I refused. This retirement of his was voluntary, as far as I know.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have the best information, outside of the Department, that Mr. Rusk's retirement was forced upon him. The plea was his ill-health, but he did not wish to retire, and claimed that he could continue to perform his duties.

Mr. BOWELL. As far as I am concerned, this is the first intimation I have had of it, but I will take the trouble —

Mr. MITCHELL. To write to Mr. Rusk?

Mr. BOWELL. No; but to lay before the House whatever documents I have in reference to the question.

Mr. McMULLEN. That will not explain it.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) knows more about it than I do. I know of no pressure being brought to bear upon Mr. Rusk by anyone.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The general impression in the Province is that which has been stated by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell).

Mr. BOWELL. I have no knowledge, directly or indirectly, that any pressure was brought upon Mr. Rusk to retire from the service.

Mr. MITCHELL. Speaking from memory, though I cannot say positively, I think I received a letter from Mr. Rusk himself complaining that he was being forced out of the Department, and that ill-health was made the plea, though he was still perfectly able to do the work.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Who is the person appointed in his place?

Mr. BOWELL. I think his name is Johnstone, but I will not be positive.

Mr. MITCHELL. Was that Reuben Johnstone? I would ask whether Mr. McGruar's superannuation was voluntary or was forced upon him?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot answer positively at this moment. I know it was reported to me that he was not necessary, and his position has not been filled; so the office was not vacated for the purpose of filling it up.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. McGruar was a most reliable and faithful officer who had been there for years, and when I saw him last he was as capable of performing his duties as I am of performing mine,

and I think I perform mine pretty well. Of course he may have asked for this, but I know he was a faithful officer and one who understood his duties much more than the person who succeeds him.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman say that Mr. Wheeler is a man whose age would justify his superannuation?

Mr. MITCHELL. No, he is a younger man than Mr. McGruar, and he is perfectly competent to do his work; but what I complain of is, that an old and faithful servant, who is still qualified to perform his duties, should be forced out of the service while others who came in after him are retained. I do not think there were too many officers at that port, and, if Mr. McGruar did not ask for this superannuation, it was unfair that he should have to go out, when others who had come in afterwards and who were no more fit than he to perform the duties—perhaps not quite so fit—should be allowed to take his place.

Mr. BOWELL. As a general principle, I agree with the hon. gentleman, but if there are officers in a port and some of them are not wanted, the easiest and best way to deal with the matter is to superannuate the old officer and allow him to retire on whatever allowance may be due to him. I do not think the Government, or a Department, is justified in keeping a number of officers anywhere who are not required. If they were to be turned out without any consideration, there might be a very serious question as to whether it would be just to an old servant to deal with him in that way, but the object of the Superannuation Law, as I understand it, is to provide for just such cases as that of Mr. McGruar. If he were unable to perform his duties, he would retire on the amount provided by the law, and if he is not required, the law is clear as to how he should be provided for. I could not well act upon the rule laid down by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). If this man could be retired, and the other was not old enough to be retired, while both stood equally well, the only course was to take the oldest man, and not to leave him in a position where his services were not required. At present my memory does not serve me as to why this was done, but I will let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the amount of Rusk's superannuation?

Mr. BOWELL. He has been twelve years in the service, and he was receiving \$1,100—it would be between \$260 and \$300. His successor was appointed at \$800. I always thought that the salary paid to the collector at Richibucto was higher than the port demanded, and I told applicants distinctly that I would not appoint a successor at the same salary received by him.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has made the plea of a non-requirement of so many officers at Newcastle a reason for dismissing Mr. McGruar. Of course, the hon. gentleman is judge of the number of officers needed, and of their character and education, and if he says they were not wanted, then I can say no more about the superannuation, except that I desire to know whether it was voluntary or not. It is my impression that there were not too many officers at that port, looking at the position of the port, at the long distance these tide-waiters have to go to watch vessels, and

Mr. MITCHELL.

looking at the fact that a good deal of smuggling has been done all along the coast, of which one very notable case occurred a few years ago. My hon. friend may feel that he was perfectly right in lessening the number of officers in that place, but with all due deference to his official responsibility, I must differ from him. The hon. gentleman has chosen to give a definition of the object of the Superannuation Act. I regret very much that in carrying out that Act, other Departments of the public service have not acted in the same rigid manner in which the hon. gentleman's Department seems to have acted, particularly in the case of some of these Lower Provinces officials. I think if there is any one Act of this Legislature that has been abused and misused, it is that Superannuation Act. So far from economies having resulted from the operation of that Act and its application by the Administration of the day, I have no hesitation in saying that men have been discharged from employment and others put in their places when the former were as fit to perform the duties as many of those who have been appointed, and they are now actively engaged either in business, or in professions, or other work for which they are competent, and they are still drawing superannuation allowances. So far from the amount of the public charge for this service having been reduced, the superannuation list shows that a large amount of money has been appropriated, when it was necessary to create a vacancy for the purpose of serving some political party or friend. That has been my experience of the application of the Superannuation Act. Perhaps later on during the Session it may be necessary to make some reference to it, with a view of having the evil remedied for the future.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand that the hon. gentleman allows a superannuation allowance to this gentleman who was relieved of his office at Newcastle?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He was removed, but not from any incapacity or bodily infirmity?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not aware that there was any bodily infirmity, but his age, his length of service, and the non-requirement of his services, justified his retirement.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Did it also justify the hon. gentleman in allowing him a superannuation allowance?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly, you cannot well refuse him that. If he has served the requisite time and paid into the superannuation fund, the sum required by law, he should receive his superannuation allowance if there were no good reason for withholding it. He had reached the age which justifies a retirement; and, as I informed the House a moment ago, the position has not been refilled for the reason that I did not deem it necessary to add an additional officer to the staff at Newcastle, notwithstanding the influence of the representative from that constituency. I know that years ago there were four or five officers at that port. That was a time, as my hon. friend knows very well, when there was a large amount of ship-building, and a great deal more business done at Newcastle than there is at the present time. The smuggling to which he refers, occurs far beyond the jurisdiction of the

officers at Newcastle, down the Miramichi. The two ports of Newcastle and Chatham are but a few miles apart, and I utilised the appraiser at Chatham, paying him an additional sum out of the contingencies, to go back and forward whenever his services are required as appraiser, and if I had deemed it necessary to appoint another officer I should not have superannuated McGruar, unless he had been reported to me as unfit for the service.

Mr. MITCHELL. You made an observation in reference to Mr. Rusk. You admitted that pressure had been brought to bear some few years ago. If my memory serves me aright, Mr. Rusk stated that the pressure had been going on for years with the object of getting him forced out, so as to make a vacancy for a friend of the Administration.

Mr. BOWELL. I should be very much obliged to the hon. gentleman if he can give me the information he has, in order that I may verify it if it is correct. I may say that it has been reported to me that Mr. Rusk's health was such as not to enable him to attend to the duties of the position he held. He was also savings bank agent, and he was obliged to entrust his work, in a great measure, to a clerk, whose reputation, as reported to me, was not such as justified me in retaining him.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the cause of the increase in St. John? There are three officers superannuated this year; and the offices, I understand, are not filled up.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not filled all these positions. W. H. Olive was superannuated, saving \$650; Isaac Olive, superannuated, \$600; proposed increase to S. Robinson, gauger, \$150; a new officer, Mr. McCart, \$500, to take charge of the post office parcels, which, as the hon. gentleman knows, have swollen to a great number; in fact it is the distributing point to the most of Nova Scotia, the whole of New Brunswick, and part of Prince Edward Island. Mr. Gallagher was transferred from Woodstock at \$600. There was an increase to G. H. Snider of \$150, he having been promoted to some position in the statistical branch; and there are also some increases of \$50 each. The net increase is, therefore, \$450 after deducting superannuation.

Mr. ELLIS. Why does Mr. Stevens get such an increase? He was brought from Albert County, I think.

Mr. BOWELL. Because he is a first-class officer, and has been placed in an important position in the Department. The report says that he is an officer well fitted for the position he now holds, and he does not receive more than that to which he is entitled, considering the work which he has to perform.

Mr. ELLIS. The circumstance that he was brought to St. John created much jealousy among the local officers, and his appointment was not considered a fair one. Will the Minister take into consideration the claims of the tide-waiters, who complain that they do not get enough to live on. They have applied several times for a small increase, and while other officers obtain increases, no increase is given to those officials.

Mr. BOWELL. Several of the officers included in the list I read, covering those who received advances, are tide-waiters or landing waiters, and I have increased their salaries as the vote at my command would justify. The hon. gentleman

says that repeated applications have been made for an increase. That is not an uncommon circumstance. There are about 1,000 Customs officers throughout the Dominion, and an advance of \$100 to each represents \$100,000. In spite of the considerable increase of business throughout the Dominion, only a few thousand dollars more than last year are asked; and the Committee will find that I have not been over-extravagant, but, on the contrary, have watched the expenditure pretty closely.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Has Mr. Roxborough been appointed to a position?

Mr. BOWELL. No. From what I hear of the gentleman, however, I would be very glad to appoint him if there was any vacancy to fill. With respect to Prince Edward Island the amount asked, \$19,885, is an increase of only \$300. That increase arises from the Department having to rent a larger examining warehouse and appraisers' room in Charlottetown.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It appears that officers in Prince Edward Island are treated differently from those in New Brunswick. There was an officer removed at Georgetown, but he was not superannuated.

Mr. BOWELL. I discussed the whole question referred to by the hon. gentleman last year. Perhaps it will be better to leave the discussion why that gentleman was superannuated, to the time when the question of superannuation will come up, as has been intimated by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I shall be very glad to repeat what I said then; and I may say that if any other officer was placed under similar circumstances, and similar reports were presented to me by the officials, I would not hesitate to act in the same way.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. Minister stated to the Committee last year that he knew of no other instance where a man had been employed by the Government at a salary of \$400 or \$500 a year, at all events in his own Department, who had been so dealt with. This official at Georgetown was appointed in 1873, and contributed to the superannuation fund from that time until his dismissal in 1889. I rather gathered from the remarks of the hon. gentleman at that time, although he did not say it in so many words, that this being the only instance, he would take it into his consideration, although he did not say his favorable consideration. Although by no means an advocate of the maintenance of the superannuation system as it at present exists, still I think that to select a man who had been seventeen years in the service, during which he had paid to the fund, and to dismiss him without any charge being made against him—for the Minister does not allege any charge of incapacity or lack of attention, but his discharge was simply in the interests of the Department, as the Minister thought there were more officials than were required—appears to be a harsh proceeding. The question is whether it is fair and just, when a Superannuation Act is on the Statute-book, and contributions had been received for seventeen years from an employé, to dismiss him without any gratuity, while day after day we are removing men and granting superannuation allowances. Unless there are some distinct facts

taking this case out of the ordinary category, it seems as if the Minister had not done justice to this Georgetown official. It seems a harsh and unjust proceeding to sentence him to dismissal and not allow him anything. If that principle is to be applied, let it be applied all round. Some Government officials receive superannuation allowances sufficient to enable them to live in ease and luxury in any country. While I do not desire to open up the general question, I must say that while this statute remains part of our law, the Minister should apply that measure of justice to this officer which he metes out to other officials in different parts of the Dominion.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not know that I can take exception to the explanations of the Minister so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. The increases are small under the circumstances, and we must be prepared for the ordinary statutory advances which are made to those in the public service. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to another matter. I received a letter shortly before leaving Halifax, in which it was stated that several of the officials in the Customs Department, who had been there for a short time, had received advances in salary, while those who had been appointed by the previous Government were omitted. I cannot make that statement from my own knowledge, because I have not the letter this moment at hand, but friends of one of the parties who feels aggrieved wrote me and asked me to bring this matter to the notice of the Minister of Customs, which I now do. I trust those who have been in the Department for a long time, and have proved themselves efficient public servants are not to be deprived of increases simply on the ground that they do not hold the same political views as the Minister of Customs. I should like to ask the Minister whether Mr. Garrison, the surveyor of the port, has yet passed his examination and obtained his position?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, he has. He passed the examination, and since he obtained a certificate he has been promoted to the position of surveyor. The promotion was made shortly after the last examination during the present season.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). At all events, he is indebted to the Government for three years of probation, to enable him to learn what an ordinary intelligent man would have acquired in a very short time. If he has passed his examination, and is regularly appointed, I have nothing more to say, although the hon. Minister of Customs knows the views I entertain on that subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it will commend itself to the sense of justice and fair play of the hon. Minister, that an employé who, for years, pays into the superannuation fund a certain allowance, and who is dismissed without any charge of wrong-doing or incapacity against him, should, at least, receive the sum which he paid in, with interest, if he does not get superannuation. There is an implied contract between the Government and the man who, year after year, pays into this fund, and it should be respected. I do not say that it is compulsory on the Government to take this course, but I do say that the conduct of the Government, since this Act has come in force, has established precedents from which it is to be inferred that "may" will read as "shall," and that

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

every man who comes within the terms of the Act should receive the allowance which the Act provides. There is no ground on which the Government can retain the money paid in by an official, year after year, to the superannuation fund, when that official is relieved of his office. If you do not grant him an allowance, surely, in common justice, you must return the money with interest, that he has paid. I happen to know this gentleman of whom I am speaking, personally. He is as honest a man as you can find anywhere; but he has the misfortune, in this instance, to be a very good Liberal, as he has been all his life, and I know of no other reason why justice should be withheld from him. I cannot imagine what could enter into the mind of the Minister of Customs to deprive him of the superannuation allowance; but now that the matter has been brought to his attention, I trust that the hon. gentleman, if he does not grant Mr. Hesson an allowance, will return to him the money, with interest, which he has paid into the fund. I cannot see how this policy of making fish of one and flesh of another can be justified.

Mr. BOWELL. Allow me to refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and then I shall endeavor to give the reasons why the gentleman to whom he has referred from Prince Edward Island, was not superannuated. I do not know that I can be responsible (and I trust he is not) for the correctness of the contents of letters which he may receive from officials, or from anyone else in Halifax. I scarcely think there is any member of this House who will accuse me of having treated the officials in the Customs Department in any other way than that which I believe they deserved, irrespective of their politics, or of who appointed them. When a case of that kind can be pointed out, I shall be prepared to deal with it. If the hon. gentleman will tell me who this party is who has not received justice, I shall be better able to dispose of his case.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think it was Mr. Cronin.

Mr. BOWELL. I don't know who he is or what his politics are. I generally act on the reports I get from the collector, as to increasing salaries, when they are increased, or on the report of the inspector as to the efficiency of each of the officers. In reference to the Prince Edward Island case, I may say an hour or two was occupied in fully discussing it last year. I told the House then, that the reason I did not recommend Mr. Hesson to be put on the superannuation allowance was because of the fact that he had been drawing \$400 a year for a number of years, and literally did nothing for it. I thought if he was a pensioner at \$400 a year at any port, without returning any service for it, that it would be neither right nor proper to place him during the remainder of his life upon the superannuation list, or, in other words, to keep him a pensioner as long as he lived, when he had been drawing a large sum of money for years and years without giving any return for it. I read the report made by the inspector then, and I found that, in fact, Mr. Hesson had been engaged in farming, and had done little or nothing for the Customs Department. I am not prepared to say that I blame Mr. Hesson for not going to the Customs house, because, as it was reported to me, there was nothing for him to do, as the collector and

the other officer were quite sufficient to discharge all the duties required at that port. I came to the conclusion that if a man had been drawing \$400 a year, less what he paid into the superannuation fund, from the Government, or from any private individual, for sixteen or seventeen years, and that for the last eight or ten years he had done comparatively nothing in return for that money, that he was not one of those cases which justified me in placing him on the superannuation list. I have no objection to bring down all the papers connected with this matter, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) will then see whether or not I was justified in the course I pursued. The hon. gentleman cannot, surely, lay down the principle that if a man is appointed to a position, where there is nothing for him to do, and he does it, and also draws remuneration for that kind of labor, that that man should be put on the superannuation list and remain a burden on the revenue. I do not hold myself responsible, even individually, for the superannuation law as it stands on the Statute-book. I was one of the few, when it was introduced in 1869, who opposed it very strongly for reasons which have been advanced by gentlemen of the Opposition. I must, however, say frankly that where the power is properly exercised, in many cases it is to the advantage of the public service that it should continue to be the law; and if I should find others in the service occupying precisely the same position as that occupied by Mr. Hesson, drawing a salary for years and doing nothing for it, I think I should be quite justified in retiring them without allowing them pensions.

Mr. PERRY. The reason given by the Minister for not employing Mr. Hesson is a very reasonable one; but the reason he gives for not allowing him a superannuation in return for the money he had paid in for years is a very lame one. So long as this superannuation business is continued, if a man who is not a friend of the Government is to be deprived of the benefit of it, we ought to know it. It is a reflection on the Department if they keep men in office who are not wanted.

Mr. BOWELL. I accept the castigation. The hon. gentleman is quite right: I ought to have dismissed him five or six years ago.

Mr. PERRY. Thank fortune, I am right for once. I shall say no more on that subject, because the hon. member for Queen's County has put the case so strongly that I need say nothing more about it. But I want to call the attention of the Minister to another matter. It appears by the Auditor General's Report that last year the sub-collector for Alberton got \$50 extra, while the sub-collector for Tignish got nothing extra, although, in addition to his duties as sub-collector, he does the work for which there is a preventive officer at Alberton. There was a preventive officer at Tignish two or three years ago, but the Minister dismissed him. I asked him why he had done so, and he said that he was not wanted, as the revenue could be collected without one. I understood then that the \$50 that had gone to the preventive officer would go to the sub-collector, who has been doing the work, but he has not got it. Although he is a friend of mine, unfortunately for myself he is not a Grit, but a red, raw Conservative; but I stand up here to represent the Tories of Tignish as well as the Grits, and I want the Government to do

justice to them; if they do not, I am afraid they will lose their votes next time. The sub-collector at Tignish is a very excellent officer, and why he should be deprived of the \$50 which is given to the sub-collectors at Port Hill and at Alberton should be explained. If he is not a good officer, dismiss him. I will not say appoint a Grit; but while he is there, he has a right to justice and fair play, and he should receive his lawful allowance, such as others are getting under the same Government for doing the same work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should be very much pleased if the hon. Minister would bring down the report of the Georgetown case, because I feel satisfied that he has been led astray with regard to it. The report was made by his inspector, but, as I took the opportunity of informing myself last summer, the inspector was there only for half an hour or an hour, and obtained his information from the other officials, who were very anxious to get Mr. Hesson removed, and their report will be found to be a cooked report, which has led the Minister astray. I have made enquiries with reference to Mr. Hesson, and I have learned from the inhabitants of Georgetown that he was always at his post when there was work to be done, and that he spent no more time on his farm than the head of the Department did. He was made to attend the steamer *Northern Light* during the whole winter while she was running, while the others were not taking any hand in the matter. This I think I shall be able to prove. I think it is very unjust indeed that Mr. Hesson should have been removed, while an official who was appointed at a later date was kept on to do the work. If there was not enough work for two men, why not dismiss the one appointed later, and retain the older official? I think a great injustice was done to this man, and I hope the Minister will bring down the report, so that we may see it and get an opportunity of contradicting it.

Mr. BOWELL. I read it to the House last year, and the hon. gentleman can see it in *Hanward*. I have no objection to bringing down the report, although the hon. gentleman has had a whole year to contradict it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I made the same contradiction last year, but I informed myself more fully on the subject during last summer, and I am in a position to contradict it again.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to a fact which I should have spoken of when the items for the Province of Quebec were under consideration, and that is some changes which have been made by which some of the ports on the frontier, which were formerly independent ports, have been made outports, and are now reporting to the principal port on the frontier. This new system increases the work of the collector, to whom the reports are made, very materially, and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he has considered the propriety of compensating that officer somewhat for that extra work. In this one instance—although that gentleman has not complained to me in any way, and I do not think he has ever, being a most modest man, made any demand on the Department—it is to my knowledge that his work has been materially increased, and he is certainly entitled to compensation.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is referring to Hemmingford ?

Mr. SCRIVER. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. In order to lessen as much as possible the work at the head office in the statistical branch, so as to avoid the necessity of putting on additional clerks, I have reduced, wherever I possibly could, the small ports in the different Provinces to outports, and the consequence is that the work, which otherwise would be done here, is done at the principal port. Hemmingford, for instance, has had two or three small ports attached to it as outports, and they report to Hemmingford instead of to Ottawa, so that we get one statistical return instead of several. This has two effects. It reduces the work here and it reduces the contingent expenses, such as for books and stationery, formerly supplied to the different ports. The case mentioned by the hon. gentleman I have not forgotten. In fact I consider that an officer of that kind, who has much additional labor and responsibility imposed upon him, should have his case considered, and I shall take it into consideration. I may mention in connection with other ports in the eastern portion of the Province of Quebec, that they have been attached to the port of Montreal wherever it was convenient to do so. I shall not forget what the hon. gentleman has called my attention to.

Mr. SCRIVER. I should like to refer to one other matter of more importance, with reference to which I have had some private conversation with the hon. Minister, and that is the great abuse existing upon our long frontier at what are called line stores—stores built upon the boundary line, partly in Canada and partly in the United States. They are numerous, and are made the means of illicit traffic, not only in general merchandise, which is of lesser importance, but in what is a great deal worse, the sale of liquor; and under the existing state of things it is almost impossible to reach the proprietors and punish them. My hon. friend, the President of the Council, who, like myself, represents a frontier county, must know how great this abuse is and how desirable it is to reach and to correct it. I know there are some difficulties connected with it. I suppose the only way will be to have a small part of territory on either side of the line set apart, and regulations made to prevent any building being constructed upon it. This, of course, could not be done without some conference with the Provincial and State authorities; but it is a question well worth being made the subject of negotiation between the two Governments, calling in the Provincial and State Governments, and I trust the hon. gentleman will give it his attention again. I know he did, some years ago, attempt to remedy the evil by legislation, which I had to tell him at the time, I thought, would be inoperative, and which proved so. I trust he will not be discouraged, but will, in some way or other, communicate with the authorities at Washington with regard to this question.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman very properly states that I did attempt to introduce a clause into the Customs Act, to prevent, as far as possible, the abuse to which he has called the attention of the Committee; and he will remember that the question of Provincial rights at once was

Mr. SCRIVER.

raised. It was contended that the Dominion Government had no right whatever to declare where a man's house should be built, nor have we any authority similar to that contained in the Customs Act of the United States of pulling down houses built upon the line, where they considered smuggling was being carried on. The hon. gentleman might have gone further and said, that, after the discussion in the House, it was found absolutely necessary to withdraw that clause; but the question of preventing smuggling and the abuses which do exist on the frontier has not been lost sight of by the Department. While there have been no direct negotiations with the United States Government, there have been negotiations carried on by some of my officers, under my instructions, with the special agents of the United States, in order that they might co-operate, as far as possible, within the law, in preventing these abuses; but it is almost impossible, where there is a mere imaginary line, and where these line buildings exist, to prevent smuggling going on. It has been known that in the cellars of these buildings they have their barrels of liquor set upon little tramways, so that when the Canadian official goes into the Canadian portion of the building, these barrels are run into the United States and cannot be touched; and the reverse practice is followed when an American official goes into the American part of the building. Sometimes the officials of both countries enter the building together, then the proprietor has no chance of escape; but, with such a long frontier and such a number of buildings along the line, it is almost impossible to accomplish the object we have in view. If in the past there had been half a mile or a mile a side set apart, on which it was declared these houses could not be built, the difficulty might have been prevented, but I scarcely think it can be now.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not at all think it necessary to declare so large a territory as that as neutral.

Mr. BOWELL. Even five or ten rods will scarcely prevent it. There are very few people outside this House who think it is any particular harm or sin to smuggle.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under a preventive tariff only.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose that is a greater incentive; but I do not think any one in Canada knows better than the hon. gentleman that, under his 17½ per cent. tariff, there was a great deal of smuggling carried on in this country. If he has any doubt he can examine the records of the Customs Department, and he will find that seizure after seizure was continually made along the frontier, and will continue to be made, whether the tariff be 5, 20 or 30 per cent. I can assure the hon. gentleman that everything which can be done departmentally will be done to put a stop to that kind of smuggling.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like to ask what amount of salary the preventive officer at Port Burwell, in my county, who is named Backhouse, receives, and what amount he collects? I believe he receives \$200 a year. I should also like to know the amount of revenue collected at Port Stanley, where, I think, the collector receives \$300 a year. There is also Port Bruce where the pre-

ventive officer receives \$100 a year, but what services he renders I cannot say. I would also like to ask why the Minister finds it necessary this year to take an increased vote of \$800 for the laboratory in the Customs Department, when only \$4,691 was expended in 1888-89? Does the hon. gentleman expect that the Department will be more extravagantly run, or that more business will be transacted, or that higher salaries will be paid, or what is the reason for his making this increased demand?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman had turned to page 25 of the Trade and Navigation Returns, he would have obtained all the information which he has asked for in reference to the port and outports of St. Thomas. I need scarcely tell him that the port of St. Thomas is increasing very rapidly. Formerly the present collector was receiving nearly \$900 a year at Port Burwell, but the business there had fallen off to such an extent as to justify his removal to St. Thomas, where he now receives \$1,200 a year, and collects nearly \$70,000. Port Burwell was reduced to an outport, where the officer receives \$200, and last year he collected \$187.77. The officer is kept there more as a preventive officer to protect the revenue than to collect duties. At Port Stanley the collection amounted to \$539.44. The present sub-collector takes the place of Mr. Finlay, who was removed from Port Stanley to St. Thomas, being a very good officer, and the postmaster at Port Stanley was appointed preventive officer there at \$300, while his predecessor received \$500 or \$600. The outport of Bruce is referred to by the hon. gentleman, who says he does not know what the officer there does. Neither do I. I am precisely in the same position as the hon. gentleman. I know nothing more than that I found him there when I came into the Department, as a preventive officer to prevent smuggling at that point. Last year he collected \$12. I must inform the House that there are many points along the frontier, more in the east than in the west, and particularly in the Maritime Provinces, where preventive officers are employed, receiving from \$100 to \$200 and \$250 a year, who make no collections, but whom it is necessary to have on the border, in order to prevent the illicit traffic which would otherwise be carried on. As to the Customs laboratory, I will not detain the House by reading the account I have of the work which is done there. I have increased the salary of the two young ladies who perform work there by \$60 a year each. We have now an immensely increased work arising from the testing of molasses from all parts of the country, and that will devolve an extra amount of work upon the officers. If the system is adopted of testing molasses by the polariscope, it may be necessary to place another officer on the staff to carry on the work. We lay it down as a principle that, no matter how many samples may arrive during the day, they are all tested and the reports forwarded by mail or telegraph that night, whether it takes the officers to six o'clock, or to ten, or eleven, or twelve o'clock at night. We never allow the receipts of one day to remain over for the next. I could give the hon. gentleman, if he desired it, a full statement of the number of tests and the amount of work performed in that laboratory. I

am quite certain that there is no department of the Customs, either in Canada or elsewhere, where so much work is performed, and is done as well, for so small an amount of expenditure, as the work which is performed in the laboratory of the Customs Department here. The contingencies will necessarily increase, because we pay the express charges upon the samples of sugar and molasses which are sent from different parts of the Dominion to the laboratory in Ottawa. We anticipate a large increase in that, and, consequently, the contingencies must increase in proportion.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I can understand the increase of the two \$60. I am not going to complain of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs for increasing the ladies' salaries. That is what most of us would do, but that would only amount to \$120. He says there is an increase in the cost of testing molasses, but he has not given us any data to show that that will amount to the difference between his expenditure in 1889 and his estimates for the present year. What I wanted to know was where the increase was likely to take place in the laboratory, amounting to between \$1,000 and \$2,000.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is wasting his time. The increase is only \$800.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. gentleman's estimate last year was greater than his expenditure in 1888 and 1889. The hon. gentleman referred me to a blue-book, and, if the hon. gentleman himself will look at the Auditor General's Report, he will get all the information in regard to this matter. He will find that the expenditure was only \$4,691.94, and yet the estimates for the years 1889 and 1890 were \$5,200, and for 1890 and 1891 they are \$6,000, showing a continual increase, and showing also that the expenditures do not warrant the estimates which the hon. gentleman has made.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman knows that no matter how much I ask for, I never spend more than is necessary. I always make it a rule to ask for all I think is necessary in order that I may not have to come down for supplementaries. I am glad to be able to inform the House and my hon. friend that in the 11 years of my experience I have never had to ask for a supplementary to my ordinary expenditure; if there has been a supplementary, it has been for extraordinary expenditure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to ask the hon. gentleman about this vote for the administration of the Chinese Immigration Act. I remember some years ago we appointed a commission to examine the question, of which commission the Secretary of State was the head, and the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was the secretary. They presented a very elaborate report that cost the country between \$25,000 and \$30,000. Parliament, in its wisdom, saw fit to throw that overboard, and legislate on lines altogether different from those recommended by the commission. So far as the Chinese Immigration Act is concerned, he would be a pretty clever man who would be able to justify it on the report of the commission we appointed. But taking the Act as it is, I find that we have in the hon. gentleman's Department a controller of Chinese immigrants at a small salary, and we have

an interpreter at a salary of \$1,000, and another interpreter at \$300, making altogether an expenditure of \$2,000 a year. I would like some information as to the work done by these officials, for I am much inclined to think some of them are in a similar position to poor Hesson at Georgetown, and that they are appointed to draw their salaries, and that is all they do.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is just about as far astray in his estimation of this Act, as he was in reference to the gentleman who was superannuated on the Island of Prince Edward. I know of no one who receives the salaries to which he refers. The Act provides for the appointment of controllers at every port where the Chinese were likely to arrive in Canada. I appointed one controller, that is the Deputy Minister here, and in addition to his salary he gets \$400 per annum. I did appoint an officer at Victoria who received \$1,600. He was a joint officer of the Customs and a collector under the controller, Mr. Hamley. The Chinese business having fallen off in Victoria to such an extent, I did not deem it necessary to continue that officer, hence he was retired without being superannuated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He was not within the Act.

Mr. BOWELL. No, perhaps not. I utilised all the collectors in British Columbia, by making them controllers in addition to their position as collectors, but I gave them no additional pay. They act as controllers under the Chinese Act, and they act as collectors of Customs without any additional remuneration. In Victoria at present, the only person employed is the collector, who, when a vessel arrives, has power to employ some one who understands the Chinese language to go and receive the certificates of those who come in, or to collect what may be termed the poll-tax. In Vancouver, there is an employé, who is not permanent, who receives a dollar a day for performing the same work under the collector, but the collector receives no extra pay for what he does. There are only three officers in the employment of the Government, under the Chinese Act, who receive any remuneration whatever. The work the collectors do can be better understood when I state the number of immigrants who arrive and the certificates which have been granted. During the year ending 30th June, 1889, there came to Vancouver 739 immigrants; there were 235 registrations, 300 certificates of leave, and the collections amounted to \$37,367.50, for which the collector received no remuneration for the work he performed. At Victoria, there were only 34 immigrants, 509 registrations, 991 certificates of leave, and a total collection of \$2,945.50. At New Westminster there were no immigrants, but 26 registrations, 27 certificates of leave, and \$40 collected. In Winnipeg there was one immigrant, one certificate of leave, and \$51 collected. In Emerson, Manitoba, there was one immigrant, and \$50 collected. At Montreal, there were six immigrants, one registration, one certificate of leave, and a collection of \$301.50. In Ottawa there was one immigrant, one registration, two certificates of leave, and a collection of \$52.50; making a total of immigrants during the present year of 894; registration, 772; certificates of leave, 1,322, and a total collection of \$40,808. I might deduct, however,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

the amount collected, in error, from five immigrants exempted, under the law, from payment of fees, at Vancouver, \$250. This is the work that has been performed, and the hon. gentleman will see from the statement I have made that the insinuation thrown out by him that there have been appointments merely for the sake of paying them out of the Chinese fund, and that they are living there, as Mr. Hesson was, without doing anything for the salaries they receive, is not founded in fact, nor is it correct in any one particular. There is no Chinese controller other than the one I have mentioned, who is receiving any salary, and that is the assistant commissioner in the city of Ottawa, who receives \$400, and the \$1 or a \$1.50 a day that is paid to the gentlemen in Victoria and Vancouver, where they are required to interpret Chinese invoices, or to assist, when the immigrants arrive, to see that no frauds are committed on the revenue. The interpreter in Vancouver is Chinese. So that really the only expenditure for this purpose during the whole time has been some five or six hundred dollars.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to correct two statements the hon. gentleman made, not of very much importance, but it would be just as well that he should not have made them. One is that I insinuated that there were a number of employés administering this Chinese Act who were not doing anything; and the other was that Mr. Hesson, to whom I referred, did no work in Georgetown, and, therefore, he was dismissed. Taking the whole statement, as the hon. gentleman must have heard it, as made by the hon. member who represents the county, the work Mr. Hesson did was to attend on the wharf where the steamboat arrives that plies between Georgetown and Nova Scotia. And, therefore, I repeat the statement is inexcusable. As regards the alleged insinuation, I made no insinuation; I simply asked a question in regard to the administration of the Chinese Act. I have my own opinion as to the justice or injustice of exacting the poll-tax, and, in my opinion, that amount is unjustly taken from those immigrants.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman does not pretend to say that I corrected him unjustly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was expressing my opinion as regards the injustice of the Act. I should like to obtain some explanation of an item which appears on page 189—E, Auditor General's Report, "extra services to J. C. Rykert, \$1,000."

Mr. BOWELL. So far as my recollection goes, that amount was to cover travelling expenses in connection with visiting different parts of the coast. He is an officer placed on the boundary between British Columbia and Washington Territory, near the Columbia River, from which goods are carried from Sandpoint on the Northern Pacific up the Kootenay River to the miners' camps in the interior. He is a salaried officer, but not on the permanent list. The hon. gentleman is aware that the cost of travelling in British Columbia is very large. I believe the \$1,000 in question is an expenditure that was incurred a year ago, and it was in connection with the officer's journey from Victoria to the place where he is now stationed, and for other services rendered while at that point.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He is an officer there?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When was he appointed?

Mr. BOWELL. Three or four years ago.

Public Buildings, Ontario.....\$202,875

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of the Almonte post office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total cost, including the site, will be about \$30,000.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I notice that \$6,500 is asked for Brantford public building. I suppose the same necessity did not exist when Mr. Fleming represented that constituency as exists now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose the matter was being investigated at that time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I notice a vote of \$10,000 for the Brantford Battalion drill shed. The necessity was pointed out last year, when it was shown that the drill shed was on leased land, and that the lease expired last spring. The battalion is a very live and active one, but the quarters are altogether insufficient, and the new drill shed is absolutely required. Plans have been prepared and approved, and I believe the battalion is exceedingly well pleased with the plan. The members are very anxious, however, that work should be commenced. Perhaps the Minister will state in what condition the works are, and whether he expects the new building will be commenced at a very early date?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The plans having been received specifications are being prepared, and as soon as they are prepared, which cannot be long, tenders will be called for.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Is the amount, \$1,625, sufficient to complete Cobourg post office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work will cost \$24,000, and \$10,000 more will be required.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). How much more will be required for the Gananoque post office beyond the \$750 now asked?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That sum will complete it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much has the Government Printing Bureau cost up to date?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have only the cost of the building; I have not what was expended by the Department of the Secretary of State for the plant and machinery. The cost for the building is: in 1888, \$53,000; 1889, \$182,000; 1890, \$26,000; balance due on the contract, on the first January, 1890, for additional works carried out in connection with the erection of the buildings, inclusive of the fittings and furniture, \$27,000. Introduction of the Edison electric light system, as recommended by the Chief Engineer, \$8,575. The vote required to meet the final payments for erection of buildings, and to provide for the introduction of electric light, is \$32,000. From that it appears that this amount will complete the building as far as we can see now.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). How much did the London military building cost up to date?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. From the 1st July, 1886, to the 29th June, 1887, \$82,000; 1888, \$30,000; 1889, \$115,000; 1890, \$3,790. The vote of \$8,800 is for building the school, stables, stores, &c., called for by the Department of Militia and Defence.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not wish to complain, but I must remark that it is strange, indeed, that all of these very large appropriations made annually, or nearly all, are for constituencies represented by Conservatives. I may say that Brantford is, perhaps, an exception; but we know that the representative for Brantford (Mr. Pater-son) is deserving of an extra amount of respect at the hands of the Conservatives. I maintain that the system adopted by the Government in this respect is hardly fair to the country, though it may be fair to the supporters of the Government. I may call the attention of the Government to the fact we have in Woodstock one of the finest towns in Western Ontario, where we have a large amount of revenue from the Customs and Post Office, but on account of its being represented by Oliver Mowat in the Local Legislature, and by an opponent of the present Government in this House, no effort is being made by the Government to erect any public building there. This is a sufficient proof of the course which the Government is adopting in this matter, and I hold that it is neither fair nor just that a donation of this kind should be made to those who are willing to come here and support the Government of the day.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Before this item is adopted, I would like to make a remark or two, with reference to a request which I believe has been made to the hon. the Minister of Public Works for the erection of a public building in the very important town of Paris, Ont., to accommodate the Post Office, Customs house and Inland Revenue, similar to the buildings which have been erected in other towns of the same size and from which about the same revenue is derived. My hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson) has alluded to the fact that there has been an exception in the way the Government has dealt in the erection of public buildings in counties represented by supporters of the Government and those who do not support them. He seems to think that the county I have the honor to represent has been treated exceptionally, as there is a vote in the Estimates for a drill shed in the city of Brantford. My hon. friend will remember that the people of Brantford have dealt very liberally in that matter, by granting \$10,000 of their own money before asking the Government to make a grant, and it has been an understood rule that a municipality which would come forward and aid the Government in that way would be entitled to consideration, and I am very happy to bear my testimony that Brantford did receive consideration. I understand that the town of Paris met the Minister in the same way, in reference to a public building, by offering to provide a site. That, I think, very few, if any, towns have done; and if the hon. Minister looks at the receipts he will find the position in which that town stands as compared with other towns. In Almonte, Brantford, Gananoque, Cobourg, Prescott, Strathroy, Walkerton and some others which I might mention, I think the receipts are less; and in none of these cases that I am aware of has

the municipality met the Minister with an offer to provide a free site. I think there is a great deal of force in what has been urged from this side, that there should be a fair system pursued in regard to grants for the erection of public buildings. All parts of the country contribute to the revenues out of which these public buildings are erected, and while the demands of all points cannot be met at once, it does seem fair that towns approaching in population, in business importance, and in revenue, to towns to which like favors have been given, are entitled to consideration at the hon. Minister's hands. I quite agree with the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) that the town of Woodstock, which will soon be a city, is almost exceptional in the treatment it has received. Its revenue is about \$14,000, and I think it presents a clear and patent case for a public building. That matter has been brought to the hon. Minister's attention by the hon. member for that riding, who, I think, is well able to attend to it. But I think the hon. Minister will see that the town whose claims I am urging on his consideration, though not standing in as strong a position as that town, stands in quite as strong a position as a dozen or more other towns whose claims have been considered. I believe the representations came too late for him to consider with reference to the original Estimates, but I should like some information from him, if he is at liberty to give it, as to how he views the application in connection with the offer made by the town in regard to procuring a free site.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to correct a statement the hon. gentleman has made with reference to Gananoque, that it, among other towns, had done nothing towards providing a site. The town of Gananoque provided a free site worth \$2,000 on which to erect a post office.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not need to be corrected, for I spoke subject to correction. I stated that few, if any, had provided a site. I think in the great majority of cases I was probably right. Gananoque may be an exception.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My hon. friend is right when he says that other places have offered sites. In several instances we have erected buildings upon them, but in other cases we did not feel at liberty to erect buildings, as we thought the amount of the revenues at present received would not justify the expense. I do not remember the circumstance of Paris offering a site, but the hon. gentleman says it has, and I suppose it is so. I have taken a note of the case, as I did of the case of Woodstock. I do not suppose these cases were brought so prominently before my Department as other cases, and I have not laid them before my colleagues; but I have made a note of the different cases brought before me, and I will not fail, as soon as they are ready, to lay them before the Privy Council for its decision. That is all I can say just now.

Public Buildings, Manitoba..... \$36,000

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Why is this large vote of \$15,000 taken for immigration buildings at Winnipeg? Almost every year we have a very large sum expended on these buildings.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is nothing expended. The hon. gentleman will see that we

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

had a vote of \$5,000 last year, and we ask a re-vote of the same sum this year, with \$10,000 additional, because we expect to go on with the buildings this year.

Public Buildings, N. W. Territories, \$134,500

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). How much is the residence for the Lieutenant Governor at Regina going to cost before it is completed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is expected that it will cost about \$42,000 altogether.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Would it not be just as well for the Government to consider whether it is in the interests of the public that an expensive building should be erected in the North-West Territories for the Lieutenant Governor? The Lieutenant Governors receive liberal salaries, and they might provide themselves with residences the same as anybody else. I think the country will consider this a very extravagant and unjustifiable expenditure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). One of the difficulties about an expenditure of this kind is that there is no certainty of Regina continuing to be the seat of Government when a division of the North-West Territories takes place. The Government have already marked out, for certain purposes, four districts into which the Territories are divided. If the settlement of the country goes forward with any rapidity at all, the time will come when it will be necessary to establish a Province, and the Government will not undertake to embrace the whole of that territory, from the western boundary of Manitoba to the Rocky Mountains, in one Province. That will be inconvenient, and the probability is that the trade and intercommunication of the people of that territory will not lie in any one direction, or to one central point, and a natural division as well, which ought to be the basis of a political division, will no doubt take place. We have no assurance that this point, at which this expenditure is taking place, will be the seat of Government at all. It may not be the capital of the Province when the Province is established. It may not be a convenient or a central part; and it does seem to me that before that fact is clearly established it is an unwise proceeding to expend a very large sum to any such purpose.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It must take several years before that territory is divided into Provinces, and during that time the Lieutenant Governor of the territory must have a proper residence. The expenditure of \$40,000 or \$50,000 for that purpose is not an excessive amount. He must be put in a suitable position to do the honors of his position, especially as there is now a Legislative Assembly there. It will be eight or ten years before the population is large enough to make a Province there, and, after all, the amount cannot be very much for every year that the Governor will reside there. Appearances are that it will be the capital of the Province. Of course, we cannot expect that all that territory will be under one government, and when the population is largely increased there will probably be five or six Provinces.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is the population increasing very fast?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is, and I hope it will increase faster after this. The territory is so large that the population going in is scattered, and does not appear as large as if it was confined to a more limited area, such as Manitoba; but altogether, I think the amount asked for this residence is not excessive.

Mr. DAVIN. As for the paltry amount that is down in the Estimates for the important purpose of giving us a fit residence for our Lieutenant Governor, I may say that long ago that amount should have been in the Estimates; and when the hon. the Minister of Interior was Lieutenant Governor, and since Mr. Royal has been Lieutenant Governor, the residence is one which would not be considered fit for a private gentleman in the East.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How much did it cost?

Mr. DAVIN. That I cannot tell at present; but I know, whatever it cost, the amount spent annually on the Territories is nothing like what they are entitled to, if a calculation is made on the same basis as the calculation with regard to the Provinces.

Mr. MITCHELL. But we bought you; you must not forget that.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend, the leader and the head and front of the third party, who carries that party under his hat, who has such control over his party that it surpasses even the control the right hon. the First Minister has over his—

Mr. MITCHELL. And they do not vote against their own amendments.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says that he bought us. Now, I have sometimes heard that stated in this House, and I will deal on another occasion with remarks of that sort; but I may say now that we in the North-West do not acknowledge any such position as that; and statesmen like the leaders of both parties, and especially the leader of the Opposition, who, I think, lapsed the other night into some such statement, know very well that that is a position which cannot be defended. But I wish to return to the question of the house at Regina.

Mr. MITCHELL. Better get something you understand.

Mr. DAVIN. I know that my understanding is very feeble, but I hope to be equal to discussing the question of the position of the Governor's residence at Regina. At present it is quite inadequate for the hospitality dispensed by the Lieutenant Governor. We have a Lieutenant Governor who is very hospitable and very popular socially all over the Territories, and who has proved himself a most energetic and efficient Governor; and he gives what would interest a great many gentlemen around here—very good dinners.

Mr. KIRK. Does he take in 4 per cent. beer?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think that would be strong enough for my hon. friend. I think by the time he visits the Territories we will require to have it 6 per cent. or 8 per cent.; but if he visits Lieutenant Governor Royal at his dinner table he will find he will not get 4 per cent. beer, but the very best wine. After all, the Lieutenant Governor of these Territories represents the Queen; and if he dispenses hospitality at all, there should be a certain Vice-regal air and substantiality about all

he does. All I can tell you is this: that Governor Royal, by his courtesy and open-hearted hospitality, as well as by the energy he devotes to his work, fills the bill. We are building a Government House there, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is apt to drop into a prophetic mood, anticipates the time when those vast Territories will be divided into two Provinces. I grant you that, and you will have, I hope, the Province of Assiniboia; and, if you have, where could you have a better seat for the capital than Regina?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is that where Pile of Bones Creek was?

Mr. DAVIN. A rose by any other name will smell as sweet; and the hon. gentleman's own name—I hope I will be excused, though it is unparliamentary, in mentioning it—but his own name, Somerville, is one which is redolent and suggestive of all the pleasantness of the most charming season of the year; and we must admit that, on looking at the hon. gentleman, he suggests all the gracious qualities with which that name is associated. But suppose he had another name, one not so suggestive of all that is pleasant and charming, he would still be just as charming a person as he is now, and just as handsome. I do not care whether you call it Pile of Bones or not. The chief thing is, that if we are to have a Province, Regina is likely to be the capital. We have had now seven or eight years' trial of that site, and what has been proved? The judgment of its location has been fully justified. The country around it is the richest, not merely in Assiniboia, but in the North-West Territories.

Mr. MITCHELL. Very expensive, though.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think we have been expensive to you. The position of the Territories is, and I must insist on the House knowing it, that of a ward in Chancery, and the amount we are entitled to is far greater than what we receive to-day, but I will deal with that question at a more suitable time. What the Government should do would be to capitalise the sum in excess of what is absolutely necessary for our needs, and to use that to develop our vast resources on a large and productive scale. Suppose we have a Province there—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose we have not—that is the difficulty.

Mr. DAVIN. There is no difficulty about it, unless it is in the mind of faithless people like my hon. friend the member for Bothwell. We are certain to have a Province there, and you will need a Government house larger than you are actually building to-day. You will also have to build a Government house for Alberta and another for Saskatchewan; but the idea of the hon. gentleman objecting to the sum which has been placed here for the Government house in Regina is absurd. I do not think my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) could have reflected upon the situation, or he would not have objected. I can only assure the Committee that a substantial Government house is being erected at Regina, and that the money which has been voted is not being wasted, but is being properly expended.

North-West Mounted Police Buildings... \$50,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman prepared with a detail as to where these buildings are to be erected? The sum is considerable, and it is within my recollection that we have already paid in the past large sums for buildings for the Mounted Police.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The details I have are these: Regina district, \$7,250; Battleford district, \$5,450; Lethbridge district, \$7,500; Calgary district, \$2,400; Prince Albert district, \$1,200; Fort MacLeod district, \$3,000; Fort Saskatchewan district, \$2,800; Medicine Hat district, \$300; Maple Creek district, \$5,500—making a total of \$35,400. Then there are the outposts: MacLeod district, \$5,150; Prince Albert, \$6,000; Battleford, \$1,000; Calgary, \$200; Maple Creek, \$200; Wood Mountain, \$850; Lethbridge, \$1,200—making \$14,600, which, added to the \$35,400, makes a total of \$50,000.

Public Buildings, British Columbia.. \$18,000

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is this expenditure of \$15,000 for the Victoria military buildings for, and how much will they cost altogether?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for "C" Battery. The appropriation was \$21,000, and we require \$15,000 to complete during the fiscal year the works in connection with the officers' quarters which are to be erected at Victoria.

Public Buildings, generally.....\$15,000

Mr. MITCHELL. Does not the Minister think he could do without that vote, after enumerating so many public buildings for which he takes a vote?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is the reserve.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am afraid you will reserve very little of it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There must be something voted for small repairs and additional work required on all public buildings.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It is probably more readily expended on election campaigns than on public buildings.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The remark of the hon. gentleman does not apply. The election took place in 1887, and there is none going on now.

Public Buildings, Nova Scotia—Annapolis Post Office, &c..... \$12,500

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This is a large amount, and some time ago I called the attention of the Minister to the contract which was made for that building. The specification was for grey granite, but after the contract was awarded the stone was changed to red sandstone. The Minister then stated that the stone came from a quarry in the United States, but I am informed that it came from Cumberland county. It was certainly unfair to the other contractors that the change should be made, as will be seen by the following statement of the difference in cost:—

Mr. DAVIN.

	Granite	Freestone
Basement of building now constructed.....	\$673 00	\$135 00
Cutting door-jambs, belt corners and window sills.....	888 00	468 80
Trimming on rear of buildings	64 80	20 00
Tools, sharpening and wear....	312 00	126 00
25 per cent. for waste and loss (usual charge).....	484 45	187 25
25 per cent. profit.....	605 50	234 00
	3,027 75	1,171 05
	1,171 05	
In favor of freestone.....	1,856 70	

The difference in the tenders was, I think, only about \$500, but those who got the lowest tender saved by using freestone \$1,856 on their contract. I contend it is unfair towards the contractors that after specifications have been put in that a certain quality of stone should be used, and the arrangement has been made, immediately the contract is awarded, a change is made in the quality of the stone to be used, making a saving to the contractors, according to experts, of nearly \$2,000, as the difference between granite and freestone. Then, with regard to the site of the building. As I understand, the Government have ground of their own, which is practically in the business part of the city, on which they have a small light, which could have been utilised for that purpose. But instead of that, the Government have purchased a lot of land, not quite so convenient, giving \$3,300 for it. I find that the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) owned that lot, with other parties, until June, 1888, when he conveyed it to another firm, called Puckett & Mills. This lot was bought by the Government for \$3,300, while the lot right across the street, with only a railway between—a similar lot—was offered to the Government for \$1,500, as I am credibly informed. So that here we find the Government paying \$1,800 more for a site than they might have paid for another one equally convenient. If the Government had built that upon their own land and made the original specifications of freestone, they would have saved over \$1,500. Assuming they purchased the lot for \$1,500, there is a difference of nearly \$4,000, as regards the building, which costs over \$12,000. With regard to the contract, the Government asked for public tenders, and asked that a certain quality of stone should be used, and then they turned around immediately and gave the contract for a different quality of stone to a favorite firm of contractors, Rhodes, Curry & Co., and if you turn up the Public Accounts you will find that firm appearing on almost every page. Immediately after the contract was obtained by them a different kind of stone was substituted, which, as I pointed out, made a difference of nearly \$2,000 in the contract. I complain that the Government have not shown fair play to those who tendered for the contract, and that they changed the specifications in favor of those who did receive the contract.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman had asked me for information, which I was able to give him, I would not now be obliged to show that he was wrong. The hon. gentleman says that we could have obtained a site at a much lower rate than the site we did obtain. That may be so, but we could not have obtained as good a site as the one that was selected. The hon. gentleman says we paid for this piece of

ground \$3,300, whilst we could have had a lot at the next corner for \$1,500. If the hon. gentleman knows the locality he will remember that the lot we have obtained, and which is the best one we could obtain, was at the corner of Church and St. George streets, which, being a corner lot, was worth more than the other. He says that we could have obtained the other lot at \$1,500—that was the Whitman lot. The information from my Department is that the Whitman lot was tendered to the Government for \$2,000; I find that in our books. That lot was at the next corner right opposite. The hon. gentleman forgets, perhaps he does not know, that not only does the street separate the two, but there is a railway, and it would have been very inconvenient for the people to have to cross that railway constantly to reach the building. That is the reason why we selected the other, where the people would not have to cross the railway, and, therefore, we paid \$1,800 more than we would have paid for the Whitman lot. As regards the tender, we accepted the tender of Rhodes, Curry & Co., of Amherst, N.S., for \$12,497. The specifications required approved grey granite from Lawrencetown, or other approved granite of an equal quality. We were not obliged, therefore, to take the Lawrencetown granite, if other approved granite of equal quality could be obtained for the whole of the external work and dressings. The contractors submitted a sample of red sandstone from North Port, N.S., which was found very hard, equal in quality and durability, more pleasing in color, and better adapted for use in conjunction with the red brick, and adding to the effects of the building when completed, as the greater portion of the exposed surface has to be quarry-faced, that is to say, without dressing. Mr. Fuller, the Chief Architect of the Department, says: "This stone offers a pleasing color, and for durability, must be considered one of the finest stones on this continent." The change will not cost an additional expenditure, and, therefore, that stone was selected.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman read in the statement that granite was to be substituted, not that freestone was to be substituted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. "Or other approved granite of equal quality."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In other words, a grave departure has been made on his own showing from the conditions on which the contract was given.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because they were not allowed to substitute sandstone, but they were to substitute granite of equal quality.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. "Approved grey granite from Lawrencetown, or other approved granite of equal quality." That is the stone that was selected.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Sandstone is not granite. Any person knows that there is a difference in durability—that granite is harder and more durable than the other. I pointed out the difference in working, and taking the work done on that building, it amounts to a difference of nearly \$2,000. The Minister says the contract was

\$12,500. The next tender was \$13,250. Those gentlemen were prepared to supply granite, but the Minister accepted another kind of stone, and accordingly the contractors have obtained an advantage of nearly \$2,000 on the contract. This is unfair. Other contractors were put to considerable expense. I am told by parties that they expended in making estimates and preparing their tender \$200, and after their tender was rejected and a contract was made with another firm, the terms were changed by red sandstone being substituted for granite at a saving of \$2,000. With respect to the Minister's observations as to the positions of the lots in connection with the railway, it must be remembered that there was a population on each side of the track, and that part of the population had to cross the railway to reach the present post office. The lot belonging to the Government is really as near the business centre as that purchased and it could have been utilised without involving any expense for land. Thus there was an expenditure of \$4,000 beyond what was necessary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister has not in the slightest degree explained the charge made, nor has he asserted to the Committee that the country is receiving the benefit of the difference in cost between the red sandstone and granite. If my hon. friend is correct, or is even approximately correct, in his statements, there is a difference as between the sandstone and granite of \$2,000, which should go into the pockets of the people who are paying for this building, and should not be secured by the contractors. In the face of these facts, it looks as if a very scandalous job had been perpetrated. This vote should be reduced by that sum, unless the Minister is able to afford a better explanation than he has offered, and I would recommend my hon. friend for St. John (Mr. Weldon) to move that the vote be reduced by that amount. As to the other point—the value of the land—I should like to know the size of the lots?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About ninety three or ninety-four feet, I think.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). When was the lot purchased?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In March, 1889.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There remains a question, and it is a question of importance, as it affects other transactions and our whole dealings with contractors. Here a change has been made that, in violation of the terms of the contract, red sandstone has been substituted for grey granite, and it is a very great hardship to other contractors that this change should have been made. But, apart from that point, if any benefit accrues from the change, on every principle of justice and common sense, the saving should go to benefit the public, and not to benefit the contractors. I do not understand the Minister to have alleged that the contractors' price has been reduced by the difference in value between red sandstone and granite.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Chief Architect brought the matter to my attention in this way: that the red sandstone was equal to the grey granite of Lawrencetown; that it was found not only equal in quality and in durability, but it would be more pleasing in constructing the building. That being so, and the Chief Architect stat-

ing that the sandstone was equal in quality and durability, there was no reduction made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That answer does not meet the point made. It may be a very good reason, in the opinion of the Chief Architect, for substituting red sandstone for granite, but it is no answer to the point, that, if the substitution were made, about \$2,000 would have been put into the pockets of the contractors; nor does it meet the point taken, that a great injustice has been perpetrated on other contractors. This is not the first or the second time when such a change has been made to suit the favored children of the Government. Rhodes, Curry & Co. have obtained whatever contracts they pleased in the Maritime Provinces, and everyone knows the reason. Tenders are sent in, and they secure the contract, and afterwards cheaper material is allowed to be introduced, and they pocket several thousands of dollars. This appears to be a most flagrant case. The facts seem to be indisputably proved before the Committee, and the Minister offers no justification whatever for the conduct of the Department in substituting a cheaper material, but the Government allow the contractors to pocket \$2,000 and do not make any reduction on the contract price. It is well known that it has been charged in this Committee year after year, that this same system has been pursued, and that this firm can obtain the contract for nearly every public work in the Maritime Provinces. Everybody down there knows it, and is satisfied that it is no use competing with the firm, because they obtain the contracts, and if they hand in a low tender the Government will make it up to the firm by allowing them to substitute a cheaper material. The Committee cannot overlook this flagrant neglect, and I will cheerfully support a motion to reduce the amount of this vote, in order to mark my disapprobation of the very censurable conduct of the Department.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman said it is a cheaper material; but I do not admit it. On the contrary, I say it is as good and as durable, that the quality is as good, and the offer having been made to the Department to substitute the red sandstone, the Chief Architect, who knows whether it is as good or better material and as durable and capable of giving a good effect—for he is the judge of such matters, and I cannot be the judge of them—recommended red sandstone, and the change was made. I stated that to be the case, and I admit it. The Chief Architect is, however, the officer to judge of such matters. He told me it was as good a material as the other, as durable and equal in quality; and more than that, he said the appearance of the building would be improved by using it. I am sure that the quality of this material is as good as that of the other.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to ask how it comes that the Chief Architect did not discover that this red sandstone was equal to the granite before he asked for tenders? I think that is a pertinent question. If the red sandstone was considered as good material as the granite, why did not the Government ask for tenders for the construction of the building with red sandstone in the first place?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That red sandstone had not then been laid before the Chief
Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Architect, and he did not know it. When it was brought to his notice he examined it, as he examines every material so brought before him, and he found that this was as good a stone as the other and that the appearance would be better.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then why, after this discovery was made, did not the Chief Architect advise the Government to call for new tenders? Such a course would not have cost more than five or ten dollars, and justice would have been done to all parties tendering.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Wholly apart from that, the Minister must see that it was in his own power, and in the power of his architect to require from these people a corresponding reduction in the tender. The contract as he read it, and as my hon. friend also stated, left it in the hands of the Minister and the architect to demand granite of an equal quality. Everyone who has experience in building knows that sandstone can be cut at a less cost than granite, and the Minister himself must know that perfectly well. The Minister and his architect have the power to say to these contractors: "If we allow you to alter the terms of your contract and to substitute red sandstone for granite, you must give the public the benefit of the alteration." There was nothing to prevent the Minister doing that, and it was his duty, and the duty of his architect, to see it was done. Not merely has the contract been altered to the advantage of his favorite contractors after it had been tendered for, and the alteration made without giving the others an equal chance, but the public have been defrauded—there is no other word which will meet the case—of the difference between the cost of the red sandstone and the granite.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The statement made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) demands a more explicit explanation than that yet given by the Minister of Public Works. There was, in the first place, Government land in the town of Annapolis that would have answered the purpose equally well as that purchased. There were two lots of land at opposite corners, one of which had belonged, a few months previous, to the hon. member for Annapolis; and, according to the statement of my hon. friend from St. John, the hon. member for Annapolis transferred his interest in that property to a second party, and that second party was able, probably on account of the political influence which that hon. member can exercise, to secure the sale of that lot to the Government for \$3,300; while at the same time a lot on the opposite side of the street, of equal size and just as desirable in point of situation, was offered for about one-half the money. It is stated by the hon. the Minister that there was a railway between, but the hon. member for St. John took away that objection when he stated that there were just as many people on one side of the railway as on the other, and, consequently, whichever lot was taken, a certain number of people who frequented the post office would have to cross the railway, which was no great detention after all, as the roadway was blocked. So far as regards that transaction, which appears on the face of it undesirable, the Government have not been able to show upon what ground they took a lot for double the sum for which they were offered another lot on the opposite side of the street, which was equally desir-

able in every point of view. Until the Minister can show for this a better reason than he has already shown, his Government and himself must labor under the imputation that it was one of those pieces of political favoritism and jobbery which sometimes happen in connection with that Department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Often happens and sometimes discovered.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then, with regard to alteration of the contract. No one knows better than the hon. Minister of Public Works the difference between red sandstone and granite. The one is very hard material, difficult to cut, while the other is of much more pliable nature and can be worked for less cost. The hon. Minister has said that the red sandstone was equally good, but he has not admitted that it was cheaper. He could not say that he did not know that it was cheaper, because he knows too much about the construction of public buildings to be ignorant of that fact, and if he did not know that the red sandstone was much cheaper than the granite, then he is not entitled to the credit which he has so often received in this House. Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Co. come on the scene when this contract was taken, and here comes political influence again. They say they did not tell (perhaps they did tell) that they possessed a quarry of their own, and the granite that would have to be purchased would have to come from other quarries; but they could bring a stone which they put in in place of the original from their own quarry, at a very much less expense, and of a cheaper quality, and the hon. Minister allowed them to substitute the stone from their own quarry, which is much less expensive than the granite. I repeat that if the hon. gentleman did not know his business he knows less about the construction of public buildings than the hon. members of this House have usually given him credit for. As has been said before, this is only part of the system; it is not the first, or second, or twentieth time this has happened. Every public building that has gone up in Nova Scotia for a long time has been almost always obtained by the celebrated firm of Rhodes, Curry & Co., of Amherst. I believe they are a very capable and enterprising firm, and in that respect I have not one word to say, but they seem to have the advantage of always getting the Government contracts. I know that not very long ago, in the city of Halifax, there was a large freight shed put up for the Intercolonial Railway, and Rhodes, Curry & Co. obtained the contract for a small sum below the tenders of the other contractors belonging to the city. I asked some of the contractors of the city how it was they had abandoned the contract—why they did not take it at a less sum. They said that the whole specifications had been changed—that the material they were required by the specifications to use was changed for Rhodes, Curry & Co., and that was the course taken with regard to every contract given to that firm. I remember being down in the town of Baddeck, in the county of Victoria, where I saw preparations going on for a public building, and I was told that the corner lot for the building had been purchased from the sitting member of that day, not the present member, for \$1,000 or \$1,200, and I was shown a lot on the opposite corner, more favorably situated, which had been

offered for \$300. This is just another illustration of the Annapolis case, and the way in which the hon. Minister of Public Works allows his Department to be managed in the Province of Nova Scotia; and I presume that Nova Scotia is no exception to the general rule, and that it may be fairly inferred that what takes place there also takes place in New Brunswick, in Prince Edward Island, and doubtless in that highly favored Province of Quebec, and throughout the country generally. Therefore, I think it is time that this Committee should mark with its sense of the highest disapprobation this job—for it is nothing else—that has been exposed here to-night, and insist on this vote being reduced.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the hon. Minister if it is not a fact that in all the contracts for the construction of Government buildings there is a clause providing that if a material of a cheaper nature than that called for in the original contract is substituted a proportionate reduction is made in the cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is such a clause in some Government contracts. I have seen it in printed railway contracts particularly.

Mr. MULOCK. I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he took steps to ascertain whether freestone would cost less than granite; and, if so, what steps?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Chief Architect told me that it was as good a stone and as durable, and that its appearance would be better than that of the granite. I understood that one stone was as good as the other, and of equal value. If he had told me that it was worth less I would of course have taken care that the contractors should have made a reduction. But it was not so stated to me, and I did not think it was, and I do not think so now.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I must say that as between granite and sandstone I have great doubts as to the durability of the sandstone. But the sandstone is more easily worked, and the Chief Architect should know that. I understand that this red sandstone came from a quarry belonging to Rhodes, Curry & Co., and that it cost them nothing but the expense of quarrying it. It seems to me that in this matter the other contractors have been very unfairly treated, because they were ready to supply the granite according to the terms of the specifications. In regard to the site, it has been pointed out that the Government had lots there lying useless, and that a large part of the town and the public wharf are on the other side. I am told that \$3,300 was given for a lot, while a more convenient lot could be got for \$1,500, while the Government lot I am told—I speak subject to correction—was more convenient than either of those lots, and could have been utilized, and the expense saved. Between the contract and the lots nearly \$5,000 has been lost to the country. I want to test this matter, and I move that the vote be reduced to the amount of \$11,000.

Mr. MULOCK. I asked the Minister whether he had taken steps to ascertain whether the freestone could be got at a cheaper price than the granite. It is quite material to know that freestone would answer the purpose, but if the Minister had been spending his money, and there had

been a proposal to change the material, I am sure he would have ascertained whether the substituted was worth less or more than the material originally contracted for, and if he found that it was worth less he would have taken good care to get the benefit of the change. Now, I ask him whether he took any steps to ascertain whether the substituted material could be procured at a less price than the granite. It was his plain duty to ascertain that, before he undertook to pay public money for the article that was used. It is a breach of trust on the part of the Minister of Public Works; it is a fraud on the part of the Minister of Public Works.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman forgets himself there. He has no right to speak in that way with regard to a member of the House, and probably less with regard to a Minister of the Crown, who has his responsibility. I hope the hon. member will withdraw that.

Mr. MULOCK. I will withdraw to this extent: if the hon. Minister has either intentionally or by negligence allowed the public money to be wasted, I say that in the eye of the law that is a breach of trust, and any breach of trust in a court of equity is a legal fraud, and to that extent—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I am in order. I am here to defend the public treasury, and I propose to defend the public treasury. We have a duty to perform, and we do not propose, even at the dictation of a majority, to allow breaches of trust to take place.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I dare say hon. gentlemen opposite do not like to be told of these things, but they will not escape by their violence and their noises. We propose to do our duty here, even if Ministers of the Crown neglect their duty. The hon. Minister does not say that he took the proper legal steps that a private individual would have taken under the circumstances. I ask him now if he can give any proof that he obtained the advice of any competent person that the material would cost as much as that which was originally called for. He admits that he did not take the first steps to ascertain what the freestone would cost, and now he gets up in virtuous indignation to try to deceive this Committee and make us believe that there was not a fraud at the bottom of it.

Mr. HESSON. I think the hon. member ought to take back what he said.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. HESSON. I rise to a question of order. I think the hon. gentleman ought to take back the language he used to the Minister of Public Works. I say that the word "fraud," as applied to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, is a breach of parliamentary language, and the hon. gentleman ought to withdraw it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman did not impute any personal fraud to the Minister at all. The hon. member for North Perth is trying to leave the impression on the Committee that my hon. friend imputed some personal fraud to the Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He did.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He imputed no personal fraud whatever.

Mr. MULOCK.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He did.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What he said was that there had been a fraud perpetrated on the public and on the tenderers who tendered against Rhodes, Curry & Co., and that the public had been defrauded to the extent of some \$1,800.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman said that there had been a breach of trust on the part of the Department in not insisting on a proportionate deduction being made for the substitution of freestone for the granite demanded for, that the public had lost so much money by that want of attention on the part of the Department, and that that amounted to a fraud on the public.

Mr. HESSON. He said the Minister had committed a fraud.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He said that, so far as the management of the Department was concerned, the public were defrauded. If his language imported more than that, he did not intend it.

Mr. HESSON. Will the hon. gentleman take it back?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. member for Perth mean to say that if the hon. member for St. John is correct—

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the question. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am speaking to a question of order, and that must be disposed of first.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman is not debating the question.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am; and if the hon. member will excuse me, I am going to show that I am speaking to the question of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It must be understood by this Committee that the Chairman here has no power to make any hon. gentleman withdraw an offensive expression. All he can do is to report to the Speaker the language used, if some hon. members asks that the words be taken down. The Chairman of the Committee can then report to the Speaker, who must be called in, and whose duty it will be to ask the hon. member who used the offensive expression to withdraw it. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House has but the power to rebuke an hon. gentleman for the use of such expression, and I must say that I regret the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) was most unfortunate in the choice of the expression he used. All I can do is to rebuke him for having made use of it, and I do so.

Mr. HESSON. I ask that the language of the hon. gentleman be taken down and reported to the Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There has been a discussion between the time the language complained of was used and the motion to have the words taken down, and they cannot be taken down now.

Mr. SCARTH. I ask the Chairman to report to the Speaker the closing words of the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock), which were that the Minister of Public Works was endeavoring to deceive this Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I repeat what I have said, that an hon. gentleman having spoken between

the time those words were used and the point of order raised, it is now too late for me to report to the Speaker.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The only person who spoke between was the hon. gentleman who called your attention to the language objected to.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not wish to protect myself behind any rules. I do not wish to prevent the Committee resorting to whatever course may be deemed advisable, nor do I wish the Committee to be under any misapprehension as to what I had in my mind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MULOCK. I am always desirous of doing justice and of doing what is right; and if I have created any false impression, I am not so cowardly or ungentlemanly or unfair as not to make the necessary amends, and even if the hon. member for Centre Toronto does not approve of a man making amends, I approve of it.

Mr. COCKBURN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood that the hon. member for Toronto was interrupting me in the course of my remarks.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He ought to apologise.

Mr. COCKBURN. I was only too delighted to see that the hon. gentleman had the gentlemanly feeling to apologise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to tell the Committee what I desired to say. It was this: It appears to me that the hon. the Minister of Public Works, as trustee of the public funds, has not taken those proper steps that he should have taken to protect the public treasury. We were, on this side at all events, insisting on the necessity of enforcing the principle of competition in the awarding of public contracts as the safest way of ascertaining the cost of obtaining service from the state. That principle was departed from in this case, and the hon. Minister allowed a larger sum of money to be paid for work done for the public than appears, on reliable statements, to be proper. The Minister of Public Works has not been able to produce the evidence of any expert to show that the public have obtained full value for the money he has expended, and without going further into the evidence I say that what has been disclosed before this Committee shows that there has been improvidence and maladministration of the public money, to that extent, and a waste of the public money; and, as I proceeded to say—and I repeat it now—I draw a distinction between a legal fraud and a moral fraud. The distinction is too plain to require to be explained, but I say that the Minister of Public Works, if he has wasted any of the public money by improvidence or negligence, has to that extent been untrue to the trust imposed upon him, and to that extent has been, it appears to me, as guilty as any trustee would be under similar circumstances of a breach of trust. A breach of trust under those circumstances is, in a court of equity, admitted to be a fraud. To that extent, and that only, did I propose to go, and that is the whole extent I have gone, and I am sure that any hon. gentleman who to-morrow reads the remarks I have made preced-

ing these will find that that is the fullest extent to which I have gone. I say again, it is the duty of any Minister of the Crown who is entrusted with the public money to adopt all safeguards and precautions in order that the public may get full value for the expenditure of that money; and if he does not adopt those safeguards he clothes himself with all the responsibility of his omission and must expect that his administration will be characterised in such a way as his conduct would be in a court of justice.

Mr. GILLMOR. It is evident that freestone is not as good for the foundation of a building as granite, and it cannot be possible that the Minister of Public Works does not know the difference between working freestone and working granite. Any hon. gentleman who knows anything about stone knows that granite is the hardest stone to work; that freestone is soft, and that a workman can dress four feet of freestone as easily as one of granite. I, therefore, cannot believe that freestone would bear the weight of a building as well as granite. With regard to this offering for tenders, it is very important that the public should be treated fairly with regard to tenders. There is no branch of the public service in regard to which the public have a right to expect fair play more than they have in offering tenders, and there is no branch of the public service where a Government or an official can act properly or improperly with greater ease than in reference to public tenders. I do not believe that freestone is as good for a foundation of a large building as granite. It is quite as ornamental, and may cost as much in the quarry, but you might as well ask for maple or mahogany, and then supply white pine, as to ask for granite and accept freestone. I think a gross injustice has been done to the parties who tendered, and also to the public, who ought to have the advantage of the difference between the cost of working the freestone and the granite.

Committee divided: Yeas, 36; Nays, 77.

Halifax Dominion Buildings \$1,500

Mr. WATSON. I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the unfairness of giving public buildings to places which have a very small revenue. I find that there is a vote for a post office, &c., at Annapolis, and another for South Sydney. The first vote is \$12,500, and its revenue is only \$2,285; and in South Sydney, for which \$9,000 is asked, the revenue is only \$2,738. In the town in which I reside the post office revenue is \$6,927, but it has not a post office or public building. I again protest against this system of spending the public money, as I think the revenues derived from post offices ought to have some weight with the Government when they are erecting public buildings.

South Sydney Post Office, Custom House,
&c. \$9,000

Mr. KIRK. Will this be sufficient to finish that building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; we will require about \$500 more.

Mr. KIRK. What will be the cost of the whole building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About \$25,000 or \$26,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I observe that \$5,000 for an immigrant building at Halifax, which was put in the Estimates last year by the Minister of Agriculture, and which it was understood would be expended immediately, is not in the Estimates this year. During the visit of the Minister of Justice to Halifax last year I called his attention to this matter, and he promised to bring it to the notice of the Government. Will the Minister of Agriculture inform us now whether the Government intends to drop this altogether, or what is being done in regard to it?

Mr. CARLING. I really cannot say, but I believe they are going on. I know that instructions have been given that the building should be proceeded with.

Mr. KIRK. I believe this building in South Sydney is the second building which the Government is erecting in the one county of Cape Breton. They have already a Custom house and post office in North Sydney, and now they are completing one in South Sydney in the same county. I think that is unfair to other parts of Nova Scotia which are paying as much and some of them more to the revenue than the county of Cape Breton. Does the Minister think he is acting fairly to other counties which have no public buildings? Perhaps he is giving two buildings to this county of Cape Breton because the Government have two supporters here from that county. Is that the reason?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like the hon. Minister of Public Work to give me the information for which I have asked in regard to the immigrant building in Halifax.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So far as I can recollect, we do not ask any more money this year, because we expect \$5,000 will be sufficient until the 1st of July.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the hon. Minister let me know what is being done, because when I left Halifax there was no evidence of a commencement of that work, and the time is nearly passed when it will be required.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take note of it.

Repairs, furniture, heating &c.....	\$496,200
Repairs, furniture, heating for public buildings.....	\$170,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. \$170,000 seems to be a large amount for repairs, for public buildings, in Ottawa.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is for all the public buildings throughout the Dominion.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Does this include the repairs at Rideau Hall?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman agreed to make a statement in his place with respect to the course to be pursued as to the repairs and furniture of Rideau Hall. This appears to be the time it should be done?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Last year the question came up in the Committee and the Committee seemed desirous that some new mode should be adopted of keeping up the repairs and furniture and

Mr. KIRK.

the general expenses of Rideau Hall. During the recess the Finance Minister and myself had an interview with His Excellency the Governor General, to see whether some arrangement could be made that would change the position of affairs in so far as my Department was concerned. It was seen that it would not be the proper thing for the Governor General to assume the repairs or the furniture of the building—that if the Government were to allow a certain amount to the Governor General for repairs and furniture of the building it would subject him, for the time being, to criticism, and after he went away there might be complaints or objections made about the disposal of the money. Therefore, it was understood that that scheme could not be accepted. We discussed with His Excellency the expenditure that we have been in the habit of making about the castle, and His Excellency, as usual, showed himself perfectly disposed to help my Department as much as possible to curtail the expenses. Amongst other things, we suggested that whenever there is a change of Governors there is supposed to be a time when some of the small articles, and perhaps larger articles, of furniture, or other matters in the building, are disposed of and disappear. At all events, when we took an inventory in 1886 we thought that was the best mode to adopt under the circumstances. It is thought there should be every year an inventory made of the furniture and other property belonging to the state in the Government House, as at that period His Excellency, his staff and family are away from Government House, and with an officer belonging to the Government and an officer belonging to the suite of His Excellency, we might make an inventory and know every year the quantity of furniture remaining and the additions that would afterwards be made. For that purpose it is suggested, and it is intended, that a book shall be opened in which the articles found by the inventory shall be noted, along with the additions made each year, and then if there is any article that is destroyed, or is put away, or is not to be used any more, an entry will be made to that effect. Another suggestion is, that the articles should be stamped with a Government stamp. Another suggestion, is that we make a contract with a house in England to provide us, for example, with the crockery or the glassware that would be necessary for Government House, and these things should be kept there. These articles should all be stamped with a certain monogram showing that they belong to the Government House, and if anything disappeared, no matter how, it could be traced by the monogram upon it. Then there is another arrangement. During the recess a contract was made with the head gardener of Rideau Hall and his assistants, under which they are to take care of all the gardens, lawns, roads and everything connected with the grounds. The contract has been made for a year, and will terminate on the 1st of July, and after it is completed we shall be able to see how they have performed their part, and we shall decide whether the contracts shall be continued.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$4,500 for taking care of the grounds, lawns and contingencies. For that sum the implements required will be provided. With respect to furniture, we think that for carpets, tableware, &c., between \$2,500 and \$3,000

will be the ordinary amount required, and that is a reduction on previous years. The cost of repairs to buildings, fences, sidewalks, drains, &c., may be placed at between \$10,000 and \$20,000; painting, including materials, \$2,000; plastering, \$500, sundry expenses, \$500. We believe that with these sums we will be able to meet the expenditure of Rideau Hall. That, of course, is independent of the sum of \$8,000 voted for fuel and heating of the Governor General's residence.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the total amount to be expended on Rideau Hall?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total will be from \$22,000 to \$23,000, plus \$8,000 for fuel and light.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is that amount supposed to cover all the purchases that may be required for glassware and other articles.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; the ordinary expenditure. There may be some extraordinary destruction, and that of course would be a separate matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. Minister has made anything like an approximately correct estimate, we have been spending from \$10,000 to \$12,000 a year more than we should have expended. The expenditure last year, outside of fuel and light, was \$31,000 odd, and it is about the average expenditure of years gone by. Now, the Minister proposes to establish a new system, by which \$10,000 will be saved.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We hope so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I repeat that if the Minister hopes and believes that his estimate is anything like a correct one, we have been squandering from \$10,000 to \$12,000 a year. There is one unfortunate matter connected with the Rideau Hall expenditure which should be freely stated. It is a somewhat unpleasant subject, and comes up year after year. A general report goes through the Dominion and a general impression is conveyed that the Governor General and his staff, or rather his staff, are more or less responsible for this extravagance. We who are members of the Public Accounts Committee, who have investigated the subject, know that this is not the case, and that whatever extravagance there has been in that Department the Minister of Public Works is directly responsible for it. The Governor General has no control over it whatever. The Clerk of Works was examined before the Committee, and it appeared that when any article is required at Rideau Hall a requisition is made to the Public Works Department, which takes the whole matter into its sole control, and the Governor General and his staff have no control or responsibility with respect to the articles purchased, either as to where they are purchased or their cost. So, for the past extravagance in connection with Rideau Hall no man is so responsible as the Minister of Public Works, and I have no hesitation in stating that from the evidence submitted to the Public Accounts Committee there has been the grossest extravagance in connection with the Department from year to year. A year or two ago the subject was mentioned in a mincing way, and there was a disposition to hush up the matter, because it was one connected with Rideau Hall, it being intimated that the Governor General had some connection with it. Let us be

honest to him and to his staff, and state publicly that neither directly nor indirectly is the Governor General or his staff in any sense or way responsible for the extravagance and for the loss of public money in connection with Rideau Hall. When the matter was mentioned a year or two ago a pledge was given by the Minister that when a new Governor General arrived a new system would be introduced, and there would be no longer cause for the complaint of extravagance made yearly from this side of the House. I regret that this pledge was not carried out. I regret it the more because not only did the Minister of Public Works fail to carry out the pledge given to the House, but when a new Governor General came no kind of an inventory or list was made of the Government property in that building. The old Governor General went away, and it is wonderful to think that the head of any Department which has expended \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year on Rideau Hall should not have made an inventory of any kind of the public property. We know what took place. That which we expected took place — a large amount of property disappeared. Who is responsible? Let the Minister of Public Works say why that which is the rule in all other establishments should not have been carried out at Rideau Hall. What does the British Government do? If an admiral takes charge of a new station a careful inventory is taken of the Government's property by the outgoing and incoming secretaries, and if there is any property missing they are held to a strict account. Nothing of the kind was done here, and it is stated, and I believe it is stated on very good authority, that the new Governor General found some of the rooms entirely stripped, and that the property had been taken away. We maintain the condition of Rideau Hall by yearly votes of money, and therefore when a new Governor General arrives and takes up his residence no extraordinary expenditure should be necessary, unless the property has been removed. I am told here, and it is a matter of public information, that the hon. Minister sends down from his Department at election times dozens and scores of men to do painting and such work, and scores and scores of washerwomen, who fill the house and do what they like. The hon. gentleman now says the Government intends to introduce a new system of stamping the articles with a Government mark. I was told a story by an Ottawa gentleman which illustrates this point. At one of the clubs an ice pitcher was broken and a messenger was sent to one of the city stores to purchase another. One was obtained for 50 cents. It proved to be a beautiful cut glass pitcher, worth from \$5 to \$10, with the Government mark on it. This is the talk everywhere in this city. There must be flagrant neglect and absolute absence of all control, and no attempt is evidently made to take care of the public property, and thousands of dollars year after year are thus wasted; and I have no hesitation in stating here, and telling the hon. Minister of Public Works that I hold him responsible for the \$40,000 or \$50,000 wasted during the last ten or twelve years, and that he is the man who is responsible. The greatest extravagance has been practised and the grossest carelessness has been practised, so that in effect thousands of dollars have been lost. I, with other members of the Public Accounts Committee, will expect that a careful inventory be

made each year of the Government property, and that steps will be taken to protect it, and that those in charge of it, on behalf of the Government, will be held responsible, and no other system can give satisfaction. The whole system under which Rideau Hall has been managed is disgraceful and scandalous to the Minister of Public Works, and I am sorry the hon. gentleman has not a better account to give.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman tries to have the Committee understand that I endeavored to put on the shoulders of others the responsibility which I have as Minister of Public Works. I did nothing of the kind. I am responsible for my Department, and if there is anything wrong in my Department I am responsible for it. I have not, to-night, tried to put a portion of that responsibility on the shoulders of His Excellency, the present Governor General, or on any other Governor, nor did I ever do so in my life. The hon. gentleman need not try to lead the Committee under that impression, because it is not so. As to the expenditure in that building, I may say that we do not go to make repairs, or to purchase furniture, or anything of the kind, until a requisition is made from the officers of Rideau Hall. When they ask what they want—if they are articles which are usually furnished by the Department of Public Works—the requisition is assented to. So much for that. When the hon. gentleman speaks of the gross expenditure, he should go a little further back and see how it was in years past. In 1873-74 the expenditure was \$56,000 a year; in 1874-75, \$39,000; in 1875-76, \$36,000; in 1876-77, \$35,000; in 1877-78, \$39,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Go on.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Under the régime of the previous Government it was about the same as it was later on. In 1878-79 it was \$56,000; in 1879-80, \$61,000; in 1880-81, \$15,000; in 1881-82, it was \$22,000; in 1882-83 it was \$31,000; in 1883-84, \$35,000; in 1884-85, \$31,000; in 1885-86, \$26,000; in 1886-87, \$29,000; in 1887-88, \$23,000; and last year it was \$31,000, which shows that the expenditure varies. There are certain years when the buildings require more extensive repairs and when there is a larger expenditure. The hon. gentleman must remember what is the extent of these buildings and of this property. The ground covered by the buildings at Rideau Hall is 89,500 square feet. The extent of the roofs to be kept in order and repair is 96,500 square feet. The yards of carpet required to cover the rooms, halls and corridors are 4,180, and 340 yards of oil cloth. The number of windows to be kept in repair and on which to put up double windows in winter and blinds in summer are 273. The number of gas lights, 570; the number of stoves, furnaces, boilers and grate fires to be kept in order and attended to, 120; the length of the drains on the property is 6,850 feet, or a mile and a quarter; the extent of pavements and sidewalks, 4,400 of block pavement and 9,200 of plank walk, or a mile and three-quarters. The fencing to be kept in repair is 22,400 feet, or more than four miles; the length of gravel roads, 23,100 feet, or more than four miles; the total extent of the Rideau Hall property is 85 acres, consisting of 2 acres of flower garden, 4 acres of vegetable garden, 47 acres of grass and 32 acres of wood, and shrubbery; so that the hon. gentle-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

man must see that it is a very extensive property, and, therefore, it is not surprising that for the past seventeen or eighteen years this expenditure has been required to put the property and the buildings in order. As the hon. gentleman sees by the statement I have given, some years we have had only \$15,000 and others \$60,000, caused by the rebuilding of certain portions of the property. The buildings are far from being new, and the necessary repairs must be made to keep them in order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I care very little for the comparison made by the hon. gentleman between this and previous years. Where the expenditure was large in previous years it was no doubt an expenditure on capital account in adding to the buildings. The hon. gentleman must see that he has made a very unjust comparison, because we know from what occurred before the Public Accounts Committee that for the last five years the \$8,000 for fuel and light is in a separate item, and is not included in the expenditure, so that he would have to add \$8,000 a year to these items which he read. In the years from 1873 to 1878 the items for fuel and light were included in the expenditure he read. However, this does not touch the point at issue, as to whether the proper steps are taken to prevent the property from being stolen.

Mr. BOWELL. It was true, as the hon. gentleman said, that this matter was before the Public Accounts Committee, but the statement made by the officer of the Public Works Department there was that he was unable to say whether the cost for gas, &c., was included in the amount, \$8,000, read to the House by the Minister of Public Works, and he was instructed by the Committee to make enquiries into this and to report on it at the next meeting. I think, therefore, it is hardly fair to say that the facts came out before the Committee, as stated by the hon. gentleman. It may be true that the \$8,000 did not cover gas, but I say that that fact was not elicited by the evidence which was produced before the Committee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will bear me out when I say that we do not want any evidence to convince us that the item of \$8,000 is not now charged in the total sum, and has not been for years past. We can take the Auditor General's Report and see so.

Mr. BOWELL. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Excuse me. On page D-206 of the Auditor General's Report we find an item for \$8,000 for additional allowance for fuel and light for the Governor General.

Mr. ELLIS. There is no difference between one side of the House and the other in this matter. The true way to reform this system is to abolish it altogether. The Governor General is called on to perform duties which are not necessary to his office at all, and the best course to take is to change the system—to make the chief executive officer of this country a Canadian, who shall perform his duties like other officers. The Governor General is required to support his office by duties which are to no purpose, so far as the general interests of the country are concerned, and if both sides of the House would agree to take the action I suggest, the results would be more beneficial to the country, and would meet with the approval of the country. It seems to me absurd to suppose

that any social duties which the Governor General can discharge here, in a small corner of Canada like this, can have any effect on the country generally. I would, therefore, prefer to see the office, as it exists to-day, re-constructed, and given to some capable Canadian, and let him receive a certain sum to discharge his executive duties, and those duties only.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Public Works has not, I think, cleared up this transaction. He has stated that he responds to the requisitions of the officers at Rideau Hall, but he has not said that he takes any steps to verify those requisitions, and to see whether they are well founded or not. The officers at Rideau Hall who make these requisitions are, I suppose, gentlemen who come out with the Governor General, and of course they are desirous that Rideau Hall should be in every way suitable, and should be supplied with everything that can add to the personal comforts and luxuries of the occupants. They are not concerned for the taxpayer. The taxpayer is represented or ought to be represented by the Minister of Public Works, but the Minister says that of course he acts on the requisition of those officers. Well, as long as he proposes to hand over the expenditure of these moneys to those young gentlemen who come from England, so long will these complaints be well founded. It is his duty to investigate those requisitions to see whether they are well founded or not. I ask him if he can justify the employment of 25 men the whole year round at Rideau Hall. Here is a list of the persons employed, including a clerk of works, half a dozen carpenters, a dozen laborers, and others. Suppose you did require six garden laborers in the summer, what are you going to do with them in the winter? Those gardens are locked up by nature for half the year and more. It is true, there are, I suppose, some hot-houses, but surely you cannot require six garden laborers all through the winter. It would appear from the explanation the hon. Minister has given that he has been wholly indifferent to the expenditure, and has been leaving it to be controlled entirely by those exotic plants from England who make the requisitions. With regard to the heating, I would ask if there has been any investigation made as to the comparative cost of heating the public buildings in Ottawa, including Rideau Hall, with wood or coal. I would also ask whether the hon. Minister has made any investigation to ascertain whether \$8,000 is necessary to supply Rideau Hall with heat and light. It seems to me that \$68,000, which we are asked to vote this year for heating the public buildings in this city, is an enormous sum. I think the Minister ought to be able to answer some of these questions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. What I said was that when the officers of Rideau Hall, I have no doubt properly authorised, make their requisitions, those requisitions are complied with, but they are always examined by the officers of my Department, by my order, to see how far they can be met. If we find that there is something that should not be allowed, there is then a conference between the officers of my Department and the officers of Rideau Hall as to what is required. When there are large repairs to be made, an officer of the Department goes through the building in company with an officer of the Governor's staff, and they make a

survey of the building to see what is actually required to keep it in a proper state of repair. An estimate is made of the different items, which is laid before me, and if I find it correct, it is passed. With regard to the sum of \$8,000 for fuel and light, I know by experience, having had conferences with the occupants of Rideau Hall on the subject—I do not speak of the present incumbent alone—that \$8,000 is not too much. I know that one year the expenditure exceeded that amount by several hundred dollars. With regard to wood or coal, I had that question examined twice, with the view of ascertaining whether we could save money by using coal instead of wood. The result of the investigation has been, that if we were to use coal we should have to make large changes in our heating apparatus, and the saving would not be much, if any, while the smoke from the burning of coal would produce the effect that the burning of coal produces—for example, in London, England, where the buildings are all darkened, and their appearance impaired by that cause. I asked my chief officer in charge of that matter whether there was any discovery made by which the smoke could be avoided. That has not been found yet, as far as I can understand, from my mechanical engineer, and, therefore, we have continued to burn wood. I would prefer by far to have coal, because by burning coal we would perhaps have better heat for an amount of money which would not exceed what we pay to-day. But just now the question is: first, we would have to make a large expenditure in changing the heating apparatus, and secondly, the appearance of the building on the outside would be damaged greatly by the smoke.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. the Minister of Public Works is altogether misinformed on this point. If Rideau Hall were heated by hot water or steam the coal used would not be soft coal, but hard coal, which does not give much smoke. The hon. gentleman seems to have great regard for the appearance of the building down there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was speaking of these buildings here. At Rideau Hall it would be still worse, because besides some furnaces, there are a large number of stoves there, and we would require to make a great change in the building to have new apparatus, and as the building is old the expenditure would no doubt have to be large.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is not by the use of hard coal this smoke is caused, but by the use of soft coal. While speaking of Rideau Hall, there has been a vast amount of extravagance in the expenditure there for many years, and it is high time some new system should be put in operation to reduce this expenditure. Apart altogether from the expenditure on the inside of the House, the management of the garden—concerning which I was pleased to hear the Minister say he has adopted a new system—has been in past years marked by the grossest extravagance. The hon. the Minister of Customs will bear me out when I say that it was shown before the Public Accounts Committee that the hon. the Minister of Public Works had entirely neglected his duty in this regard. An officer from Rideau Hall stated in that Committee that thirteen gardeners were employed there all the year round, for whom they could not find work, and that he had repeatedly reported this to the Minister of

Public Works, or the officer in charge of Rideau Hall matters here, and yet the Department had persistently refused to authorise him to discharge these men. These men were kept on the whole year round, winter and summer, although there was no work for them to do, and the Minister of Public Works refused to authorise their discharge. The same system of neglect has marked the whole expenditure at Rideau Hall. No doubt the whole system has been managed in the most extravagant manner, for which extravagance the Minister of Public Works is responsible. The hon. gentleman says that this \$170,000 included the expenditure on public buildings all through the Dominion for heating. Now, I see another item further on, headed "Dominion Public Buildings, \$60,000."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That has been the heading of the vote for years, but it is not correct. The word "heating" should not be there in the first instance, and we shall strike it out.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then the whole heating of the public buildings is done for \$60,000. Does that include the Parliament buildings?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. On page 52 there is an item for heating public buildings in Ottawa, \$60,000, and another item for heating of the Dominion buildings, \$60,000. That makes \$120,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) From the evidence given in the Public Accounts Committee with respect to Rideau Hall and the public property there, it is evident that unless an exact inventory be taken of all the property and an account opened in the hon. gentleman's Department, in which every article supplied on requisition will be entered, he will never be able to carry out an efficient control.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated that an account would be opened and an inventory made, and any articles that may be set aside will be sold and credited to the account.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When will this inventory be made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As soon as the Government House occupants go away for the summer.

Mr. WATSON. It seems to me, judging from the cost of heating Rideau Hall, namely \$120,000, it would be a good thing to destroy that building and put up a new one. It is a miserable rookery at the best, and I see in the Auditor's Report that \$3,790 was paid for papering and painting alone, and the amount paid for heating was \$8,000. If the amount used on that building from year to year were capitalised it would represent a sum sufficient to put up a very respectable residence, and it would be better for the hon. gentleman to decide whether it would not be better for him to do so.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the wood purchased by contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The wood for years has been bought by contract.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is the contractor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it is Mr. Heney. Rideau Hall we have nothing to do with.
Mr. SOMERVILLE.

Mr. WATSON. Is the wood delivered here supposed to be four feet long?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so.

Mr. WATSON. I have observed that the wood I have seen is not more than three feet six inches long.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you measured any of it?

Mr. WATSON. I have measured some. If the Government are paying for four foot wood they are paying a great deal more than they should, and the contractor must be having as soft a snap on the Government as those gentlemen in Nova Scotia who put in freestone instead of granite.

Removal of Snow, Public Buildings,
Ottawa..... \$3,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the reason for this increase of \$1,000? Are we to have any more buildings?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have more buildings.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We have one—that is the new departmental building; but I suppose the city cleans the snow from the sidewalks.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; this is for the public buildings, for these grounds, for the Supreme Court, for the Geological Museum, for the sidewalks on Cartier square, for the fish-breeding establishment, and so on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) According to the details which are given in the Auditor General's Report, the total expenditure last year was \$1,600, and you are now asking for \$3,000. That is \$1,000 more than you asked last year and \$1,400 more than the Auditor General's account shows you spent. What is that for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not here the details for each place.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Surely the hon. gentleman will not ask \$1,000 more than the vote of last year, which appears to be \$400 more than he spent, without giving some explanation for the increased vote.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My officers have stated that this amount is required, and they refer to the Geological Museum, the new block, the fisheries building, Cartier square, the city post office, the Printing Bureau and Parliament Hill. I cannot give the details for each of these. Sometimes the work varies.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The expenditure appears to have been \$1,600 last year including everything.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is the Printing Bureau and the new building.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There is no sidewalk in front of the Printing Bureau.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At all events we must clear the road.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The only place where this is required is at the new departmental building.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The roofs have to be cleared after every heavy snowfall.

Heating Public Buildings, Ottawa..... \$60,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is the coal contracted for

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The coal is let by contract.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is the soft coal Canadian or American ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is Canadian soft coal.

Gas and Electric Light, Ottawa.....\$27,000

Mr. WATSON. I would ask the Minister of Public Works why the grounds between this building and Wellington street should not be lit by electric light. The gas is very poor.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If we put the electric light on these grounds we would have to put wires, which would disfigure the square. Later on, having the apparatus here or in one of the other blocks, we might light the square by the electric light as well as the buildings, but at present it would certainly disfigure the square. The hon. gentleman will see that we took care, in lighting Wellington street, that the lights should not be on this side of the street, but on the other side, in order to avoid disfiguring the square.

Mr. WATSON. These wires could be conducted under ground.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will think about it.

Telephone Service, Public Buildings, Ottawa.....\$3,200

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the rent paid for each telephone ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it is \$30.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How is it that more is charged here than in other cities ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know, but we do not pay more than they pay in the town.

Major's Hill Park, Ottawa.....\$6,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I must renew my protest against that expenditure as utterly unjustifiable. If you go to other cities of the Dominion, just as important as Ottawa, you will find public gardens very much prettier and much better kept up than these, but kept at the expense of the respective cities. If any hon. gentleman goes to the city of Halifax he will see most beautiful gardens kept at the expense of the city, where the citizens go to take recreation and to enjoy themselves, and they do not come crying to the Parliament of Canada asking us to keep up their gardens. Go to the city I belong to myself—we keep up our own gardens, and do not come cringing to Parliament asking for assistance. Now, on what grounds can the taxpayers of Canada be asked to pay \$6,000 to keep up the gardens in Major's Hill Park ? The thing is utterly indefensible. If the citizens of Ottawa want to keep up a garden, if it adds to the beauty of the city, well and good, but let them keep it up themselves. We all know that they have enough of the public funds of Canada already ; the taxpayers of the Dominion all contribute to maintain Ottawa ; and I say this item is utterly indefensible, unless you choose to vote money for a similar purpose to all the other cities of the Dominion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We pay this money on an arrangement made with the city of Ottawa

some years ago by which certain properties of the city are taken care of by the Government in consideration of the public buildings being exempted from city taxation. Therefore, the city asks that some consideration should be given it for that reason. This property was handed over to the city of Ottawa 17 years ago, but the city could not keep it up. Though they have the capital, they have not the means of doing it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They are as rich as any other city.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. But this property having belonged to the Government, they handed it back at that period, and a bargain was made with the city by which we would keep up that property as a park, unless we required it for some other purpose ; because there was then some thought of building a new residence for the Governor General on that site, but we have still continued to use the old residence. The park adjoins the Government grounds here, and certainly it is a property that we should keep in good order. I do not think we should refuse the sum of \$6,000 for that purpose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I fail entirely to see that the city of Ottawa has been such a loser by an expenditure of four or five millions of public money in erecting the Government buildings here, and by maintaining a regiment of something like a thousand men with all their wives and children, at an enormous cost to the public. The long and the short of the matter is, that the city of Ottawa has received extraordinary benefit, as everybody knows, from the Government being established here. The value of every lot in Ottawa has been doubled, trebled, and quadrupled by the Government's coming here. It is the height of absurdity for the citizens of Ottawa to advance this claim after all that has been done for them.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The same argument for a relief from taxation would apply to every city. The city of Ottawa gave up nothing. In every city Crown property is exempt from taxation, and there is no reason at all why the citizens of Ottawa should not, like the citizens of every other city, maintain their own public parks.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Public Works says this was an arrangement made some years ago with the city of Ottawa. If he had stated that it was part of an arrangement made by the present Government with the city of Ottawa he would have stated the whole facts. But he should have stated that during the administration of Mr. Mackenzie he made an arrangement with the city of Ottawa that the citizens should take charge of this Major's Hill Park and ornament it themselves. He proposed, in the first place, to do one of two things—either to dispose of that property for public purposes and put the money into the revenue of the country, and let any speculator buy it, or to allow the city to take it ; and while we held a nominal ownership, to allow the city to ornament and beautify it to whatever extent they pleased. That is the arrangement to which the people of Ottawa were glad to agree under Mr. Mackenzie's administration. But when the Government changed, unfortunately for the interests of this country, the present Administration thought they would make another arrangement with the people of Ottawa, and they relieved them from the undertaking which

they had deliberately entered into, and they have expended, as hon. gentlemen are aware, for many years, sums varying from ten thousand down to the amount we are now called upon to vote. Now, during the discussion that took place here with regard to the Admiralty courts, we contended the other day that in respect to those courts the same treatment should be accorded to one part of the country as to the other. That view was admitted by the Government, and even the Minister of Justice contended it was not fair that public money should be granted to one part of the Dominion for a certain purpose and should not be granted to another part of the country for a like purpose. This park is in that position. There is no other park in the country which receives a public grant for a like object; and the contention that the city of Ottawa suffers in consequence of the large expenditure of public money here is too absurd to call for attention. In fact, Ottawa has been built up, and is now largely maintained and sustained by the money which comes from Parliament in sustaining the number of people who are in the civil service, and if it had not been for that expenditure it is well known that the city of Ottawa would never have attained the very respectable proportions it has reached to-day, and on that ground alone it cannot be upheld for a moment. I will move that this amount be struck out of the Estimates, and if I fail to obtain the concurrence of the Committee on that point, I will move on concurrence again, so that the names can be formally recorded. I move that this item of \$6,000 for Major's Hill Park be now struck out.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It is fair and right that the Government should reconsider their course on this matter, and should decide whether it is really in the interest of the people of the country that \$3,000 or \$4,000 should be expended yearly on this park. This park is really for the city, and the city should be able to maintain it in a reasonably good condition. The people of Ottawa have many advantages from the capital being located here, and they should be able to maintain their own park. There is no reason whatever why the Government should continue to maintain it, and I hope, therefore, the Committee will adopt the resolution.

Committee divided : Yeas, 35 ; Nays, 37.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if it is not advisable to apply to this park a similar system to that he has adopted in maintaining the grounds at Rideau Hull, namely, by letting the work by contract. The hon. gentleman expects to make a large saving by this system, and I trust he will look upon its adoption favorably for this park.

Mr. WELSH. There is a nice flower-house in the grounds, and I should like to know to whom the flowers are supplied.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You are not a Minister.

Mr. WELSH. I do not profess to be a Minister, and if I could not make a better Minister than one hon. gentleman I am looking at, I would not be a good one. He has had a good raking over, and he will have many more if he does not mend his ways. I want to know who gets the flowers, what they are for, who has a right to them, and who does get them; also, whether I can go and ask for a flower

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

for my button-hole, as I see hon. gentlemen opposite wearing them.

Mr. LOVITT. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I went there the first Session I came here, and I was distinctly told they were for the Ministers.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We should have the declarations of the hon. Ministers on this question. I have been in the conservatory several times, and have seen some very fine flowers there, but I have been utterly unable to discover who has a right to them. We should have an official declaration from the hon. Minister who has charge of the Department as to the persons who are entitled to those flowers, and for what purpose they are kept in the conservatory.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The plants are kept in the conservatory until spring, when they are transplanted to ornament the grounds.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. Minister visited the conservatory he would find that the bulk of the plants were not suitable for bedding out in the spring, but were for winter blooming. The Minister has not answered the hon. member's question as to what is done with them, and for whose use they are kept, and who has permission to use them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No one.

Mr. WELSH. I want to know from the hon. Minister of Public Works if I call in the morning and ask him for one of those flowers if he can give it to me?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. WELSH. Well, who can give it to me.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Nobody.

Mr. WELSH. Then nobody has anything to do with it. I want to know who this conservatory belongs to, or who has control over it? I intend to go there to-morrow morning to ask for some flowers, and if I do not find out who has control I will lay hold of all I can get, and then we will see who is in charge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. Minister may think that an item of \$5,000 or \$6,000 for flowers sent to Minister's tables may be very trifling. It may be objectionable or it may not be objectionable, but we want to know if it is the case.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where do the flowers go, then?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then the hon. gentleman is the only ignorant man in the House on that subject.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, the hon. member for Queen's is very learned.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I ask why the hon. Minister is asking for an increase of \$10,000, in this vote.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I answered this already. The hon. gentleman has no right to repeat question after question, which I have already answered. He may think it is a very nice thing to do so, but he cannot take advantage of his position to do that when I have already answered.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is altogether wrong on this point. There is an opinion prevalent everywhere that these flowers are sent to Ministers' tables. I do not know whether that is true or not,

but my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) has only quoted that impression, and he has a right to be answered, in a manner different from that in which he has been answered by the hon. Minister.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I answered the hon. gentleman in a civil way. I told him that these flowers were not sent to the Ministers that I know of. I know that they are not sent to me, and I do not see what other answer I could give.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That makes the matter worse. If these flowers, were sent to the Ministers' tables it might not be so objectionable, but if they are not it is quite time for the House to know what is done with them. If we spend public money for private parties to get these flowers it is still more objectionable, and if they are not sent to the hon. Ministers, I want to know what becomes of them.

Mr. WELSH. The same here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will observe, Sir, that my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. Fisher), who understands these floricultural matters, in connection with a good many such subjects, stated of his own knowledge what, I believe, is a fact, that there are a very large number of plants in that conservatory which are of no possible use for bedding out. It is absurd to say that they keep expensive and costly plants simply for the pleasure of the gardener to look upon. We know that cannot be so, and if it is so, it is a gross piece of wastefulness. These flowers may or may not be for the hon. Ministers; I do not know and I do not care, but they cannot be for the purpose of bedding out in these grounds which would be a legitimate use for them. They must, therefore, be for the purpose of handing over to some parties who have no right to have them grown for them at the public cost.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think that at all follows. I know there are semi-tropical plants in that conservatory in winter, which are bedded out during the spring, and remain until the cold weather comes when they are taken back to the conservatory. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) may undoubtedly be a better floriculturist than I am. I have not been in the conservatory for years, but I know that on two or three occasions I tried to pay it a visit, as the hon. member for Queen's did, and I did not get in. I never had a flower out of that garden, either for my table or for any other purpose. I do think the answer made by the hon. Minister of Public Works should have been sufficient for any gentleman. When the question was put to him by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) as to whether these flowers were used for the benefit of the Ministers, the hon. Minister of Public Works said he had no knowledge of their having been used for such purpose, and that as far as he knew they were for the purpose of bedding out on the grounds during the summer. Surely that ought to be a sufficient answer to hon. gentlemen opposite, unless they are prepared to establish the fact that the hon. Minister of Public Works is not telling the truth. If that be the insinuation, and there be evidence of that, I find no fault with hon. gentlemen opposite, if they say so distinctly and positively, they are not blamable in trying to find out the facts.

Mr. WELSH. I really think so, honestly, myself.

Mr. BOWELL. I think we should treat each other at least as gentlemen. The hon. Minister says he has no knowledge of any abuse of the kind referred to by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), and that ought to be sufficient. I am sure my hon. friend from Queen's would accept it if I told him so.

Mr. WELSH. I would if you say so; I would not if he said so.

Mr. BOWELL. I am sorry the hon. gentleman should say that. It is well known that in all conservatories gardeners take a pride in having rare plants, and it really is not more expense. A man occupying the position which Mr. Robertson—who, I think, is a strictly honorable and straightforward man—does, takes a pride in that. I have no doubt that although there may be tropical plants there, as stated by the hon. member for Brome, they are only such as are to be found in other conservatories. It is a question for Parliament to say whether these grounds should be decorated as they have been for the past twenty years, so as to present a pleasing appearance, or that they should be allowed to go to grass.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The dandelions would cost more than the flowers.

Mr. BOWELL. I think so, too. I believe that these grounds should be kept in such a condition in the summer that they will be a credit to the Dominion.

Mr. WELSH. The same here.

Mr. BOWELL. There is not another capital in the world which I have seen which does not decorate the grounds of the seat of Government; and I think this money is well expended in decorating our grounds, so as to make them creditable to the country.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am sure the members of the Government will feel obliged to the members of the House for having ventilated this question, because there has been an impression, and it is believed by the members of this House generally, that those flowers were used by members of the Government. Hon. gentlemen deny this, but this information was given by the gardeners themselves. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) happened to be strolling in the neighborhood of the greenhouse one day, and going there, he saw some plants that were apparently drooping, and from which the flowers had been pretty well stripped, and he asked how it was that they were not as fresh as the other flowers. The man in charge told him with perfect frankness: "Those have just come in from one of the Ministers, and we have had others put in their places." That statement has been reported around the corridors of this House ever since. The hon. Minister of Customs may not get any of these flowers. He boasts sometimes that he has no cab hire, but other Ministers have cab hire, and other Ministers may have flowers, and it would appear from the evidence of the persons in charge of them that they did have them sent to their homes when they require them. If this is denied and cleared up to-night, the members of the Government will be relieved from this supposition. At all events, I think it just as well that this explanation should be given.

Mr. SCARTH. There seems to be difference of opinion between the hon. member for Queen's and the hon. member for Halifax. The hon. member for Queen's rather thinks Ministers should have flowers, while the hon. member for Halifax thinks they should not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not express any opinion one way or the other. I said that it might not be objectionable, but I know a couple of ladies who asked for flowers, and who were peremptorily refused by the gardener, who said: "No, I cannot give them to any but Ministers; these are all reserved by order of the Minister of Public Works for the Ministers of the Crown." An hon. Minister says to-night that the gardener has made a false statement to everyone who went to this conservatory, and if the flowers do not go to the Ministers, I say it is the duty of the Ministers to find out where they do go.

Mr. DAVIN. It appears that the great grievance is that the hon. members of the Opposition, when they go to the conservatory, cannot get a flower—especially that my genial friend from Prince Edward Island could not get one for his button-hole. I am very glad that the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition have at last found a policy with which they can destroy the Government. The great Liberal party, which has been hitherto known as the Grit party, will now be known as the bouquet party, and one hon. gentleman after another will go before the free and intelligent electors on the hustings, and, holding up his button-hole, and shedding deciduous tears, will say to them: "I went there to get a flower, and I was denied a flower;" and when the free and intelligent electors come to comprehend the outrage, they will rise in their might and fury and sweep this dishonest and unfair Conservative Government out of existence; and when we come to see that Government entombed, we shall be told: "It was but a little foolish flower." I think this debate is really a happy circumstance for Canada. In England they have a "Primrose" party; in fact, the great Conservative party is now almost synonymous with the primrose party, as henceforth the great Liberal party of Canada will be the "bouquet" party. There will be a tender element about their policy henceforth. What they have wanted in the past has been sweetness and light, and a certain aroma of cultivation; but now, associated with their rigid Grit principles and their somewhat severe views, there will be associated all the charm of the flower garden; and I have no doubt that the popular fancy, running riot in this direction, will take the hon. members one after another, and will christen them, according to their various moral and intellectual qualities, with the names of certain flowers. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), owing to the delicate and gracious manner with which he always deals with questions of this kind, I have no doubt will be known as the lily from Queen's. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who, when he deals in rhetoric, is strong in color, but who is yet without that delicate aroma exhaled from some natures, will be known as the tulip of the Reform party; and my hon. friend who is so dreadfully cut up for not getting anything for his button-hole, will be known, as the rose of Prince Edward Island. And the popular fancy will take to the study of horticulture, so that their nomens and cognomens

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

will all be perfectly suitable. I have no doubt that not only they, but the Conservative party and the people at large will have to study horticulture, and we shall all go armed with rosebuds and lilies into the fray, and fight our battles on this great issue. But, speaking seriously for one minute, positively it is hardly creditable that we should see great men like my hon. friend from Queen's, and great and fashionable men like my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. Fisher), at this hour of the morning, discussing in the Parliament of Canada, the question of flowers for their button-holes. It may be that the favorable view I take as to how they will stand before the country will not be correct. It is barely possible that a people so serious and grave as the great Canadian people, may, after all, think that men who will spend so much time at one o'clock in the morning discussing whether they can get a flower for their button-hole may not, after all, be the proper persons to be entrusted with the great and important issues with which Ministers of the Crown have to deal.

Mr. WELSH. I wish to know simply for what purpose this flower garden is kept. If it is kept for the use of the members of the Government, I am quite satisfied, because I know that the members of the Government have to entertain and show hospitality to many who visit Ottawa during the session. But we have got no satisfactory reply to that. We have only got the flowery speech we have just heard from the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Davin). He does not know what name to call us by. I do not know what name we will call him—dandelion or something else. I notice the hon. gentleman, ever since he has been in the House, gets up on various questions and speaks. He will speak on every motion, and approve of every motion, and will vote on every motion. He puts me in mind, always, when he gets up to speak, of something like the question of a dogma in the church:

You will and you won't;
You shall and you shan't;
You can and you can't,
You'll be d— if you do; and
You'll be d— if you don't.

It was a grand chance for him to get up and make a flowery speech, but I do not think he has thrown any light on the subject at all. He has not shown us what these \$6,000 were used for in keeping this conservatory. I want to know under whose control it is, and what service it is to the country? Will his speech give any information on the subject to his constituents at Regina? If I had some of his fine language with which to express myself I would characterise it as buncombe; and if I were up in Regina, and he presented himself again before the people, I would ask the people to get him to explain why he voted this \$6,000. For what purpose did he vote it? He looks very serious, and is not so cheerful as he was a moment ago when talking of primroses and that sort of thing. What answer would he give his constituents when asked for what purpose they grew the flowers? He is a jolly, good fellow—too jolly, sometimes. Let us hear a little common sense.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We must have the gardener of the flower house before the Public Accounts Committee, and we will then be able to get the real facts of the expenditure. I would say with regard to the statement of the hon. member

for West Assiniboa, that although he has been announcing a policy for the Opposition to present to the country, we all know what his policy has always been, and what the policy of hon. gentlemen on that side who support the Government has always been. They are looking out for public buildings, railway charters, timber limits—everything that will put money into their pockets; and I think the hon. member for West Assiniboa stands pre-eminent among all these gentlemen. He stands out more boldly in the Auditor General's Report every year. He is a favorite of the Government. He rejoices in the flowers which fall to his lot on the Pile of Bones out west. He draws annually from the Dominion Government from \$6,000 to \$8,000 for advertising and printing, and can afford to buy his own flowers and button-hole bouquets at Ottawa. I often see the hon. gentleman with a button-hole bouquet in his dress suit, and I think it becomes him admirably.

Mr. DAVIN. It is always given me.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When he announces the policy of the Opposition, he ought to remember what his policy has been. It is always to put money in his own pocket. We have had various illustrations of his consistency in this House. Not longer than last week he proposed an amendment in this House, and the Government proposed an amendment to his amendment, and he actually voted against his own motion. He is always willing to support the Government, because, forsooth, the Government support him, and it is very desirable for him to pursue the policy he has always pursued of supporting the men who support him. Nobody knows what becomes of these flowers. It was reported during last session that the senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) had the run of the conservatory when his little dickey-bird Bill was before the House for the protection of pigeons, and that he presented to all those who voted for it a pigeon-hole bouquet every day, and sent them a circular thanking them for their support. If it was the case that the senior member from Hamilton secured this advantage from the Minister of Public Works, I would like to know it.

Mr. GILLMOR. Did he get them at that conservatory?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I want to find that out, and if the Minister of Public Works cannot inform us on this point, as the senior member for Hamilton is not present, perhaps the junior member for that city (Mr. McKay) can tell us whether his senior obtained the run of the conservatory last Session, and presented those who supported his little bird Bill with those bouquets? I know the junior member was not favored in this regard, because he opposed the Bill; but still he may be in the confidence of the senior member, and can inform us whether his *confrère* secured this advantage from the Minister of Public Works of using the conservatory.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is this point in the matter. Hon. gentlemen on this side accept the statement of the Minister of Public Works that he did not receive those flowers, but will be as ready to accept the statement of hon. gentlemen on this side, who said that the gardener told them expressly—one speaks from his own knowledge, and the other says he had his information from a num-

ber of ladies—that the Minister of Public Works did receive them; and the hon. gentleman will then see that he is retaining in this employ an official who not only labels the Government, but makes statements without foundation to members of this House. Is it proper to retain a person of that kind in the public employ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I ask for an explanation of the increase of \$12,000. The hon. member for Assiniboa, who was not in his place to-night—

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He was in his place.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—when we voted half a million dollars, has chosen at this late hour to make a flippant speech about the manner in which the Opposition conduct their proceedings. If he had been in his place discharging his duties—

Mr. DAVIN. I was in my place the whole evening.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—he would have learned that we had voted over \$500,000 of public money. I want to know what reason there is for this increase of \$10,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman put that question three or four times, but he must see that I had no opportunity of answering him. Last year, in Nova Scotia we had fifteen buildings to provide for; this year we have eighteen. Last year in Prince Edward Island we had six; this year we have six. Last year in New Brunswick we had fifteen; this year we have eighteen. Last year in Quebec we had twenty-five; this year twenty-seven. Last year in Ontario we had forty-eight; this year we have fifty-seven. Last year in the North-West Territories we had one; this year we have four. Last year in Manitoba we had four; this year we have two. So that makes twenty-two more buildings this year than last, and this is the reason.

Material for Repairs, &c., in connection with ventilation and lighting public buildings, Ottawa.....\$6,000

Mr. CASEY. In regard to this item for ventilation, I think it is absolutely necessary to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that, in spite of all this expenditure, these buildings are abominably ventilated. In spite of all the machinery which we have down stairs, and of the repairs which are made from year to year, the ventilation does not improve. In this chamber we are either subjected to draughts and have cold falling on our heads, or we are roasted. We get the benefit of all the smells that arise from what goes on in the various offices connected with the buildings, as well as from the cookery. If the hon. the Minister of Public Works would devote his energy to this subject, and would get a competent man to devise a plan, the air might be made purer. I say a competent man, because the present engineer, Mr. Arnoldi, has been trying to ventilate these buildings for many years, and has not yet succeeded, and I think it is time to try some one else, to get an expert in the matter, because the present state of things is injurious to the health of members. The present man has been a failure, and we must call in somebody who has larger experience, and see if he could do something with these buildings.

Committee rose, and reported the resolutions.

THE BUDGET.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would enquire whether the Minister of Finance is able to state when the Budget speech will be delivered.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to say that I am not, but, to avoid future trouble for the hon. gentleman, I will inform him that I will give a week's notice of the delivery of the Budget speech.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is very proper, and I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for the promise he has given; but my reason for putting the question was not simply for my own convenience or for that of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. It was with a view of pressing upon the Government the propriety of having the financial statement made without further delay. We have been here nearly two months, and we will probably be kept a much longer time than is desirable unless that financial statement can soon be made. While I am on my feet, I would also like to know whether the hon. gentleman expects shortly to bring before us the banking Bill. That is a Bill which, for obvious reasons, should be before us for some time before it is discussed.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope to be able to bring down that Bill within a week.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 5th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVILEGE—THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we should take into consideration, or fix a day for taking into consideration, certain papers and documents appearing in our Votes and Proceedings with respect to the case of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). I might ask the First Minister whether he has any additional document to submit? He expected, when I last interrogated him, to have one in a day or two.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have received a telegram that the letter has been mailed. I suppose I will get it to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a question, although it may not be absolutely one of privilege, which is, nevertheless, very closely allied thereto, involving, as it does, the position of an hon. member of this House. It seems to me that it would be right we should fix a day for discussing it. Of course, it is a matter in which the convenience of the House and Government must be consulted. It has now been before the House for nearly three weeks, in a sense, and, under the circumstances, the discussion of it should not be

Mr. CASEY.

delayed. I would like to know if the Government will consent to have this matter taken up, say on Friday, by which time the hon. gentleman will be in possession of the letter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to Monday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be a very inconvenient day for a great many members. If the hon. gentleman objects to Friday, say Tuesday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You would be taking a day from us then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This involves certain reflections on the Government, and would most properly come up on a Government day for that reason.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not agree with that. Say Wednesday, if Tuesday does not suit. We are not near the end of the Session yet, I am sorry to say, and business must be proceeded with.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry to think that we are only half through, as far as I can judge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will give you Monday or Wednesday to discuss the matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The matter is particularly interesting to the right hon. gentleman, in right of his son, at all events.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be as interesting on Wednesday as on Tuesday.

Mr. LAURIER. The right hon. gentleman must remember that if he has contemplated to take Wednesday away from us he will take away the only day we have now. This motion will come up next week or the week after; and if Wednesday is taken away, private members will have no day left.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well, I will give you Tuesday. I would say, however, that this is either a question of privilege or it is not, and I think the hon. gentleman ought, at a convenient time, in justice to the member whose name is mentioned, give him and give the House notice of the course he is going to take.

Mr. BLAKE. Contemporaneously with this, an arrangement might be made to put the motion on the Orders of the Day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that the arrangement made with the hon. gentleman is that this matter should take precedence on Tuesday?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may just say the motion will be calling attention to the fact of those letters published in the *Globe*, and now placed on our Votes and Proceedings, and I shall then demand that the hon. gentleman's conduct shall be dealt with by the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman should formulate the motion and put it on the Votes and Proceedings, in justice to the hon. member.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I shall endeavor to have that done at a reasonable date.

The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has pretty ample notice of all this, and it ought to be quite sufficient if the motion is put on the paper on Friday or Saturday, which will give him two days to consider the case.

Mr. RYKERT. Go on as fast as you like. I am not in the least alarmed about your motion. I will deal with you afterwards.

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 110) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day. He said: I shall claim, Mr. Speaker, the privilege of following the custom in the British House of Commons, and make a few remarks on the first reading of this Bill. The Lord's Day Alliance of the Dominion of Canada was organised nearly two years ago in Ottawa, and at the meeting of this Alliance the following subjects were selected for consideration, and the following motions made:—

"On the evening of Friday, 20th April, 1888, a conference of representative men from the different religious bodies was held in the City Hall, Ottawa, for the purpose of discussing the question of united effort in promoting the due observance of the Lord's Day. There were representative clergymen present from all the denominations, and among the laymen a number of Senators and Members of Parliament.

"The Hon. G. W. Allan, Speaker of the Senate, was elected chairman of the meeting.

"At this meeting it was agreed, on motion of Archdeacon Lauder, seconded by John Charlton, M.P.: 1.—To organise an Alliance for the protection and preservation of the due observance of the Lord's Day.

"On motion of the Rev. Dr. Armstrong, seconded by Senator McKay: 2.—To issue a circular to the directors of the various Railway Companies, calling their attention to their duty in regard to the Lord's Day.

"On motion of Rev. J. Scanlon, seconded by Dr. Thorburn: 3.—To appoint a Committee to examine into the legal aspects of the Sabbath question, and to report as to the possibility of obtaining additional legislation; this Committee to consist of Hon. Speaker Allan, Hon. John Macdonald, John Charlton, M.P., George Jamieson, M.P., Prof. Weldon, M.P.

"On motion of Hon. J. Macdonald, seconded by Rev. J. Wood: 4.—To seek to educate public opinion with regard to Sabbath observance by means of the pulpit, the press, and petition.

"On motion of Dr. Armstrong, seconded by Rev. H. Pollard: 5.—To ask the various religious bodies to appoint delegates who shall represent them in the Alliance.

"The following officers were appointed:—President, Hon. Speaker Allan; Vice-Presidents, Hon. John Macdonald, John Charlton, M.P., Archdeacon Lauder, Hon. J. Macdonald (B.C.). These, with a committee of resident ministers, were to submit a constitution for adoption at the next annual meeting.

"The following officers were chosen for this organisation:—President, Hon. G. W. Allan; Vice-Presidents: Ontario, John Charlton, Esq., M.P., Quebec, Rev. John Scanlon (Montreal); New Brunswick, President St. John's Society for promoting the due observance of the Lord's Day; Nova Scotia, President Halifax Lord's Day Observance Society; Prince Edward Island, Hon. David Laird; Manitoba, Right Rev. Bishop Machray, D.D.; North-West Territory, Right Rev. Bishop Pinkham, D.D.; British Columbia, Hon. W. J. Macdonald, Secretary, Rev. Dr. Armstrong (Ottawa). Treasurer, George Hay (Ottawa). Executive Committee: Rev. Jos. White, Rev. H. Pollard, Rev. John Wood, Rev. G. McRitchie, Rev. T. W. Winfield, Rev. W. J. Crothers, Mr. John Charlton, M.P., Sheriff Sweetland, Dr. Thorburn, Messrs. John A. Cameron, Wm. Porter, Frank P. Bronson, Paul M. Robins, Neil McKinnon."

At a meeting held the year afterwards a committee was appointed to report as to the power of this House to legislate with reference to the Lord's Day observance, and the following report was presented:—

"Resolved, That, in the opinion of this meeting, the Parliament of Canada is competent to enact laws to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day. Section 91, subsection 27, of the British North America Act, empowers the Parliament of Canada to enact criminal laws. Parliament can, therefore, clearly bring Lord's Day legislation within the scope of this sub-section, by making breaches of the law, in such matters, misdemeanors. We are further of the opinion that the powers to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada, includes the power to secure the due observance of the Lord's Day by proper legislation. We are also of the opinion that legislation securing the better observance of the Lord's Day, in matters pertaining to general railway traffic, the management of the postal service, and the management of the railways and canals belonging to the Dominion, is, in the highest sense, necessary for promoting peace, order and good government in the Dominion of Canada."

A committee, consisting of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and myself, was appointed to prepare a Bill in pursuance with this resolution. This subject of the Lord's Day observance unquestionably elicits the active sympathy and co-operation of all the evangelical communities in this Dominion. The feeling evinced by these bodies is indicated pretty clearly by the resolutions introduced into the Dominion Synod of the Anglican Church with reference to this subject. The motion was made by the Hon. G. W. Allan, and, as it is brief, I will read it, as a specimen of the action taken by the various religious bodies in the Dominion:

"That this Synod do petition the Parliament of the Dominion, at its next Session, to enact such laws as will secure the better observance of the Lord's Day in the Dominion in all matters pertaining to general railway traffic, the management of the postal service, and in the management of the railways and canals belonging to the Dominion, as well as in all other matters over which Parliament has control, and that such petition be signed on behalf of this Synod by the presiding officers of each House."

This motion was seconded by Dean Carmichael, and passed unanimously. The Lord's Day Alliance of this Dominion is co-operating in this work with the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States, which is attempting to influence public sentiment in that country, as the Lord's Day Alliance of the Dominion is in this country.

It is not necessary for me, to-day, to enter into any discussion as to the religious aspect of the Lord's Day question. The Sabbath, unquestionably, was instituted by the Creator at creation, as we are informed in Genesis, second chapter.

Mr. AMYOT. It was Saturday.

Mr. CHARLTON. It was the seventh day. The language is: "The Lord rested from His labors on the seventh day and sanctified it." The change of the Sabbath to the first day of the week, which was made at the time of the Resurrection of our Redeemer, was a change which all Christian bodies, both Catholic and Protestant, have accepted as proper. They accept it on the ground that the Resurrection of Christ was a greater event than the creation of the world. But this Bill takes lower ground, if I may use the term. It bases the necessity of the observance of one day in seven on the interest of the public merely, in securing a day of rest for all who may be engaged in labor. I need not stop at this moment to attempt to prove what is universally accepted, that it is a physical necessity that man should have a day of rest at regular intervals; and experience teaches that one day in seven is the natural period, the observance of which is for both his physical and moral well-being.

I may say that the delay in introducing this Bill has been due to the absence of my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), who was to act in concert with me in this matter. The Bill, however, is prepared, and I beg briefly to call the attention of the House to its provisions. There are only a few clauses in it, and I do not know that I should be trespassing on the patience of the House unduly if I were to read them :

"Whereas it is desirable, in the interests of religion, morality and the public welfare, that better provisions shall be made for securing the observance of the first day of the week, hereafter called the Lord's Day, as a day of rest: Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

"1. Whoever on the Lord's Day shall either labor himself, or shall compel his apprentice, servant or other person under his control or charge to labor, or perform any other work than the household offices of daily necessity or other works of necessity or charity, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

"2. Whoever on the Lord's Day sells, or publicly shows forth or exposes or offers for sale, or purchases, any goods, chattels, or other personal property, or any real estate whatsoever, or does any work or business of his ordinary calling, works of necessity and charity only excepted, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

"3. Whoever shall on the Lord's Day be guilty of promoting, directing, or causing horse racing, foot racing, cock fighting, or dog fighting, or shall engage in any noisy public game whereby the peace and quiet of the Lord's Day is disturbed, and manual labor made necessary in preparing for and conducting the same, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

"4. Whoever shall on the Lord's Day, tipple in any inn, tavern, house of public entertainment, or shall allow or permit tipping in any such inn, tavern, or house of public entertainment, or shall revel or publicly exhibit himself in a state of intoxication, or shall brawl or use profane language in the public streets or open air, so as to create any riot or disturbance or annoyance to Her Majesty's peaceable subjects, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

"5. Whoever shall on the Lord's Day hunt, shoot, or pursue, or take or kill any game or any wild bird or animal, or shall discharge fire-arms, except in the just defence of person or property, or in the performance of military or police duty, or shall use dogs, net, trap, or other appliance for the abovementioned purposes, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

"6. Whoever shall on the Lord's Day go out fishing, or shall take, kill or destroy any fish or use any gun, fishing rod, net or other appliance for that purpose, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

"7. Whoever shall on the Lord's Day, either as proprietor, publisher or manager, engage in the printing, publication and delivery of a newspaper, journal or periodical; and whoever shall on the Lord's day engage in the sale, distribution or circulation of any newspaper, journal or periodical published on that day, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor."

This latter is an important section, which will now, if adopted, be embodied for the first time in Sabbath legislation. The Sunday newspapers, in the experience of countries where its publication is permitted, notably in the United States, is found to be one of the greatest sources of demoralisation that exist. One of its evil effects is, that it keeps up the strain pertaining to daily business every day in the week. It interferes with Sabbath rest and quiet, and tends to destroy the sense of withdrawal from worldly employments, excitements and occupations. It leads to the desecration of the day in numberless ways, and is known to be in that country a crying evil of giant proportions, one that the Christian people of the United States would gladly put down. Could they have foreseen the extent to which that evil has grown to-day, they would not have permitted it to exist at all. We, in Canada, are at a point where we can prevent this evil arising in our

Mr. CHARLTON.

country. There are, I believe, two Sunday newspapers in the Dominion—one at Victoria, B.C., and one at Vancouver, B.C.; with these exceptions, we have none, and if we profit by the experience of our neighbors, we shall take steps to prevent this fruitful source of irreligion and disquiet being established in this country.

"8. No canal belonging to Canada shall be open for traffic or business on the Lord's Day; but this provision may be set aside by Order in Council after the first day of November in each year."

This qualification is introduced because, in the case of vessels coming down the lakes, it is often a matter of great importance that they should reach their destination at a certain time towards the close of navigation, and one day's delay might prevent them doing so.

"9. No post office in Canada shall be open for the delivery of letters or the transaction of business, other than the reception of mails, on the Lord's Day."

It is supposed that it is necessary to receive mails on Sunday if they are delayed. But it is deemed in the highest degree important that the Government should, in the management of the canals and post offices of the Dominion, set a good example to the public, and should themselves avoid being guilty of the sin of Sabbath desecration.

Section 10, with regard to railway traffic, is one of considerable importance. The subject is one with which it is very difficult to deal. The question is an important one, because a great many men are employed on our railways. I suppose from 25,000 to 30,000 men are employed on the different railways of Canada. The majority of these men are compelled to work on the Sabbath, to a greater or less extent, which is a very serious injury to their social and religious interests. The railway man who is obliged to leave his home on the Sabbath cannot feel otherwise than degraded by the character of the work he is engaged in. I have frequently talked with railway men, and they lamented the necessity they were under of laboring on the Sabbath, and of their inability to remain at home with their families and go to Sabbath school and to church. They felt they were debased by being compelled to do business on that day. It is a cruelty and a hardship that more than twenty thousand men in this Dominion should be deprived on the Lord's Day of worshipping with their families in the various places of public worship which they might wish to attend. The railway companies, in their operations, attract the attention of a great many people, and the influence they exercise on the observance of the Sabbath is of a most demoralising nature. But there are many very serious difficulties surrounding the case. There is, for instance, the through traffic in connection with the American roads. Our railways are helpless in this respect, for if they wish to put an end to working on Sunday, they will require the co-operation of the American roads, or will be obliged to sacrifice a large portion of their through traffic. Unless we can have concurrent legislation on the part of the American Government, it will be impossible to deal with this branch of the question. Then there is the transportation of perishable goods, which is a work of necessity, and no law can properly prohibit the transportation of these goods on the Lord's Day. Then there are various contingencies, such

as snow blockades, which may delay traffic for days, and thus compel the use of the Sabbath for the forwarding of traffic thus delayed. There are also accidents and stress of weather, which cannot be avoided. Now, I am happy to be able to believe that our railway officials in this country are enlightened Christian men, and not averse to any practicable legislation in the direction of securing more perfect observance of the Sabbath on their lines. They are, on the contrary, anxious that everything practicable should be done. A circular was addressed by the Secretary of the Alliance, the Reverend Dr. Armstrong, to railway managers, and replies were had from Sir Joseph Hickson and Mr. Van Horne, the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I will take the liberty of reading these communications. Sir Joseph Hickson writes as follows:—

“GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA,
“GENERAL MANAGER'S OFFICE,
“MONTREAL, 25th March, 1889.

“REVEREND SIR.—The question of Sunday labor on the railways of Canada is one beset with many difficulties, and it is hardly practicable to deal with it exhaustively within the compass of an ordinary letter.

“Personally, I have been, and am, opposed to Sunday labor, and would be very glad to see the running of all trains on the Lord's Day discontinued, but I believe this to be impracticable, and especially so in a country situated as Canada, with a population holding so many different religious views, and a considerable portion of which do not, from the moral standpoint, look upon the running of Sunday trains with disfavor.

“There are very few regular passenger trains run upon the Grand Trunk Railway on Sundays,—I may say none are started on their journey on that day, but such as the company have been seriously urged by the public to run. Trains which have started on their journeys on the preceding day, are run through to some central point on Sunday mornings, in some instances.

“As regards merchandise traffic, there are certain perishable articles which the company has felt compelled, when in transit on the preceding day, to move forward on the Lord's Day, and which if they refused to go forward, they would simply not carry at all. Then, it sometimes happens that, from blockages from snow, stress of weather, or accident, traffic which has been seriously delayed, has, in order to prevent loss to the owners, to be moved forward on the Sabbath.

“Over probably 2,100 out of 3,250 miles of the Grand Trunk Railway there are no trains run on Sundays, and over probably 430 more miles, the only trains are one passenger train passing in the early morning to the end of its journey begun on the preceding day.

“I am not satisfied that combined action of the railway companies in Canada would have the effect of curtailing materially the amount of Sunday labor on the railways of the country. Such action must necessarily extend to railways in the northern portion of the United States, to affect in any appreciable degree such work as is done on Sundays on the railways of Canada, as a result of competition for traffic.

“As any men who have to do a day's work on Sunday have the opportunity of taking some other day for rest, physically, I do not consider them in any sense suffer.

“That the Railway Company would suffer pecuniary loss if all traffic on its lines was entirely prohibited on Sundays, I think cannot be doubted. Most of the railway is a single track, and there is not the same elasticity of expansion of its capacity as there is in the case of double track railways; and when from the effects of storms or accidents the business is interrupted at some particular place, the limit of work which can be done in the six working days may easily be, indeed as at times exceeded on some portion of the railway. It is manifest that in addition to the loss to the Railway Company, the loss in such cases to the owners of commodities in transit, might be very serious, if under no circumstances was such traffic allowed to be moved on Sunday.

“I very sincerely wish your Association success. Many years ago, as you will see from the small volume which I have taken the liberty to send herewith for your perusal, efforts were made in England to effect reform in the matter of Sunday labor. Amongst other railway workers

at that time (1852) this volume was sent to me. I have ever since taken a deep interest in the subject of it.

“I am, Reverend and dear Sir,
“Yours faithfully,
“Rev. Dr. ARMSTRONG,
“Ottawa, Ont.” J. HICKSON.

Mr. Van Horne replied as follows:—

“THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.,
“MONTREAL, 11th June, 1888.

“Rev. Dr. W. D. ARMSTRONG,
“Ottawa, Ont.

“DEAR SIR.—Your circular of the 22nd ultimo has been received and will be laid before our directors at their next meeting. I think, however, that I may anticipate their action by answering your three questions as follows:—First, our Sunday traffic is already limited to clear cases of necessity. Second, it is impossible to define the extent of the Sunday traffic on the railway, as such traffic largely depends upon emergencies, few of which can be anticipated. Our passenger trains when they start from the termini are obliged to run through without laying over, and as between five and six days are required for the through trip it is impossible to arrange these trains so that they will not, to some extent, run on Sunday somewhere on the line. We have arranged, however, so that no main line trains will arrive at Montreal Sunday morning or leave there Sunday night. This arrangement is made with a view to avoiding Sunday trains on the main line in the most populous district traversed by it, namely, between Montreal and Carleton Place. I may say generally, in answer to your second question, that our train arrangements, to the extent that trains are required to intrude more or less on Sundays, whether on the main line or elsewhere, are forced upon us by the action of the American lines with which we are competing for traffic, and I can see no way to overcome this difficulty without destroying our through business, upon which the railway largely depends for support.

“As to your third question, I beg to say that there are very many local lines in the United States as well as in Canada that can stop Sunday traffic entirely without pecuniary loss, but I do not see how a line of, say, five hundred or a thousand miles in length, forming part of a great through route can do so. It has been tried in a number of cases without success.

“So far as the effect of Sunday work on railway men is concerned, I have never observed any ill effects from such Sunday work as the emergencies of the service may require them to perform. They look upon it as emergency work, and accept it as such. An experience of more than thirty years in railway work has convinced me that the railway men both in Canada and the United States are, as a class, above the average in point of sobriety and morality. This is doubtless to some extent due to the discipline which is maintained in all branches of the service.

“In conclusion, I beg to assure you that those responsible for the management of the railway are as anxious as anyone can be to avoid all Sunday work, and that no effort has been or will be spared to restrict it to the closest possible limits.

“Yours truly,

“W. C. VAN HORNE,
“Vice-President.”

Mr. Ledyard, the President of the Michigan Central has stated that he was opposed to Sunday traffic, that he never had permitted excursion trains on that day over his road, and, so far as it lay in his power, he discouraged Sunday business. I am happy in thus being able to say that it is evident the managers of the great railway lines in Canada are not wilful trespassers upon the Divine law in this respect, and do not allow Sunday traffic, except in what they deem to be cases of unavoidable necessity. However, it is well to make some provision with regard to this matter. We may safely aver that there is a growing tendency to Sabbath desecration on the part of railway companies, and the section I propose with regard to this matter is one to which I would ask the attention of the House:

“10. Any railway corporation, superintendent, traffic manager, or person or persons by virtue of whose authority and command railway cars or trains shall on the Lord's

Day be loaded at any railway station in Canada, or despatched from such station when loaded, or permitted to continue a journey, (except in the case of perishable goods) with Canadian local freight; or any person or persons as aforesaid who shall direct local passenger trains to be run on the Lord's Day (except one mail train each way, and one milk train on each road), or shall direct empty cars to be moved from station to station, within the territory of Canada, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor. But two through passenger trains each way, with their necessary connections, shall be permitted on any trunk line of Canada, when American through passenger train connections render such trains necessary."

Then there is a provision that,

"At such time as the laws of the United States shall make corresponding provision, no through freight in transit from one point on the frontier of the United States to some other point on the said frontier shall be allowed to pass over Canadian roads on the Lord's Day, except live stock and perishable goods."

These provisions, in brief, amount to this: The movement of local freight, except in regard to perishable goods, is prohibited. The movement of empty cars is prohibited. The loading of cars on the Lord's Day is prohibited; and the movement of cars on the Sabbath Day is prohibited locally; but no restriction is placed in regard to through freight, because it is impossible to deal with that matter except when it is dealt with by the American Government. I am afraid that this provision will not meet the views of some of our religious friends, but my hon. friend Mr. Weldon and myself could not see how it was possible to deal with the matter in a more drastic way. The 11th section is practically the law of Ontario now. It is in regard to excursions, and was introduced into this House some years ago by myself:

"11. Excursions upon the Lord's Day by steamboats plying for hire, or by railway, or in part by steamboat and in part by railway, and having for their only or principal object, the carriage of passengers for amusement or pleasure, and to go and return the same day by the same steamboat or railway, or any others owned by the same persons or company, shall not be deemed a lawful conveying of passengers within the meaning of this Act; and the owner or corporation, superintendent or person, by virtue of whose authority and direction such excursion is permitted or ordered on the Lord's Day, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor."

These are the provisions of the Bill in regard to the infractions of the law which it is proposed to enact. I am clearly of the opinion that Sunday excursions are unnecessary and demoralising, that they involve unnecessary labor, and that they are destructive of the Sabbath quiet and rest. Christian people will not go on these excursions, and they are generally scenes of riot and disorder. These excursions also deprive the employes of the railway and steamboat companies of the rest to which they are entitled.

The rest of the Bill provides for the mode of procedure. Any person convicted under the sections from No. 1 to No. 7, may be fined \$50, or imprisonment in default. Under sections 10 and 11, there may be a fine imposed not exceeding \$400. I say, without hesitation, that this Bill is demanded by the Christian sentiment of this country. I do not believe there is a provision in the Bill which will not be accepted by the Christians of Canada. Even the Catholic Church, even Cardinal Taschereau—

Mr. AMYOT. We can manage our own affairs.

Mr. CHARLTON. It may be true that they can manage their own affairs; but the Christians of this country, including, if I am not misinformed, Cardinal Taschereau, believe that a uniform Sunday law should prevail. The Sabbath Day Alliance has

Mr. CHARLTON.

taken a stand on this matter, and has instructed me to introduce the Bill which I now introduce. I introduce this Bill believing it to be for the good of man; for the good of the laborer; in order to get for the laborer his weekly rest; in order to save him from merciless employers who would take seven days' labor out of him for six days' pay. This is in the interest of the laborer, and it is also in the interest of the employer; because it is in the interest of the employer to have a religious laborer, a sober laborer, a God-fearing laborer—one who keeps the commands of God. It is also in the interest of the State to have a community of God-fearing, moral citizens; and nothing is more calculated to produce that result than the observance of the Lord's Day. It is in the interest of the State, and it is in the interest of humanity at large. Moreover, and this is not the smallest consideration, it is in consonance with the command of the Creator to observe one day in seven as a day of rest; and, therefore, whatever may be thought of the Bill itself, I move its first reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PETERBORO' PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What amount of money has been paid to the following legal gentlemen respectively, namely: W. H. Moore, A. P. Poussette, Q.C., John O'Meara, John Green, E. A. Peck and John Burnham, Q.C., all of Peterboro', on account of legal services or otherwise, rendered by those gentlemen, or any of them, on account of, and in regard to, the following works, or any of them:—1st. The purchase of the site and the construction of the Peterboro' Post Office; 2nd. The purchase of the site for the construction of the Custom House at Peterboro'; 3rd. On account of the Trent Valley Canal, distinguishing if paid on survey or construction, or damages to land consequent on construction?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In January, 1886, there was a payment to Mr. Peck of \$152.38 for legal services in connection with the purchase of sites for public buildings at Peterboro'. Nothing has been paid to the other gentlemen.

SURVEY AT NORTH CARLTON POINT.

Mr. YEO asked, Whether the Government has caused a survey to be made at North Carlton Point, P.E.I.? If so, has the Engineer made a report of the same?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There has been no survey.

ERECTION OF POST OFFICES.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Seeing that the Government of the Dominion have erected, or have in course of construction, post offices in the following places in Quebec and the Lower Provinces, at a cost of about twenty-three thousand dollars each, the average receipts of which are \$1,415.38, viz. :—

Annapolis, Nova Scotia, receipts	... \$2,026 85
Dalhousie, New Brunswick	... 1,153 00
Joliette, Quebec	... 1,967 50
St. Henri	... 1,269 56
Aylmer	... 1,345 70
St. Jérôme	... 1,295 76
Lachine	... 825 18

Do the Government intend, in the Supplementary Estimates, to provide for the erection of post offices in Ontario in the following places:—

Listowel, receipts	\$4,348 78
Mount Forest "	3,716 98
Harrison "	2,973 65
Palmerston "	1,925 12
Arthur "	1,949 15
Clifford "	1,102 00

If not, why not ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to answer that question now. When the supplementaries come down, there will be an answer one way or the other.

LIEUT.-COL. DUVAR.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether Lieut.-Col. John Hunter Duvar, late Inspector of Fisheries for Prince Edward Island, is superannuated? If so, what is the date of his superannuation, and what amount? Whether the same Lieut.-Col. John Hunter Duvar is still in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?

Mr. COLBY. Lieut.-Col. John Hunter Duvar was superannuated on the 6th July, 1889, at an allowance of \$200 a year. He is not now in the employment of the Government.

FORTIFICATION OF ESQUIMALT.

Mr. PRIOR asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed shortly with the necessary works for the fortification of Esquimalt? Whether any arrangement has been arrived at with the Imperial Government in regard to the same?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The question of the necessary works for the fortification of Esquimalt is still the subject of correspondence between the Imperial and Canadian Governments. Under the circumstances, it is impossible to give any definite information in reference thereto.

SCRIP FOR VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the Deputy Minister of Justice has yet reported on the reference respecting scrip for volunteers and others, made to him by the right hon. the Prime Minister at the request of Messrs. Sproule, Davis, Macdowall and Davin? If so, when it will be laid before the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A report has been made upon it, and that report is now before Council.

COMMISSIONER OF NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether an humble Address to His Excellency the Governor General, from the Legislative Assembly of the North-West, praying for enquiry into serious statements made in the said Chamber reflecting on the conduct of the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, has reached His Excellency?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A resolution of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West on that subject was transmitted to the Secretary of State in the usual way.

CLAIM OF MRS. A. A. DOIG.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the papers in the case of Mrs. A. A. Doig's claim to the amount paid for improvements on west half of section 22, 21 west of Second Principal Meridian, were referred to the Minister of Justice to determine whether or not the money paid for the house by the person to whom she sold it, and which money was paid into the Land Office at Regina, should or should not be paid to the said Mrs. A. A. Doig? Whether the money has been paid to anybody? If so, to whom, at what date, and why; and was it paid before any report from the Department of Justice was received?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The papers were referred to the Department of Justice on the 29th April and 13th June, 1889. The money, it now appears, was paid by the agent of Dominion Lands at Regina on the 3rd March, 1889, to John Burns Doig, who had at one time a homestead entry for the half section mentioned, who erected the house, and who, according to the rule of the Department governing cases of this description, was entitled to receive it. It will thus be seen that the money was paid over before the date of the reference to the Department of Justice, but that fact was not within the knowledge of the Department until quite recently. The Department of Justice has now been requested to advise whether, in paying the money over to Mr. Doig, it has incurred any liability to Mrs. Doig, who claims under a marriage settlement. The amount involved is \$60.

RANK OF QUEEN'S COUNSEL.

Mr. AMYOT asked, In conferring on advocates the rank of Queen's Counsel, is it the intention of the Government to appoint them as such in courts created or maintained by the Provinces, or merely for courts created or maintained by the Dominion?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the intention, in making such appointments, to continue in use the form of commission heretofore used. That commission is understood to confer the right and precedence to which the persons receiving it may be entitled by law, by virtue of the appointment to be Queen's Counsel.

MAILS FROM READ TO SHANNONVILLE.

Mr. BURDETT moved for:

Return of all advertisements, contracts, petitions and correspondence touching or relating to the carriage of Her Majesty's mail from Read to Shannonville.

He said: I should like to ask the attention of the House while I offer a few observations in support of this motion, in order that hon. members and the country may understand the position in which a large number of my constituents are placed. Something over five years ago a contract was let to carry the mail from a post office called Read, in the Township of Tyendinaga, from there to Melrose and thence to Shannonville, and return the same day, going twice a week by way of a post office named Blessington. It was the people of Read, desiring a daily mail, sent a petition to the Postmaster General, and tenders having been asked, the service was granted to them at an annual cost of \$225. The service was efficiently performed, the mail starting from Read each morning, going to Melrose, a distance of some six miles, and then

to Shannonville in a southerly direction, returning in the afternoon, and going twice a week by way of Blessington. Tenders were subsequently asked for the same service, and the contract given to a gentleman who resides at Melrose. I have no objection to this gentleman having the contract to carry the mail; and he performed the service for some time efficiently and properly. The contract was then changed in order, it is said, to give Blessington a daily mail; and the mail carrier, instead of starting from Read, the most northerly post office, in the morning, was permitted to start from Melrose, where he lived, and he was allowed \$34.60 extra for carrying the mail daily by way of Blessington. Had this service been let by contract, I am instructed to undertake that it could have been performed for the same or less money, the mail carrier starting each morning from Read instead of from Melrose. The reason the carrier was allowed to start from Melrose was simply because he lives there and not at Read. The difficulty is this: A person writing a letter from Belleville to Read cannot get an answer, under the present system, within from three to four days. If a letter is written on Friday afternoon at Belleville, it goes to Shannonville, and is taken out to Melrose on Saturday, but it will not get to Read until Saturday night, and, therefore, an answer cannot be received in Belleville until Tuesday evening's train, and the reply will not be in the hands of the writer before Wednesday morning. There is neither telegraph, telephone or railway communication at Read, the nearest communication of this character being at Shannonville. Very great inconvenience is caused to the people by this arrangement, especially in case of sickness or death; but it is one of great advantage to the mail carrier. He obtains \$34.60 more than previously, or \$263 to deliver the mail, to start at Melrose, going out to Shannonville in the morning, coming back and going to Read by way of Blessington, and dropping the mail in the evening and returning to Melrose at night. So the person who gets a letter at Read has no opportunity to reply that day. The mail carrier, moreover, saves a distance of seventy-two miles a week, besides obtaining \$34.60 additional. What is asked is, that the Postmaster General should look into this matter. I will guarantee that the service can be performed for the same money, and good security given, and have the mail start at Read every morning instead of at Melrose. I have no objection to the gentleman at Melrose having charge of the mail; he is a good, active supporter of the Government. I make no complaint in regard to the Government employing him, and I offer no serious objection to a little extra money being given to him; but if he receives extra money for performing extra work, the service should not be so changed that during the year he receives \$34.60 additional, or \$263.60 for the year's service, and has 3,600 miles cut off the distance. This is a great advantage to him, but a very great disadvantage to the people. It is a thickly-settled district; every farm is occupied, and has been occupied for fifty years; and the people are entitled to a daily mail, especially when they are entirely without any railway or telegraph communication, and when it takes so long to obtain a reply to a letter sent from Belleville, considering that the distance by road is only about eighteen miles. I am

Mr. BURDETT.

satisfied the Postmaster General will remedy this matter now that it has been brought to his attention.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no objection to all the correspondence on the subject being brought down. The change in the mode of performing the service between Read and Shannonville was made, as the hon. gentleman states, in order to give Blessington Post Office a daily mail. At that time the carrier between Read and Shannonville passed over the route daily, a detour being made every few days in order to serve Blessington. An offer was made by the contractor to serve the place daily at an increased rate—I think, \$34.60 additional. On 21st November, Mr. White laid before me an offer from the contractor to carry the mails daily from Melrose and from Read and Blessington to Shannonville and return for an additional sum of \$40. This offer was accepted, and the inspector at Kingston was ordered to carry it out. The inspector, however, stated that Mr. Ray had misunderstood the proposition, and his offer was to carry the mails from Melrose direct to Shannonville and return *via* Blessington and Read. The inspector thought this proposition was not as good an offer as the other, and he did not recommend it. However, on consulting with some parties there, it was thought that the service as proposed by Mr. Ray would be as acceptable as the other one, and we resolved to try it. It is at present being tried. It is true I had a letter from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burdett), protesting against the arrangement and enclosing a petition. I gave him the information that we would try the arrangement, as at present existing, for a short time; and if it did not answer, we would try to accommodate your views in the matter.

Mr. BURDETT. There is another matter to which I would call the attention of the hon. Postmaster General. A merchant in Melrose writes to me, that he sends about \$6,000 a year through the mail, there being no bank or any other means of sending the money, and that, besides him, many other persons are obliged also to send their money through the mail. I personally know the postmaster at Melrose, and I know him to be a man above reproach; but that money lies over night at Melrose, and he has no vault or safe in which to keep it. If that money were lost, through robbery or fire, it would be a serious matter for these people; and I would like to know who would bear the loss? I know the money will not be lost by any want of care on the part of the postmaster, but, nevertheless, precautions should be taken so as to prevent any possibility of its being stolen by burglars or destroyed by fire. I am glad to hear the Postmaster General say that if the present system is found to be inconvenient, after a trial is given, it will be changed.

Motion agreed to.

DAMAGES DONE BY STEAMERS, &c.

Mr. COOK moved for:

Return of all claims made by the Government since Confederation against individuals, companies or corporations, for damages, done to Government property by steamers, vessels or other craft; giving the names of vessels, &c., their owners, dates and items of each claim, distinguishing those paid and unpaid.

He said: In connection with this motion, I have only to say that I understand there is a very large amount due to the Government by parties whose vessels have done damage to Government property, and from whom the damages have not been collected. I understand also that, in some instances, persons who were of a different political stripe from the present Government were made to pay up immediately, while it was not collected from the Government's friends. Be that as it may, when the return comes down we will be placed in possession of all the facts, and if the case is as I am informed, I will have an opportunity of discussing it at greater length.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CHARLTON moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in all cases where an election is held in any riding in Canada for the return of a member to the House of Commons, if the voters' list for such riding, prepared under the Dominion Franchise law, have not been prepared, revised and published within twelve months of the time of holding such election, that then and in such case the said election shall be held upon the last Provincial voters' list, provided the same is a more recent list than the latest Dominion voters' list.

He said: I think, Sir, the nature of this amendment must commend itself to the approbation of both sides of the House, and I cannot see that any objection can be made to its adoption. The right of every citizen who has the necessary qualification to vote, and who is 21 years of age, cannot be questioned by any man. If it should happen again, as it has happened before through the negligence of the Government, that the voters' lists were not revised annually, and that in consequence citizens of the full age of 21 years should be deprived of the rights of suffrage, some other provision should be made to secure for them the right of the franchise if they are justly entitled to it. During a period of three years no revision of the lists was held, and if a general election had taken place, which might have been the case, for we are liable at any time to have a dissolution of Parliament, the Government would have gone to the country on a list three years old, and many persons of 23 and 24 years of age, having, in addition, the required qualifications, would have been deprived of the right to vote. That is a condition of things which should not be tolerated for a moment, and if there is any possibility of such occurring again, a safeguard similar to that I now propose in this motion ought to be adopted without delay. The election previous to the last one in the county of Haldimand, was held upon a list under which, I venture to say, no man in the county under 24 years of age voted. There was a large percentage of votes cast in that election which would not have been on the revised list, and a large percentage of the voters entitled to vote were not able to do so. The same thing would have occurred in every constituency in this Dominion, if there had been a general election, in consequence of the failure of the Government to revise the list between 1886 and 1889. We have been distinctly told by the hon. Secretary of State this Session that the cost was so great, the Government were not justified in revising this list every year, and he foreshadowed most distinctly that it was not the intention of the Government to revise that list next year. It is, therefore, more than probable

that the next general election will be held on the list which has been lately revised. The Government stand aghast at the cost of preparing this list; they shrink from subjecting the country to the enormous expense, and I venture to say, they do not intend to do so. If, then, they do not revise the list, why not make the arrangement I propose in this motion, and which would be a safeguard against the probability or the possibility of perpetrating a great wrong on the electors of this Dominion? The adoption of this motion would have another advantage, because, if we were obliged to resort to the Provincial lists, it would give us a better list than the Dominion list. In the Province of Ontario, it would give us a list based upon the broader principle of universal suffrage, a list more popular with the people, a list in accordance with the public sentiment in Ontario, and a list which the Government ought to adopt, if they were governed by the principles of right and justice. There is another consideration in the matter which is not the least one, and which I had in my mind when I was preparing this motion. I will give the Government a chance to gracefully and quietly drop this white elephant, the franchise law. They do not like to retrace their steps, or to acknowledge that the Bill is what it is, a bungle and a fiasco, and one that they should repeal. But if they would adopt my substitute, they would be able to revert to the Provincial lists without the necessity of any action on their part, and without the necessity of any direct legislation on the subject. I am sure that nineteen-twentieths of their supporters would be pleased to see this amendment adopted, and to return to the use of the Provincial lists. We have here not only a safeguard against the recurrence of such abuses as have occurred in Haldimand, of holding an election on lists which are two or three years old, but a means by which the Government can drop gracefully the bungling legislation which they have placed on the Statute-book, and return to the Provincial lists. I beg to move this resolution, seconded by Mr. Paterson, of Brant.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman bases his resolution on untenable grounds. He bases it upon the assumption that the Dominion voters' lists will not be revised every year. If the hon. gentleman was in possession of information which would satisfy his mind that they would not be revised every year, then there would be some good grounds for his moving this resolution. But, with the improvements that have been made from time to time in the Dominion Franchise Act, and the consequent reduction in the cost of revising the lists, it is not at all improbable that they will be revised annually as the Provincial lists are, besides the law provides for it. Therefore, I do not think it would be wise to adopt the course suggested by the hon. member for North Norfolk. It would cause confusion in the minds of the electors, because they would mix up the one franchise law with the other, and have to learn the provisions of both, whenever they wanted to hold an election. I do not see that there would be any great injustice done to the people, even if the lists were not revised every year. Supposing they were not revised for two years, it would be no greater injustice to ask the people to return a member to this House by the electorate found

on the existing lists, than it would be to ask them to return a member on a franchise entirely different from one under which they would elect a member to this House. We know that the different Provinces have different franchises, and the result would be that, as was the case before the Dominion Franchise Act was enacted, members of this House would be elected on different franchises; and I think there would be less irregularity in electing a member on the Dominion lists, even though they might be a year or two old, than by adopting a new one. I think this is only another attempt, made in a roundabout way, to discredit the Dominion Franchise Act, which I believe is growing more and more popular every year. I think it is a law that is based on sound principles and that it ought to be sustained by this House. If this innovation is allowed, it is only one step, and then the ingenuity of hon. gentlemen opposite will suggest something else in the direction of discrediting this law. Therefore, I think this first step should be opposed by the House, and the Government should retain the Act for the purpose for which it was intended.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I certainly do not agree with the remarks made by the last speaker with reference to the resolution before the House. I consider it desirable, as, no doubt, every member of the House well knows, that we should revert to the Provincial lists for Dominion election purposes; but failing that, I should prefer doing what this resolution proposes—reverting to the Provincial lists in cases where the Dominion lists have not been revised for over a year, as that plan would give, to persons having the right, an opportunity to record their votes in the event of an election taking place. It is the right of every individual of good standing in society, who has attained the age of 21 years, to be placed on the voters' list, if he complies with the requirements of the law. It is the duty of the Government to place him in a position to record his vote, and if they fail to do that, through no fault of his, they inflict a wrong upon him. I believe this resolution embodies a principle we ought to resort to, and I regret exceedingly that the Government cannot see their way to adopting it, and utilising the provincial forms and rules as far as possible without infringing on the rights of the Dominion. My hon. friend who last spoke says that, by a reduction in the expenses of revising the Dominion lists, we shall very likely have a revision every year. I dissent from that view. I say it is the duty of the Government to revise those lists every year, and they have no right, by failing to do so, to deprive any person of his privilege of being placed upon it. We ought to have a revision every year; but if any circumstance should occur in any locality, by which, either from neglect on the part of the officials or from any other reason, the list should not be revised, then this resolution would give the people the right to record their votes under the Provincial lists. My hon. friend says that this Franchise Act is becoming very popular. I ask, where is the evidence of that? Is it at any Conservative convention or annual meetings, or in the speeches made by any Conservative candidates on the hustings? Not a single one ever dared to get up on the public platform and defend the Franchise Act.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes, they did.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). They knew that the Act was conceived and brought forth in iniquity and intended to deprive the people of their rights. The hon. member dared to speak about the popularity of this Act. Why, it is as unpopular an Act as any Act could possibly be; and although the Gerrymander Act was one that should never have been placed on the Statute-book, the Franchise Act was intended to strike a blow at the liberties and rights of the people, which the Prime Minister knew full well would be its effect, if carried out according to its original inception. The hon. gentleman says: "Oh, we have this Act, and if the local lists are to be used, that would create confusion." Have we not confusion now? People living in the same municipality, side by side, permitted to vote on the local lists, and under the impression that they are on the Dominion list, when they come to record their votes for their candidate in the Commons, they are quietly told they have no vote. I do not wish to detain the House, the majority of which is, I am aware, very much wedded to this Dominion Franchise Act. It operated in their favor considerably during the last election, but the feeling of the country is aroused, and unless some means are adopted of lessening the enormous expenditure necessary to carry it into effect, the people will protest at the next election, and instead of the Act being beneficial to hon. gentlemen opposite, they will find it an injury. If I cannot get the Act repealed, I am strongly in favor of this resolution, so that every individual entitled to be placed on the list, shall not, by arbitrary application of the Act, be disfranchised.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can quite understand the motion of my hon. friend who introduced and did not carry the resolution the other day. He based his resolution upon the principle that it was preferable to adopt a Provincial electorate than to have one Dominion electorate. He pressed that resolution with his usual ability and earnestness, and his resolution was quite intelligible. But I must say that the resolution now before us is beyond my comprehension. In the first place, it tries to bring in a small slice of the proposition of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson), and, in the most ridiculous form, it next brings in the proposition that if in any constituency there happens to be a later Provincial list than the Dominion list, then the Provincial list must prevail; and in that county or constituency, for that election, there is to be quite a different electorate, so that for one single election in one single constituency there may be a different body of men voting for the Dominion elections from the electorate in all the other counties. The hon. gentleman supposes that there is going to be no revision during the present year. That is a supposition which the hon. gentleman has no foundation for indulging in.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have the declaration of the Secretary of State to that effect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Nothing of the kind; and the answer that I gave to the question, the other day, ought to be sufficient for that purpose. The law says that there has to be a revision every year.

Mr. LAURIER. The law said so in 1887.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was not the Government, but Parliament that changed it. I am not at all aware—I do not see it written on the faces of any of my hon. friends on either side—of any resolve to withdraw the law or to interfere this year. If there be interference, there must be a revision. All these reforms and all these revisions come from Ontario. They look at the lists of Ontario and at the electorate of Ontario, and my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson), and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), both happen to like the franchise in Ontario better than the franchise of the Dominion. They propose, without reference to the other Provinces, without reference to whether it will lower a constituency for a particular occasion, or a particular election, at a particular time, to hand over one election at one time, to one set of voters, when, perhaps, in case, which is not improbable, the Liberal member would be elected, he would be unseated by the court, and a new election for the same constituency held, there would be quite a different electorate. This stepping in here with this resolution seems to me most ludicrous and most absurd, and I am surprised that my hon. friend from North Norfolk would think of making such a hand-to-mouth change, which may disturb the electorate in twenty, thirty or forty constituencies after a general election, and then, in case of another election, quite a different body of electors will be called on to return their representatives.

Mr. LAURIER. The motion of my hon. friend, ludicrous as it may be to the right hon. gentleman, would not have been moved at all, I am sure, if the Government had done their duty by the country. My hon. friend was induced to make this motion, and it was a proper inducement, by the course the Government have taken. Time and again, as the hon. gentleman knows, the Government have been afraid or ashamed—I do not know which—to carry out the law. We are not sure at this moment whether we will have this year a revision. The only assurance we have is the statement made by the Prime Minister, who this moment and only a day or two ago said that the law requires there should be a revision every year. But the hon. gentleman forgets that the law required that in 1887 and in 1888 there should have been a revision; and yet, though the law imposed that as a necessity on the Government, the right hon. gentleman knows that in those two years there was no revision, and it is because there may be no revision this year that my hon. friend provides that we should have the best lists to be had under the circumstances. We have had the declaration of the Secretary of State, three weeks ago, that, in his opinion we should have no yearly revision, and that declaration has not been contradicted so far by any member of the Administration; and, under such circumstances, the hon. gentleman has no right to characterise as ludicrous the motion of my hon. friend. Let the hon. gentleman state at once if we shall have a revision this year, and my hon. friend will withdraw his motion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The statement made by the hon. the Secretary of State on the subject of the annual revision of the Franchise Act, furnished the text to nine-tenths of the debate on the resolution of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson), and we had the changes rung by hon.

gentlemen opposite on this statement, which was given by them with variations entirely astray from the speech itself, and it seems now that the same observations are to be made the text of this debate and the foundation for this resolution. We have had just announced to this House, that in the previous debate the Secretary of State declared that there ought not to be a revision every year. I presume these gentlemen have been misled, not by the observations of the Secretary of State, but by those of the gentlemen who followed him in that debate, because the Secretary of State said nothing of the kind. He declared, in the first place, that he was speaking not for the Government, but for himself; and, having guarded himself to that extent, he said it would not be justifiable to have a revision if the cost would amount to as much as that of last year, but he said then that he believed the cost would be reduced 30 per cent. So, instead of stating that there would not be a revision every year, the statement of my hon. friend would lead to the contrary conclusion. The observations which were presented by the Prime Minister in regard to the inconvenience and inconsistency of having a double franchise for this Parliament, can be further supplemented by a glance at the result which would happen in any constituency where, by delay, neglect or accident, the revision was not completed. There are constituencies where, by reason of the distances and the inconvenience of travel at certain times of the year, the revision is delayed for months beyond the time prescribed by law. The delay caused by the occurrence of any accidents to the mail, or the death or illness of the revising officer while the revision was to be completed, might result in disfranchising many voters if the Provincial lists were resorted to, though it might enfranchise some. That would be the case if a member were unseated and another election had to be held. The result of the proposition of the hon. gentleman would be, in that case, that we would have 214 members of this House elected upon one franchise and one member elected on another franchise.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You have that now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman knows that it does not exist now. He knows that, for the purpose of having a proper franchise for this House, we have established the franchise upon which members here are elected. Under the circumstances to which I have alluded, if the hon. member will glance at the remarks of the Secretary of State, as they are reported in the *Hanward*, he will feel himself called upon to withdraw this resolution.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The First Minister has been pleased to characterise this motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk as a ludicrous motion. The hon. gentleman must have overlooked the fact that I seconded this motion, and, therefore, being a grave person myself, it could not be a ludicrous motion; and I see that the Minister of Justice treats this as a grave subject. I, therefore, think it is taken out of the category of ludicrous motions. I may say that I did not see the usual jollity which we observe on the part of the First Minister when a ludicrous motion is before the House. The right hon. gentleman cited the arguments which had been advanced on

both sides. I can see some force in what he advanced in reference to a bye-election being run, provided that the motion before the House should prevail, upon a list of the Province. That being contested, the election being voided, another election might be ordered in which the Dominion list would be used. I can see that there is some little force in that. But what harm would, practically, be worked by it? Besides, while objections may be urged against almost every measure, nothing has ever equalled the everweighing arguments against the use of the Dominion voters' list during the past few years. The history of this measure shows that these lists, instead of being revised every twelve months, as the law provides, were not revised for thirty-six or perhaps for forty-eight months. I have never given my assent to the principle of this Bill, and I believe the vast majority of the members of this House do not approve of it or assent to it. It is a costly and expensive measure. The expense reached the figures which the Opposition predicted, about half a million dollars, and then the Government themselves were alarmed and adopted provisions overriding the law, postponing the revision of the voters' list for two or three years. Now we are told that the law compels the Government to have a revision every year, but we were told that in the first year after the adoption of the Act, and yet it remained a dead letter for two years afterwards. The next year the hon. gentleman brought down a proposal to postpone the revision for another year, and he did the same thing a year afterwards. So that, in fact, that list which was prepared from the assessment rolls was virtually the same at the bye-elections which were held two years after its date as it was when it was prepared, and it was unrevised for the best part of four years. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) does not desire that to occur again. We have had a motion made to return to the use of the Provincial franchises, but that was lost, and now we are shut up in the use of the Dominion list, with almost a certainty, notwithstanding what the Minister of Justice has stated, that this Dominion voters' list will not be revised every year, but that there will be seen in this Parliament in the future the spectacle we have seen in the past—that the Ministry will come down and propose to suspend the operations of the Act for a year, and perhaps for another year, and so the same state of things will prevail. Perhaps the First Minister was not in the House when the Secretary of State spoke on this subject, and said that it was probable that we would not have a revision of the voters' list again. The Secretary of State, who was the prime defender of this Bill, when it was attacked by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) the other day, said, according to *Hansard* :

"I do not see that it is necessary, I do not see that it works harder for one side or the other, that a revision should take place every year."

The Minister of Justice will see that the Secretary of State was speaking as a member of the Government, and not for himself alone. But when we are talking of a Government measure, and a member of the Government gives his view in reference to the matter, and when he is the gentleman more particularly charged with this measure, when he says that he himself does not see that, as a matter of

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

policy, it is necessary it should be so, the plain, obvious inference is that it is not intended to have a revision of the voters' list every year. I cannot come to any other conclusion. The Secretary of State, I believe, did, in another part of his speech, state that if the revision was to cost the amount of money that it had cost, or even approaching it, or, I think, he said that if it cost even \$100,000 a year, it would not be desirable to have a revision every year, but he hoped to reduce the expenditure. Well, Sir, we have no guarantee, we have no expectation, we have no hope—at least, I have not—that we will be able to have a revision of the list at a cost of anything like that amount of money. Therefore, we are to face the fact that the member of the Government primarily charged with this Bill and all connected with it, does not give us any indication, does not afford us any hope, that we are to have this annual revision. Well, if we are to have that annual revision, what harm does the motion of the member for Norfolk do? Why, Sir, his motion does not propose that if the Provincial voters' list should happen to be newer than the revised Dominion voters' list, that it should be used; it provides that if it is newer, or if, in that municipality, the Dominion voters' list has not been revised for more than twelve months before, then you say, use the Provincial voters' list. It does not mean, for instance, that if you have a finally revised Dominion voters' list completed in October, and a finally completed Provincial voters' list revised and completed in November, that, therefore, you will use the Provincial voters' list. It would only be in case there had not been a revision of the Dominion voters' list within twelve months of the time the bye-election is held, that the Provincial voters' list would come into operation; and, therefore, if the Ministry wish us to understand, if they wish their followers to understand, that there is to be a revision of the Dominion voters' list every twelve months, then my hon. friend's motion would be inoperative. But if, on the other hand, we are to see in the future, as we have seen in the past, a suspension of this rule, lists not revised, running on for two or three years, where the electorate of a county has wholly changed; men voting that have no right to vote; young men that have grown up and become of age, entitled to the right that a free-born Canadian citizen is entitled to, but denied it by the operations of the law placed upon the Statute-book, kept upon the Statute-book by a Ministry powerful in this Parliament, but working under that disadvantage,—then I say that it is necessary that we have a motion something like the one introduced by the hon. member for North Norfolk. Why, the First Minister cannot be insensible of this fact, that it is a possible thing that his Government may be defeated—perhaps not today, perhaps not to-morrow; but he will admit that it is a possible thing that he may be defeated, and it is a possible thing that, instead of gracefully submitting to it and advising His Excellency to send for the leader of the Opposition to form a new Ministry, he might take the other course and advise His Excellency to dissolve the House and appeal to the country. Well, Sir, what would have been the result if, a year or two ago, that had happened, before the last revision of the list last year? Why, we would have had a general election over the whole Dominion to elect members to this

House of Parliament, and the constituents voting for them would be voters, in a vast majority of cases, having no proper right to vote; but we would have had hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands, having a right to vote, but who would be debarred from it. Why, Sir, there would have been people living in the United States, living at the ends of the earth, who, when they came here, would have a right to say who should represent Canada in the Canadian Parliament; and there would have been tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, perhaps, in this broad Dominion, of Canadians living here, whose whole interests were here, subject to military duty, volunteering for the defence of the country, contributing to its revenues, who would have no right or title to say who should represent them and make the laws which they are to obey. That would have been the position of things we would have been in. It may arise any time; I believe we are warranted by the expression of the Secretary of State in saying that such a state of things will arise. Viewing the question in that light, my hon. friend has taken the precaution to offer this resolution, which will secure to this Parliament that if you have an annual revision of the Dominion voters' lists, the elections will have to be under the Dominion voters' lists; but if the lists are not revised every year, why, then, it says that there shall be a list used that has been revised within a year; and that will give to the citizens of Canada within that municipality a right to cast their votes at that election, and withhold that privilege from those who, having left the country, have forfeited their right to vote in the country in which they no longer have any interest. I cannot see that the proposition is ludicrous. I think the proposition, under the existing state of affairs, is one that should commend itself to the wisdom of the House. I will not, however, express the conviction that the House will see it in the same light; I will only say that, I think, the House ought to see it in that light, and so to declare their opinion.

Mr. COLBY. Whether the proposition is ludicrous or not, I think the position of this House, if it should pass the resolution, would be an extremely ludicrous one after the action we took upon the proposition of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) a few evenings ago. The hon. member who introduced this resolution cited, as one ground for its necessity, the fact that a general election might be held after a period of one year from the latest revision and publication of lists had elapsed; that was one reason why he urged that there was a necessity for a resolution of this kind. Would not this House stultify itself most egregiously to state by one resolution that the next general election shall be held under the existing franchise, and then affirm another resolution, a few evenings afterwards, by which a general election might be held under a totally distinct franchise? What reason can the hon. gentleman have to expect that the lists will not be revised according to law? Is it because the Secretary of State, the other day, speaking individually and casually in reference to this subject, expressed the opinion that perhaps, under certain circumstances, it would be better that they should not be revised than that an expense which he did not anticipate should

be incurred? The law has hitherto been carried out in the matter of the revision of the voters' lists; the revision has been made according to the expressed will of Parliament in every instance hitherto. Why, then, should the hon. gentleman infer that the expressed will of Parliament will not hereafter be carried out as it has hitherto been in every instance? The Franchise Act, to be sure, made one provision, but this House afterwards deliberately modified the operations of the Franchise Act; and the Government acted in accordance with the latest expressed will of Parliament on that subject. The hon. member anticipates that even now the Prime Minister may come down with a proposition that no revision be held this year. When the Prime Minister comes down with a proposition of that kind, then it will be quite proper for the hon. gentleman to propose his alternative proposition, if he sees fit. If there ever can be any propriety for such a proposition, that might be some partial justification for it; but I am sure that the electors of this country, and the Parliament of this country, do not want a patchwork franchise law, using in some elections a law which Parliament, in its wisdom, has decided is the best for the country at large, and using in bye-elections a totally different law. Another thing that Parliament, I am sure, does not want, is, that those people who are electors under the existing law shall be disfranchised by the operation of Provincial franchise laws. The hon. member cites the possible case of some young men who have just come to the age of twenty-one years, and who, in case a revision of the voters' lists were not made, might be excluded. But, on the other hand, let him consider the case of the employes of the Dominion Government, at the case of postmasters, at the case of railway employes, and, in fact, of all employes of the Dominion Government, who, under our law, are entitled to vote and should have the privilege of voting at elections for members to this Parliament, but who have, by the legislation of the Province of Quebec, been disfranchised. If we go back to these Provincial lists we find that men forming a numerous and respectable class whom, we have deliberately stated after having discussed the question, are entitled to the right of the franchise, and we have given them that right, will be deprived of it, and we will be deliberately stultifying ourselves by saying that, in any alternative whatever, we will accept a franchise which disfranchises them. I say that, in every aspect of the case, the proposition is uncalled for at the present time. There is no reason to suppose, and no person has a right to suppose, that the law of the land will not be obeyed by the Government, as it has been in every instance hitherto.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COLBY. I say, that it has been obeyed by the Government; and no person has a right to draw so violent an inference as that it will not be obeyed in future. I repeat, that it would be the height of unwisdom to consent to any proposition which would effectually disfranchise those to whom we have deliberately given the franchise.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The President of the Council thinks it would be inconsistent on the part of this House to accept the proposition of the hon

member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), after having given an adverse vote on the proposition of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) to abolish the Act. I cannot agree with the hon. Minister, that there would be anything inconsistent in the House adopting such a course. The proposition of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) was to abolish the Act entirely. The House, in its wisdom, and to my great regret, voted down his proposal. Now, another hon. member makes a proposition, that a certain section of that Act should be amended so that those lists which had been completed for the past twelve months by the Provincial Governments might be accepted as part of the Dominion list. I fail to see there would be anything inconsistent in the House accepting the latter proposition. It would only be providing for a contingency that might arise, and this House and the country would generally recognise the fairness and the necessity of giving the broadest franchise to the people who are called upon to elect members to represent them in this House. The Minister of Justice stated that if we were to adopt this proposal, members would be sitting here under different franchises; and when I ventured to remark, in reply, that that was the case now, the hon. gentleman made answer to me that such was not the case. I was surprised, I must confess, to hear the Minister of Justice make such a reply, when he was aware, and no one knew better, that there were hon. gentlemen sitting here from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Ontario under one franchise, and members from Prince Edward Island and British Columbia under another franchise entirely. The hon. gentleman, I think, was, therefore, not at all correct when he so emphatically contradicted the statement I made with respect to that point. But we have seen the results of the neglect of the Government to revise the lists in days gone by. We found in Nova Scotia, for instance, and in other Provinces as well, that previous to this revision all the elections were run on the lists of 1886. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, will recognise the fact that from 1886 to 1889 there must have been a very material and important change in almost every electoral district. People had acquired the right to vote by becoming tenants, by purchasing property, and by coming of age; yet all these people were disfranchised, and in Nova Scotia we saw election after election contested on lists that were three years old. I venture to say that in no part of the British Dominion, certainly not in England or in any place where there is a healthy public opinion, would the Government have ventured to sustain such a view of the Act. The First Minister and the President of the Council have stated that they have followed the law and carried it out. They have carried out a law which they themselves created by their majority in this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We could not create it by a minority.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman has made a very wise observation, as he usually does, for which I am obliged; but if the minority had been allowed to create the law, it would not exist in its present shape. The Government created this law by virtue of the majority which they possess in this House, a majority which has always proved itself ready to carry out the
Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Government's suggestions. I repeat what I said on a previous occasion, that there is as much discontent among supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, with respect to this law, as there is among hon. members on this side of the House; and if the First Minister were to leave his followers free, and if this were not viewed as a party question, this Franchise Act would be swept from the Statute-book. We found during the last discussion that several hon. members who usually support the Government, exercised their independent right to vote for the repeal of this Act. They saw the expense it was entailing on the country, and they recognised that it was a very important matter to spend \$250,000 or \$300,000 a year on revision. Does any one suppose, with our past experience, that the list can be revised any cheaper in the future than in the past? We know very well that with two hundred revising barristers, and all the printing and the patronage and expenses attendant on the carrying out of the work, it will never be done for less money than it costs already; and while hon. gentlemen opposite may say that they have carried out the law, they have carried it out to suit their own party purposes, and the country has had to bear the expense. This proposal is a declaration for a wider franchise. If hon. gentlemen opposite could point to any one of the Provinces and say that this Dominion Act would give a greater majority of the people a right to vote, there might be something in that view of it; but in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island the franchise is on a broader basis,—that is to say, that if we adopted the Provincial franchises there would be more men exercising the right to vote than there would be on the Dominion list, there would be more names on the local list than on the Dominion list. Accordingly, there is no harm and no injustice done to the public at large. The proposal before the House is a reasonable one, and it is one to which the Government could assent, because they have the remedy in their own hands. They could have the list revised every year, and then this proposition would not come into operation at all; but if they did not revise the list, and bye-elections came on, then the lists which had been last revised would afford the best index of the wishes of the people with respect to those whom they desire to represent them in this House.

Mr. SMITH. I desire to say a few words in relation to the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). My only excuse for doing so is, that the vote I intend to give upon it might be misunderstood. Some of us remember the efforts put forth by hon. gentlemen opposite to defeat the Franchise Act in 1885. They have attacked that Act on more than one occasion since, and it was, of course, within their right to do so. On two occasions I voted for the resolutions put forward by the hon. gentleman opposite. But it appears to me the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has made a mistake in introducing the resolution now under discussion. We were told in 1885, and during the elections of 1887, that one of the principal reasons urged against the Dominion Franchise Act was its expense. And whilst a double franchise might not greatly increase the cost to the country, it certainly would be very expensive to

the candidates and those interested in election matters. I opposed the motion upon that ground; I oppose the proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) because it increases the expenses of candidates and others interested in political life. The difference in the qualifications required between the Dominion and the Provincial franchises was fully exposed by the Premier, and by the President of the Council, and I shall, therefore, do nothing more than refer to it. I cannot support such a mongrel scheme as that propounded by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and I shall feel it my duty on this occasion to vote for the Government and against the resolution.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has made a statement which, if allowed to go to the country uncontradicted, would leave the wrong impression on the minds of the people, that the Dominion Franchise Act is not as broad in its provisions, and does not give to the voters of Canada as fair a representation in the selection of candidates for this House as a number of the Franchise Acts in operation in the Provinces do. I am prepared to dispute that with the hon. gentleman. I have gone carefully through the list for my county, and I know whereof I speak, when I say that our franchise list is much more liberal, and much wider in its provisions, and gives us a better class of electors, than the Manhood Suffrage Act in Ontario. The Dominion Act is based upon the intelligence of the country, upon the wealth of the country, and upon an honest representation of the interests of the individuals who intend to make this country their home. Let us consider the illiberal provisions of the Ontario Franchise Act. There is not a civil servant of the Dominion Government under that Act but who will be prohibited from using his franchise. Why should this class of men, who are selected for their ability, for their knowledge and for their intelligence, be denied the rights of free men; and yet they are so wronged, because of the illiberal Franchise Act passed by the Local Legislature? Then again, as to property holders—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Question.

Mr. HESSON. I would like to know what is the matter with hon. gentlemen on the opposite side?

Mr. BARRON. Our minds are being changed.

Mr. HESSON. I can assure hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, who, year after year, are trying to undo the work of the long and hard Session of 1885, that they will find hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who will answer them. It has been said that we have not the courage to defend this measure, and that we are forced to vote for it because our leader chooses to sustain it. I deny that any hon. gentleman has the right to say that, because I believe, on principle, that the Dominion Franchise Act is a more honest franchise, and a more liberal, and better one, than the Act in force in Ontario. I may point out that the Ontario Act disfranchises every man who has property in a county and who may have his family living in that county, but who does not reside there himself. I say that this is a gross injustice. I know hundreds of men in my own riding, who have property and large interests

there, and who cannot vote because they are not residents. Some of the best men we have got in Canada are in this manner disfranchised by the local Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Mr. HESSON. Hon. gentlemen may say "Oh!" but the fact remains that, if you compare the Dominion list with the Ontario list, you will find that the Dominion franchise is wider and broader than the local one.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentlemen opposite have brought up the discussion, and they must, accordingly, submit to it. If they challenge us on this side of the House, as to our opinion on the Franchise Act, they will find that we are prepared to defend it.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I do not propose to occupy much of the time of the House, but the ridiculous feature of this discussion does strike me. I think there is something exceedingly ridiculous, not in connection with the motion, but in connection with some of the features of this question, as presented to the House. We have had a supposed revision of these voters' lists last year, and I would like to ask how many gentlemen there are among the supporters of the Government who would like to go to the electors on the list as revised? I will be bound to say that one-half of them will pray fervently that they may not have the opportunity to face their constituents on that list. Speaking from my knowledge of the revision in a number of counties, I can say that, unless some persons interest themselves in seeing that the names of parties who have the right are placed on the voters' list, the list does not give anything like a fair reflex of the voting capacity of that county. I believe that there are not a few gentlemen on the other side of the House who gave no personal attention to the revision of the list, and if they were asked their opinion, they would say that the list did not reflect the sentiments of their county and that they did not want to go to the polls on that list. I sympathise with the position which the Secretary of State is forced to take in this matter, for even if the Government spent a hundred thousand dollars a year on these precious lists, unless some individuals in the various ridings see that their friends are placed on the voters' list, it will not be a fair representation of the voting community in the various constituencies. That is where the initial difficulty comes in, and it was only the pressure of circumstances which led the House on two occasions to suspend the operation of this Act. I confess that I feel, that unless the qualification of the voter is changed, unless we make the qualification something more approximate to manhood suffrage, justice cannot be done to the electors of this Dominion. We should make the practice approximate to the idea, that the men who pay the taxes shall have an opportunity to say who shall tax them, and not, as it is now, in limiting the franchise to a man who can show that he is a property holder, or is the receiver of an income of \$300 a year, as no official report exists on the assessment rolls of the various Provinces to show that he earns this income and is entitled to go on these lists. There are difficulties in the operation of this Act which make it de-

sirable that some other mode should be adopted in cases in which the Government, having respect to public opinion on this matter, and yielding to the necessity of Parliament, may suspend the operation of the Act from time to time. I have no hesitation in saying that if the sentiment of the community were taken to-day in my county, three-fourths of the voters would ask that this Act be suspended for all time, and that the Provincial lists should be used as they come from the hands of the municipal officers. I have no occasion to express my opinion in regard to this Franchise Act, because I remember that in my last campaign my opponent, who was a supporter of the Government, said that he was thoroughly opposed to this Dominion Franchise Act through and through, and that if the people sent him down here to represent them he would support the repeal of that Act. Under these circumstances, I think we should have some provision for avoiding it being made a perpetual burden on the community, as it will be unless the Government modify the qualification, so that the elector will have some reasonable chance of getting on the list. The difficulty is just here—that a large proportion of the electorate are disfranchised under the Act unless they take special pains to see that they are put on the list; and, unfortunately, many men do not take sufficient interest in the duties and responsibilities which the law imposes upon them, to take the pains which are necessary from year to year to see that they are on the list. I warn the First Minister that this difficulty will grow in the years to come, and that this Act will be found to be an unbearable burden on those who take an interest in political matters, unless some mode is adopted of easing us of that difficulty; and at the present moment, I believe the easiest way to remedy the difficulty is to provide that, in case this Parliament sees fit in its wisdom to suspend the operation of the Act in any one year, as it has done on two occasions already, the course proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk should be adopted, and the last revised Provincial list should be used. In that way the interests of the community would be better served than by using a list two or three years old. Everybody knows how many changes take place in the electorate of our constituencies from year to year, not to speak of the young men who are growing up and becoming electors. Therefore, I think that the proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk is a wise one, notwithstanding the ridicule which hon. gentlemen cast upon it as introducing an undesirable qualification. The Act as it stands to-day is a standing anomaly in our institutions, and nobody knows it better than the hon. Minister of Justice, although in his position he feels called upon to defend it.

Motion negatived on a division.

MANAGEMENT OF THE NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN. It is with great diffidence that I rise to propose the following resolution:—

That it is expedient that a Select Commission of Enquiry, having power to examine witnesses under oath, do issue, to enquire into the management of the North-West Mounted Police, and into the conduct of Lawrence W. Herchmer, Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, from the date of his appointment until the 31st of December, 1889.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

My hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), when I said that I rose with diffidence to speak on this subject, was good enough to say that I did not look as if I was diffident; but, Sir, appearances are often deceitful, and if I do not appear unwilling to deal with this subject, it is because I exemplify that proverb. A man might be unwilling to put in motion such a vast machine as the Parliament of a great power like the Dominion of Canada against a single individual, especially as that man had at one time been a friend; and, as far as any personal feeling is concerned, my regard for Mr. Herchmer, my desire for his success and welfare, is just as keen as it could have been at any time. In making this motion, I do him, after all, no wrong, for if he is innocent of the charges I shall make against him, he has nothing whatever to fear. When one looks at the individual, a man of family occupying one of the highest positions in the North-West Territories, one may, of course, feel a certain sympathy for him. But you have to take into account the fact that there are a thousand men and more whose interests are to be considered; and if the men and officers of that force are placed in a dangerous position as to their reasonable peace of mind, as to their sense of manliness and their sense of security in the performance of their duty—if all this is in peril—for they do not divest themselves of citizenship when they join that force—then there are greater and graver considerations than any feeling for Mr. Herchmer, or any desire for his prosperity. And there is another point of view. A man occupying the position of Mr. Herchmer is not merely the commander of a thousand men, but is brought in contact with the people of the North-West Territories. He has large business relations with them, and his demeanor towards them is of very great importance; and if that demeanor is—I will not say undesirable, because that word would be inadequate—but marked by insolence, haughtiness, pride, almost ferocity, that is a very grave matter. It must be remembered by hon. gentlemen that the people of the North-West, as Mr. Van Horne once said, are the finest frontier men in the world. They are the pioneers of Empire; they are, many of them, the flower of our older Provinces. From the North-West to the Atlantic, there is not a Province which has not sent us a contingent of their best men to lay the foundations of prosperity and greatness in that great country; and it is not to be borne for a minute, that a man who is a public servant, who is paid by the money, a part of which these people contribute, should treat them as if they were dirt beneath his feet. It is not merely the feelings of the police force, it is not merely the feelings of the people of the North-West that you have to take into account, but the prosperity of this Dominion itself. Mr. Herchmer has, unfortunately, hardly one of the qualities desirable in a man occupying a position so responsible as that which he occupies. If you were to go, Sir, into the North-West Territories—and I am speaking in the hearing of men who travelled through them last year—you could not visit the remotest hamlet, travel where you might, on the Saskatchewan, or into the depths of the northern forests, or south to the boundary, west to Rocky Mountains or east to Manitoba, and you will meet no man, whether French or English, whether half-breed, Scotchman, or Englishman, or to whatever other nationality

he might belong, who, if you were to ask him whether Mr. Herchmer were fit for the great position he fills, would not say that he is utterly unfit for it. I do not attach so much importance, but some importance has to be attached to it, as some people, perhaps, do to newspaper criticism; but, one has to recognise the fact, that newspaper writers write for their clientele, they write for the public, and they cannot afford to express opinions about any individual which would not be sanctioned by the public among which the paper is circulated. What is the fact? Throughout the length and breadth of that great North-West, in every portion where a newspaper is published, you hear but one opinion. There is not a discordant note in the unity of expression of disapproval of the conduct of that gentleman, who—I repeat it unwillingly, and solely under a sense of duty—has rendered himself utterly unacceptable to the people. The North-West Mounted Police are one of the finest bodies of men I ever saw. We occasionally have a soldier—men distinguished in war—visiting us: and whether he come from old France, or from England, or from Germany—and we have had some visitors who earned distinction in the German army—we have never had a soldier of distinction visit the North-West who was not loud in his praises of the North-West Mounted Police. Force. They are indeed, as a body, a *corps d'élite*. We might make of that thousand men a splendid hussar regiment. In fact, I have heard a distinguished gentleman saying that there was nothing you could not do with such men. They are a credit to Canada. The public generally here are little aware of what their duties are. Sometimes a young man will join that force utterly unaware of the heavy duties he will have to perform. I have spoken with young men who took it into their heads to join the force, and who, before they joined it, were full of the idea that they would have nothing to do but ride fine chargers and see the country. I have spoken to them some time afterwards, and they have told me what hard work they had to do, how rude was the discipline they had to undergo; and I may tell you, Sir, that, in summer and winter, by night and by day, they are ready, at the word of command, to go sixty, a hundred or two hundred miles in any direction. Let the glass be twenty below zero, let a blizzard be a contingency not unlikely, it matters not, off they start at the call of duty—sleeping out in the snow, sometimes under canvas, often under the shelter of a waggon, covered by their blankets, and sometimes under the canopy of heaven; and you know very well, Sir, what great dangers are incident to that mode of life. The men, whether you look at their physique, their morale, or at the work they perform, are men who fill you with admiration of their qualities, and who give you a fine idea of what sort of regiments, when we are ten millions or twice that in population, we shall be able to organise in Canada, and what great things we may do.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 69) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Interprovincial Bridge Company.—(Mr. Perley.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Shore Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Moncton and Prince Edward Island and Ferry Company.—(Mr. Landry.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. Trow, for Mr. Prefontaine.)

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Provincial Provident Institution of St. Thomas, Ontario.—(Mr. Small, for Mr. Ward.)

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto.—(Mr. Small.)

RELIEF OF GEORGE T. SMITH.

Mr. SMALL moved second reading of Bill (No. 98) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George T. Smith. He said: The object of the Bill is to instruct the Commissioner of Patents to renew a patent which had expired by reason of the negligence of the solicitors in not transmitting to the Commissioner of Patents the proper fee, through an error of one of the clerks. He transmitted the sum of \$10, when the sum of \$20 should have been transmitted.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Who is Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMALL. He resides, I believe, at Stratford, in the county of Perth.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If that is the case, I would like to know if Stratford is the place of his business, or whether his main place of business is not in the United States?

Mr. SMALL. One of the parties, I believe, resides in the States; I think the other one, George T. Smith, resides in Stratford.

Mr. TROW. The firm reside and carry on their trade in the town of Stratford. The Bill is to remedy a mere oversight on their part, in not having remitted a sufficient sum of money to renew their patent. They employ some 200 men in Stratford, and are doing a good work in this country in the milling interest.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 111) further to amend the Acts respecting the Quebec Harbor Commission.—(Sir John Thompson.)

GREAT NORTH-WESTERN AND CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. SMALL moved that Bill (No. 106) respecting the Great North-Western Railway Company be read the first time. He said: This Bill came from the Senate about a week ago.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Order for House to go into Committee on Bill (No. 5) to make further provision as to the prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and to amend chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, read.

Mr. BROWN. Through a combination of circumstances, the House is very thin to-night, and the absence from their seats of a large number of hon. gentlemen, by causes unavoidable, has led me to let this Bill stand. I desire very much that the discussion in Committee, of this measure, which has excited so much interest in the House, should take place in a full House.

Mr. WATSON. I know that some hon. gentlemen have stopped here to-night on purpose to vote in favor of the hon. gentleman's Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, go on.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no motion before the House. There would need to be a motion that I do now leave the Chair, and in the absence of such motion, the Order stands.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 104) to amend the Railway Act (from the Senate).—(Mr. Shanly).

Bill (No. 96) for better securing the safety of certain Fishermen (from the Senate).—(Mr. Jones, Halifax).

THE INDIAN ADVANCEMENT ACT.

Order for second reading of Bill (No. 42) to amend Chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intitled: "The Indian Advancement Act," read.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Perhaps the hon. member will agree that this Bill be postponed, as the Minister of the Interior is not here. The fact is, every hon. member is tired out this evening. I would suggest that the hon. member should allow the Bill to stand.

Mr. DOYON. (Translation.) This Bill is on the Order paper since the 5th February. I have already on the Order paper several items which were postponed for similar considerations, and were never brought back before this House. I should urge that the second reading of this Bill take place this evening, if possible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I should suggest to the hon. member that he be willing to allow it to stand.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Should the hon. member let his Bill stand, very likely it will not be brought back before this House during this Session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Oh, yes.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) If the Government agree to the hon. member that an opportunity shall be offered him to have his Bill considered, very well.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) We shall give him an opportunity to bring back his Bill before this House. The principal reason why it should be allowed to stand is that the hon. members are all tired, after the long sitting of yesterday.

Mr. DOYON. (Translation.) If this is the only reason, I shall not detain the House long.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Perhaps my hon. friend did not understand that the Government agree to give him an opportunity of moving the

second reading of this Bill at another day. Under these circumstances, I think he might agree to let it stand.

Motion for second reading allowed to stand.

BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS.

Order for adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Lister, for the appointment of a Select Committee to enquire into the claims of the Bresaylor Half-breeds for losses sustained during the rebellion in the North-West, and also in reference to furs taken from Charles Bremner, a Half-breed residing at Battleford; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto, read.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The First Minister, who is unable to be present, desires to make a statement on this subject, and, under these circumstances, I would ask the hon. gentleman to postpone this Order.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not desire to be at all critical, but I cannot fail to observe that three or four measures have had to be postponed this evening because Ministers are not in their seats, and are not discharging their duty to the House. It must be admitted that the Opposition is not at all disposed to be factious or severe, but the public business must be discharged. My hon. friend (Mr. Lister) informs me that no action has been taken by Chas. Bremner against General Middleton or any other parties; and, in view of the declaration which was made to this House the other day by the Minister of Justice, and the fact that I am now informed that no action has been taken by Chas. Bremner against General Middleton or anyone else, I do not see why the debate should not be proceeded with and the Committee granted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sure the leader of the Opposition has no desire to misrepresent me in the matter, or in any way to make an uncandid statement of the facts. The facts are these: I was informed, the evening I made the statement, that an action had been commenced. My reason for making that statement was that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), who had had written instructions to settle the matter on behalf of Chas. Bremner, read to the House a statement that those instructions were withdrawn, for the reason that the claim had been placed in the hands of the solicitor, and that the solicitor referred to had written a letter to General Middleton, asking him to name a solicitor who would accept service of a writ for him. That was a day or two before the motion was made in the House, and the General, accordingly, named a solicitor who would accept service of the writ for him. I think I was justified, therefore, in making the statement that Bremner had proceeded at law, and such was certainly the view of the solicitor for Bremner himself, because he has since—and only to-day, I understand—informed General Middleton that the action would not be proceeded with.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that a Committee ought to be granted now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will remember that the leader of the Government pledged himself to give an early opportunity to move.

Mr. LAURIER. The same pledge stands good.
Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suppose so.

Mr. MITCHELL. It seems that there is something more involved in this, than the simple question as between Mr. Bremner and General Middleton. There is the public interest to be considered in this matter, and the reputation of Canada, and the reputation of the Commander of the forces in Canada. It is due to this House that they should take steps to have a charge so publicly circulated as this (if it is untrue) investigated, so as to wipe out the stain on the character of the General in charge of our forces; and, therefore, a Committee should be granted to enable the gentleman accused to clear himself, and also to vindicate the honor of Canada. General Middleton should have the opportunity to prove that the statements made in connection with the improper taking of these furs, are untrue, if they are untrue. No action at law can oust this Parliament out of the right to deal with a question affecting the reputation of the country, and the conduct of an important official.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The promise made by the Premier stands good. I would ask the hon. gentleman to be kind enough to wait until to-morrow, when the First Minister will be in his seat, and will be able to make a statement as to what course will be taken.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well; let it stand until to-morrow.

THE BEHRING SEA QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the House is adjourned, there is an important matter which I think should be brought to the attention of the Government. I find the following paragraph in the newspapers, dated Washington, 4th March:—

“The President will, in a few days, issue a proclamation, warning all persons against entering the waters of Behring Sea within the dominion of the United States, for the purpose of violating the law forbidding the killing of fur seal or other fur-bearing animals, without authority from the Secretary of the Treasury.”

This is a matter which the Government should take up and deal with at once. If the fishermen of this country are to be excluded from Behring Sea, by the declaration of the President of the United States, we ought to know it. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman now leading the House, to this paragraph, with a view to having some explanation about it at an early date.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The paragraph referred to by the hon. gentleman has not been unnoticed by the Government. The position of affairs, in regard to that proclamation, is this: By a statute of the United States, passed two or three years ago, the President is bound, in the month of March, every year, to issue a proclamation warning all persons against trespassing within the territories of the United States, in Alaska, including all the territory ceded by Russia to the United States. The telegraph announcement, I presume, relates only to the duty cast upon the President by that statute, to issue that proclamation. It by no means follows from that proclamation being issued, that a hostile action is taken by the Administration of the United States with regard to Behring Sea. The President is simply discharg-

ing the duty that the statute casts upon him; and, even if the proclamation is issued, it need not interfere with the negotiations now going on.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman will see that this does not refer to the Alaskan Territory, but to the Behring Sea, over which they claim an exclusive right, and from which all other nations are excluded. I am glad the attention of the Government has been called to this matter, and I trust they will not overlook it. It is a matter of great public interest, that the United States should not be allowed to crawl, by degrees, into getting a recognition of their claim of exclusive rights to the fisheries of that sea.

Mr. EDGAR. I understand the Minister of Justice to state that the proclamation issued this year is the same proclamation issued last year, and which caused, undoubtedly, considerable alarm before it was understood. Are we to understand that that proclamation of last year, as well as the Proclamation of this year, is simply the following out of the provisions of a statute of Congress?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The proclamation of last year was, the proclamation this year has not been issued yet. It is foreshadowed in the telegram read by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and it is presumed to be a proclamation of the same description.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEED BARLEY.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture is not present, as I wished to draw his attention to a matter in connection with his Department. It is known that the Department has purchased, recently, a large quantity of barley to be sown as an experiment by the farmers of Canada; and a circular has been issued, stating that the price of this barley is to be at the rate of \$4 per bag of two bushels. I have received some communications on the subject, and one farmer specially writes to me to suggest to the Government that the distribution of this barley, which is to be grown rather as an experiment than a source of profit, should be a free distribution in the first instance. The circular just issued by the Government states that the barley will only be issued on the payment of the price mentioned. I think that, in view of all the aids the Government have given to the other industries of this country, it is not asking much on behalf of the farmers that this distribution of this barley should be made free. I, therefore, would ask the leader of the House to make this communication to the Minister of Agriculture at the earliest possible moment, inasmuch as now they are offering the barley for sale. If the policy of free distribution is to be adopted, it should be adopted before any of the barley is distributed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no doubt that the Minister of Agriculture, when in his seat, will show that there are two sides to that question. I will, however, communicate to the Minister of Agriculture the remarks made by the hon. member.

ADJOURNMENT—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Under existing circumstances, I do not oppose the motion of adjournment, but I must again protest against the delay of the Government in not bringing forward the measures. There is no reason why we should adjourn at ten minutes to nine. If we do, it is simply because Ministers are not in their seats to answer the questions that are put before Parliament. There are three or four Bills which have to be postponed this evening because the Ministers are not in attendance. I should also remark that we are in the sixth or seventh week of the Session, and we have not yet had the Budget speech, and everyone knows that postponing it is simply postponing the day of prorogation, because many matters have to be put off until it is brought down. Under the circumstances I will not oppose the motion, but I must protest, and I hope that in the future they will be in their places when public business is called.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt the Ministers should be in their places when sickness does not prevent them, but I am sorry to say that four of my colleagues are absent from the House on account of sickness. Three of them could not be in the House at all, and the hon. First Minister is unwell, as he was last night, when the hon. gentleman was kind enough to postpone for that reason a motion which he had to make. This is the reason my colleagues are not here, and I have no doubt it will be considered a sufficient reason.

Mr. MITCHELL. While I have every regard for the statements made by the hon. Minister of Public Works, I entirely concur with the observations made by the hon. leader of the Opposition. We are now approaching the close of the seventh week of the Session, and I have in vain endeavored to ascertain when the Budget speech would be delivered; and the fact that we do not even now know is an indication that we cannot say what the probabilities are of an early prorogation. I do think it is a protraction of the public business which can be hardly tolerated. Everybody knows the ability of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. We know that he is always ready with the business of his own Department, and we know the influence he possesses as a member of the Government. We also know the ability of the hon. Minister of Justice.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the Minister of War?

Mr. MITCHELL. With regard to the Minister of War, that Batoche thing is hanging a little, and we do not know anything about it; but with two leading Ministers, including the Minister of War, in this House, we ought not to have it stated that the business cannot go on because one or two Ministers are incapacitated. If the Government have Ministers who are incapable of carrying on the business, it is their duty to resign. Let them give away to men like ourselves, who are not only capable, but ready to carry on the business of the country. They ought not to come to this House and plead illness for the extraordinary delays that have occurred in proceeding with the public business. We ought to have had on the Table long ago the statement with regard to the changes in the tariff. My constituents are most anxious to hear what changes are to be made; and the Government

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

ought to have told us long ago, so that we could understand what we should have to consider, and to enable us to communicate with our constituents, in order to ascertain what course we should have to take in relation to those changes. I am not going to press the Government unduly to-night. They have pledged their inability to go on. We know that they are incapable. We know that there are two or three clever men in the Cabinet, and the rest do not amount to a row of shooks; but those two or three clever men—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Who are they Name.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you think I am a fool to name them? Not much. The country knows who they are. There are two of them there—you pay your money and you take your choice. I want to say in all seriousness, that I do not think we ought to have the public business delayed in this way; and if there are festivities going on to-night in the town—the Government benches are almost empty, and there are only three members of the Cabinet here—it is not treating the business of the country right, or treating us right, who are away from our business, or treating our constituents right, to have an uncertainty hanging as to what the tariff will be for the next twelve months, or perhaps two or three years. We will let them off this time, but do not plead sickness or inability to be present any more, if untrue. If you are unable to carry on the business of the country, resign. There are lots of us able and willing to take your places.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 6th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY TO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 112) to authorise the transfer of certain public property to Provincial Governments. He said: I will take the opportunity of explaining the provisions of the Bill more fully when it comes to the second reading, but I will briefly state sufficient now to indicate the subject to which it relates. I suppose nearly all hon. members of the House are aware that the rights of the Dominion of Canada and the rights of the Provinces, in certain territorial waters of Canada, have been in a state of uncertainty for some time. The disputes, so far as litigation is concerned, have been carried on between private individuals. To some extent the right in regard to the fisheries has been held to belong to the Dominion of Canada in some particulars, and in regard to non-navigable rivers, it has been decided to be in the Provinces. For various reasons it is desirable that the foreshores, and the beds of rivers and lakes should be vested in and should be administered by the Provinces as part of the public lands controlled by them. The reasons for this are obvious. The principal reason is that the administration of property of

that character requires constant local supervision, as well as the registration of plans and of conflicting applications. This, if undertaken by the Dominion, would necessitate a staff of officers for registration purposes and surveys, being kept up in every Province of Canada, and we should be in constant danger of a conflict of title as regards the boundaries of various applications. To avoid this, we deem it best for all concerned that properties of that character should be transferred to the respective Provinces, providing that all the rights of control which the British North America Act vests in this Parliament are still retained in this Parliament, the bare right of property passing to the Provinces. When I speak of the rights of control, I mean control of navigation, fishing and everything relating to the general interests of Canada, irrespective of the property itself; reserving also our rights to any lands which we have heretofore patented, or on which we have erected any public work, or on which it is desirable that we should hereafter erect any public work, and our right to a sufficient space around any existing public work. It is proposed by the Bill to allow the Governor in Council to transfer, either *en bloc* or in part, these properties, to the various Provinces of Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not quite understand the hon. gentleman, as to whether the right of foresore that he speaks of is confined merely to non-navigable waters, or whether it includes navigable waters.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It applies to both.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has any particular emergency arisen to call for this legislation? I have not heard of anything of the kind, and the Bill seems to be very vague in its character. The hon. gentleman speaks of the transference of the foreshores. What does he mean by that term? It may be very comprehensive or very limited in its character.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On the coast and lake shores. I mean all the land below high water mark, and the Bill comprises also the beds of rivers and streams, so far as we possess them. The hon. gentleman asks me whether any emergency has arisen. Some seven or eight years ago there was a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, that all the harbors of the Dominion, whether natural or otherwise, were vested in the Dominion, and that has been followed by various decisions since, holding that the Provincial Governments are incapable of granting even a site for a wharf. The result has been constant applications ever since to this Government, for leases and patents of water lots, either in confirmation of grants issued by the Local Governments, or for new lots hitherto ungranted. I can hardly speak of it as an emergency, but the difficulty has been a constant source of friction between the Dominion and Provincial Governments. The Provincial Governments do not acquiesce in the soundness of the decision even as to harbors, and they are constantly disputing our rights as to the beds of rivers. We desire, therefore, for the convenience of the public, that that question should be settled. We have had correspondence with the Governments of Quebec and Ontario, in the way of an exchange of views on this question; but, instead of fighting it out by correspondence, we have deemed it better to propose a

solution of the whole question, which, we think, will reserve to Canada all the rights which it is desirable Canada should reserve to herself, and transfer to the Provinces that property which they can administer more conveniently. I may mention as an illustration a great natural basin like St. Martin's Bay, has harbors within itself, is it to be considered a harbor vested in the Dominion, or does the decision of the Supreme Court apply merely to the smaller inlets? That illustration can be applied to the lakes, as, for instance, in the case of Toronto harbor. It is almost impossible to define the limits of the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada in that respect. Therefore, instead of having litigation between private individuals with regard to the boundary lines of harbors, and our territorial rights to the beds of navigable streams, we think it better to cut the gordian knot, and relieve ourselves of a kind of property which we cannot administer with advantage to the public, but which the Provinces can and desire to administer.

Mr. BLAKE. So far as I can judge from the hon. gentleman's statement, I think the Bill a highly commendable one. But I was about to ask him with reference to the correspondence which he says has taken place, and which I think he should lay on the Table before he asks us to discuss the next stage of the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad the hon. gentleman gave us the information he did, because the mere title of the Bill is very vague. I rather approve of the course pursued. I think it is an easy way of solving the difficulties which I know to exist in the Maritime Provinces, and I think the measure will result beneficially. But it would be well to have any correspondence that has arisen on the subject.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). As this is a question largely affecting the Maritime Provinces, I would ask whether it would not be as well that we should have any correspondence with those Provinces as well?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have had no correspondence with those Provinces on the subject, but they are included in the provisions of the Bill. The correspondence with the Prime Ministers of Ontario and Quebec has been in connection with their assertion of the rights of the Provinces to this description of property, and there has been no assertion of that right by the other Provinces.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Does the hon. gentleman propose to transfer all those properties by the effect of the Bill itself, or simply to authorise the Governor in Council to do so?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The proposal is that the Governor in Council should be authorised to make the transfer on conditions set out on the schedule of the Bill, and it requires that the Provincial Governments should accept the transfer on these conditions.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Do the Government preserve the control as regards fishing privileges?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have not only done that, but have provided that any transfer which may be made under the Act shall not change the fishing rights.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not intended or competent for us to surrender our right to legislate on this subject or any of our proprietary rights?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, and it is carefully provided that, in surrendering our proprietary rights, we are not to be taken as surrendering any proprietary right as regards fishing.

Mr. AYMOT. In the Province of Quebec there are fisheries called stake nets, which are set in the spring and remain until the fall. They are above low water mark. Will the Bill give the Local Government control over those?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Bill proposes to leave the question precisely as it is.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland) moved that the report of Mr. A. F. Wood, commissioner to enquire into the management of the Welland Canal, be laid upon the Table of this House.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was a motion made in the Senate for this report, but none made here; but, as I have the return ready, I asked my hon. friend to move for it.

Mr. EDGAR. I think I saw in the *Empire* of the 4th instant that a supplementary report was published. Does that return contain both reports?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. EDGAR. It is published in the *Empire* of the day before yesterday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be. I have not seen the *Empire* of the day before yesterday; but the same return is made in the Senate. I see they are moving in the Senate for a supplementary report. That is not yet brought down.

Mr. EDGAR. Will it be brought down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may be; that is under consideration.

PRIVILEGE—ANNAPOLIS LAND PURCHASE.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). My attention has just this moment been called to an article in the *Montreal Herald* of 6th March, and, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to give a denial to the statements therein contained. The whole article, I may say, has not a word of truth in it. The reference that is made to myself particularly, I should like to have the opportunity and the endurance to enter into fully to-day, but, suffering, as I am, under physical disability, I cannot do so. I will read what has reference to myself more particularly:

“A second feature of this delectable transaction is worthy of notice. The Government owned a lot of land—”

Referring to the matter of the purchase of land for a public building in the town of Annapolis—

“The Government owned a lot of land convenient for the proposed building, but Mr. Mills, M.P. for Annapolis, and faithful supporter of Sir John,—”

Mr. MITCHELL. Is that true?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It is.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thought you said there was not a word of truth in it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

—“owned one opposite.—”

That is not true—

“The value of these lots was said by Mr. Jones, of Halifax, to be \$1,500—”

That may be true—

“The Government might have used their own property, but they decided to purchase for \$3,300 the lot that their friend Mr. Mills owned.”

Mr. MITCHELL. Is that true?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That is not true.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). He had owned it.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Yes, some years ago.

“This, of course, had to be done by transfer through a third party, but the job got there all the same.”

That is not true—

“The firm of contractors and Mr. Mills, M.P. for Annapolis, should now present the Premier with a testimonial.”

That will go for what it is worth. I can only say that, so far as the imputation upon me is concerned, there is not one word of truth in it at all. I am well aware from whom all this emanates. It has come from a man in Annapolis town who is greatly disappointed at his own lot not having been selected by the Government. That lot, I have no hesitation in saying, if he gave it away, I would not advise the Government to take possession of for the purposes of a public building—

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly not.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis)—because, when a public building is placed in a town, it is there for all time, and should not be placed alongside a horse stable or old rickety buildings, but in a prominent position, well worthy of the dignity of the Dominion Government, and that is where the building is at present. I take this first opportunity I have to contradict the article I refer to. My attention was only called to it five minutes ago, and I entirely repudiate the imputation cast against myself; and it is only right that the party who is supposed to be the inspiration of this sheet should retract those statements when they are denied upon the floor of this House. I regret exceedingly that I was not here at the little scene the other evening.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). This has reference entirely to this question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine himself, according to the Rule followed here, to a strict statement, because the House will see very well that if he enters into a discussion, other hon. members may claim the right to reply, which would be altogether against parliamentary usage, and it is not desirable that such a precedent should be established.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I am quite in order.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Are you connected with the *Herald*?

Mr. MITCHELL. I have the honor to be, as your party know very well, to their cost. I think it is in order for me to reply to the attack made upon a newspaper in which I have some interest. Until the hon. gentleman brought up the case, I had not even read the article, for circumstances prevented me getting the paper in time, and a gentleman for whom I have great respect took it away from me before I had an opportunity of reading it. But I

have heard something of the facts, which have been referred to by the hon. gentleman from Annapolis (Mr. Mills). My chief editor, who, I suppose is responsible for this article, is one in whom I have the greatest confidence, both as to his ability and his veracity; and I am satisfied that he would not write a line if he had not good ground for stating what he did. Further than that I say nothing. The hon. gentleman has his remedy against the *Herald*. I may say hon. gentlemen who sit near me, inform me that the lot of land which the hon. gentleman says did not belong to him, was his last year.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). No such thing.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am informed that it belonged to him in June, 1888, and the inference is that it was sold to somebody else to sell it to the Government. I have the greatest opinion of the ability and veracity of the gentleman who conducts this paper, and, if the hon. gentleman is satisfied that these statements are not correct, he has his remedy.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I can only say that I was credibly informed that the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) owned this land, jointly with other parties, up to the 20th June, 1888—

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It is not true.

Mr. WELDON (St. John)—and it was conveyed to the Government, as the deed shows, on the 20th June, 1888.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Whoever your informant was, spoke what was false.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman admits he did own the property?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL. When did he part with it?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I am not here to submit to a cross-examination.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already stopped the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), and I must now call the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) to order.

BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the Prime Minister to the question of the investigation demanded by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister), as to the claim of Charles Bremner. The Prime Minister was not in his seat last evening, but I was glad to discover that he was not absent on account of illness, but was accepting the hospitality of some of his supporters in another part of this city. The Minister of Public Works stated, last evening, that the Prime Minister was not prepared to make a statement in regard to this matter, but that he would probably fix a day for its discussion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has brought the matter up. The gentleman whose name has been used in this motion has asked that a Committee of investigation should be appointed, and I am, therefore, quite willing that the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) should be adopted, but I do not think the Committee proposed is one we can consent to, especially as the hon. member who has made the charge, who is the

accuser, and upon whose statement, as a member of Parliament, the Committee is struck, could not possibly be a member of the Committee. I would submit that the following Committee of seven should be appointed:—The names I had were those of Messrs. McNeill, Tisdale, Girouard, Kenny, Weldon (St. John), Casgrain, and Sir Richard Cartwright. I understand, however, that the other avocations of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) are such that he cannot sit on the Committee, and I, therefore, propose that Mr. Holton should be placed on it instead. If that Committee will suit hon. gentlemen opposite we might have the resolution passed at once.

Mr. BLAKE. I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman as to the impropriety of the gentleman who made the charge being appointed on the Committee, but I think our system at present is very defective in that respect. I believe the practice in England is, that an additional member is added to the Committee on each hand, without having the power of voting, in order that he may take part in conducting the investigation on the one side or the other. By the adoption of this process, the impartiality of those who are to be the judges is maintained, while, at the same time, a standing is given to those who are about to prefer or to repel the accusation. I think that, while it is expedient that the member who makes the charge should be on the Committee, it is equally expedient that he should have the opportunity to conduct the case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was not aware that that practice prevailed in England, but I think it is a very proper practice. At all events, there cannot be the slightest objection that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) should be a member of the Committee, without the power to vote, but so as to allow him to conduct the proceedings, and in such a case there should be a similar selection made on the other side.

Mr. LAURIER. The motion had better stand until to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Are the names satisfactory?

Mr. MITCHELL. In relation to the selection of that Committee, there is a very serious charge brought against an officer of the Government, occupying one of the highest positions outside of the Government; an officer who was presented by this House with \$20,000 for his services in the North-West; and now the Government ask to be allowed to select their own judges to try the truth of the charges which have been made against him. I do not think that is right; I do not approve of the Committee, but, I suppose, the right hon. gentleman would vote down any motion I might make.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not prepared at present to pass any opinion upon the proposition of the right hon. gentleman, but will leave it until to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it would be the most agreeable way that we should agree upon a Committee, instead of having to resort to the cumbrous mode of selecting one. We could agree upon a Committee very easily; and, I think, these names are very respectable ones.

Mr. LAURIER. If we can agree, no doubt it would be better; but if not, there is a mode provided for selecting the Committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. The respectability of the Committee is one thing; but we want men who will have enough backbone to say what they believe and to stick to it.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE, CHEQUES AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 6) respecting Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), the last time the House was in Committee, proposed to change the definition of the word "bank" in sub-section "c" of the first section. With all deference to the hon. member, I would prefer to adhere to the words in the Bill. The definition which the hon. gentleman proposed was that the word "bank" should apply to any bank to which the Banking Act had application. The objection made then was that saving banks do no business in bills and notes, but that is a mistake. There are saving banks coming under the Savings Bank Act which do business in promissory notes and bills of exchange, and desire to have the provisions of this Bill extended to them. Besides that, I think it would be inconvenient to have the definition of terms in this Act referring us back to another Act, and, indeed when we come to that Act we find that the definition there is a very vague one, and may be changed from time to time without any particular reference to this Act. It seems to me that the definition here is a proper one, and we had better adhere to it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Do I understand the Minister to say that savings banks do business in promissory notes?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Montreal City and District Savings Bank do such business.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I doubt very much whether a savings bank has a right to accept discount.

Mr. BLAKE. I know the general custom in that large corporation is not such as the Minister has stated. It may be that they make such loans, but their general custom is to make what are called special agreements, not bills or notes at all, and the real credit is, of course, the credit of the stock or security. I doubt their doing any bill discounting business.

Mr. SPEAKER. Being one of the directors of the Montreal City and District Savings Bank, I may say, that as a rule they always lend on a loan note which embodies certain conditions as to the disposition of the collateral security which is deposited with the loan notes; but it does sometimes happen that the particular note may be an ordinary draft or an ordinary note, accompanied with that collateral security in the shape of a bond or a stock of some corporation. But I have known that notes have been deposited with it, on some

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

very important occasions, when banks, for instance, have had to come to us and deposit, as collateral security, and an additional security, I may add, and deposit their notes with us. We have to collect them, and, of course, the bank ought to come under this Bill in order to be able to carry on that business, which is, I may say, an exceptional one with the bank, but such business sometimes comes to the bank.

Mr. BURDETT. Will the hon. Minister insert a clause about seed oats, or would he prefer to have it in the other Bill?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I thought the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), when I gave way on this point, would guarantee me against such applications. I am foregoing my own opinion as to the propriety of inserting the clause suggested by the hon. member for Frontenac in this Bill.

Mr. BURDETT. I beg to call the Minister's attention to the fact that, in Ontario, some of the insurance companies have the right by law to sue for notes at the company's chief place of business. This might possibly work a hardship on the makers of the notes, but it is very convenient for the companies. If it is intended that those companies should retain that privilege, I would ask that notes given for subscriptions to churches and colleges should be put in the same category. In the city of Belleville, where a college endowment fund was raised, many notes were given as subscriptions, varying from \$10 to \$100, the limit of the jurisdiction of the division court, and payable in from one to five or six years. They were dated at the different places of residence of the makers. Before the notes came due, the makers of them changed their views about paying the subscriptions, and there are now in the hands of a Committee of the Board of Managers notes of this kind to the extent of from \$10,000 to \$15,000; and if they are obliged to sue for them at the various places of residence of the makers, they are practically of no value whatever. I think that notes given as subscriptions to colleges and churches might be sued for at the place where the church or college is situated, as in the case of notes given to insurance companies.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand the difficulty to arise in this way. By a statute of Ontario, certain notes to companies may be recovered at the principal place of business of the company, while a suit for the recovery of other notes must be brought in the county where the maker resides. It seems to me that we may safely leave that subject to be regulated, as now, by legislation with reference to procedure. If we undertook to deal with it, we might have to interfere with the legislation in regard to procedure in all the different Provinces. Or we may leave it to the persons who sign the notes, or the persons who receive them, to say where they shall be paid.

Mr. BURDETT. That is not the law of Ontario under the Division Court Act. It is possible the question of jurisdiction might arise; but I would ask the hon. Minister to consider the matter, on further considering the Bill.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think that is a matter for the Local Legislature to decide, according to the jurisdiction it shall give to the courts. I

not think it would do for us to introduce any such measure into this Bill.

On section 51, sub-section 3,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to amend the sub-section, so that it will read as follows:—

A bill which has been protested for non-acceptance, or a bill of which protest for non-acceptance has been waived, may be subsequently protested for non-payment.

On section 51, sub-section 10,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to strike out that sub-section, for the reason that a like provision is made in a more complete form in section 94, sub-section 5.

On section 60,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is the section about which the discussion took place, the other evening, touching the question of forgery of endorsements. I do not want to prolong the discussion or to press any further the views I then expressed. I said then, all I could say now on the subject, and unless the Committee have come to a different conclusion from that expressed by the majority the other day, I will drop the section.

Mr. COCKBURN. We ought to have a little interest in the banks as well as regard for our own convenience. No doubt it is very convenient for us to make the banks with which we are depositors, responsible for the endorsements of our cheques, but I do not understand that such is the contract we make with a bank, when we open an account with it. The banks, when we open an account and make a deposit, take the security of having the depositor sign his name in a book, so that when cheques are presented bearing his signature, in cases of doubt, a comparison may be made with the signature in the book, and the bank has to that extent guaranteed the authenticity of the cheque which it pays. But it is a very different matter, when you are asking a banker to guarantee the authenticity or genuineness of any number of endorsements on a cheque. We are trying to impose upon the banks, for our own convenience, a burden which ought not to fall on them. This may be an inconvenience to the poor man, though a great convenience to the rich man. A man comes down from lumbering up the Ottawa, with a cheque payable to his order for fifty or sixty dollars, and he presents it at the bank but cannot get paid, because he has no means of giving the bank assurance that he is really the person to whom the cheque is payable. I have known cases where the men had to return to their homes without the money. I hold, we have no moral right to throw upon the banks a responsibility of that kind, when they are not in a position to acquit themselves of it. It is, therefore, to encourage our own laziness, that we have determined that the banks shall keep our accounts, and it is insisted upon, that they shall be responsible for every endorser whose signature may have been put upon the cheque which passes through their hands. I think the Minister should press this provision of the Bill, as the banks have their rights as well as other people.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When I first saw this clause I thought it was injudicious to insert it in the Bill, but I have changed my opinion. It is not a question of identification, because, supposing any

person through whose hands the cheque has passed has had his name forged, the bank has to guarantee the genuineness of every endorser.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No; they have only to know the man to whom they pay the money.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the cheque is made payable to John Smith, and John Smith's name is forged, and the cheque goes through several hands, the bank would be liable. If John Smith had not endorsed it himself, the bank would be liable to pay the amount again, because they had previously paid what they had no authority to pay. Several gentlemen have stated that this provision would be very inconvenient, but it has existed in the English law for over thirty-seven years, and, I understand, it has worked well. As the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) says, we throw an undue responsibility on the banks. They are bound, of course, to know the signature of the drawer. If they pay a cheque with a forged signature to it, the signature of a man who deals with them, they take the responsibility and have to pay it a second time; but, when they identify the signature of the drawer as being genuine, what means have they of identifying the signatures of several endorsers through whose hands the cheque may have passed? Business men make cheques payable to order for their own convenience, but that seems to throw an undue responsibility upon the banks.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I understand that the bank looks to the last man to whom the money is paid. The bank takes care that the man to whom the money is paid is known, and his signature relieves it from liability. If he has brought a cheque to the bank with a forged name upon it, he will be held responsible.

Mr. COCKBURN. Suppose he is not worth anything?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. They will not pay to a worthless man.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that, in relieving the bank of the responsibility of scrutinising the name of the drawer—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not the drawer.

Mr. CHARLTON—*or of anyone whose name is on the note, we will be taking a course which, perhaps, may be in the interest of the bank, but is not in the interest of the public.* It is the business of the bank to satisfy itself as to the genuineness of the signer and endorser. It is always easier for the endorser to get himself identified, and if the bank is allowed to pay on any piece of paper, and to get exonerated from carelessness on its part, there is a wrong done to the business people of this country. That is the law in all the American States. The bank satisfies itself of the genuineness of the signatures before it pays, and that is no hardship. If we exonerated the bank from this responsibility, we might be doing something in the interest of the bank, but not in the interest of the people of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have had this matter under discussion on three occasions, but no attempt has been made by anyone speaking with authority, to show that any inconvenience results from the present system.

Mr. COCKBURN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, in that case, the experience of the hon. gentleman is gravely at variance with that of a large number of business men. I think a far greater inconvenience than any which now prevails will be inflicted by our altering the common law in favor of the banks. The banks are asking that they shall be exempted by statute from the liability which the common law places upon them. If the bank chooses, it can refuse to pay cheques payable to order; and, if it did, I have no doubt that twenty other banks would be found to rise up the next morning willing to pay those cheques.

Mr. COCKBURN. They cannot refuse to pay a cheque made payable to order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend near me (Mr. Weldon, St. John) says they would refuse to pay cheques payable to order. If you pass this clause, for which no reason has been given, except that there is an English precedent for it, they would do so. The conditions here are entirely different from those in England, and I am not prepared to accept such a change in Canadian law because it has been found expedient in England to adopt this particular clause. With the exception of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), I have not heard any business man state that any serious inconvenience has arisen from the present practice. As the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) intimated, in discussing this question some nights ago, if the banks ask to be relieved from any inconvenience caused, according to my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), by a number of subsequent endorsements, there might be something in favor of the provision; but, if the cheque is made payable to a particular man, it is difficult to see why the bank should be discharged from its liability to see that the money is paid to that particular man. If it is argued on high moral ground, I think the convenience of the public is as much to be considered as the convenience of the banks. This will also introduce a great deal of confusion and uncertainty in the country, and a material check will be removed from forgeries, because, I think, you are more likely to have forgeries committed under this provision than if you were to leave the law as it is at present.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. gentleman puts forward the current idea that a bank can refuse to cash a cheque until the party is identified. It cannot do it. As a matter of convenience, a man will take the trouble to be identified, but he is not bound to do it, and it is a mistake to imagine that a bank can refuse a cheque unless the man is identified. Thus the banks have to take the responsibility of an act to which they have not conduced. The bank has either to do this or refuse payment of the cheque, and the rumor is spread abroad that the party's cheque has been refused, and then the bank has an action against it, in which the party may recover heavy damages. I say that is possible, and those difficulties have occurred. Banks have got to run that risk and say to a party: You have got to be identified. The bank is bound to know the signature of its customers; but that they should be bound to know the signature of every other individual outside of them, is putting on them a burden that ought not to be. The custom of drawing cheques payable to order is one that has

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

grown up within the last thirty or forty years in England. On account of the Stamp Act they could not draw them until the Act of 1853; in consequence of the operation of that Act they allowed cheques payable to order, and then this section was inserted, which has been the law of England from that day to this, and it has worked well. The banks are not responsible for a cheque being made payable to a party; the party does it for his own convenience, to get a voucher for payment. If he sends it out, it may occur through his own carelessness, or through the carelessness of the payee, that an opportunity is given for forgery, yet the bank, who are perfectly innocent of the transaction, have got to bear the blame. The member for West Durham admitted, the other day, that where a cheque was given to the party himself and he lost it, or it was forged, the payee would have to bear the liability. He suggested the case of it being sent by letter and never received. Any man who sends a cheque through the post office without paying the fee or registration by which the cheque could be traced, is just as careless as if he had dropped it out of his pocket.

Mr. BLAKE. Isolated instances, no doubt, will be found which prove that there may be difficulties both ways; but I maintain, as I said the other evening, that with the vast amount of transactions that are constantly going on in this country in cheques payable to order, remembering the thousands upon thousands of cases occurring every week of the year, it is utterly beyond probability that any very serious difficulty can have been created for the banks. As I said to the Minister, on a former occasion, we want to know if experience has proved that the banks are placed in a position which is intolerable. He has given us no statistics, no information. My hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) himself the president of a bank, has stated that he was not aware of any grievance. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. F. Langelier) who is largely concerned in commercial affairs in the Province of Quebec, in his capacity of a public man and professional man, says he has not heard of any case of inconvenience. I do not mean to say there may not be an isolated case in those thousands upon thousands of transactions, in which some inconvenience, some loss, may not have occurred to a bank. But I say that, so far as we are made aware, these are infinitesimal, while the public convenience is enormous under the present system. I say that it is not a question between sound theory and practice, but it is a question in which the practice of thirty or forty years has demonstrated that the theoretical objection is unavailing. The practice has been found to be good for the community, and it should be continued unless it has been found to be seriously injurious to the banks as a whole. I have no doubt whatever that if it were rendered possible for any one bank to avail itself of the proposition, that it should attach the same measure of security which now subsists in the case of a cheque payable to order, that bank would get a great deal of business from its competitors. My hon. friend from St. John says that in England, up to a comparatively recent period, the Stamp Act prevented cheques being made otherwise than payable to the bearer, and almost contemporaneously with the change which rendered it possible for a cheque to be made payable

to order, this protection was introduced by the influence of the banks. They never had an opportunity of testing how it would work there. They decided at once that when the system of cheques payable to order was introduced, it should be introduced coupled with this limitation. We have had a system of cheques payable to order without this limitation, it has worked well, and I see no reason at all why we should embark in this enterprise and change it.

Mr. DESJARDINS. As I said the other day, I do not know of any bank—although the bankers have met several times lately—that has asked for the change contemplated in this section. A bank, of course, on receiving a cheque signed by one of its customers, sees that the signature is protected, and the process of identification has never been challenged by any honorable man. When a stranger comes to a bank, he generally brings with him a man who is known to some of the officers of the bank, and when he presents his bill, if he is not known, the clerk asks him to be identified, and he immediately submits to it, because he knows that he must be identified. It is not only his signature which must be known, but he must be identified himself. That has been the custom for many years, and I do not know of one instance where any difficulty has arisen, or where an action for damages has been entered, as spoken of by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon). When a man is refused by a clerk because he is not known, it is easy for him to find some one whom the clerk does know; but a customer who gives a cheque generally takes such precautions as that the bank, to which it is addressed, may be able to pay the proper party. That custom has worked satisfactorily; it has been found convenient to the customers of the bank, and to change that practice now would harm the banks more than it would benefit them. I know many instances where banks have received deposits from people who preferred to pay by cheques just because they found there was a security in paying that way; and the bankers are willing to accept the risk, because there is a benefit attached to it. I do not know any reason why we should change the present system.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I will venture to make a remark because the Minister of Justice, with great good temper, has expressed himself as willing to accept the views of the Committee in reference to this matter, while holding his own opinions. The member for Prince Edward Island has been a convert to the views of the Minister of Justice, through his persuasive eloquence, and I feared that the Minister might think, perhaps, that all those who had taken a different view might have been equally influenced. For my own part, my views remain at they were. The member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) was not a convert; he was wrong from the beginning. With reference to the inconvenience to a bank, although I am not a lawyer and am not fully posted on matters of this kind, I think inconveniences are arising continually. My understanding of the law is that I might buy from a person in good faith anything—a horse, for instance—on which there was a chattel mortgage in a distant county; I buy it in good faith, and I pay him the money. The man to whom I pay the money I may never see again. I think that horse

could be taken away from me. But take another case, although it might not run on all fours with the horse—the horse, of course, would run on all fours. But take this case that will be more parallel on the line we are speaking of, in which there is fraud. Supposing a horse has been stolen from a distant county, and I buy it in good faith. It turns out, however, that it has been stolen, and the horse is then taken from me. This is inconvenient, but it is recognised as being just and proper. The present system as regards to frauds has not worked any material hardship on the banks. The argument of a bank president (Mr. Desjardins), and the statement made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), go to show that by adopting the system suggested the customers of the banks would be largely increased. The feeling of the Committee remains as it was manifested the other day, and I am glad the Minister of Justice is prepared to yield his views in order to meet the wishes of the majority of the Committee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am glad to find that two days' reflection has increased our numbers and strength very materially; but still I perceive that the views of the Committee have not been changed.

Mr. LOVITT. I take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins). I had occasion to have a draft for \$500 cashed in Quebec, and immediately I entered the bank I was practically asked if I was a forger. I hold that the customer should be protected. I did not get anyone to identify me on that occasion, but I was obliged to occupy two hours before I was paid the money.

On section 87,

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I see no necessity of making a distinction between notes and bills of exchange. By turning to section 52 of the Bill it will be seen that when a bill is accepted generally, presentation for payment is not necessary in order to render the acceptor liable. If I draw a bill on a person, and he accepts it, payable at the Bank of Ottawa, in Ottawa, this section would apply to that particular bill, and it would not be necessary, in order to render the acceptor liable, that it should be presented. The Committee are now, however, asked to make a distinction between bills of exchange and promissory notes, and to say that a bill of exchange accepted generally need not be presented in order to hold the acceptor liable, while a promissory note must be presented to render the maker liable. I fail to see the necessity of any distinction. The present Act does not make any distinction between the effect of a bill or promissory note, unless the words "not otherwise" or "not elsewhere" are incorporated. By this Bill, however, it is proposed to make, all over this country, a distinction between a bill of exchange and a promissory note, and persons will have to learn that as regards a bill it need not be presented, so far as the liability of the acceptor is concerned, but that a promissory note must be presented in order to render the acceptor liable. I suggest, that in order to make the present clause conformable to the present law with regard to bills, to insert the words "not otherwise or elsewhere," and in this way we may be able to secure uniformity throughout the Dominion. The words I have suggested will make

it uniform with the provisions further back in the Bill, in reference to bills of exchange.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As to this, I think there are very material distinctions between a bill of exchange and a promissory note. Some of my hon. friends across the House suggested that it was unreasonable and unphilosophical that an acceptance payable at the Bank of Montreal should be regarded as an acceptance payable anywhere else. That argument was not so strong as regards bills of exchange, and in that respect there was more show of reason in favor of making the words very precise in the affirmative and in the negative form, before the contract should be held to be restricted. In this case we have the words embodied in the contract, and if a man makes a contract that he will pay at the Bank of Montreal, in Ottawa, I do not see why that should not be regarded as a limited contract. There is the further reason that in dealing with promissory notes, in which this is embodied in the note itself, we are not running the risk which we were as to the bills of exchange, of having the drawer and previous endorser released by the bank taking a qualified acceptance. Here it is the essence of the contract, whereas, with bills of exchange, the danger was that the banks or the holders, or the persons presenting such acceptances, by making the acceptance payable at a particular bank, would be releasing the previous parties to the transactions, and doing so unintentionally. That does not apply to a promissory note. Furthermore, I think that the weight of authority which I pressed on the House as regards the other case, is against this change. I urged on this House that the practice in Ontario, and the practice in England, was in favor of the change I desired. In this case, the practice in England, and in the Provinces, except Ontario, is the same as now stipulated by the Bill, and in changing it, we would be making a change all over to suit the law of one Province.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Do I understand that it is proposed to leave section 87 stand as it is?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). This clause provides that a promissory note, if made payable at a particular place, must be presented for payment at that place, in order to make the holder liable.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Only before action.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Oh, that is different.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I always like to yield gracefully to what the Minister of Justice has made up his mind upon, even though it be not agreeable to my views. I venture to say that in the rural districts there are ten promissory notes to one bill of exchange, and if it becomes an absolute necessity that every promissory note must be presented before action, we are going to have a protest attached to every promissory note, no matter how small the amount may be.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is where it is made only payable at a particular place.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I understand that fully. Of course, so far as the endorser is concerned, if there is one on the note, it must be presented, or free goes the endorser. Suppose I promise to pay so-and-so a hundred dollars at my residence,

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

or at such a bank, at a certain date; by this section, I cannot be sued until the note is presented, and proof of presentation must be made. In twenty or twenty-five years' experience as a lawyer, I have never yet experienced any difficulty arising on the question whether a note was presented or not. If the present Bill passes, proof of this presentation must be made at a particular place, and that would entail a great deal more protests. As a lawyer, perhaps I should have no objection of that, but, as a matter of convenience to the community, I think I should. I question if the benefit to be derived from attaching a protest on every small note is going to be a convenience to the public generally.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is the same as a note on demand in that particular.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman sees that, if the maker of a note does not want to make it payable at a particular place, he can make it general, and it can be presented anywhere; but if he limits his contract and says: "I promise to pay you one hundred dollars at the Bank of Montreal," is it not reasonable that he should comply with the condition of his promise, and that it should be presented where he promises to pay? Surely that is the practice known all over the world.

Mr. MULOCK. Theoretically, my hon. friend is right, but he assumes that laymen know the law as well as lawyers. I know that, in theory, everyone is supposed to know the law; but, in practice, few people are familiar with the intricacies of the commercial law. I sympathise with the sentiments of my hon. friend (Mr. Moncrieff). If a protest is necessary, it shall be necessary to have witnesses to prove the presentation and dishonor, at the trial of the cause. This means extra expenses in these small suits, and costs heaped upon poor suitors, or a non-suit may result. The plaintiff may fail to obtain justice by reason of not having complied with this technicality. In other cases, costs may be thrown upon the defendant for necessary witnesses brought to court to give evidence, as required by this section. I know that in country places, a note made payable at a certain place, is often disregarded by those who are not commercial men. As to the technicality, I think, as a matter of convenience, this ought to be considered in the same way as the question of payment on the endorsement of cheques. So far as I know, no evil has arisen under the law in Ontario, as it now is; and, if the experience of the practices of the commercial community guided us in striking out clause 60, the same experience should guide us in striking out the provisions of the Bill as they now exist.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not agree with my hon. friend from East Lambton and my hon. friend who has just spoken. I think, when a person makes a note payable at a particular place, it is only right and proper that it should be presented for payment at the place named in the note; that is one of the conditions of the contract. Certainly, it is much more satisfactory that it should be presented and sued upon after the presentation than that it should be sued without presentation at all, which might be done in the case of a note payable generally without a place being specified.

Mr. MASSON. I quite approve of the law as it stands at present, and I cannot see why the proposed change should be made, especially after the discussion we had on the subject of bills of exchange. There is a distinction, as the hon. Minister of Justice has pointed out, between the two, as regards their custody up to the time of their acceptance. From the time of their acceptance up to the time of their payment, there is practically no difference between a note and a bill of exchange: the acceptor and the maker of a note are practically identical. We have not found any inconvenience in Ontario from the present practice, and I cannot see how it is possible that any inconvenience could arise. On the other hand, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Lambton, if a note is presented before action is taken, then it is material that presentation should be proved, either by a witness called and sworn, or by some other legal evidence. All notes would have to be protested, which would mean a charge of \$1 or \$1.50 on each note, no matter how small it might be. That would be a great inconvenience to the makers of small notes. For instance, farmers who buy implements from agents give notes, which are invariably made payable at a particular place, and it would be necessary to prove the presentation of those notes before they could be sued upon. That would be a great inconvenience. Besides, the person who makes the note is generally the debtor. Why should there be any reason given for his not paying the note, if he can raise the point, that he had money at a particular place at the time the note was due? He is not subjected to any costs by the non-presentation of the note. In my practice, extending over twenty years, I have not heard of a case of such inconvenience occurring, in which the defendant came into court, and said: I should not pay this note, because I had money where it was to be paid. It seems to me, that to make the distinction proposed, would be a confusion to the ordinary mind—to say that a bill of exchange need not be presented, but a promissory note must be.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). To my mind, there are two phases of this question. In the first place, there is, no doubt, a great deal of force in what has been urged against the clause, if it involves proving the presentation of the note. For instance, in the case of merchants who take notes from their customers, varying in sums from \$10 upwards, would it be necessary, for the purpose of making the makers of those notes liable, to have them formally presented to some person in his office, and to have the proof of that presentation before going into court to collect the note? If that is the effect of this clause, it should not be here at all. The other view of the case is this: numbers of notes are given by farmers for agricultural implements and other purchases. In many cases, if there is not some provision that these notes must be presented at the place where they are made payable, either the residence of the maker or some other place where the note is made payable for his own convenience, they might be sued for the note somewhere in the country, perhaps hundreds of miles from where the note was made. I think we ought to consider very carefully the question as to what constitutes presentment. If to render a maker liable, a formal presentment must be made, and

evidence of that must be given in some way in court, then I think we should modify this clause. If that is not the case, and the note on falling due does not require any formal presentment, then perhaps the clause might stand.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the number of people who make notes compared with the number who use bills of exchange is as a hundred to one; and they belong to a class who do not understand commercial law. They believe that when a note is made payable at a particular place it must be paid there, and it is a convenience for them to have the note left there. But if the law remains as at present, they may, unfortunately, find that they are sued for that note a long distance from home, and they are subjected to loss, while they have provided for the payment of the note by some commercial agent in the locality, or in some other way. Therefore, I think this proposed amendment to the law is a very good one. It is a convenience to people to have their notes payable at a certain place. It is much more convenient to the maker of a note to have it presented at the place where he has made provision for it beforehand, or where he intends to provide for it, than to have it presented somewhere else, and let him be sued and put to the trouble of defending himself before the courts. If a protest becomes necessary, under this amendment to the law, it is unfortunate, as that would incur expense, and that we want to avoid. One hon. gentleman said that the party who defended his note would be apt to plead non-presentment. I apprehend he would not be disposed to set up that plea in a court of law, because he would know that it would subject him to the costs. If some other way could be found to get over it without imposing the cost of protest of every note it is most desirable that it be done. In any case the number of notes sued would be fewer in number, if it was understood that they were to be presented when made payable and payment demanded, than if they could be sued anywhere in the country, although the party owing the note did not know where to provide for payment.

Mr. BURDETT. The hon. Minister of Justice is entirely right, and the clause should remain as it is. I understand it makes the practice uniform all over the Dominion, which has not hitherto been the case. Cases have occurred within my knowledge in which men have given promissory notes throughout the country, payable at their own homes or at some convenient place, and yet, although they had provided the money to meet the notes where they were made payable, they were sued elsewhere and had to pay costs. It not infrequently happens that men will deposit the money with the officer of the division court and tell him to hold the money and pay it when a man presents the note, and not to sue. Cases have actually occurred, and will probably occur again, in which the maker of many notes may have some enemy or some person evilly disposed towards him, who bought his note, and, without any presentment, sued him, the purpose being to put him to his defence and make him pay costs. That would be avoided by compelling the party who holds the note to present it according to his agreement at the place where it was agreed to be paid, before taking action. I cannot see any inconvenience in this. I cannot see how any man who signs a note can be misled, and I have known of a number of

cases where a great inconvenience and costs had to be suffered by the maker of the note, who was entirely ignorant of the law.

Mr. MASSON. If it is the wish of the Committee that this principle which is embodied in this clause should be carried out, there should, for the purpose of avoiding the expenses of protest, be some provision making a presentment presumable unless non-presentment is especially pleaded, because, if, under our Division Court Act, a general dispute will raise that question, then the plaintiff has to prepare his proof. He may not have taken the precaution of protesting, which a prudent man naturally would, and immediately before action he will have to make the presentment and bring his witnesses to the court to prove it, thereby incurring considerable expense. That is an evil which should be remedied by providing that presentment as against the maker of the note be presumed, unless the contrary is especially pleaded.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). No doubt the plaintiff may be put to a little expense, but very little, and that would be a small inconvenience compared with the great inconvenience which at present exists, when a party may have a note payable at his office and have the money there to pay it, and yet, not knowing who holds the note or where it is held, the first thing he gets is a writ.

Mr. MULOCK. He would not have to pay the expenses in Ontario, for by the law there the judge can make the other party pay the costs.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). But in the other Provinces he could.

Mr. MULOCK. You are behind the age.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not know that we are, but we do not think that perfection exists in Ontario.

Mr. BURDETT. The wise men came from the east.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is a proof they are in the west.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I am opposed to the principle, as far as bills of exchange are concerned, but there are more reasons against it as far as promissory notes. When a party undertakes to pay a note at a particular place, it seems to me that that is a condition attaching to the contract which would oblige the holder to apply for payment there before taking action. The hon. member for Renfrew wished to know if, in the case of a country merchant who had a number of his customers' notes payable at his office, the fact of its being payable there would be a sufficient presentment. If the notes are there on the day they are due, or for a day before the action was brought, there is no formal presentment necessary, and that would be a sufficient presentment. There would be no inconvenience. Greater inconvenience would exist by making this change. The only Province that system exists in is Ontario, and you would revolutionise the whole mode of proceedings in the other Provinces. With regard to notes given to agricultural implement manufacturers, they would take care to have the words "not otherwise, nor elsewhere" inserted.

Mr. BURDETT.

On section 94,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Instead of sub-section 3, I propose to insert these words :

"Notaries may charge the holder of a bill or note the fees recoverable by them before the passage of this Act."

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am afraid you are destroying the uniformity of the Act. It is provided in a former clause that justices of the peace may protest as well as notaries. In that case, will these other parties who perform the duties of notaries be deprived of the fees?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not intend to provide any fees for justices of the peace.

Mr. MULOCK. I think justices of the peace should be paid the same as notaries.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Could you compel them to protest if they were unwilling to do it?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. A justice of the peace will not be liable for any negligence, and, therefore, he should not be paid any fees. He would do this merely as a matter of favor.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think it is necessary to provide for fees for justices of the peace. It is very rarely that notes will be protested by them. I propose to strike out sub-section 3, and to substitute the following:—

"Notaries may charge the fees in each Province heretofore allowed them."

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I made a suggestion to the hon. Minister as to allowing householders to protest notes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Unless the hon. gentleman can give some reason for it, I am disposed to restrict the protesting to justices of the peace when notaries cannot be obtained.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am not able to say that any inconvenience has arisen up to the present, but I thought that, if the power of protesting is extended to justices of the peace, it might be extended a little further.

On schedule 1,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that schedule one be struck out.

Committee rose and reported progress, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 6) respecting Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes. Bill reported.

QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSIONERS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 111) further to amend the Acts respecting the Quebec Harbor Commissioners. He said: The object of the Bill is to make it clear that the Quebec Harbor Commissioners have power to grant warehouse receipts within the meaning of the Banking Act. I understand that they have custody of property of the description mentioned in the Banking Act, but the

question is unsettled, as to whether it is beyond their powers to grant certificates and warehouse receipts.

Mr. LAURIER. Have they acted upon this legislation?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They have been exercising the power.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not intend to oppose the Bill at this stage, but I am not quite sure the principle is one which is acceptable to this House. If the power was requested for the Harbor Commissioners to give space on their wharves for the purposes of constructing warehouses and carrying on trade, I can well understand there can be no objection, but I am not quite sure that the Bill is one altogether free of objection. I will not, however, oppose it at this stage, reserving to myself the right to oppose it at a subsequent stage.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

SUPPLY—THE SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LAURIER. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I propose to call the attention of the House to the expenditure which was lately incurred by the Government—an unauthorised expenditure, I must say—on the proposed line of railway between Harvey and Salisbury. Shortly after the close of the last Session the fact became known that the Government were having surveys made over the projected line of railway between those points. The fact, in view of the events which occurred at that time, seemed almost incredible. The Government, by expending money under such circumstances, seemed to be treating Parliament with such full contempt that even those who were the most credulous hesitated to believe that the Government would go to that length; yet the fact was true. In the early part of this Session I enquired whether the report was true that the Government had expended money; if so, what sum, and upon what authority they claimed to have expended it. The answer given was that the Government had expended \$22,302.28, and that expenditure had been partly paid out of the vote for surveys and partly by warrant. Now, I charge against the Government that the authority which they claim to have exercised they did not possess. I charge that the Government had no right to apply a single dollar of the money voted under the general head of surveys for that work. I charge, moreover, that the Government had not the slightest excuse whatever for advising His Excellency to sign special warrants to cover any part of that expenditure. I charge this, because the Government were violating the authority of Parliament by so doing. Not only so, but they were violating also their word, which had been pledged to Parliament, that not a cent of money would be expended until this work had been approved by Parliament. I say that the Government have not only violated the authority and power of Parliament, but they also broke their own word, solemnly pledged, and the expression which I now use is not one whit too strong. During last Session, as is within the recollection of members of this House, the Government introduced a

measure to build a branch of the Short Line Railway, known as the Harvey and Salisbury branch. The measure was carried through this House, although it was strongly resisted; but when it went to the Upper House, I am happy to say that that House did what this House should have done—it rejected the measure by a considerable majority. Yet, strange to say, scarcely had the vote been given in the Senate before the report was circulated that the Government would ignore that vote and would proceed to construct the work. The rumor prevailed to such an extent that when the Supply Bill came before the Senate, the Government were interrogated as to their intention, and they were asked whether they intended to respect the will of Parliament, or whether, as was reported, they intended to violate the decision of Parliament given with respect to this work. The leader of the Government in the Upper House, Hon. Mr. Abbott, stated most distinctly at that time that not a cent of money would be expended until the work had been approved by a vote of Parliament. In order to establish this point beyond dispute, let me quote what took place in the Senate on that occasion. The occasion was the voting of the Supply Bill by the Senate. The report is as follows:—

“Hon. Mr. ABBOTT moved that the Bill be now read a second time.

“Hon. Mr. MILLER. I rise to a question of order. It would be necessary for the hon. gentleman to get the leave of the House to the suspension of the 41st Rule with regard to this Bill. Before that motion is put, I want to know whether or not there is a grant of half a million of dollars towards the Short Line of railway in the Supply Bill, and, if so, whether any attempt will be made to expend any of that money until authority is obtained from Parliament for the construction of the Short Line road?”

“Hon. Mr. ABBOTT. As to the first question, I shall be obliged to look at the Bill before answering; as to the second question, I may say most positively that no expenditure of any kind will be made on this road until it is sanctioned by Parliament. I move that the 41st Rule of the House be suspended with respect to this Bill, and that it be read the second time.”

“No expenditure of any kind whatever will be made until it is sanctioned by Parliament.” Now, Sir, scarcely had the doors of Parliament been closed, and when the sound of the words pledging the Government to this course were still vibrating within the walls of this chamber, when the Government positively disregarded their own utterances and set to work at once to do this work, which the leader of the Senate declared would not be done, and on which he declared not one cent would be expended until such time as Parliament itself approved of the work. I ask, can there be a greater outrage upon the dignity and power of this Parliament? Can there be anything—I utter the word—so criminal as the conduct of the Government, in not only wilfully and designedly breaking through all rules of legislation, and breaking through all the authority of this Parliament; but even going to the extent of violating the promise they had pledged to the Senate and Parliament of Canada on the most solemn occasion? What is the authority which is now claimed for having sanctioned this expenditure? The right hon. gentleman, when I put him the question some time ago, as to whether or not the fact was correct, as reported, that money had been expended on this survey, stated that they had expended a certain sum of money, amounting to something like \$8,000, out of the vote which is taken every year for gen-

eral surveys. I maintain that the right hon. gentleman has not the power to take one single dollar for this purpose out of the money voted on the general heading of surveys, and I maintain it for this reason: when the Bill was before this House last year, my hon friend for St. John (Mr. Weldon) asked precisely, regarding what has been done since without any authority whatever. He asked that not a single dollar should be expended on that road, until an ample survey had been made as to whether the project was feasible or not. This is the motion which was then moved by my hon. friend:

"That the said resolution be not now agreed to, but it be resolved, that no action should be taken by this House authorising the construction, by the Government of Canada, of another line of railway between Harvey and Salisbury or Moncton, until a proper survey of the proposed line and reliable estimates of its probable cost are laid before Parliament, and until time has established that the existing line of railway between the points named is not sufficient to meet the demands of passenger and freight traffic."

This motion, which was most appropriate, was voted down by the majority of this House. No answer was given to it from the other side; simply the vote came down that the motion should not be granted, and nothing more. But still we have the fact that the Government pretended at that time that there was no necessity whatever for the surveys; and they proposed to go on with their Bill which authorised them to spend half a million dollars on that road. When that Bill was defeated, can it be maintained, for a single moment, that Parliament having refused to make any special appropriation for that survey, the Government had the power to fall back upon the general appropriation for surveys, and take money out of that appropriation for this work? In view of the fact that the Government had rested their whole case upon the Bill, and upon nothing else, and the Bill having been defeated, this fact alone condemned them to remain quiet until such time as Parliament had been consulted once more, and had determined whether or not the project would be carried on. Even though the Government had the authority of appropriating any sum of money out of that general vote, they certainly could not do so in view of the fact I have stated a moment ago, namely: That they had pledged themselves that not a single dollar would be expended until such time as Parliament had been again consulted on the subject. We have the British form of Government here; we have three branches of Parliament; one of these branches pronounced in favor of this road, but the other pronounced against it, and, therefore, the project became null. The plain duty of the Government then was to wait to consult Parliament once more, and if the two Houses of this Legislature had agreed to it, the right hon. gentleman would have been justified in doing what he did, in expending money for this road. In presence of the facts, as they stand at this moment, what excuse can be given by the Government for acting as they have done? What is the value of Parliament sitting and expressing an opinion upon any public subject, if it be within the power of the Government to discard the authority of Parliament and to do precisely what the Legislature had refused to sanction their doing? Sir, there never was a time in England when such conduct would have been ventured by any Parliament. If, at any time in England, the Government had

Mr. LAUBIER.

attempted to do what this Government has done since last Session, namely, to expend money without any appropriation for it, and to advise His Excellency to sign special warrants (not for urgent works, but for a work which had been condemned by Parliament), such a Government in England would be compelled to withdraw at once. If such a thing, incredible as it is, had occurred in England, that the Government would disburse public money in face of an adverse vote of Parliament, and contrary to their own pledge that nothing of the kind would be done, such a Government would be forced to withdraw before public indignation and anger. There was a time also, I must say, when even in this House such conduct would not have been tolerated, though I am not sure that the majority will do again, as they have often done in the past—condone such an offence against the public of Canada. I ask the majority: Is this parliamentary government, or is it not simply personal government? Upon what principle of the British Constitution can such conduct as this be at all reconciled? I say that it cannot be reconciled in any way, for such conduct is an outrage upon the Government of this country, and upon British institutions. Whatever the majority may do, such conduct must be denounced, as it ought to be denounced, as an infringement of the undoubted power of Parliament. Therefore, I beg to move:

That all the words after the word "that" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—The measure introduced last Session by the Government for the construction of a railway between Harvey and Salisbury was rejected by Parliament; and after the said measure had been so rejected, the Hon. Mr. Abbott stated in the Senate, speaking in behalf of the Government, "that no expenditure of any kind would be made on the road until it was sanctioned by Parliament;" that since last Session the Government have expended for surveys on the said projected railway a total sum of \$22,322.28, in connection with which special warrants have been issued to the amount of \$13,782.28; that the expenditure of the said sums of money under the above circumstances is a wilful breach of the pledge given by the Administration to Parliament as above set forth and constitutes a designed violation, by the said Administration, of the undoubted powers of Parliament, and deserves the severe censure of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Government have committed no breach of the privileges of Parliament; they have committed no violation of any parliamentary principle; they have violated no principle of any kind; so that we meet this resolution with a negative in every respect. The hon. gentleman says we had no right to expend any portion of the vote for surveys, and still less right to ask for a warrant from the Crown for that purpose. Now, we will look at the case without reference to the action of the other branch of the Legislature on this measure. The Government every year asks for a vote of Parliament for the purpose of carrying on such surveys as they think would be in the interest of the country, whether they be for railways, canals or any other public improvements. Sometimes the vote taken is insufficient; sometimes it is more than sufficient. When it happens to be insufficient, then the Government take the responsibility of asking for a warrant; and any Government worthy of the name will not hesitate to take that course. In this case the money voted was insufficient to meet the expenditure, and, therefore, the Government asked for a warrant, knowing and believing that Parliament would, as in all such cases, indemnify them, and

would vote in Supply that this warrant was properly asked for from the Crown. Now, we remember that when this measure for the building and working of a line of railway from Harvey to Salisbury or Moncton was introduced, the Government asked this House to support that measure, believing that the House knew what the wants of the country and the merits of the railway were; and the Government believed that they had sufficient evidence of the feeling of the House to ask for a warrant. Now, although the hon. gentleman says we were very wrong in going on with this survey, hon. gentlemen opposite did not think so last Session. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) moved a resolution to the effect that no action should be taken by this House authorising the construction by the Government of Canada of any line of railway between Harvey and Salisbury, or Moncton, until a proper survey of the said line and reliable estimates of its probable cost should be presented to Parliament. The hon. gentleman who has made the motion of censure now before the House, happened then to be absent, but all the members of the Opposition who were present, voted for that resolution. The House of Commons did not think there was any necessity for such a survey, and, therefore, they voted against the resolution and carried the Bill. Still, it is very odd that hon. gentlemen opposite should object to our carrying out the policy which they themselves recommended and pressed upon this House. The hon. member for St. John drew a proper distinction between an expenditure for the survey of a road and an expenditure on the construction of a road, and insisted that there must not be one farthing spent on the construction of this road until there had been a previous expenditure for a survey. That was the doctrine preached from the other side; they said: Go on with your survey, have a complete and thorough survey; and the expenditure for such a survey must be paid either out of the vote for surveys, or, if there was no vote, out of a general warrant. Yet the hon. gentleman now complains that the Government took the course which was pressed upon them by the other side, and which every one of the hon. gentlemen opposite who happened to be in the House at the time, voted for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And which you refused to accept.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let us read the names: Armstrong, Bain (Wentworth), Beansoleil, Brien, Campbell, Cartwright, Casey, Charlton, Colter, Davies, Doyon, Edwards, Fisher, Gillmor, Holton, Innes, Mackenzie, McMullen, Mills (Bothwell), Mitchell, Mulock, Paterson (Brant), Platt, Préfontaine, Ste. Marie, Scriver, Skinner, Somerville, Sutherland, Trow, Watson, Weldon (St. John), Wilson (Elgin). Every one of these gentlemen voted that there must be an expenditure, no matter how—whether by warrant or whether out of a vote for surveys—and a large expenditure, because they demanded a thorough survey. No action could be taken by this House authorising the construction by the Government of another line of railway between Harvey, Salisbury and Moncton until a proper survey of the proposed line, and reliable estimates of its cost, were laid before Parliament, and until time has established

that the existing line of railway between the points named is not sufficient for the demands of passengers and freight.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is right.

Mr. LAURIER. You voted it down.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was that fact established?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman would allow me to speak, I would say to him that he must remember the story of the clergyman who was preaching on a fine Sunday in summer, with the window open, when an old lady rode up to church on a donkey, and fastened the donkey to the door of the church, which was open. While the clergyman was preaching, the donkey put his head in and brayed. The clergyman did not get annoyed, although he heard the bray, but he said: "One at a time, if you please." The Bill passed this House and went to the Upper House; the Upper House had a considerable discussion upon it; and if hon. gentlemen will look at the debates in *Hansard* upon it, they will find that one of the strong arguments against that Bill—the argument, in fact, which defeated the Bill in the Senate—was, that there was a great doubt thrown upon the statements which had been made regarding the saving of distance to be effected by building the road *via* Harvey and Salisbury, instead of allowing it to go round by St. John from Mattawamkeag. The statement made here was that the saving would be at least twenty-seven miles, but it appears from the debates in the Upper House, that it was there said Mr. Van Horne had declared the only saving would be seventeen miles; and the chief reason, I may say the only substantial reason, why the Senate rejected the Bill, was this doubt as to the saving the proposed line would effect. Therefore it was all important that that question should be finally settled. It had to be known whether or not there was a substantial saving which would warrant the expenditure in building that line, and the Government undertook that survey. There was no pledge by Mr. Abbott, that no survey would be made to ascertain that point. The pledge made by Mr. Abbott, on behalf of the Government, was that there should not be a cent spent in the construction of that road until Parliament authorised the expenditure of that cent. But, how could Parliament, in the ensuing Session, decide whether that expenditure should take place or not, unless this doubt was cleared up; unless there was a new survey to ascertain what the saving would be, and whether the Government ought to come to Parliament again, notwithstanding the rejection of the Bill in the Senate last Session? I say we have ascertained that there is a substantial saving of time and distance, and that, therefore, we are in a position to come and ask you to vote a sum of money for the construction of this road. That was the promise of Mr. Abbott—that there should not be anything spent on the construction of the road until Parliament had decided in favor of it. But how could Parliament act intelligently on the point unless in the meantime a survey was had for the purpose of knowing whether this road ought to be built or not? The whole of the hon. gentleman's statement is a mere mare's nest; it has no value, and it only shows the paucity of subjects of attack which hon. gentlemen have to bring against the Government, when they

bring up such a flimsy motion as this, without any foundation. We say that we are strictly within the lines of our duty and power. We have offended against no parliamentary principle; we have offended against no constitutional practice; but we have, for the purpose of giving Parliament information on a most important point on which further legislation might be asked for, or ought to be asked for, exercised the power which has always been given to any and to every Government, of making the necessary enquiries by survey and otherwise for the purpose of basing further legislation upon such information. It is quite clear that such is the case. The hon. gentleman has confounded the expenditure of a sum of money for the purpose of acquiring information regarding the construction of the road with the expenditure on the road itself. Let me give an illustration. There is a strong attempt made to build a railway from Winnipeg to Hudson's Bay. But there is a great deal of doubt about that subject, and if the Government were to introduce a Bill for the purpose of building that road, hon. gentlemen opposite would say: Oh, no; there is not sufficient information, and you must not spend a single farthing in building from Winnipeg to Hudson's Bay until you get the fullest information. Well, we say we will not spend a farthing on that road, we will not build a mile of it, we will not build a single bridge, we shall have no expenditure on the railway itself until we have had a thorough survey and acquired the information necessary, no matter at what expense. Would it be said that because we sent our surveyors in order to ascertain whether the Hudson's Bay Railway should be built, that we broke our pledge not to build that line until we got that information? Why, Sir, the fact that my hon. friend has been forced to make this motion shows that he is, unfortunately for himself, greatly in want of subjects for attack against the Government; and I ask this House with every confidence to vote down this resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Numerous as are the somersaults which we have been in the habit of witnessing on the part of the hon. gentleman during the past two years, I do not think even he himself has ever committed, or ever asked his followers to commit a more humiliating, a more discreditable somersault than that which he has now turned. What is the whole argument of the hon. gentleman? What is his whole answer to the evidence laid on the Table by my hon. friend as to the language used by his own colleague? The hon. gentleman comes to us here and tells us that he and his colleagues last year came to this Parliament and asked us to consent to the construction of a road involving an expenditure of several millions of dollars, that they asked us then for a vote of \$500,000 for the construction of a road about which they knew absolutely nothing, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, in regard to which they had not taken the common and ordinary precaution which the hon. gentleman now declares to be imperatively necessary in order to be able to announce within ten or twenty miles what the saving in distance would be. The hon. gentleman now says, how can he come to Parliament, and how can Parliament act intelligently in regard to this road without a survey having first been

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

made? Was ever a greater insult offered to his own followers? Last year he asked them to vote this money without a survey having been made. If it were possible, I would say that the excuse was worse than the act which he has committed, and which my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, correctly characterised as an insolent defiance of all parliamentary usage. The hon. gentleman has deliberately defied the authority of Parliament. After a co-ordinate branch of the Legislature rejected his proposal, the hon. gentleman—in a way which I shall presently show he was not justified in taking—took a sum of money out of the public chest for the purpose of doing what he now admits he should have done before he asked us last year to pass that measure. But, grave as that matter is, it is perhaps not so grave as the other branch of the subject. If there is one thing which the Parliament of Canada should insist upon, though it has been very remiss in that regard in the past, it is to insist that the promises of Ministers made in their places should be carried out. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Abbott did not pledge the Government not to make a survey. Let me read again what Mr. Abbott said, and let me ask any fair-minded man if my hon. friend was not justified in declaring that his promise had been violated:

"As to the first question, I shall be obliged to look at the Bill before answering; as to the second question, I may say most positively that no expense of any kind will be made on this road until it is sanctioned by Parliament."

Now, if there is anything which is absolutely necessary to be made in the way of expenditure in connection with a road, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, it is the expenditure on the preliminary surveys. That is a part of the construction. Those surveys are charged to construction expenses. Every penny of expenditure which we made on the surveys of the Canadian Pacific Railway is charged to the capital account for construction expenses. The hon. gentleman knows that no private company ever severs in any way, the cost of the original surveys from the cost of the construction. I say that, in making this pledge, if hon. gentlemen intended—and they ought to have known what they intended—to have made this survey and to bring forward this Act again, it was their bounden duty as honest and honorable men, to have stated to the Senate, that, although they would not make any expenditure for the construction of the road, they intended to proceed with the survey. If they had any spark of honor in them, they would have done this, or they would not have allowed any expenditure to be made on that account. I cannot put the construction which the hon. gentleman does on the use of the Governor General's warrant. These warrants are only to be used for special purposes, and the Act distinctly declares for what they may be used:

"If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good."

Then the Governor General's warrant may issue. I say it is a most gross abuse of that power which is granted for such emergencies in regard to matters which could not be reasonably foreseen or provided for, to ask His Excellency to issue a

warrant taking a large sum of money from the public chest for such a purpose as this. I say that the Minister who advised the issue of that warrant committed a fraud on His Excellency, and made His Excellency a tool to perpetrate a gross wrong and to offer a gross affront to the authority of Parliament. I regret exceedingly that it should be necessary to so stigmatise a pledge given by Ministers to Parliament, but it was their duty to have stated explicitly to the Senate when the pledge was made that, although they would not spend any money in construction, they would have a survey made. Not having done that, they had no business whatever to expend this money.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When we on this side are accused of having turned a somersault on this question, it is well to consider what was the policy propounded by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to this road, and to do that it is only necessary to compare the resolution which was moved last Session with the resolution which is now before the House. The resolution which was proposed by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) last year, was that we should not propose a vote for the Harvey and Salisbury road until we had preliminary surveys; and the policy propounded to-night is that we should not make preliminary surveys until we have a vote for the construction of the road. I think, in view of that fact, that the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) may congratulate himself on being able to turn a somersault as easily as anyone possibly can. As to the remarks made in the Senate, and referred to by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who evidently had only glanced at them casually, I do not think there is a member of either House who can fail to understand that the pledge given by Mr. Abbott was distinctly limited to the construction of the road. What was the position when this matter was dealt with by the Senate last Session? There was a Bill presented to the Senate involving the expenditure of \$500,000 for the construction of the Harvey and Salisbury Railway, and there was not a word in regard to surveys. That Bill was defeated in the Senate, but it was publicly stated in the press and these Chambers, and in the corridors, that the Government had inserted that provision in the Supply Bill in order to force its passage and to put it in such a position that the Senate could not defeat it without using almost unconstitutional means. When the question arose in the Senate, not in regard to the survey, but in regard to the expenditure of \$500,000 on the construction, Mr. Miller rose, before he had had an opportunity of examining the Supply Bill, and asked the leader of the Government in that House whether the Government wished to force the Senate to that expenditure of \$500,000 for construction. There was no suggestion as to the survey, except Mr. Miller's previous contention that it was unwise to proceed with the expenditure on construction until we had the surveys to lay upon the Table of the House. It would have been most inconsistent under those circumstances for the Senator, an inconsistency which would not have been paralleled excepting by the motion which has been made to-night, after having urged the Government not to force the Bill for the construction of the railway without

a survey, to have risen and challenged the Supply Bill on the ground that the surveys were being provided for in that Bill. Everything that took place with regard to the Supply Bill, was a challenge by the Senator from Richmond against the Government putting into the Supply Bill a vote for the construction of the road; and not a single observation was made as to the surveys, or as to the expenditure on anything but construction. It was under these circumstances that the leader of the Government in the Senate gave the pledge that the expenditure which had been the subject of the debate the night before, the expenditure which, it was feared, would be provided for in the Supply Bill, for the construction of the road, and not any other object, and this alone was the subject of the pledge of the leader of the Government in the Senate. The Hon. gentleman who has just sat down has stated the singular proposition, for the purpose, it seems to me, of wresting the language violently which the hon. Mr. Abbott used in the Senate last Session, that there can be no expenditure more directly made on a railway than expenditure for survey. Why, Sir, if, at the urgent solicitation of an important part of the country, the Government made preliminary surveys for the purpose of ascertaining whether a railway ought to be built or not, but decided, after those surveys were completed and after the information was acquired, that it was unwise to construct the road, and abandoned the undertaking—could that be called expenditure upon that road? Could it be said that because the Government had promised not to build the road or to spend a dollar on it, the survey was a violation of the pledge which they had made to Parliament? Now, let me call the attention of the House to the inaccuracy of the observations which have just been made by the hon. member for South Oxford as to the developments in this House last year. This measure for the construction of the Harvey and Salisbury line was not presented to the House in the absence of information, in the absence of authorities, in the absence of even the roughest surveys, as he has said to-night. On the contrary, we had the written opinion, the written report, the written pledge of the ablest officers of the Railway Department, indicating to Parliament that less than two millions would amply suffice to build that road; we had that on the highest authority that the Government could get at the time. That was the authority on which Parliament had been accustomed to make railway votes from time to time. But we were met by the startling announcement from the other side of the House that our calculations were all astray, that instead of saving about thirty-two miles of road the new line would only save about seventeen. That was constantly repeated in the course of that debate, and it was vehemently asserted that instead of building the road for two millions, we should be well out of it if we got it built for four millions; and one gentleman in this House, and one, I think, in the Upper House, went so far as to say that we were actually pledging the country for an expenditure of seven million dollars. With the strong assertion that we were incurring an expenditure of at least four millions, and perhaps of seven millions, and that we were only to save seventeen miles by the construction of this link; with the strong request for a survey backed by the strong vote on the

other side of the House, I ask if it was not reasonable that, before presenting that subject to the consideration of the House again, we should enquire whether the alarming statements made by the opponents of the measure were correct, or whether the estimates made by our own engineers were nearer the truth? But there was another consideration. It was not merely incumbent upon us, before deciding whether to go on with the Bill for the construction of the road, it was not merely necessary for us to deliberate whether we should abandon the road or not, but we had in view this circumstance: that Parliament had made by a statute still in force an offer, which was still outstanding, of upwards of \$60,000 a year for the construction of this road. As the matter stood after last Session, any railway company might have come forward and asked us to sign a contract for the construction of that railway and to pledge \$63,000 a year for twenty years. Were we in a position to say yes or no? We had been met by statements on the other side of the House that we were only going to save seventeen miles of railway, and that the construction of the road would entail not only an enormous waste of money to any contractors who undertook it, but a waste of public money to the extent of \$63,000 for twenty years. Would we have been in a position to avail ourselves of any offer made under those circumstances, with that statement made in the House, with that statement backed by the vote of the Opposition in the House, with that statement believed by an overwhelming majority of the Senate? What would have been our censure if we had even availed ourselves of the statutory powers we had, to bestow that subsidy, and made a contract for the construction of this road, by which the public money of Canada should go to the extent of \$63,000 a year for twenty years? There was the possible abandonment of the road, or the proposition to bring forward the measure at this Session, or, on the other hand, the possibility of a company coming forward, as a company was likely to do, to ask us to enter into a contract under the legislation existing last year. But, in view of the strong stand taken in this House by the Senate, that any further action on the subject should be preceded by surveys and by detailed estimates, we would not have complied with the will of Parliament, if we had entered into a contract for the subsidy without a survey. If we had done so we should have had, weeks ago, a resolution twice as strong, a resolution of censure declaring that before we pledged the public money of Canada to that extent, even under an outstanding statute, we ought to have made the very surveys which we are now censured for having made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says that \$63,000 a year had been appropriated for the construction of this particular part of the Short Line Railway. The hon. gentleman knows well, that we had appropriated a subsidy for the construction of that short line, from Montreal to St. John, and he knows well that under an Order in Council, which received a great deal of criticism from this side of the House, the Government had appropriated \$63,000 as a subsidy to a company who would build that part of the line; and he knows that the Atlantic Company had refused to construct that part of the line for the amount of subsidy which

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

the Government had appropriated; and he knew, as a consequence of that, that the line could not be built. The hon. gentleman must not argue, and cannot argue, that this Government were authorised in expending any portion of the public money in surveys, because \$63,000 a year subsidy had been appropriated to a company if they would construct the line; the hon. gentleman could not argue that, and, therefore, the whole of that portion of his remarks was utterly irrelevant and no answer whatever to the charge which the hon. gentleman formulated in his resolution. The charge made in the resolution is, that the Government have not only acted in defiance of the solemn pledge which, through the mouth of the leader of the Government in the other House, they gave to the country, but they have acted illegally and contrary to the law of the land in expending money on those surveys. The hon. gentleman in defending himself, tried to show that no such pledge was given, and as an exhibition of skill in casuistry, I have never seen him more successful. If the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to read the question put to the leader of the Government in connection with that matter, he would not have endeavored to establish that Mr. Abbott did not pledge the Government at that time, not to spend a single dollar on the construction of that road. The question put by the hon. Senator Miller was this:

"I want to know whether or not there is half a million of dollars towards the Short Line of railway in the Supply Bill; and, if so, whether any attempt will be made to expend any of that money until authority is obtained from Parliament for the construction of the Short Line Road?" The hon. Senator asked distinctly whether there was to be any attempt made to spend any of the money until authority is obtained from Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of the \$500,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) At that time Parliament had refused to sanction the expenditure of that money. Parliament had thrown out the Bill which the Government had introduced providing for that expenditure, it had stamped that Bill with disapproval, and the leader of the Government in the other House, in answer to a question, said:

"I may say most positively that no expenditure of any kind will be made on this road until it is sanctioned by Parliament."

Not that no expenditure of the \$500,000 would be made, but that no expenditure of any kind would be made on this road.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On this road.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the First Minister pretend to argue before this House that the expenditure connected with laying out the road and surveying is not an expenditure in connection with that road? Such a contention is absurd. It is an expenditure on the road. It is one of the expenditures which the \$500,000 which Parliament was asked to vote would provide for; but Parliament did not pass the Bill granting that expenditure, and Mr. Abbott stated distinctly:

"I say most positively that no expenditure of any kind will be made on this road until it is sanctioned by Parliament."

Parliament did not grant that \$500,000 or any other money. The Minister of Justice argued that they had sufficient evidence last year to justify them in asking Parliament to pass the Bill for the construction of this road. What evidence

has he? He had about the same evidence which the House had presented to it when it consented to vote some millions for the construction of the Oxford and New Glasgow road. We had then the pledges of Ministers that the road would be of a certain length and cost a certain sum of money, that there would be an absolute saving effected with regard to distance, and we had the absolute pledge made by Ministers that the saving consequent on the construction of the road would be forty-five miles, and upon that solemn pledge given by Ministers, and this House believed that such pledges would not be given unless Ministers had evidence to justify them, Parliament voted the money. What did hon. members find after the money had been voted and expended? They found that the pledges made by the Government were absolutely no good, and instead of a saving of forty-five miles being effected, as the Government had promised, the saving was only seven miles. So we had the evidence before us last year. What is the resolution which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) asks this House to pass? He asks this House to pass a vote of censure on the Government, because they expended \$22,300 without a vote of Parliament. This has been done, not only without a vote of Parliament, but in absolute defiance of a contrary vote of Parliament. The Government had asked Parliament to sanction that expenditure; they had brought in a Bill providing for an expenditure, in the first place, up to \$500,000, and although it passed one branch of the Legislature by a majority, it was thrown out at the other end of the Legislature and it never became law. There was, therefore, no authority given, but the expenditure was condemned by one branch of the Legislature, and this condemnation was shown by the Senate throwing out the Bill; and yet expenditure has proceeded in the face of the pledge given by the leader of the Government in the other House, that not a dollar would be expended until the authority of Parliament had been obtained. What authority has the Government for this outlay? We know that every year the Government have been usurping the powers of this House, and there is no greater danger existing at this moment than the danger which exists from the usurpation on the part of the Executive of powers which properly belong to the Commons of Canada. We have evidence of this every year. A year or two ago two millions were spent just before an election, largely to maintain the party in power; and when we challenged that expenditure in this House and showed that it could not properly be made under the Governor General's warrant, hon. gentlemen opposite were left without any defence. We thought, after that experience, that hon. gentlemen opposite would not continue to pursue that course. What do we find to-day? The leader of the Government says: We spent the money, and we now come here and ask Parliament to support us. But the hon. gentleman's contention is utterly unjustifiable, for he has no right to spend money unless it is voted by Parliament, or unless he is able to bring that expenditure within the terms of the statute which authorises the issue of special warrants. He did not get a vote of Parliament; and unless he can bring himself within the section authorising the expenditure by special warrant, he is without any authority, and the money has been spent in

violation of the law, as the resolution expresses it. What does the law say? It says:

"No cheque for public money shall issue except upon the certificate of the Auditor General that there is parliamentary authority for the expenditure, save only in the following cases."

There was no parliamentary authority for this expenditure, and, therefore, unless it comes within the exceptions of the Act, the Government have been guilty of spending \$22,000 in violation of the law. The Act further says:

"If, when Parliament is not in Session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good."

The expenditure does not come within this section. This expenditure was foreseen and was recommended to Parliament. It was, therefore, foreseen, recommended and rejected. Accordingly the First Minister stands in a worse position than if the Government had never recommended it, because the Government not only recommended it but Parliament stamped the measure with their disapproval, rejected the recommendation of the Government, and gave no authority whatever for the expenditure. Parliament did not provide for it; the whole matter was foreseen, but it was stamped with the disapproval of Parliament. In what position, therefore, do we stand? The First Minister says: I do not care whether it was foreseen or whether Parliament provided for it; if we think the expenditure is an outlay in the public interest, we will make the expenditure, and will ask Parliament to sanction it afterwards. Every member knows that this is one of the most dangerous precedents that can be introduced; it is still more dangerous if it is sanctioned, as no doubt, it will be, by a majority of this House. The First Minister has added a new section to the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act. He says: Although it is true that this expenditure was not sanctioned by Parliament, I am going to show that I had authority to spend that money. What is his authority? He says a certain resolution was introduced by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) and supported by a certain number of members in this House. What became of this resolution? It was voted down by a large majority. And therefore, he says, if a resolution—assuming for the nonce that his construction was at all possible—asking for a vote is voted down, that resolution justifies me in spending the money. Why, the hon. gentleman knows that the very resolution which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) moved was, that no money should be spent on the construction of the road until proper surveys had been made, and until time had demonstrated its necessity and advisability. There were two conditions: one was, until the surveys had been made; and the second was, until time should demonstrate the necessity and advisability of the construction of the road. No one will say that time has demonstrated its necessity. What is the fact in regard to that resolution? The majority of the House voted it down. The First Minister read the minority names; why did he not read the names of the majority that pronounced against the resolution, headed by the name of the First Minister himself, and followed by those of every Conservative in the House? And, therefore, even if

the resolution had passed, the hon. gentleman could take no authority under it for the expenditure of money; but as the resolution did not pass, it is child's play, it is treating the House with contempt, and insulting the House, to say that the expenditure was justifiable, because it was made in compliance with a resolution which was voted down by a large majority in this House. Neither by Act of Parliament, neither by the clause authorising expenditure by special warrant, nor by any resolution sanctioned by this House or by the Senate, could the hon. gentleman spend one dollar. We know why he spent it. He had given pledges, or some of the members of his Government had given pledges, that the work would be constructed. They were annoyed by the check given to their plan by the other branch of the Legislature, in the proper exercise of their powers—and the proposal was defeated by a large majority—and they were determined to proceed with the work. The Government have expended the money illegally, and the First Minister stands to-day, although he tries to laugh the question out and tells funny stories to this House, convicted of having illegally expended this money; and the hon. gentleman cannot point to a section of any Act of Parliament, or to any resolution, or to any precedent worth following, which will justify him in violating that which is one of the most precious privileges of the Commons of Canada—the right to declare when and how the public money shall be expended.

Mr. KENNY. It will be within the recollection of the members of this House—at least those of them who come from my native Province, and from the adjoining Province of New Brunswick, and who take a special interest in the Short Line Railway—that, early last Session, I caused to be placed on the Notice paper, a resolution asking for the papers in connection with this railway. My object in doing so was to bring to the notice of Parliament, in the most formal manner which was at my disposal, the very unsatisfactory position in which that railway stood. It will also be within the recollection of hon. gentlemen, that, subsequently, in the Railway Committee, when a Bill connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway was under discussion, I there held that that Bill should not be granted until some provision had been made for the completion of the Short Line Railway. I, and others, who had then made that proposition, were met by the statement that we were doing a great injustice to the Canadian Pacific Railway in presuming to come before the Railway Committee, until we had the fullest information to give as regards the length, the total cost, and the time which would be occupied in constructing the Harvey, Fredericton, Moncton Railway. We were met by the most extravagant opposition statements at that time. It was true that a preliminary survey had been made, and that the chief officer of railways, a trusted and confidential official of the Government, had stated that it could be constructed for \$16,000 a mile, but that would not satisfy certain hon. gentlemen. They contended that a full and a complete survey must be made before Parliament would consent to grant any money for the construction of this railway. My contention then was: that the distance was just the same, and the conditions of the country would be the same, as when, in 1885, Parliament

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

voted a certain sum for the construction of that railway. Finally, the Government brought down a resolution providing for an expenditure for the construction of the remainder of the Short Line Railway. That was met by the motion of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) in which he demanded that a more complete survey should be made, and to which motion the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) has just referred. That resolution of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) is divided into two clauses: the first of which is, that a full and complete survey must be made before any vote of Parliament should be granted for the construction of that line. I find that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Davies) took an important part in that debate. In looking over *Hansard* I see that that hon. gentleman stated:

"That it could not be emphasised too strongly, and insisted on by the country too carefully, that we are asked to embark on the construction of a road, a survey of which has not yet been made."

Here is this hon. gentleman, who contended from his place in Parliament, that not one dollar of public money should be voted for the construction of this railway (to which Parliament was committed, and in which the people of the Maritime Provinces took a special interest), and that no expenditure was warranted, because a survey had not been made; but, notwithstanding all those contentions he now finds fault with the Government of the country for having that survey made.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) For having it made without the authority of Parliament.

Mr. KENNY. So anxious was the hon. gentleman in the public interest, that the most accurate information should be obtained before the expenditure was made, that he then stated:

"In the absence of correct information as to the length of the line, and without correct information as to the cost of the line, we are not warranted in indulging in so large an expense."

Again he says:

"I say, speaking from the interest of the Dominion at large, that this vote is inadvisable, and that with the information before the House it is more than inadvisable, it is shameful and disgraceful that Parliament should enter into an unknown expenditure for 140 miles of railway."

The hon. gentleman was not finding so much fault with the expenditure as he was with Parliament entering upon an unknown expenditure. Now, however, the hon. gentleman holds a different view—he can always find some excuse for opposing the present Government. He was not the only hon. member who, last Session, seemed to be actuated by a desire for more positive information. We were met everywhere around the House with the contention that it was unfair to urge this expenditure on the Government until the survey had been made. One hon. gentleman stated that the calculation of the Government officers was that the line would cost \$2,000,000; another hon. gentleman that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company estimated the cost at \$4,000,000, and, speaking from memory, I think that the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), stated that it would cost \$7,000,000. I am speaking from memory, and the hon. gentleman can correct me if I am wrong. Now, Sir, in view of these facts, and in view of the great differences of opinion which existed, I hold that the Government, instead of being

blamed, should be commended for having, in the public interest, endeavored to ascertain the most positive and correct information possible in connection with this railway. What are the facts in connection with this question? As I understand the right hon. the leader of the House, he has told us that it is usual to put in the Estimates a sum for expenditure on railway surveys, which sum is placed at the disposal of the Government of the day. When an additional sum of money is required for these surveys, a warrant is issued, and we find that in this case, as in all others, this parliamentary custom has been exactly followed. As regards the language used in the other House by the hon. gentleman who there represents the Government, I may state that the hon. Senator Miller—referring to the resolution which had passed this House, and which was defeated in the Senate because sufficient information in connection with the railway was not before the Upper House—asked if any part of the \$500,000, which was in the resolution passed by this House, would be expended on the railway? The leader of the Government in the Senate stated that there would be no expenditure on the road, and, as a matter of fact, not one single dollar has been expended on the road. I personally may be very sorry that it was not expended. Last year I certainly urged the construction of that road in the public interest, because I thought the faith of Parliament was pledged to it and should be kept. It is true that since then the other great railway of Canada, the Grand Trunk, has intimated its desire to have access to the Maritime Provinces, and that is a matter which is exciting a great deal of interest there; and the hon. leader of the Opposition—who I regret to say during his parliamentary career has never shown any very great affection for the Maritime Provinces—realising the interest which is being shown in those Provinces by these two rival railroads in their anxiety to come down there, may now be anxious to draw the Government and obtain from them the most positive and accurate information as to their intentions with regard to these railways. The other day a gentleman who attended a deputation that waited on one of the Ministers found very great fault because the Minister did not tell him what he was going to do. Perhaps the object of the hon. leader of the Opposition may be to ascertain what the Government are going to do with regard to the extension of the Grand Trunk system or the completion of the Short Line Railway to the Maritime Provinces. If that was his object, I regret that he has not been more successful. If this resolution had been moved by a gentleman on the back benches, like myself, I would have said that he was not serious—that he was trifling with the House—I would not like to apply that language to the hon. leader of the Opposition—in asking this Parliament to censure the Government for doing the very thing which the gentlemen who surrounded him last year urged the Government to do. The hon. gentleman will remember that, in 1885, he endeavored to retard this Short Line Railway, and he is consistent to-day in his opposition to it. From its inception it was recognised to be a benefit to the Maritime Provinces; from its inception to this day it has met with the opposition of the hon. leader of the Opposition. In 1885, when the Government measure came down, providing for the construction of the

Short Line Railway, it was met with an amendment moved by that hon. gentleman, which was characterised by the gentlemen surrounding him as an injustice and an injury to the Maritime Provinces. The object of that amendment was to secure delay and an additional survey was asked for; and yet when more surveys are now provided he is dissatisfied. As I said before, I consider that for having secured this survey, the Government, instead of being censurable, are entitled to the thanks of Parliament and especially to the thanks of the members from the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has wandered away entirely from the question before the House. He has made a very nice speech, a sort of echo of his speech of last year, in favor of this line, and I have no doubt that before this Session is over he will be asking for a subsidy for another line as a great advantage to the Maritime Provinces—a line which, I think, he will find the hon. leader of the Opposition supporting, as he has before advocated it in this House. But that has nothing to do with the question before the House. The merits of the expenditure it is not necessary to go into at all. The simple question is the constitutional question: have the Government acted within the law, or have they acted without the authority of Parliament? The hon. leader of the Government has laid great stress on the resolution which I brought forward last Session. At a time when the members of the House were anxious to get away, during the dying hours of the Session, the proposition for the construction of this railway was brought forward by the Government. They had made arrangements with a railway company to run that line, by an agreement which I contended was inimical to the interests of the city and county I represent. It was then contended on this side of the House the Government had not sufficient knowledge to justify them in proceeding with the work. We had already had a certain experience in connection with the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, which a Minister had stated would save a great distance, whereas it turned out that the distance really saved was very much less, and we asked the Government to hold their hands. The amendment I put forward last year embraced two points: first, that no action should be taken by this House authorising the construction of the railway until a proper survey of the proposed line and reliable estimates of its proper cost should be laid before Parliament, and, secondly, until time had established that the existing line of railway between Harvey and Salisbury or Moncton, was not sufficient to meet the demands of passenger and freight traffic. Shortly afterwards, even before the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had an opportunity of developing the traffic over their line, the Government, without the authority of Parliament, commenced an expenditure of money on surveys, in defiance of the pledge given by the leader of the Government in the Senate. But my resolution was voted down, the majority of this House declaring that the Government should go on with this work, and that a half million of money should be expended in the construction of the road. As the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), has pointed out,

that vote was intended to include the cost of surveys, plans and profiles, which it would be necessary for the Government, before issuing the contracts for construction, to have completed. Yet my resolution was rejected by Parliament; and after voting that those surveys were utterly unnecessary, the Government expended this money on surveys. Now, the hon. leader of the Government said that the objection taken in the other House was that the surveys were not proper surveys; and he endeavored to make out that the language of Mr. Abbott in that House referred entirely to the building of the road, and not to surveys. In looking over the debate, I find that it was the Hon. Mr. Miller who moved the six months' hoist, and in doing so he said:

"I think it will be admitted that the general feeling in both Houses of Parliament, whatever party exigencies may have rendered necessary, is that the expenditure contemplated by this Bill is a useless and wasteful application of the public funds."

Then he goes on to deal with the argument about the saving:

"Therefore it is doubtful if there will be any saving in the length of the line; but supposing they would save twenty miles on the Canadian Pacific Railway between the two oceans, or even say between Montreal and Halifax, the saving in time would not exceed three-quarters of an hour, and I ask this House if, in the present condition of the finances of the country, with the large debt and the heavy burdens which Canada has had to assume for necessary public works—I am not now condemning the Government for these large expenditures, because I believe in a great measure they were the outcome of a wise policy which will have future beneficial results—but looking at the necessary debt that this country will have to assume in connection with those public works, are we in a position, unless impelled by some inevitable necessity, to spend three million dollars on this railway to secure such insignificant advantages."

The argument made by the gentleman who led the opposition to the Bill in the Senate was the absence of necessity for this road. I find the Hon. Mr. Abbott, in summing up the objections, does not say a word at all about the surveys. He says:

"My hon. friend from Marshfield submitted to the House in a condensed form the substance of all the objections that are made to this enterprise. Now, let us see how far these objections have not been already met by what has been done, and I propose merely to glance at that, and at what my hon. friend said, which attracted my attention. This road, it is said, will be a rival with the Intercolonial Railway; it will take away the traffic past St. John; it does not go by the most direct line, inasmuch as it goes by Fredericton; it is not, according to the gentleman's objections, a direct line, and it is not entitled to the name of the short line, because it makes a detour in order to reach Fredericton; and, moreover, it is said: Why build this short line? What is the object of it? What is the advantage to accrue from it? What good is it going to do?"

These are the objections summed up by Mr. Abbott in his reply; and you will find the objections urged by the Senate were based on the utter want of necessity for this line, and that it would be a waste of the public funds, to spend money upon a road running parallel to the Government road at the very time that connection was made with the Government road, and no opportunity afforded for ascertaining whether that did not meet the requirements of passengers and traffic. The Senate, upon those objections, rejected the Bill, and Parliament disapproved of any money being spent on the road. You must read the language of the Hon. Mr. Abbott in this connection. The hon. member for Halifax says there is no expenditure. But my hon. friend carefully leaves out the emphasis which Mr. WELDON (St. John).

the hon. Senator puts on the language he used, "expenditure of any kind:"

"I say most positively that no expenditure of any kind will be made on this road until authorised by Parliament."

Any man who understands at all railway construction, will know that surveys and plans are just as necessary and part of the construction of a road as the very sleepers and iron put upon it; and if the Senate had voted the half million dollars which the Government proposed to spend, a large portion of that money would have been devoted to this very object. Last Session, on the floor of this House, the Government urged that the surveys were all made, and that it was unnecessary to have further surveys, as those they had were sufficient; and yet the Government have dared, without the warrant or authority of Parliament, or without law, to spend \$30,000 on surveys, which they declared they did not require. Another point I took in my resolution is, that we should wait until time has established that the existing line of railway between the points is not sufficient to meet the demands of passenger and trade traffic. Shortly after that resolution was moved, a connection was made by which trains were run from Montreal through to Halifax. Inside of six weeks, those trains commenced running and have been running ever since. I appeal to the evidence of every person in the Maritime Provinces if that train has not been run in a most creditable manner. We have now quick and regular communication, and I have not heard one word except in praise of the manner in which that traffic is carried on by the Canadian Pacific Railway. We can now leave Montreal at eight in the evening and arrive in Halifax at eleven o'clock the next night, and be in St. John the next day at two o'clock. So far as the requirements of trade in traffic and passengers are required, time has shown that that road is sufficient for them for some time to come; and for the Government to spend this money without warrant and without parliamentary vote, is simply a waste of money for the purpose of keeping some constituencies in such a position that they will return supporters of the Government to Parliament. This proposed line will be another Oxford and New Glasgow, for the purpose of securing to the Government certain counties by means of this expenditure. My hon. friend has pointed out that the Governor General's warrant can only be employed under the Act:

"If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent—"

I should like to ask where is the urgent necessity in this case? It is only in the two instances mentioned in the Act that the Governor General can issue his warrant. In this case there was no urgent necessity. The road was completed which served the purposes of all the traffic, and there was no necessity whatever for this new line. Were the people of Nova Scotia in any difficulties for the want of this road?

Mr. KENNY. Is that the road the hon. gentleman voted for in 1885?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In 1885, as I pointed out last year when the resolution was brought forward, there was a certain sum granted for this road. I voted for that. The hon. member for Halifax insisted that this should be part of the arrangement at that time, which was that a certain sum should be granted to the company and not that the Government should build the road; and I said last Session I was prepared to stick to that agreement, and let the company have their \$63,000, and build it. But I protested against the Government setting to work to draw away trade from my city and county by building this road. But the merits of the case are not before the House at present. I said, in 1885, I was willing to abide by that agreement, and my hon. friend will remember that I voted against the resolution of the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk). I say this in justice to myself, but this has nothing to do with the present case. It is quite immaterial what passed in 1885. It is quite foreign to the question which is now before the House. The question now is, whether the Government were justified in taking the course they did in regard to the surveys. They had voted down a resolution in regard to the surveys, they had given a pledge in the other House that no expenditure of any kind should be made, and no words could be stronger than those that were used, whether they referred to the preliminary surveys or to the building of the road. The question now is, had the Government the right, without the authority of Parliament, to spend any money upon that survey. If they had no authority of Parliament, they are driven to the Act, and they must show that this expenditure was urgent, and was absolutely required, and the Minister of Railways must have stated a case showing that the necessity was urgent. Anyone who heard the debate last year, anyone who knows the facts connected with this matter, knows that there was no urgent necessity. I, therefore, say that the Government, not having the authority of Parliament, and not having met the requirements of the statute, are deserving of the censure contained in this resolution of my hon. friend.

Mr. KIRK. It is true, as the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has said, that this is a matter in which the people of Halifax and the people of Nova Scotia are much interested. It is more than five years since the Government brought a measure before Parliament, promising the people of that Province that this road should be built. In 1885 a measure was introduced by the Minister of Railways, to provide for the building of the Short Line through the State of Maine to St. John, and pretending at the same time, to provide for the construction of a line from Harvey to Salisbury. While the Government pretended that they were bound to build that Short Line, to my mind, it did not seem very clear that they intended to do anything of the kind, and I, therefore, moved a resolution in amendment to the proposition laid before the House by the Minister of Railways, which I will read. I intend to show that the policy pursued by the Government in this matter from the first, has been a policy of deception. While the

resolution to which I refer was before the House in 1885, I moved the following amendment:—

“That the report be not now considered, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending the Bill by providing that the work on the sections of the line between Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury shall be begun and prosecuted simultaneously with the portion of the whole line west of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine.”

The Minister of Public Works on behalf of the Government, requested me to withdraw the motion. He explained that it was the intention of the Government to take power to build that road, and that the passing of my amendment would retard rather than assist the construction. This is the explanation he made:

“I do not think this is an amendment which should be made, as, if it were carried, instead of helping the enterprise, it would throw obstacles in its way. Other hon. gentlemen may come forward and ask that work on other portions of the line shall be prosecuted simultaneously. That is not done anywhere, we see no such provision in any charter; no road is undertaken in that way. After the explanations I gave just now, that the contract which the Government will have to make will be made in such a way as to secure the completion of the line, taking care that the heaviest portions of the line may not be left to be built and paid with an amount only equal to the easiest portions of the line, but that the different portions may be paid for according to the character of the work to be performed—under these circumstances I hope the hon. gentleman will not persist in his motion.”

I did not, however, consider that that was very satisfactory, and I did not withdraw the motion, but it was voted down by the Government. The Government pretended all the while that they intended to proceed with the construction of this line. In 1886, I asked a question in this House which was answered by the Minister of Justice with reference to this line of railway. The people of Halifax and the people of Nova Scotia were led to believe that a contract was entered into to construct this line as well as the line to St. John:

“Mr. KIRK asked, Has a contract been entered into by the Government with any person or company for the building of the Short Line Railway from Montreal *via* Fredericton to Salisbury? If so, with whom? Will the contract be laid before the House this Session?”

“Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, a contract has been entered into with the International Railway Company, of which Mr. Duncan McIntyre is president. I understand it will not be laid on the Table this Session, unless asked for.”

Here is a declaration by the Minister of Justice that a contract was entered into to build this railway by way of Salisbury to Fredericton. Further, this question came up and was discussed in the elections in Nova Scotia in 1887, when a declaration was made on a platform in Halifax, by the late Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, who distinctly declared that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was bound under contract to build this section of railway. I quote from a newspaper report of what he said on the 5th February, 1887:

“When I stated last night that the last act I did before leaving London was to sign, as joint trustee with Lord Revelstoke and Lord Wolverton, the bonds for the construction of this line of railway (the Short Line) by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that it is now in their hands; when I told him (Mr. Jones) that, he felt that it was a death knell ringing in his ears. He felt that with the gigantic work in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, knowing their enormous resources, and knowing that the moment they had expended their money in the construction of this short line of railway, and carried out their magnificent project of having running to Halifax as fast a line of steamers as crosses the ocean from England to New York, that this harbor must become the entrepot of the traffic and commerce between Europe and the east. He knew that this would

become a great transcontinental highway, and that we would not only bring over it the traffic from Europe to Japan and China, but that we should be able to compete with Boston, Portland or New York with regard to traffic, and travel to the cities of New York and Chicago and the Western States.

"I have already told you that this gigantic Pacific Railway Company, with between four and five thousand miles of constructed railway now in operation, with an army of 25,000 men in their employ, and expending money to an extent that is calculated to sustain and develop a country of itself, if we had to rest upon it almost alone. When that company have declared by the most solemn, important and business-like act that it is possible for them to do—by putting their hand and seal to a contract binding them to build, not only the short line of railway that comes to St. John, but also the short line of railway that passes St. John by coming from Fredericton to Moncton, because that is in the bond, and that is the work with which they are immediately to grapple."

There is the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper himself, who was Minister of Railway, at that time, declaring that not only had they entered into a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build the road from St. John, but also had entered into a contract with that company to complete the branch from Salisbury and Fredericton to Harvey. After the elections were over, Sir Charles Tupper, on the floor of the House, in 1887, made an almost similar statement in discussing the Estimates. I will read from the *Hansard* what was stated by him on the question which has been brought up here :

"Mr. JONES. I see there is an item here for the Short Line Railway; and while we are on that subject I would like to ask the Minister of Railways to give us some information with reference to the Short Line Railway which is now going on to the cities of St. John and Halifax, and which, it was expected, would shorten very much the distance from Montreal to those cities. There is a good deal of anxiety at present, on account of the report that they were about connecting with the Maine Central Line, instead of proceeding with the work as originally contemplated to Fredericton, Salisbury and Moncton; and if that is the case, it would appear from the information which reaches us indirectly, that while the road would have an advantage in connecting with the American line, the distance to be gained by the connection with St. John would not be anything like what was originally contemplated. I have heard it stated by a person who pretends to be well informed, that the line has been deflected so much, owing to the lack of accuracy in the original survey, that the distance to Halifax would not be shortened fifteen miles. I should like to have some information from the Minister of Railways on that point, because the expenditure can only be justified on the ground that it would shorten the distance to Halifax and St. John by over 200 miles; and if, as is said to be the case—I speak not from personal knowledge—it will not shorten it more than to the extent I have named, I think the intention of Parliament will not be carried out. If the hon. gentleman is in a position to give any information on the subject, I know it would be very acceptable just now, when the question is being discussed a good deal in the Lower Provinces.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is aware that that work is in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with whom a contract has been made, and that contract is on the line originally agreed upon by Parliament to carry the road to Mattawamkeag and from Mattawamkeag, the company, as I understand, have made arrangements with the Maine Central Railway and the New Brunswick Railway to go to St. John. That was always the intention. The road is, therefore, being constructed precisely on the line and in the terms of the contract approved by Parliament, and the work is going on vigorously; and I am informed by the company that the line will be completed by the end of this year. The other portion of the contract requires the line to go from Harvey to Fredericton, and from Fredericton to Moncton, for the Halifax connection, and that the company are also bound under their contract to construct on the line originally laid down by Parliament.

"Mr. JONES. If my information is correct, they are constructing the branch from Mattawamkeag to the Central Railway, and no progress is being made on the other branch. I am aware that it is said to be under the

Mr. KIRK.

charge of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but it appears to me that the Government should exercise supervision over those roads when public money is expended on them.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly, the contract is with them.

"Mr. JONES. I would like the hon. gentleman to inform the House whether progress is also being made on the line from Harvey to Fredericton? I am informed that it is not.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand that they are concentrating their attention on the main work first, and that they will then take up the other; but they are bound by the contract to take up the other and prosecute it vigorously, and complete it within a certain time."

Here, then, is the statement of the Minister of Railways on the floor of Parliament, confirming what he stated on an election platform in Halifax, that the Government had entered into a contract to build the railway from Harvey to Salisbury. The following summer the people of Halifax and Moncton became uneasy with regard to the progress that was being made. They saw that no work was being done, and a delegation was sent by the municipal councils of the city of Moncton and the city of Halifax to Ottawa, to interview the Government with regard to building this line. These delegates came to Ottawa and had a consultation with the First Minister with regard to the construction of this road, always under the impression that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were under contract to build the road. The whole blame of the delay was laid upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and not upon the Government. Under that impression, they came here and pressed upon the Government the necessity of seeing to it, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should perform their contract and build the road. I have not the exact words of the answer of the First Minister to that delegation, but it was in substance that the Government would see to it that the company would be compelled to perform their contract. He did not tell the delegation that the company was not under any bond to build that Salisbury branch, to secure the building of which was the object of the delegates' visit here. He simply put them off by telling them that he would see to it that the company would perform their contract. They went home, I believe, perfectly satisfied that the road would be built. But nothing was done, and it was not until last winter when, in the Railway Committee room in this House, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) put the question plainly to the Minister of Public Works, who was chairman of that Committee, whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was under bonds to build the road. The people of Nova Scotia and the people of Canada were, until that time, under the impression, believed until that day, that the Canadian Pacific Railway were under bonds to build that road, but the Minister of Public Works, in answer to the member for Northumberland, stated that they were not under bonds; and that was the first the public knew of the fact that the Government had done nothing to secure the completion of that road.

Mr. MITCHELL. I often draw a good deal of light out of them, you know.

Mr. KIRK. You did that time. Owing to the answer given to the hon. member, the people then saw the exact position they were in. They saw they had been deceived from the start; they saw there was a necessity for the

motion that I had moved, binding the Government to see that the road was completed simultaneously with the other. Now, I do not see that the Government can expect that I, at least, can vote with them on a motion of this kind. I believe they deserve the censure of this House, not only for spending money unauthorised by Parliament last year, but for the manner in which they have been deceiving the House and the people with regard to this matter from the inception of this business.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Had the Government submitted a proposal for the consideration of this House simply for a sum of money to survey that portion of the line between Harvey and Moncton, I should most undoubtedly have voted for it, as I did for the proposal of the Government last year to expend \$500,000. But when the question comes before us in the shape we find it to-night, under the present resolution, and when I have to choose between my judgment as a public man standing here in the defence of the independence of Parliament and the questions which affect my own constituency in Halifax, whose people are undoubtedly interested in this question, I must, to be consistent with myself and with the duties and obligations imposed upon me here in defence of the independence of this House, take a different view of the question. This matter has been from its very first inception a piece of deception on the part of the Government. The present Government proposed a resolution to this House providing for the construction of that road, and when the question was brought up here by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) and by other hon. members respecting the disposal of this money, the Minister of Public Works, on behalf of the Government, made the most emphatic declaration that a public man could make in his place in Parliament, that the Government would take care that the contract to be made would ensure the construction of that road all the way through to Moncton. The position occupied by the Minister of Public Works in this House was such as to give great force to his observations, and there was not an hon. gentleman who listened to him at that time but believed that the contract to be entered into, would embody the provisions which the hon. gentleman said it would contain. Later on, as has been detailed this evening by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk), the present High Commissioner, who was then Minister of Railways, in his speeches in this House on two occasions which have been quoted, at public meetings in Halifax, at a very critical time during the elections, made most emphatic and positive declarations not only that the road was going to be built, not only that we might expect the money voted by Parliament, applied for the purpose Parliament intended, but that the contract had been signed and settled, and that he had signed the debentures on the other side with Lord Revelstoke, which secured the money for the completion of the line. Taking those two declarations in connection, and taking them in connection with the *exposé* made when the papers were brought down to the House, in return to a motion moved by my hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Kenny), I repeat there never was, there never could be, and I hope there never will be again such an exhibition of

disregard for every public obligation, for everything that should influence a public man, for everything that should entitle a public man's utterances to be received with acceptance as the declarations which those public papers contained. It was found then that so far from an engagement having been entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway or with an other company for the construction of the road to Moncton, it never had been contracted for at all; the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had never undertaken to build it beyond a certain distance, they were in no way obliged by their contract with the Government to build one foot of road beyond what they had already completed; and, therefore, despite the statement of Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, now High Commissioner in England, repeated twice in this House, that the agreement had been signed and sealed, there never had been an agreement and there never had been a contract made and sealed, and the Canadian Pacific Railway was under no obligation whatever to construct a foot of road beyond that they have already built. Here was a melancholy exhibition, one discreditable to this country and highly discreditable to the Government, and more than discreditable, I might say, dishonorable, if the phrase were not unparliamentary, to the hon. gentlemen who made the statements in different places to secure party advantage. So matters passed, and after the elections were over, my respected colleague came to this House and he very properly moved for these papers. I do him the justice to believe that he was under the impression, as I was, and as the people in Halifax were, that this contract had been signed. I have no doubt whatever that my colleague, when he moved for those papers, expected a contract to be produced with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the construction of this road, and I could imagine the chagrin and disappointment of my colleague when, on the papers being produced in Parliament, it appeared that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were completely exonerated from building a foot beyond what they had already completed. I watched with great interest and attention the speech which my hon. friend and colleague delivered on that occasion; I listened with very earnest attention to see whether he would rise superior to all party considerations and would denounce the Government, or express his independent opinion with respect to the Government of which he was a supporter. But I watched in vain for any expression of condemnation of the Government. On referring to the hon. gentleman's speech it will be found that my hon. colleague was very careful to condemn the Canadian Pacific Railway, to observe that the Canadian Pacific Railway should carry out its contract, when he had in his hands at that time all the documents that had passed between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and knew that they completely exonerated that company from building a foot of the road. If the hon. gentleman had stood up in the interests of the city which he and I mutually represent and had denounced the Government at other times in respect of views which he did not entertain or support, if he had risen superior to party considerations and had exercised the powerful influence he is well known to possess on the Government of the day, I cannot say what the

result of such an independent course might have been. But, instead of doing so, he was most careful to avoid by imputation or insinuation, directly or indirectly, any reference, to the responsibility of the Government in that transaction, and endeavored to show that the whole matter rested on the shoulders of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which had no legal obligation in that respect. The hon. gentleman has spoken to-night of the delegation which came shortly afterwards to interview the Government here, that deputation including the mayors of Fredericton, Moncton and Halifax. The hon. gentleman gave a graphic description of their trip to the capital in his speech last year. He said :

"Many hon. gentlemen now listening to me, and members of the Cabinet, are aware that the chief magistrates of Fredericton, Moncton and Halifax made a pilgrimage up here in a most inclement season of the year, to interview the Government and place before them the importance which their people attached to the early completion of this contract. I am glad to say that when these gentlemen returned they came back with their heads erect and their hearts elated, and satisfied with the assurance which had been given them that the contract would be carried out. So far as I am personally concerned, I believe in the very positive assurances that were given in Parliament by the Ministers of the day, and it is for that reason that I have quoted the remarks of the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper and Hon. Sir Hector Langevin, who are leading Parliament in these debates."

I have no doubt my hon. colleague relied on the statements made by the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways. He said: The mayors of those three cities came back with their heads erect and hearts elated at the very positive assurance which had been given to them that the contract would be carried out, and the road would be completed all the way to Moncton. I ask my hon. colleague what he thought of it when he got the contract before him, and what he thought when he had found that he been deceived as I had been deceived, as this House had been deceived, and as the country had been deceived, by the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works, and the statement of the Minister of Railways of that day? I know that the hon. gentleman was deceived, and the reason I took exception to his course was: that he did not stand up as an independent member of this House, occupying the high position which he does in the country and the city he comes from; and say to the Government: You are pledged by the highest member of the Cabinet to stand by this road. Your Minister of Railways made the direct statement that the contract had been signed for it, and I shall not be satisfied until that road is carried out on the original lines." The hon. gentleman instead of doing that, which would have reflected honor on him, as an independent representative of the important city of Halifax, was very anxious to save the Government all he could, and to throw the blame on the Canadian Pacific Railway, which had nothing to with it at all. The policy with regard to this road has been a mistake from the very beginning. If was a mistake in my judgment to have ever built the line at all, for I maintain that it was not done in the interest of the country. It is well known that the amount originally granted, was granted in consequence of members of the Government being connected with roads which were interested or which were going to be absorbed in the new line. It is known, and it has never been denied, that there

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

were members of the Cabinet of that day who drew very important financial advantages in consequence of these large grants. We find the Government giving a sum equal to about \$6,000,000 to build a rival road to the Intercolonial Railway through a foreign territory, instead of spending the resources of the country in further equipping and developing the Intercolonial Railway. That was a mistake, and every day is demonstrated to the country that it was a positive injury to that great public work. On many occasions I have complained of the working of the Intercolonial Railway. I pointed out to the late Minister of Railways that we should be able to come from Halifax to Montreal in thirty hours, instead of forty hours, which was occupied in the journey at that time. The then Minister of Railways assured us, in the most positive manner, that the shorter run was utterly out of the question, because of all the stops we had to make along the line. What do we see now? The moment a rival road was opened, constructed as it was by the money of the country, the Government of the day found that they could make the run on the Intercolonial Railway from Halifax to Montreal in twenty-seven hours. If that had been done before, this new road would never had existed. It was only in consequence of the great length of time in making the distance from Halifax to Montreal, which gave any reason in our part of the country, and I believe in this part of the country as well, for the vote of Parliament, to secure a shorter road. I am told that the present quick service on the Intercolonial Railway is going to involve a very considerable outlay every year, and this will be an additional expense which might have been avoided, if the same service were given at first and no rival road constructed. I believe further that, according to the present arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, to divide the through traffic and the freight traffic as well, a larger deficit will each year be incurred on the Intercolonial Railway. In order to make the deficit greater, and to render our own public works of little value, the Government gave \$6,000,000 to build a rival line to a foreign country. Coming back to the original proposal, I repeat that I would not object to the survey of this line if the Government had made the proposal to vote a certain sum of money to establish an instrumental survey in place of the preliminary survey which existed previous to that time. If the Government had made such a proposal, I would have said: "Very well; let us have the survey and let us see what the result will be." There was considerable difference of opinion as regards this line, and it was stated by various authorities that the distance to be saved by its construction was all the way from fifteen miles to thirty miles. I repeat that it was important, in the interests of the country, to ascertain what the actual saving of this distance would be; and, therefore, if it were only a question of the survey itself, I should not condemn it. But, as one of the representatives of the people, I am here to guard the privileges of Parliament above all things. I value too highly my position in this House to violate, for one moment, the principles which have been held sacred in every representative assembly from time immemorial, for the sake of gaining even a paltry temporary advantage in the district I repre-

sent. I will go back to my people in Halifax, if my action here to-night is questioned, and I will explain the whole transaction from beginning to end, and I am not afraid, here or elsewhere, before those who value principle above expediency, to justify the course I intend to take in voting for the amendment of my hon. friend. Such a course is one that every honorable man who prides himself upon the liberty of Parliament should take. This question has gone so far, now, that we would like very much to see the end of it, and to know exactly what the views of the Government are. It is no secret, and it was no secret last year, that many members of the Government were opposed to this appropriation of half a million dollars, and that it was defeated in the Upper House by the action of members of the Cabinet, and by the Government whip in that House bringing the members who support the Government there to vote it down. Does any one suppose for a moment, that if the Government were in earnest, and that if they desired to pass it in the other branch of the Legislature, it would have been defeated? The history of this country gives a different lesson entirely. It was known that the members of the Government spoke of the measure in light and sneering terms, as done to conciliate a certain member of the Cabinet from Nova Scotia. The Government went through the farce, it would seem, of passing the Bill in this House, knowing that it was going to be defeated in the other branch of Legislature. Then, came the promise which was made by the leader of the Government in the Senate, and that promise has now been attempted to be distorted by the First Minister, and by other gentlemen who have spoken on this subject. I think that anyone who reads for himself, and who understands plain English, will arrive at the conclusion that the Hon. Mr. Abbott, when he made the declaration on that occasion, meant that no money should be expended directly or indirectly on the road itself or for surveys, or for any other purpose. The Government cannot, therefore, hope to make any such contentions as they have made, because it cannot be borne out by the statement made by the Hon. Mr. Abbott, last Session. Be that as it may, I say that the intentions of Parliament should be respected; and if we are ever going to maintain any authority at all over the expenditure of this country, that authority must be vindicated on every occasion. Hon. gentlemen who have preceded me have referred to the objects of the Governor General's warrants. Will the hon. First Minister say that this survey was a matter of such urgent necessity that he should ask the Governor General for his warrant to carry it on? The hon. gentleman, as well as every member of this House, knows that the Governor General's warrant is only intended to be used for purposes of great public extremity. If a lock should break on our canals, or a bridge should be carried away on our railways, or a public building should be burnt down, or any great public exigency should arise, which was unforeseen and for which money was not provided, then and only then would the Government be justified in asking for a Governor General's warrant. To use it for anything short of such things is a misappropriation, and is putting His Excellency the Governor General in a false position; and the people who would place before the Governor General a re-

quest for his warrant for expenditures which are not of the most urgent public necessity should be condemned by Parliament and the country. I should like to see that road built, and the intention of the Government, as pledged by them and by this House time and again, carried out; but I regret extremely that out of this question has come an exhibition of unfairness and misrepresentation on the part of the hon. members of the Cabinet that can reflect no credit on the country and no credit on themselves.

General LAURIE. I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman, who has just sat down, through his speech, because a large portion of it falls under what is usually designated as ancient history, dealing with matters which are four or five years old. I propose just to touch upon one point. A definite charge is brought against the Government to-night, and it is with that we have to deal. The Government, I believe, did make a very serious mistake in the division of the subsidies for this road.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do not be too hard on them.

General LAURIE. I will, of course, speak my own views, whether they are hard on any member of this House or not; that is for the members themselves to consider when they hear what I say. I say I think that the Government made a mistake in the division of the subsidies. They did their best to make amends by proposing to this House to complete the road as originally designed — by a somewhat different method, certainly, but according to the understanding which had been come to with the city of Halifax and the city of St. John. It was late in the Session when that resolution passed, and when it was sent to the Upper House it was there thrown out. It was then too late to bring a fresh proposition before this House for surveys. But a desire had been expressed by this House that a survey should be made preliminary to the construction of the road. The measure was thrown out by the other House, on expressly different grounds. Those grounds are put forward to-night by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), as reasons why the road should not be constructed. Why did he not advance those reasons last year, instead of proposing something entirely different. But the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), says he does not object to the road. Of course he does not, as his constituents want it; but he charges my hon. friend, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), with subjecting himself to the exigencies of party in acting as he has done. I am a constituent of the hon. member, and I can tell him that in acting as he has done, he has been going against the interests and desires of his constituents; he is acting most injudiciously, as far as they are concerned. The hon. gentleman, like several previous speakers, refers to the law relating to the Governor General's warrant, and he says that the necessity in this case was not urgent. I maintain that the necessity was urgent. Fresh propositions were being made for another road to the Maritime Provinces, a road which had been previously proposed, and which is now again proposed as a most desirable one. Surely, in such circumstances, it was most desirable that the Government should ascertain which was the most advantageous road for carrying out

the original intention of securing the shortest possible route from Montreal to the Atlantic. With that view, I take it that the Government most properly had that survey made, and I think their action will meet with the views of all our friends from Nova Scotia unless party considerations supervene. The cloven-foot was shown to a certain extent in a remark that fell from the hon. member for St. John. He said he most earnestly protested against the trade being drawn away from his own city. There is the point: the question is not whether the money should be spent, but whether St. John should have the monopoly of that trade—whether it should go to St. John and go out again, instead of passing by the shortest route from Montreal to the Atlantic. I do not object to St. John having its share; but I desire that the shortest route should be taken, so as to put Nova Scotia in communication with the interior by that shortest route, whatever it may be, and I think it was desirable that the fullest information should be obtained by the Government, in order that when the different companies should be pressing their respective routes upon the consideration of this House, the Government would be in a position to afford to this House—and it is their duty as an executive to do so—the fullest information to enable us to vote intelligently on the question of the best line to be chosen. Therefore I do not think that the resolution proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition should be passed by this House.

Mr. MULOCK. The debate has taken a somewhat wide range, and with the permission of the House I will give my view upon the point under discussion. I understand the question to be whether the warrant under which this expenditure was made was a valid one or not, whether it was one within the provisions of the Act authorising the issue of the Governor General's warrant for the expenditure of public money in the absence of any parliamentary provision for such an expenditure. I think all hon. gentlemen will admit that it is the duty of Parliament to guard the public treasury and to see that no public moneys are expended except under the sanction of the law. The law requires certain precedent conditions to exist in order to justify a warrant; they are the foundation, the authority of a warrant; if they do not exist, such a warrant issues, then it is the ordinary case of a trustee misapplying funds at his disposal; and, whilst in the case of a private individual there may be a remedy in the ordinary courts of the land, the only remedy for a misappropriation of public moneys by the Government of the day is to be found in the high court of Parliament in the first place, and afterwards before the grand jury of the country. Now, I regret extremely that on this occasion the Minister of Justice has, with a degree of astuteness more creditable to his ability than to his interpretation of the law, held that the warrant in question was valid. The Act providing for the issue of warrants requires four conditions to exist in order to make a warrant valid. They are as follows: the expenditure must be unforeseen; it must be urgently required; it must be immediately required; and it must be required for the public good. All these conditions must exist under the Act. The First Minister so admits, and, therefore, I need not press that point any further.

General LAURIE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They all did exist.

Mr. MULOCK. Let us see if they did. The expenditure must have been unforeseen. Was it unforeseen? It was for the purpose of making a survey for the construction of a railway from Harvey to Salisbury over a route that had been the subject of discussion in Parliament last Session. Parliament last Session refused to vote money to aid in the construction of a road over the route on which this money for surveys has been expended during recess. Parliament rejected the scheme. The Government for four years previously had had this scheme in their minds. There was nothing unforeseen whatever in regard to it. The next point is, was this expenditure urgently required? In what sense was it urgently required? Who stated it was urgently required? The Cabinet, I presume. But they have not laid on the Table the report on which this warrant was issued. The law requires that a certain report be laid before the Governor in Council before the Government can obtain a special warrant. I presume such a report was made by them; and if so it ought to contain the statement required by the law that such an expenditure was urgently required. When did the Council declare it was urgent? Its urgency is a question of fact. Parliament decided last Session that it was not urgent, and refused to tolerate such an expenditure. Where then does the urgency come in? The Government last Session asked for the money and Parliament refused to give it. The First Minister knows well that it was reported that the Senate refused this grant owing to a hint from the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MULOCK. I accept the hon. gentleman's denial. We know that the leader of the Government in the Senate, declared the Government were pledged to the measure and sincerely desired its passage, and yet the Senate refused to sanction the expenditure, so that when Parliament adjourned in May last, it had, by its decision, refused to authorise an expenditure on the proposed line. Therefore, Parliament declared that the construction of this work was not urgently required in the public good. Who gave the Government power to override the decision of Parliament, and say that a certain work is for the public good when Parliament has decided to the contrary? A third requirement of the law is, that such expenditure shall be immediately required, and that it will not do to wait until Parliament assembles. The urgency must be great and arise during recess. The First Minister knows full well that that is the spirit and letter of the law. He knows that the Governor General's warrant can only be resorted to when the matter is so urgent that it cannot wait until the people's representatives assemble in Parliament to consider it. The only possible excuse for the issue of this warrant is that the construction of this road is so urgent that the public interests would suffer if it were delayed until the duly accredited agents of the people assembled. What made this expenditure so particularly necessary during recess? The scheme is not a novel one. It was conceived a short time before the general elections, when a pledge was given by the late Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, that

work would be begun shortly, and who declared that at the very time he spoke a firm contract had been entered into, by which the Canadian Pacific Railway was bound to put the work through. On the pledge so given, no doubt many supporters of the Administration were returned to this House. But it remained unfulfilled until last year. How did it become so urgent in the summer of 1889, when it was not so urgent in 1885? How is it that it became suddenly urgent on the eve of a general election? If it can be argued that the maintenance of an Administration in power is one of the urgencies actually contemplated in the Act, then, of course, the warrant was properly issued; but as a matter concerning the public good, irrespective of party considerations, it cannot be argued that this scheme could not, without detriment to the interests of the country, when it was held over for four years, from 1885 to 1889, be held over a year longer, and, therefore, there was no justification whatever for the Government alleging in their report to the Governor General that it could not wait until the people's representatives were assembled in Parliament in 1890, to give their opinion on the matter. The Act requires that the expenditure should not only be urgent and immediately required, but that it should be required in the public good. Now, there has been a decision given on that point a short time ago in this Parliament. In 1889 in the Railway Committee of the House of Commons, in this House, and in the Senate, all the merits of this question as a matter of public interest were discussed. Several issues were presented, on all of which Parliament pronounced. It was alleged that the effect of the construction of this railway would be to injure the leading city in New Brunswick, the city of St. John; and Parliament pronounced that, having regard to that city, it would not construct this road. It was also alleged that the construction of this road would destroy a non-paying property of the Dominion, the Intercolonial Railway, of which it would be a rival. It was proposed to construct this line from Salisbury to Moncton to connect with the Intercolonial Railway, then to give the Canadian Pacific Railway running powers from that point, with connection to Halifax; and that the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway were to enter into partnership for the purpose of running fast through trains from Halifax to Montreal, in rivalry with the Government road, the Intercolonial Railway, which has been a losing concern for years, and which has lost more money during the last seven months than during the preceding, and the loss on which during the current year will not be under \$500,000. Parliament decided last Session that the construction of this road as a rival to the Intercolonial Railway would be an injury to the property of Canada, destroy to a large extent the earning power of the Intercolonial Railway, and, therefore, Parliament, for that reason, refused to sanction that expenditure; and further, because it would have added an enormous sum to our already large debt. In all these ways Parliament declared that it was not for the public good, because it was not necessary, because it would injure existing interests, because it would destroy a portion of the Dominion property, and because it would add to the public debt. Thus we have the declaration of the people's representatives in May, 1889, against this expenditure, and thereafter, I ask, what change in the condition

of affairs took place to justify the Administration in saying that this expenditure was urgently required? We have a declaration of the highest authority, a decision of the people's representatives in Parliament, negating this expenditure only a few days before this expenditure was authorised. I am compelled to say that this expenditure, of all the expenditures I have seen made, is one which I most deplore, not for the amount of it, but as indicating a disregard on the part of the Administration for one of those trusts which, above all others, they are bound to be true to—the dealing with the public moneys of the country. There is nothing which strikes more at the independence of Parliament, there is nothing upon which the liberties of the people are more dependent than the control of the public money. That is the only safeguard as between the liberties of the people and an arbitrary Government. It is that which compels the Government to call the people's representatives together. What is the meaning of the provision that certain appropriations for expenditures shall expire on a certain day? What are the provisions the neglect of which have caused bloodshed in the past? The illegal levying of taxes caused the expenditure of so much life and so much blood. That trust is one which every administration which appreciates it will carefully guard. A fine sense of honor is necessary in dealing with such matters, and I deeply regret that on this occasion it fell to the lot of the hon. Minister of Justice to express as his opinion that this expenditure fell within the spirit or the letter of the law. Whatever Parliament may do, we cannot as an assembly be too careful in dealing with the public funds, and I trust that, though in this case I have no doubt Parliament will endorse what has taken place, the discussion will be productive of some good effect, and that it will be many long years before we will be called upon again to consider what I believe to be a gross violation of the law authorising the issue of Governor General's warrants.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Call in the members.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the members are called in, I desire to make a few remarks on this subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Too late.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The members have been called in, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman is too late.

Mr. MITCHELL. I knew the First Minister did not want to hear me, but he shall have it some other time.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Landerkin,
Armstrong,	Langelier (Quebec),
Bain (Wentworth),	Laurier,
Béchar, d,	Livingston,
Bernier,	Lovitt,
Borden,	McIntyre,
Bowman,	McMillan (Huron),
Brien,	McMullen,
Campbell,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mitchell,
Casey,	Mulock,
Casgrain,	Neveu,
Charlton,	Paterson (Brant),
Choquette,	Perry,
Couture,	Platt,

Doyon,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,
Fiset,
Fisher,
Flynn,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Godbout,
Holton,
Innes,
Jones (Halifax),
Kirk,

Rinfret,
Robertson,
Rowand,
Ste. Marie,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Thérien,
Trow,
Turcot,
Waldie,
Watson,
Weldon (St. John), and
Wilson (Elgin).—61.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Barnard,
Bell,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Boisvert,
Bowell,
Brown,
Bryson,
Burns,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cimon,
Cochrane,
Colby,
Coughlin,
Coulombe,
Curran,
Daly,
Davie,
Davis,
Dawson,
Denison,
Desjardins,
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dickinson,
Dupont,
Earle,
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),
Foster,
Freeman,
Gigault,
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hesson,
Hickey,
Jamieson,
Jones (Digby),
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Laurie (Lieut.-General),
Lépine,
Macdonald (Sir John),
Macdowall,
McCulla,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougall (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGreavy,
McKay,
McKeen,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Monerchief,
Montague,
Montplaisir,
O'Brien,
Patterson (Essex),
Pope,
Porter,
Prior,
Putnam,
Riopel,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross,
Skinner,
Small,
Smith (Sir Donald),
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tywhitt,
Vanasse,
Wallace,
Weldon (Albert),
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wilson (Lennox),
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland), and
Wright.—98.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TROW. I observe that the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), and the hon. member for Queen's (P. E. I.) have not voted.

Mr. GILLMOR. I paired with the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills). I would have voted for the resolution.

Mr. LISTER. I paired with the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson). I would have voted for the resolution.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MULOCK.

(In the Committee.)

Harbors and Rivers, Nova Scotia—
Cove Bay, Repairs..... \$3,500

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is that for ordinary repairs, or has there been any accident to the wharf there?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was a storm last year and some damages took place to the pier.

Port Maitland or Green Cove..... \$1,000

Mr. LOVITT. Four or five weeks ago I asked the Minister of Public Works if the tenders had been accepted, and he said the Government were about to accept them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This must have been done by day's work.

Mr. LOVITT. It has not been done at all. The wharf has never been touched. The hon. gentleman asked for tenders returnable in November last. The work had not been touched up to Christmas, when I left home, and I know it could not have been touched since.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We had not the money sufficient to do it. The whole amount required was \$5,200 and the estimate of \$4,200 was voted last year, and we are asking an additional thousand this year.

Mr. LOVITT. I would like to know if the Minister is going to do this work. It laid all last summer after the money was voted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work will be done.

Mr. LOVITT. Let it be done as soon as possible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It must be done before the first of July, or the vote will lapse. I am asking for one thousand dollars more in order that the whole work may be done at the same time.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is something that requires explanation. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) says that the work has not been commenced, and as he comes from that place, I should feel disposed to place great reliance upon any statement made by that hon. member. I am disposed to think that the Minister of Public Works is, perhaps, looking at some other expenditure, because his statement is so utterly at variance with the statement of the member for Yarmouth, that it would lead one to suppose that there must be some misapprehension.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We had not money enough under the vote of last year, because I have a note here stating that of the three tenders received for this work, the lowest was that of Mr. McKinnon, \$5,400, and I am placing \$1,000 in the Estimates for next year in order to cover the amount required in excess of the appropriation. The work was not commenced, because the estimate of last year was too small.

Mr. LOVITT. I will remind the Minister of Public Works that he ought to accept a tender right away, because it is hard to get timber there after the season gets later.

Mr. KENNY. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the application which I made to him some time ago—I do not trouble him very often—for a breakwater in the

immediate harbor of West Chezzetcook, situated in the eastern portion of the County of Halifax. It is a harbor where there is a large amount of local shipping, employed in coasting and in fishing, and there is very great risk that if something is not done to prevent the accumulation of sand, the harbor may be choked and the entrance become useless. I hope the Minister has taken into consideration the application which I made to him, and that the amount will appear in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That question has been studied in the Department. Though I cannot say to the hon. gentleman what will be done, he may be sure that the matter is not lost sight of.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not, for a moment, suppose that anything coming from me would add force to the application of my worthy colleague; but I rise for the purpose of reminding the Minister that there was a work undertaken by the Government of which I was a member, and it was discontinued at the change of Government. I think there was considerable dredging done, and as my colleague says, it is a place that deserves consideration, and I hope, with his strong recommendations, the matter will not be overlooked. I would like to ask the Minister if contracts have been taken for all these votes that were passed last year—Barrington, Cheticamp, East River and seven or eight other places. If contracts have been given for these works, are they under way and are they likely to be completed with the sums voted last Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am under the impression that the reason why the votes are not renewed this year, is that the works are progressing, or have been completed.

Harbors and Rivers, P. E. I. \$8,200

Mr. PERRY. I wish to ask how far the work at Cascumpec Harbor has gone on? I find in the Auditor General's Report last year that there is a great discrepancy in the prices paid to the men. I see by the Auditor General's Report that a diver was paid 89½ days at \$3 per day, and another diver, was paid 61½ days at \$2.25 a day. I do not understand why one of these men has been paid 75 cents less than the other, except that one happens to be an Irishman, and a friend of the Government, and the other is not. I have known the men well for 25 or 30 years, and the man receiving the smaller sum is as competent as the other. Last year I observe \$3,000 were expended in blasting rock in Cascumpec Harbor. The rock blasted was allowed to fall back into the channel, and the result was that one vessel grounded in the harbor and was very nearly lost. I fail to see any use in spending money on rock blasting if the rock is allowed to fall back into the channel, because it reduces the depth of water from what it was formerly, and where there were fifteen feet of water before the rock blasting there were last summer not over ten feet. It is quite proper to expend money on the harbor, but it should be expended under proper control. In regard to the diver to whom \$2.25 a day was paid, I believe he was induced to come back from the State of Maine on the promise that he would receive big wages, but when he returned he received 75 cents a day less than the other man, no doubt because he was a poor man and was not

able to fight against the Government. I should like the Minister to explain why this man was paid 75 cents a day less than the other man, and why such gross neglect occurred last summer at Cascumpec Harbor in allowing the stone blasted to drop back into the water and cause obstruction to the channel.

Mr. WELSH. Ever since I have had a seat on the floor on this House I have been advocating the claims of Prince Edward Island to have their wharves and piers properly attended to, but with very little effect. I notice in the Estimates this year the sum for this purpose is \$6,000 less than last year. I see no amount entered for dredging the harbor of Pinette or Wood Island. Before Confederation the Local Government expended a considerable sum at this point, and the Dominion Government expended a sum consequently to complete the breakwater, but it has never been finished and the harbor has never been dredged. The breakwater is there without any road upon it, but the Government have taken care to appoint a wharfinger and to collect wharfage, although it is impossible to take a horse or waggon on the wharf and the people have to carry the freight. It is in a most disgraceful state. Last year I used some strong language to the Minister of Marine in regard to these piers. At the opening of this Session I asked for the report of the engineer to be laid on the Table. Last year the Minister of Public Works stated that a survey of the harbor of Pinette and Wood Island would be made before the ice left, but it was not done, as, in fact, every promise made in regard to those piers has failed to be carried out. In the summer there was a survey made of those harbors, and I obtained an Order of the House for a copy of the report of the engineer, but up to the present I have seen nothing of it. A junior official in the Department of Public Works could have completed the return in half an hour, but there seems to be a determination on the part of the Minister to work against the interests of the people and to shirk his duty. I was in that Department once or twice, but I did not know whether I was going into a lunatic asylum or a museum; there were some old fossils and some other things there, and out of respect to the old gentlemen I will not say more about them. I do not know whether any amount will be placed in the Supplementary Estimates to complete those works. On referring to the Auditor General's Report I find these items under the heading "Vernon River": "Sounding lines (2), \$2.56; balance, \$8.60; revolver (2), \$40; cartridges, \$3.10; repairing cupboard, \$5." This is the way our piers are repaired. When I ask in regard to repairing piers, two revolvers are presented at my head. What is the meaning of this? Will the hon. Minister please explain, for the people of the Island would like to know how revolvers are connected with piers. I must say that I have no confidence in the Minister of Public Works. When I first came to this House, I had an interview with him, and he received me very courteously and kindly, and entered into all the details connected with the wharves and piers, and said he saw the necessity of these works being attended to. I pointed out to him that by expending \$200 or \$300 on China Point Wharf, a large sum might be saved. He promised that this sum should be spent, but it was not expended. People wrote to the *Examiner*

newspaper—they are mostly Conservatives there—complaining of the neglect of the Department. I went to the office and told them not to publish any more complaints, as the Minister had passed his word that the work would be done. On the following year the Minister admitted that the work had not been carried out, and he asked me to go over to his office. I had an interview for an hour with the hon. gentleman and with Mr. Perley, and we discussed the different works required. I told him I would not ask him to spend money until surveys had been made. He promised the matter would be attended to and the piers repaired. Afterwards I wrote to him across the House, asking him if I understood these matters would be attended to. He wrote me back saying that they would be done that year. I was perfectly satisfied, and I told the people of the Island so. The people afterwards came to me, and said they were not able to ship anything. At about the first July I again called the attention of the Minister to the fact that the time was passing and the shipping season was commencing. He never took one step to fulfil his promise. What is the consequence? Instead of \$200 which would have kept China Point in proper order, they have to ask for a vote of \$1,200 because of his neglect. Now, what am I to do? I am really astonished. I could not have believed it possible, that any man with the pretensions of a gentleman should have acted—well, that he should have acted in such a negligent manner. It is a fact, and there is no nonsense about it. Here is Prince Edward Island which has got more harbors than all New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Oh, oh.

Mr. WELSH. Well, do not quarrel about it. Do not kick up a row. Here is \$6,000 for the removal of this rock at Cascumpec and for the repairs of nearly thirty piers and breakwaters; \$6,000, Mr. Chairman! Divide thirty into six thousand, and you will get about what each pier will require. There is not one word about the important work on the Harbor of Pinette, or the important work on Wood Island breakwater. I do hope that the Government will give me some assurance that these things will be attended to. By the way, I was nearly forgetting to ask the Minister of Public Works when I may expect these papers that were moved for last January.

An hon. MEMBER. To-morrow.

Mr. WELSH. Well, I suppose I will have to abide by that. The people of the Island are anxious about this matter and they know when they are treated fairly and when they are treated badly. I have very little hope, I must say, from the Minister of Public Works, judging by his past conduct, whatever it may be in the future.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In reference to Cascumpec, the hon. gentleman says that he believes that one of those divers received seventy-five cents a day less than the other because he belonged to a certain nationality. I know nothing about that. I do not know whether the man is English, Irish, Scotch or French, but I shall enquire why one receives seventy-five cents a day less than the other. The hon. gentleman says that the \$2,000 voted last year was not expended with all the care possible. That may be, but there was a foreman in charge of the works, who my officers tell me is

Mr. WELSH.

a good man; but if the hon. gentleman states that the work we have been executing there does not produce the effect we have expected, I shall not expend a dollar of this money until I see by examination through the proper officers what may be the result of the work. If the work is useless the money will not be expended. I thank the hon. gentleman for calling my attention to it, for at this distance from Prince Edward Island I cannot look after it myself, but I will see that the matter will be investigated. The papers which the hon. gentleman has asked for will be brought down on Monday, if not to-morrow. Unfortunately, two of my officers are on the sick list, and they cannot attend to those returns just now, but I think we will be able to have them before the House on Monday.

Mr. WELSH. What about the revolvers?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My colleague, the Minister of Finance, told me that this matter had been mentioned in the Public Accounts Committee, and the explanation is this: The paymaster, who had to travel to pay on the different works, had to pass through certain portions of the country that were very solitary, and as that officer was known to have a good deal of money about him, it was thought proper that he should have a revolver to protect himself.

Mr. WELSH. I don't think he could have a good deal of Government money about him, judging by the way the piers are neglected there. If he had a great deal of money it must have been his own. I think it is an insult to Prince Edward Island for the Minister to say that any man should have a revolver to protect himself. The man ought to have been taken up and tried for his life, for he was most likely trying to rob somebody else. Why, a child ten years old might travel all over Prince Edward Island and protect himself without a revolver. I think everyone will agree with me that it is a disgraceful thing to charge these two items to the expenditure on the Vernon River works.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the cupboards?

Mr. WELSH. It is the same thing. Charge up everything to the Vernon River. I will be bound to say that if this man took \$500 with him he could not buy a revolver in all the district of Belfast. The people don't require such things down there. I want to know how the Minister can explain that this item for revolvers is charged to the Vernon River works? Can he give me any explanation of that? No; he cannot, and I guarantee he will not answer that question. If he does not do so I want some other member of the Government to give me his word about this, and I will take it. I have had the word of the Minister of Public Works; I have had his promise, I have had his note at hand, but it is not worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. PERRY. The hon. Minister of Public Works says that he will enquire why one man received seventy-five cents a day less than the other. I can tell the hon. Minister that he is well aware of that, because there was some correspondence with his Department on the subject. The man who is complaining is a countryman of the hon. Minister, and is that the reason that he has been robbed? I

have papers in my possession to show that this correspondence has taken place, and the Minister ought most decidedly to know the nature of it. There is something rotten in the State of Denmark, in connection with this matter. It is all very fine for me to be told that the Minister will enquire into it to-morrow; it should have been enquired into long ago. The gentleman to whom I am alluding now, the man for whom I am fighting this battle, has complained long ago, and he has had a letter from that Department giving some nonsensical reason why he should get seventy-five cents a day less than the other man. If that kind of partiality is to be carried out in Prince Edward Island I am afraid we shall have to make use, not of revolvers, which my hon. friend from Queen's county has spoken of, but of constitutional means to bring the Government down on their marrow bones, and make them give us justice. As the Minister has promised that to-morrow or some other day he will do justice in that matter, I will leave it in his hands. But I will come to the next item, that of \$6,000 for repairs to piers and breakwaters in Prince Edward Island. Why, Sir, it is a mere farce to propose such a sum, and when I take up the report of the Department of Public Works, what do I find? I am only going to refer to the piers and breakwaters of Prince county. We have seven or eight piers and breakwaters in that county, but this report only makes reference to two. Where am I to find out what has been done during the last year or the year before on the others? I have gone to the expense of travelling over the whole county to find out, as I cannot get any information in the hon. Minister's report. There is no report here about the West Point breakwater or pier, and although the Local Government have spent \$4,000 or \$5,000 upon it, it has all gone away. There is no report on the wharf at Higgins Shore, either, or on the wharf at Miminingash. The hon. gentleman knows that I complained last year about this wharf, and I told him that it would require \$500 or \$600 to repair it; but no money was spent on it, and the consequence is that the whole of the cover and half of the ballast has gone. Now he tells us that the repairs of the breakwater are under consideration. I am afraid that nothing has been done to that wharf yet, and whether he will do anything to it this year I do not know. Then there is the wharf at Hurd's Point, about which there is nothing in the report. What inference can we draw from all this? Just this inference: that the Government do not care what becomes of these wharves and breakwaters—that they are quite willing to let them go to destruction. Let me compare the amounts expended by the Local Government of Prince Edward Island on wharves in 1877, 1878 and 1880, and if I am wrong the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), will correct me, because in two of those years he was in the Local Government. I find that they spent in 1877 \$19,998, in 1878 \$10,000, and in 1879 \$14,000, or \$43,998 in the three years, whereas this Government vote \$6,000 a year, or \$18,000 in three years. Sir, while such penuriousness as this is shown by this Government, it is impossible for the people of Prince Edward Island to be in good humor with them. Now, I wish to allude to the petition of the people of Summerside for a breakwater. It was supposed that it was no use for

them to send petitions to the members representing the county, and what did they do? They got the hon. member for Colchester, N. S. (Sir Adams Archibald) to represent that constituency in the matter; they had to appeal to one knight to appear in state before another knight in order to present that petition, as none of the members from Prince Edward Island were dignified enough to do it. What was the consequence? We were told the other day that it was not the intention of the Government to build a breakwater at Summerside. But I am here to speak of the great necessity that exists for a breakwater at that place, for it is undeniable that if a breakwater were built there, navigation would be kept open for six weeks later in the fall, and would open two or three weeks earlier in the spring. The Government are willing enough to vote \$3,000,000 for a ship railway in order to carry two or three counties, but when an expenditure is wanted for Prince Edward Island, there is nothing for us. We are told that we do not pay anything into the revenues. Sir, we pay one-fortieth of the revenues, and we want a reasonable share of the expenditures. The hon. Minister of Public Works is very liberal on the eve of a local election. He takes a cue from his leader, who gave us to understand in 1887 that if we voted strong for the Government we should have that subway. Sir Charles Tupper telegraphed on two occasions, "I am strongly in favor of the subway;" and the next telegram was, "you must send a solid phalanx, or you will not get the subway." This year, just before the local elections, the hon. Minister of Public Works was stated to have given an order for a breakwater at St. Peter's. That statement was sent to a paper which is paid by the Government \$2,000 or \$3,000 a year—I do not know what for, unless for printing some imaginary things.

An hon. MEMBER. What paper is it?

Mr. PERRY. The *Examiner*—I am almost ashamed to say so; and if that paper misrepresents the Government, they have no right to subsidize it. Two or three days before the election, on 27th January last, it said:

"The Minister of Public Works has given instructions to his engineer to hold a survey at St. Peter's Bay with a view to the construction of a public wharf, as asked for by a largely signed petition forwarded to the Department by R. N. Cox, Esq., of Morell. Electors of that district in polling their votes on the 30th for Sullivan and Underhay, will be strengthening the hands of the petitioners for the new wharf. The Dominion Government being Liberal-Conservative, the electors will support candidates for the Local who have influence at Ottawa. The Opposition men have none. Our advice to electors there is, vote the square ticket for Sullivan and Underhay. Let no Conservative split his vote with the enemy."

If that is not correct, if the *Examiner* is misrepresenting the hon. gentleman and his Government, they should withdraw the subsidies they give to that paper. I contend that it is a slur on the Government if it is not true, and I feel sorry to see the Government placed in that position. I contend that \$6,000 is no amount at all to repair our breakwaters and wharves. In fact, I find that one-third of the money voted for repairs to breakwaters finds its way into the pockets of private individuals, friends of the Government. When the Government spend \$1,000, \$300 of it goes into the pockets of these gentlemen. Why not do this work properly? Why not give these contracts by public tender instead of allow-

ing private individuals to do, early or late as it suits them, this work? I asked for a return from the hon. gentleman's Department five or six weeks ago, and for another from the Postmaster General almost months ago, and have not got either yet, nor may I get them next Session. And if I do, what benefit will that be to me? Most of the returns I asked for last year have not come down yet. What is the good of our asking year after year for information and only getting it the Session after we ask for it? The hon. Ministers are not so remiss in drawing their pay, which they take good care to get when it suits them. If the Government expect the people of Prince Edward Island to be—I will not say true lovers of the present Government—but true and loyal subjects,—if they expect Prince Edward Island to remain in this Confederation much longer, they had better do justice to our people. Otherwise the people will battle, not with rifles or pitchforks, or revolvers, but in a constitutional way; and I hope that when our delegates go back to London to the foot of the Throne, they will not meet with the opposition they encountered four or five years ago from Sir Charles Tupper. When the people of Prince Edward Island take up their cause, the First Minister will find that it will be useless telling us that we cannot break up the bonds of Confederation, if we do not get justice from Canada, for we will do it, but in a constitutional way. We are one of the parties to this contract of Confederation, Her Majesty herself is a party to this contract, and she will see that justice is done us. I am in earnest, and the people of Prince Edward Island are in earnest, and all I am sorry for is that they have not a stronger advocate for their rights than myself, for if they had they might be more successful in obtaining their rights. But even if we get only a small portion of what we require; if my hon. friend, will repair that breakwater at Miminigash, and begin to build the West Point wharf, and if he will see that the stones blasted at Cascumpec are taken away from the bottom, he will do something towards allaying the spirit of discontent which now prevails among our people.

Mr. WELSH. I would like the hon. Minister of Public Works to give me his reason why his promises are not carried out.

Mr. MCINTYRE. I quite agree with all that has been said by the hon. gentleman who immediately preceded me. Any reasonable person, looking at what has transpired in the past few years, cannot fail to agree with what fell from the lips of the hon. member for Prince County (Mr. Perry). It is notorious that our public works under the present Administration have been going to ruin. As is well known, we are an agricultural and a fishing community, and have none of the wealth derived from the mines and pine forests such as are possessed by other Provinces of this Dominion. Under these circumstances, it is the duty of the Government to look after our public works. In the fall of the year, as in most other places, our roads are in extremely bad condition, and it is of the highest importance that our harbors should be looked after and new harbors constructed where they are most required. As far as the fishing community are concerned, they are in the same condition. For thirty or forty miles along certain shores of the Island there

Mr. PERRY.

is not a single harbor, and in the morning the fishermen have to ballast their boats and in the evening haul them back again. Under such circumstances, it would be only common justice that the Government should take into consideration the wants of our people. For the last two years I have been bringing to the attention of the Minister of Public Works, two works which the people specially require in King's County. I brought to his attention the case of the Bay Fortune breakwater, and hon. gentlemen will remember that on that occasion I stated that the people of that locality had already constructed several feet of that breakwater at their own expense. They spent an amount in the vicinity of \$1,000, and all their money then being expended, they had a right to expect that the Dominion Exchequer should come to their assistance. They forwarded several petitions to the Minister of Public Works and I brought the matter to his attention on several occasions, and on these occasions I obtained a kind of quasi promise that something would be done as quickly as possible. The other work was one at a place called Naufrage, on the north shore of King's County, and the object of the people there in trying to form that harbor, was to do so by connecting Naufrage Pond with the sea. There is a sandbank of some 30 or 40 yards which requires to be cut through in order to finish the connection, and a survey was made some years ago to find out what it would cost to do this, but the estimate arrived at by the survey was found to be a little too high. A year or so ago I asked the hon. Minister to have another survey made, and the result was that the first estimate was cut down to about a quarter of the amount then stated. The people have urged the necessity for this work repeatedly upon the Government, and I brought it to the attention of the hon. Minister on several occasions, and yet nothing has been done. It appears to me that, considering the condition in which we are placed, deriving no advantage whatever from the enormous yearly expenditure in the deepening and widening of canals, especially in Ontario, and in the granting of millions of dollars of railway subsidies, the Minister of Public Works and the Government generally should give some little attention to the public works required by the farmers and fishermen of Prince Edward Island. I wish to direct the attention of the Minister to the work at Souris, which is being repaired year after year. I do not say that too much money is expended there, because that was one of the most important works in the Island at the time it was built under the Mackenzie Administration, and I may say that most of the works in Prince Edward Island were built under that Administration. That work cost about \$100,000 to the country at that time, and the present Government must, for very shame, make a show of keeping up the work. Last year I see nearly \$5,000 was expended there. It appears to me that a large portion of that money, like a large portion of other money which is expended in Prince Edward Island is uselessly expended, that it is expended in the interests of the bumper and the heeler more than in the interests of the people. A man named John Cantwell has been foreman of that work for some time. He employs his two sons, mere boys, to do work there, and he gets \$2.50 a day for that. I see that last year he received \$282.50 on that account, and he

supervises the work which his two boys are doing, and I do not suppose he is too exacting in regard to them. There is a very curious item in connection with that, "photographs, \$52." It is difficult to know what this means, whether these were photographs of the breakwater or of Mr. Cantwell and his two sons. It would be interesting if the Minister would let in a little light on that point. There is no doubt that this money is uselessly squandered year after year upon political favorites, and everyone there is aware of the fact. Even the Conservative party are getting ashamed of it, but year after year this man is appointed. Personally, I have no objection to him, as he is as good to me as any other Tory, but I do object to the way in which these men are employed to work on that breakwater. A great many of them are boys, including his own. When their farm work is over, they commence this work, and continue it on short days. Every two or three days they have to leave off work, because none can be done, as the spray is driven in by a south-east storm. Reference has been made to an article published in the *Examiner* newspaper, the Conservative organ of this Government and the Local Government of Prince Edward Island. That paper, a few days before the last election, came out with an article in reference to the district of St. Peter's, where I live, trying to induce the voters to elect the Conservative candidates by promises that, if they did so, new works would be commenced there. It is notorious that no new work has been commenced in that Island by this Government. They may have patched up some old works, but I am not aware of any new work that they have initiated in King's County. This newspaper to which I have referred, the *Examiner*, has good reason for being a supporter of this Government. I find that in 1886-87, \$1,796.96 was paid to the *Examiner* for printing and lithographing; in 1887-88 the amount was \$1,669.85, for subscriptions, printing, advertising and lithographing. In 1888-89, \$1,318 were spent for printing and publishing, so that that newspaper has a very good reason for advocating what the Government chooses to put into its mouth. It has lived by hoodling for many years, and I believe that to-day it receives more from the Dominion Government than it does from its weekly subscriptions from one end of the year to the other. I think that is a poor exponent of public opinion, and the sooner it stops prating about its opponents the better, but we cannot expect much better from a subsidised organ. It would be in the interest of the public of King's County generally if the Minister of Public Works would try to assist the people of that county. Their harvest has been very bad last year, the fishing has gone back on them for the past three years, and the general condition of the people is very bad. The *Examiner* will say that the condition of the people is very flourishing. No doubt the condition of the *Examiner* is, but it is quite different with the people.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I regret that I cannot say that the management of the Public Works Department in Prince Edward Island is very creditable. I am not going to make any request to the Government or to present petitions to the Department. I have asked for some public works in my county and have had no favorable response. In regard to the matter now before the House, I

may say something with respect to this revolver business. It seems a small amount, but when the amount of \$97 is charged for repairs to Vernon River Bridge, and \$43.10 of that goes for the purchase of two revolvers, it is no use hiding the fact that this is simply a question of hoodle. There is no part of the Dominion in which less crime is committed, and people can go about with more safety, than they can in Prince Edward Island, and the idea of a man buying two revolvers for \$43 to use there, is insulting to the intelligence of the House. Then we have \$5 for repairing a cupboard. There is no cupboard at the wharf at all. It cannot be defended. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Department must make some enquiry as to the manner in which the money voted by this House is expended. I regard the expenditure as disgraceful. I am sure there is not a member in this House but is absolutely ashamed to see the Public Accounts come out showing that money is spent in that way. The money was simply stolen, there is no use of trying to avoid the word. The Souris breakwater is the most important work on the Island. That is the harbor where all the fishing fleet, numbering sometimes over 200, come in to shelter. We find \$52 for photographs. That is simply robbery, simply stealing; no other word can be used to explain it properly. I regret to say that I was not satisfied with the statement the hon. gentleman made respecting the rather grave charges which the hon. member for Prince County (Mr. Perry) brought with respect to Cascumpec Harbor. Hon. members may not be aware that Cascumpec Harbor is of more than provincial importance, for the reason that it is the harbor on the north side of the Island where the large fishing fleet of two or three hundred vessels, when they are caught in a north-easterly gale, have to run for shelter. That harbor, at low water, has a depth on the bar of ten feet, and at high water, of fifteen feet. These vessels must go into that harbor to get shelter. Before the hon. gentleman commenced the expenditure of public money in blasting, it was safe enough for fishing vessels. He spent six or seven thousand dollars in blasting, and owing to the maladministration of his subordinates, the rock which is blasted is left in the channel of the river. The consequence was that last year two vessels went ashore in trying to get out of the harbor, and it is owing to God's mercy alone that the fleet were not driven in last year in a storm—there is a storm there every year. If the fleet had been driven in there, one or two hundred vessels driven upon the north bend of the Island, dear only knows what would have been the result. The hon. gentleman can see by the report of the Minister himself that I am not exaggerating the importance of that harbor. The report says:

"Casumpec Harbor, Prince County, is situated on the north coast of the Island, about 17 miles to the southward of North Cape, and about 20 miles to the north-westward of the entrance into Richmond Bay. The town of Alberton, the second one in importance in the county, is located at the head of the harbor, and is a station on the Prince Edward Island Railway which has a branch to the railway wharf, where vessels can load and discharge. A large amount of produce is shipped yearly from the wharves at Alberton, and the harbor being commodious and perfectly safe, with a depth of water sufficient to accommodate sea-going vessels, it is sought as a harbor of refuge during easterly gales, and as many as 100 fishing vessels, principally American, have been counted at one time."

I look upon my hon. friend's statement as one of

the most serious made in this House for some time, and I urge upon the Minister not to allow the summer to go by and the fall storms to come on, when very serious accidents will follow, but to take immediate steps to see that the rocks which have been blasted are removed from the channel of that harbor, and that the harbor itself is made safe and deepened. I wish also to refer to the vote for the repairs of piers and breakwaters. In the county that I have the honor to represent conjointly with my hon. friend, there is a very important breakwater at Wood Island. We brought the matter before the attention of the hon. gentleman last year, and told him the condition that breakwater was in. They have appointed a wharfinger and have charged wharfage for landing at it. I went to see it last year, and you cannot drive a horse and cart over it. Every box landed on the breakwater has to be carried on the back of a man over stones and logs for two or three hundred yards, at the risk of the man's neck. It is simply disgraceful. A man ought to be paid for taking his vessel there, instead of being charged for it. The hon. gentleman must see that this kind of thing cannot go on. He has been expending \$2,000 a year there every year. He has been placing it in the hands of Tory wire-pullers down there to distribute among their friends, while the work has been going to ruin and decay. The fact of the matter is it will take now \$10,000, at least, to put that wharf and breakwater in anything like decent repair. If the hon. gentleman does not take the matter in hand properly, instead of laying out \$1,000 piecemeal, and giving Tory wire-pullers *carte blanche* to expend it among their friends, the consequences may be serious. We want the breakwater put into decent repair once for all, and that can only be done by giving it out properly at contract, and when that harbor is dredged properly there will be some accommodation for vessels for the 30 or more miles around that coast. There is no other harbor in which these people can ship their produce at all, on the south coast. This was commenced some years ago by the Local Government, and after we came into Confederation it was carried on by the Dominion Government, but they never carried it on with efficiency, it was all done by dribbles. You get a dozen or two men down there hauling some loose stone, and it is all washed away. It would be a great deal better to keep these small amounts until a vote of \$5,000 or \$10,000 is passed, and a contract entered into to place the breakwater in proper repair and put a dredge there, so that the people may derive some benefit from the money expended. I do not, however, expect very much from the present Government. The Minister of Public Works has not treated the county from which I come with ordinary fair play. Last year I only asked for a small wharf at Mount Stewart, costing \$1,200 or \$2,000. The hon. gentleman gave me an evasive answer. No amount appears in the present Estimates for that work. The total amount entered for Prince Edward Island is \$8,200. It has not been put in proper state of repair yet. With respect to the harbor of Cascumpec, about which the hon. member from Prince (Mr. Perry) spoke, I may say that it is called a harbor of refuge; it is the only harbor of refuge the fishing vessels have upon the north side, and if, by the maladministration of his subordinates in that

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Department, that commodious harbor has been destroyed, I say it is a matter calling for very serious comment. I regretted to hear the Minister make this remark: "I will make enquiries as to these facts which have been disclosed by the member for Prince County; I thank him for making them, and if I find that they are correct, I will not spend any more money."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is not what I said.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman did not intend it, surely.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I said I would not expend a single cent of that money until an investigation was made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When a member of Parliament living in the vicinity, having a personal knowledge of the facts, makes the statement my hon. friend did, and looking at the importance of the harbor as a harbor of refuge for the fishing fleet, it is indispensably necessary to take immediate action in the premises, to ascertain if the facts are correct, and ask this House to vote a sum which will enable him to undo the wrong which the mismanagement of his subordinates has caused, and to complete the work so that the harbor may be a safe and commodious harbor of refuge, and not a trap which may be the grave of hundreds of fishermen. It is appalling to think of it. Hon. gentlemen smile at my statement, but let me tell them that it is within my recollection when over fifty-four American vessels went ashore on the north coast of that Island because they could not get into this harbor, and the shore was strewn with the dead bodies of the seamen. I can tell the hon. gentleman that if this statement is true, and that harbor has been destroyed, he ought to call to a very severe account at once and dismiss those men who have had charge of that work, and take immediate measures to prosecute it in an efficient and speedy manner, so that the harbor may be restored to its former usefulness. This is not an ordinary matter about repairing an ordinary wharf. We do not expect, down in Prince Edward Island, to get justice, but we do not want to see our harbors destroyed and ruined. The Government may expend money in buying revolvers, but when it comes to renewing one of the best harbors in the Dominion, the only harbor of refuge the fishermen have, the Government have no money.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). How about post offices?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is not so much expended on post offices as there is on planting Major's Hill Park with flowers for the people of Ottawa. The whole state of things is disgraceful; the wharves are going to ruin, the people are discontented, and all we can do is to voice their discontent. The Minister of Public Works seems to ignore Prince Edward Island, and yet the Island people have proved good friends to him in days gone by, when they sent members to support the Conservative Government; and this is the return they receive. The people watch public affairs, and they know well whether their interests are attended to or not, and whether they receive money for public works; but I hope there is a better time coming, when some one else will occupy the Minister's position and when justice will be done.

Mr. MITCHELL. I observe there is no item for the county I represent. For years I have been endeavoring to get a small vote, which the hon. gentleman will recollect he promised me on one occasion, for a steamboat wharf at Neguac, and also for the deepening of the harbor and river of Miramichi. Will the hon. gentleman bear this in mind, and amend the Estimates?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot amend the Estimates, which are the regular Estimates covering work already entered upon. Any new votes will not be found there, but in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. MITCHELL. One of these works, dredging of the Miramichi, is not a new work; it is a work that has been commenced and should be completed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was no vote last year for Miramichi River, or for Neguac, and, therefore, they cannot appear in the regular Estimates, but only in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then, you will do it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say that; I must consult my colleagues in regard to it.

Mr. MITCHELL. You had better tell your colleagues they will have to do it.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 113) to authorise the Toronto Savings Bank Charitable Trust to invest certain Funds (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 7th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BRIEN) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 114) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the Bill.

Mr. TROW. I have only received the Bill about fifteen minutes ago, but, so far as I can see, the amendments proposed are very trifling and are absolutely necessary. The first proposes that, instead of 300 electors constituting a polling sub-division, the number shall be reduced to 250; the next provides that, if there is no newspaper in the county, notices may be published in the adjoining county; and the third is that, in the event of the unavoidable absence of the returning officer, through sickness or otherwise, the municipal clerk shall have the right to adjourn the court. These are all the amendments proposed in the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE LOWER PROVINCE MAILS.

Mr. ELLIS. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if he could not do something to facilitate the delivery of the mails from the Lower Provinces, which come by the Short Line Railway. They are now detained seven hours at Montreal, so that the mails which should be here at two o'clock in the afternoon are not here until eight or nine in the evening. It would not be much trouble to have them brought here as soon as passengers.

Mr. HAGGART. It would necessitate the expenditure of a largesum of money to pay for another mail train between Montreal and Ottawa. I think it would cost between \$6,000 and \$7,000.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. Minister might at least enable members during the Session to get their mails as soon as passengers arrive. I do not think it would cost anything like that.

Mr. HAGGART. We had negotiations with the company with that view, and if my memory serves me, we found that it would cost fully that.

Mr. WATSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House to an item in the Toronto *Empire* accusing one R. W., M.P., of allowing his frank to be used for the purpose of having matter passed through the post office. As far as I am personally concerned, I never authorised or allowed anyone to use my frank. A year ago the postmaster called my attention to the fact that matter which he believed should not pass through the post office here, was passing through with my frank on the envelopes. I informed him that I had not authorised anybody to use my frank, or franked matter for anybody, and if he saw any matter going through the post office, which he considered was being passed through by somebody else with my frank, he was to stop it and let me know. I wish to contradict this item in the *Empire*. I believe the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has been accused of the same thing. I deny entirely the truth of the statement.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 6) respecting Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes.—(Sir John Thompson.)

QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSIONERS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved third reading of Bill (No. 111) to amend the Acts respecting the Quebec Harbor Commissioners.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I was not here when this Bill was read the second time. It gives the Quebec Harbor Commissioners power, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Acts respecting them, to carry on the business of warehousemen and issue warehouse receipts, but I think there will be something better and more in the interest in the trade of Quebec. It is to my knowledge that some gentlemen occupying high positions in the trade of Quebec have tried to lease some of the properties in question from the Harbor Commissioners, but could not get any satisfactory answers. The best course for the Commissioners would be as much as possible—though there may be cases in which they cannot do it—to lease those wharves to merchants or other parties instead of

being wharfingers themselves; and in order that there should be no special protection given to anybody, the leases should be put up at public auction. I beg, therefore, to move:

That the Bill be not read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the whole House, with instructions to amend it by making it obligatory for the Harbor Commissioners to lease at public auction and in convenient lots, the wharves and warehouses belonging to the said Harbor Commissioners.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman has no objection, we will postpone the third reading till Monday, to hear what may be said on the other side. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

DUTY ON CORN.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FISHER. Before that motion is put, I would like to say a few words on a question of considerable importance. It is commonly understood that there are going to be some changes in the tariff, and I think it but fair and right, that this House should have an opportunity of assisting the Government by passing such resolutions and tendering such advice with regard to these changes as it may deem necessary. We can quite understand that the Government may take the ground that they have on former occasions taken this Session, of desiring to leave all such matters until such time as the changes in the tariff may be declared; but I think it is well within the competence and authority of this House that we should take upon ourselves to express our views, and thereby assist the Government in coming to correct conclusions as to what changes in the tariff are advisable. A little while ago I heard an hon. gentleman, who is somewhat prominent on the floor of this House, state that the agriculturists and farmers of this country have not come to the Government in deputations, or had not formulated their demands, in regard to what they believe to be their interests in the changes of the tariff. This is true to a certain extent. It is quite true that the farmers have not sent deputations to the Government, as the manufacturers have, to explain personally their needs and demands. But other means have been taken by the farmers; and I need only refer to the number of petitions which I had myself the honor of presenting to this House in favor of certain changes in the tariff—petitions which were signed, under direction, by the officers of the various agricultural societies in the Province of Quebec. I need only, also, refer to the expression of opinion formulated by what I might characterise as that great Parliament of the farmers in Ontario, which met in Toronto a few weeks ago—a meeting of the Central Farmers' Institute. At that meeting the farmers expressed themselves with no uncertain sound as to what they believed to be the condition of the agricultural interest at present, and the necessary steps which it is within the competence and the power of the Government to take to aid them in removing the disabilities that interest is laboring under. I have no doubt whatever that the farmers are, to-day, fully appreciative of their situation. For a long time back, I may say, without casting

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

any reflection upon the farmers whatever, they have not been fully appreciative of the difficulties under which they have been laboring, or of the cause of those difficulties; but, to-day, I find that the farmers of the country, meeting, as they do, constantly in convention, in institute meetings, and in dairy conventions, are awakening to the full difficulties which they are suffering under, and are investigating and formulating the disabilities under which they labor, and the way in which those disabilities can best be removed. This being the case, I desire to lay a few remarks before the House, in reference to the removal of the duty on corn, and before I sit down I shall move an amendment to the motion which is before the House. The circumstances of our industries have changed a good deal in late years. Not to allude to other troubles and difficulties, I would point to the fact that, in consequence of the immense strides in advance in improved communication that have been made all over the world, the product of distant lands is now brought into competition with that of lands which are closer to the market in which they compete. This country, and the United States to the south of us, have spent enormous sums of money in developing the two countries, in building railroads for the express purpose of developing new countries and bringing the products of those new lands, those virgin soils of the great west, into direct competition with the fertile lands of the eastern part of this continent. I will not dwell upon that point at present, which, perhaps, is more galling and more unjust to the farmers than any other, namely, that we, in eastern Canada, and the people in the eastern States are bearing the burden of taxation caused by this expenditure, which has directly helped to incapacitate them for bearing that taxation. I grant that the farmers of the eastern Provinces of this country are, like all the rest, committed to that policy; I grant that we have acknowledged the justice and wisdom of the expenditure which has been made by this Government and by the country in the development of the North-West; but, unfortunately, the development of a new land where these things may be produced more cheaply than we can produce them, leaves the fact existing that we are thereby injured, and our circumstances and our means of competing in the markets of the world are weakened and hurt. That fact remains, whatever may be the reason, and, although we ourselves are, to a large extent, I confess, sharers in the responsibility for the expenditure, the only way in which we, in the eastern part of this continent, may be able to meet this competition, the only way in which the farmers of our eastern Provinces can have the same chance as they had before these cheap products of the west came into competition with them, is to lessen the cost of production for ourselves. The end we must aim at, the goal we must strive to reach, is that we should produce as cheaply as the virgin soil in the western part of this Dominion. That the farmers have come to that conclusion is, I think, evident to any one who has followed the discussion and the propositions which have been laid down in the meetings of the farmers during the last year or two. Wherever they meet and discuss their interests, we find that the men who are best able to state what is required lay down this view, and I concur in this line of conduct. There is no question that the only

hope of the farmers in the eastern part of the Dominion, in order to be able to compete with the cheap lands and the cheap products of the North-West, is to lessen the cost of production. There is no doubt, that to-day the system of farming in the eastern Provinces has changed. In days gone by, our farmers have produced grain very largely, and in doing that they have to a large extent exhausted the fertility of the soil. Expedients have been resorted to, to remedy that. They have endeavored to remedy it by giving a rest to the land by summer fallowing, by tilling, so as to take another and a deeper layer of soil, by deeper ploughing, and also by trying to have a more systematic rotation of crops, by which no one ingredient in the soil shall be exhausted to so large an extent, and also by trying to use such artificial fertilisers, such mineral manures, as are within their easy reach. But with all this, they have not succeeded in maintaining the fertility of their soil or of maintaining competition in the markets of the world. They have, therefore, had to turn to what is probably the only, as it certainly is the best, solution of the difficulty, and that is, making and using a large quantity of barnyard soil. It is not necessary for me to show in that connection the absolute necessity of a large stock. Instead of being able to raise grain as they were formerly, they are going to be, and are to-day, obliged, instead of producing wheat, to produce the finished product of their soil instead of merely the crude material. I may say that it is a good sign that this is the case. I am rather glad that our farmers have come to this, because I am convinced and know well that the farmer who takes the crude material of his soil and works it up to the highest point within his legitimate reach, and sells it as the finished article, is evidently getting larger prices for it, and not only that, but he himself is a better man and a better citizen. In this connection, there is abundant scope for the very best intellect, education and business capacity in farming as in any other business, or even in the liberal professions. If any man in this country desires that his son should be successful in his career, that he should have a large scope for his intellect, that he should shine and show himself a great man in this country, I do not believe that a farmer can give his son any better opportunity than to put him into his own business, and by means of good attention and abundant opportunity let him study that business. If every opportunity were given to these young men to study their business, this country would be made more prosperous to live in, and the business of the young man would be more prosperous than any other in the land. I am, therefore, not at all sorry that to-day the best farmers of our land must assume the position, that if they are going to succeed to the greatest possible extent, they must be educated, they must study and learn, not simply to do as their fathers and grandfathers did, but they must adapt themselves to new conditions, and must study those new conditions and methods which are necessary to ensure success. In this connection it would not be out of place for me to talk a little shop. I know it is not quite the thing to talk shop, but I think it is allowable when, as in this case, the shop is the whole country in which we live, when it is only limited by our boundaries and the sea coast of

our land, and when it is the workshop of the great bulk of our population. I say that farming to-day is the chief industry of this country, and, in saying that, I do not wish merely to repeat a truth that is so often and so lightly repeated, without any just appreciation of its importance. I will mention a few facts in regard to the agricultural industry in this country, and in regard to our trade, to show that farming in Canada is King. I have no later statistics than the census of 1881, but I find there that, in regard to the occupations of the people, those connected with agriculture are more than half of all those classified, they are more than twice the industrial class, more than six times the commercial class, and more than thirteen times the professional class. If I go to our Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that nearly one-half of the whole exports of this country are the products of the agricultural class; that they export eight times the exports of manufactured goods, eight times the product of our mines that are exported, five times the product of our fisheries that are exported, and one and a-half times the product of our forests that are exported. Although I have not got the statistics to prove the statement, I know that I am well within the limits when I say that the farmers of this country also produce much the larger supply taken by the home market to be consumed in the country. Not only is their production thus great in comparison with the productions of other classes of the country, but their consumption of the products of this country is, by far, greater than the consumption of any other class. Our manufactures and other industries are all largely dependent upon the home market afforded by the farmers. We hear hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House declare that manufactures are best promoted by a home market; and where is the home market of the manufactures of this country? The farmers and the agricultural classes afford this home market in a much greater degree than any other individual class in the community. I stated a few minutes ago that in consequence of the new conditions of our farming here, the farmers must take to the keeping of stock, and this is essentially a good thing. Even in the past, though we have not turned our attention very much in that direction, and though the farmers have, to a large extent, tried to carry on their business in the same way as their fathers did, still we find under these conditions, even under the old régime, our farmers did produce a much larger proportion of animals and their products than of products of agriculture pure and simple. If you examine the export table of our Trade and Navigation Returns, you find that while the agricultural products amount altogether to about \$37,000,000, the products of animals, and the animals themselves, amount to \$23,800,000, in round numbers, thus showing that the products of stock kept on the land formed nearly two-thirds of the whole export of our agricultural productions. We see, therefore, the immense importance of that portion of our agricultural industry involved in the keeping of stock. With these facts before us surely we ought to desire to remove all the disabilities under which farmers labor in regard to the keeping of stock in our eastern Provinces. I am glad to be able to say, that the Government have acknowledged this fact in establishing an experimental farm here at Ottawa, and several in other parts of

the country. They have shown an appreciation of the great importance of the keeping of stock, by laying out a large sum of money, and incurring obligations for future expenditures in this direction, in order to show farmers in the country how they can best go into stock-keeping and stock-raising. The Government have, during the past year, appointed a dairy commissioner, whose business it will be especially to study the best means of manufacturing butter and cheese. They have shown by their bulletins, and by the interest they have taken in farmers' institutes and farmers' conventions in all parts of the country, that they believe this to be most important and essential to the interests of the great agricultural industry. Sir, it is certainly a good point in favor of the Government that they thus appreciate the agricultural industry, and I congratulate the Minister of Agriculture that he has taken this step; I congratulate him that he has thus acknowledged the need of the farmers of the country turning their attention to stock-keeping in the future more than they have done in the past. This has been evidenced on the floor of this House, and we see by the growing interest of the farmers themselves in farmers' conventions, that this is the trend of opinion amongst them. I think it is a most desirable thing that these conventions should be encouraged and that they should be continued. When our farmers exported simply the surplus of the grain which they raised in the field, without putting that grain through processes which it might have been put through in Canada, they exported actually each year a large portion of their capital, because, in that grain, there was actually contained a very large amount of the elements of the fertility of their soil; and when they exported the grain they were not able to return those elements of fertility of the soil from which they took them. While they pursued that method of farming they did not attempt to utilise their brains and their business capacity to the fullest extent; they did not sufficiently understand that as the elements in the soil are the raw material for the production of grain, so the production of grains are the raw material for the manufacture of butter and cheese. It is better for the farmers of this country, as a class, that they should employ their brains and their business capacity in elaborating, as much as possible, all their raw material in the finished product, before they pass it off into the hands of strangers to be used. There is no question, as I have pointed out, that the farmer to-day is using his brains more than formerly, and it is necessary, in order that he may have an opportunity to exercise his greater brain power, that the Government should assist him as far as possible to put into a condensed form the products sent out of the country. The exportation of condensed agricultural products, such as beef, cheese and butter, takes out of the country an almost inappreciable amount of the fertile elements of the soil, while coarse grains exported by the bushel contain a very large proportion of such elements. This state of things is very extraordinary; and it is only by feeding coarse grains, and by keeping stock on our lands, that we will be able to preserve our farms in the highest state of fertility. I may point out a few facts contained in our Trade and Navigation Returns in this regard. It will be found that our finished products of beef,

Mr. FISHER.

which were sent to England, the most fastidious market in the world, reached last year 60,000 head, which were valued at \$4,992,000, or an average of about \$80 per head. On the other hand, we sent to the United States our unfinished beef in the shape of store cattle, to the number of 37,360 head, but the value was only \$488,250, or \$13 per head. Here is distinct evidence of a case of farmers utilising their brains and sending to England the product of their skill in the shape of the finest cattle, of an average value of \$80; while, in the other case, our farmers sent to the United States the raw material for beef, the frame, bones and hide, and only sufficient muscle to carry the animal, and no attempt was made to finish it, but it was sent to the farmers of the United States, who will turn it into good beef and reap the larger profit. These are examples of the two kinds of farming—one, the crude, unskilled, ill-judged; the other showing the highest skill and the greatest application of skill to the product in order to utilise the raw material. Not long ago, at a farmers' institute, one of the members stated that we want to export, not simply the raw material, but the finished products of our farms. In order that this result may be obtained, I appeal to the Government to express their opinion that the raw material shall, as far as possible, be obtained at the lowest price, and that the farmers shall have the benefit to the full of the raw material they need to carry on their business; and to-day they need to have corn free of duty. Hon. gentlemen opposite will, no doubt, reply that the farmers are in a first-rate condition to-day, and do not need assistance. No one acquainted with the people will, however, say so. I will merely allude to one or two facts which have come under my personal knowledge in the county which I know best. Last spring, I travelled through Compton County at the time the election was being held there, which resulted in the return of the present member. I drove many miles through the county, spending some days there, and I saw the state of affairs prevailing, and I will give one example as being perhaps the most intense, but only in degree greater than other cases I saw. I drove ten or twelve miles to a village, accompanied by a gentleman living in one of the adjacent villages. As I went along, I noticed house after house with windows barred up and doors fastened, and the whole condition showed they were not occupied or used. I asked the reason. I was told the farms were lying idle, and that the owners had gone to the United States, because they could not carry on their farms successfully and maintain their families on them. I asked if the neighbors were running the farms for them. I was answered in the negative, and it was stated that the farms were altogether deserted; and in twelve miles I counted ten such houses which were barred up, and ten such farms which were deserted. In the evening of that day I attended a public meeting. I spoke of the fact, and asked if such a state of affairs was really true, and if the facts were as represented. A young man, thirty years of age, rose in the meeting and said to his friends and neighbors, everyone of whom knew him: I am going away to-morrow, because I cannot make a living on my farm and maintain my family; I am going to the Western States, and there are several here who are going with me. This case of a young man of thirty

years, living in an Eastern Township village, deserting his farm because he could not make a living, gives force to my argument. It is true the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) was returned at that election, and I suppose this circumstance will be pointed to by hon. gentlemen opposite as proof of the prosperity of the people there. Those who know the county are well aware of the influence and power of, and strong attachment to his family, and these circumstances, combined with the fact that the hon. member in his business employs a certain number of men, explain his election. I am not going to make any statements which might be taken as being made from a party standpoint on this matter: I am not going to quote writings tinged with partisan feelings, but I have an editorial here written by one of the staunchest Conservatives in the Eastern Townships, published in a newspaper fully devoted to the National Policy, and which has consistently supported and endorsed the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). I refer to the *Richmond Guardian*. Referring to the remarks made by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), in moving the reply to the Speech from the Throne, that paper said:

"Mr. Pope, in moving the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, congratulated the country on the good times prevailing, and, particularly, on the prosperous condition of the farmers of the Dominion. We have a sort of liking for optimistic men; there is generally a hearty geniality about them that influences their surroundings and makes those who come in contact with them 'feel good,' even when the commercial weather is cloudy. 'Better be merry than sad,' is a very comfortable maxim to act upon; but it is never wise to 'live in a fool's paradise.' And we cannot help thinking that Mr. Pope has got into that retreat for over-wrought optimistic thinkers. There are lots of people who hug the same delusion; they are generally those very fortunate folks whose fathers were born before them, and have a comfortable surplus to handle, as well in bad times as good. But those not so favored—who have to live day in and day out by their labor, or on the profits of business, know that these congratulatory assurances of optimistic members of Parliament, Ministers, and Governor Generals are mere palterings with the truth. Times are hard;—have not been so hard for a dozen years as they are now. If those good people who dispute these facts honestly believe that Mr. Pope's statement is true, we invite them to run a country store in the Eastern Townships, or a rural newspaper, or to purchase a farm, and if after a year's trial they do not come out of the ordeal 'wiser and sadder men,' we will turn Annexationist, or submit to any similar torture to our loyalty to Canada. Outside of the born-with-a-silver-spoon-in-the-mouth fraternity, every son of Adam, at least in this part of the world, knows that business is very depressed, and that farming profits are at the lowest ebb, and that the banks are carrying half their customers. We cannot see what good object is served by keeping up this delusion about the prosperous condition of the country. No country can be said to be prosperous when the classes whose labor creates the wealth are living from hand to mouth; and it is of no use denying the fact that this is the condition just now of the producing class. This may be a gruesome thought; we do not know but it is. We are not pessimistical, and no more disposed to look on the dark side of things as the most benign and resigned of our neighbors. The truth forces itself upon us in spite of our inclination, and we repeat, with the confidence born of a conviction, that we are experiencing very hard times in the Eastern Townships.

"The depression is from the very bottom, and is felt upwards in every avenue of industrial and speculative life; and it must be when the tillers of the soil are unable to 'make the two ends meet.' In our view the depression is ascribable to three principal causes: 1st, Over productiveness in manufactures; 2nd, reduced productiveness of the soil in new countries, and the enlargement of the area of supply, causing a thrusting out of the natural productions of the older countries; and 3rd, chiefly to the extravagant expenditures on public works all over the world."

Now, Sir, from what I know myself, I can

say that the storekeepers of the Eastern Townships are finding it harder this year than ever before to get paid for what they sell. I know one prominent storekeeper in my neighborhood, who has had a business experience of nearly half a century, and this year he has been obliged to dismiss two of his clerks because he could not afford the expense of retaining them in his service. This is a specimen of what is being done all through the Eastern Townships. I will now refer to the report of the committee appointed by the Farmers' Institute of Toronto to consider the prevailing agricultural depression. Now, Sir, if there was no depression, that great parliament of the farmers of Ontario, which I have referred to before, would not have named a committee to enquire into it and to find remedies for it. The following resolution was adopted by that committee:—

"That the agricultural industries of this Province are severely depressed, no one will deny who is at all acquainted with the agricultural interests of this time. Your committee believe that the chief causes of that depression are—among other things—excessive taxation to meet the expenditure required to open our Western Provinces and meet the payment of interest upon our over-increasing public debt; this taxation being levied in many instances in a manner which is very unjust to the agricultural interests of this country.

"As to the proper remedy for any or all of these causes, opinion may differ to a wide extent, but your committee believe that the following suggestions are along the line in which at least a measure of relief might be obtained: (1) Free entrance to the markets where our products have to be disposed of; and your committee would strongly advise that in future all legislation in regard to import duties be in the direction of lowering those duties."

I will also read to the House the following petition to the Government, adopted by the Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario:—

"Whereas, we consider the present high tariff is very injurious to the agricultural interests, making what we buy proportionately dearer than the products we sell; and

"Whereas, the present high tariff has given rise to the combine system by which competition is to a great extent prevented; and

"Whereas, the agricultural interest is suffering under a serious depression and unable to bear the strain occasioned by the tariff and the combine system aforesaid, and as the agricultural interests represent the larger majority of the population; that, therefore,—

"This, the Central Institute do respectfully ask the Government to reduce the duty on articles of prime necessity to the farmer, such as iron, steel, coal, cottons, woollens, rubbers, sugars, corn and salt, to such an extent as to relieve the agriculturist of the unequal burden under which he is now laboring."

This resolution was carried on a vote of 70 to 4, which was practically unanimous. There were 100 leading farmers present from Addington, South Brant, Bruce, Dufferin, West Durham, Elgin, South Essex, Frontenac, Glengarry, South Grenville, Grey, Wentworth, Winona, York, Halton, Milton, Huron, Seaforth, West Kent, East Lambton, South Lanark, Lincoln, Middlesex, Monck, Norfolk, Northumberland, Ontario, Oxford, Peterborough, Perth, Renfrew, Simcoe, Stormont, Waterloo, Wellington. And there were delegates from the following branches of the farming industry: Ayrshire Breeders, Clydesdale and Shire Horse Association, Dominion Draught Horse Association, Eastern Dairymen's Association, Ontario Creameries Association, Ontario Fruit Growers' Association, Ontario Beekeepers' Association, and the Ontario Hog Breeders' Association. We find also at that meeting that, on the motion of Mr. William Stewart, seconded by Mr. James

Ewing, it was proposed to reduce the duty on corn; there was an amendment to raise the duty on corn not imported for cattle-feeding, and this amendment was lost, and the main motion carried by a large majority. That is the opinion of the farmers in Ontario, and from the districts which were represented, and we cannot conceive a more thoroughly representative meeting than that was of the farmers of Ontario. Just the same expression of opinion has come from the farmers of the Province of Quebec wherever they met to discuss their present condition. These resolutions of the farmers of Ontario, do, I believe, express the feeling as to the depression of the agricultural interests all over the country. I wish to place this matter clearly before the House, so that it may be thoroughly understood, and that the taunt thrown across the floor of this House, that the farmers of the country were not taking an interest in the tariff resolutions of the Government, and were not desirous of having their views laid before Parliament, may be answered. I take this course so that this House, representing, as it ought to represent, in a large degree, the agricultural interests of the country, may be enabled to give a full expression of its views on this matter, I may say, further, that if the farmers have to resort to stock-breeding, the procuring of cheap food for the stock is primarily essential to their success. The feed of this country is largely obtained from forage which we produce ourselves. We have already had a discussion in this House with regard to the system of ensilage, when it was shown how much that system tended to cheapen the production of the higher class of agricultural products in this country. It was also proved that, as that system is used in conjunction with the old plan of growing hay and straw to provide the rough forage, it is necessary to the feeding of stock that supplementary foods should be provided, and in those supplementary foods corn plays a very important part. Corn is not produced in this country to a very great extent—in fact, scarcely at all, except in two or three counties in Western Ontario. We in the Eastern Townships do raise corn, but the crop is not a safe one. In a large part of Canada to-day, the land which used to be applied to the attempt to raise corn for grain is coming to be applied to the production of ensilage, and I submit that that is the true way to utilise it. It is, therefore, probable that in the future less corn will be produced in our land. But that part of Canada which can grow corn cannot come anywhere near producing enough to supply the demand in Canada. We import a large quantity of corn from the United States, and we shall continue to do so, notwithstanding the duty upon it; and if there were no duty, we should import a great deal more. We know very well that corn is the basis of the fattening process. We know very well that the great hog products of the Western States are almost entirely produced on corn, and it is owing to the cheapness of their corn that the people of those States are able practically to control the whole market. A very curious state of affairs exists in this country. Although ours is an agricultural country, which exports a large quantity of agricultural produce, it also imports a very considerable quantity, but it is a finished product which we import, not a raw material. We import beef, bacon hams, mutton, pork, dead meats, and meat in the carcass. It seems an extraordinary thing that an agricultural country like this should do so; and

Mr. FISHER.

what is the reason for it? It is because, by putting a duty on the coarse grains which come from the United States, we enable the farmers of the United States to compete in those animal products in our own market at an advantage over our own farmers. But if our farmers could buy corn in the cheapest market, and use it for the production of cattle and swine, for the raising of which Canada is unrivalled, they would not suffer under this disadvantage. In Canada, which is unrivalled for the production and growth of animal life, it is a manifest absurdity that we should be obliged to import annually about \$2,500,000 worth of animal products; and were it not for the fact that cheaper corn enables the people of the United States to produce those things more cheaply than our farmers, we should not be obliged to do it. Therefore, let us take the duty off corn, which is the farmer's raw material, so that he can put it into the production of animals, and make the finished product in this country. I understand that there have been deputations urging the Government to put a duty on meat—that some farmers are asking that they should be protected, and should be enabled to produce beef to better advantage than it can be imported from the United States. I want to say "Amen" to their efforts, but in a different way. Instead of putting the duty on meat, and thereby making it dearer to those who consume it, I want to take the duty off the material that goes into the production of that meat, so as to enable our farmers to produce it at its present price, but to produce it at a profit instead of at a loss. This is the gist of the whole. We import from the United States a large quantity of the products of corn. Instead of importing the product, let us import the corn itself, and let our farmers apply their skill to converting that into the finished product of lard, beef, mutton and hams, which will enable them to sell the finished product to our own people at the same price as now, but at a profit instead of at a loss. There is another side to this question. Ours is an agricultural country, as is the United States, and we compete in the same market in Europe in agricultural products; but do we export to Europe anything like our fair share of the agricultural products of this continent? Do we have a fair chance in the competition in Europe with the United States? What is the fact? I have looked up the relative exports of the products of animals from the United States and from Canada, and in making the comparison, I have taken the United States as having twelve times the population that we have, so that we ought to export, at any rate, one-twelfth of what they export. Therefore, by multiplying our exports by twelve, and comparing the result with actual exports from the United States, we shall obtain a fair comparison. The result shows the relative exports of the two countries to be as follows:—

	From Canada. (Twelve times actual exports).	From the United States.
Lard.....	Lbs. 96,000	Lbs. 30,422,370
Bacon.....	4,332,000	36,320,774
Beef.....	324,000	16,902,448
Hams.....	240,000	5,590,570
Pork.....	216,000	5,010,767
Canned meat.....	348,000	6,026,979
All other meats.....	756,000	956,640
Tallow.....	60,000	4,717,229

Of cheese I am glad to know that we export more relatively than they do; but it is the only product of animals of which we export, according to our population, anything like the quantity which is exported from the United States. Therefore, I contend that there is something wrong in our system, when we, an agricultural population, having natural conditions just as favorable, and being just as capable mentally and physically, can only show such a comparison as that. But, Sir, I trust that, instead of putting a duty upon meat and thereby making it dearer to the consumer, our Government will remove the duty from the corn and enable our farmers, at better advantage, to produce the meat. That is the line that I believe to be the right line of policy in the interests of our agriculturists. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of increasing the duties. They yield to the representation of deputation after deputation clamoring for increased duties. Will they now yield to the representation of one great class of the community, not to put on, but to remove the duty, and so enable a cheaper production to be made. I say this is not only in the interest of agriculturists—although I speak for that class, and I believe if it were only necessary for that class, it would be a just demand on the Government—but it is in the interest also of every other class in the community. Every man, woman and child who has to eat meat, butter and cheese, will be benefited by getting a cheaper article, which they will get through the removal of the duty on the raw material, which goes to make up those products, whereas, by increasing the duty on those articles, the farmer will not be in a better position. By removing the duty on corn, the product itself is made cheaper to the consumer, and the farmer has just as good a chance, or a better chance, to make a profit. It is often said that the manufacturers in this country require protection. I claim that the farmers are the greatest manufacturers we have. The agricultural class produce more valuable products than any other manufacturing industry in the country; and if the other manufacturers are to be aided, certainly we should not refuse to aid that most important manufacturing industry, the farmers and agriculturists. Holding these views, though not believing I am going the whole way I should have gone, but to make the first step in this direction, I move:

That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved that, in the opinion of this House, corn should be put on the free list.

Mr. POPE. I am very much pleased that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) has directed the attention of this House to our agricultural industries. They are worthy of every consideration, and, although I cannot agree entirely with what the hon. gentleman has said, I am glad that he has given us an opportunity of considering these industries. I am afraid that he is not agriculturally honest in the way he has brought this matter before the House. I am afraid he has been tainted with party politics to a certain extent, in being induced to bring this motion before the House as a party motion, whether as a vote of want of confidence in the Government of the day or otherwise; but this is not the only question in which the hon. member for Brome has deceived this House and attempted to deceive this country. There is a great moral

question which he has often mooted before this House—the temperance question—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. POPE—in which he has been as indiscreet as on this question. He had the opportunity of visiting the constituency I have now the honor to represent, last May, for agricultural purposes. At the first meeting held there at Johnsville, he informed the agricultural community of the County of Compton that he was there as an advocate of the great cause of temperance. Quite true, he was a Liberal in politics, but he said that whenever the question of temperance arose he should always separate himself from his party, if necessary—that he would bury his party affiliations and come out boldly and freely in the interest of the cause of temperance. Well, he came out in that county, and went from one place to another. Not that I have any jealousy or ill-feeling owing to his visit, for, with one exception, in every place he visited I received a larger Conservative majority than was ever given at those districts before. Therefore, I am not at all jealous of his visit; and if I should ever contest another election in that county, I ask him to come there and assist me, for I do not know of any greater strength I can have in Compton County than the presence of the hon. member for Brome. With regard to this temperance question, the hon. gentleman had an opportunity of showing his sincerity, for there was a local election since then held in his own county, in which Mr. England and Mr. Duffy were the candidates, the former being the Conservative candidate chosen by the Conservative party and endorsed by the Temperance Alliance. Under those circumstances, we would naturally expect so strong a temperance man prepared to separate himself from his party entirely in the cause of temperance, and to support the candidate of the Dominion Alliance. But, it was surprising in one who always poses as the honest agriculturist, to find him supporting Mr. Duffy and opposing Mr. England in that contest. He has said that the county that I represent was a desolate section of the country, that the people had left there and gone to foreign parts to reside; and that this was owing to the fact, I suppose, that we had not free corn in our section. If the hon. gentleman had taken the opportunity of counting the houses inhabited, and spent as much time in looking over those as he did those uninhabited, he would have given us credit, I think, for having the majority of houses in that county so well populated that, since the introduction of Mr. Mercier's policy to donate a hundred acres to those families which number twelve children, I have had several letters from my constituents asking me to apply for the Mercier grant on their behalf. But I am afraid that, under this policy of Mr. Mercier, it will be some time before the hon. member for Brome will be able to apply for a lot. In that respect I am ahead of him. Young man as I am, I am entitled to at least half a lot, and if nature continues to favor me as I expect she will, I intend to win in the future one of the lots Mr. Mercier is offering. He poses in our section of the country as an adept or a scientific agriculturist. No doubt he is scientific. He is so extremely scientific and so devoted to the great cause of agriculture, that upon a certain occasion, which per-

haps is not known to this House but is well known to our section of the country, he concocted an artificial food on which to maintain the life of cattle cheaper than it can be maintained by the use of that material which engenders the cud. No scientific was this that in its operations it was something like the principle which was adopted by the old man who tried to teach his horse to live upon sawdust, but, unfortunately, when he had got the infernal brute almost educated to that point, the horse died. The hon. gentleman goes further. He attends our agricultural societies there, and we are always pleased to see him; and during the last election in Brome, he stated on several occasions that he had received from Mr. Mercier a promise of \$400 to assist an agricultural society there. In the proceedings of the House the other day, I saw that a question was put to Mr. Mercier by Mr. England, as to whether it was true that Mr. Fisher was authorised to state that Mr. Mercier, or any other member of the Government of the Province of Quebec, had, directly or indirectly, promised \$400 for an agricultural society; and the answer of Colonel Rhodes was that it was not promised.

Mr. FISHER. That is not correct.

Mr. POPE. I suppose the hon. gentleman is more correct than the record of the proceedings.

Mr. FISHER. More correct than the quotation.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman compares our country with the United States. I have no objection to that; but, though I am not quite so great an admirer as that hon. gentleman of the great republic, I will take the trouble to compare some of the agricultural productions, and some of the prices paid in our section of the country, with those of the States which adjoin us. It is an undeniable fact that the price of a farm which you can buy on the American side for \$2,500 is worth not less than \$4,000 on the Canadian side of the line. They say that is an imaginary line. If so, it is a fortunate thing for the people of this country that it is there, whether imaginary or unimaginary, so that we can realise for agricultural lands in the section of country in which I live nearly double what the Americans can get for land 35 miles from my house. By profession I am a butcher, and I have some knowledge of the price of meats in that country. I know that I am enjoying good healthy three meals a day out of the profit I make on my butchering. I know that I can buy beef or pork—not shipped from Chicago, but from the farmers in Vermont and New Hampshire, which adjoin our part of the country—and I can pay the cent a pound duty imposed upon it, and have it brought to my door and made ready for the market, at a less price than I can buy from the farmers in my county. No one can contradict that; for, to use the language of the hon. member for Simcoe, I speak by the book. The hon. gentleman says that if we had free corn we would have cheap pork, and, perhaps, cheap whiskey. Well, there is a country which has free corn, and that is the United States. I have spoken of the Eastern States. It may be said that that is an old section of that country, that the soil there is run out, and that we have no right to expect to find there the same fertility that we would find in the great west. We will glance for a moment at the banner State of the whole Union, which is Indiana. We

Mr. POPE.

find that the farm mortgage indebtedness in that State increased by \$60,379,000 between 1873 and 1879; that between 1882 and 1888, the increase was \$46,476,000, a total of \$106,855,000. Interest on those loans is at the rate of 7 per cent., and the farmers of the State are paying annually \$7,480,000 in interest. Nearly all these mortgages are held by foreign companies, thirteen of which, in three years, foreclosed mortgages aggregating one million dollars. Indiana is one of the banner States of the Union. She has the benefit of commercial union. She has all the benefit to be derived from being centrally situated in such a great country, as the hon. gentlemen opposite say the American republic is. Yet we find her farmers paying an interest on mortgages amounting to almost as much as the interest on the entire debt of Canada to-day. When we can buy these articles on the other side for less money than we can buy them in this country, what benefit will it be to the farmers here to have free corn? The hon. gentleman says that would be a benefit to the consuming community in this country. Let us look at that question for a moment. Swift & Co., and Armour & Co. of Chicago, practically control the meat market of the United States. Mr. Swift was a small butcher in Boston and Lowell, but he established himself in Chicago, and is now at the head of his firm. In the East he established his agents, who were then known as the agents of Swift & Co., but are now wholesale butchers. They sold to merchants in Boston, Lowell, Manchester, and other points in the east. After Mr. Swift had severed the connection between the farmers, and drovers, and the butchers in the Eastern States, he said he was going to have his own prices, and the result is that you pay from 18 cents to 25 cents a pound for choice roasts in the New England cities, while in this country you can buy them from 13 cents to 15 cents per pound. That is the practical result. That same Swift & Co., of Chicago, are now trying to monopolise the markets of this country. You can find their meat in every city—Toronto, Montreal, and even down to Halifax. He is trying to play the same trick on the people of Canada as he did on the people of the Eastern States. So serious is this matter there, that when I was talking to a butcher from that section the other day, he said: We are trying to find means of ridding ourselves of this monopoly. How are you going to do it? I asked. He said: We have an idea that this is bruised beef, and that it is not healthy beef, and that we are going to propose that the meat shall be slaughtered in the State where it is sold. This was a man from Vermont. That is what they are trying to do in regard to that; and that system, which has been spread over the Eastern States, is likely to be spread over this country. If there is anyone entitled to the markets of this country, it is the farmers of this country, the men who own this country, and we are going to have it. I hope the leader of the Opposition will listen to this. We are going to have it. Whether under this Government, or some other Government, we intend to have it. The hon. gentleman says we import from the United States into this country, that we are capable of importing agricultural products into Canada, notwithstanding the duty placed upon them, and, yet, at the same time, he says our

country is fearfully depressed. What, then, must be the condition of those people on the other side of the line, who have to pay a cent a pound to get their meat in here, and yet can get a cent a pound more here than they can get at home? The physical capacity of our farmers, and the mental capacity of our farmers! Beautiful theoretical idea—the physical and mental capacity of our farmers! I say that, physically, not only our farmers, but everybody in this country, are equal to those of any other country on the face of this earth, I do not care where that country is. Mentally, we are superior to a great many nations of the earth; and the people of the constituency that I have the honor to represent, are evidently superior, mentally, to the hon. member for Brome, as was evidenced by the verdict of my constituents at the last election in my county. There is another subject to which I wish to refer, and the member for Brome referred to it a moment ago. In looking over the debates of this House, I ascertained that he takes a great interest in the dairy interest of this country, that he has studied it, that he keeps dairy breeds of cattle, that he makes a specialty of dairying. While he says that he does not wish that the dairying interests of Canada should be fostered to the detriment of any other industry of this country, at the same time, in order to illustrate the great generosity of the man, the noble character of the man, he is able to meet this House, and to meet this country, and say: I am a dairyman and get my living from dairying, my constituency gets its living from dairying, but, at the same time, I am perfectly at liberty to say that I should not oppose the importation into this country, and the manufacture in this country, of that beautiful stuff called oleomargarine.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. POPE. He says "no." He started in that direction, and if he drew back, the start shows the true heart of the man. Now, he wishes to cover it up under the same deceit with which he has covered his temperance principles and his agricultural principles.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member, must refrain from using the word "deceit," since it has been objected to.

Mr. POPE. I withdraw it. I crave the indulgence of this House and the pardon of the hon. member opposite. As you know, Sir, I am not accustomed to speaking here; I am a born agriculturist and accustomed to speak frankly, and perhaps my language may be too forcible for a Legislature of this kind. I have a letter in my hand from a farmer in the County of Compton, a resident of the township of Compton, a township that gave a majority against me, and the signer of the letter is the man through whose influence that majority of 17 was obtained against me. This is what he says:

"I see some of the farmers are asking to have the duties taken off corn."

This is a man who feeds and exports cattle.—

"I would prefer to have it doubled, and one cent per pound added to beef and pork brought from the United States, which, I think, would help farmers more. I do not know as this is exactly in keeping with Liberal views.

"Yours respectfully."

The farming community of this country, as I said before, I think, are entitled to the kindest consideration from this or any other Government. We furnish the markets for the cities of this country, for the manufacturers of this country; and we furnish the traffic for the railroads of this country. We are perfectly prepared to do it. We believe that, in establishing these manufactures within our limits, we are increasing our home market; we believe that in building up these railroads we are developing this country, and in its development we are going to gain some benefit; we believe that the employment of labor upon those railroads is going to furnish a market for our produce, and that we are going to have the privilege of selling our produce to those laborers; and all we ask from this or any other Government is to give us this market, to give it to us untrammelled, to shut out from us undue competition, and let the Canadian farmer have the privilege of feeding the Canadian population.

Mr. McMULLEN. I shall not attempt to follow the hon. gentleman in his wandering address. I may say that his remarks brought to my mind an incident that once happened in my own experience. I was travelling along the road, and, while resting at a hotel, one morning there sat opposite me a man who appeared to enjoy his breakfast very much. After taking half a dozen cups of coffee, the waiter came along and said to him: "Why, sir, you appear to enjoy your breakfast. Will you have another cup of coffee?" "I will," said he; "and certainly I never had to drink so much slop for a little coffee in my life before." Well, Sir, we have listened to a tremendous amount of slop from the hon. gentleman, who has not entered into the question at all. He never touched a point. He wandered all around it; but he never came to the question before the House. He did not attempt to deny that, even in his own constituency, there were empty houses. He never said, for a moment, that the statement made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) was not true. On the contrary, he admitted the statement he had made. He said, however, that if he counted the houses that were occupied and then compared them with those that were empty, he would find there were a great many more occupied than were empty. Now, that does not at all refute the statement that had been made by the hon. member for Brome with regard to empty houses in his constituency. Then he says that he can buy beef across the line from where he lives on the American side, cheaper than he can from his next-door neighbor. He says he can buy beef cheaper across the line than he can afford to feed it. Now, we want to alter that condition of things. We want to place the farmers of this country in such a position, by free importation of grain, that they can feed beef on our own soil, and prevent our neighbors across the line from bringing it in. We want to place our farmers in such a position that they can produce beef upon our own ground. Then the hon. gentleman referred somewhat to the indebtedness of the State of Indiana. He said the mortgaged indebtedness of that State had risen very rapidly, until it has now reached an enormous sum. Well, all we have got to say is, that the State of Indiana lives under the burden of a National Policy the same as we do, and the farmers of the United

States have been robbed by the operation of a protective tariff the same as the farmers of Canada are robbed, and the results to the farming communities in both countries are precisely the same. The people there have been subjected to an enormous strain from year to year, and they are beginning to realise that fact. The people of this Dominion have been subjected to the same strain, and they are beginning to realise that fact also. The hon. gentleman says also that some of the States are talking about legislation for the purpose of preventing beef slaughtered at Chicago from finding a market throughout the United States and Canada. That is not new. The State of Illinois, years ago, attempted legislation of that kind, but after the people of Illinois had seen through the intended legislation and the effort that was made by the butchers of that State to bring the people to pay an increased price for the beef they had to eat, they opposed the legislation and it did not pass the House. They were afraid of a monopoly being created in that State, from the results of which the people would suffer. I will draw the attention of the House to the question that is properly before it, because the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat rather led us away from the point at issue. It is patent to everyone who has taken any interest in the financial interests of the farming community of the Dominion, particularly of those living in the older Provinces, that a complete change must be made in the manner in which the farmers work their farms, and there must be a change in their ordinary annual operations in order to enable them to make money. Since the opening of the North-West, wheat-growing has become unremunerative to the farmers of the older Provinces, and, in fact, the older Provinces are undergoing the same experience as was passed through by the Middle States some years ago. We remember when Indiana, Illinois and Missouri exported large quantities of wheat and corn. After some time, they were unable to compete with the western States, and, in order to place themselves in a position in which they would be able to maintain their families, they were obliged to take up stock-feeding. As regards the farmers of Ontario, I am satisfied that unless some very decided change is made, in order to facilitate the farmers in helping themselves financially out of their present position, very serious disaster will ensue. They cannot possibly relieve themselves by growing crops and selling them. The only thing they can do is to turn their attention to feeding stock, and feeding hogs. In order to do that successfully, they must be able to obtain feed as cheaply as possible, and if the farmers of Ontario are given corn free, they can produce a much larger volume of their present products. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) spoke of bacon. I notice that last year we shipped bacon to the value of \$360,000, but we imported the same article from the United States to the value of \$335,000. We want to be able to import our corn free of duty and lay it down on the farms, and with it grow pork and produce bacon, instead of importing it from the other side of the line, and the only way we can accomplish that result is by allowing the farmer to have his corn free. With respect to cattle, it is well known that throughout the Dominion there is no better

Mr. McMULLEN.

feeding section than can be found in Ontario. If the farmers had the advantage of cheap feed, they could raise beef in almost unlimited quantities. They have all the necessary accommodation in the way of commodious, convenient and comfortable barns; the best water to be obtained in the Dominion—flowing springs in all directions; the best pasture in the Dominion, and, everything considered, if they can be induced to give up the present system of trying to grow crops and sell them for the purpose of releasing themselves from their financial embarrassments, and turn their attention to cattle feeding, they will improve their condition very rapidly. In order to do that, we want to give them the opportunity of bringing in what corn they require free of duty, and they will then be able to double the quantity of cattle now exported. I have already alluded to feeding hogs. I contend that if we allow corn to come in free we can feed hogs in place of importing bacon from the United States, to the value of \$335,000 last year, and we will be able to export very large quantities to our advantage. With respect to butter and cheese, I am glad to notice that this Dominion has become a large exporter of cheese. Our trade in that commodity has, indeed, increased rapidly during late years; but, in order to still further promote the trade, it is specially desirable that the farmers should be given the opportunity of using the corn for feed. Any one feeding cows knows that they must be fed during the winter with a reasonable portion of corn or grain, in order to enable them to give the necessary quantity of milk during the summer months, and thus the requisite quantity of cheese. Any one knowing about the production of cheese is aware that it is an absolute necessity that the cows should winter well and be fed with grain, if the farmers are going to realise remunerative profit from the cows, in the shape of butter and cheese, during the summer. It is well known that cows will produce more milk and butter fed on chopped corn than on any other feed, and it is an absolute necessity, in the interests of the production of these commodities, that we should have cheap corn. With regard to bacon, I have stated the importation from the United States last year. Even with the duty that is now on that commodity coming in here, 2 cents a pound on bacon and 1 cent a pound on pork, that product is brought in here; but if our farmers are allowed corn free, they will be able to produce four times the quantity at present raised. I observe that our exports of sheep and lambs have also greatly increased. I am glad to notice that our shipments to the British market have increased, and I hope they may continue; but, in order to encourage that trade, it is desirable that the farmers should be allowed to have their corn free, because it would facilitate the feeding and preparation of the animals for the British market. It must also be remembered that, owing to the limited size of the farms in Ontario, the farmer cannot possibly grow sufficient feed on his farm for a large quantity of stock, and if he goes into the feeding business he must purchase feed for his cattle beyond that which he can grow himself. You cannot grow on 100 acres a sufficient quantity of grain, roots and hay and straw to meet the requirements of a large number of stock, such a quantity as would prove remunerative and require the employment of two

or three men all the year round, and it must be remembered that one man can attend to forty head as well as twenty head. If the farmers are able to obtain corn free of duty at the low price at which it can be purchased in the Western States, they will be placed in a position much more favorable financially than in the past. I contend that we have been drawing very largely on the resources of the farming community. We shall, perhaps, have an opportunity to discuss the whole question on the Budget speech, and I should have liked to have heard the statement of the Finance Minister before this hour of the Session. I contend that the farmers are beginning to awaken to the fact, as it has been presented by the hon. member for Bromo (Mr. Fisher), that the National Policy has very seriously militated against their best interests. They are beginning to realise that the increased duties on iron, and on almost everything they purchase daily, add to their burden. The farmers are beginning to realise that there have been very large amounts deducted from their resources, and that they are gradually being pauperised.

Mr. DAVIN. What about Haldimand?

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend asks me to account for a certain election. There is no accounting for things that occur in certain places, and if I were to enter into the *minutiv* of the question he referred to, it would take me too long, so I decline to be led from the thread of my discourse.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The courts will probably give him the explanation about that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes; I believe they will. I say that the Canadian farmers are beginning to realise that this National Policy has virtually robbed them. The farmers of the United States have realised that long ago, and they are awakening to the fact that reduction has got to be made in the duties imposed upon them. The Canadian farmers, through their institutes, are beginning, apart from their political leanings, to discuss the effects of the National Policy upon their resources, and one by one they are pronouncing, in the most emphatic terms, that the National Policy is not doing them any good. Three years ago, when a resolution with regard to the increased duty on iron was introduced, the Minister of Finance of that day stated that we would soon have plenty of blast-furnaces making iron, and that we would be able to get it cheaper or as cheap as before the increased duty. That promise has not been fulfilled. There has been no increased production of iron in Canada, and the farmers are compelled to pay excessive duties on everything made out of iron which they use on their farms. It is high time that this Parliament should begin to consider the interests of the farmers; and I have no doubt that, in view of the expressions of opinion of the Farmers' Institute in Ontario, the Minister of Finance, in his coming Budget speech, will give some indication of a consideration for that particular class of the community. I have no doubt that he will feel it his duty to bow, to a certain extent, to the remonstrances the farmers have made, and that he will realise that the Government cannot longer dally with those people, and they cannot be treated with indifference in the future as they have been treated in the past. I hope that no mere sop will satisfy the farmers, but that they will insist on

sweeping changes being made, and continue to demand their rights and privileges until the Government grants them. A very good example has been set to the farmers by the manufacturers of this country. Year after year, the manufacturers have urged their interests upon the Government, and we do not know that the Government ever denied them an increase in the duties which they asked. The farmers have been taught the lesson that they must combine for their own interests, and that if they do not do so their interests will be neglected by the Government, and ten years hence they will find themselves in the same ditch as they are in to-day. If the farmers combine, as they are now combining in their institutes, and press upon the Government their claims, the result will be that the Government must accede to their demand. I am exceedingly sorry to have to confess that the farming community of the country is in a deplorable state. It is much to be regretted indeed that the farmers find themselves embarrassed to the extent they are. I know that hon. gentlemen opposite have, for years past, been endeavoring to persuade the House and the country, that the statements we made with regard to the financial embarrassments of the farmers were not true; but the evidence of every day proves that the statements we made with regard to the injurious results of the operation of this tariff upon the resources of the agriculturists, are fully realised, and the proof is very plain that this policy strikes at the root of their resources, and tends to impoverish them year after year. Every man on this side of the House should advocate these changes in the tariff which will relieve, to some extent at least, the unfortunate agriculturist of this Dominion and give them a chance for their life. I have no doubt that the Government will, sooner or later, be compelled to allow the farmers of this country to import what they require free of duty; and, after the discussion we have had to-day, I believe that the Government must take into their consideration the propriety of taking off the duty on corn for feeding purposes. I am not advocating that corn should be admitted free for the manufacture of liquors, but if you admit corn free for the purposes which the farmers require, you can easily meet the deficit in the revenue in this respect, by increasing the duty on the manufactured spirits. This House would only be discharging its duty to the farmers of this country, and granting them what they are justly entitled to, by relieving them of the bondage under which they have so long suffered. If they discontinue to subject them to the heavy burdens now imposed on them, I have no doubt that before many years the farmers will be in a better position. As I have said before, the day of wheat-growing has passed away in Ontario, and has now to be limited entirely to the North-West, so far as this Dominion is concerned. Our farmers have, therefore, to take to stock-breeding, and if we encourage them in this industry and remove the barriers against its success, I have no doubt that success will attend their efforts. We see from the returns, that our stock productions are growing every year, and that our export of sheep and horses to the United States is largely increasing. If we cannot get him to drop grain-growing and turn his intention entirely to feeding, I have very little hope that he will get out of the difficulty that now

surrounds him. I felt it my duty to make these few remarks, simply because I represent an agricultural district, and I consider it my bounden duty, every time there is any question before this House affecting the interests of the agriculturists of this Dominion, to endeavor in my feeble way to put in a word on behalf of that class of the community.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), in moving this resolution, appears to be about as consistent as he usually is in the discharge of his parliamentary duties. It was only a few evenings ago that we heard the melodious and stentorian voice of that same hon. member raised in this House, in condemnation of a Government who would allow corn to come in comparatively free of duty, because that corn was manufactured into alcohol or whiskey; or, in other words, because the Government would allow a rebate of the duty on the small amount of corn used in the manufacture of alcohol or whiskey which was exported from the country. He endeavored then to make a strong point against the Government on his temperance principles; but to-day he asks the Government to take the duty entirely off corn used not only for the manufacture of whiskey to be exported from the country, but for the manufacture of whiskey to be used in the country, so as to make it as cheap as possible. If the hon. gentleman was consistent in the argument he used then, he is not consistent to-day; but his course on this subject is only in harmony with the argument he usually presents when party interests and the interests of the community are at variance. The hon. member for Compton dissected that argument. He told us at the outset that he was only a butcher; but I think he might have said that he was an anatomist, for he dissected it to such an extent that the refuse left was only fit to be put out of sight. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) is reputed to be a scientist—one who analyses his subjects from a scientific point of view, and so effectually that, in the language of chemistry, they only amount to a conglomeration. A gentleman once asked a chemist: "What do you understand by a demonstration in chemistry?" He said, "I will give you an illustration: take an effervescent, add a deliquescent, there will be a precipitation, which is a conglomeration, and that's a demonstration." That is about as clear as the scientific arguments presented on behalf of the farmers by the hon. member for Brome; they really amount to a conglomeration. What does the hon. gentleman's argument mean? It means simply that the Government should allow corn to come in free of duty. For what purpose? He says, for the feeders of the country. Now, it may not be out of place if I analyse this motion a little closely, and see how far it affects the great agricultural interests of the country. Are they directly interested in it? It is true, that the man who engages solely in feeding, and who exports meat to a foreign country, would be benefited by the free importation of corn; but the moment he engages in that business he becomes a competitor of the cultivators of the soil, having antagonistic interests to theirs. We have a few distillers and brewers in this country who are engaged in the feeding of cattle, and we have a few farmers, like the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), who turn their attention exclusively to that line; but in number, they are

Mr. McMULLEN.

as one to five hundred in comparison with the cultivators of the soil; and while you might benefit that one, by removing the duty from corn, you would be injuring the interests of the remaining 499. As soon as men become feeders of cattle, their interests become antagonistic to those of the agricultural class; it is to their interest to obtain cheap feed, but to that extent they are impoverishing the market for that great class of people who must live by the cultivation of the soil and the raising of grains. The hon. member for Brome, as an argument in favor of the free importation of corn, spoke of the large exports of our agriculturists compared with the total exports of the country; he said that they amounted to nearly one-half of the whole, of which he said the exports of cattle form a very large proportion. But he forgot to tell the House that probably four-fifths of the exports of beef from this country are virtually the exports of distillers and brewers, who feed cattle from the refuse product of another line of manufacture, and not the exports of farmers at all. The farmer's interest is in raising stock which supplies the home market, and which they raise and feed on the products of the soil. Now, about \$500,000,000 worth of products are raised and manufactured by the people of this country annually, of which they export about \$72,000,000 worth; therefore there is \$4 worth consumed in the country to every dollar's worth exported, and the farmers of the country are engaged in raising the food for the cattle which are consumed by the people of Canada. It is not the agriculturist who exports cattle largely; it is largely distillers, brewers, and men in other lines who are turning out a product which, I am sorry to say, is, to a limited extent, coming into competition with the products of the agriculturists of the country. If there is anything in the argument that in benefiting the larger number you benefit the whole, the very fact that the cultivators of the soil must represent over a hundred to one as compared with the feeders of stock, would indicate to us the importance of looking after the interest of the larger number instead of the interest of the smaller number. What are we doing to-day? We are endeavoring to induce the farmers of the country to produce a cheaper kind of feed for cattle for dairy purposes, to which they are turning a great deal of attention. When the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) stated that there is nothing better than corn for butter and milk, I thought the hon. gentleman must know very little about farming. If it were not known to me that he has spent the most of his life in commercial pursuits, I should conclude that his experience of farming was of the most limited character, because he must know that the juicy foods, such as grasses, roots and ensilage, are the great sources of dairy products—milk and butter—instead of grains; and hence we are teaching the farmers how to raise those things cheaply, and thereby reduce the cost of dairy products, and thus benefit the country. The hon. gentleman said that every farmer wants to raise as many cattle on his own place as his men can fairly attend to. He says that one man can attend to forty head and do it nicely; then, he ought to be able to raise on a hundred-acre farm enough food to support those forty head the year round. Well, if he is an intelligent farmer and possessed of the information the Government has endeavored

to inculcate in him, he will be able to raise that feed, because I know that practical farmers are doing it to-day easily. Take my own locality, I know of a man who is this year keeping thirty-five head of cattle, and all the portion of the farm he is cultivating, including hay, is only thirty-five acres, representing one head to every acre, so that, with the pasturage in the summer and the feed he raises, he is enabled to feed the cattle the whole year round. We are raising a better class of feed and producing better milk and butter now than if we imported corn from foreign countries. One hon. gentleman, for the purpose of strengthening his argument, made reference to the report and the resolutions which were carried by the Farmers' Institute in Toronto. Perhaps all hon. gentlemen in this House may not be as well acquainted with the designs of those institutes and their application as we in Ontario are. I regret to say that we have, unfortunately, found, during the last few years, that these farmers' institutes, like the grangers before them, which were organised ostensibly for a good purpose, but were turned into a political purpose, are being used in the interest of party politics and are suffering from the same baneful influence which destroyed the grangers. No better evidence of this could be had than the vote given the other day in Toronto. Forty-six members voted in harmony with the principles of free trade, and every man, I am told, was known to be a Reformer, and voted to strengthen the hands of the Reformers in this House by making a point against the Government. Twenty-three voted on the other side, and forty-six voted to carry this resolution for the purpose of embarrassing this Government. Unfortunately for the interests of the farmers in our Province, every attempt is being made by the Ontario Government to control those institutes. I have ever strongly protested against this since the time these institutes were organised. We see it, and know it, and regret it. We fear the same result awaits them which overtook the Grangers' Association, which died from inanition, because, when it was found they were nothing but political institutions, people would not attend them, and they soon came to an end through sheer lack of interest. In this way, the farmers' institutes are being destroyed to-day. They were hatched by the Central Institute, which is controlled by the Local Government. No hon. gentleman in this House, knowing as well as I do the constitution of those institutes, would take the arguments based on their proceedings as having any weight, controlled as these institutes are by political influences. The hon. gentleman said that at a meeting of the Central Farmers' Institute at Toronto, the proposition was made to take the duty off iron and other articles, and that it was carried by a majority of seventy to four; and he further said there was an attendance of one hundred. What became of the other twenty-six? They would not vote at all I presume, because, as they said, it was a political dodge, and not having the numbers to vote it down, they were powerless to give an expression of opinion as representing the great agricultural class. Therefore, I presume they withdrew. I have it from members of the institute who were there and voted against the resolution, that it was only a political dodge, which they were powerless to prevent, and they were obliged to let it go and enter their protest against it. So much for the argument

with reference to the farmers' institutes. They are simply a tool in the hands of the Opposition. Should this resolution pass, it would effect great injury to the agricultural class, because there are four hundred of our farmers who sell the coarse grains, instead of feeding for export. It is, therefore, in their interest that coarse grains should be quoted at the highest possible figure. Those who intend to feed cattle can, by giving their attention to the regular means, raise feed enough on their farms to feed their cattle the whole year round. Any one can do it by cultivating on proper intelligent lines. We are spending money yearly to teach our farmers those lines, and are doing it successfully. As representing a very fruitful agricultural district of Ontario, I am satisfied that nine-tenths or forty-nine-fiftieths of the farmers do not want this resolution carried, but are strongly opposed to it, as they feel it would be against their best interests. I hope this resolution will be voted down, and that we will continue to carry out the policy we have been carrying out during the past eight or ten years in its entirety, and which has proved to be of the greatest value to our agricultural population.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I cannot allow this resolution to pass without saying a few words on it. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat has misrepresented our farmers' institutes. Allow me to explain, and I claim to be better posted than that hon. gentleman—although he said there was not a gentleman in this House better posted than he—how these institutes are worked. I have been in his locality, and I do not know of any institute meeting which was better attended than the one held there. At that meeting the Conservatives numbered three to one Liberal. These farmers' institutes were established by the Ontario Government in each riding in which the county council would vote \$25, the Ontario Government giving a like sum; and each institute was given two directors at first, of which one was a Conservative and the other a Reformer. In many of the institutes which I attended last winter, the president was a Conservative. I was appointed by the Agricultural College of Guelph to visit these institutes, and of those sent out, twenty-one gentlemen in all, eleven were Conservatives, nine Reformers and one doubtful; so that the Conservatives were in the majority. My instructions were not to introduce party politics, and I have never done so, unless they were first introduced by local men. The Government of Ontario do not want party politics discussed at those meetings; but it is almost impossible to discuss the important questions brought before them without bringing in politics. Let me show how politics come in. Last summer a gentleman visited some of those institutes and asked the farmers to give their consent to an increase of the duty of 50 cents per barrel on flour. This gentleman preface his remarks by saying he did not want to introduce politics, but only to have a little talk with the farmers about the duty on flour; but that naturally led to politics, and he was a strong Conservative. I say no institution was ever established in the Province of Ontario from which the farmers have derived greater benefit than from those institutes, which are educating our agricultural people, both Conservatives and Reformers. A gentleman who could take the position of the hon.

member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who would make the statements which he has made, is speaking contrary to the facts in connection with those institutes to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the complexion of the Central Institute which met in Toronto last year? It was forty-six Reformers to twenty-three Conservatives.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). At the outset, each farmers' institute chose two representatives to the Central Institute, and all the institutes I have ever been at chose one Conservative and one Reformer to go to Toronto; so, when the hon. gentleman says the majority are Reformers, he admits that the Conservative farmers will not take as much interest in their own profession as the Reformers do. In that case they can blame themselves. I was much amused to hear the statement that those who fed cattle had an interest opposed to the general interest of the agricultural community. We were told that four-fifths of the cattle exported were exported by brewers and distillers. I have been in that business myself, and for the last four years I have been to the old country, in connection with it, every summer, and I give that statement a most distinct denial. I say that more cattle are raised by the farmers of Ontario and sent to the old country than are sent by distillers and brewers. The teaching which the hon. gentleman desires to send out on this subject is not in accordance with the best interests of the agricultural community. He thinks that the Government should do all they possibly can to keep up the price of coarse grains. The Government has engaged an eminent gentleman to go into the country and educate the farmers on this subject—I mean Professor Robertson. What did he say at the time of the Dairymen's Convention in this city? He said he thought the time was past when farmers should export coarse grains out of the country—that they should, on the contrary, become importers of coarse grains and consume on the farm all products of that nature. Either the hon. gentleman must abandon the system of education he desires to give to the farmers of Ontario, or he must ask Professor Robertson to close his mouth. I was very much amused to hear the member for Compton (Mr. Pope) tell us that he can go to the United States and purchase meat there, and pay a cent a pound duty and bring it into Canada, and yet get it cheaper than he would if he purchased it from the farmers in this country. I have made a calculation to show a comparison between the cost of meat to the farmer, with free corn coming into Canada, and the cost with the sale of his barley and peas to the outside world, and I find the difference to be one cent a pound; that is we could raise beef and pork cheaper to that extent with free corn than we can at present, which would be a proof of the hon. gentleman's statement so far; but, when he stated that our farmers had by so much better a market for their produce than the farmers of the United States, I could not believe him. Any good beef animals which are fattened in the United States are sent to the old country markets. I have watched the markets closely for two years past, and I have found that prime beef cattle are a little higher in Buffalo than they are in Canada. One reason for that is that they are somewhat heavier, and

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

perhaps they fatten them a little more with corn. From the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that we exported to the United Kingdom last year only \$3,674,000 worth of agricultural products. The United States is an agricultural country which competes keenly with us in all agricultural products, and yet we exported to that country \$9,123,767 worth. This proves conclusively that the United States farmers must have a better market for their produce than we have, or they could not take that quantity of produce from us, and pay the duty on it besides. Then I turn to the returns in regard to the Province of Ontario, to which I have the honor to belong, and I find that \$880,879 worth of agricultural produce is exported from that Province to the markets of Great Britain, against \$7,720,457 worth to the markets of the United States; which is a conclusive proof that the farmers of the United States have a better market and realise higher prices for their produce than the farmers of Canada. Why otherwise should the United States take the produce of Ontario and pay the amount of duty which they have to pay at the present time? I hold that this resolution ought to receive the favorable consideration of the Government, and, amongst others, for one particular reason. The Government has sent out circulars informing the farmers that it is about to distribute ten thousand bushels of barley seed. Perhaps it may be doing this in the best interests of the agricultural community, and, if that is so, all the barley raised from that seed will be exported to the old country. It is stated that this distribution is for the purpose of our raising an article for the English market. The only way in which the Government can keep the farmer on a proper basis after that is to give him free corn. If we can get 50 cents a bushel in the Canadian market for barley, and if we could bring free corn into Canada—as we were told during this Session by an hon. member we could—for 30 cents a bushel, then we could receive 50 cents for 48 pounds of barley, and could purchase 56 pounds of corn for 30 cents. Besides, corn returns the fertility to the soil. It is a fertiliser as well as a food, and that is what the agriculturists of this country require in order to maintain the fertility of the soil and meet the keen competition which we have to meet in the British markets. I hold that, if the Government does not give us this little redress in the shape of free corn, seeing that they are going to interfere with the fertility of the soil by sending out this barley, they will be neglecting the interests of the agriculturists. It is not true that the farmers of Canada are, as a rule, opposed to free corn. I have conversed with the farmers in most of the western parts of Ontario—Conservatives and Reformers alike—and I have yet to meet a farmer who stated that it was not in the interests of the agricultural community to have free corn. I was surprised at the speech of the last hon. gentleman, who reproached my hon. friend who moved this resolution with inconsistency, and spoke about the distillers getting free corn if this resolution were adopted. The Government have already told us that the distillers are to get free corn, and my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) has only tried to place the farmers on the same footing as the brewers and distillers. I hold that cheap production lies at the foundation of the success of the farmers of Canada to-day;

and no man, who is thoroughly acquainted with the business of the farmers can show me any other means by which farming can be made successful and continue to be so than by the return to the soil of that which they have raised from it. I believe it is in the interest of the farmers that the Government have taken the step they have taken in finding a seed barley that will suit the English market; and, as I hold it, every enterprise that the Government enters into of that kind ought to be completed in the interest of the class to which it refers. Their scheme will be left incomplete if they do not take it for granted that the farmers want cheap food to feed to cattle in order to keep up the fertility of the soil, and to sell their fat cattle in a foreign market. By the Trade and Navigation Returns I find there are over 15,000,000 pounds of pork yearly imported into Canada at the present time, and I find no other export of any description to counterbalance that. This is something that the farmers of Canada ought to raise themselves, but as long as the farmers of the United States have the benefit of the corn which they can raise cheaply, while we are compelled to pay a duty upon it, just so long are they able to produce the article more cheaply than the farmers of Canada. Just as soon, I believe, as that corn is allowed to come in free, the farmers will take advantage of it. It would require something like 1,300,000 bushels of corn annually to raise the quantity of pork I have mentioned—because I think Professor Robertson told us in one of his addresses that it would require five pounds of corn to raise one pound of pork. It would require, therefore, to fatten the amount of pork that we get from the United States, about 1,300,000 bushels of corn to come into the Dominion, and if it comes in duty free I believe we will be able to meet the Americans on their own ground. I believe, in other respects, we can produce as cheaply as they can; but as long as we have to pay that duty upon corn it is impossible for us to produce as cheaply as they can or to compete with them in the markets of the world in the sale of either beef or pork. We must remember that conditions are continually changing. The Government have found that there is a change going on in Canada to-day, and they have seen that it was in the interests of the agricultural community to import a large amount of barley seed and to spread it amongst the farmers. I hold that the Government ought to go a little further and give the farmers an opportunity of retaining the fertility of the soil, and no action the Government can take will contribute to this very important object in the same degree as allowing the farmers to import corn free. There is no farmer in Canada to-day who looks after his own interest, and understands the interest of the agricultural community of this Dominion, and the keen competition we have to meet in the markets of the world, who does not know that cheap production lies at the foundation of our success, not only as individual farmers, but as an agricultural community; and as the welfare of the Dominion of Canada at the present time depends upon the success of the agriculturists no other relief that can be offered to the farmer will prove so effectual as to give him free corn.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the vote is taken I wish to say just one word. This motion has to be met

by the Government in the same way and for the same reasons that the other motions were met that had to do with tariff matters, just on the eve of the Government bringing down a Tariff Bill.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 16) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Samuel May.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Calgary Water Power Company (Limited).—(Mr. Hickey.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Rainy River and Boom Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 61) to amend the Act to incorporate the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 82) to confirm an agreement between the Montreal and Western Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 84) to amend the Act to incorporate the Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the North Canadian Atlantic Railway and Steamship Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 113) to authorise the Toronto Savings Bank Charitable Trust to invest certain funds (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small.)

SUPPLY.

Amendment of Mr. Fisher negatived on a division, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Harbors and Rivers, New Brunswick. \$20,000

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the object of the ballast wharf and landing at Campbellton? Very few vessels go there now, I understand—not as many as in former years.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Altogether, it will cost a little less than \$10,000. Thus far, \$4,600 has been spent, and this vote of \$5,000 is expected to complete it. The first idea was to connect it with a landing pier which was there, but it was found that the landing pier did not belong to us, and, therefore, we decided simply to build a ballast wharf.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Edgett's Landing, for which \$2,000 is taken for a ballast wharf, is, I believe, in Albert County.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. There has been expended \$2,384, and this \$2,000 will complete the work.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In 1887, there was a vote of \$450 in the Estimates to complete a

wharf at Anderson's Hollow. I see in the Auditor General's Report that a balance was paid on that work of \$3,356. I suppose that is finished?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose so.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What will the wharf on the Richibucto River at Kingston cost, and is it nearly finished?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was a vote last year of \$4,000, but there was less than \$40 expended up to the 31st of December, so that that vote is still good, and, with the addition of \$2,500, will complete the work.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Has any contract been made yet for that work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the work will yet have to be done by contract.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Was any application made for that wharf? I am informed that very few vessels go up the river at that point.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The memorandum I have states that the proposed wharf will consist of an approach from the bridge 63 feet in length and 20 feet in width, and a block of crib work built solidly which will answer as a wharf and pier. There will be from 11 to 20 feet of water along the outer base of the work at low water spring tide, which has a rise of four feet. A place for the deposit of ballast is much needed at Kingston, and by a judicious distribution of the ballast unloaded at the pier made ground can be had in a few years. The village of Kingston is situated on the river about six miles above its mouth; it has a population of about 1,000 souls, contains 28 places of business, and a large amount of general business is done there. At that point the river is about 1,200 feet in width, and is spanned by a bridge having a draw, which permits vessels to pass up the river a distance of 16 miles, and a smaller class of vessels can ascend a distance of 22 miles above Kingston.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That river is perfectly well known to me, for I was born on its banks, and I lived there before the bridge was built. Very few vessels went above the bridge, although Kingston at that time did a larger business than it does to-day. There was quite a large amount of ship building done there. There are several wharves below the bridge, but above the bridge a pier can be of no use whatever except to benefit some private individual. To spend \$6,500 on the wharf in question is perfectly useless, and yet the Government only gave \$6,000 to Prince Edward Island, where wharves are required which would be of some practical benefit. I protest against this vote until we have some information as to its public utility. Wharves should only be built by the Government in places where vessels are in the habit of visiting, and not where vessels cannot reach. There is a wharf at St. Louis where no vessels can reach, and yet \$1,877 have been expended on it. A boat drawing two feet of water cannot get to it. I would ask is that wharf completed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was no money voted for that last year.

Mr. WELSH. I know that, but I see in the Auditor General's Report that \$1,800 have been spent on it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That money must be expended and the work completed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think this principle of building wharves in rivers which are not harbors is entirely foreign to the principle which should actuate the Government in giving these grants. Practically, this wharf which is built at Kingston is not in the harbor at all. I never knew of a square-rigged vessel going up there, although there was no bridge there at all. Occasionally a schooner may pass there, but it will not be used for any practical purpose at all. I protest against the people's money being squandered in this way when there are other places which really require wharves. With regard to St. Louis, that is a river which no vessel except a bark canoe could go into at all. There is practically no entrance to the river at all, although there may be, as stated last year, nine feet of water near the wharf. The river goes into a lagoon, and all that goes down are rafts and logs. Every deal manufactured on that river has to be floated down to Richibucto, and yet a wharf is put there for the purpose of piling on it deals and boards to accommodate some little mill. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) is here, and he can tell us what benefit, so far as navigation is concerned, can be derived from this expenditure.

Mr. WELSH. In the Estimates of last year some \$400 was appropriated to build this wharf at the mouth of the Miminigash River, alluded to by my hon. friend, but it was withdrawn, and I supposed the work was abandoned. To-day, however, if I understand the Minister rightly, the work is in progress still. I fully corroborate all that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has said relative to this wharf at Kingston. Last year only about \$8,000 were voted for all the wharves, piers and breakwaters at Prince Edward Island, although \$100,000 would be required for that service. The Government are now about to give \$150,000 to build a pier at Cape Tormentine, but I see no vote for a pier to connect Cape Tormentine with the Prince Edward Island Railway. There will have to be an equal amount of money spent on the Prince Edward Island side before that pier is of any use, as far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. The railway constructed by my hon. friend from Westmoreland runs down to Cape Tormentine, and he will corroborate my statement that that wharf and railway will be practically useless to Prince Edward Island until we have a harbor on the Cape Traverse side. I do hope that this useless expenditure of public money in building wharves and piers where the hon. member for St. John says they are useless, and I know his statement to be true, will not be persisted in. I would like to hear the hon. member for Kent explain the necessity for the expenditure both on the Kingston pier and the pier at the mouth of the Kouchibouac. I shall oppose the item until I hear from him.

Mr. KIRK. I have always understood that the policy of the Government was to build breakwaters or wharves on the sea coast where they were necessary to protect the lives and property of seafaring men. I never supposed this Government had adopted the policy of building wharves in rivers merely for the purpose of benefiting private individuals. The hon. members from Prince Edward Island and other places have explained that they

have not had justice in this matter, but if there is any member in this House who has a right to complain of the course of the Government, it is myself. I represent a county which has a sea coast extending over 100 miles, yet if you take that sea coast, which, with all its indentations and bays, extends over 160 miles, you will find that not one dollar has been expended there during the past seven years in building breakwaters or wharves to protect the fishermen. The coast of the County of Guysboro' is well known by hon. gentlemen who know anything about it as one beset with dangers to the fishermen. We have, it is true, some superior harbors. We have some excellent harbors that do not require any improvement at all, but there are large portions of the county, where improvements are required in order to protect the fishing craft. I have applied from year to year for money to build breakwaters in several places that have been surveyed by Government engineers and reported upon, but I have applied in vain. I still hope that the Minister of Public Works will not altogether overlook the County of Guysboro'. The people there pay taxes as well as other people, and they have a right to fair consideration in the distribution of the public funds, which they never have had under this Government. I have frequently applied for a breakwater at Indian Harbor. The engineer has reported that it would cost \$13,000 to construct a breakwater there, and the people there feel that the Government are entirely neglecting them. Some of them are thinking of removing from the place altogether. One of the most enterprising and wealthy shipowners and shipbuilders in the district is about to leave, or, perhaps, has left, and gone to live in another county, but I do not know whether he is going to remain in Nova Scotia at all. I heard he was going to the United States, and that simply for the want of a breakwater.

Mr. SPROULE. Will they get more breakwaters when they go there ?

Mr. KIRK. They will go where there are breakwaters. While the Minister of Public Works has thousands of dollars to expend in building wharves in rivers where no protection is required for craft or where no craft larger than a birch-bark canoe has ever gone, it is manifestly unjust that he should overlook such important public works as those I have spoken of in the county which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. ELLIS. The chief objection appears to be to the useless expenditure of money on the Richibucto River. There is no reason for the construction of a wharf there of the size which is mentioned. What is the position in regard to that wharf at St. Louis now ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it is completed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What was the cost of that wharf ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot state that at present.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There was a vote of \$3,800, including a re-vote, and last year there was a vote of \$1,000, which was dropped ; and by the Auditor General's Report, I find that \$2,000 was

expended. What is the use of that wharf ? It is simply used as a piling wharf, and not at all for purposes of navigation. As to the Kingston wharf, \$4,000 was granted last year, and \$2,500 is asked this year. How much does the hon. Minister expect to spend on that ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is to complete the wharf.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). For purposes of navigation that wharf is practically useless. It is not in the harbor of St. John, but in the river. Of course, it is in tidal waters, but it is in the River Richibucto above the harbor, and very few vessels go above the bridge at all. There are plenty of wharves there below the bridge, there is a wharf which was built by the Local Government which has been there for years, and I should like to know what object is to be gained by the expenditure of \$6,500 on that wharf, which is \$500 more than is given altogether for Prince Edward Island.

Mr. WELSH. I would suggest that this item should stand over, until we hear from the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The member for Kent will be here in a few minutes, and we may go on with the remainder of the items in the meantime.

River St. John, River Des Chutes to Woodstock and above Grand Falls, including removal of obstructions between Fredericton and Woodstock ; also River Tobique—To complete.....	\$1,000
--	---------

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I am glad to see that the Minister has reduced that vote. Last year it was \$4,000, and the year before it was \$6,000, and no one seemed to know where that money went. That vote may be required on that river, but I do not think it can be so much required as formerly, because the railway has largely superseded the use of boats on the River St. John. I think this amount will be ample.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman knows how bars are made and banks formed, and we have to keep that portion of the river open.

Mr. GILLMOR. Is this for dredging the river ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. ELLIS. I object to this whole expenditure on the Tobique, the Madawaska or any other rivers above Grand Falls. These rivers run through the constituency of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and there is no object in this expenditure. The Tobique is merely a stream for driving lumber. There is no towpath at all. The Minister ought to look into the matter. It is shameful that money should be wasted in this way. There is a breakwater at the mouth of the Little River, just above Grand Falls, and you might as well put a breakwater at the mouth of the Rideau River here. It would be better to buy the only house there that this breakwater can protect, and take it away, than to expend this money.

Shippegan Breakwater.....	\$10,000
---------------------------	----------

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to have some information about this work. It was begun about ten years ago, and is no nearer completion now than it was then. What was completed in the summer usually

goes out in the winter. Really, I do not think the breakwater is wanted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a little late in the day to say that it is not wanted. It was begun on the 1st July, 1875, and down to the 1st July, 1889, there had been expended upon it \$31,000. This sum is to complete it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Last year, when the question was asked, the Minister said it would require only \$20,000 to complete it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$10,000 last year and \$10,000 this year make \$20,000.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Last year my hon. friend alongside of me (Mr. Ellis) pointed out that the total shipping in 1887 at that point was 560 tons; total duty collected, \$622; goods entered, \$4,220; for that business we pay \$40,000 for a wharf.

Harbors and Rivers, Maritime Provinces generally. \$12,000

Mr. KIRK. Will the hon. Minister inform us where the \$12,000 voted last year was expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A small sum was spent at Halifax, others at Round Bay, Negro Island, Upper Salmon River, N.B., and several other places.

Mr. WELSH. The \$12,000 will be expended in the same way this year. I would recommend the Minister to insert a clause excluding Prince Edward Island from all benefit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no occasion for that, because Prince Edward Island never gets anything.

Mr. LOVITT. I would call the attention of the Minister to the Sandford Breakwater. I think he had better send somebody down to look after it. I am informed that if it was repaired immediately, it would not cost very much, but if left for some time it would cost a good deal more.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman wrote me about it the other day. I gave orders about it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). For what was the amount spent on the Halifax Graving Dock?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was to make an examination and report.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Did the company pay for that, or the Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government paid, because it was for our own purpose to see whether the work was done in such a way that we might begin to pay the subsidies that we are bound to pay every year.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to the breakwaters in the County of Lunenburg. Quite a number of those breakwaters and public wharves are sadly in need of repair, and if they are not looked after soon they will all go to pieces. A few years ago the Government took over the breakwaters from the Local Government, but little or nothing has been done on them since. It would be well to send an engineer down to look after those wharves and breakwaters, otherwise, in the course of a year or two, they will all go away.

Mr. ELLIS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention to have an engineer go round and visit them all. When there is not a special vote for a work, if some repairs are required, we will take it out of this vote. If there was something very extraordinary or very expensive, which was unforeseen and absolutely necessary, then we would ask a special warrant from the Governor General.

Mr. ELLIS. Has the Minister any information with regard to the breakwater in St. John harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think a representation has been made to me, and if there has been, I am sure the engineer has gone to examine it. If there has been no representation, and if the hon. gentleman says that damage has been done, I will take a note of it and send an engineer.

Mr. ELLIS. I understand the sea runs right through it now.

Harbors and Rivers, Quebec. \$131,150

Mr. LAURIER. Chicoutimi, St. Alphonse and Anse St. Jean, \$3,800. This is an item that very often occurs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is the only vote we have to keep these wharves in repair. Last year, I think, we voted \$3,700, and the engineer reports that \$100 more are required.

Mr. LAURIER. What is this item of \$5,000, River St. Francis?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for dredging the river, and in order to provide a channel five feet deep at the mills, and eight feet deep below the mills at the lowest stage of the water.

Mr. LAURIER. With respect to the item, \$5,000, Three Rivers pier, I observe that items of this character occur very frequently.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Four times. In 1887 we expended \$285; the following year, \$17,480; in 1889; \$2,715; last year, \$1,000. More money was required to complete the work, and it will be finished this year.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the hon. Minister would explain the item respecting Lévis Graving Dock.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to make provision for carrying out certain improvements, for construction of fences, additional fire hose, and erection of a house for the dockmaster.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister promised to give certain particulars with regard to receipts and expenditures connected with the dock.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman wanted to know the annual revenue and expenditure. For the year ending 31st December, 1888, the expenditure was \$5,793, and the revenue \$2,349, being an excess of expenditure over revenue of \$3,444. Last year the expenditure was \$9,002 and the revenue \$17,499, an excess of revenue over expenditure of \$8,497.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That arises from the *Polynesian* having been there for so long a time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There were several vessels.

Mr. SCRIVER. Under the item of \$1,000 for general repairs and improvements, I should like to ask the Minister if his attention has been called to the fact that the wharf of St. Anicet, in the County of

Huntingdon, is very much in need of repair. I am informed that, if it is not repaired, the steamer *Bohemian*, of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, will not be able to make its usual calls there during the coming season.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Is it a Government wharf?

Mr. SCRIVER. I suppose so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will make a note of it.

Piers and Harbors, Ontario..... \$125,500

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). How much has the Toronto Harbor works cost up to the present, and how much will they cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. From the 1st July, 1875, to the 1st July, 1887, the cost was \$536,000. In 1888, \$19,000; in 1889, \$30,000; and in 1890, \$27,000. The vote was only \$20,000 last year, but we have received a contribution from Toronto of \$10,000, and of course we take from their share when required. \$50,000 are now asked to go on with the work, and I am told, by my engineer, that it will likely need \$100,000 more.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Will the works at the eastern portion of the bay be then complete, so that we will not be expending \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have done some dredging, in order to get the necessary depth of water at the eastern gap, but it is not so deep as at the western gap. The Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company's boats go by the eastern gap, and when I was up there, last year, I saw a number of vessels passing there without any difficulty. We have to guarantee the safety of the channel by piers on both sides, and the question is now under consideration whether we will be obliged to make deeper dredging, in order to put the cribs at the proper level. That may cost a little more than was intended, but it is better to expend it now than to have those piers, perhaps, destroyed later. We want to make a good job of it, in order that the work which has been done so successfully up to the present, may be completed.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What depth have you in the eastern gap?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Twelve feet, and the channel will be 250 feet in width. The depth of the other channel is, I think, 14 feet.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. Minister did not give me the answer I desire. I wish to know whether we may regard this as a final completion of the work, or whether we will be asked to spend large sums of money on it every year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. According to the statement made by the engineer, we will require \$100,000 more than this vote; but I do not think that will be sufficient, and I believe we will need \$25,000 or \$30,000 more than this estimate. However, I cannot speak as to that precisely.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I wish the Minister would tell me how much it will cost, annually, to keep this harbor in repair, after he gets this work done?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work will be new, and I hope it will stand good for several

years. It will be necessary to keep it in repair, the same as all other work, from time to time, and if we are unfortunate enough to have a big gale and damage done, of course we will have to repair it. Just now, an hon. gentleman has very kindly told me that the Negro Point breakwater, at St. John, had been damaged considerably. If I had stated last year that that required only some small repairs, I would be found fault with, because I could not see what Providence was keeping in reserve for us in that way. It is impossible for me to say how much it will cost to keep this work in order.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I asked the hon. Minister what was likely to be the ordinary expenses annually, of keeping the work in proper repair, provided it does not meet with any extraordinary accident? I think the hon. Minister ought to be able to tell me that.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take a note of that, and try to give the hon. gentleman an answer later on.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What has the harbor at Little Current cost, and how much will it cost in the future?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Up to the 31st of December last, the works there had cost \$61,370. We have still a balance from last year's vote, which, with the \$5,000 we are asking now, will carry on the work next year. It is intended by submarine blasting to increase the width of the steamboat channel from 120 to 300 feet, and to make it 16 feet deep at low water. This is necessary to enable vessels to pass there with safety at all times. It is a very important work, as the hon. gentleman knows, and it will require more money to carry it on.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Is the hon. Minister able to say how much money will be required to complete it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say. My chief engineer, before he was obliged to leave by illness—he is better, I am pleased to say—told me that \$15,000, perhaps more, would be required to complete the work.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What about Midland harbor? A considerable amount of money has been expended there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, nearly \$36,000 has been expended there. The Grand Trunk Railway Company also contributed \$10,000 and the town of Midland \$5,000, in 1880, and lately they have each contributed \$5,000 more.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This Midland harbor is a work of very great value to the whole trade of Georgian Bay; and, as it has been very largely done by private enterprise, I think the Government are justified in all the expenditure they make upon it. At the same time, I should like to ask the Minister to take into consideration the application made to him for the deepening of the inside channel of Georgian Bay, which is one of the feeders of Midland, Penetanguishene, Parry Sound and various other ports on the Georgian Bay, and the amount of money asked to be expended upon it is very small compared with the amounts expended in other parts of the country. It is a work of very great importance to the lumber interest, because

all the barges engaged in that growing trade pass through that channel. The depth is so shallow that if there happens to be low water at any time, many vessels are obliged to take the outside course, which is very much more dangerous in rough weather.

Mr. DAWSON. I can join my hon. friend in saying that it is a matter of great importance that the channel between the mainland and Manitoulin Island should be improved. It affords safety to vessels in the fall of the year when the weather is stormy, because it is a channel that can always be travelled. I would certainly urge the Government to bestow some expenditure on that channel, which is of very great importance to all the trade of Georgian Bay.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Before this vote is passed, I wish to state that early in the Session I moved for a return for some information in reference to the expenditure of money on a survey of Kettle Creek, between Port Stanley and St. Thomas, but up to the present time I have been unable to get any information with reference to it. I would not, of course, complain of an appropriation for a survey, if there was any reasonable excuse for it; but I have no hesitation in saying that it was quite uncalled for, and the Government ought to have known that there was no possibility of constructing a canal between those two points. The only object or motive which could have inspired the action of the people at St. Thomas, or the Government, in the matter, was the desire to make political capital. At the same time the Government knew very well, as I have time and again represented to them, that the harbor at Port Stanley was rotting and wasting away, and the traffic to that harbor on the lake was becoming impaired, because they neglected, blindly and determinedly, to pay any attention to the representations made, and refused to spend a single dollar on that harbor, where an expenditure of money would have been of some use. But when they found that they were unable, by building the harbor, to secure the election of the defeated candidate there, they promoted him to the bench to do him honor for having had the representation made to them which induced them to send engineers up to make a survey for an impossible work. What I complain of is that, notwithstanding the representations which have been made to the Government from London, St. Thomas, and other points, that the harbor at Port Stanley was decaying, and although only a few days ago a petition was presented to them urging that they should do something to preserve that harbor, I find them treating with indifference the actual necessities of the people of that locality. Has the Minister the information I moved for some time ago, and can he tell me what was the expenditure on these surveys? I would further ask him, upon what information and what grounds he sent his engineer, last summer, to make the survey, and what was his object? I require this information and the locality requires it. They look upon the survey and the proposition to make a canal as one of the most absurd things the Government could possibly do, although I am aware the Government is capable of doing many absurd things.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I could have told the hon. gentleman from the beginning, but I was so glad to hear him refresh my memory that I

Mr. O'BRIEN.

did not want to interrupt him. All the information I have will come down Monday. I inquired about the return, and they said it would be ready by Monday.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am not to get any information now, but the item is to pass, and perhaps I will be told, as I have been every Session, to wait a little longer and there may be something in the Supplementary Estimates. I have waited without receiving any return for my patience, and I am now tired of waiting. Port Stanley and Port Burwell have been grossly neglected, and yet the Government can spend \$6,000 on a public park for the convenience and comfort of the people of Ottawa. The Government have no right to squander the people's money in this way in Ottawa, while harbors in different parts of the country are being allowed to go to ruin for want of a little expenditure on them. If I should find there is nothing in the Estimates for these ports I shall call attention to it, not only here, but in the county I have the honor to represent.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was not here when the item for Port Owen Sound was passed, and I would like to have some information with regard to that vote.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The object of this vote and the vote last year, and the contribution by the town of \$20,000, is to enlarge the harbor. Large steamers go there during the season of navigation. The harbor will be enlarged by taking possession of a certain piece of land for a site, to which the town has contributed \$20,000, and we are going on with the work. The contract has been given. A basin is to be excavated on the right side of the river, going up. There will be a clear passage, of nearly uniform width, of about 300 feet, and a depth of 18 feet. Between the dry dock and the turning basin, a distance of 1,500 feet has to be provided where the water-way is now 150 feet wide for half the distance, and 300 feet over the remainder.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If the hon. Minister will turn to the Auditor General's Report, page B-228, he will find for Goderich that David Porter was paid for losses sustained in connection with his contract, \$1,378. What was that paid for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This work was undertaken at the time, on a report made that we might open a new channel in order to give an outlet to the river which empties into the harbor, and later on it was found, by the engineer, that it would be a heavy expenditure and a risky matter. We, therefore, stopped the contract, and paid the contractor for the articles he had bought.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Am I to understand there was a contract for the work and tenders offered?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). After the engineer had made a full report to the Government as to the necessity of the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We paid him 5 per cent. on \$10,500, as we had to indemnify him for giving up his contract, and we paid him for wood and other things. David Porter is a contractor who has executed a number of works for the Government.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Does he live in Goderich?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think so.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Certainly, the Government must know.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot keep that in my memory, with all my good-will.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Good-will is very well, but a little information would be very much better.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not see exactly what is required, but, if the hon. gentleman will tell me the object of knowing where Mr. David Porter lives, I will take a note of it, and give him the information to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know on what principle this loss is calculated. I see there are 60,000 feet of pine timber at \$2.50 a thousand, and below I find 89,000 feet at \$3. In what way does the hon. gentleman get at those figures?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say exactly; that is done by the engineer of the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take it for granted that the pine timber cost more than \$2.50 a thousand, so I do not understand exactly what it means, and I should like to know.

Mr. CHARLTON. The amount of \$2.50 and \$3 a thousand for pine is about from one-fifth to one-eighth of its value.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will obtain the information and bring it down.

Kingston, N.B.—Wharf on Richibucto
River—To complete \$2,500

Mr. LANDRY. I am sorry I was not in when this question arose, and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) spoke about it. When this item came up last year the hon. member for St. John took exception to it, and said this:

“Vessels never go up there. I know that vessels built up there came down passing through the draw, but I never heard of any going up the river, except small schooners carrying rigging for the vessels built there.”

In two or three different places he made the statement that vessels never went up there. The Minister of Public Works promised to give information on concurrence. I asked a gentleman living at Kingston, who is well known to my hon. friend (Mr. Weldon), Mr. William Brait, whose veracity cannot be doubted, to give me that information, and that was given in the House on concurrence, and my hon. friend from St. John said nothing about it. The information was to the effect that ninety-four vessels had passed up through the draw of the Kingston bridge, where my hon. friend had asserted he never knew of a vessel going up, and that ninety-four vessels had gone down laden. If my hon. friend's information on other matters is not better than it is on this, I think the Committee would be very sorry to receive his statements as correct. This wharf is simply to be built inside the bridge.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What sort of vessels were these that went up through the draw?

Mr. LANDRY. Large and small.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that a square-rigged vessel has ever gone up through that draw?

Mr. LANDRY. I think so. I know that large vessels go up to the bridge, though I have never myself seen them pass through the draw; but I am satisfied that they go through to the opposite side of the bridge, and this wharf is intended to accommodate those vessels. The Richibucto River is a large river, and the Kouchibouguac River is wider, though perhaps not so deep. I think this vote for the St. Louis wharf was taken in 1888, and not last year. When the discussion came up last year, the wharf was under contract, and was actually being built. The vote in 1888 was \$3,800. The contract was let for \$1,800, and the wharf was built for a little over that sum; so that, while it was apparently a large vote at first, the expenditure only amounted to something over \$1,800, and the wharf has been completed for about a year. I presume the vote of last year was a revote. All I can say is that a very large majority of the people of that place had petitioned for that wharf as being important to the locality, that I made representations to the Department, that the Department sent their engineer there, and I suppose he reported to them and satisfied them that it was a necessary public work. With this information before them, the Department very properly asked for tenders. As to Kingston, I think the hon. gentlemen will see that their information was not correct in view of the telegram which was sent by Mr. Brait, showing that the business there justifies the building of this wharf.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I thought the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), knowing the opposition which was made last year to these two grants, would have been prepared now to give us some further information on the subject. I know that when I lived in that locality vessels did not come there at all, and I will venture to say that if there are ninety-four vessels coming there now, they are as small a class of vessels as can be found, and they come there perhaps for cordwood and bark. I will venture to say that my hon. friend, the member for that county, never saw a square-rigged vessel above that bridge. Even admitting that ninety-four vessels come there of all sorts and sizes, of what use is this wharf? They go up the river. If they are going to Kingston, there are plenty of wharves below the bridge. There is the old Jardine wharf and the public wharf below the bridge. They are not obliged to go there at all. Then, when they do go above the bridge, where do they go? They go up the river, twelve or fifteen miles further, to get cordwood or tanbark. What is the good of this wharf? Simply to enable them, perhaps, to land cordwood or tanbark, or the parties who are bringing it down. Are there not plenty of wharves below the bridge? Just a little distance below the bridge there is a public wharf where square-rigged vessels can lie, and then the old Jardine wharf below that. There is more wharf accommodation in Kingston than would supply all Kingston is worth; yet here we are asked to pay \$6,000 or \$7,000 for a wharf which would be practically useless, except for the benefit of a few individuals who may bring down cordwood or tanbark from the head of the river and pile it there for the purpose of taking it away later on. What benefit is it to the public? My hon. friend says that people petitioned for it. You can get a

petition for anything; but, I think, the Government are bound to see whether the public work asked for is to be of any benefit to the public. Then with regard to the St. Louis wharf, on which my hon. friend says they spent \$1,800. In 1888, when the Government asked for \$3,800, I asked the Minister where St. Louis was. He said that it was in the County of Kent, and it was a general wharf for shipping purposes. St. Louis was a large parish. I did not know where it was situated until I had an opportunity of knowing it the Session before last. The bar at the mouth of the Kennebecasis River would prevent any vessel of any size from passing up it. Except for small boats or a scow, that river is only used for floating down deals that have been sawn in the mills at the head of the stream, or logs that are cut to be sawn in the mills at Richibucto. There is no necessity for a wharf at that point, and the money spent there is simply thrown away. I venture to say that out of these two wharves the Government will not get enough revenue to pay the salary of a man to collect it. My hon. friend falls back upon a statement made last year by the Minister of Finance in regard to a telegram sent him by Mr. Brait. I would like to have the Minister examine the class of vessels that go through that draw. The fact of the matter is, the vessels do not use that wharf, but they go 12 or 15 miles up the river.

Mr. LANDRY. I did not seek for any further information in relation to the St. Louis wharf, because the wharf was under contract and was being built when the discussion came on, and the money had already been voted. Neither did I seek any further information as to Kingston, because when the discussion came on the hon. member for St. John, who had made the objection, as soon as the information was given, made no further reply to it whatever, and I thought it satisfied him; therefore I did not seek for any further information. The hon. gentleman says we must see, when a public work is asked for, whether it is a public necessity. Well, this wharf is like all other wharves. We knew and asserted that it was needed, and what more could we do? It is for the public generally, and not for private individuals. A large number of vessels use it; the people of Kingston themselves use it. As for a wharf below the bridge, it could be of no use whatever, for vessels go through this draw in order to get above the bridge. It is the wharf above the bridge that is of use to vessels. It is true that I never happened to see a ship go through this draw, but I have seen them lying there. They are towed through the draw, and the last two or three years there was a large number of vessels from Richibucto going up to the Kingston bridge. I have seen them going backwards and forwards, although I never watched them going through the draw, but my information is that they do go through the draw. I have seen them towed up and down on several occasions for the last two or three years.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend says he has seen them towed up from the entrance of the harbor past Richibucto up to Kingston. I have been there long before the hon. gentleman ever knew the County of Kent at all, and sixty years ago vessels came up a little below the site of the present

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

bridge, but beyond that they never went. My hon. friend says that because ninety-four vessels go there they must have a wharf. Last year when I discovered that the wharf was above the bridge, I then asserted that these vessels never went there at all. The first bridge was built there without a draw, in 1847. There was no draw in it until a new bridge was erected a few years ago, for the reason that there were shipyards above where ships were built.

Mr. LANDRY. Your own friends there wanted it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not care who wanted it. I say that my hon. friend has come here and asked for this vote, and the Minister ought to show this House what public benefit is to be derived from this wharf. To expend \$7,000 upon that wharf will be simply throwing the money away. Still it is to be given, because, I suppose, my hon. friend is on that side of the Speaker and not on this side.

Mr. LANDRY. I think it is exceedingly unfair for the hon. gentleman to make an assertion of that kind. I do not know myself whether that makes a great deal of difference.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If you were over here, you would find it did.

Mr. LANDRY. It may be so. If hon. gentlemen opposite cannot get anything when it is needed, I sympathise with them, but surely they cannot blame us when we get an appropriation for a public work that is needed. If they represented more fairly the public sentiment, perhaps they would obtain a little more, but they ought not to find fault with us because members on this side obtain some necessary public works. And, moreover, I do not admit that the constituencies represented by hon. members on this side of the House receive more public money than do constituencies represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. The constituency represented by the hon. member for the City and County of St. John (Mr. Weldon) has received, I venture to say, 100 per cent., 200 per cent., or even 300 per cent. more than my constituency. It may be that the constituency does not receive it on the recommendation of my hon. friend; perhaps he does not represent the sentiment of the county, and the Government give the patronage elsewhere. Let hon. gentlemen opposite criticise the fact that they do not get the patronage, if they like, but it is unfair for those hon. gentlemen to criticise public works, because they are not able to control the patronage of their constituencies. The County of St. John has received more than my constituency, since the last election, by 100 per cent.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I am astonished to hear the hon. gentleman talk in this manner. The vote now under discussion is for a wharf to be built above the bridge where there is, technically, navigation, but where my hon. friend (Mr. Weldon) has shown that vessels do not go, and we are asked to vote \$7,000 for this work. It is a wharf which will be used simply for piling tanbark, and yet, the hon. gentleman has attempted to make this Committee believe that the same measure of justice is meted out to the constituencies represented by hon. members on this side of the House. What is the fact?

Was it not shown yesterday, that for Prince Edward Island, a Province surrounded entirely by water, a Province situated in the middle of the whole fishing fleet, where more vessels enter the harbors, five thousand times over, than enter the place for which the hon. gentleman is receiving \$7,000 for a wharf, and for the whole Island, wharves, breakwaters, piers and harbors, only \$6,000 were voted, and from these wharves the Government receive from \$1,000 to \$1,500, reducing the whole amount received by the Island to about \$5,000. We have the harbor of Cascumpec, a harbor of refuge for the American and the Provincial fishing fleets, the only one on the north side of the Island, except Rustico, which can hardly be so considered, and the Government have been dredging the rock from the bottom of that harbor and emptying it in the channel, thus making the condition worse than before. The sum of \$2,000 has been voted yearly, but it was not sufficient to make the expenditure any benefit. On the south side of the Island there is Wood Island breakwater, which has been lying for years half completed, and the people for a radius of 30 miles have no harbor, except the artificial harbor which is being constructed, and not a dollar can be got. I cannot get a cent for any wharf in the Island from the Government; yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landry) has the hardihood to say that we are not treated wrongfully. I say we are treated shamefully. I assert that the administration of the Department of Public Works is a scandal and a disgrace to this Government; and I have no hesitation in using that language. It was proved conclusively last night. The Minister of Public Works knew nothing of the expenditure in that Province; he did not know that the contractor had been allowed in Cascumpec harbor to throw rock taken out of the channel again into the harbor. An expenditure of \$10,000 or \$15,000 is made on useless work, while we can get nothing. No attempt is made to do justice. Wharves which were taken over by the present Government, as was shown by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry), are going adrift; others are rotting, and no attempt is made to protect the public works existing, much less to give the accommodation the people require. We do not want to build wharves on which to pile tanbark, but we do want harbors of refuge for the immense fishing fleet visiting us every year. We want breakwaters, and the channels at the entrances to harbors deepened, for the protection of the whole Provincial fleet, not for any local fishing boats alone; yet we are denied even that request. And why? The Minister of Public Works cannot deny that these works are necessary, but he refuses to grant our request simply because the people of the Island, in the exercise of their rights, chose to return six representatives who are not in sympathy with his policy. I intend, at a later stage, to bring up this matter at greater length and to show the disgraceful way in which Prince Edward Island has been treated in the matter of public works, but I cannot sit and hear an hon. gentleman, in the face of the debate of last night, and in face of the fact that the whole appropriation for Prince Edward Island is \$6,000, \$1,000 of which is returned in the shape of fees, tell the Committee that justice is being done, or that the semblance of justice is being done.

Mr. GILLMOR. I think, in the public interest, the hon. gentleman who represents the constituency in which these \$7,000 are to be expended, and who asked the Government to make that appropriation, should be able to give to this Committee, a distinct statement as to why public money should be appropriated in that way, and what business is being done at that wharf. Am I to understand that the policy of the Government is to build a wharf in my hon. friend's county on which to pile cordwood and tanbark? In my county we have wharves, but they are private property, and are maintained at the expense of the owners. The Minister should be satisfied that it is in the public interest to construct the wharf in question before he recommends this appropriation. Either the hon. gentleman or his assistant, who has, no doubt, visited the place, should know what trade was expected to be done from that wharf. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) is a very fluent talker, and he said a great deal, but he has not yet told us what is expected to be loaded or unloaded there, what trade is carried on right above the bridge. If it was to be placed elsewhere, I could understand it. I represent a county on the seaboard, where milling and commerce are carried on, and where passengers are being landed at the different seaports; yet we have no public wharf there, not one to which the Government gives a cent, and, in fact, not a cent of money has been appropriated in my county for many years. Let the hon. gentleman who represents the County of Kent, who must know what is the need of a wharf and what business is being done, tell us whether the people will pile tanbark or cordwood on the wharf, or whether it will be used for the shipment of potatoes. The hon. gentleman must know these facts, and he ought to have satisfied the Government regarding them before they agreed to give an appropriation; indeed, it cannot be possible that the hon. gentleman is ignorant of the facts connected with this matter.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) argues that this is a necessary work. I take issue with him. As regards any works that are essential, I am prepared to support appropriations in their favor. With regard to this very harbor, I have never objected to an appropriation for improving its entrance, and I have supported appropriations made. These, however, appear to have been dropped out this year. The hon. gentleman spoke of justice being done to hon. members on this side of the House. Let him compare some of the counties. An appropriation of \$10,000 is given for a wharf in Restigouche, and if the hon. member for Northumberland were present he would no doubt be able to show that that work was unnecessary. The County of Gloucester obtains \$20,000 for a breakwater. The large County of Northumberland, including Miramichi River, gets nothing, and the application of the hon. member (Mr. Mitchell) for a small pier at Neguac was treated with utter disdain, and no attempt was made to meet his views. Then, with regard to my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Landry), we find that the building of one wharf, at a place where none but small boats ever go, cost \$1,800 or \$2,000. This wharf is built close to the bridge, and I maintain that it is not a necessary public work. It is incumbent upon the Government to

satisfy this House that this was such an important public work that an appropriation out of public money should be made for it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) asked the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) why he had recommended the Government to expend that money, and I think that the hon. gentleman should give some explanation. If the Government have not the information, the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) ought to have it in his possession. We will be satisfied if he can show us that this money was for a useful public work, but we are not satisfied that a wharf should be built for the convenience of a private individual, or a private company. I do not think it was fair for the hon. member for Kent to tell the hon. member for St. John that his city gets an equal proportion of public money. My hon. friend is not the only representative from St. John in this House at the present time. It is true that, for the first Session or two, the city and district of St. John did not get as many favors from the Government as it is getting now, but there are, perhaps, two representatives from that city, and it may be on account of one of the representatives giving aid to the Government which induces them to bestow the patronage upon that constituency. I think it was hardly fair for my hon. friend from Kent to say, that because there had been certain moneys expended in and about St. John, that was due to my hon. friend (Mr. Weldon). There is some other reason for it, which my hon. friend would likely know, just as well as I do.

General Repairs, Harbors and Rivers,
Manitoba.....\$3,000

Mr. WATSON. I wish to ask the Minister where he intends to spend that money?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no special place named. This money is to cover the costs of small repairs in different parts of the Province, and also to pay for improvements on wharves which have no special vote. It is also to pay for the expenses and salaries of officers who are employed to report on the public works to be done in the Province.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention of the Government to make a survey of St. Ann's Rapids on the Red River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That has not yet been decided upon. There was a survey made there some two or three years ago, but the works required were so extensive that the Government did not think they could go on with them. The matter is being examined into now, at the representation of deputations, some of which were accompanied by my hon. friend (Mr. Scarth), but I am not sure what we may do there. We may remove some boulders or not. Some say it would damage the navigation elsewhere if we did so. The matter is to be examined, but I am not in a position, just now, to say what will be the action of the Government.

Mr. WATSON. This is a matter which the Minister of Public Works ought to give his attention to immediately. It has been hanging for ten years, and year after year, for the last six or seven years, promises have been made to deputations,

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

but nothing has been done. It is of the utmost importance, not only for the city of Winnipeg itself, but for all the country to the south of the city on the Red River, that this should be done. The navigation of the Red River is good for vessels drawing five feet of water, for 260 miles above the international boundary line. It is navigable for river boats from Winnipeg to the international line, and for lake boats, up to the commencement of these rapids. These rapids extend about ten miles, on which there is only about fifteen feet of a fall or a foot and a half per mile, but they are full of boulders which are dangerous to navigation. A very careful estimate has, I believe, been made which shows that for about \$300,000 the rapids could be made navigable for boats drawing five feet of water. If that is the case, I think the Government would be justified in making the expenditure. There is a large trade in lumber, stone and fish there from Lake Winnipeg, and not only that, but this route brings a large portion of the Saskatchewan district into communication with Winnipeg. There is about a thousand miles of navigable water here, with the exception of these rapids, and if the obstacles to their navigation were removed, it would be an immense advantage to the city of Winnipeg and to the surrounding country generally. It is estimated that half a million worth of wood would be brought down by that route, and if it could be distributed at the different towns along the river, the saving to consumers of fuel would be about \$200,000 a year. The shipments of lumber there are between 10,000,000 and 12,000,000 feet per annum, on which there would be a saving of \$3 or \$4 a thousand, if it could be delivered by boats at Winnipeg or at a point where there would be railway competition. This matter was brought to the attention of the Minister on several occasions. Some six years ago a very large deputation waited upon him, and went home feeling satisfied, from his reception of them, that this work was going to be proceeded with, in the near future; but nothing has been done yet. The people of Manitoba, like those of the other Provinces, are commencing to doubt the sincerity of the hon. Minister of Public Works, who always receives deputations in a very kind and courteous manner, and leaves them under the impression that their purpose will be served. I did believe, some years ago, that the Minister intended to do this work, but I have some doubts now, after visiting him with all these deputations from the west and hearing his sweet promises. It is in the interest, not only of the Province of Manitoba, but of the whole Dominion, that this work should be done. A great deal of the timber around Lake Winnipeg is being manufactured into lumber, and there is a large amount of refuse which could be used for fuel if it could be transported by water; but as it is now, it only goes to waste; it is left in the woods to rot, and is the cause of very extensive fires, which destroy large tracts of green timber. It cannot be said of Manitoba, as it has been said of Prince Edward Island, that the Government have not sufficient supporters from that Province, as a reason why these improvements have not been made, because four out of the five representatives of Manitoba support the Government; but it appears to me that if they would bring such pressure on the Government as they should, this work would be done in the near future.

Mr. SCARTH. I do not know what the hon. member for Marquette means when he says that if the hon. members from Manitoba who support the Government would bring such pressure as they should on the Government, the work would be done. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works will admit that the members from Manitoba supporting the Government, have brought every pressure they reasonably and honestly could bring to induce him to do what the hon. member for Marquette urges with regard to dredging Red River.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. SCARTH. I myself have, time and again, called on the Minister with deputations from Manitoba, and we had the Minister's promise that he would look into the matter, and, after doing so and ascertaining what the expense would be, would do what he could in that direction. Not longer than two weeks ago, I visited him in company with the secretary of the Board of Trade of Winnipeg, and I have also sent him a petition from the City Council of Winnipeg in favor of this work. I believe these gentlemen have now come to the conclusion that an expenditure of \$50,000 would remove the boulders, and give a depth of five feet in the river between Winnipeg and the lake; and we have pressed the Ministry strongly to let us have that \$50,000 to improve the navigation of the river to that extent. I can corroborate everything the hon. member for Marquette has said about the importance of this work being done in the interest of Winnipeg and the whole country thereabout. What he says about the fish, lumber and cordwood trade is perfectly true, and I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works will take into consideration this year the pressure that has been brought upon him, and will give us enough at least to remove the boulders.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. member for Marquette says that he has his doubts now about my wish, at the time he and others came to me a few years ago, to go on with the work or to ask a vote for it. Of course, I cannot give confidence to the hon. gentleman; but I received him and his friends politely and civilly, which, I suppose, was right. He supposed that my civility meant that the work would be done, but I promised nothing, and I will not promise. In such cases I look into the matter, and if I find, after obtaining all the proper data which I can obtain from my officers, that the work can be done, I go to my colleagues, and if they think as I do, I put a vote in the Estimates and afterwards come to Parliament for the money. But I must say that when I saw the reports about this work, that it would cost at least \$300,000, I concluded that it could not be done then, at all events. I spoke of it to my colleagues, and they were of the same opinion. Since then, as my hon. friend (Mr. Scarth) has said, he came with others and presented new petitions to show that our friends in Manitoba thought they might content themselves with requesting that the boulders should be removed, at a cost of \$40,000 or \$50,000. That is a much more moderate sum, although it is still a large one. But when I saw that, I thought I would certainly consider the matter, and see whether my colleagues would find that the financial position of the country would allow that and other works to be

undertaken now. If they say so, I shall, of course, have great pleasure in complying with the request made to me. I know it is an important work for that region, but I cannot make a promise now; I have no right to do it without the consent of my colleagues.

Mr. WATSON. I happened to be present with the deputation the hon. gentleman speaks of, and I think the removal of the boulders will be of great assistance. That scheme of improving the navigation of the river was suggested four or five years ago. One proposal was to remove the boulders, another to build wing dams, and another to build locks. The locks would cost half a million dollars; the wing dams would cost some \$300,000. I do not know that the Minister has actually yet made a survey, or knows what the work of removing the boulders will cost. The estimate of \$300,000 was made by the city engineer of Winnipeg. I do think that the hon. Minister of Public Works has neglected doing his duty in regard to this matter, which has been brought to his attention so often. He should not be surprised that I do not think he intends to do this work even now, because I do not see an item in the Estimates for it. The hon. gentleman received the last deputation long before these Estimates were down, and he had an opportunity of putting a vote in them for the work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman knows that he could not see a vote in these Estimates. He knows that if the Government wish to ask for that money from Parliament it could not appear in these Estimates.

Mr. WATSON. Will this \$50,000 appear in the Supplementary Estimates?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will see that when they come down.

Fraser River..... \$20,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is in the direction of completing the work we have undertaken there. We had to close certain channels to throw all the water into one channel, and the result is that now very large vessels can go up the river. We will require \$20,000 more to complete the work.

Mr. TROW. Where is that dredging done?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At the mouth of the river, where the different channels are.

Harbors and Rivers generally..... \$6,000

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the hon. Minister allow his wharfingers to pay for the repairs out of the wharfage?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are appointed by the Marine and Fisheries Department. We have given orders that all the money paid to the wharfingers must go into the public treasury, and not into the repairs; and the wharfingers are required, when any repairs are needed, to send us a report so as to save the expense of sending an officer to examine and make a statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I see that the amount received for wharfage at Moncton, P.E.I., is only \$182. Before those wharves were taken over by the Dominion Government, the Local Government used to receive over \$300 revenue from them, and there

were then only about half the wharves there are now. Either the collectors' accounts are kept in a very bad condition or the trade has fallen off very much, which would be a sad commentary on the National Policy. I do not believe that the trade has fallen off to that extent.

Mr. FOSTER. The amount of \$182.97 is the amount collected over and above the salary of the wharfinger, who is allowed so much in fees. In this case his allowance would be about \$150 or \$200. The wharfingers receive a percentage of the fees, which differs with the different wharves, and an Order in Council fixes the amount.

Mr. PLATT. Looking through this interesting volume, this is about the only item I can find that probably is intended to reach the much neglected harbor at Picton, County of Prince Edward. There are two Prince Edwards, and my county is likewise an island. It is not the Prince Edward Island we have heard so much about the last two or three evenings, but there seems to be two islands of the same name and in the same relative position, so far as the distribution of patronage by the Government is concerned. The Minister of Public Works is aware that a large delegation has impressed upon his attention the necessity of doing something to the harbor at Picton. He promised to send an engineer to examine the harbor and report, and I believe an engineer did go there. Has he sent in his report, and does it give any encouragement to the hon. Minister to spend some money on this harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I know that orders were given to an engineer to visit the place, and his report may be in now, but I have not had time to look over that and several other reports. I will do the best I can, later on, when I see what these reports say.

Dredging, Nova Scotia..... \$40,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). A good deal of discussion has taken place respecting the expenditure on public works in the various counties represented by supporters of the Government and by hon. gentlemen on this side. I do not think it is becoming my position here, to ask the Government for any favors in this or any other respect. I merely stand here as one of the representatives of the people to perform the duty imposed upon me of pointing out to the Government what, according to my own views, is the best way of disposing of the public funds. I repudiate entirely the idea that members on this side approach the Government as supplicants for expenditure on public works. It is very offensive to me at any time to have to ask the Government in any way for any expenditure. It is merely as one of the representatives, discharging my duty, that I feel called upon now and at other times to point out to the different Departments the way in which I think the money should be expended. Unfortunately, the Government seem still to possess the idea that they not only own the Government at the present time, but that the whole of the revenues of the country belong to them and are to be disposed of according to their ideas, for party purposes and not in the general interests of the country. The Government seem, on all occasions, to be seized with the idea that it is a matter of favor if any money is expended in any county which is not represented in their in-

Mr. ROBERTSON.

terest. This is a view to which I, for one, must most emphatically take exception, and I believe that no member on this side of the House ever brings a question before the Government with a view of asking for any favor at their hands. Hon. members on this side hold, as I hold, that, if the counties we represent or the places we recommend require the expenditure of public money in the public interest, that expense should be made in the public interest, no matter who represents that county in the House. That is one of the reasons which induced me to-night to bring to the notice of the Government an application from one of the western counties of Nova Scotia, which was my native county—the County of Digby. I do not wish to interfere in any degree with the duties of the hon. member for that county (Mr. Jones), but, knowing the interest which I take in that county, knowing it to be my native county, the leading men there, on both sides of politics, have sent me a circular which they have addressed to the Government, with reference to the expense of public money at Weymouth, which is my native place. I cannot do better, perhaps, than read this petition which explains, in shorter terms than I could, the grounds upon which the application is made for an expenditure at that place. This memorial says:

“The lumber manufactured within a radius of sixteen miles of Weymouth amounts to at least sixteen millions of feet, and is, in a very short time, capable of being nearly doubled. There are, moreover, large quantities of other produce annually exported from this place, and said exports are annually increasing. The import trade, as the annual Customs returns will show, is also yearly increasing. The port of Weymouth is the most natural outlet and inlet of this whole shipment, yet only about one-third of this quantity is shipped annually from the above named port, and the remainder we are compelled to ship, at a very great disadvantage, from other ports. The reasons for the said diversion of trade are quite plain, and can with your kind assistance be remedied. We ask for no favors when a legitimate claim cannot be sustained, but we feel that our claim is just. The approach to the Sisiboo river is impeded by a bar, and also a stone dam across the channel of the river opposite the bar, in consequence of which, at the highest tides only, is the said river of sufficient depth to allow large vessels to load. The channel of the river leading to the town is also, in consequence of said stone dam, fast filling up, so that, in a very few years, no shipments can be made with safety. By referring to the annual returns of imports and exports for this port, you will find that the total of said imports and exports is by no means a small amount. This amount can be more than doubled were your Government to order a dredge here to work for one season at least at the mouth of the said river and at points in the channel.”

Further on they add:

“We would also most anxiously ask your assistance to another, and by no means unimportant matter, which would arise, partly as an outcome of the removal of the said impediments, but which is absolutely necessary at the present, to further facilitate shipments. We refer to the urgent need of a subsidy, sufficient to locate and build a piece of railway of not more than one-eighth to one-fourth of a mile, on the line of the Western Counties Railway, near the railway station at Weymouth, to be located on either side of the railway, and on either side of river near said railway, as a Government surveyor may determine as the best shipping point, to a point on the river, thus fully justifying our needs.”

I may say in addition to this, if my recommendation can add anything to that which I know will be made by the sitting member for the county, that this town is a very important place in the county of Digby with a large trade, and that the river requires deepening and dredging in order to enable vessels to go up to the bridge where the trade is principally carried on. Although this railway matter is not in the department of the hon.

Minister of Public Works, I may as well, while I am on my feet, refer to that also as being of the greatest possible advantage in connecting the harbor with the present railway station. Now, having said so much on that point, I desire to say a word or two with reference to the expenditure which has been made in the different counties of our Province. It was said by an hon gentleman who spoke this evening, and it has been contended by the Government on other occasions, that the Government have made expenditures as they thought the public interest demanded; but it seems a very singular circumstance that the public interest, according to the views of the hon. gentleman or of the Government, always seems to lie in a county which is represented on their side of the House. This is fully borne out to-night by the statement which I shall be able to submit to the Committee. In the first place, we will take the report of the Minister of Public Works respecting the item of dredging which is now under consideration. Under the head of "Surveys and Examinations," we find that surveys took place in the County of Antigonish at Dunn's Lake, Georgeville, and Monk's Island—three places. Of course, Antigonish has the honor of being represented by the Minister of Justice. In the County of Cape Breton, surveys took place at Belfry River, Big Lorraine, Cow Bay, East Bay and Sydney—five places. That county is represented by a supporter of the Administration.

An hon. MEMBER. Two representatives.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). By two representatives, and I suppose that is so much the better for them. In Cumberland county, surveys took place at Fox Harbor, Joggins, Minudie, Port Greville, Sand River, Tignish, and Two Rivers—seven places—and Cumberland is a traditionally Conservative county. In Shelburne county surveys took place at Barrington, Barrington Passage, Jones' Harbor, Jordan Bay, Green Harbor, Little Harbor, Louis Head, Negro Island, Port La Tour, Roseway Beach, and Round Bay—eleven different places—and that county is represented by the gallant officer who sits on my left (General Laurie). Then we find that in the important county of Guysborough, there were no surveys at all. In Richmond county no surveys were made at all, and in the very important County of Lunenburg but one survey has been made, and in Yarmouth, none. Now, to give you an idea of the importance of those counties, I will give you the amount of shipping that is entered and cleared from those places. I wish the Committee distinctly to understand that I do not object to these surveys being made in the various counties to which I have referred. I have no doubt that they are all needed in the public interest, and I should be very glad to hear that they are all provided for, and that the works will be proceeded with in due time; but I wish to point out, that while those places, not of much importance in view of the trading interests of the country, are so largely provided for, the more important counties have no attention paid to them at all. In Arichat, I find there were 207 steamers entered, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, and 840 coasting vessels. In Guysborough there were 201 steamers entered, and 635 sailing vessels; while I find that in Antigonish, where these surveys had been made, no steamer has been reported at all, and only 52 vessels have been entered in that county.

Now, Sir, when you come to contrast that expenditure which has taken place in a county like Antigonish, independent of these surveys which indicate a further expenditure, when you come to look at the Public Accounts and observe that expenditures are going on at Arisaig, Bayfield, Blue Rock and McNair's Cove, besides the surveys which are included in these various ports, I think it will be seen by this House that Antigonish, an agricultural county itself, is not a commercial county as compared with those to which I have referred. Therefore, it would appear, I think, that the Government had not displayed that just discrimination in the expenditure of public money which we have a right to expect. I repeat that I do not object to any expenditures made in these counties which have been referred to, and where expenditure is going on; neither do I object to the surveys, but I say it is a scandal, it is more than a scandal, when you see small and unimportant counties with very little coasting and no foreign trade, getting so much public money, and when you compare them with a large county like Lunenburg, with a coasting trade of 182 steamers and 968 sailing vessels, with a foreign trade of 275 vessels—I say that when you consider that fact and realise that these important, and large, and contributing counties, are treated in this way by the Government, it cannot be defended on any ground in this House or out of it, and it reflects no credit on the Government, it reflects less credit on the Minister of Public Works who has charge of that department. The Minister of Public Works told us last Session that when these applications were made to him he sent them all into the Privy Council, and they were dealt with there. As I remarked on that occasion, it was a very singular and happy coincidence for his own friends that when these applications came out of the Privy Council, those of his friends were always granted, and those applications for expenditure in other counties were always refused. Now, I am not asking any favor from the Government at all. I have too much respect for my position in this House and in this country, for one moment to ask any favor of the Government on such a ground as that. I stand here taking higher ground, the ground on which I have based this representation, the ground of the trade of the country, the foreign and domestic shipping of the country; and if that is not a sufficient recommendation to satisfy the Government that such counties as Guysborough and Lunenburg are entitled to a larger expenditure than those counties to which I have referred, then I think no argument will avail with the Government. However, I am not yet without hope that the Government will see that the policy they have pursued hitherto has not been one in the real interest of the country. If they propose to expend money on that branch of the public service, it should be expended on places where it is required. I have no doubt many of these expenditures in some of the counties I have referred to, could have been postponed; I have no doubt, while they may be useful to some extent, at the same time, at these points to which I have referred, they might have been delayed, while these more important places, like Yarmouth, Lunenburg and Guysborough, are actually suffering for the want of those piers and breakwaters and dredging which hon. members in this House have from year

to year brought to the attention of the Government. I repeat that neither those hon. members who represent those counties should desire to ask any favor any more than I should; they are discharging their duty in bringing this to the notice of the Government, and I suppose they are relying upon the public opinion of this country, which should be sufficient of itself to induce, if not compel, the Administration of the day to expend public money at such points as are most urgent, leaving those places that are not immediately suffering for the want of the conveniences which are thus provided, to a future day. I hope in that sense the Government will accept the suggestions which I have made, and in the future, at least, that they will adopt a policy that will be more generally approved by the people of this country. They are not the owners of the treasury. The people on this side of the House, and the Liberal party generally, I believe, eat as much, and drink as much, and wear as good clothes as hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches, and in that way we are entitled to a share of the public money, not as a favor, but as a right. I say I scorn to ask any favor from the Government, I demand it as a right, a right which the people of this country generally have a right to demand at the hands of the Administration.

Mr. KENNY. I also received, from friends in the County of Digby, a copy of the document which my hon. colleague has placed before the House. My hon. colleague has stated, by way of apology, I presume to the hon. member who represents the County of Digby in this House, and as an excuse for what might be called—I hardly like to apply the term to an old parliamentarian such as my friend the senior member happens to be—his violation of parliamentary etiquette. In my ignorance of parliamentary custom, I always supposed that an hon. member, in bringing a matter of this kind before the notice of the House or the Committee of the House, to some extent might be supposed to be meddling and interfering with duties which more properly belong to the hon. gentleman who represents that constituency in this House. But my hon. friend, I must say, has given a very good excuse for his breach of that parliamentary rule. He told us his reason for doing so was that Digby happened to be the county of his birth, and I am sure that reason will have very great influence with the Government and with this House; and we will all be only too happy to find that the Government recognise that that county has special claims, as it happens to be the birth-place of my distinguished colleague. I happen to have been born in another county in that Province, and I must find fault with my hon. friend the senior member, because he has not brought that county, not the least—on the contrary, I consider it the most important—county in Nova Scotia, to the notice of the Government. I happen to have been born in the County of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia, in that county which is represented in this House by my hon. friend opposite and myself; and I regret exceedingly that in the discharge of an important public duty, of which my hon. friend has acquitted himself with his usual ability, and to which I think he has given more than usual attention, he omitted entirely the name of that important county. I consider it my duty to follow the senior member for Halifax on this occasion and to remind him

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

that we all have not had the happiness of having been born in Digby; that some have been born in other counties which are as loyal to the Government as is that very beautiful County of Digby. I have to find fault with the Minister of Public Works. I approached him on this very question of dredging, and I had to find fault that the county in which I was born had been neglected. When I came to investigate the matter I found that one reason given was the fact that the dredge had been employed in the County of Yarmouth, and, consequently, it was not available for the County of Halifax. I do not know that the County of Yarmouth has done any more for the present Government, or been any more loyal to it than the County of Halifax. It is true that Halifax occupies an exceptional position in this Legislature. It may be very unfortunate for Halifax that it is so, but Halifax sends one supporter of the Government and Yarmouth has not done so, and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) attempted to convey the impression that the Minister of Public Works is guided by improper motives, by party motives, and he gave us as his reason for saying so that important counties of the Province which return opponents to the Dominion Government have been entirely neglected by the Minister.

Mr. KIRK. There is no question about that.

Mr. KENNY. Yarmouth was not neglected, that is very evident; because when I take up the report of the Minister of Public Works I find on page 17, dredging done in Nova Scotia, Yarmouth, the county which returns an opponent to this Government, receives more than any other two counties in the Province. I know for a fact, that gentlemen in Yarmouth, gentlemen of energy and ability who are a credit and an ornament to our Province, and who do not take the same political views on Dominion matters as I do, have expressed to me their great indebtedness to the Minister of Public Works for the manner in which he assisted them to remove some rocks or mud, which had proved a very great obstruction to the navigation of that important harbor. I do think, as my colleague has brought the Minister to task, that it would have been fairer to have completed his list of dredging done in Nova Scotia and to have mentioned that Yarmouth, represented as I have said, by an opponent of the Government, has really received a larger amount than any two counties in Nova Scotia. I find that the County of Halifax, in which my colleague and myself take an especial interest, has been entirely ignored. I suppose that must be because the senior member for Halifax occupies a seat on the other side of the House, and he is so much more influential naturally in this House than the junior member. That is the only reason which suggests itself to my mind as a consequence of the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones). The hon. gentleman in the course of his remarks referred to the expenditure in the County of Richmond, and he stated that there was no report of steamers in Richmond.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I did not say so.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman referred to Arichat.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was speaking of Antigonish.

Mr. KENNY. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. As regards the special counties to which the hon. gentleman referred, Shelburne, Cumberland and others, I am not surprised he does not assail the expense of the surveys in those counties, but all he suggests is that it might be better if the expenditure had been postponed. The paternal heart of my colleague took in the whole Province in this matter, and I was glad to find that when he analysed the matter he found no fault with the expenditure, but simply suggested that it should be postponed. I will only say that I hope that the Minister of Public Works will not be deterred by anything that has fallen from the hon. gentleman opposite from commencing some dredging in the county where I was born, and which dredging I consider to be very necessary.

Mr. JONES (Digby). I am exceedingly obliged to the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) for the interest he has taken in his native county, and I can fully endorse all he has said in regard to the necessity of dredging there. I would remind the hon. gentleman that four weeks ago I presented one of the largest petitions ever submitted to this House, signed by a thousand electors, asking that this dredging be done, and now that the Opposition have joined with me in order to make my case doubly strong, I hope the Minister will see his way perfectly clear to put an amount in the Estimates for that work, because he will find no opposition on the other side of the House and none on this side. This work is necessary because our trade is very largely increasing. At present we are building a fine steamer to run around St. Mary's Bay and to New Brunswick, which will be launched in the summer, and it will be necessary for navigation purposes that the dredging work be done there this year. I believe the engineer has reported on the advisability of making surveys again, although they were made about two years ago. I again thank the senior member for Halifax for his support, and no doubt the work will now be done.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. colleague could not have quite apprehended the scope of my argument, or he would have found, on the principle that the greater includes the less, that my recommendation extended to my own County of Halifax as well as to others, provided there was an absolute necessity for that expenditure. The hon. gentleman is aware that I have never been backward at any time in defending my county, and I have led him in the recommendations, and he was not always willing, but he was compelled to follow in those recommendations. If he had apprehended the scope of my argument, it was: that if in Halifax County there was a public work required, the Government should make that expenditure, and if it is not required, I do not ask it simply to have the money expended in Halifax. But if the Government finds that in the public interest of this country many harbors in Halifax County require dredging, it is their duty to make that expenditure, whether the member for the county may support or oppose it. I do not come to the low level which some hon. gentlemen seem to think proper to take, namely, that simply because they are supporters of the Administration they are entitled to have money spent for political purposes in their own counties, and that counties of more importance,

with greater commercial interests at stake, should be discarded until such time as the hon. Minister of Public Works is disposed to look into it. I take the higher stand, that if the work is in the public interest, it should be carried out, no matter who represents the county. That was the ground I took in the observations I made, and I am sorry if I did not make my remarks clear to the usually astute mind of my respected colleague (Mr. Kenny).

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. member for Halifax has taken all the counties in the Province of Nova Scotia under his wing, except the county which I have the honor to represent, and he advocates the dredging of harbors in counties in which he finds a large quantity of shipping. He refers, especially, to Arichat, in Richmond, as having two hundred steamers entering its harbor, and he refers to Guysborough as having two hundred and one steamers entering it. He might have referred to North Sydney as having double that number of vessels entering the harbor. I contend it is not these harbors in which large steamers can enter with facility, that require dredging at all. The very argument he used to secure dredging for these harbors is the one which, in my opinion, ought to prevent the Government from dredging there until other sections of the Province which are greatly in need of facilities for shipping are attended to. It is a remarkable fact to us, who know the Province of Nova Scotia so well, that the south and south-eastern coast is amply supplied with harbors, and that if dredging is done there it is not for the purpose of making harbors, but for dredging in the coves and other places inside of the harbors and rivers. I contend, and I think I do so with reason, that Government dredges should not be employed clearing out rivers and around docks and wharves in harbors, which accommodate such shipping as he has referred to, until places like that part of Nova Scotia bordering on the Strait of Northumberland, in Pictou County, Antigonish, St. George's Bay, and the coast of Inverness, have been attended to. In Antigonish, notwithstanding the dredging that has been done, the hon. gentleman intimated that not a single steamer has entered into this harbor. The reason for that is that there is not a single harbor in the County of Antigonish, except one, into which a steamer of even moderate capacity can enter. I represent a county as important as Richmond and Guysborough put together.

Mr. KIRK. No.

Mr. CAMERON. I beg your pardon, and my county is nearly as populous as the two of them put together, and a great deal more important than a dozen of them. There is not a harbor from Cape North to the Strait of Canso, excepting Port Hood, for one hundred and fifty miles along the sea coast, into which a steamer, of even modern capacity, can enter at all; while I find that wharves are being built inside harbors, in other sections of the Province, and that in Prince Edward Island we have no less than thirty wharves built at the expense of this Dominion, I regret to say that only one has been built in the County of Inverness ever since Confederation. We have had a few piers built outside for the purpose of protecting shipping, but inside the harbors we have but one. Twenty years ago, dredging was commenced in the harbor of Cheticamp, and if there were sufficient water to enable

shipping to enter that harbor, there are very few harbors in the Province of Nova Scotia which would be frequented by shipping so much. I am happy to admit that the Minister of Public Works has done some dredging in that harbor, and enabled a large portion of the fishing fleet from North Bay to enter there.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is not Port Hood a better harbor?

Mr. CAMERON. No. Port Hood is simply an open roadway, and a pier has been erected there which cost \$100,000 since 1867. I am sorry to say that the expenditure for the annual repairs on that wharf is enormous, and that alone should convince my hon. friend that Port Hood is not a harbor. There is a shelter on the Port Hood island side, but on the mainland side there is no more shelter than on any other exposed part of the coast. I contend that until such time as the harbors of Cheticamp, Margaree and Mabou, are dredged and improved to such an extent that shipping can enter them, the dredges should not be employed in dredging rivers and at the heads of bays and inside harbors in every part of the Province. If any county in our Province has reason to complain, it is the County of Inverness. Several appeals have been made to the Minister of Public Works, and he has done fairly well, but I regret to say that the dredging of harbors commenced twenty years ago, and which are not half finished yet, is not, to say the least of it, very satisfactory. It has been stated here to-night, that counties which send representatives to support the Government receive greater favors than those who oppose the Administration. I sometimes envy the representatives from Prince Edward Island, when I hear them talk by the hour, and sometimes by the week, complaining that they have not more harbors and piers built in that Island; when I consider that in Inverness County, which is as large as King's and Queen's Counties put together, and as large as Queen's and Prince Counties put together in area, has only one wharf in the whole county, and three piers built by the Dominion since Confederation. Before Confederation a number of piers were built and maintained by the Local Government, but many of these have been carried away by the sea, and since Confederation the works which have been commenced have not yet been finished. I hope the Minister of Public Works will see his way clear next year to have at least two of the harbors in Inverness County dredged.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). He will.

Mr. CAMERON. Well, perhaps so, since it is recommended by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones), who has such very great influence with the Government, and who has taken all the counties of the Province under his wing. The Minister of Public Works will, I hope, take a note of it, and see that Inverness will be well provided for.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. member who has just taken his seat, said that his county is larger than the Counties of Guysborough and Richmond put together.

Mr. CAMERON. In population.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. gentleman must have forgotten the geography of his Province when he

Mr. CAMERON.

made that statement. The County of Guysborough is the largest in Nova Scotia, with the exception of Halifax.

Mr. CAMERON. How many harbors have they?

Mr. KIRK. That is not the question at all. While we have a few fine harbors in the County of Guysborough—indeed, we have two or three which are not inferior to any in the Province of Nova Scotia—yet we have a sea coast of 150 miles, and two or three harbors are not sufficient to accommodate a sea coast of that extent. There are places between those harbors where not dredging so much as breakwaters are required to protect the fishing industry. I agree with a great deal of what the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) has said with regard to dredging in harbors. I do not see the necessity of dredging harbors which will admit large steamers and other large vessels; it is in harbors which have shoals in them that dredging is necessary. There is but one harbor in the County of Guysborough for which application has been made for dredging since I have been here in 1882; I refer to the River St. Mary's. Since that time I have made several applications to the Minister of Public Works, and he has acknowledged the necessity of dredging it. In 1882 he sent a dredge there, but it was found to be unsuitable, and it was removed, with the intention, I understood, of sending a more suitable one, but none has been sent since. I have made an application to the hon. Minister this year, to see if he could not accommodate the people by sending a dredge next summer. I pointed out to him that the trade is increasing there, and vessels of the size required for carrying lumber from Sherbrooke cannot be brought up to the mills. I do not think a great deal of dredging would be required. There is another place, a small channel known as White Haven, about three-quarters of a mile long, which requires to be opened up so as to let small vessels through; I do not know whether the work could be done by one of the dredges or not. It was opened up by the Local Government before Confederation, but it has been filled up, and only small boats can pass through. It requires to be opened up so as to admit larger vessels. One hon. gentleman has spoken of the hon. Minister of Public Works having had so many surveys of harbors made in the different counties of Nova Scotia last year. I do not think the mere survey of harbors gives any security that breakwaters will be built. I think the hon. Minister had three harbors surveyed in my county in 1883 or 1884; but not a dollar has been spent on them since. When we look over the report, it is somewhat singular to find so much money expended in counties represented by supporters of the Government, and very little in counties represented by members of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman refers to Yarmouth as a county represented by an Opposition member in which some money was expended; but I understand that that expenditure was begun before the present member was elected. But how is it that in the County of Guysborough, which I have the honor to represent, not a dollar has been expended since 1882, although I have been doing my best to induce the Minister to expend some money in that county. I do not know whether the Government's failure to do so is because I exercise

my right here to vote sometimes on questions in opposition to the Government; but at any rate such is the fact. I do not believe it is the duty of the Government to spend money in any county merely for the sake of spending it. I think there has been too much of that done already; and I can point to instances in Nova Scotia where public money has been expended apparently for no other purpose than to satisfy the friends of the Government. Where there is a necessity for the expenditure of money in the public interest, I have no fault to find with the Government for expending it in counties represented by their supporters; but I think it looks rather suspicious when very little is spent in counties represented by Opposition members, though we can present a fair claim. It seems to me there is a great deal in what the hon. member for Halifax says, that a great deal of money is spent to favor those who support the Government.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I cannot say that the hon. Minister of Public Works has overlooked Lunenburg altogether, for he caused a survey of the harbor of Lunenburg to be made in 1889; but nothing has been done since. I would urge upon the hon. gentleman the necessity of doing some dredging there during the coming season if possible. In a private interview which I had with the hon. Minister the other day, he asked me as to the probable cost of the work. I could not give him any idea of it; I supposed he would gather that from the report of the survey. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has already alluded to the subject of dredging in the County of Lunenburg, and he has given figures which I had noted down, showing that 182 steamers, 968 coasting vessels, and 275 vessels engaged in foreign trade cleared last year from the harbor of Lunenburg. Further than this, as I have already brought to the notice of the hon. Minister, during the winter season our large fishing fleet are laid up at anchor in the harbor, and owing to their being obliged to anchor very close, during storms they often suffer very serious damage. I press again upon the hon. gentleman the necessity of doing some dredging there.

Mr. BORDEN. As the hon. the Minister of Public Works has been somewhat severely assailed on this side of the House to-night, I feel constrained to do him an act of justice. Having been badly wounded by the Opposition, if there is any balm on this side he ought to receive it. In my county—and it cannot be said that I am a supporter of the Administration—the hon. gentleman caused a survey to be made at seven different points, during last year, and I desire in this public manner to thank him for having done this. I am not aware that I have pursued any peculiar course in obtaining those surveys, for, if I remember rightly, I addressed my letters to him in the usual formal manner, and I am very glad that he has seen fit to give me the benefit of those surveys. But surveys do not make breakwaters, and I hope the Minister will keep on with the good work, and be able to put in the Supplementary Estimates, the grants specially necessary for the harbors, about which I had the honor to write him letters, and have had interviews with him, on more than one occasion.

Mr. CAMERON. I quite agree that the areas of Inverness and Guysborough are about the same,

but the population of Inverness is nearly equal to that of Guysborough and Richmond put together. If Inverness were as well supplied with harbors by nature as Guysborough is, not only for seven years but for ten times seven years, I would not ask for a single dollar to be expended there for harbors. The County of Inverness is the best agricultural county in the Province. By referring to the statistics of the census taken in 1881, hon. gentlemen will find that the agricultural products of Inverness alone are equal to those of all the southern counties of the Province, including Richmond, Guysborough, Halifax, Lunenburg, Queen's and Shelburne. If Inverness be such a good agricultural county and has not to-day a single harbor into which a vessel drawing ten feet of water can enter, hon. gentlemen will agree with me that if there is any necessity for dredging in any part of Nova Scotia, it is in Inverness, which has a sea coast of one hundred and fifty miles—longer than that of Guysborough.

General LAURIE. I do not think it right that Shelburne should be the only county in Nova Scotia not heard from on this vote, especially when reference has been made to it by the senior member for Halifax. Attention has been called to the fact that I have done my duty to my county. Well, my county has not been left to be represented by the senior member for Halifax. He points out that I have represented its wants and that they have been enquired into. I am happy to say that they have, and that, to some extent, they have been met, and those wants are justifiable. The hon. gentleman was good enough to call attention to the shipping entered and cleared in some counties, but when he came to Shelburne he dropped the subject, because he found he would have to handle rather larger figures than he expected. According to the returns, Shelburne County shows something like 1,300 vessels entered during the last year; they show further that we sent out of our ports about sixty bankers, manned by 826 fishermen, and that daily along our coast 1,088 boats go out in pursuit of fish, manned by 1,185 men. These men largely contribute to the revenue, and they certainly have the right to have their wants considered. I have represented those wants to the Minister of Public Works, and am happy to say that he has seen fit to have them, in due course, attended to.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Of course it is quite natural that hon. gentlemen should speak in the interests of their respective counties, and they will bear me out in saying that I took no exception to their doing so. I am glad to learn that the gallant general does his duty to his county. That is not what I find fault with, but what I take exception to is those cases in which the Minister of Public Works does not do his duty. If he did his duty properly to the people, we would not have that miserable exhibition, for it is nothing else, every Session—complaints being made of favoritism in the expenditure on public works. There is a great deal in what the hon. member for Inverness said, with regard to the small harbors where fishing boats come in. I admit they require to be dredged, but I did not point at a small harbor particularly. What I said was, that if expenditure was required it should be made, but that it should not be made for political reasons, which is the

motive that always influences the Minister of Public Works in every vote he brings down to this House. The hon. Minister stated last year that the dredges he was taking from the Harbor Commissioners at Montreal, he would use in the Maritime Provinces. Will he do so this year ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are still required to complete the deepening of the channel which will take another year. In answer to the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) I would say that I have taken a note of his remarks, and though I cannot make a promise, will look into the matter, and, if possible, meet his wishes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia have complained of injustice done to several parts of that Province in the manner in which dredging is done, but the complaint we have to make in Prince Edward Island is that no dredging has been done in any portion of that Province. In 1887, the dredge we had was sent to the harbor of Tignish, and \$3,488 were spent in dredging that harbor ; but the work was done so badly that the mud was not carried out to sea but only to the mouth of the harbor and washed back, so that the harbor was worse off in the end than if no expenditure had been made. But that is not the worst. The hon. gentleman sent the dredge to Charlottetown where it was found to be thoroughly out of repair, and he left it there the whole winter without ordering the repairs to be made, although they could have been made then cheaply when men were seeking employment. When the spring sun thawed the ice, and the rivers opened, the dredge which should have been sent to work, was hauled up instead in the yard of one of the hon. gentleman's supporters, and, during the whole season of 1888, she lay idle in the ship-yard while under repair, at an expense of \$20,000, with her captain and officers under pay. He knows that during all this time petitions were sent from different parts of the Island asking for a dredge where dredging was urgently required. The season of 1888 went by without a shovelful being taken out by a dredge. In 1889, he sends the dredge to Red Point wharf for twelve days, and then takes her back to Charlottetown and hires her out for the whole season to dredge around the private wharves of private gentlemen. For that he received \$1,500, but I should like to know if this country provides a dredge at an enormous cost for the purpose of leasing her out to improve private property, while the entrances to the harbors are filling up with silt to such an extent that no approach to them is possible. The management of that dredge in Prince Edward Island is on a par with the management of everything else by this Government in connection with the Island. It is impossible for any one to defend that management. I do not know what the hon. Minister is going to do this year, but complaints are loud from all parts of the Province, from his own party as well as from the Liberal party, as to the gross mismanagement of this part of the service.

Mr. PERRY. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to a harbor called Ship River. If that were dredged a little, it would be of great service. It is the distance of about 15 miles from the railway, and the people there have petitioned for a dredge to dredge the harbor. It has not been sent there yet, but I hope

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

that the Minister will see that the prayer of the petition is complied with during the coming season. As my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) has stated, the dredge was, for the best part of last summer, employed in dredging around private wharves, and she realised the handsome sum of \$1,525, which the Minister said had been placed in the hands of the Receiver General. I did not know that we had such an officer, but I suppose it means the Minister of Finance. It was understood that the dredge would be sent to Cascumpec Harbor to dredge out the rock that was blasted there. Instead of the dredge being there to take it out of the way, so as to make room for vessels that desired to enter there, the stones were allowed to remain on the bottom, and several vessels were stuck last summer on the rocks, which were lifted by powder or by something else. There were two wrongs perpetrated there. The one was to allow the public dredge to perform work for private property instead of being at Cascumpec, and the other was to allow Cascumpec harbor to be spoiled because there was no dredge there to take away the stone which was blasted out. I contend that this was a gross wrong on the part of the Government. As my hon. friend stated, the dredge left Tignish in August, 1887. She was then sent to Charlottetown and was there for five months without being repaired, and there was no reason why that dredge should not commence work in May, 1888. But even up to June of that year, not a stroke of work had been done in repairing her. My hon. friend is mistaken as to the cost of repairing that dredge. She did not cost \$20,000 to repair, but \$12,000, and her first cost was only \$7,000, so that she cost \$5,000 more to repair than the whole of her first cost. It would be amusing to the Committee to see the account of what went into that boat for repairs. Certainly she cost more than twice as much as she should have cost for repairs. Then one whole season was gone. As I said, there was no reason why she should not have commenced work in May, 1888, and certainly there was no reason why she should not have been dredging last summer. We have the harbor of Summerside which requires dredging, we have the harbor of Malpeque which requires dredging, and we have also the great harbor of Cascumpec which is the only harbor of refuge on the north shore of Prince Edward Island. If the Government were manly enough to spend \$50,000 or \$100,000 to make that harbor safe, and to protect the vessels which come there from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as well as from our neighbors to the south, the Americans, it would be all right, but the Government seem to be in such a bad humor with the Americans that they will not give them refuge or allow them to spend their money on shore in buying beef, pork, milk, butter and cheese, all of which Prince Edward Island has in plenty. It is not like Inverness in that respect. I was in the County of Inverness a short time ago, and it was very hard for me to swallow the statement of my hon. friend who represents that county (Mr. Cameron), when he said that that was the finest farming county in Nova Scotia. The Lord help the rest of Nova Scotia if that is the finest farming county. It is a very large county with very little in it. It is *parrum in multo*. I trust

that next year, when we meet, I shall be able to congratulate the Minister of Public Works on having done justice to Prince County, and that he will send the dredge to Egmont Sheep River Bay and Harbor and to all the other places on the coast where it is necessary. I find that the dredging in Prince Edward Island does not get its fair share of the \$40,000 which the hon. gentleman asks for. The share for Prince Edward Island is very small. I do not desire to rob Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. I have a great many friends in those Provinces, but I am selfish for the good of my own people, and I would like to see that no scheming is done, as my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) has said, but that the dredging should not be done as a matter of expediency but as a matter of right. The people of Prince County pay their taxes the same as other citizens of this Dominion. They are an honest, industrious people, and they do not come on their marrow-bones to ask favors from the Government. They are not like the Irishman who said he was afraid of justice. All the people of Prince County ask is justice and no favor. I suppose that, if we only get half the dredging which we require, we will still be loyal subjects, and will not take those old muskets in order to fight the Government.

Mr. ELLIS. Last year, I called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that he requires some better dredges, particularly in the case of rivers where there is a great tidal water. The whole amount he asks for the service is not sufficient to do the work thoroughly, and I should think that double the amount ought to be asked for this particular service. All the tidal rivers, and many of the other rivers throughout the country, are making demands for dredges, which are never met at all. I would suggest that about half the money that is expended on the North-West Mounted Police might be applied to this service with greater results to the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that an item involving an expenditure of money like this, should be allowed to pass until the Minister of Public Works, if he has any explanation to offer to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, as to the management of that important branch of the public service, should give them. I call the attention to the fact that the statement made by the member for Queen's were as specific and distinct as they could possibly be. He stated that during the entire summer, if I understood him correctly, instead of having the dredge repaired during the winter, when it could have been done easily and cheaply, the dredge was laid up and was under repairs during the entire working season, by day's work, done in a private yard of a friend of the Government. Now, it is not to the credit of the Minister to sit still if he has any answer to make to such charges as these.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter came before the House already, and I answered by saying, "Yes, I did." The hon. gentleman should not say no. He charged just now, that the cost had been \$20,000, when his colleague told him just after that it had been only \$12,000. I do not suppose he wants to deceive the Committee. It was only a mistake on his part, and I think he should treat me in the same way as I treated him. I did not

insult him. If he finds fault with my administration of my Department, let him say so; but he has no right to insult me across the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by insulting him. He said this case came before the House before.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, last year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) These statements never were made to the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I beg your pardon. It was made here. I did not suppose this matter would come up again. I was ready at the time; I had my papers to that effect; I had the statement. No doubt the dredge was in bad order and had to be put in order, and the best mode was adopted at the time. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, that I cannot keep all these things in my memory. But, at all events, I know that this thing came before the House and it was explained. I will find the papers again, I will take a note of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What time was this brought before the House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot remember that. Perhaps it was simply on a question put, or on a return made, but I know it was stated then. I will obtain the information in my Department again and lay it before the hon. gentleman. The cost was certainly large, but the dredge had to be put in order, and we did the best we could at the time. As to the remarks made just now by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), that we have not sufficient dredges, I think myself that we will require a new one. I think that a similar dredge will be required also in Ontario, but I have not been able to obtain the money yet for these dredges. I think I am not mistaken when I say that we had a large dredge in the Lower Provinces that was lost, and which has not been replaced. As soon as I get the money for a new dredge I will have it purchased or built in good time, and the same thing for Ontario. We will require a new one there, but we cannot afford it for the present.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has not touched the point. The charge made by me was that in the autumn of 1887 that dredge returned from the dredging of Tignish harbor. It was found to be thoroughly out of repair, and the persons in charge of it were kept on wages all winter, but no attempt whatever was made to repair the dredge during the winter months when it should have been put in repair. When spring opened it was hauled into Peake's yard, and the whole summer of 1888 was taken up in repairing that dredge. This is from my own personal knowledge, but if the hon. gentleman is not sure about the facts, I will refer him to his own report, page 114 :

"The Prince Edward.—The whole of the summer of 1888 was spent in repairing this dredge and the attendant scows."

That is in his own report. Now, I ask why was not that done during the winter season, so that she might have been available in the spring of 1888, the only part of the year when a dredge is capable of working?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will say to the hon. gentleman, that it was in 1887. I do not remember the time, but I will take a note of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was another point, which is easily understood by those who have anything to do with dredging. If I understood my hon. friend aright, he further stated that, in the succeeding summer this dredge, instead of being employed in clearing out the harbors along the coast, was hired out to a number of private parties in Charlottetown, for which service \$1,500, or thereabouts, seems to have been placed to the credit of the Government. Now, it appears to me that *prima facie*—I wait the explanation of the hon. gentleman—that is an abuse of the machinery at the disposal of the Government. There are a great many people who would like to employ a valuable Government dredge at the rates which were paid, for their own private convenience. I have known other cases, when dredges at the disposal of the Public Works Department, were taken away from places when private parties would have been willing to pay for the purpose of having the dredge a little longer time. It appears to me, on the face of it, to be a very extraordinary circumstance, that the dredge should be employed for this service by a few private persons in Charlottetown during the summer of 1889. The result of that would be, that for two whole seasons the dredge, which was intended to be used along the coast of Prince Edward Island, was either under repair or was employed for private purposes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In certain cases when a dredge is in a harbor and work is petitioned for by private individuals, which cannot be done at the public expense, we have several times said: We will have the work done, but you will have to pay for it. In other cases, as the hon. gentleman says, the thing has been refused—in Ontario for example. We did refuse it there because there were private dredges that could be hired by the parties, and we did not want to enter into competition with them. I do not remember the circumstance at Charlottetown, but I may say that there was no other dredge there to do the work. If there had been a dredge, I have no doubt the use of our dredge would have been refused.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Can we entertain the hope that we will get the dredge to some of the harbors in King's County during the coming season? I called the attention of the Minister to the fact that the dredge has not been in that county, except one summer, or part of one summer, since Confederation. We pay our share of the public cost of its maintenance, and I think we should share in the work done. I call specially the Minister's attention to Murray harbor, Montague harbor, Sturgeon harbor and Grand River harbor, all of which require much dredging. There is much shipping there, and it is only justice that King's County, which I represent, should have a share in the work done by the dredge. We have been waiting for twelve years, and the dredge has only been in the county one season, or a part of a season, during that time.

Mr. FREEMAN. As this appears to be the time for claiming the use of the dredge, I desire to enter a claim. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has stated that the counties represented by members supporting the Government have the first claim, and as I have the credit of supporting the Government, I presume the Minister will not neglect the harbors in Queen's County,
Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Nova Scotia. The harbors of the county I represent have only had the dredge, I believe, once since Confederation, and it was there only a short time. We have a "barred" harbor, and large vessels cannot enter without danger, and the trade of the town of Liverpool will be greatly increased if the dredge is there a few weeks next season. I request the Minister to take a note of this. It occurs to me, from this discussion, that the hon. gentlemen opposite are very hard to please. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) claimed that they did not get a fair share of the services of the dredge, and that the wants of members supporting the Government were attended to first. When it was shown that Yarmouth had had a large sum of money expended in dredging, they said that it was due to the efforts of the member who preceded the sitting member and who got the favor. When it was shown that Prince Edward Island obtained a larger share than some of the counties in Nova Scotia, it was said that the dredge was good for nothing and out of repair and so on. So they appear to be dissatisfied in any event. I suppose if the Government refuse to listen to the claims of their supporters and give the services of the dredge only to members of the Opposition, they will be satisfied. This discussion bears testimony to this fact, that it is a very good thing to support the Government, and I am very glad to hear it. This being on the eve of an election, I suppose those hon. gentlemen have some object in view in making that declaration. I frequently heard the complaint that the Government make promises just before an election; but hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have anticipated the Government this time. I am glad to hear that the supporters of the Government will have their claims attended to first, and I will look forward to some advantage on that account, and I am quite sure the Minister will send his dredge to Queen's County and to Liverpool harbor next year.

Dredging, Manitoba.....\$15,000

Mr. WATSON. Does the Minister intend to expend the money on the same works next year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot answer that question directly.

Mr. WATSON. I am always ready to give credit to the Minister when credit is due. The work done at a small expenditure on Red River and White Mud River has proved very satisfactory, and I only hope it will be continued, because the water in the lakes and rivers has been very low during the last three or four years, and the work should be continued. Good service has been rendered.

Telegraph Lines.....\$49,450

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman state whether the amount asked will complete the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount of \$5,000 will complete the work of the extension towards Pointe aux Esquimaux. Next we want to put a cable across to Anticosti, in order to join the local service there. That will carry the line to the east end of Anticosti. There it will join the new cable, which a company propose to lay between Canada and England.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman think it wise to expend \$15,000 to make the

connection with Anticosti? I think the direct cable scheme to Canada will be something like the railway project to Labrador, which was thrown out of the Railway Committee to-day. I cannot believe that it will be undertaken unless under a very considerable subsidy, and I hope this House will never sanction such an expenditure when we have so many cables now existing. It is an unnecessary expenditure, and a waste of public money.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This expenditure is only to connect the two lines belonging to the Government. The other question as to extension to the Labrador coast is yet to be determined.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman explain if there is connection by cable there, now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The island is separated from the north coast altogether. We want to have the telegraph system joined together.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Can the hon. gentleman say who owns Anticosti Island now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I don't know.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is there a cable there now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Roads and Bridges..... \$45,300

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). This is a very large item and ought to be explained.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is exactly the same as last year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) These bridges don't seem to require all these repairs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They have to be repaired constantly, if we want to keep them in good order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the Dominion of Canada under any obligation to keep these bridges in the city of Ottawa in repair?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; there was a bargain made between the city of Ottawa and the Government, some five or six years ago, that the Government should keep these bridges in repair.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course, if there is a binding obligation, there is no use discussing this. It does appear to me that, if we were not under a written obligation, it would be a gross outrage to maintain the roads and bridges of Ottawa. You might as well maintain the roads and bridges in Toronto or Montreal, or any city of the Dominion.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). There must be some reason why the Government entered into an arrangement with the Corporation of Ottawa to keep these bridges in repair, and I have not yet heard the explanation of the Minister of Public Works. What obligation are we under to the city of Ottawa, that we should assume this responsibility, and what return are we getting for it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The whole thing has been explained to Parliament, and all the details given and the papers brought down.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If there is such an arrangement, it should be brought down.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman will find it was brought down in 1885.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where can the details of this expenditure be found?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. From the 1st of July, 1885, to 1887, we expended \$29,000. In 1888, we had a vote of \$8,300, and we expended \$8,036, and last year we had a vote of \$11,000 and expended \$13,000, which was made up from the balance of a previous vote.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand that the hon. Minister will bring down the arrangement that exists between the Government and the city, because, if there is not a binding agreement, I wish to take the sense of the House on voting the money?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a binding agreement. I will bring it down.

Mr. BOWELL. The whole arrangement between the city of Ottawa and the Government was laid before Parliament years ago, and fully discussed. The Government agreed to take over the Dufferin bridge and certain works in front of these buildings on Wellington Street, to rebuild the bridge across the Chaudière, and to give certain assistance to the city for the construction of the bridge across the Rideau on the way to Rideau Hall.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask how far the work on the bridge across the Battle River at Battleford has progressed, and what is the amount of the tender for the contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount of the contract is \$24,500. The work has not progressed satisfactorily, and not long ago I gave orders that the contract should be taken from the contractors.

Mr. WATSON. Who are the contractors?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Kennedy & Heney. The work will, however, be proceeded with at once; and my engineer told me the other day that he expected that the whole work would be completed in four months or so.

Mr. WATSON. How much money has been spent on the work so far?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Nearly \$12,000.

Mr. WATSON. I see that there has been an inspector on this work for nearly two years.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work was begun then, and from time to time timber and other material were brought to the spot, so that the services of an inspector were required. I have no doubt that, at certain periods, he had very little to do, but we could not leave the work without having some one to look after it. The work will now proceed without any interruption until it is completed.

Mr. WATSON. What time was given to the contractors to complete the work under the contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It should have been completed eight or nine months ago.

Mr. WATSON. It appears to me that the Government should have cancelled the contract with these contractors some time ago.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There were difficulties about that on account of the site. Complaint was made by the contractors, and I think by the local manager there, that the bottom of the river, where the bridge was to be constructed, was too soft. Therefore, I had to have it examined, and the report which has come to me is that it is

being built at the best place. They found that though there was some soft material, they came very soon to hard pan, and that the bridge will have a good foundation. That is another reason why the contract was not cancelled sooner.

Mr. WATSON. Is it to be completed at the expense of the contractor.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We look to the contractor afterwards for the difference in price, but in the meantime we must go on with the contract until it is completed.

Miscellaneous Works not otherwise provided for..... \$10,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have a photographer employed by the Department who from time to time photographs the works as they stand. This dispenses with our sending constantly an officer to examine and report.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It seems to me that the amount of \$50 charged for photographs of a small work like this, is a heavy charge.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He has to move about, and his travelling expenses must be paid.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think this must include photographs of some of the hon. gentleman's supporters.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They would have been good photographs, no doubt.

Surveys and Inspections..... \$15,000

Mr. WATSON. Is it the hon. gentleman's intention to make a survey of the rapids of Red River with a portion of this money?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If we have a survey to make there, we will have to take it out of this fund.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 10th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RAILWAY COMMITTEE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that Mr. Montague, member representing the County of Haldimand, be appointed a member of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, and of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce. He said: This is in place of the previous member.

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the Hon. J. A. Chapleau be appointed a member of the Joint Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Committee on Printing, in place of the Hon. Mr. Bowell.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 115) to amend section 20, chap. 122 of the Act entitled: An Act respecting certain Savings Banks in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Choquette.)

THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Mr. BOWELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire, in view of the motion of which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has given notice in reference to the correspondence of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), and the debate that may arise thereon, to lay upon the Table and ask for their insertion in the Votes and Proceedings, a letter from Mr. Stewart Tupper, and also one from Mr. Hugh J. Macdonald, both of Winnipeg. I will read them to the House, and then ask that they be placed in the Votes and Proceedings:

"RIDEAU CLUB,
OTTAWA, 25th February, 1890.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I observe that Mr. Rykert has dragged my name into the correspondence relating to the Cypress Hills timber limit.

"You have already read to the House Mr. Hugh J. Macdonald's telegram denying Mr. Rykert's statements respecting both himself and me. I do not, therefore, consider it necessary to do more at present than to say to you that I was never 'brought' to Ottawa by Mr. Rykert, as he states in his letter of 5th March, 1883, and repeats in his letter of 28th March, 1883, nor was I ever requested by him, or any one on his behalf, to come to Ottawa, and I never acted for Mr. Rykert, Mr. Adams, or Mr. Sands, in Ottawa or anywhere else, in this matter.

"I understand that Mr. McArthur—a partner in my late firm—represented Mr. Sands in December, 1882, when he purchased the limit from Messrs. Rykert and Adams, and I find that the firm received a fee of one hundred dollars for Mr. McArthur's services. I never received one dollar from Mr. Rykert, or anyone else, for travelling expenses or fees in connection with this business, and I can find no charge in the books of my late firm against Mr. Sands subsequent to the purchase of the limit, for which, as already stated, we were paid by Mr. Sands.

"Yours faithfully,
J. STEWART TUPPER.

"The Hon. M. BOWELL,
Minister of Customs.

"P.S.—You can, of course, make whatever use of this letter you may think proper."

I have also a letter placed in my hands, dated at Winnipeg, 4th March, as follows:—

"WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, 4th March, 1890.

"MY DEAR FATHER,—With reference to the statements concerning my partner, Mr. Stewart Tupper and myself, made by Mr. Rykert in his correspondence with the late Mr. Adams, respecting the Cypress Hills timber limit, I can only repeat what I have already said in the telegram which Mr. Bowell read to the House. Neither of us, Mr. Tupper or myself, had anything to do with either obtaining or selling the limit in question, nor were we, directly or indirectly interested in it in any way. Our sole and only connection with this limit was as solicitors for Mr. Sands, of Manistee, Michigan, who bought it from Messrs. Adams and Rykert, and even as solicitors, neither of us had anything to do with it personally, the title having been searched and the whole business connected with this purchase having been conducted by Mr. J. B. McArthur, who was at that time a partner of ours. I may add that I never acted for Mr. Adams or Mr. Rykert in connection with this limit, nor in any matter whatever, and never went to Ottawa at Mr. Rykert's request, nor was I ever asked to do so by him or anyone on his behalf; consequently I was very much astonished when I read what he states in his letters of the 5th and 28th March, 1883, about his having 'brought Macdonald and Tupper' from Winnipeg. I can only say that this statement is

absolutely without foundation, and that Mr. Rykert would hardly have written about my being in Ottawa in the way he does in his letter of the 12th February, 1883, if I had been 'brought' there by him. It is true that I was in Ottawa in February, 1883; but I was there on other business; and I say, most positively, that it was never even suggested to me by Mr. Rykert, or anyone else, that I should go to Ottawa about this timber limit matter. While I was in Ottawa I met Mr. Rykert accidentally, and he at once began to speak about the harsh manner in which Mr. Sands was being treated by the Government, and asked me to speak to Sir David Macpherson, the then Minister of the Interior, on the subject. I pointed out to him that the fact of my being one of the solicitors of the C. P. R. precluded me from urging on the Minister anything that might militate against their interests, but I added that I should be very glad to speak to Sir David about giving Mr. Sands compensation for the loss he had suffered through the odd-numbered sections having been awarded by the Government to the Railway Company. I subsequently spoke to Sir David Macpherson on the subject, when he promised to give it careful consideration, and thus begun and ended my connection with Mr. Rykert in this matter. I never spoke to you or any other Minister, except Sir David Macpherson, about this timber limit.

"In conclusion, I would say that I never received, or expected to receive, a single dollar from Mr. Rykert, Mr. Adams, Mr. Sands or any one else, for services rendered or expenses incurred in connection with this Cypress Hills timber limit matter, with the exception of my share of the fee of one hundred dollars received from Mr. Sands, by the firm of which I was a member, for Mr. McArthur's services as his solicitor at the time he bought this limit.

"Yours faithfully,
"HUGH J. MACDONALD."

I move, with the consent of the House, that these letters be placed upon the Votes and Proceedings, in the same manner in which other letters have been placed, in connection with this subject.

Mr. RYKERT. I have no objection of these going upon the minutes, but I would have preferred that the Minister had given me an opportunity to read these letters and produce what I have to say in answer to them. I have it at my hotel, and I had no thought whatever that these letters would be brought up this afternoon. All I can say is that I have in my possession, evidence of a most unmistakable character that I wrote to Mr. McArthur on 10th February, 1883, requesting him to send his partners to Ottawa in order to explain the matter to the Government. Mr. McArthur has recognised the truthfulness of the letter and has recognised my telegram, and he wrote a letter to me, and enclosed it to Hugh Macdonald of Winnipeg, asking him to peruse the letter and send it to me if he thought it was right. So hon. gentlemen, when they come to see all the evidence, will find there was some foundation for the observation made in my letter. I am not saying they are not telling what is not the case; I would not do so; but I think what took place has escaped the memories of those gentlemen, for I asked their partner to send them to Ottawa, and explain the matter to the Government. I should like to ask the Minister of Customs if either Mr. Macdonald or Mr. Tupper has sent to him a letter addressed to me, which Mr. McArthur wrote on 18th February, this year?

Mr. BOWELL. I have read to the House all the letters I have received, either from Mr. Tupper or from Mr. Macdonald; I have no others, nor have I any intimation from those gentlemen that they have others. I must say, in justice to myself, that, before laying those letters on the Table, I handed them to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), asked him to read them, and told

him I was going to lay them on the Table of the House. Had he made a request for delay, in all probability I would have consented to it; but he made no request to me for delay until he could produce any other evidence, and I took it for granted, from the fact that he handed them back without any remark of that kind, that I was quite justified in laying them on the Table.

Mr. LAURIER. In justice to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), I think he should have the privilege of putting in those letters any time during the day.

BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the private Bills are called, I desire to refer to the subject of the motion moved by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), in regard to the claims of Charles Bremner. I move:

That precedence be given over all other business to the Order of the Day for resuming the adjourned Debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Lister, for the appointment of a Select Committee to enquire into the claims of the Bresaylor Half-breeds for losses sustained during the Rebellion in the North-West, and also in reference to furs taken from Charles Bremner, a Half-breed residing at Battleford; and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Motion agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Bill (No. 90) to amend the Act incorporating the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

PROSECUTION OF SALT MANUFACTURERS.

Mr. TROW asked, Whether the Government instructed William Johnston, Chief Inspector of Weights and Measures for the Belleville district, to prosecute certain salt manufacturers in the Goderich district for selling salt in barrels having light weight? 1st. Who were the parties prosecuted and fined? 2nd. What was the amount collected, and how applied? 3rd. How many barrels, in the aggregate, were seized?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Peter McEwen, of Goderich, was prosecuted and fined by the Mayor of Goderich the sum of \$10, for selling barrels of salt which did not contain 280 pounds. This is the only case of prosecution of any one residing in Goderich. The Department is not in possession of information as to number of barrels seized from Mr. McEwen, as salt was released. The amount collected was \$10, and deposited to the credit of the Receiver General. Archibald Rowe, of Picton; George McEwen, of Hensal; Wm. M. Gray, president of the Gray, Young & Sparling Company (Limited), were also prosecuted for the same cause, and fined the same amount each. The above prosecutions were instituted by Mr. William Johnston, Inspector of Weights and Measures at Belleville.

CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS.

Mr. DOYON asked, Whether the Department of the Interior has recently received from certain Indians of the Caughnawaga Reserve, now at San Francisco, a petition setting forth that they had

been engaged by a circus company to go to California and Australia; that the company abandoned them at San Francisco last fall; that they are in a state of destitution, and ask for aid, out of the Indian Fund, to enable them to return home? If so, what reply did the Government make to the Indians, and what steps do they propose taking?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Department of Indian Affairs received recently from certain parties, who describe themselves as being Indians of the Caughnawaga Reserve, now at San Francisco, an application that money be sent them to enable them to return home, they having been engaged by a circus company to travel with it, and finding themselves in a state of destitution in San Francisco. The reply made to the Indians was that their application would be taken into consideration, and a letter was addressed to the Indian agent at Caughnawaga enclosing a copy of the application of the above Indians, and requesting his report thereon. A report was received confirmatory of the statement of the Indians in question, as to their having left Caughnawaga on a tour with a circus company. The agent was advised that, unless the band at Caughnawaga would vote that money be sent them from their funds wherewith to defray their expenses home, the Department had no money for that purpose; and the applicants have been informed to the same effect.

COLLINGWOOD HARBOR.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. COOK) asked, What has been the amount expended each year since Confederation, in improving the harbor at Collingwood, and the total amount for said period?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The following expenditures have been made in improving the harbor of Collingwood since Confederation:—

In 1874 (a)	Building a breakwater 700 ft. in	\$ 44,437 66
1875 (b)	length with lighthouse	13,030 77
1879		4,104 81
1880	Deepening the entrance to 14 ft.	6,506 98
1881	of water	7,990 00
1882		8,566 10
1883	Building 1,800 ft. of breakwater,	23,932 55
1884	continuing the work of deepening	30,802 27
1885	the entrance, and dredging	26,931 10
1886	a basin at south end of harbor.	23,468 37
1887	Dredging to 16 ft. at lowest water.	4,884 00
1888	Building stone breakwater and	5,003 80
1889	dredging to 16 ft. at lowest	7,281 55
	water	
	Total	\$ 206,939 96

(a.) Including \$15,505.00 contributed by Northern Railway.
 (b.) Including \$12,763.26 contributed by Northern Railway.

CASCUMPEC HARBOR.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether any repairs or new work were done to the brush work at Cascumpec harbor, P. E. I., during the winter of 1889? If so, how much money was expended and who superintended the work?

Mr. COLBY. About 300 feet of brush work was placed on the west end of the work already done, to complete the shore front, and the sum of \$309 was expended in the work. The work was carried on under the superintendence of the light-keeper at Sandy Island, and under the general direction of the Agent of Marine at Charlottetown.

Mr. DOYON.

CLAIMS OF MISSISSAUGA INDIANS.

Mr. MADILL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any, and, if so, what, steps towards obtaining a settlement of the claims of the Mississauga Indians for compensation for unsundered lands?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This subject is now under the consideration of the Government.

SNOW-PLOUGHS ON GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether there have been any snow-ploughs purchased for the Intercolonial or other Government Railways within the last three years? If so, how many? From whom were they purchased? At what price? Were tenders asked for? Where were they built? How often have they been used? Have they given satisfaction? Are they the same kind of snow-plough that is used by the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk? At whose recommendation were they purchased?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been six snow-ploughs purchased within the last three years. They were purchased from James Harris & Co., St. John. Three cost \$1,650 each, and three cost \$1,750 each. Tenders were not asked for. The plough is a patent plough, Harris & Co. controlling the patent. They were built at St. John. I cannot say how often they have been used, but very frequently. They have given satisfaction. They are not the same kind of snow-plough as is used by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk. After full trial for several years, they were adopted on recommendation of the engineer and roadmasters. They are known as the Russell Eagle Wire Snow-plough. In addition to these, there have been purchased two rotary snow-shovels from Messrs. Polson & Son, Toronto. They cost \$13,000 each. They were not purchased by tender, they being patent machines, Messrs. Polson & Son controlling the patent. I cannot say how often they have been used, but not very frequently, as there has been much less difficulty encountered with snow this season than usual. They were built in Toronto. We have not had sufficient heavy work in the snow this season to warrant an opinion as to their utility and serviceability, but they are spoken very highly of by the Union Pacific Railway Company, the Northern Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who have the same kind of rotary snow shovels in use. They were purchased upon the recommendation of the Chief Engineer and General Manager of Government Railways.

LIGHTHOUSE AT ST. ROCH'S TRAVERSE.

Mr. CIMON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to provide, during the present Session, for the erection of a pier and lighthouse at St. Roch's Traverse, on the River St. Lawrence, to replace the two lightships now employed for these purposes?

Mr. COLBY. The hon. member will find his answer on page 62, item 185, of the Estimates of this year.

THE QUEEN VS. BOUCHER.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether the Government have received the account of Mr. Elie Moreau, advocate, of Sorel, for fees *in re* The Queen vs. Boucher?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The account has been received.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether the account of Mr. Elie Moreau, advocate, for fees *in re* The Queen vs. Boucher, has been paid?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has not been paid.

ALBERTON LIGHTHOUSE, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether the Government of Canada is actually employing at the present time men and teams breast working Lighthouse Island, Alberton Harbor, P.E.I., under the direction of G. R. Montgomery? If so, what amount is authorised to be expended? What wages are paid for men and teams per day? How much per load for brush?

Mr. COLBY. Mr. Artemas Lord, the agent of the Marine Department, Charlottetown, was authorised on the 30th January last to carry out certain breast working required for the protection of the Sandy Island light. He was limited to an expenditure of \$400, and received general instructions to carry out the work in the most economical and useful way. The Department has not been advised whether any work has yet been performed under that authority. For work of a similar character executed last year, Mr. Montgomery was paid 50 cents per load for brush in place, and Messrs. Montgomery and Wells each 50 cents per ton for stone in place.

THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Mr. RYKERT. I would crave the indulgence of the House while I read the correspondence which I have had in reference to the matter before the House, and ask that it be placed on the minutes with the rest of the correspondence. On 15th of February, I wrote the following letter to Mr. McArthur, of Minneapolis:—

“ST. CATHARINES, ONT., 15th February, 1890.

“J. B. MCARTHUR, Esq.,
Attorney-at-Law,

401 Lumber Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

“MY DEAR MCARTHUR,—I have just wired you asking if you recollect my writing or telegraphing you some time during the early part of 1883 in reference to the trouble with the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. over the Sands' limit. You will, doubtless, recollect that they made claim to every alternate section, some time after the sale to Sands, and, as your firm had acted as Mr. Sands' solicitors, I took the liberty of communicating with you requesting that you should ask Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Tupper, your partners (who either at the time I wrote were in Ottawa, or else were expected there), to interview their respective fathers while here, and acquaint them with the facts regarding the claim set up by the Canadian Pacific Railway to Mr. Sands' limit. I wrote you because your firm acted as solicitors for Mr. Sands at the time of transfer and investigated the title thereof for him.

“My reason for so doing is because the *Globe* has in some way got hold of and published some of my private correspondence with Adams regarding the limit. In one of my letters to Adams, I wrote that I was going to get Messrs. Macdonald and Tupper to see their fathers about the matter, and the truth of my intention and attempt to do so has been denied.

“Would you mind writing me a letter stating your recollection of the facts and the steps which you took upon receipt of my letter, and the report made to you by Messrs. Macdonald or Tupper, or either of them, of the

result of their interview with their fathers or any members of the Government about the matter. I would like you in the letter to state that my reason for applying to your firm was because you had acted as Mr. Sands' solicitors.

“I would feel obliged if you would give this your immediate attention and address your reply to me at Ottawa, as the matter has been brought up in the House, and I want to use your letter to corroborate my account of the transaction.

“The correspondence was obtained by the *Globe* by theft, and they are striving, by putting a distorted meaning upon it, to throw discredit upon myself and some members of the Government.

“I want to show by you, my reason for asking the members of your firm to call upon Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper.

“Yours truly,

“J. C. RYKERT.”

On 17th February I wrote again:

“ST. CATHARINES, ONT., 17th February, 1890.

“MY DEAR MCARTHUR,—I find from a memorandum I have that I wrote you on February 10, 1883, of which the enclosed purports to be a copy. I find also that I telegraphed you to attend to the matter referred to in the letter. Will you kindly see if you have any letters or telegram now in your possession? If you have any recollection of the letter and telegram, please let me know. It is likely you will recollect the circumstance. I also received a letter from you enclosing a clipping from a *Winnipeg* paper, which I have mislaid. I know that you felt as I did—that we were in honor bound to do everything we could to persuade the Government to ignore the C. P. R. claim, and maintain Sands' license.

“Very truly,

“J. C. RYKERT.”

This is the letter I wrote on 10th February, 1883:

“OTTAWA, 10th February, 1883.

“DEAR MCARTHUR,—I presume you have heard before this that the C. P. R. has put in a claim to part of the limit sold to Sands, which is a most unfortunate piece of business. We must, if possible, try to get the Government to compel the company to abandon its claim. It seems to me that if you get Macdonald and Tupper to come to Ottawa and explain to the Government that your firm passed the title for Sands and that they ought to protect the holders of the license, especially when the license was granted before the railway was built anywhere near the limit, they will do so.

“You will recollect reading Sir John's speech in Parliament to Sands, where he speaks of yearly licenses being as good as those for 21 years. I am satisfied, if the matter is explained by those gentlemen that the Government will renew the license. In conversation with several members of the Government I find that they take the ground that the license should not be interfered with.

“Faithfully,

“J. C. RYKERT.”

I telegraphed a few days afterwards:

“Please attend to the matter I wrote about, in reference to claim on limit.”

Then I sent a statement to my partner as to this matter having been brought up in the House, and told him to see McArthur in Minneapolis, and on 19th February, I received the following telegram:—

“MINNEAPOLIS, 19th February, 1890.

“J. C. RYKERT, M.P.,

“Russell House.

“McArthur corroborates everything you say in his letter to Macdonald.

(Signed)

“J. H. INGERSOLL.”

On 21st February, I received a letter from my partner, Mr. Ingersoll, as follows:—

“ST. CATHARINES, ONT., 21st Feb., 1890.

“DEAR SIR,—I returned from Minneapolis this morning. I saw Mr. McArthur on Wednesday, and told him the object of my visit. He had already seen the *Globe* containing the Adams letters, and had also seen the *Globe* containing the account of what took place when the matter came up in the House. I stated the object of my visit, and urged him to give me a letter which you could use when the matter came up again in the House.

"He was unwilling to do this, giving as a reason that he did not care to write anything on the subject, in view of the professional relations which formerly existed between himself and Macdonald and Tupper when in partnership. He discussed the matter freely with me, and remembers quite well the receipt of your letter of the 10th February, 1883, and identified the copy which you gave me to show him as being a copy of the original. He also remembers the receipt of your telegram sent him about the same time regarding the matter. He thinks that Mr. Stewart Tupper was in Ottawa at the time, but remembers quite well that Mr. H. J. Macdonald was about to start for Ottawa, in reference to a Bill then before the House regarding the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company.

"He admitted that he spoke to Mr. Macdonald on the subject of your letter and telegram, but declined to say what took place between them, either before Mr. Macdonald left for Ottawa, or after his return. He said that all their correspondence on the subject had been left by him in their office in Winnipeg. Your letter and telegram were not the first intelligence he had received of the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway in defecting their line southward, as Sands had already written him, stating that they had defecting their line and had made claim to the alternate sections, and complaining bitterly of the injustice of their claim.

"He finally told me that he would be willing to write you a letter and send it to H. J. Macdonald for perusal, and request him to forward it to you, provided he was satisfied with it.

"I prepared a memo. of the heads which the letter should cover, which was as follows:—

"1. That his firm acted as solicitors for Sands when he bought the limit and assured him that the license was all right and would be renewed as often as necessary, and that at that time the northern boundary of the limit was fully 40 miles south of the surveyed line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that he (McArthur) had personal charge of the matter.

"2. That when he learned that the Canadian Pacific Railway had defecting their line southward to embrace the limit, he, acting in the interests of Sands, and upon the request contained in your last letter and telegram of February, 1883, requested his partners—Macdonald and Tupper—to represent to the Government, when in Ottawa, the injustice that would be done to Sands by the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway and to endeavor to secure from the Government a renewal to Sands of the entire limit.

"3. That in so doing they acted simply as solicitors for Mr. Sands, and to prevent an injustice being done to him.

"4. That there was no attempt made by you to influence them, or through them, the Government, improperly, and that they acted simply as above.

"5. That his partners subsequently informed him that they had seen the members of the Government and had represented the matter to them.

"He stated that there was nothing objectionable in it and that it properly stated the facts. I left the memorandum with him and he said he would write to H. J. Macdonald that afternoon and that the letter would be on the above lines, and ask him to forward the letter after perusal. He stated, however, that he would not promise anything regarding what he might say as to the 5th head, and would have to consider what he would say regarding it, as he did not wish to violate the confidence of his partners. I assured him that you did not wish him to be guilty of any breach of confidence, but that all you wished was to have him contradict the assertion made by the enemies of yourself and the Government, that you sought, through him and his firm, to bring improper influence to bear upon the Government, as he was the best qualified of all men to contradict this, and explain why you called upon his firm in the matter."

This was signed by my partner, Mr. J. H. Ingersoll. I received a telegram stating that Mr. McArthur had forwarded the letter to Mr. H. J. Macdonald, to be forwarded by him to me. I do not wish to contradict these young gentlemen; I do not think they would willingly state what was untrue, but I think this matter which took place seven or eight years ago, has entirely escaped their recollection, and I think they would be more likely to forget what took place than I would. I have made a statement which I think I can corroborate, and I think the House will come to the conclusion that I had some reason for the letters which I wrote. I

MR. RYKEE.

move that these letters be printed in the Votes and Proceedings, with the other letters which have been laid on the Table to-day.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. MULOOCK. Would not this be a good time to go through the unopposed motions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If there are any motions of importance to be discussed, we had better discuss them now if we intend to do so this Session.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

Mr. ROOME moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has come when the Federal Government should establish a Health Department with a responsible head, presided over by a Minister or Deputy Minister, for the purpose of preventing the spread of disease, collecting mortuary statistics, and educating the people, as far as possible, in all health and sanitary matters.

He said: In rising to move this resolution, I do so believing that the time has come when this important subject should receive the earnest attention of this House, as well as of the people of Canada. I shall endeavor to express my thoughts on this matter, and the arguments which I have to bring forward, in such a manner that, though I may not be able to properly place them before the House myself, they may, at all events, induce discussion, and I hope that other hon. members may be able to make them more impressive than I can. Looking at the history of Canada since the confederation of the Provinces, observing the vast progress which she has made, the large and various industries which have been built up, the rapid growth of her cities and towns—in fact, looking at the great and increased prosperity of the whole Dominion, and asking ourselves what has brought that about, I have only, I think, to refer to the speech made last Session by the young and talented Finance Minister, in order to prove that not only this Parliament, but previous Parliaments, have brought about this prosperity by spending millions of dollars in building up our great railway system, which extends from ocean to ocean, and which, with her branch lines, joining the great trunk line, gives us now one of the best railway systems in the world. Parliament has also spent millions of dollars in enlarging our canals, so as to join together our great inland lakes and to make a complete chain of communication, so that our producers and our consumers are brought close together, and we are able to compete with the other nations of the world. While the different Parliaments have been spending money on railways and canals, on the erection of public buildings, on the encouragement of immigration, at the same time hardly any thought has been given to the importance of rescuing many persons from untimely graves, by preventing the spread of those epidemics which occasionally appear amongst us. We, in Canada feel proud of our country, believing that we have formed the nucleus of a great nation, and while we boast of our most excellent form of government whereby our laws are strictly enforced, protecting our lives from the hands of the assassin and murderer, our property from thug and robber, we have scarcely any protection against the spread of those zymotic diseases which are constantly amongst us. While we have spent so much time in opening and developing our country,

I think it would not be amiss if we were to expend some time and some money in endeavoring to prevent the spread of diseases and to save the lives of our own people, many of the best of whom are cut off in the prime of life by preventable diseases, to say nothing of the sickness and suffering our children have to endure from disease engendered into the system in childhood, which cripples and deforms them through life, which, if the cause were removed, they would grow up strong men and women. It is not the numerical population which constitutes the strength of a nation, but it is the physical and mental development as well, as we might say :

" 'Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.'"

Now, Sir, looking at this subject from a practical point of view, it should be the first duty of every statesman to legislate for the health of the people. Let us consider for a moment what would be the object and what could be accomplished by such legislation. England to-day stands foremost amongst the nations of the earth in having given her attention to health legislation, and during the past half century she has passed a great number of Health Acts. Amongst those, I may mention the Public Health Act in 1842, the Public Health Act of 1848, the Sanitary Act of 1866, the Public Health Act of 1872, and the most important Act of all was one amending the Public Health Act in 1875. By such legislation there has been a marked and marvellous decrease in the death rate of England since the first Act was passed. Previous to the passing of the first Health Act of 1842, she had a system of collecting mortuary statistics from the year 1837, and it was by the collection of these statistics that her physicians and sanitarians were able to impress upon the legislators the necessity of some legislation towards the health of the people. According to the Registrar General's Report of 1841, the death rate of England and Wales was 26 per 1,000. Now, in order to show what has been accomplished in England during the past fifty years by such legislation, I shall divide it off into decades of ten years, which will make a fair and just comparison. If I took one year and compared it with another I might be accused of selecting a year in which there was a great amount of sickness and comparing it with another in which there was not much sickness; but in dividing the period into decades of ten years, there can be no unjust comparison. These figures I have had copied from the Registrar General's Report from England. During the years from 1841 to 1851, the annual death rate was 25·4 per 1,000; 1851 to 1861, 22·4; 1861 to 1871, 22·2; 1871 to 1881, 21·4; 1881 to 1890, 19·1 per 1,000. Now, in order to show what legislation has done in England, let me say that in the year 1875, at the time of the passing of this General Health Act, the death rate of England was 22 per 1,000; from 1876 to 1880, it fell to 19·3; 1886, 19·2; 1887, 18·7; 1888, 17·8; 1889, 17·2, showing that since the passing of that Health Act in 1875 there has been a continual decrease of the death rate every year; and I have no doubt that for the next ten years to come, the rate will continue to diminish in England down to 13 or 14 per 1,000. Now, estimating the population of England and Wales at 28 millions and a-half, it implies that during the last eight years, or at the end of last year, there were

500,000 people living in England whose deaths would have been recorded had the death rate continued the same ratio during the past eight years as it was from 1871 to 1881. Having shown what has been accomplished by health legislation in England, let me draw your attention to what may be accomplished in the Dominion of Canada by similar legislation. For the past number of years we have had a system of collecting vital statistics through the Department of Agriculture. When the system was established in 1882 it only applied to cities having a population of 25,000 and over; since that, it has been extended, until now the statistics are collected from twenty-eight centres. In order to make my calculation, I am going to take the mortuary statistics for the Province of Ontario, from the Registrar General's Report of that Province, which I believe are more correct than those of the Dominion. I believe the system adopted by the Province of Ontario is preferable to the system adopted by the Dominion Government, as the Provincial system leaves it in the hands of medical men to report as to the cause of death. I will read from the Provincial Act in regard to that point :

" Every duly qualified medical practitioner, who was last in attendance during the last illness of any person, shall, within ten days after having notice or knowledge of the death of such person, transmit to the Division Registrar of the Division in which the death took place, a certificate under his signature of the cause of death, according to form of schedule I."

When that is carried out they have a pretty correct system of collecting statistics. The system adopted by the Dominion Government collects statistics from the cemeteries, or those in attendance on those cemeteries. Now, if we take any city in the Dominion that is growing rapidly it is to be remembered that people are constantly coming in from the surrounding districts to seek employment, and those who die there have friends or relatives in the country who carry the body back to be buried in the rural districts, so that the cemeteries in the cities do not give a correct number of all those who die there. We find the population of those twenty-eight centres from which statistics are collected by the Dominion Government, to be 840,000. The death rate in those centres for the past year has been an average of 22·2 per 1,000. As there is no report from the rural sections and small towns, we will have to estimate the death rate of the whole Dominion at, say, 20·5 per 1,000, and we will estimate the population of the Dominion at the present time at 5,500,000. In England, the difference between the rural sections and cities, is 1·7, and for Canada I am giving the whole difference as 2 per 1,000, although I believe medical men will agree with me, that in our small towns and villages zymotic diseases are more fatal than in cities, so that in all probability the death rate is as great, if not greater; but I am going to give the difference as 2 per 1,000. So that, if we estimate the population of the Dominion at 5,500,000, it implies that during last year, if death rate had been reduced as low as it was in England and Wales, namely 17·2, there were about 15,000 or 20,000 deaths recorded in Canada last year which might have been saved. Perhaps, some may think that I have not made a just comparison, by taking the twenty-eight cities in Canada and calculating the death rate for the whole Dominion by that. Now, if there should be objection to the mode by which

I have made my calculation, I will take the twenty-eight cities in Canada and compare them with twenty-eight of the largest cities in England. The population of twenty-eight cities in England was 9,400,000. There were 179,865 deaths recorded last year, or an average death rate of 19·2 per 1,000. The average death rate in the same cities from 1871 to 1881, previous to the legislation of the Health Act, was 24 per 1,000. In those twenty-eight cities during the last nine years the average death rate has been 21 per 1,000. This implies that at the end of last year 200,000 more people were living than would have been in existence if the former death rate had prevailed for the past eight years as what it did from 1871 to 1882. In twenty-eight cities in Canada with a population of 840,000 the death rate was 22·2 per 1,000. If the death rate had been reduced to that of the twenty-eight English cities, 19·2, no less than 2,520 lives would have been saved, or for the past ten years, 25,200, which might have been saved by proper legislation. Perhaps I might make a still stronger comparison as to what might be done by health teaching and sanitary legislation, by comparing old London and Montreal. Old London, with a population of 4½ millions, had an average death rate of 18·5 per 1,000 for the past nine years. I desire to say here, that there is no reason why our cities in Canada should not be as healthy as old London is to-day. Montreal has a beautiful situation, with its front washed by a magnificent river whose waters flow so rapidly to the sea, and with high lands in the rear; in fact, with all natural advantages for a metropolitan city; yet Montreal, with a population of 200,000, had an average death rate for the past six years of 34·8 per 1,000, or nearly two to one as compared with overcrowded London. There is no reason why the death rate should not be reduced as low, if not lower than London, by proper sanitary legislation. The difference of 16·3 per 1,000 means that there would have been living in Montreal 3,600 persons at the end of last year, whose deaths have been recorded, or 21,000 during the past six years; if continued for the next ten years at the same ratio the number would have increased to 40,000, who might have been saved and continue their lives as respectable citizens. Toronto, with her beautiful structures of fine architectural design, broad streets and a frontage on Lake Ontario, is the pride of the people of Ontario. The average death rate of that city for the last six years was 21·5 per 1,000, or three per 1,000 more than London. There is no reason to doubt that by proper legislation the death rate could be reduced three or four per 1,000; but if the death rate had been as low as that of London no less than 510 deaths might have been prevented for the past, or in ten years more, if allowed to continue at the same ratio, 5,100. In Quebec the death rate for the past six years averaged 30·7 per 1,000. I will make one more comparison, and then I will close, and that is a comparison of the death rate of the city chosen for the capital of the Dominion; chosen, no doubt, for high elevation and picturesque surroundings. The different Governments have spent money lavishly in erecting buildings, in becoming a great nation, but the people of the city have been derelict of their duty in putting in force sanitary arrangements; so that, instead of this being one of the most healthy cities, it is the most unhealthy cities in the Province of Ontario, and one of the most unhealthy cities in Canada. The

Mr. ROOME.

death rate for the past six years was 28·5 and for the past seven years 33·7 per 1,000, 12·2 per 1,000 more than Toronto, 15·2 more than old London. I repeat that it is the most unhealthy city in the Dominion, excepting Hull, which has an average death rate for the past three years of 37·7, Hull being not only one of the most unhealthy cities in Canada, but one of the most unhealthy cities in the world. The reason I take the records for the past three years is that the health statistics do not go further back. I may say that, three years ago, the death rate was 41 per 1,000. So from the cities of Quebec, Montreal, Toronto and Hamilton we have in this Parliament a large number of representatives, including men of mark and ability, who are willing to spend hours in discussing the advisability of spending a few thousand dollars on some public improvement or some imaginary cruelty to some dumb animals. I trust I have aroused a feeling in their breasts if they are not favorable to Federal health legislation they will spend time in urging on further health and sanitary measures at home. I have now drawn attention to this important subject, from comparisons made between Canada and our mother land, as to what may be done by proper legislation. I have no doubt there will be exceptions taken, perhaps not with the statements and comparisons I have made, but with the propositions I am about to make to carry out such legislation towards educating people on health matters. The first objection taken, no doubt, will be the great expense necessarily incurred in putting sanitary legislation into force, and this will be the more apparent at the present time when we are all talking economy, although we are not on all occasions practising it. But, if I can show that the money spent will be returned to the people tenfold, the objection should be waived. I now draw attention to the financial aspect of the case. I have shown pretty clearly that there were 20,000 deaths in Canada which could have been prevented; take three-fourths of this number, and say 15,000 deaths recorded, and let us consider what financial loss to the country these deaths represent. First, let us consider the expense on the people from attendance, doctor's bills, &c. It has been estimated by our best aid and relief societies that there are twenty cases of severe sickness for every case of death. That means for 15,000 deaths, 300,000 cases of sickness. What must have been the suffering endured during those 300,000 cases of sickness, to say nothing of the poverty and crime which must necessarily have followed. It has been estimated by the best sanitarians that every case of sickness costs \$40. Accordingly, 300,000 cases of sickness, costing \$40 each, would represent \$12,000,000 loss to the people of Canada. Let us go a little further, taking our information from our aid and relief societies. It is computed that each case of sickness lasts twenty days; the total sickness would, therefore, represent 6,000,000 days. Taking the time lost by the sick, and those waiting on them, at \$2 per day, there is a loss of \$12,000,000 or more, or a total loss of \$24,000,000 yearly. There is not only this direct loss, but there is an indirect loss also, for, during the time of sickness, nothing is added to the wealth of our country. There is also to be added another indirect loss from those who have died. It is estimated that each additional emigrant is worth \$1,000 to the country, and that of the 15,000 unnecessary deaths 60 per cent.

die between birth and 15 years of age and above 50, leaving 40 per cent. to die between the ages of 15 and 50, making 6,000. Some may contend that \$1,000 is too much to place on a man's life, but the Bible says, would not a man give all that he had got for his life, and the unnecessary deaths, computed at that rate, would represent \$6,000,000. A second objection, perhaps, which will be raised, is that all health teaching should be left in the hands of physicians. I will admit that it is partly the duty of the physician to assist in carrying out wise legislation on health matters, but his chief duty is to stand between his patient and the grave; and I am proud to say that there is no class of men more willing and ready to take their lives in their hands in going to the bedsides of their patients, and facing the most malignant and fatal diseases, than gentlemen of the medical profession. But, Sir, they are also ready and willing to assist in any efforts that may be made for the prevention, as well as for the cure of disease. There are some who believe that death and sickness will come; it matters not what we do, but that is a mistaken idea. This world is run by fixed laws, and when we violate these laws, we suffer the consequences. The object of the legislation such I now suggest, is to educate our people how to observe these laws, and so to escape the consequence of their non-observance. A third objection which doubtless will be raised, and which will admit of a good deal of discussion, is, "That all health matters and sanitary regulations should be left in the hands of the Provincial or Local Governments." I do not wish it to be understood that I am opposed to each Province having a board of health or some forms of health legislation; far from it. I would be pleased to know that each had such a board and that their laws were strictly enforced. I am satisfied that the board of health in the Province of Ontario is doing a great deal of good, and would do very much more if the people were educated on health matters and the cause of disease. Disease knows no provincial or municipal lines. Therefore, health teaching must necessarily fall upon the Federal Government. I believe it is just as essential to have a Federal head or Department of Health as it is to have a Department of Agriculture, or a Department of Inland Revenue, or even a Postmaster General. Each Province now has a Minister of Agriculture or a similar office; still, they do not interfere with our Federal Minister of Agriculture. Each has its particular functions to perform. The Department of Health could be carried on similar to the Department of Agriculture. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has had established, since he has occupied his office, a Central or Experimental Farm, with several branch farms, in the different Provinces. The object of these farms is to make investigations, so as to instruct the farmers as to the best and most improved system of farming; also the most reliable seeds to sow, so as to produce to the farmers the greatest rewards for their labors; also to indicate the best animals to raise and the best fruits to grow, that farming may be made as profitable as possible. And, Sir, while doing this, is it not just as desirable that there should be a department where useful knowledge could be gathered, useful experiments made, and the knowledge so gained disseminated amongst the people, as to the best modes of preventing disease? During last Ses-

sion, Prof. Saunders, of the Experimental Farm, informed the Committee on Agriculture that he had imported a variety of wheat from Russia, which he had been experimenting on, and that he believed it was equal in quality to any which we had, and would ripen ten or twelve days earlier, so that it would escape the early frosts of the great wheat-growing districts of the West and North-West. If such proves to be the case it will be worth millions upon millions of dollars to Canada, and the Experimental Farm should be heralded as one of the grandest undertakings the Government has achieved since Confederation. Now, Sir, if we had a similar place where experiments could be made as to the cause and origin of disease, and especially to that dreaded disease tuberculosis, which is on the rapid increase in our country (more having died from it in Canada last year than from any one other disease). It is now becoming an important question, and engaging the attention of the physicians and scientists of the world, whether it is communicable from the domestic animals to man. I believe, to-day, the medical men are about equally divided upon the matter. Now, Sir, by having a place for experimenting ourselves, and collecting the observations of others, it could soon be studied out, whether this disease was so communicable or not, and if it is found to be so, without a doubt it would be the duty of this Parliament to take steps to eradicate the disease from our domestic animals. By so doing they would confer a greater boon on the people of Canada than the introduction of any kind of grain or fruit into this country. Almost every civilised country in the world, except Canada, has some central organisation to look after the public health. In England they have their central local government board, presided over by a president, who in both of the Hon. E. Gladstone's Governments had a seat in the Cabinet. Prussia, Russia, and Austria have their Imperial boards of health. France has a central or federal board, and since it was organised the death rate has diminished in as great, if not greater ratio than in England. In our neighboring Republic they have established at Washington a National board of health, and almost every State has its State board of health. Florida was an exception, and I have no doubt all of you will remember the dreadful scourge of yellow fever they had there two years ago. The Governor of the State was compelled to call the Legislature together in special session to consider measures for the protection of the public health; and at that time they established a State board of health. It will, for long years to come, be a matter of regret to the people of Florida that, from inexcusable supineness and lethargy, her Legislature did not listen to the warnings of danger, given previous to the year 1888, by her physicians and sanitarians. Had Florida been ready to have availed herself of this, with the assistance of the Federal Government, millions of dollars and thousands of lives might have been saved to the State. Let us take warning from Florida, and not let our young and prosperous Dominion be caught in a similar position if an epidemic should approach our shores. Let us be prepared to meet it at every point. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me draw your attention to what would necessarily come under this department, namely: All health matters, such as collecting mortuary, natal

and nuptial statistics, reports on prevailing diseases, quarantine, adulteration of food and diseases of domestic animals. In connection with this department there would be required an efficiently equipped laboratory for the investigation as to the cause and origin of disease, and the knowledge gained from those sources communicated to the people monthly, quarterly and yearly. Now, Sir, I think if you will consider the matter carefully, you will agree with me that these subjects would more properly come within the province of the Federal Government than of the Provincial. I must give credit to the Dominion Government for the systematic manner in which they have already carried on the work of collecting mortuary statistics and statistics of prevailing diseases, and sending out monthly bulletins of those statistics; and I am pleased to know that the statistician of the Government, who is making preparations for the taking of the census of 1891, is now preparing books to be sent out to medical men, in which they will be asked to keep a correct record of the deaths of people whom they attend, the causes of death, the cases of sickness, and the length of time those cases have lasted. If this intention is carried out successfully, we shall have some very valuable statistics relating to the causes of sickness and death among our people. Now, in establishing the health department I propose, the subject of the adulteration of food, which is now under the control of the Department of Inland Revenue, and the subject of quarantine, which is now in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, might be taken from those Departments and put under the control of the new Department. Then there should be established in connection with it an efficient laboratory for the investigation of the causes and origin of diseases. Such a laboratory would collect cases from one end of the Dominion to the other, and yet could be carried on at very little more cost than a laboratory for one Province would cost. Now, I have detained the House longer than I intended. I thought, when I rose to my feet, that I would suggest a plan as to how such health legislation could be carried out; but, on giving the matter a second thought, which you know is always best, I have concluded not to. I will be satisfied if I have awakened a feeling on this important subject in the minds of a majority of those present. I have no doubt that the Ministry of the day will devise a plan which will be acceptable to the House and the people of Canada; for I have unbounded faith in our grand old chieftain, who stood foremost amongst our statesmen in bringing about Confederation, and who has so successfully steered the ship of state for so many years. If he takes the matter in hand, I have no doubt but that he will bring forward a scheme by which a federal system of health and sanitary regulations may be established, thereby saving the lives of thousands of our people yearly. Such an achievement would redound to his credit in years to come as great, if not greater, than some of the most important undertakings he has started and lived to see accomplished. I, therefore, move this resolution, seconded by General Laurier.

General LAURIE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear from the hon. gentleman who brought forward this resolution, that he is inclined, to a certain extent, to modify it, as I certainly should not read it as it

Mr. ROOME.

appears on the paper. I did not intend to support a motion that a fresh department should be created for this purpose. On the contrary, for reasons which I will submit to the House, I think it most desirable that the work suggested by the hon. member should be carried on under the Department of Agriculture. It may be considered somewhat surprising that I, as a non-professional man, should move in this matter, but it will be in the recollection of some hon. members of this House that, last year and the year before, I acted as chairman of a Committee working under the Select Committee on Agriculture and Immigration, to enquire into the communicability of disease from cattle to man and from man to cattle. That Committee, with a view of obtaining as much information as possible, sent out 1,480 sets of questions to medical gentlemen practising in this Dominion, from whom we received 215 replies. Analysing those replies, we ascertained that those medical men believed:

"That from 10 to 50 per cent. of cases of disease and premature death might be prevented by judicious sanitary measures; that consumption is contagious and infectious, and isolation would assist in prevention, but that the chief preventable causes of disease are contagion, impure air and water, unhealthy diet, decaying animal and vegetable matter, bad drainage, general want of cleanliness, and sudden changes of temperature, and the ordinary measures are suggested as palliatives. * * * A few express the opinion that tuberculosis may be transmitted to the human system, as well as diphtheria, by the medium of impure milk and meat; but few have met with actual cases in their own experience of diseases being so communicated. They consider tuberculosis in domestic animals is produced by improper feeding and unhealthy surroundings."

The Committee, in making their report, appended this recommendation:

"We are led further to the belief that our enquiries into the subject entrusted to us would have been much facilitated, and productive of a much greater amount of information, if a system of observing and recording vital statistics were established in the Dominion, and thus preventive and precautionary measures against contagion in any form would be better appreciated and more satisfactorily carried out."

Now, Sir, I do not intend to detain the House by reading statistics or extracts from blue-books at any length. I simply wish, in as few words as possible, to give my views on this subject. It may be, as the hon. member has stated, that the duty of looking after the health of the people belongs more to the Provincial Legislatures than to this Parliament. But the duty of bringing immigration into the country, in order to increase our population, has been largely devolved upon this Parliament, and if it is worth our while to bring people here, surely it is worth our while to keep them alive when we have got them; and, therefore, to that extent, I think this duty is fairly and justly imposed on the Federal Parliament. The hon. mover of the resolution has quoted statistics at considerable length, showing how much the health of people in towns and cities, and even in larger areas, in the countries of the Old World, has been improved by the study of hygiene—the study of preserving health rather than that of simply curing disease. He has shown how many unnecessary deaths have taken place in other parts of the world, and how many he believes have taken place in Canada, which might have been prevented had we some proper system of hygiene. But without statistics it is impossible for us to obtain information as to what our people die from, and as to

what steps should be taken to keep them alive. Last year I went across the Atlantic, in the hope of being able to attend the medical congress held in Paris at the end of July last, at which, among other subjects, that of the communicability of disease from cattle to man was to be considered; but, unfortunately, I was detained by some foolish Customs officers in London, and was unable to get there in time. I obtained, however, a report of the proceedings. One of the matters brought before the congress was the report of the French Government Commission of 1888, which ascertained from medical statistics that one-third of all the deaths in France resulted from that fatal disease, tuberculosis. They came to the conclusion almost unanimously that tuberculosis came under the head of preventable diseases, and was most largely communicated by animals to man in some form of food, as in meat and milk, as well as otherwise by bacilli, and was also communicated from man to man. The death statistics of Paris for 1884 showed that out of 56,970 deaths that took place in that city in that year, over 15,000 were due to that disease. Therefore, as the hon. gentleman has shown how many deaths have been already prevented by the study of hygiene and the precautionary system established in France, it might be shown that if that disease had been more fully studied, a large proportion of those 15,000 people might have been preserved from it, and would probably have been living for years afterwards. That question to which I am confining my attention more particularly, because the mover did not attend to that question so much, the communicability of disease from animal to man, is a matter which it is necessary further to investigate. It is necessary that we should obtain this information from statistics. The belief of medical men now is, that disease can be communicated from an animal to a man, but we want to have the facts, and those facts can be obtained only by a record ranging over a number of years. It is certain that there is not so much tuberculosis in this Dominion as exists in other parts of the world, but there is too much of it. We found last year, that cattle suffering from tuberculosis had been imported into this country, and the animals had to be slaughtered. While I was in England, I called on the Secretary of the Royal Agricultural Society, who asked me to see Sir Jacob Wilson, the executive officer of the society, who was knighted last year because of the active part he has taken in connection with the Royal Agricultural Society's exhibitions and his general interest in the subject. I did not see him personally, but he writes me:

"The subject (that is, of tuberculosis) is daily growing in importance in this country, and representations are, I believe, about to be made to the Agricultural Department of this Government, from various towns, urging the necessity for legislation thereon. Whether Her Majesty's Government consider the question sufficiently ripe for legislation, I know not, but it appears to me that, sooner or later, the question must come under their serious consideration. I think it highly desirable that you should have a few minutes' conversation with Professor Brown, the chief veterinary authority to the Government, upon the subject."

That was signed by Sir Jacob Wilson. I called to see Professor Brown, and I found he was much impressed with the same idea, and, after two or three interviews with him, he drafted a series of proposals to the President of the Board of Agri-

culture, the Right Hon. Henry Chaplin, pointing out that these diseases which were known to be dangerous as being communicable from animals to men should be placed on the schedule, and that those animals which were suffering from them should be slaughtered. I could not see Mr. Chaplin, as he was suffering from influenza, but I saw his secretary. I saw Sir James Caird, and I saw Professor Brown several times. Mr. Chaplin, writing to me, says:

"He is conscious of the great importance of the question, and it is one which will have to receive the careful attention of the Board of Agriculture, when some other matters which are pressing for settlement have been disposed of. Mr. Chaplin is exceedingly obliged for your kind offer of a copy of the report of the sub-committee of the Canadian House of Commons on tuberculosis, which he will most gratefully accept."

I introduce these points now to show that this matter is growing in importance in England, but there is a very serious difficulty in dealing with it in England, which both the Board of Agriculture and the Local Government Board have to face. It is that the Board of Agriculture can only deal with diseases which are communicable between cattle, and the Local Government Board can only deal with diseases in men which are communicable to other men. It is a pity that the two boards should have to deal with these two matters separately when there are so many diseases which are communicable from animals to men. Consequently, while I desire to see action taken to stamp out these fatal diseases, I should be very sorry that the power should be placed in the hands of any other Department than the Department of Agriculture. I think it is vital that the Department of Agriculture should be charged with the collection of statistics in reference to this, and that, having collected statistics, that Department should act upon them, and should have executive authority to stamp out diseases either in animal or in man, which might pass from one to the other or might affect the health of either. I, therefore, think it is desirable, that the Federal Government should have this power under the control of the Department of Agriculture, and should deal with it rather than that it should be left, as has been suggested, to be dealt with by the Provincial Governments alone. I am glad to hear that there is some chance of the establishment of experimental stations to test the communicability of diseases in this Dominion. We have spent a great deal of money on the Experimental Farm, and we have spent it wisely and judiciously, but I am of opinion that there is now necessity to expend some money on experimental stations, in order to endeavor to ascertain the causes and to endeavor to avert the diseases which have afflicted us. I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Mr. PLATT. The full explanation of this subject, which has been given by the mover of the resolution, obviates the necessity of any lengthened remarks from me. The mover of the resolution has brought to the attention of the House, a matter which surpasses in importance many of the subjects which we have had to discuss during this Session or in previous Sessions. I am glad to see that one layman, as he calls himself, has taken an interest in this subject, and expressed his views upon it. I cannot say that I would support the motion as it stands now, but I very heartily endorse the object of the mover. For many years this subject has

been discussed in the Parliament of Canada, and, unfortunately, we have failed to see the increasing interest taken in it which should be taken in it, by the people of this country. Great advancement has been made of late years in sanitary science, and in the knowledge of preventive medicine to such an extent that we may hope that, in the near future, we shall see beneficial results arising from steps taken on the part of the Government in the direction which is aimed at in this motion. The objection which is most likely to be taken, and which has heretofore proved fatal to similar motions, has been the difficulty of dividing the responsibility and the work between the Provincial and the Federal Legislatures. I confess that there is some difficulty on that point, but, so far as the foundation of all sanitary work is concerned, there can be no doubt but that the Dominion Government have it in their power; it is, in fact, their duty to lay the foundations for the collection of such statistics. Indeed that has been recognised by this Parliament, and a Department of Statistics has been organised, and for several years a considerable sum of money has been expended for the collection of what is termed mortuary statistics. I have already intimated, during this present Session, that, in my opinion, we have either done too little or we have been doing too much; we should either move forward from where we are now standing, or we should cease to expend \$10,000 a year for providing mortuary statistics. It is acknowledged on all hands that the basis of all sanitary work throughout the country must of necessity be statistics, and statistics which are incomplete, or imperfect, or incorrect, are of very little use for any sanitary board. I am sorry to say that the opinion prevails, and not without reason, that the mortuary statistics furnished by the Department of Agriculture are not reliable, and cannot be of very much service to any sanitary board. We continue to collect them from a certain definite number of points, but they give us a very inadequate idea of the ravages of diseases throughout the country generally, or of the number of deaths which occur from certain diseases in various localities. Now, I will take the trouble to compare the death rate, and the number of deaths, as announced in the last return of mortuary statistics furnished by the registrar of the Province of Ontario, with those which have been furnished by the Dominion Government, to show the difference between the results arrived at by those two authorities in respect of the same cities. In the city of Toronto, we find, according to the report of the Department of Agriculture, that in 1888 there were 2,498 deaths; whereas, according to the registrar of the Province of Ontario, there were 2,839 deaths. The rate per 1,000, according to the Dominion Government, is only 14·97, and, according to the Ontario authority, it is 20·3. You see that a great discrepancy exists with regard to the city of Toronto. Then, take the city of Hamilton. The Dominion Government reported 823 deaths, and the Ontario Government, 720; rate per 1,000, according to the former, 18·57, and according to the latter 16. For the city of Ottawa the Dominion statistics returned 923 deaths; the Ontario statistics 958, not a great discrepancy. The death rate was 23·9, according to the latter, and 22·51, according to the former. As we go on through the list we find in the smaller towns, where statistics are given by the two separate

Mr. PLATT.

boards, and where both authorities collect their returns from officials of cemeteries, there is very little discrepancy indeed; but in the larger cities where those boards strive to arrive at correct calculation, we find a great discrepancy. This throws distrust upon all the statistics, and shows the necessity of organising a new and better system whereby we may arrive at conclusions that will assist sanitarians much more than the present system aids them. I think there is also a feeling that much more should be done in the way of teaching the public, in the way of sanitary improvements, in the way of providing instruction for the people, and assisting in lessening the deaths from various diseases. As I have already stated, they have found in England and elsewhere, that without statistics of a reliable character, this cannot be done. I will read from the annual report of the Registrar General of England, for 1887, in which he says:

“The Registration Act of England came into force in July, 1837, and was opposed by the clergy and the uneducated masses, and supported by the medical and legal profession, particularly by the former. The Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons issued a circular pledging themselves, and asking all their members to do the same, to give in every instance that might fall under their care, an authentic name of the fatal disease. The immediate benefit of medical knowledge to be derived from this action on their part, was a more accurate knowledge, not only of the comparative prevalence of various mortal diseases as regards the whole of England and Wales, but also of the localities in which they respectively prevail, and the age, sex and condition of life, which each principally affect; but a far greater benefit than any foreseen by these medical authorities has, in reality, been obtained from it, namely, an addition of more than two years to the average span of life of the inhabitants of England and Wales. That such an addition has, however, been made, and that it has been the result of the Registration Act that came into force in 1837, is beyond all doubt. For it is the registration of deaths and of their causes that has made sanitation possible.”

I am glad the mover of this resolution has relieved me from the necessity of going over the statistics with regard to the death rates of England and Canada; I am prepared, however, having gone over the same without his knowledge or consent, to verify the figures he has given to this House. Some very interesting things might be stated with regard to the benefits which might accrue from the establishment of a better health board for this Dominion. Previous speakers have stated that we, in Canada, are somewhat behind other countries. That is evidenced by our comparatively high death rate—not so high as some other countries, but the fact that the death rate in Canada exceeds the death rate of populous England, with her great cities, shows that there is something lacking in our statistical and hygienic arrangements. The mover of this resolution has correctly stated that in the twenty-eight cities and towns from which we have reports, the average death rate last year was 21 per 1,000, while in England it was only 17·4. Upon the same method of calculation we find that if we take the previous year and compare it with the last year reported upon, if the death rate of Canada was reduced to that of England, we would save annually 20,000 lives. To show that very much can be done towards saving valuable lives in this country, we have only to look at the large number of deaths that are caused by what we term preventable or zymotic diseases, which principally affect children; and we find that the death rate of children in this Dominion is

something amazing. The birth rate of this country is not very much behind that of other countries of a similar population. There are over 150,000 children born in Canada every year—over 400 every day in the year. Taking the whole of the twenty-eight cities reported upon last year, we find there were 18,355 deaths reported, of which 9,645 were under the age of five years, proving conclusively that such diseases as attack children, and which in almost every instance are zymotic or preventable diseases, were the causes of death, giving the very best argument, indeed, for the establishment of a sanitary or hygienic bureau of some kind. The general impression, of course, is that there are few diseases which it would pay the people to look after very carefully. For years the whole community has been terribly frightened of small-pox, while other diseases, which have every year carried off thousands and tens of thousands, have been considered as of small importance. Taking the public records, it appears that not a single death from small-pox was reported last year, while there were from scarlet-fever, 51; measles, 140; typhus, 381; diphtheria, 1,182; or 1,758 deaths from these four preventable diseases in a population in these twenty-eight cities of 700,000. If the deaths were in proportion throughout the rest of Canada, there were 14,000 deaths during the year from those four preventable diseases. A very interesting document came into my hands some time ago prepared by an English authority, entitled "Loss of Wealth by Loss of Health," and if hon. members were to examine the pamphlet carefully they would come to the same conclusion as that reached by the distinguished author of the pamphlet, and they would be of the opinion that we would not be losing money, but saving money, if we expended a much larger sum on a hygienic laboratory in this country. Taking England, the writer shows that the average of sickness among workmen is two and a-half weeks per year. Taking England and Wales, he places the number of working-class families at 4,259,000, the bread-winners of which earn daily wages amounting to £8,819; the loss from sickness, according to this computation, reaches £13,307,000 per annum, or £1,000,000 per day of sickness for these people. Manchester offers a very striking example of what may be done towards protecting the people against disease and saving vast sums on this account. That city has a working population of 92,500, which earn weekly wages of £115,700; therefore the loss to the working families amounts to £20,000 per day, for each day of sickness *plus* the loss to the employers, and so forth. The cost of the Health Department of Manchester for last year was £87,000 for hospitals, disinfection, drainage, sewerage, and so forth. The saving of life effected is estimated by the best statisticians at 2,301 lives, one thousand of these being between twenty and seventy years of age. The total saving was £300,000, obtained at an expenditure of £87,000. The mover of the resolution refrained from expressing an opinion as to the manner in which we should proceed in order to reach the result at which we wish to arrive. I have not prepared any scheme, and I do not know what scheme may present itself to the minds of the Ministers, if they look favorably on this proposition, but that will be a matter for them to consider and report on at an early date, I hope. Of course, as I have already

intimated, I believe it to be the duty of the Government to establish on a firm basis a Department for the collection of such statistics as sanitarians wish to use; mortuary statistics of themselves are not sufficient, we want vital statistics, we want reports of births and marriages, of epidemics and of the ravages of preventable diseases throughout the country, and then we will have a foundation upon which the Provincial authorities may act. I have no doubt whatever that this Government has full authority to institute measures to educate the people on this subject. There is nothing to prevent the Dominion Government spending a large sum in the distribution of weekly or monthly bulletins and reports relating to epidemic diseases throughout the country, and the distribution of literature teaching the people the various methods by which these diseases may be prevented, and also literature relating to the establishment of a hygienic laboratory and bacteriological laboratory for the investigation of these diseases; and in that way they can do a very large amount of work which is now attempted to be done by the Provincial authorities. So far as coercion and the enforcement of different measures are concerned, I grant that this rests with the municipalities, acting under their Provincial Legislature. That portion of the work can safely be left to them, but that is no reason why this Parliament and this Government, acting in concert with the Local Legislatures, and the municipalities acting, in turn, with the Legislatures, cannot very largely increase the efficiency of the regulations now existing in this country. It has been said that this question is always lightly considered by Parliament. I am sorry to say that, in the past, this has been the case; but I trust the time has gone by when the Parliament of Canada will treat lightly such an important question as that now under discussion. In every Province, and in this Dominion Parliament, we find the House almost unanimously adopting measures to prevent death from contagious disease in animals when an outbreak occurs, and this House should not be more negligent in undertaking similar measures when the human family is concerned; and we are well aware that if an epidemic among cattle occurs in any district, an officer is at once despatched to ascertain the cause and, if necessary, to slaughter the infected animals, and, in fact, to take such steps as are necessary to prevent the spread of the disease. We know that disease increases in geometrical proportion; that one case of small-pox brings two, and so on. Even simple isolation, if properly carried out by Parliament and enforced by the municipalities, would, in almost every instance, cut short the ravages of any of the fatal epidemics which have carried off thousands and tens of thousands in this country. I am heartily in accord with the object aimed at by the mover of this resolution, and I hope that the Government, although they may not see fit to grant the motion as now proposed, will take the subject into consideration, and that in future Sessions we will see an increasing interest taken in this very important subject.

Mr. SPROULE. The only excuse I have to offer to the House for occupying its time in discussing this question, is the importance of it. An able writer once said that health is the *summum bonum*, and that, when lost, no consideration is too great or

any reward too high for its restoration. In all well ordered civilised countries where the Government of the state is discharging its duty to the people, one of those important duties is to guard the public health. Governments are said to be entrusted with the protection of the life and property of the people. It is not simply that life is to be protected from the hands of the assassin, but it is likewise to be protected from those lurking diseases which prevail in different parts of the country, and which carry off their victims by thousands. I recognise that it is as much the duty of the state to protect life from these diseases as it is from the dagger of the assassin. England considered this question over fifty years ago, and, owing to its importance, entered upon legislation to remedy the evils and prevent these diseases. From that time to the present over fifty Acts of Parliament have been passed in the direction of establishing health bureaus or hygienic bureaus for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of the people or preventing the spread of disease. It is said to be the duty of the physician to prevent death when presented in the shape of disease, but even before the physician is called in, remedies may be adopted that may prevent the imbibition of disease by the human being, and prevent not only death but sickness and suffering, and the loss of money which follows. England has been legislating on this question for a great many years, and the result has been that she has reduced her rate of mortality something like 23 per cent. That human life in England, in 1842, the average of it was only twenty-two years; it is, to-day, a little over twenty-seven years. England has reduced the mortality of her population about 23 per cent. France has dealt with the same subject in her great hygienic institutions, and the result has been a reduced mortality of over 17 per cent. Germany has dealt with the subject in a very elaborate and comprehensive way, and the satisfactory result has been obtained of reducing her mortality 22 per cent. In Switzerland a similar result has followed. Returning to the continent of America, we find that the Republic to the south of us has been establishing State boards of health in connection with her Federal Hygienic Institute, and in the State of Michigan the mortality, in twenty-five years, has been reduced 17 per cent.; in Massachusetts, 23 per cent., and in the different other States the reduction has been in proportion to the care and attention given to this important subject. The experience of all other countries, therefore, proves to us that the adoption of a broad sanitary system has been beneficial, and is it not time that we, in Canada, should consider the matter? It is true that we have Provincial Boards of Health doing an admirable work; but in conjunction with them, I think we should have a National Health institution, which would direct these hygienic investigations, calculated to prevent, in many localities, the spread of diseases which result from preventable causes. This Government assumes part of that work, to-day, in the collection of its statistics, but we believe that this work should be extended, and that we should not only collect such statistics as have been, so far, obtained by the Minister of Agriculture, but that we should have reports from the various Provincial Boards of Health, and embody these reports in our own—not only reports of vital statistics, but reports of mortuary statistics, also the statistics

Mr. SPROULE.

of births, marriages, and deaths, and reports in connection with these zymotic diseases which are so destructive, not only in towns and cities, but in rural localities as well. The Federal Government now goes a little further than this statistical work, and we have a Department for the purpose of analysing adulterated food. That is really done for the purpose of preventing disease. Therefore, at present, this Government are attending to two branches of this important work, although not to such an extent as we believe they ought to. If, under the Federal system, we are entitled to attend to certain branches of the subject, why should we not go a little further and attend to those which are equally, if not more, injurious to health, than the adulteration of food? It appears to me that it would not be interfering with the rights of the Provinces to do so. Even, though it might be in some way an interference with Provincial rights, I think that some understanding might be arrived at between the Provinces and the Dominion so that they could co-operate with each other in doing this work much more efficiently than it is done to-day. Our sanitary legislation is yet in its infancy; but, notwithstanding that, I believe that great good has been already accomplished. We believe that at least one-fourth of the deaths which take place in the country might be prevented if we attended to this matter on a larger scale, and sought the co-operation of the medical men of the country. If we can prevent one death out of every four which takes place now, it means, as my hon. friend said, a saving of 20,000 lives to the state every year. If we could under such a system, and by a judicious arrangement, as has been suggested by my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Roome) and from Shelburne (General Laurie), prevent 20,000 deaths in a year, how much better would it be for the state than the importation of 20,000 immigrants? Those now living in our country, acquainted with its ways and manners and customs, are schooled in all which enables them to add prosperity to the state, and to make life a success in the Dominion of Canada. I, therefore, say that the saving of these lives would be of much more value than the importation of the same number of individuals from any country. In addition to that we would prevent a great amount of human suffering, and save to the state the large number of days' labor which is lost every year, by reason of the sickness which results from preventable diseases. If eminent physicians be correct who have cited statistics to prove that for every death in the country, about twenty days' sickness is caused, then we can understand the amount of labor lost on account of sickness. If we could prevent the loss of this labor to the state of which I have spoken, it would be a saving to the state of over twenty million dollars annually, and if we spent five million dollars in the perfection of this hygienic system, I am sure we would be doing all that the country would expect from us at present, and there would still be an annual gain to the state of at least fifteen millions of dollars. Such an institution as I have referred to would give us a much more efficient power to combat these diseases which are destroying human life. If our efforts in this direction bore the same fruits as they have in other countries, there would be prevented a large amount of that suffering which prematurely breaks down the human system.

There is no doubt that every serious case of sickness tends to make life shorter to the patient, and even after recovery the system is not so strong as before to resist the ravages of disease. How important, then, is it not, that the state should establish some hygienic board of health, or some institution which would co-operate with the local boards of health in combatting, as far as possible, these serious diseases which are so prevalent to-day. It is a fact, which every medical man in this House will admit, that diphtheria, one of the most prevalent and destructive diseases we have in the Dominion of Canada, might be reduced 50 per cent. if only proper precautions were taken to prevent its spread, and to stamp it out in any locality where it may become prevalent. If we go still further, as might be done under the hygienic board which we propose, and investigate the local causes which produced that disease, it would mean the analysis of the drinking water, and an enquiry into the local conditions which generated the disease. It would also mean, perhaps, as the hon. member suggested, the establishment of a bacteriological institute here, which would investigate the causes of these zymotic diseases, and the best means for their prevention and cure. I believe it to be a fact that, in every locality where we have a competent board of health, we have not one case of diphtheria, where we had three or four some ten years ago. That change has been brought about very largely by the perfecting of these local boards of health and by compelling the local municipalities, as soon as any epidemic disease shows itself in a locality, to report it to the local board of health, and have it properly attended to by medical men. But we have not a collection of such statistics, showing where the diseases are most prevalent, what the causes are, how they might be prevented, and what might be done to stamp out any disease as soon as it makes its appearance. That might be done with regard to small-pox, scarlet fever, diphtheria, whooping cough, and other epidemic diseases which sweep over the country with such destructive effects. I think the Federal Government should take some action in this matter. I think they have power, under the British North America Act, to do so; and if they have not the requisite power, I think it is high time that steps should be taken to have the constitution so amended as to give them power to co-operate with the Provincial Governments for the purpose of elaborating some hygienic organisation to take charge of this work and effectually carry it out. I think that such a system would effect most important results to the state, that it would save more money than any one has any idea of, more suffering than perhaps one-fourth of the medical men in this country could save, more lives every year than we are bringing in by immigration, and more wealth than would pay a very large share of our national debt.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the importance of this subject cannot well be over-estimated; and if there were any doubts as to that, the able and impressive speech of my hon. friend who moved this resolution, supported, as he has been, by the remarks made by other hon. gentlemen, would convince us that it is a subject which should not be overlooked. It has not been overlooked, however, by the Dominion Parliament;

and as far as the Government of the Dominion have been able to act under the powers given to them by the British North America Act, very substantial steps have been taken for the purpose of ascertaining the best methods of preventing the spread of disease. The mortuary statistics which have been collected have been very full—as full as, under the circumstances, could well be obtained. When we consider that the reports have been made in a great degree, if not altogether, gratuitously, we must admit that considerable progress has been made. The resolution asks that the Federal Government should establish a health department with a responsible head. Well, we have a health department in the Department of Agriculture, and it would not advance the purpose of the resolution at all to establish a separate department, giving another member of Parliament the title of Minister of Health. The Minister of Agriculture, in the first place, is given charge of the census and statistics, and also of quarantine; and the remarks of the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) show the importance of having these subjects under one head. He has pointed out that in England there are two departments, one looking after the diseases of men, and the other looking after the diseases of animals; but, as it is now ascertained beyond a doubt that diseases are communicable from man to animals, and from animals to man, it is of great importance that the whole subject of health should be under one head. One of the difficulties to be encountered in this matter arises from the divided authority of the Federal Parliament and that of the different Provinces. I think, if I remember aright, that before 1872 there were certain statutory powers given to the Federal Government on this subject; but it was found, from the nature of the division of powers, that the officers who could be best utilised for the purpose of collecting mortuary statistics, and who could really aid most effectually in the stopping of the spread of diseases, were officers of the Provincial Governments—so much so, that Parliament repealed the clauses giving those special powers to the Federal Government. The same reason which induced Parliament then to throw the responsibility principally upon the Provincial authorities exists at this moment. This resolution specifies that, besides preventing the spread of disease and collecting mortuary statistics, the proposed department should educate the people as far as possible in all sanitary matters. Now, when you consider that all county and municipal officers, and the whole educational system of the country are under the jurisdiction of the different Provincial Governments, you will see that in the employés of those Governments are to be found the best men and means for collecting information, for assisting in preventing the spread of disease, and for educating people in sanitary matters. In each of the Provinces, there is to be found an enormous body of educated men in the schoolmasters. Those men would, as a matter of course, be available, and would be only too glad, I have no doubt, to aid in this important and humane object. The Federal Government, on the other hand, have spread throughout the country only a few Custom house officers, excisemen, and such officers, and if the responsibility of attending to this subject were thrown upon the Federal Government only, it would be absolutely necessary to appoint

a staff of special health officers at an enormous expense, who would not be able to do the work so well as the Provincial Governments with their extensive machinery. It has occurred to me, after listening to the very able speeches of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that the best plan would be—and I would suggest it to my hon. friend before asking him to withdraw his resolution, after having fully impressed Parliament with the subject—to have a convention, to which the Federal Government would ask the various Provincial Governments to send representatives, for the purpose of endeavoring to frame some united plan for exercising the various powers conferred upon them by the Constitution in such a manner that they could unite in one system and carry it out as efficiently and inexpensively as possible. It has occurred to me only since I have heard this discussion, that the general feeling of the House is that that suggestion could well be carried out, and we might combine the Provincial and the Federal Governments in the adoption of some united system in order to carry out this great object as efficiently and as inexpensively as possible. I again say that I think we owe a debt of gratitude to my hon. friend (Mr. Roome) for bringing up this subject, and I think every member, no matter on which side of the House he may be, will agree with me that it has been well and impressively placed before the House, and in such a manner that we cannot ignore it. I now ask my hon. friend to be satisfied with the progress the subject has made in the House, and to agree that his motion should be withdrawn.

Mr. LAURIER. I can agree with almost every word which has been spoken by the Prime Minister on this subject, and I must say that I am pleased to see that he is more and more coming to the true doctrine of Provincial rights. As time goes on, I am glad to see that he is compelled to abandon the heresy on which he tried to govern the country for so many years past. He has now struck the true key on which this country should be governed. I am not, however, prepared to agree to his suggestion that a convention should be held respecting the different boards of health to consider this question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; what I suggested was that the different Governments might agree to send representatives.

Mr. LAURIER. I would not, perhaps, agree even to that. The subject is a new one, and is one which should enlist the attention of every man in this country. The House must be gratified at the way in which it has been dealt with by all the gentlemen who have spoken on the subject, but there is sufficient legislative power in each of the Provinces to deal with it, and it is now engaging the attention of all the Local Governments. I do not say that the suggestion may not be acted upon at another period, but at present I do not think there is anything more to do than to accept the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman, to let the matter drop, and to rely upon the legislative powers of the different Provinces to deal with the subject.

Mr. ROOME. After having listened to the suggestions of the First Minister, of course I propose to withdraw the motion. I do not altogether agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman who

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

last spoke. My idea of making a central board was based on the fact that epidemic diseases do not know any provincial lines. I made a comparison in reference to Hull, which is close to the city, and showed that there was no possibility of preventing disease from crossing to Ottawa, though they are in different Provinces. I think it is quite as desirable to have a health centre as to have a central agricultural institution. However, I will adopt the suggestion of the First Minister, that a committee should be selected from all the Provinces to deal with this matter, and on those conditions I withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

ST. EDOUARD MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. RINFRET (Translation) moved for :

Copies of all petitions, correspondence, &c., asking for a daily mail service for the parish of St. Edouard (post office, "River Bois Clair"), in the county of Lotbinière. He said: In bringing this motion before the House, I wish to call the attention of the Government to the fact that the parish of St. Edouard, in the county of Lotbinière, a very important parish, with a rather large population, is served with mail only twice a week, which is a great inconvenience to the business men of that locality. During last Session I received from the rector of that parish a letter complaining about the great inconvenience resulting from the receiving of mails only twice a week, and suggesting a new mode. Here is what he proposed: The parish of St. Edouard is situated behind the parishes of Ste. Croix and Lotbinière, at about half way between the two post offices.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation.) At what distance?

Mr. RINFRET (Translation.) About six miles. The mail service is carried out between the parish of Lotbinière and that of Ste. Croix, calling at the post office of Point Platon, a distance of about twelve miles. He proposes that the mail which, from Quebec, passes through Point Platon on its trip from Ste. Croix to Lotbinière, should go back by the parish of St. Edouard on its trip from Lotbinière to Ste. Croix. The whole distance would be about fourteen miles. Of course, the carrying of the mails through St. Edouard, the route being two miles longer, would cost a little more with respect to the courier employed by the Government; but, on the other hand, the Government would not have to pay for the present bi-weekly service, so that I think it would be a saving, and the mail service would be a great deal more convenient for the parish of St. Edouard. I do not know to what extent this plan is practicable, but what I should ask now of the Postmaster General would be to send the inspector there, in order that he might see himself whether the plan would be practicable and of benefit to the public. I hope that the inspector will reach the same conclusion as the rector of St. Edouard, that is to say, that by following the route I have pointed out, he will be able to make the service more convenient for all parties concerned.

Mr. HAGGART. Rivière Bois Clair is now served with mails tri-weekly from Lotbinière. The cost of the service is \$78 per annum; the length of the route is six miles. The revenue of

Rivière Bois Clair for year ending 30th June, 1889, was \$129.50. To make the service over the present route daily would cost about \$150, or \$72 more than is paid at present. It is proposed, as an alternative scheme, that the present service be done away with, and that Rivière Bois Clair be served by the courier on the daily route between Leclercville and Ste. Croix. The plan is, that the courier shall visit this office instead of Point Platon on his trip east, and shall call at Point Platon on his trip west only. This arrangement would effect a saving of \$28 to the Department, as the courier on the Leclercville and Ste. Croix route would be entitled to \$50 for his additional travel. But the scheme is open to strong objections. The route between Leclercville and Ste. Croix is one of the links connecting Three Rivers with Lévis, ninety-two miles away, and it is of the utmost importance that all the connections should be maintained. As these connections are sharp, and the unavoidable delays numerous, it is pointed out that to add even one and a-half miles to the length of one of the routes is to expose the service to serious prejudice. There is also an objection made by the Hon. Mr. Joly to this scheme, on the ground that Point Platon, which was established at his instance, and maintained mainly for the benefit of his family, would thereby lose the direct connection which it now has with Montreal.

Motion agreed to.

THE LATE MR. JUSTICE SMITH, N.S.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) moved for :

Return of all correspondence between the Minister of Justice and the late Mr. Justice Smith, of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, relating to his application for leave of absence on account of ill-health.

He said: My object in bringing this motion before the House, is to show the manner in which the judicial patronage of the Government is exercised in Nova Scotia by the present Administration. If this were the first case that is recorded in recent years, perhaps it might have been passed over without such a strict investigation as I think it now demands at our hands. It will be remembered, that when the late lamented Judge Rigby died, the vacancy on the bench of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia was left open for a long time, and it was left open with the object of providing for political exigencies which might arise in that Province. It went on—I am speaking from memory now—somewhere about nine months, I should say, when the political exigency arose in consequence of the return to this country of the present High Commissioner who required a seat in this House. It was well known, and no secret was made of it in Nova Scotia, that the present Mr. Justice Townshend, then a member of this House, had made application for the position on the bench of the Supreme Court, and it was well known that the hon. Minister of Justice had refused that application on the grounds that Mr. Justice Townshend, in his judgment, was not altogether the person he desired to appoint. It was known, also, that Mr. Justice Graham, lately appointed to the Supreme Court, was an applicant at that time, and was preferred to Mr. Justice Townshend in that application. Now, I do not mean to say, from any knowledge I have—I would be sorry to make any insinuations—that Mr.

Townshend was not qualified for the position which he now occupies on the Supreme Court bench, but I am merely repeating what was commonly known among the profession in Halifax, that his application had been refused for a long time by the Minister of Justice. In that case it must be apparent to every one who hears me that this position was kept open for that long time in order to provide for political necessities which might arise, and under the circumstances did arise, as I have related. Last October Mr. Justice Smith made application to the Minister of Justice for six months' leave of absence. Mr. Justice Smith had just recovered from a very severe attack of jaundice, and about the time of his recovery he met with a very severe family affliction, which in his then weak condition, completely unnerved him, and he asked for six months' leave of absence on account of ill-health, stating in his application that if, on his return, his health was not improved, he would tender his resignation. An answer was sent from the Minister of Justice declining to grant him the required leave of absence. It has been usual, I think, as all legal gentlemen are aware, that when a judge makes application for leave of absence, one of two courses is generally followed—either to present the application to the judges, through the Lieutenant Governor of the Province, enquiring whether the judges can conduct the business of the courts during his absence, or to grant the leave of absence with the condition that he must make arrangements satisfactory to the remaining judges of the Supreme Court. Neither of those courses, I am sorry to say, was adopted in reference to Mr. Justice Smith. An answer was sent him declining the request for reasons which I will be able to give to this House. The reasons which the Minister of Justice, in this letter, assigned to Judge Smith, were simply these :

“ OTTAWA, 31st October.

“ HON. MR. JUSTICE SMITH :

“ DEAR SIR,—I received yesterday your letter requesting leave of absence for six months. I regret much the state of health which induces this request, the more so as I do not at present see my way to make the recommendation which you desire. Mr. Justice Graham will be unable to hear most of the cases which will come before the courts at the winter term, which is now approaching, and which will last probably until spring. The health of Mr. Justice Macdonald, I regret to learn, is in so uncertain a state that his ability to attend during much of the term, at a distance from his home, is doubtful. The leave which you ask would place nearly the whole work of the term on the remaining four judges who would be required to sit from day to day for several months. This would be impracticable, and even if it were practicable, nearly all the cases argued would have to wait over for judgment, and no judge would be available for the Chamber work or criminal terms.”

Now, I wish to draw the attention of the House to this fact, that the Minister of Justice laid down the proposition here, that it was impossible for him to grant leave of absence to Mr. Justice Smith, on the ground that the court would not be properly constituted, that is to say, Mr. Justice Macdonald being indisposed, and Mr. Justice Graham, appointed a short time before that, being disqualified from taking part in much of the business going on in consequence of having been engaged professionally in those cases before they reached the court. The Minister says :

“ Nearly all the cases argued would have to wait over for judgment, and no judge would be available for the Chamber work or criminal terms.”

Now, it would appear that the Minister of Justice was willing that the country should be saddled with a pension to Mr. Justice Smith, provided he could get the appointment at that time, and he points out to him the grounds on which he thought it was necessary to have the court properly constituted. Mr. Justice Smith, writing after the death of Mr. Justice James, addressed a telegram to the Minister of Justice in these terms:

"Since the death of Judge James am only judge in town. My medical advisers think I cannot hold the criminal term. A prompt appointment would remove the difficulty."

To this the Minister of Justice replied:

"I understand your telegram to mean tendering your resignation, and if such is the case, I am prepared to appoint your successor without delay."

Of course Mr. Justice Smith did not intend to send in his resignation in those terms, and he made a subsequent explanation to that effect to the Minister of Justice. Since that time Mr. Justice Smith has passed away. His friends think his end was hastened by the act of the Minister of Justice; I should be sorry to say so, but that is the impression among his friends and with his medical adviser. They think that had he been permitted to retire for six months, as was granted to Judge Macdonald before him, and had he gone to a warmer climate and been relieved of the anxiety and annoyance attending him in other ways, his life might have been prolonged for a much longer time. Be that as it may, he had to bear the anxiety and the trouble attending his position. He was not allowed to retire, but he was kept there, when he was not fit to work, but had to attend to his duties from day to day as well as he could, until he brought on a severe illness which terminated his life. That is the position of the case. Mr. Justice Smith died about last January, and I wish to bring to the notice of the House the position which the Minister of Justice occupies to-day, with respect to this matter. He said it was absolutely necessary to have the court properly constituted in order that the business of the country might be attended to. In that opinion he was quite right. I have received letters from two leading barristers in Halifax, who tell me they have great difficulty in getting business attended to, and in order to obtain a quorum of judges they have to change the docket from one part to another, as Mr. Justice Graham has not been able to take part in certain cases before the court. Mr. Justice Hugh Macdonald, I am sorry to add, although able to attend to the duties for a short time, has been compelled to return to his residence at Antigonish, and is in such a bad condition of health it is not thought he will be able to return. Mr. Justice Graham, as was pointed out by the Minister of Justice in this letter, is disqualified from considering a great many of the cases now before the court, and Mr. Justice Smith's position has not been filled. Therefore, the House will observe that at the present moment the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia is three short of its complement. I am not a legal man, but I am only giving statements made to me by reliable gentlemen belonging to the profession, that the business of the court is very much impeded in consequence of the vacancy not having been filled. If the Minister of Justice was able to say to Mr. Justice Smith, when he construed this telegram

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

into a resignation, that he was prepared to name his successor immediately, I think there is very good reason now for asking the hon. gentleman to carry out his promise. The time has been sufficiently long to enable the Government to consider this matter and make an appointment. It does not arise from lack of applicants, as the hon. gentleman is well aware; but it arises, no doubt, in part, if not in whole, from the difficulty which the hon. gentleman finds in making a choice between two contending candidates, who are now candidates for the Local House. These gentlemen, prominent in their profession, undoubtedly men of high legal standing, either of whom would adorn the bench, are looking for legal preferment as is natural with members of their profession; but they have been nominated, one for Halifax County and another for the County of Annapolis, and, I suppose, the Minister is placed in a rather embarrassing position to know which one to appoint. He feels, perhaps, that if one is appointed it might give offence to the other, and in the critical condition of political affairs in Nova Scotia, with local elections pending, and with these two eminent barristers as candidates, the Minister is doubtless apprehensive that the *entente cordiale* between those gentlemen and other political friends of the party might run a great risk of being disturbed. Be that as it may, an appointment has not been made, and every day's delay is but adding to the difficulty. The Minister of Justice, in reply to an enquiry I made in this House about a fortnight ago, I think, said he intended to make an appointment at an early day. Every one would suppose that a fortnight would stand in that sense not as a very early day, but rather as a later day, considering the position in which the Minister is placed and the material he has at this command for filling the vacancy. But my apprehension is—I will not say my apprehension, for I have no apprehension and I have no feeling in the matter one way or the other—but it would look as if the course pursued with regard to Mr. Justice Rigby's vacancy is about to be repeated in this case. It would look as if the Minister of Justice proposed to leave this vacancy open until after the local elections, probably in midsummer or later—I am not in a position to speak—until he should see which of the gentlemen had earned the party's favor and had shown that he could render greater assistance to the party. That is the impression which prevails with us. If the Minister would appoint either of the candidates and settle the matter, the public would be satisfied, and neither I nor any one else would have a word to say. The court would then be constituted properly, the business would be properly attended to, and those having business in the court would not be subjected to those great annoyances and delays which now interfere with their business with the Supreme Court. But, if the hon. gentleman proposes to allow the appointment to remain open until the local elections have taken place, it will be rather taking a liberty with the people of Nova Scotia. In his letter, the hon. Minister of Justice says it would be impracticable for the judges then to continue the business. I ask the hon. gentleman how, under the present condition of affairs, it can be said to be any more easy than it was at the time at which this letter was written? The hon. gentleman said, and I repeat the language:

"The leave which you ask would place nearly the whole work of the term on the remaining four judges, who would be required to sit from day to day for several months. This would be impracticable, and even if it were practicable, nearly all the cases argued would have to wait over for judgment, and no judge would be available for the Chamber work or criminal terms."

I would ask the Minister, if that is the condition, how much greater trouble, with only Mr. Justice Macdonald indisposed, and Mr. Justice Graham disqualified on account of his recent appointment, must ensue with the additional vacancy, because by the death of Mr. Justice Smith there was only one judge who was unable to sit then, for Mr. Justice Graham could take part in some of the cases; but now there are three judges, and the bench is left in a position which according to the reports I have from legal sources, in Nova Scotia, is very unsatisfactory to those having business with the court. I think that the Minister should make his choice and fill the position. He has now had sufficient time to make up his mind as to whom he is going to recommend for that position; and I suppose he will have no difficulty, even if these two gentlemen were not available. It is always pretty well known among the members of the profession who is to succeed to the position, and it is also known among the friends of the hon. Minister of Justice, in Halifax, who is to receive this appointment when it is made. I repeat, therefore, that in the interests of justice, and for the despatch of legal business, the hon. Minister will not longer delay, and that he will act on the spirit—although I think it was a very unkind spirit—of this letter to Mr. Justice Smith. I think it was a spirit in which very few men would write to a man suffering under severe disease, and under the circumstances this application was made. I venture to say that very few hon. members in this House, would have made such an emphatic and prompt refusal to a man who was suffering from ill-health, as this letter discloses on the part of the hon. Minister of Justice. That it hastened his end few doubt, and if such was the case, it would be another evidence that the hon. Minister should be guided by the rules which have hitherto determined the judicial patronage and the mode of bestowing leave of absence to judges. If the Minister had followed the usual course, and allowed the judges to decide whether or not they could dispense with the services of their brother judge, the responsibility would be off his shoulders. If he had granted him leave of absence, conditionally, on making an arrangement with the other judges, the responsibility was also off his shoulders; but the Minister took the responsibility on himself to refuse the application, and I repeat again (and I will leave it to any hon. gentleman in this House who will study the matter carefully) that the Minister committed a more than unkind act towards this gentleman who occupied the high position of judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. The hon. Minister has now had sufficient time to consider the matter, and I trust that the early day promised will soon arrive to appoint a judge to this court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) commenced his address, I really thought that he was sincere in stating that his object in making this motion was to bring to the notice of the House the administration of judicial patronage in the Province of Nova Scotia.

But, as the hon. gentleman proceeded with his address, and, towards its finish, I ascertained with perfect distinctness that this was not his object, but that it was to fulfil the promise which he made on the streets of Halifax, before coming to Ottawa—that he would bait the Minister of Justice, until an appointment was made in place of Mr. Justice Smith; and that he would do so, not in the interests of the administration of justice in the Province of Nova Scotia, but for the purpose of inducing the Minister of Justice, if it were possible, to get him and his friends rid of one or two inconvenient candidates who are now contesting constituencies in that Province.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is all untrue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will call attention, first of all, to the particulars which the hon. gentleman has stated, by which he thinks that the administration of judicial patronage in that Province has been so much a matter of reproach. The hon. gentleman called attention to the vacancy which required to be filled on the bench of the Province of Nova Scotia, in the year 1886, and he stated that, for the purpose of serving political ends, the vacancy which existed at the death of Mr. Justice Rigby—the hon. gentleman said, I think, Mr. Justice Ritchie, but I presume he meant Mr. Justice Rigby—

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Mr. Justice Rigby, I said.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman said that, for political purposes, that vacancy was kept open for, as he stated, nine months, and that it was so kept open in order that a constituency might be found for the High Commissioner for Canada, who was then in England, and who, I suppose, he means, was expected to return to Canada before the general election, and who might find a seat if the then sitting member for Cumberland were promoted to the bench. I need not hesitate to give that statement a most emphatic contradiction, and to assure the House that there is not a particle of truth in it. An instant's reflection—if the hon. gentleman has not already reflected on the question—will bring to his mind the fact, that no sane man would believe that statement. The vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Justice Rigby occurred in the month of July, 1886. At that time there was no prospect, nor any indication of a general election. There was no general election decided upon, and no one in this country thought that the High Commissioner for Canada would come to seek a constituency in this House. Mr. Townshend did not expect it, nor did any one. The circumstances connected with that vacancy were not that the position was kept open for nine months for political reasons. As a matter of fact the appointment of Mr. Justice Townshend was made in less than eight months after the death of Mr. Justice Rigby. Two of these months were months of vacation, and three months, down to November, were months of circuit. The circuits were amply supplied, and not the slightest inconvenience was felt in the Province, from the vacancy having been kept open. The hon. gentleman has stated to the House, that then the vacancy was filled by the appointment of the sitting member for Cumberland, Mr. Townshend—a gentleman

of whose qualifications I had so much doubt that I had refused to appoint him before. In that particular the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) is equally unfortunate in his attempt to arrive at the truth. I had never refused Mr. Townshend's application, and I had never questioned his qualifications for the position he now fills. Mr. Townshend, it is true, was only one of a number of gentlemen at the Bar of Nova Scotia, any one of whom would have fitted the position admirably. Mr. Townshend pressed no claim upon me. He simply indicated, as any professional man of high honor might do with perfect propriety, that if the Government thought fit to avail themselves of his services for the bench, he was willing to accept the appointment. He let the matter rest there, without any reply from me in the negative or affirmative, and without my having down to this moment, thrown the slightest doubt on his qualifications or fitness for the position to which he was subsequently appointed. The hon. gentleman made allusion to another gentleman, who has since been appointed to the bench, Mr. Wallace Graham, and I understood, as well as I could hear the hon. gentleman, that he said, Mr. Graham had been repeatedly refused by me.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No; I did not say so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Then I was unfortunate in hearing the hon. gentleman. I believe he also stated that the Minister of Justice was more anxious to appoint Mr. Justice Graham at that time. I do not know that that is material to the question, but if the hon. member for Halifax considers it material, or if any member of the House does, I will be frank enough to say that my personal associations, and my personal and private judgment of Mr. Graham, and the very high esteem I have for him, gave me the natural preference one has for an associate and a warm personal friend. Did that by any means justify his statement that the appointment was subsequently made in Mr. Graham's place? Mr. Townshend was Mr. Graham's senior at the bar; he had been in public life; he had enjoyed, and was then enjoying, perhaps, the largest practice of any barrister outside of the city of Halifax; he conducted a good deal of business in Halifax, where he came to conduct his cases before the full bench; and he had the highest standing at the bar. Of Mr. Graham, he cannot be said, even in the most delicate sense, to have been a candidate for the position. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Halifax stated that Mr. Justice Smith sent me a telegram in September or October, informing me of the death of Mr. Justice James, and he undertook to quote to the House the sense of that telegram.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is in error again. I said he applied for leave of absence in October.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am speaking of the telegram which preceded that, and of which the hon. gentleman undertook to quote the sense to the House, and in which the hon. gentleman said: Mr. Justice Smith announced the death of Mr. Justice James, and requested an early appointment on account of his ill-health. The hon. gentleman, I am persuaded, was giving the House the sense of that telegram from memory. If he had seen the telegram—

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I did.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Then the hon. gentleman is not able to avail himself of the excuse I was offering for him. Mr. Justice Smith never sent such a telegram to me, and I never received such a telegram. What Mr. Justice Smith telegraphed to me was that he was just recovering from illness, that he was unable to conduct the criminal court then coming on, and that an immediate appointment was necessary; these are almost the words. I had never heard of the death of Mr. Justice James; as a matter of fact, that telegram must have been dispatched before Mr. Justice James was cold; not a word had then arrived in Ottawa indicating that he had died. I had simply the announcement in that telegram, and when I received it, I considered it with perfect honesty, to be an intimation that Mr. Justice Smith was unfit for his duty and desired that an appointment should be made in his place. I immediately answered him that his telegram was ambiguous, but that if it were to be considered as a resignation, I was prepared to appoint his successor. It was not until hours afterwards that a second telegram came from the same judge saying that I had misunderstood his telegram, that Mr. Justice James was dead, and that it was to that vacancy he had referred. Subsequently, it is true, as the hon. gentleman stated, Mr. Justice Smith wrote me a letter in reference to a protracted leave of absence. Let me say, at the outset, that so far from having the slightest reason to be unkind or ungenerous to Mr. Justice Smith, I had no political or other reason for feeling any such disposition towards him. He had been, it is true, appointed to the bench by our political opponents, but he was appointed long before I had entered public life or had engaged in any affairs which are supposed to create anything like acrimony between political opponents. He had been, before his appointment and for ten years before his death, on terms of friendship with myself. I had done him many services, and I was prepared to do him any service again, unless it was at the expense of the public interest; and Mr. Justice Smith knew that as well as I did. But, in October or November he applied for six months' leave of absence. All he stated to me in his letter, and all I knew of any condition of health requiring leave of absence at all, was the simple statement in that letter that he was rather unwell—I quote his exact words. I need hardly say, after making that statement, that he sent no certificate indicating that his health was seriously impaired, and made no statement of the kind in his letter; he simply said that he was rather unwell, and would like to absent himself from the Province during the winter, and, under those circumstances, requested that I should give him six months' leave of absence. I need scarcely say that no judge applying for six months' leave of absence on account of ill-health makes the application in those terms. He either states what his illness is, or states that there are serious grounds for asking for leave, or forwards a medical certificate in which that fact will appear; because any judge making application for leave of absence on the ground of ill-health knows that the Minister who grants it, or recommends that it be granted, will have to come before the House of Commons and answer any attack such as that made to-night by the hon. member for Halifax, and will have to show

the grounds on which that leave is granted, and knows also that light grounds would never satisfy the House that a high public functionary should be permitted to absent himself from his duties for six months in the year. The judge knew perfectly well the responsibility that devolved on the Minister of Justice. Having obtained leave of absence the very year before at his own solicitation, indicating that he desired to visit Europe, he knew perfectly well the grounds he had to offer in order to induce the Minister of Justice to accede to his request; and the letter of Mr. Justice Smith I regarded, and nobody could but regard it, as merely opening the correspondence which might lead to the statements which would sustain his request, if the request could reasonably be entertained. Now, let me call the attention of the House to the circumstances in which the court was placed at that time. By the law of Nova Scotia all the judges have to sit in full bench in January, February, March, and sometimes in April—at all events, until they finish the docket of appeal cases. The duties devolving on the judges during that term are very laborious while it lasts. We have seven judges in Nova Scotia. By the law of the Province four are required to constitute a quorum of that court. It is true, three may sit if a judge is necessarily absent from illness or on duty; but it is always desirable not to diminish the quorum established by law, and it is always a subject of complaint if the bench is reduced below four; and the judges themselves, when their numbers are so impaired, find their work largely increased. We had the obligation to have four judges sitting in appeal every day during the winter, and it was absolutely necessary that there should be another judge for the duties devolving on a single judge in the trial of cases, in dispatching chamber business, in the trial of suits in equity, and to relieve his brethren occasionally. We had the necessity, therefore, for five judges. One of those on the bench, who makes the sixth, as the hon. member for Halifax has just shown, was disqualified from sitting in, I am sure, nineteen out of the twenty cases that would be on that docket, so that his services were practically unavailable; and the only other judge who was available, if we had given leave of absence to Mr. Justice Smith, was Mr. Justice Macdonald, who had come from leave of absence with his health very seriously impaired. I had myself seen him in the summer, and knew him to be in a frail state of health. He was not asking for leave or holding out any indication that he would absent himself from his duty at all; but I knew, and all his friends knew, that while he would go to his duty like a man, he might be compelled by illness to leave his duty. Under these circumstances, if I had acceded to the request of Mr. Justice Smith, based on the ground that he was rather unwell, and had given him six months' leave of absence, I would have run the risk of depending upon Mr. Justice Macdonald's rather precarious state of health for the purpose of having a quorum, or the court would have had to reduce the quorum of judges to three. Otherwise, we would have had no judge in the Province to discharge the duties of a single judge. The hon. gentleman asks why I did not relieve myself of the responsibility of deciding the matter, by asking the Provincial Government what they thought of the subject. It is customary, and it is

most convenient, to apply to the Provincial Government to ascertain whether a judge can be spared from his duties or not, because the Minister of Justice cannot possibly be conversant with the state of affairs in each Province. But this happened to be my own Province, a Province I had just come from after a visit during the summer, and I was intimately acquainted with the state of business there in the courts, from conferences with the judges, from conferences with Mr. Justice Smith himself, and from conferences with members of the bar; and for me to have referred it to the Provincial Government, and asked them what they thought of the matter, and whether they were of the opinion that Mr. Justice Smith could be conveniently spared or not, would have been merely an excuse to relieve myself of the responsibility, but would not have been to discharge, conscientiously, the duties which I believe devolve upon me. Then the hon. gentleman suggested that the other course was to leave it to the other judges. I have been humbly endeavoring to discharge the duties of my present office for five or six years, and I never heard of such a course being followed, I have never followed it, and certainly I never will. If I know that a judge cannot be spared under the existing condition of affairs, I tell him so. If I do not know, I apply to the Local Government to ascertain whether he can be spared or not; but I do not leave it to the judges or throw upon them the responsibility of giving one of their brothers on the bench leave of absence or refusing it to him. But I had no ground for uncertainty in this respect at all. The House may remember that a question was asked here by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McDonald) last Session, as to the state of health of Mr. Justice James, and attention was then publicly called to the inconvenience which arose from Mr. Justice James' absence from his public duties, just as Mr. Justice Smith proposed to absent himself from his public duties. I then had letters from that Province, I think I had one from Mr. Justice James himself, stating that he would ask—as Mr. Justice Smith did at the end of the Session—for a prolonged leave of absence on account of ill-health; and just then I received a remonstrance from the council of the Bar Society of Nova Scotia, which was forwarded to me by way of protest against that leave being granted; and more, I had a protest from the judges, excepting the Chief Justice, but including and headed by Mr. Justice Smith, calling my attention to the inconvenience of the absence of a judge under such circumstances. If I had granted Mr. Justice Smith's application for leave of absence in the month of October, I would have been violating his protest and that of all his brethren made a few months before, and that under weaker circumstances from those of Mr. Justice James, who had been suffering from a lingering and malignant disease and was totally unfit for duty, while, in the other case, it was simply a judge stating that he was rather unwell and would like to go abroad for a few months. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), stated that I was willing that the country should be saddled with a pension to Mr. Justice Smith. Well, Sir, I was, and the hon. gentleman knows why. He knows that for some time past Mr. Justice Smith had not been in a position to discharge his duties efficiently, but that he was prob-

ably in a position which might entitle him to ask for a pension. He had passed the time when he might apply for a pension; he had been, I think, seventeen years on the bench, and he was a man with somewhat failing health. For the last seven or eight years, he has discharged very little duty in that Province indeed, and, under those circumstances, it would be no reproach on any one, if Mr. Justice Smith made a request for a pension, to say it might reasonably be granted. But it was an altogether different thing to say that, still occupying his seat on the bench, he should be allowed to withdraw for six months on full pay, and should leave the administration of justice insufficiently attended to. The hon. gentleman's argument, at the opening of his statement, indicated that I was very unreasonable and very harsh—nay, he concluded with the statement that it was an unkind letter which I had written—and the hon. gentleman was evidently anxious to use a stronger expression; and yet he stated that he had now in his pocket letters from two or three Nova Scotia barristers, stating, that in consequence of the breaking down again of the health of Judge Macdonald, great inconvenience has resulted, that the judges have had to skip about from one case to another on the docket, and that he thinks a judge ought to be appointed immediately, though only five or six weeks have elapsed since Mr. Justice Smith died. I think the state of affairs which he pictured, but which, I am afraid, he overdrew in order to make a case against me, is an ample proof that he was wrong in stating that I was guilty of undue severity in refusing to dispense with the services of a judge under the circumstances. As to the imputation that I have hastened the end of Judge Smith, it may suit political purposes, or it may suit the purposes of the hon. gentleman at this moment, under circumstances which excite sympathy for one who has passed away, to make such an assertion, but everyone in Nova Scotia, where the circumstances are well known, would treat the aspersion with ridicule and contempt. Mr. Justice Smith has never received at my hands anything but kindness, and he has been assisted and served by me on many an occasion for the purpose of lightening his labors and his duties. Everyone knows—and I say it with as little reproach to his memory as possible—that Mr. Justice Smith's discharge of duty for the last seven or eight years has been of the lightest possible character, and there was nothing unreasonable, under the circumstance of that court commencing the long winter term, in requesting him to remain and perform his duties, when all he could say was that he was rather unwell, or, at all events, form one of the quorum of four who had to preside over the court of appeal during those months of December, January, February and March. The hon. gentleman says, however, that there had been a certain grief which had broken down the health of Mr. Justice Smith. I do not know how that may be. The circumstance to which no doubt the hon. gentleman referred transpired months before the leave of absence was applied for, and months after that event Mr. Justice Smith was attending to his duties fully as well as he had been for several years before. As regards the reproach which the hon. gentleman thinks falls on me for not having recommended a successor to Mr. Justice Smith, I think the period which has now elapsed since his death

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

is not more than five or six weeks. The hon. gentleman's haste with regard to filling the vacancy indicates that he is anxious that an appointment should be made, which he supposes will have to be made in an embarrassing manner and in a manner that will aid him politically. As regards that appointment, I will answer by saying that the two gentlemen upon whom he has fixed attention, to whom he has referred in such complimentary terms with the view of assuring me that either one of them would make a good appointment, and advising that I had better appoint either one immediately, are, as he says, contesting two counties in the Province of Nova Scotia; but he is entirely mistaken in supposing that they are contending candidates for the vacancy made by the demise of Mr. Justice Smith. Those gentlemen deserve all he has said of them; they are both highly qualified, and either one of them, I am sure, would adorn the bench; but they have too high an appreciation of their position as professional men to be "two contending candidates," as he styles them, for a judicial position, I am sure, at any period of their lives, much less now; and they are by no means the only gentlemen in that Province on whom an appointment of that description could be with propriety conferred. But the hon. gentleman has asked the House this question: If it were so unreasonable that six months' leave of absence should have been given to Mr. Justice Smith in the month of October, how can I possibly justify the leaving of that position unfilled now? Why, the hon. gentleman forgets that this is by no means the month of October, and that the long term of four or five months to which I called the hon. gentleman's attention, and during which the judges would have to sit, four of them, every day of the week from ten to four o'clock, has passed by, and the long docket, to which I called the attention of Mr. Justice Smith as having to be disposed of, has been almost disposed of. The Supreme Court of Nova Scotia is now, if not at the close of the docket, very nearly so, and about two weeks ago I had a letter from the head of the bench there regretting very much the absence of Mr. Justice Macdonald on account of illness, but indicating to me that the docket was practically then within reach, and would be dispatched notwithstanding his illness. I had at the same time a letter from Mr. Justice Macdonald stating that he was able to inform me that though he had been obliged to leave the city on account of ill-health, he felt very much better than he had expected to feel. Under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman will see that the confusion in the administration of justice, which would undoubtedly have resulted if leave of absence had been given in the month of November, is not serious at the present time, owing to the fact that the docket has been disposed of, and owing to the fortunate circumstance that Mr. Justice Macdonald's health lasted until the docket was practically within control, and that the spring circuits, which are next on the judicial programme for the Province, have already been provided for.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I listened with a good deal of interest to the observations of the Minister of Justice, and I do not take great exception to much that he said, except the turn which he endeavors to give to the observations I made on

one or two points. The hon. gentleman stated that I had boasted in the streets of Halifax that I was coming here to bait the Minister of Justice and to compel him to make an appointment. I can only say this much—not to characterise it with too harsh a term—that the Minister of Justice drew on his fertile imagination entirely for his facts. That is the first time that I have ever heard of any such statement, and I certainly never made it. The hon. gentleman says that I was inaccurate with regard to Mr. Justice Smith's telegram, and then he proceeded to give his version of the telegram in precisely the same sense. I saw the telegram which Mr. Justice Smith sent, or which he told me he sent, and if he did not send it, of course, that is a matter for which I cannot vouch; but when the Minister brings down that telegram with the application of Mr. Justice Smith, we shall be able to see whether the statement which I made to this House is not literally borne out in fact. The hon. Minister says that the circumstances differ very materially now from what they did at the time he refused the application for leave to Mr. Justice Smith. There is just this much difference about it. He says that the long term was from December and January and February and March. Well, if the hon. gentleman's views were correct with regard to the necessity of having the bench complete during the long term, he had two months during which he could have given the bench their full number, that is to say, February and March. But he has allowed February and March to pass over, without giving the bench the appointment which he said in his letter, which I have already read to the House, was absolutely necessary for the proper carrying on of the business of the court. He says that Mr. Justice Macdonald's illness realised the apprehension which he entertained that he would not be able to conduct his work, and, therefore, the position of the bench was precisely what he had expected. Well, that may be true, but I pointed out to him and I think the House will observe, that the condition of the bench to-day is much worse than the Minister of Justice anticipated at that time, because, in addition to Mr. Justice Graham being disqualified, and Mr. Justice Macdonald being ill at his home, there is a vacancy on the bench in consequence of the death of Mr. Justice Smith; therefore, there are three now in the place of the two which he referred to at that time. Then he says, in this matter he has been guided by what was right and necessary in the public interest. I do not mean to attack his administration, I do not mean to attack his appointment of Mr. Justice Townshend. The House will bear me out in the statement that I said not one word but what is complimentary to Mr. Justice Townshend. I believe him to be a man eminently qualified for his position; but the hon. gentleman, I think, touched that point very tenderly, and his explanations were very unsatisfactory, and he cannot justify himself to this House for keeping that appointment over eight months to meet what was evidently the exigency which arose, and which required that seat in Cumberland for the High Commissioner. The hon. Minister has endeavored to draw attention from this letter. His letter is sufficient to condemn him. When that letter is printed in the *Hansard* and comes to be read by legal men throughout this Dominion, I think they

will arrive at the conclusion that the Minister of Justice dealt out very scant courtesy to Mr. Justice Smith, and that the proposition which he laid down in this letter if correct—I am not disputing it; I say the principles which he laid down in this letter in my hand, if correct—places him in a very false position to-day in delaying the appointment of a successor to Mr. Justice Smith, and completing the bench and enabling it to perform the necessary judicial work of the Province. I say I need hardly add another word to it, because the letter itself states most emphatically that it was not practicable and, if it was practicable, nearly all the cases argued would have to wait over for judgment and no judge would be available for chamber work or for the criminal terms. That applies to-day with increased force. Whatever force there was in the hon. gentleman's contention at that time, it has double force to-day under the present condition of the bench in Nova Scotia. I repeat, and I need not further emphasise it, that if the hon. gentleman was honest in his contention at that time, he should lose no time in making an appointment. But I was amazed, and I think the House was amazed, when the hon. gentleman told us that he hardly understood Mr. Justice Smith's point with respect to Judge James' vacancy. I would be very sorry to say that I doubt the hon. gentleman's statement; but I will say this: does it seem probable that the Minister of Justice, watching as he keenly does everything pertaining to the Province of Nova Scotia, knowing that Mr. Justice James had been in a delicate state of health, knowing that he was going to appoint Mr. Justice Graham, a most eminent member of his profession, does it seem probable that Mr. Justice James should have passed away and the Minister of Justice know nothing of it until he received a telegram from Mr. Justice Smith, saying that a prompt appointment would remove the difficulty. I think few members of this House would imagine such an extraordinary circumstance, or that the Minister of Justice was so innocent in that transaction as not to know that Mr. Justice James had passed away, and that Mr. Justice Smith was referring to the vacancy in that connection, because in the telegram which Mr. Justice Smith sent to the Minister, as shown to me, he emphatically stated that since the death of Mr. Justice James he was the only judge in town. Whether he sent that telegram or not I cannot state, but the telegram, as shown to me, looks like an attempt to mislead, and it is hardly treating the party addressed with that respect and dignity which is due to a judge of the Supreme Court. I have brought this matter before the House and the letter of the Minister is the ground on which I have brought it. I am satisfied to leave it in the hands of the House and the country and to legal men, and if they are not satisfied that the Minister is departing in this case from the principle laid down when Mr. Justice Smith made application, I shall be very much mistaken, and let the Minister draw all the comfort from it he can.

Mr. KENNY. The House has recognised that the Minister of Justice has given a full and satisfactory reply to the very extraordinary and, as I consider, unwarranted attack made upon him this evening by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). The hon. gentleman has made some ex-

traordinary statements, statements which, I think, will very much surprise his fellow-citizens when they are read in the public press. I am as familiar with current events passing in Halifax as is the senior member, and I say this is the first time in my life I have heard the extraordinary story he has narrated here in regard to the appointment of a successor to the late lamented Mr. Justice Rigby. I say, and I repeat it most emphatically, that, familiar as I am with current rumors in Halifax, intimate as I am with many of the members of the legal profession, I have never heard, until to-night, any such romance in connection with the appointment of the successor to Mr. Justice Rigby, as we have heard from the senior member for Halifax. The hon. gentleman has not been satisfied with the statements made by the hon. Minister of Justice. It is a fact that, immediately after Mr. Justice Smith's death, some half dozen gentlemen in Halifax became exceedingly excited. Mr. Justice Smith died, I think, after the Session of the present Parliament commenced; it was while my colleague and myself were in Halifax. The excitement to which he refers was confined to a very small number of persons, and that number was very much reduced when the senior member for Halifax departed for Ottawa. He referred to the impression which prevailed with us. Who does the hon. gentleman mean? He means a small clique of excited Grit politicians in the city of Halifax. That is the whole source of this present discussion. It is, moreover, because the names of two prominent members of the legal profession who have been associated with this vacancy, happen to be candidates for the coming elections in the Local Legislature. They are very prominent gentlemen, they are distinguished members of the bar and respected members of the community, and they are dreaded and feared by the senior member and his political associates. The hon. gentleman's anxiety is solely to get one of those gentlemen out of the way. This is the whole cause of this extraordinary and unwarranted attack on the Minister of Justice. I well know that the Minister does not require any defence at my hands or at the hands of any hon. member in this House, but I regret exceedingly that any hon. gentleman from the Province of Nova Scotia should make such statements as we have heard to-night. The members of the legal profession in the city of Halifax, the people of the Province of Nova Scotia, and hon. members of this House, well know and fully realise that there is nothing which the senior member for Halifax can say which will lower the Minister of Justice in the estimation of his fellow-countrymen, or in the estimation of members of this House. The appointments which have been made by the Department of Justice, since it was controlled by my friend the present Minister, have reflected credit upon himself, and they have been unanimously approved by the people of the Province of Nova Scotia; and I can only say that the people of our Province are quite satisfied to leave the matter in the Minister's hands, knowing that in his own good time he will make an appointment which will be satisfactory to them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat wandered so very far from the point which the House is discussing, that I fear he could not have heard the charges made by his colleague from Halifax (Mr. Jones). Into the

Mr. KENNY.

merits of the larger parts of the controversy between the senior member for Halifax and the Minister of Justice I do not propose to enter, for the simple reason that the version of those two gentlemen respecting the telegram forwarded by Mr. Justice Smith and the answer given to that telegram by the Minister vary so much that an intelligent judgment could not be formed by an outsider. When the papers come down we will have an opportunity no doubt of reading the telegram and the answer, and we will be in a position to form some fair judgment in regard to it. The point in which this House and the public are interested is whether the appointment to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Justice Smith of the bench of Nova Scotia was unnecessarily delayed; and, if so, was it delayed for party purposes. That, I understand, is the only point of interest to the public in this enquiry. We know that the winter term, which is the largest term of the court in Nova Scotia, commences in December. We have it on the authority of the Minister that the administration of justice in that Province will be seriously impeded if the strength of the court is not at least kept up to five judges. We have it on the authority of the Minister that he would be recreant to his duty, to use his own term, if he granted leave of absence to a judge at the commencement of that term, and by granting that leave reduce the number below five. I do not think I can do better than read the closing words of the letter sent by the Minister of Justice to Mr. Justice Smith, wherein he referred to the leave of absence and argued the question. He said:

"The leave which you ask would place nearly the whole work of the term on the remaining four judges, who would be required to sit from day to day for several months. This would be impracticable, and even if it was practicable, nearly all the cases argued would have to wait over for judgment, and no judge would be available for the chamber work or criminal terms."

Now, we find that the vacancy which existed on the death of Judge James has been filled by the appointment of Mr. Justice Graham. We find, by the statement made by the hon. Minister of Justice, that Judge Graham is unable to hear the arguments in nineteen-twentieths of the cases now on the docket, because he was interested in these cases when practising at the bar; and, therefore, he is not practically an available judge for the present term. We find that Judge Smith, whose leave of absence was refused, died on or about the last of January, and that Judge Macdonald has had to leave Halifax owing to his bad state of health, and is unable to sit on the bench. We find this very state of facts which the hon. gentleman declared would impede the administration of justice, exists there to-day, has existed there for the larger part of this term, and yet the hon. gentleman has taken no steps, and does not now announce to the House that he intends to take any steps to fill the vacancy. I cannot see, in the face of his letter, how the Minister can defend his position. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) says he is quite willing to endorse any action which the Minister of Justice may take. He has such absolute and perfect confidence in the Minister's integrity and ability, that whether he fills the vacancy or leaves it open, or whether or not the administration of justice is hampered, the member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) is satisfied.

Mr. KENNY. That is what the people of Nova Scotia think.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. Minister of Justice was right when, on the 31st October, 1889, he wrote that, to leave the bench with a less strength than five judges, would be to impede the administration of justice, then the hon. Minister is censurable to-day, if he has failed to fill the vacancy, and he is doubly censurable if it is true that he failed to fill that vacancy for political reasons.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to remind him that he has assumed that the two vacancies caused by the illness of Mr. Justice Macdonald, and the death of Mr. Justice Smith, have occurred since last January.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly not; but the vacancies exist. I am assuming that to be true, which has been stated by the hon. Minister himself, and by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), namely, that there are three seats practically vacant on that bench, as Mr. Justice Graham is unable, owing to the fact that he was engaged in many cases as counsel, to take any part.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The appeal business is now practically done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Probably it may be. Everyone knows that the names mentioned most prominently for the position, are those of two gentlemen who have received Conservative nominations for local constituencies in the Province of Nova Scotia, and, I think, it is fair to hazard the assertion, that if these gentlemen had not been named and had not accepted the nominations, one of them would now occupy the high position of judge of the Supreme Court. I think that is a fair assumption; but whether it is fair or not, and whether they are the only two available men, or whether there are others, on which I am not in a position to give an opinion, this fact is plain—I assume the Minister of Justice wrote that letter carefully, and weighing the responsibility of the language—that this vacancy, which is essentially necessary to be filled up for the furtherance of justice, has remained unfilled. Further, we see it left open for political purposes, as the facts would show on the face of them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no doubt of that whatever. There is no doubt of the first fact, and whether they are left open for political reasons or not, it is a fair inference to conclude. I happen to know that these two gentlemen mentioned in connection with the appointment, occupy a leading position at the bar of Nova Scotia. I happen to know that they are Conservatives in their political leanings, and, I believe, in all human probability, one of them would have received the appointment before this if they had not been nominated. That, taken in conjunction with the statement made by the hon. Minister of Justice: "that it was essential for the administration of justice that the bench should be of the full strength of five judges, sitting during the month of February" (the time when the Supreme Court is engaged in this appeal work), convinces me, at least, that there must be some motives other than these which generally actuate the hon. Minister

for delaying this matter. The hon. gentleman did not give the House any information which would lead them to conclude that the appointment would be made before next summer. In the letter addressed in answer to the telegram of Judge Smith, the Minister stated that he was prepared to make the appointment at an early date. He does not give the House the assurance that he is now prepared to make the appointment at an early date. Why? Because the elections in Nova Scotia may not take place until the month of May or June, and certainly if there is an appointment to be made before then, it cannot be gathered from any language used by the Minister of Justice; for I watched him carefully and he practically refrained from giving the slightest intimation that he was prepared to recommend that the appointment should be made now. On the contrary, so far as one could gather from his language, the chances are that that vacancy which he said it was so essential to fill a short time ago, will remain open until the political exigencies of the local Conservative party justify him in filling up.

Motion agreed to.

N. W. T.—RANCHES.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. COOK) moved for:

Return giving a complete list of applications as yet made for ranches in the North-West Territories, showing the names and addresses of the applicants, the amount of each application, the Orders in Council relating thereto, the action taken on such applications, and all the correspondence relating thereto.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must ask my hon. friend to explain to the House the reason why he makes this motion, and the object for which it is made. The application is one which would be very expensive to comply with. He asks for a return of a complete list of applications as yet made (that is from 1871 up to this time), as well as all the correspondence about every ranche that has ever been applied for since we have had the North-West Territories. Why, it would take a couple of years to get that up. I think my hon. friend must show some reason for this motion. I know he only moved it in the absence of another hon. member, and I am quite sure if he cannot give any reason for this extraordinary application, he will consent to let it stand.

Mr. TROW. I have been requested by Mr. Cook to make the motion, but I was not prepared with the explanations which the First Minister asks. I am willing that the motion should stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

SEIZURE OF THE TUG *ROOTH*.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for:

Copies of all papers connected with the seizure of the tug *Rooth* at Amherstburgh, in July or August last, having a raft in tow, and bound from French River to Fort Erie.

He said: It seems that the tug *Rooth*, of Port Colborne, had a raft in tow from French River to Fort Erie, some time in July last. The raft, consisting of about 1,200,000 feet of timber, with the tug, were seized at Amherstburgh by the Custom house officers. The pretext on which they were seized was, that the timber was intended to be exported to the United States, and that the export duties upon it had not been paid. Now, the

intention was to land the raft at Point Abino, about midway between Port Colborne and Fort Erie, as it was impossible to enter Port Colborne with a raft of that size. Along the Welland Canal are situated a number of mills, and it seems that the person in charge of this raft desired to land it at Point Abino for the purpose of selling a portion of the timber to the mills on the Welland Canal if possible. He was simply coasting from one Canadian port to another, and the question arises, by what authority did the Custom house officers of the Dominion seize a vessel and a raft in transit between one Canadian port and another? The raft was duly cleared from the Canadian port, French River, to the Canadian port of Fort Erie, and it was on its way to the latter port when seized in Lake Erie, or in the Detroit River, and the owner of the raft, Mr. Joseph Jackson, formerly a member of this House, was obliged to deposit a large sum of money, more than covering the amount of the export duty, although the Government had no proof that there was any intention to export the timber. If there had been any fraud, or if the tug had taken the raft to a United States port, it would have been responsible for a breach of the revenue laws, and could have been seized, and it was worth much more than the raft. The sum which the owner was compelled to pay to the Government was largely in excess of what would have been sufficient to pay the export duty, and the balance is still in the hands of the Government. I think the Government in this case took a most unwarrantable course and inflicted a great injustice on the owner of this raft. The intention was to land it at Port Abino, where the owner was to decide whether he would transport it or any portion of it to the United States, or whether he would sell the whole or a part of it in Canada. I call for these papers for the purpose of ascertaining on what authority the Government made the seizure, and I hope they will be able to show some reason for what seems on its surface to have been an unwarrantable assumption of power and an infliction of a great injustice on the owner of the property.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman's statement is not altogether accurate. In the first place, the tug *Roots* never was seized, never was detained; there was no interference with her on the part of the Customs officials. The raft should, before leaving French River, have made entry and paid the export duty upon the logs.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before going to Fort Erie?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, she was going to Fort Erie ostensibly, but was intended to go to Tonawanda. The contention was that she intended to report at Fort Erie, and make her entry there, but that is directly contrary to the law and to the regulations of the Department. No vessel and no proprietor of logs has a right to sail from any port in Canada for the United States *via* any Canadian port until the proper entry has been made, the timber measured, and the duty paid. Concessions have been made in the past, by some of the officers permitting this to be done, but we have found that, where it has been conceded, great difficulties have arisen in ascertaining the actual quantity that left the original place of departure, wherever that might be. Instructions have, therefore, been given that no raft shall be permitted to leave any

Mr. CHARLTON.

part of the Dominion for any other place in a foreign country without the entry being made and the duty paid. This raft was detained for having illegally left French River without having made the proper entry and paying the duties. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is quite right in saying that a large deposit was demanded by the officer, but, as soon as this came under the notice of the Department, instructions were given to the inspector to make a thorough investigation into the case, ascertain as far as possible the quantity of the logs, exact the full amount of duty, and remit the balance. The reason why the balance has not been remitted is, that there is a dispute between the party who ostensibly owned the logs and the bank at Tonawanda, which claims the money. Our position is, that we must be sure that we are safe in handing over the money. Another investigation has been held by Mr. Mewburn, the inspector, and instructions have been given to pay over to the Blake firm, with which Mr. Lash is connected, the balance, and Mr. Lash the other day expressed himself quite satisfied, because I told him that the money would be paid through his firm and a receipt taken from him, and that they would be responsible if the money was not properly paid over. As to the tug, the *Roots*, she was never detained, she remained at her own option and could have left whenever she pleased.

Mr. CHARLTON. It seems a very extraordinary thing if the Customs Department are to take upon themselves the authority to determine where a raft or a vessel is bound for, and to go behind the clearance and assume that she is going to some point that she has not cleared for. This raft was bound for Fort Erie, and, if the owner could have sold any of the timber in Canada, he was no doubt anxious to do so in order to avoid the duties. If he could not do that, he would have to go elsewhere, but it is a very curious thing that he should in this way be prevented from doing what he desired. The Minister says that the raft was bound ostensibly for Tonawanda. It was bound ostensibly for Fort Erie, and it was really bound for Fort Erie, and went there, and, if the owner had not been placed in the position he was, the probability is that a portion of the logs would have been sold to mills on the Welland Canal. I think the Government has been guilty of a high handed act of injustice. If a raft cannot leave the Georgian Bay for some port in Canada without being obliged to pay export duties for what the owner desires to sell in Canada, I think the Customs Department is taking a course which is not warranted. Any one has a right to go from one port in Canada to another if he chooses, but, if the owner of a raft takes it to the United States, then let the raft or the boat which tows it be seized. If the owner clears his raft from one Canadian port to another, do not deem that the man is a scoundrel, that he intends to defraud the revenue, that he is a fraud, but assume that he is a British subject and hold him responsible if he violates the law. I think the sooner the Government comes to the conclusion that, when a man clears a raft or a vessel from one Canadian port to another, he is to be regarded as honest in the act, the better. If he violates the conditions of his clearance, then seize him, but do not assume that he is a villain until there is some proof of it. I know that the owner of this

raft would have been glad to sell the whole of these logs in Canada, if he could have done so on satisfactory terms. He had hopes that he might do so, and he cleared for Fort Erie, in order that he might find out first, whether he could sell a portion in Canada or not, fully intending to pay the export duties on the logs that he might have to take to the United States. I hope that in future the Minister of Customs will allow coasting from one Canadian port to another without taking such an arbitrary course as this, and will afterwards punish those who may be guilty of an infraction of the law.

Mr. BOWELL. If the case were as has been stated by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I should say he was strictly correct, and the Customs Department should be condemned for acting as he says it did; but I say there is no evidence in the Department to show that the raft was intended to be sold in Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is the evidence of the clearance.

Mr. BOWELL. No; the object was to evade the payment of the export duty when the raft left French River.

Mr. CHARLTON. You had no right to assume that.

Mr. BOWELL. I had. There was no evidence to show that the owner, Mr. Jackson, who was formerly a member of this House, and whom I do not desire to blame in the matter, intended to sell any part of it in this country. He intended to take it to Tonawanda, and to sell it in the United States. It was intended to save the payment of duty, so that, if anything should occur in the meantime—the breaking up of the raft or anything of that kind—the duty might not be paid. There is no evidence that it was intended to sell one stick of that timber in Canada. The documents show that the raft, the timber, and everything connected with it belonged to the bank at Tonawanda, and that Mr. Jackson had no interest in it except what might be obtained after the payment of the advances which the bank had made. It is the bank that has claimed the refund, and has contested our right to stop the raft *en route*. The raft should have been seized long before, if the officers had been able to ascertain its whereabouts. All the officers did was strictly in accordance with the regulations and with the law. If that raft had been entered outwards for a Canadian port, without any intention of taking it to a foreign port, the owners had a right to do so, and would never have been interfered with. But the raft was intended for Tonawanda *via* Fort Erie, and for that reason we acted at once, and the officers acted quite within the law and correctly in the interest of the revenue.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the fact is as the Minister of Customs asserts, that this raft was held by an American bank at Tonawanda, I do not know that it follows even then that that bank as the owner of a Canadian raft had not a right to, and could not in good faith attempt, to tow that raft from one Canadian port to another. I do not know but the American bank had the same rights as the Canadian citizen to go from one port to another, and sell Canadian property taken from one Canadian port to another. I do not think the Minister of Customs has

made it at all clear that his Department is free from the charge of having been guilty of a high-handed proceeding in this matter. I say they have no right to go behind the clearance. If the owners of that raft, or the men who held that raft in security, cleared that raft from a Canadian port to Fort Erie, they had a right to do so, and the Minister of Customs had no right to accuse those men, in advance, of fraudulent intent. If they had been guilty of fraud then it was time to seize the raft and inflict the penalties of the law; but to assume beforehand that these men were going to commit a fraud and a crime, and to seize their raft because, forsooth, the Minister of Customs thought they intended to defraud the revenue, is a very high-handed proceeding. I think, on the next occasion, the Minister had better allow the bank at Tonawanda, or Mr. Joseph Jackson, or any other individual who is interested in a Canadian raft, to clear that raft from one Canadian port to another if they want to do so, and if they attempt to evade the law, if they take that raft to some other point to evade the payment of export duties, then let him proceed against them; but wait till they have done that, and do not assume that they are going to do it.

Mr. BOWELL. It will not occur again, for I will not allow it to leave the port.

Motion agreed to.

LIGHT OPPOSITE YAMACHICHE.

Mr. RINFRET (Translation) moved for :

Copies of all petitions and correspondence respecting the placing of a floating light opposite Yamachiche, in Lake St. Peter, River St. Lawrence.

He said : Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, I wish to call the attention of the Government on the great importance which attaches, with respect to the sailing of schooners and light vessels, to the replacing of a buoy called "La Caille," by a floating light. This buoy is situated opposite Yamachiche, at about four miles from the upper light and seven miles from the lower light on the river. It is a very considerable distance between these two lights. The river makes a curve at this point and it frequently happens that ships, after passing the upper light, cannot well see the lower light, especially when winds are somewhat foul. During very dark nights it happens that ships are compelled to anchor at this very place, one of the most dangerous on the River St. Lawrence in times of violent gales. I am told by seamen who have spoken to me about this matter, that several shipwrecks have occurred there, so that I think it my duty to call the attention of the Government on this matter. During last Session, I have spoken about it to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who said to me he had received no petitions asking for the placing of a floating light there. I am aware that petitions were forwarded since then, since I laid some myself on the Table of this House. I think the Government would do well not to disregard the information I give them, for the change asked for is of the utmost importance for the safety of seamen who are compelled to sail at night time in Lake St. Peter.

Mr. COLBY. I am informed that the Government have no petition nor correspondence on this subject.

Mr. RINFRET (Translation.) I laid some petitions myself on the Table of this House, in the early days of the Session. I think the Government have not had time to consider them yet, but I hope they will send inspectors to the spot who will enquire as to the truth of what is recited in the petitions. I hope that, after investigation, they will comply with the request I have just made.

Mr. COLBY. I will make further enquiry. This is the memorandum placed in my hands by the deputy.

Motion agreed to.

INDIANS OF CAUGHNAWAGA—INDEMNITY.

Mr. DOYON (Translation) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the Indian Department and the agent and chiefs of the Caughnawaga reserve respecting any indemnity claimed by the Indians of the reserve, on the ground that the extent of their reserve has been considerably diminished by encroachments.

He said : Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that the reserve of Caughnawaga has been considerably diminished, and I may say by more than half; for I have in my hands the original title deeds of the concessions made by the Kings of France, bearing the respective dates of the 29th May, 1680, of the 31st October, 1680, and of the 15th June, 1717, which give to the reserve of Caughnawaga an extent of two square leagues, besides another concession of two leagues by one league and a half. In order to make the thing better understood, I produce the title deeds and patents of concession I have referred to. I may also add that they even likewise granted two islands and islets, described in these deeds which have also been taken away from them :

"29th May, 1680.

"Concession to the
Jesuit Fathers of the land
called
'Le Sault.'

Our very dear and well beloved the members of the Religious Society of Jesus, residing in our country of New France, having most humbly represented to us, that the lands of the Prairie de la Magdeleine, which have been heretofore granted to them, being too wet to be sown and provide for the subsistence of the Iroquois settled there, it might be feared that they would go away, if we were not pleased to grant them the tract of land called 'Le Sault,' containing two leagues in front, to commence at a point of land situate opposite the St. Louis Rapids, and ascending along the lake, by the same depth, with two islands, the islets and shoals opposite and adjoining the lands of the said Prairie de la Magdeleine which would allow them not only to settle the Iroquois, but also to increase their number and to extend by this means the light of the Faith and the Gospel.

"Now, therefore, being desirous of contributing to the conversion and instruction of the said Iroquois, and favorably treating the said petitioners, we have made and do make them a gift by these presents, signed with our hand, of the said tract of land called Le Sault, containing two leagues in front, commencing at a point of land situate opposite the St. Louis Rapids and ascending along the lake by a similar depth, with the two islands, the islets and shoals opposite and adjoining the lands of the said Prairie de la Magdeleine subject to the condition that the said tract of land called Le Sault shall belong to us, all cleared, when the said Iroquois shall abandon it. We do hereby permit all persons desirous of bringing to the said Iroquois, rings, knives and other small wares and things, to do so; most expressly prohibiting and forbidding the Frenchmen who may settle among the said Iroquois, or other Indian nations, who may establish themselves on the said tract of land called Le Sault, to have and keep any cattle, and

Mr. COLBY.

all persons to establish any tavern in the village of the said Iroquois, to be built on the said tract of land.

"Hereby commanding our well-beloved and trusty officers holding our Supreme Council at Quebec, and others our officers of justice whom it may concern, that these our letters of gift and concession they cause to be read and registered, and the contents thereof to be enjoyed and used by the said petitioners, ceasing and causing to cease all troubles and hindrances thereto, for such is our pleasure.

"In witness whereof we have caused our seal to be affixed to these presents.

"Given at Fontainebleau, the twenty-ninth day of May, in the year of grace one thousand six hundred and eighty, and of our reign the thirty-eighth.

(Signed) "LOUIS.

(Signed) "COLBERT.

"And sealed with the great seal in yellow wax.
"Registered according to decree of this day, at Quebec, the twenty-fourth of October, one thousand six hundred and eighty.

(Signed) "PEUVRET."

"OFFICE OF THE PROVINCIAL REGISTRAR,

QUEBEC, 11th May, 1887.

"I certify that the preceding copy is in everything conformable to its original, registered in Lib. Reg. des Ins. du Cons. Supérieur, folio 93.

"JOHN LANGELIER,

"Dep. Prov. Reg."

TITLES OF SAULT ST. LOUIS. THE REVEREND JESUIT FATHERS.

"LOUIS, by the grace of God, King of France and Navarre, to all those who these present letters shall see: Greeting.

"Our very dear and well beloved the members of the Religious Society of Jesus, residing in our country of New France, having most humbly represented to us that the lands of the Prairie de la Magdeleine, which have been heretofore granted to them, being too wet to be sown and provide for the subsistence of the Iroquois settled there, it might be feared that they would go away, if we were not pleased to grant them the tract of land called Le Sault, containing two leagues in front; to commence at a point of land situate opposite the St. Louis Rapids, and ascending along the lake, by the same depth, with the two islands, the islets and shoals opposite and adjoining the lands of the said Prairie de la Magdeleine, subject to the condition that the said tract of land called Le Sault shall belong to us, all cleared, when abandoned by the said Iroquois. We do hereby permit all persons desirous of bringing to the said Iroquois rings, knives and such other small wares, to do so; most expressly prohibiting and forbidding Frenchmen who may settle among the Iroquois, or other Indian nations, who may establish themselves on the said tract of land called Le Sault, to have and keep any cattle, and all persons to establish any tavern in the village of the said Iroquois, to be built on the said tract of land.

"Hereby commanding our well-beloved and trusty officers holding our supreme council at Quebec, and others our officers of justice whom it may concern, that these our letters of gift and concession they cause to be read and registered, and the contents thereof to be enjoyed and used by the said petitioners, ceasing and causing to cease all troubles and hindrances thereto, for such is our pleasure.

"In witness whereof we have caused our seal to be affixed to these presents.

"Given at Fontainebleau the twenty-ninth day of May, in the year of grace one thousand six hundred and eighty, and of our reign the thirty-eighth.

(Signed) "LOUIS, by the King.

(Signed) "COLBERT.

"The above letters patent have this day been registered at the Greffe Souverain at Quebec, in pursuance of the

decree of this day, the said petitioners to use and enjoy the contents thereof.

QUEBEC, 24th October, 1680.

(Signed) "PEUVRET."

"Louis de Buade, Comte de Frontenac, councillor to the King in His Councils, Governor and Lieutenant-General for His Majesty in Canada Acadia and the Island of Newfoundland and other countries of North France, and Jacques Duchesneau, Chevalier, also Councillor to the King in his Councils, Intendant of justice, police and finance in the said country. By reason of what has been represented to us by the Reverend Fathers of the Religious Society of Jesus, that His Majesty by his letters patent of the 29th May, 1680, registered in the Supreme Court at Quebec, on the 29th October following, having made them a gift of the tract of land called Le Sault, containing two leagues in front commencing at a point of land situate opposite the St. Louis Rapids and ascending along the lake by a similar depth with the two islands, the islets opposite and joining the lands of the Prairie de la Magdeleine, for the reasons set forth in the said letters and subject to the same charges and conditions therein contained, they ask that it will please us to grant them a remnant of land of one league and a half, or thereabouts, in length, commencing at the said tract of land called Le Sault, ascending along the Lake towards the Seigniory of Chateau-Gay by two leagues in depth, which would allow them to attract there still more Iroquois and other Indians, and to increase their number and to extend by that means the light of the Faith and the Gospel. We, in virtue of the power given us conjointly by His Majesty, and to facilitate still more to the Reverend Fathers of the Society of Jesus the means of continuing the care they have for so long and with so much zeal taken for the conversion and instruction of the Iroquois and other Indians, have given, granted and conceded to them, and give by these presents the remnant of land of about one league and a half in length commencing from the said tract of land called Le Sault and ascending towards the Seigniory of Chateau-Gay by two leagues in depth to be enjoyed by the said Reverend Fathers subject to the same charges and conditions contained in the aforesaid letters patent of His Majesty, and they shall obtain from His Majesty the confirmation of these presents. In witness whereof we have signed these presents, and caused our seal and arms to be affixed thereto.

Given at Quebec, the thirty-first of October, one thousand six hundred and eighty.

(Signed) "FRONTENAC,
"DUCHESNEAU."

"OFFICE OF THE PROVINCIAL REGISTRAR,
"QUEBEC, 11th May, 1886.

"I certify that this present copy is conformable in every thing to the original registered in the Cahier d'Intendance Vol. 1, folio 122.

"JOHN LANGELIER,
"Dep. Prov. Reg."

"15th June, 1717.

"This day, the fifteenth of June, the Letters Patent of one thousand seven hundred and seventeen, the King being in Paris, having caused to be produced letters of the gift to the members of the Religious Society of Jesus, residing in the country of New France, dated at Fontainebleau, the twenty-ninth of May, one thousand six hundred and eighty, of a tract of land called Le Sault, containing two leagues, commencing at a point of land situated opposite the St. Louis Rapids and ascending along the lake by a similar depth, with the two islands, the islets and shoals opposite and joining the lands of Prairie de la Magdeleine, in order to settle thereupon the said Iroquois Indians, who were settled upon the lands of the said prairie, which were found to be too wet to be sown, and to provide for their subsistence, subject to the condition that the said tract of land should belong to His Majesty all cleared, when the said Iroquois should abandon it, the deeds of gift dated at Quebec, the thirty-first day of October, one thousand six hundred and eighty, granted by Sieurs the Comte de Frontenac and Duchesneau, the Governor-General and the Intendant of New France, to the said Reverend Fathers, in order to put them in a position to settle a greater number of Iroquois Indians, of a remnant of land of about one league and a half in length, commencing from the same tract of land called Le Sault, towards the Seigniory of Chateau-Gay, with a depth of two leagues,

to be enjoyed by the said Reverend Fathers subject to the clauses, charges and conditions contained in the said letters patent of the twenty-ninth of May, one thousand six hundred and eighty, and His Majesty having been informed that a change of locality had become necessary for these Indians, seeing that the tract of land in which they were settled was exhausted, and that it was necessary to settle them in another place upon the lands granted for them, and having also been informed that the said Indians were only leaving their former lands for a time and that they intended to return thereto, now, therefore, His Majesty, having taken cognisance of what had been written on this subject by the Sieurs de Vandreuil and Begon, Governor and Intendant of New France, and of the memorials presented on this subject by the said members of the Religious Society of Jesus, and desiring to reserve the said tracts of land as much for the said reverend fathers as for the said Indians, His Majesty, on the advice of M. le Duc d'Orleans, Regent, has anew granted and made a gift to the members of the Religious Society of Jesus residing in New France, of the tract of land called Le Sault, which, in future, shall not only contain the tract of land, the islands, the islets and shoals mentioned in the said letters patent given at Fontainebleau, the twenty-ninth May, one thousand six hundred and eighty, but also the tracts of land mentioned in the said deeds of gift made by the Sieurs de Frontenac and Duchesneau on the thirty-first October, one thousand six hundred and eighty, for the purpose of locating thereon the mission of the Iroquois Indians, called the Mission of the Sault St. Louis, subject to the condition that the said tract of land shall belong to His Majesty when abandoned by the Iroquois. His Majesty commands that the present letters shall be registered in the Superior Council at Quebec, that parties concerned may have recourse thereto, and in testimony of his will His Majesty has commanded me to forward these present letters patent, which he has been pleased to sign with his hand and has caused to be countersigned by me, Councillor, Secretary of State and of his Finance Administration. Signed, Louis, and lower down, Phelypeau, with flourish."

"The deed of gift above transcribed was registered in the records of the Superior Council at Quebec, the Attorney General heard and so requiring under his order of this date by me, the undersigned, commissioner, &c., at Quebec, the second October, one thousand seven hundred and nineteen.

"RIVET."

"OFFICE OF THE PROVINCIAL REGISTRAR,

"QUEBEC, 11th May, 1887.

"I certify that this present copy is in every thing conformable to its original, registered in the books of records of the Conseil Supérieur, E. No. 5, folio 6.

"JOHN LANGELIER,
"Deputy Provincial Registrar."

And when I assert that these concessions have considerably diminished in extent, I refer, in support of that assertion, to the answer to the enquiry I made last Session, of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Dewdney), reported at page 481 of *Hansard*, and to the following words at the end of that answer:—

"The reserve contains 12,327½ acres, and the survey of the whole reserve, when all the work is done, will cost \$22,000."

I believe that the original reserve must have contained at least 30,000 acres more. My intention in asking the Government to produce all the correspondence and any deeds that may have been made respecting lands taken from the Caughnawaga Reserve, is to ascertain by what right the Government or any other person or society, having the administration of this estate, have, at any time since the original concession of these lands, disposed the Indians of this part of the reserve. What justifies me in concluding that a portion of the reserve has been conveyed to whites in an illegal manner, is the fact that I have here a deed made before a notary by Ignace Mikanawaha, on 16th April, 1819, to a Canadian, Jacques Patenaude, a farm laborer of the parish of Saint Constant;

whereas we know that at no period had an Indian the right to give a valid deed to a white man. The deed in question reads as follows:—

“Before the undersigned, notaries public of the Province of Lower Canada, residing at the village of La Prairie de la Madeleine, in the district of Montreal.

“Appeared Ignace Mikanawaha, one of the principal chiefs of the Iroquois nation of Sault St. Louis, authorised hereunto, by a resolution of all the chiefs of the said Nation, in Council assembled yesterday, the twenty-sixth April instant.

“Who did voluntarily admit and declare by these presents, that he hath given and conceded à titre de cens et rentes *seigneuriales*, unredemtable, henceforth and forever, and free from all disturbance and impediments whatsoever resulting from acts and promises of the said chiefs, their successors or administrators, to Jacques Patenaude, laborer, of the parish of St. Constant, hereunto present and accepting, lessee, for himself, his heirs and assigns forever, a land and concession situated in the Seigneurie of Sault St. Louis, measuring two arpents in front by about seven arpents in depth, bounded in front by the land of the said lessee, in rear by the limits laid down by M. Archambault; on the one side Alexis Henry to the south, and on the other side Paul Chaperon to the north; without any warranty of precise measurement, but in accordance with return of metes and bounds prepared by M. Archambault, surveyor, which the said lessee declares he well knows, having seen and examined the same, and is content and satisfied therewith, the said lessee to enjoy, use, work and dispose of the said land, himself, his heirs and assigns, on the charges, clauses and conditions following, that is to say: the lessee, his heirs and assigns shall pay each year to the seigniors their successors, administrators and assigns, at their accounting place in the said seigniorie or to their receiver or agent, two *Sols Tournois*, French money, for each arpent in superficies and one bushel and a-half of wheat, all good, dry, clean and merchantable, for each twenty arpents in superficies; and three *Sols Tournois* of cens for the whole of the said concession; the whole cens et rentes, *seigneuriales* payable each year, the first payment shall fall due and be payable on St. Martin's day, 11th Nov. next year; but the lessee binds himself to pay to the seigniors next St. Martin's day for all seigniorial rights, one *écu* or three *livres* for each arpent in the place and stead of the aforesaid cens et rentes of the present year only, and shall continue thenceforward, while and so long as the said lessee, his heirs and assigns shall be holders in whole or in part of the said land; with power, nevertheless, to the said chiefs to alter the term of payment; the said cens et rentes to carry profit of *lods et ventes* seizure and fines, on occasion, together with all other seigniorial and feudal rights, in accordance with the original title deed of the said seigniorie; the said concession to be subject to the common mill thereof, under pain of confiscation, arbitrary fine and payment for the grinding of any grain ground elsewhere; lessees to occupy the said land within a year and day from date hereof, give *décount* to their neighbors as it is required by them, and make party ditches with them (the said seigniors not being in any way bound thereunto as regards their unconceded land) and suffer all roads, bridges, ditches and discharge for watercourses suitable for public convenience, keep the same in good condition, and help with the other tenants to make roads and bridges on the *domaine* of the seigniorie and to maintain the same; work and cultivate the said land, keep it in a good condition, so that the said cens et rentes may easily be collected therefrom year by year.

“The said seigniors, lessors, reserving to themselves the right of redemption in case of the sale or other equivalent alienation of the whole or part of the said land, on repaying to the purchaser of the principal money of his purchase, costs, and true outlay.

“Right of *reconnaissance* and declaration at each change of seignior, by succession or otherwise, at the cost of the holder; nor shall the lessee his heirs or assigns have the right to give, cede or otherwise alienate the whole or part of the said land to any holder in mortmain, nor any community impose cens on cens of the said seigniors the lessors, who shall be entitled to take from the said lands all kinds of timber, stone, lime, sand, and other materials required for building churches, priests houses, mills and other public works. manors or other houses, or enclosures on the *domaines* of the said seigniorie without in any way paying anything to the said lessee, his heirs and assigns, and if the said seigniors wish to build water-mills, windmills, or saw-mills, they reserve the right, for the building thereof, to take, occupy, or cut lands for the passage of water in such places as they think proper, on paying for the clearing,

Mr. DOYON.

as estimated by experts, and reducing the cens et rentes in proportion to the land cut or taken, and the lessee shall not nor shall his heirs and assigns have power to build on the said concession any mill whatsoever, under pain, &c. And should the common mill of the seigniorie be burnt, or the dam thereof carried away by flood, in that case only the lessee, his heirs or assigns, shall be bound to give two days labor, in order to assist the other tenants in restoring the said mill or dam.

“To all which clauses, conditions, servitudes and reservations, the lessee hath submitted himself, for himself, his heirs and assigns, hath promised to comply therewith, and the whole thereof will follow out and execute and well and duly pay the said cens et rentes to the said seigniors at the time and place aforesaid; with hypothecary lien on his estate, movable or immovable, and specially on the land above conceded, and the one obligation shall not derogate from the other.

“And if the lessee, his heirs and assigns, fail to comply with the conditions aforesaid, in such case the said seigniors may re-enter *de plein droit* the said land, and restore it to the domain of the said seigniorie, and dispose thereof in favor of any person as they think proper, and they shall not be bound to adopt any form of process whatsoever in so doing. The lessee shall be bound to have the said land measured by a sworn surveyor, and before planting bounds shall furnish the surveyor's report thereof to the seigniors at his own cost and expense, together with a copy of these presents within eight days.

“And for the execution hereof, the lessee hath elected his domicile on the land herein above conceded, at which place, &c.

“Notwithstanding, &c., for, &c., promising, &c., binding, &c., renouncing, &c.

“Done and passed at the village of La Prairie, at the office of the undersigned notary, in the year 1819, the 26th April, in the afternoon; and the said Ignace Mikanawaha hath signed with the notaries; the said lessee, on enquiry, having declared his inability to write, hath made his mark, these presents having first been read.

(Signed) “IGNACE MIKANAWAHA,

bis

“JACQUES x PATENAUDE,

mark

“Ls. BARBEAU & R. F. DANDURAND, N. P.

“As set forth in the minutes hereof preserved at the office of the undersigned notary.

“One marginal reference good.

“R. F. DANDURAND, N. P.”

This deed is sufficient to create a strong presumption that the reserve has been illegally dispossessed and diminished by similar proceedings. Moreover, the present Government has threatened with legal process some of the *censitaires* who have occupied these lands for many years, and who have not paid any seigniorial rents, for the benefit of the Indians, for over 25 years in many cases. These *censitaires* who have been threatened by the Government are located at La Prairie, St. Constant and St. Isidore, and are now proprietors of these lands. These threats have not been generally put in execution, but I learn that the Government have prosecuted two of the richest and largest proprietors of St. Constant, in order to make their case a test case. I know not how the matter stands now; but in any case the fact of the farmers who occupy these lands being compelled to pay certain *rentes*, would not prove that the Indians had a right to sell these lands, whether they were sold by them, or by others who held them for their exclusive benefit; for the deeds of grant from the French kings declare that these lands were given to the Reverend Jesuit Fathers for the benefit and education of the Indians. It is also declared in the said deeds that the said lands shall revert to the Crown only in the event of the Indians abandoning the reserve. It is perfectly clear that the Indians have not abandoned their reserve, for they still occupy it; but they only occupy it in part, having been dispossessed of the rest. Mr. Speaker, I desire specially to call the attention of the Government

to these facts. I do not want that the farmers who now hold a part of the Caughnawaga reserve should be dispossessed. In fact I am not sure the thing could be done, even if it were desirable to do it, but I want that justice should be done to the Indians. If their lands have been unjustly taken from them—and until proof to the contrary, I am inclined to think they have—I think it would be but reasonable that the Government should take steps to indemnify them, or at least to ascertain whether they have not been dispossessed in an illegal manner. Mr. Speaker, I did not anticipate that this question would be taken up this evening, and I am unprovided with certain documents which would have enabled me to treat this question more completely. Nevertheless, I submit these explanations, reserving to myself the privilege of bringing this question before the House again, when I shall be in possession of fuller information.

Mr. DEWDNEY. From what I can gather of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman, as interpreted to me by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), the white settlers have been making encroachments on the Indian reserves at Caughnawaga. Since the notice appeared on the paper, I have had enquiries made in the Department, and I find that there is no correspondence whatever in reference to this matter. Since the hon. gentleman has made these remarks I will, when they are printed in the *Hansard*, go through them, and I will instruct my officers to enquire further into the matter, and I shall be very glad to confer on the subject with my hon. friend.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the Minister to these facts in connection with this matter. It appears that the Indian reserve, such as it was conceded first by the Government of France, covered an area of over 30,000 acres of land, and it appears the reserve has now been diminished to about 12,000 acres. The white people evidently have crowded out some of the Indians, and taken possession of their lands. This may have been done with or without authority. I understand that some of these encroachments have been made with authority, though I do not know what the authority could be. I understand that the Indian Department has taken proceedings a few months ago to compel some of those who are in possession of those Indian lands, to pay the ground rent. Now, I do not see how the Department could sue anybody in possession of Indian land to pay ground rent, unless those parties had derived their title to possession from some concession made by the Government. If the Government are collecting ground rents which are owing to the Indians, these payments naturally go into the funds of the Indians, and would inure to their benefit; but if they are encroachments which have been made without any authority whatever by the whites, the case is different. We know how it is in the vicinity of reserves; the white settlers are very apt to encroach a little every year, and the process goes on so long that the Indians may be deprived very materially of the reserve they originally possessed. If some of the encroachments have been going on, if to-day the Indians are deprived of a good deal of their lands, certainly the Department must take some measure—not to restore them their land, because I suppose that could not be done without a good deal of disturbance—but certainly in my

opinion the Department should take some measure to indemnify them for the encroachments they have suffered. It is not fair to the Indians that they should be deprived of the lands which have been conceded to them for their benefit, that the white settlers should be allowed to encroach upon them without any compensation being given to the Indians whatever. This is the idea which my hon. friend has been endeavoring to impress upon the Minister. The Minister says there is no correspondence; there may not be correspondence, but the subject is one which, in my opinion, ought to engage the attention of the Department.

Motion agreed to.

I.C.R.—EMPLOYÉS' INSURANCE SCHEME.

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

Return showing the past operation of the Intercolonial Railway employés insurance scheme, and specially, (a) the annual receipts and expenditure, including salaries of officials for each year the scheme has been in operation; (b) the amounts paid each year out of the fund to the employés or their representatives, and whether for death or injury; (c) the surplus (if any) now on hand of such fund. He said: I hope this return will be brought down at an early day, because I should like to have it before we pass to the estimates of the Intercolonial Railway. The information is almost at hand, and with a little extra exertion I think we might have it in a day or two.

Motion agreed to.

I.C.R.—OFFICIAL CARS.

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

Return showing (a) the names and number of officials' cars on the Intercolonial Railway and its branches; (b) the original cost, date and place of building each car, or name of person or company from whom purchased; (c) the cost of repairs to, or expenditure in each of such cars since acquired; (d) the names and salaries and expenses of each employé on such official cars; (e) the annual expenses of providing the supplies to each such car. He said: The return will be interesting for more than one reason. A few years ago we had one official car, and I know that about 1878 that car formed the text of more speeches and orations than I suppose any other similar expenditure ever made in the country. I do not think there were any Conservative candidates from the Province of Quebec down to Prince Edward Island who did not iterate and reiterate the expenditure on the celebrated Brydges car. Since then we have been undergoing a process of development at the cost of the taxpayer, and it has been a very rapid progress. If I am rightly informed, we have not simply one official car by which railway officials can pass from one place to another, but we have six or seven, or at all events a considerable number. These cars have not only increased in number, but also in magnificence, for this is a great country, we are a great people and we have great officials, especially great officials. In comparatively modern times and under the comparatively economical expenditure of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) and his Administration, we had only one great railway official entitled to travel in an official car. Now every railway official must have his car, not only the general manager of the Intercolonial but some of the Ministers, and also some of their families; and, moreover, they must have cars with all modern improvements, black men to wait on them, and so on. We want to know how much

the country is paying for these officials' cars. As the elections are coming on it will be interesting to the taxpayers to know how their money is expended. We want to know the number of the cars and the cost. I am told that the expenditure for repairs and the cost of some of these cars will startle even some hon. gentlemen opposite who are accustomed to vote anything which the Ministers ask them to vote.

Motion agreed to.

I. C. R. AND P. E. I. RAILWAY.

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

Copies of all petitions to the Minister of Railways since 1st January, 1889, from employés of the Intercolonial Railway workshops at Moncton and the Prince Edward Island Railway, asking for an increase of wages; and also for copies of all answers to the same from the Department of Railways or any official thereof.

He said : It will be in the recollection of the House, that some years ago I brought to its notice the unjust discrimination which exists between the pay of the employés of the Intercolonial Railway and that of the employés doing the same class of work on the Prince Edward Island Railway. I endeavored to show to the then Minister of Railways that this discrimination should be discontinued. I understood there was a rule passed prohibiting the employés of the Prince Edward Island Railway under pain of dismissal, from making any application at all for an increase of their salaries. I understand that rule did not apply to the Intercolonial Railway proper, and that applications have been made from the workmen on that railway for increases in their wages. This whole question will probably be discussed later on, and I express the hope that this petition will be brought down before the estimates for the Intercolonial Railway are gone into.

Motion agreed to.

CASCUMPEC HARBOR.

Mr. PERRY moved for :

Return showing the date of commencing the works of blasting the rock in Cascumpec Harbor, in Prince Edward Island, in the summer of 1889, the date at which the work stopped, the names of workmen employed, the amount of wages paid to each diver and to each laborer; also the whole amount expended in blasting said rock up to December, 1889.

He said : I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the necessity, that when the rock is taken out of Cascumpec harbor that the stone will be carried away, and not allowed to remain in the water to obstruct vessels. I hope the Minister will also investigate that matter in which one of the divers received 75 cents a day less than the other. I am sure that the man who got the 75 cents a day less, was as well entitled to it and earned it as hard as the other. Although it is nearly a year since this happened it is not too late to render justice.

Motion agreed to.

MONEYS BELONGING TO THE INDIANS OF CAUGHNAWAGA.

Mr. DOYON (Translation) moved for :

Statement showing: 1st. All moneys in the hands of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, belonging to the Indians of the Caughnawaga Reserve, 2nd. All the several sources from which the said moneys were derived.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

He said : Mr. Speaker, as in the case of the first motion I brought before the House this evening, I am in want of some of the papers required for a full statement of this matter. However, I wish to make some few observations in order to enable the House to understand the object I have in view in moving in this matter. Some thirty or forty years ago an old missionary had in his hands a sum of several thousand dollars which he managed in the interest of the Indians. I know nothing whatever of the source this money was derived from, but one thing sure is, that the reverend missionary used part of it in the building or repairing of the still existing church, and when he died, as none could be found in Caughnawaga who could properly manage the balance of this sum, the money was deposited in the hands of the reverend gentlemen of the Montreal Seminary. The sum amounted to \$3,333, which, at interest at the rate of six per cent., represented a yearly revenue of \$200. Up to these last few years this interest was paid to the Indians by the reverend gentlemen of the Seminary. I am informed that seven or eight years ago the Government sued these reverend gentlemen, or asked them to render an account of this sum of \$3,333, and never since have the Indians received this yearly sum of \$200 which they used to receive. I tried to trace this money in the Department of Indian Affairs; as it appeared to be derived from other sources than those from which other moneys belonging to the Indians were derived, I thought it was possibly entered under a special head in the Report on the Indian Affairs, but I find it nowhere. This is why I ask for the bringing down of the papers relating to this matter. I want to know whether this money was added to the other moneys belonging to the Indians, or whether it was made a separate fund. In either case, the money must yield an interest, whatever that be, and the fact that the Indians received \$200 as interest up to eight years ago shows that they are entitled to it, and even if this money was added to the other moneys belonging to the Indians, I want to know what has become of this sum of money, and if they are entitled to receive the interest it yields. It is not through ill-intent that I move in this matter, but I am bound to serve the interests of my constituents, and to comply with their wishes. That is why I enquire about this from the Government, and I hope the hon. the Minister of the Interior will gladly help me in my investigations.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will take the opportunity of bringing the matter to which the hon. gentleman has referred before my Department, and see if they have heard anything of it. I think that from the memorandum I have got here, the Department knows nothing of the subject. However, it will be easy to find out. If the hon. gentleman will come and see me at the office, and give me the particulars, I will make enquiries to find out where the money has gone.

Mr. DOYON. Very well.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing the number of tenders made or put in for the public work at the Eastern Gap of the Toronto Harbor Works; the name or names of each person or company tendering for the work, and the amount of each tender and the terms thereof, with a statement of the approximate quantities upon which each tender was cal-

culated; and of all letters and correspondence, statements, documents and papers pertaining to the letting of the contract and to any and all of the tenders.—(Mr. Barron.)

Copies of forms of advertisement and of tender, of tenders received of the contract entered into in connection with a steam service between any ports in the Maritime Provinces and any West India ports; also all correspondence connected therewith between any of the Public Departments and any persons interested in the establishment of the said service.—(Mr. Trow for Mr. Ellis.)

Return, in detail, of all expenses attending the passage and enforcement of the "Liquor License Act" of 1883 up to date; 2. The amount of all law costs *pro* its constitutionality; 3. The names of all the legal firm or firms employed by the Government, and the amount paid said firm or firms.—(Mr. Trow for Mr. Cook.)

Copies of all petitions forwarded to the Government by Messrs. Nazaire Ouellet, Geo. Voyer, Alfred Ouellet, F. Côté, and others, in relation to damages caused to their properties by the Intercolonial Railway.—(Mr. Fiset.)

Return showing the original cost of the Marine Hospital at Sackville, including cost of the site; the number of patients received each year into such hospital; the annual cost of such hospital.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Copies of all instructions issued by the Director of the Geological Survey to officers in charge of all surveying parties sent into the field within the last five years.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 11th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved:

That whereas it appears from certain documents and letters published in the Votes and Proceedings of this House, that John Charles Rykert, member for the County of Lincoln, did, in or about the beginning of the month of April, A.D. 1882, apply to the Government of Canada for a grant of certain timber limits in the North-West Territories, at or near Cypress Hills, in the name of one John Adams, and that, at or about the time of such application, he procured an agreement to be signed by the said John Adams, whereby, in consideration of the services of the said John C. Rykert, alleged to be voluntarily given, in obtaining the grant of such limits, the said Adams agreed to assign to the wife of the said John C. Rykert one-half interest in the limits so applied for, and to pay over to her one-half of all the net proceeds of the sale of all timber thereon or the purchase money derived therefrom, which agreement is in the words and figures following:—

Memorandum of agreement made this third day of April, A.D. 1882.—Between John Adams, of the city of Winnipeg, of the first part; and Nannie Marie Rykert, of the city of St. Catharines, of the second part.

Whereas the above named John Adams has, through the intervention of John Charles Rykert, obtained certain limits in the North-West Territories, at or near Cypress Hills, and has, in consideration of the services of the said Rykert, voluntarily given him, agreed, to and with the said party hereto of the second part, to give to her one-half the proceeds of the said limit, after deducting all expenses connected therewith:

Witnesseth, that the said party of the first part, in consideration of the sum of one dollar to him in hand paid by the party of the second part, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, and in further consideration of the premises, hath agreed, and by these presents doth agree, to assign and transfer to the said party of the second part one-half interest in the limits applied for and to be granted by the Government at or near the Cypress Hills, in the North-West Territory, and to pay over and account to her for one-half of all the net proceeds of the

sale of all timber thereon or for the purchase money derived therefrom, after deducting all expenses and charges in connection therewith.

"Witness the hands and seals of the parties hereto the day and year above written.

(Signed) "JOHN ADAMS.

"Witness: (Signed) J. C. RYKERT."

That whereas it further appears from such documents that the application of the said John C. Rykert was successful, and that an Order in Council was, on the 17th April, A.D. 1882, approved granting to the said Adams such limits, and that the said J. C. Rykert in such correspondence claimed and insisted that he was successful in procuring such Order in Council owing to the extraordinary influence he, the said Rykert, possessed with the Department of the Interior and with the Government, as appears from the following extracts from the letters of the said Rykert to the said Adams, contained in such Votes and Proceedings, viz., on the 11th April, 1882:

"I to-day saw McCarthy, and he was terribly surprised to hear that I had got the limit, as he was refused point-blank. He is willing to join with us in the survey, and I go to Hamilton to get Laidlaw to say where he wants the limit. He has written me he will do almost anything if I will assist him in getting his. I will write you from home on Thursday. The Order in Council went before the Government to-day, and it is likely it will pass at once. Instructions will then be given to the surveyor. We are awfully lucky, as the deputy told me that no other man could have forced them to yield."

And again on the 16th April, 1882:

"The Order was passed several days ago. Laidlaw is to meet me in Hamilton to-morrow. He has not yet got his Order, and is now of opinion that I have more influence than McCarthy, who told me he was refused by the Government."

And again on the 21st April:

"The Order in Council has been finally passed, and this although every effort was made to induce the Government to alter their minds."

And again on the 24th April:

"Laidlaw offered to bet me \$1,000 I could not get the Order passed for you, as he had been refused in January and again in February."

And again on the 10th May:

"Laidlaw only got his Order passed this week, and he had to get me to help him, so you see who had the influence with the Government after all."

And again on the 1st August, 1882:

"It will be satisfactory to know, after my hard fight with the Government, that I did get what you anticipated. I would not go through the same difficulty again for twice the amount. I never spent such six weeks before as I did while endeavoring to force the Department to do justice. The fact of their having refused McCarthy before had a great deal to do with the delay and refusal. Poor Laidlaw. I am pleased he did not get the start of this child. He thought he was very smart and had all the influence of the country at his back. I think another time they will recognise the fact that J. C. R. is not very easily defeated at anything."

And whereas it further appears that the said limits were subsequently sold, by, and on behalf of said Adams and Rykert, to one Louis Sands, at and for the sum of \$200,000, and that the said John C. Rykert did, on the 16th day of January, A.D. 1883, receive from the said John Adams the sum of \$74,200 out of the said purchase money, and which sum was payable under the said agreement as and for the share of the said John C. Rykert, or his wife, in the said limits, and that he signed a receipt therefor in the following terms:—

"WINNIPEG, MAN., 16th January, 1883.

"Received from John Adams \$35,000 in cash by drafts on the Bank of Montreal, and four notes of Louis Sands for \$39,200, payable in one and two years. All payable to the order of Mrs. N. M. Rykert, and in full of the moneys payable to her under agreement.

(Signed) "J. C. RYKERT,
"Her Attorney."

That whereas it appears from the *Hanward* report of the proceedings of the House that, on the 2nd day of May, A.D. 1883, Mr. Charlton, the then and present member for North Norfolk, did in his place ask: "If the said John C. Rykert did not negotiate the transaction in connection with the timber limits in the Cypress Hills, and if he did not, as agent for other parties, get a timber limit there at \$5 a square mile and sell it at \$2,000 a square mile, and if he did not get such limit on behalf of one Adams, and if he did not go to Winnipeg in

person and sell it to Louis Sands, of Michigan, for \$200,000, of which \$90,000 was paid in cash, one-third of which he, the said John C. Rykert, put in his pocket?" to all of which questions the said J. C. Rykert categorically replied in the negative, and at once proceeded to make, and did make, the following statement from his place in the House:—

"The hon. gentleman has asked me several questions, and I propose now to answer them. I neither directly nor indirectly drew the money he spoke of, nor put any sum in my pocket except professional fees, and professional fees only. I deny that I negotiated any timber lease for Mr. Adams, or any other person. On the contrary, Mr. Adams had his own agents to negotiate for him; he made his own bargain, and I had nothing to do with it, and did not pocket the money the hon. gentleman has spoken of. On the contrary, I advised Mr. Adams not to dispose of the limit, but to work it. The hon. gentleman on several occasions has made remarks outside the House to the same effect, and I am glad now to have an opportunity to give it an emphatic denial."

That whereas it further appears from the said correspondence published in the said Votes and Proceedings, that certain difficulties having arisen with respect to the said limits, owing to their being claimed, in whole or in part, by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as being within the Railway Belt, the said John C. Rykert did agree with the said Adams to use, and did inform the said Adams by letters signed with his own hand that he was using, corrupt influences with certain members of the Government of Canada and of the Parliament thereof, and with other officials thereof, in order to defeat the claim of the said Canadian Pacific Railway Company and to secure to himself and the said Adams, or their assignee, the said timber limits, and did further inform the said Adams that he had eventually successfully arranged the matter; all of which appears in the following extracts from the letters written by the said J. C. Rykert to the said Adams published in the said Votes and Proceedings, viz.:—

In the letter of 28th January, 1883:

"I have to go to Ottawa to-morrow night to fight the matter out, which I do not like. I seem to have all the hardest part of it to do. I have Bowell working for me. And if we succeed in beating the railway, we will have to pay the amount we agreed to pay, as you recollect, when we two were in the Queen's Hotel. I have not slept for a week on account of this. We must keep perfectly quiet."

And in the same letter, further on:

"I am engaging all I can to assist me at Ottawa, and we will have to pay them well for it, as we cannot afford to lose this."

And in the letter of the 12th February, 1883:

"I have not yet succeeded in doing anything, but I am pulling wires in every direction. John A.'s son from Winnipeg, McArthur's partner, is here, and I intend employing him to go for his father. I think if you had young Tupper here, and paid him pretty well, he would help us materially. The Canadian Pacific Railway has a great hold on the Government, and we must counteract this in some way."

And in the same letter:

"I am completely sick of it, as it is something I had no right to expect, and which I should not be called upon to undertake. If it costs all we spoke of, we had better do it than let it go."

And in another letter, dated 5th March, 1883, he says:

"I have not yet succeeded in getting anything done in the limit matter. I have brought Macdonald and Tupper from Winnipeg, and hope they will be able to induce their fathers to act promptly in the matter."

"I am almost discouraged at the delay. Sands is writing me daily about it. He knows all about it. Some persons sent him the papers containing the statements. Will make any effort this week, and must do something, if we have to let a note apiece go."

And in the letter of the 8th March:

"I find difficulties surrounding us in every way in reference to the limit, and I find that the Canadian Pacific Railway have certain Ministers working for them. I am afraid it will cost us each six or seven thousand dollars to get this made all right. I have five or six at work with me, and have agreed to pay them well if they succeed. Muckle was here, and told me the limit was all within the belt. I am afraid they will do their very utmost to defeat me. I want to be satisfied that you are sure I am doing what is right, and also that you will back me out in all that I do in the way of payment."

Again on the 28th March, 1883:

"I am having a hard time with the limit matter. It will cost us each at least \$5,500 to get this through. I

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

have laid my ropes so that I expect to have it settled in a few days. I have a dozen at work for us. You must be prepared to pay the amount of your share at any time, as it will have to be all cash. When this is settled we must get rid of all the notes and have an end of it. It has completely used me up. The excitement and strain is too much for me. I had Tupper and Macdonald brought from Winnipeg, and they have been working hard for me."

That whereas it is apparent from the said documents and correspondence, that the said Rykert did make use of his position and influence as a member of this House, in the matter of the said limits, for his own pecuniary advantage; and that he did afterwards make a statement, from his place in this House, with regard to his connection with and the obtaining the said limits, entirely at variance with the facts, and calculated to mislead the House and the country; and that he made further statements in his correspondence with the said Adams to the effect that he was obliged to resort to corrupt practices with members of the Cabinet, and members of Parliament, and other Government officials, in order to perfect the title to the said grant of such limits (which statements have been challenged as false by members of the Cabinet, from their places in this House, and admitted by the said Rykert, in his place in the House, so far as members of the Cabinet are concerned, to be untrue).

That the conduct of the said John C. Rykert in the premises is, and has been, discreditable, corrupt and scandalous.

He said: In accordance with the understanding arrived at with the Premier the other day, I propose to call your attention to a certain motion, of which I have given notice. It is as nearly as possible a month since I took occasion to call the attention of the Government to certain correspondence, purporting to be signed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), which I thought required our attention. Since that time that correspondence has been placed on our Votes and Proceedings; that correspondence has been admitted to be correct by the hon. gentleman himself in his place, and in certain communications which also appear on our Votes and Proceedings. Now, in the first place, I desire to say that it appears to me that it was the duty of the Government of Canada, under these circumstances, to have taken this matter into their own hands, inasmuch as this correspondence appears to contain statements and facts which seriously affect the honor and reputation of a member of this House, and which appeared to the Government themselves to reflect so seriously on certain members of their own body, that one hon. member of the Government found it necessary to rise in his place and repudiate the apparent construction which might be placed on those letters, in the strongest possible language, while the Premier himself appears to have thought that transaction to involve such consequences that he deemed it right to cause a communication from his own son, repudiating all connection with these transactions, to be likewise placed on our Votes and Proceedings, and made part of the record. Sir, I shall not, at present, attempt to say why or wherefore the Government did not see fit to act on this matter—possibly the causes may appear in the course of this debate; but as they did not choose to act, it is clearly our duty, on this side of the House, to call your attention and that of the House itself, to these facts and to this correspondence. Now, some of these matters appear to me to involve questions of very great gravity. It is not only that the statements themselves seem to reflect gravely on the honor and reputation of an old member of this House, and a man of some prominence in it too, but I believe they reflect on the honor and reputation of the House of Commons, and of the people who sent us

here. Sir, it would hardly be going too far for me to say that on the right or the wrong handling of the questions incidentally involved in this motion, depends, I will not say the possibility, but I will say the utility, of parliamentary government, in Canada. The question really amounts to this: Is this House of Commons, from this time forth, to be considered as a place of assembly where the representatives of the people are to meet and discuss matters affecting the welfare of the community, or is it to become, from this time out, a sort of happy hunting-ground for needy and unscrupulous adventurers? Is the House of Commons to be known henceforward as a body composed of trustees of the people, bound to act for the benefit of the people, or are the members of the House of Commons from henceforth to get full license to use their position and influence in this House for the purpose of their own private gain and advantage? These, Sir, are some among the questions which appear to me to be involved in the discussion of the motion now on hand. My opinions on this and on certain kindred questions are well known. Both in this House, on many occasions, on the hustings, before my own constituents, and in published speeches of mine, I have not infrequently called attention to the extent to which, as it appeared to me, the public service was being demoralised, and in danger of being further demoralised under the twofold influence of a corrupt fiscal system and a corrupt Administration. Sir, it seems that things have been going from bad to worse. In a late Parliament it was stated on the floor of this House, and, so far as I can remember, the facts were fairly made out, that out of the majority of 140 very nearly seventy members, or one-half of the whole, had entered into such pecuniary relations with the Government in one form or other, as could not fail most seriously to embarrass their position as free agents and representatives of the people. I have always myself had a very strong prejudice, indeed, in favor of our form of government. I have always regarded what we may call the Cabinet form of government as a great improvement in many ways on the Presidential form of government adopted by our neighbors; but I am bound to say that the events of the last few years have caused me at times to entertain grave doubts indeed as to whether the fathers of the American Republic did not, after all, better understand in some respects the condition of society on this side of the Atlantic, when they saw fit to separate the executive from the legislative function. Still, notwithstanding that, I am of the opinion that there is a better mode than they have adopted, but I am free to admit that, if no remedy can be found for the state of things to which I have alluded, we might do well to consider whether, under the circumstances, it was not necessary for us to adopt somewhat similar precautions. Sir, I think that the facts disclosed in the case of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) show that it is a very bad case. But I am not at all disposed to say that the hon. member for Lincoln is, by any means, the only sinner in this matter; I am not at all disposed to say that that hon. member is the only man who has transgressed all those wholesome maxims and principles on which the vitality and usefulness of parliamentary government depend. More than that: I have said elsewhere, and I repeat here, that I hold a considerable

section of the people of Canada, a considerable number of the constituencies of Canada, are far from blameless in this matter. I have always believed that to a very great extent members of Parliament were likely to be as honest as their constituents required them to be; and there was one fact, perhaps one only, which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) stated in his defence, recorded on the Journals of this House, with which I am disposed to agree: that is, the statement which he made in which he implied, at any rate, that he came here with the full knowledge and consent of his constituents, who were acquainted with all the material facts now stated before they sent him here. And he implied, and I think he implied correctly, that if he was wrong, his disgrace was their disgrace. If he had committed a crime, his constituents were accomplices in it. I am not disposed to dispute that statement. It is well, and it is right it should be understood, that if constituents condone these things, they have only themselves to thank if the members of Parliament fall far below the standard set by our English forefathers for their members of Parliament. Every practical man knows perfectly well that, in most cases of the kind which are now coming before us, the facts are apt, as a rule, to be exceedingly well covered. It is probable that in not one case in ten, or one case in fifty, can we obtain full and complete evidence detailed, as it is here, of all the ways and modes in which members of Parliament can exercise their influence for their own personal gain. Sir, it is very hard indeed, and it will always be very hard for a minority, no matter how resolute and determined, to uncover these things and obtain the requisite evidence, and still harder for them to punish. In fact, Mr. Speaker, unless the thieves fall out, unless there is a quarrel over the division of the plunder, unless these things come before a court of law and are there subjected to the ruthless cross-examination of counsel on both sides, it is the rarest thing in the world to obtain absolute and complete proof such as we have now recorded on our Votes and Proceedings. Here such an accident has occurred. Here there was a quarrel over the division of the plunder. As Carlyle puts it, we have had a glimpse of the workings of Satan's invisible world, and we are now able to understand in some degree how that personage, with the aid and assistance of some of his most favored friends, has contrived to bedevil and to pervert the representative institutions of this Canada of ours. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which the House and the country will do well to consider. I repeat, that where you have disclosed one transaction of this kind, where you obtain against the accused clear proof and evidence of what has happened in a particular case, you may rest assured there are ten times as many cases in which the evidence cannot be brought forward, however strong and well grounded our suspicions may be. This transaction, after all, is only a sort of peak on which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) stands self-gibbeted, by his own act, but a peak below which lies a mountain—or, perhaps, I should say a mountain range of undiscovered, but well developed rascality.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a strong word.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a strong word, and the transaction is one which deserves the strongest terms in the English language I am

able to apply to it, within the limits of parliamentary usage. I say this whole correspondence, from start to finish, reeks of corruption at every pore; I say, with full knowledge of what I say, that I challenge any parliamentary authority to point out to me in the annals of any single English-speaking parliamentary assembly, at all comparing in rank and dignity to ours, any transaction which for one moment can compare with this. If you want to find a parallel you will have to go to the doings, and to the worst doings too, of the ring which, under the name of the Tammany Hall ring, so long controlled the municipal administration of the great city of New York. In all this matter there is one thing, and one thing alone, on which I think the House may be congratulated, and that is: that, at any rate, the facts are clearly established without any possibility of denial or dispute. There is no room for wrangling here over the facts themselves, although you may quarrel, if you like, as to the deductions which I draw from them, or as to the deductions which ought to be drawn. Sir, we have here established, and admitted by the gentleman whose conduct is called in question, first, the agreement made between himself and Mr. James Adams, by which his wife became entitled to one-half of the whole profits arising from the acquisition of the timber limits. We have, next, the Order in Council, obtained by his exertions, granting those lands. We have proof that tenders were not asked, although many applicants were known to be in the market for those limits. We have further evidence, from the hon. gentleman's own mouth, that he knew perfectly well that those limits he was acquiring were likely to prove of great value. We have evidence that, within six months after the passage of the Order in Council, the hon. gentleman sold—he, the representative and trustee of the people of Canada, sold—for \$200,000 what he acquired from the other guardians of the public interests for \$500. We have, Sir, from the hon. gentleman's own mouth, evidence of what he (I am using his own words) called an "honorable division" of the plunder. We have, from the hon. gentleman's own mouth, ample evidence of the use of influence, the use of his position as a member of this House, and we have a most curious and instructive narrative, showing the hon. gentleman's remarkable skill in wirepulling, and the continuous exercise of the same." We have in the *Hansard*, recorded beyond dispute, the clearest possible evidence from the hon. gentleman's own mouth, that when challenged with this transaction by my hon. friend who sits beside me (Mr. Charlton), he utterly and entirely repudiated every one of the facts admitted in this correspondence. And, Sir, I come to this, last of all: we have, curiously enough, incidentally, the hon. gentleman's own opinion of the transaction. I shall deal with these several points in due rotation, and, first of all, I desire to call the special attention of this House to the date, and to the terms of the agreement entered into, before the acquisition of this same timber limit, between the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) and Mr. John Adams. It reads as follows:—

"THE AGREEMENT.

"Memorandum of agreement made this third day of April, A. D. 1882:—Between John Adams, of the city of Winnipeg, of the first part: and Nannie Marie Rykert, of the city of St. Catharines, of the second part.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

"Whereas the above-named John Adams has, through the intervention of John Charles Rykert, obtained certain limits in the N.W.T., at or near the Cypress Hills, and has, in consideration of the services of the said Rykert, voluntarily given him, agreed, to and with the said party hereto of the second part, to give to her one-half of the proceeds of the said limits, after deducting all expenses connected therewith:

"Witnesseth, that the said party of the first part, in consideration of the sum of one dollar to him in hand, paid by the party of the second part, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, and in further consideration of the premises, hath agreed, and by these presents doth agree, to assign and transfer to the said party of the second part one-half interest in the limits applied for and to be granted by the Government at or near the Cypress Hills, in the North-West Territory, and to pay over and account to her for one-half of all the net proceeds of the sale of all timber thereon or for the purchase money derived therefrom, after deducting all expenses and charges in connection therewith.

"Witness the hands and seals of the parties hereto the day and year above written.

(Signed) "JOHN ADAMS.

"(Witness) J. C. RYKERT."

I need hardly tell the House that the John C. Rykert, the witness, is the husband of the aforesaid Nannie Marie Rykert. Now, if it be asked, although I do not know that it matters very materially, why the hon. member for Lincoln kept in the background in this transaction, and why, if, as he and his friends assert, he was perfectly justified in doing what he did—he, a member of this House, in obtaining for \$500 property which afterwards sold for \$200,000—if it be asked, why his name did not figure in this Order in Council, if not instead, at any rate along with that of Mr. John Adams; possibly a glance at the date of the transaction may throw some light upon it. This bargain was made on the 3rd April, 1882, and a gentleman who stood so close to the Government, and was so much in their confidence, and possessed such enormous influence over them, as the hon. member has informed us he did, could not fail to know that a general election was pending, and that scandalous tongues like my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Charlton), and those of other hon. gentlemen, might put an evil construction upon this very natural and proper arrangement entered into by the hon. member. It is also apparent from this correspondence that the member for Lincoln was determined on one thing, namely, that he would not put one dollar of his own money into this transaction, that he would incur no risk, that all the money that was to be expended or risked was to come out of his partner's pocket, and that he was to have, for the benefit of his wife, one-half of the proceeds. Sir, I might possibly hint, also, that the transaction, in the mind of the hon. gentleman, was rather shady, and the less said about it the better. Now, Sir, as regards the Order in Council and the terms of it. That Order in Council granted, as I understand, to Mr. John Adams this large tract of country for the sum of \$5 per square mile, which he afterwards sold—it cannot be too often repeated—for \$2,000 per square mile. That Order in Council was passed, and it is clear that no tenders were called for. It is clear also, from the correspondence of the hon. gentleman himself, that there were plenty of applicants for it, and that if it had been put up to tender, beyond all doubt, a very large sum of money—how much, I cannot say—would have been offered for the limit which had been disposed of to Mr. Adams. I note that some parties are disposed to think that, after all, prob-

ably the hon. gentleman was not aware that he had got such a very good bargain in this matter. Should there be any such, I would call their attention to a few letters written by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). You will observe that the Order in Council was granted on the 17th April, and a week before that date he writes as follows:—

“10th April, 1882.

“(Re Limit.)

“MY DEAR ADAMS,—After calling at the office eight or ten times I got the enclosed copy of Order in Council. It will be pushed through very likely to-morrow if the Government is not too lazy. You will see they give us 400 square miles to choose from. If this is not satisfactory I do not know what is. Get your surveyor ready, and I will have his instructions in a few days. They give us six months.

“Faithfully,
“J. C. RYKERT.”

Then comes the postscript, and perhaps, like many others, it is the most important part of the letter.

“If you can get \$40,000 let it go, and we will get another. Try McCarthy. Perhaps he will buy.”
McCarthy would not, though.

Mr. MITCHELL. What McCarthy is that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That, I understood, was the hon. member for North Simcoe; but I am open to correction on that point, if I am mistaken. Then, Mr. Speaker, we find that, on the 24th April, this gentleman who did not know that the limit was of any particular value, writes as follows:—

“24th April, 1882.

“MY DEAR ADAMS,—I have daily gone to the office for instructions and copy of Order in Council. I now enclose order, which you will see gives you the right over 400 miles. This is the largest privilege ever given to select from, and none has ever passed in the same speedy manner. I enclose memorandum of one of the clerks, showing he will prepare instructions in a day or two. I will keep at him daily. Get ready to leave at once. Laidlaw offered to bet me \$1,000 I could not get the order passed for you, as he had been refused in January and again in February. You ought to get up company if possible and sell half for, say, \$35,000, or the whole for \$70,000. If this is done I will go for something else.

“Faithfully,
“J. C. RYKERT.”

And on the 24th July, this gentleman who was not sure that the bargain was worth anything, writes:

“St. CATHARINES, 24th July, 1882.

“MY DEAR ADAMS,—I am in receipt of your favor, and am pleased to learn that the limit has panned out all right, as I was in great dread it would be a failure. I am in a certain sense glad that Laidlaw has failed, as he acted so infernal mean about it. I think if you can get \$80,000 you had better sell immediately, or less than that. If as good as you say the C.P.R. can give us at least \$60,000 and expenses. You better see them at once, and if they will bite at all tell them I will assist them in getting all the timber within the twenty square miles. It is important to realise the cash, when we can look out for more. Have you stopped them from cutting? This is necessary. I see by the papers that the C.P.R. is cutting timber at the Cypress Hills. I do not think it will pay to work. The cash is very much better. I would not delay at all in seeing the company. Perhaps Muckle can urge them to buy.

“Faithfully,
“J. C. RYKERT.”

We find the value goes up by leaps and bounds, according to the hon. gentleman. First it was \$40,000, then \$70,000, and then we find it was underestimated at \$80,000. On the 1st August, 1882,—because it is really of some moment that we should understand how well posted the hon. gentleman was in these matters—he writes from St. Catharines as follows:—

“I still am of the opinion that you had better sell out boldly and get the cash, if they will pay you \$75,000 or \$80,000. We would then be in a position to go in for something larger, if possible. That notice in the paper is pretty well got up. I guess I can see who wrote it or dictated it. Can you not get some railway man in whom you have confidence to go to Van Horne and tell him the Railway Company ought to purchase, and that the limit is well worth \$150,000. Some such a game as this might take well.”

On the 19th August, 1882, I find another letter dated St. Catharines:

“I see by the report that there are 37½ miles of timber instead of 50 miles. If this is all timber, as it appears to be, you will have a grand future. Would it not be well to make an effort to get up a company, putting in the land at \$150,000. We might take stock to the amount of one-third. How would it do to give Wolf, say, \$5,000 to get up a company, or whatever you can agree upon. I read Laidlaw's letter. He thinks you are mistaken as to the limit he applied for having no timber. Now that it is well known that you have a grand limit, I think there will be no difficulty in getting up a large company. I want Mrs. R.'s half to bring her in \$50,000 if possible. I hope you got telegraph, and that you have sent me the outh.”

I think, Sir, that correspondence will show tolerably clearly—remembering that the Order in Council was passed on the 17th of April—that the hon. gentleman had a pretty good idea that he had got a very valuable property. Sir, it is not often that the hon. gentleman is guilty of the sin—for I suppose he will consider it such—of underestimating a property that belongs to him; but, Sir, it would appear from an important document which has been laid on the Table of the House that, fast as the hon. gentleman raised his price from \$40,000 to \$70,000, from \$70,000 to \$80,000, from \$80,000 to \$150,000, he had not yet measured the full value and importance of his plunder. The following receipt, dated Winnipeg, Manitoba, 16th January, 1883, witnesses the crown of his virtuous efforts, and his success, as he says himself, in making provision for his old age:

“WINNIPEG, MAN., 16th January, 1883.

“Received from John Adams thirty-five thousand dollars in cash by drafts on the Bank of Montreal, and four notes of Louis Sands for thirty-nine thousand two hundred dollars, payable in one and two years. All payable to the order of Mrs. N. M. Rykert, and in full of the moneys payable to her under agreement.

“J. C. RYKERT,
“Her Attorney.”

Now, Sir, this shows, as I have said, and as the hon. gentleman has admitted, that the plunder was “honorably divided.” As to the question of the use of influence by the hon. gentleman, I must refer you to the hon. gentleman's correspondence *passim*. The hon. gentleman, on the 11th of April, 1882, writing to Mr. Adams, says:

“I to-day saw McCarthy, and he was terribly surprised to hear that I had got the limit, as he was refused point-blank. He is willing to join with us in the survey, and I go to Hamilton to get Laidlaw to say where he wants the limit. He has written me he will do almost anything if I will assist him in getting his. I will write you from home on Thursday. The Order in Council went before the Government to-day, and it is likely it will pass at once. Instructions will then be given to the surveyor. We are awfully lucky, as the Deputy told me that no other man could have forced them to yield.”

On the 16th of April, he writes:

“The Order was passed several days ago. Laidlaw is to meet me in Hamilton to-morrow. He has not yet got his order, and is now of the opinion that I have more influence than McCarthy, who told me he was refused by the Government.”

Again, on the 21st of April:

"The Order in Council has been finally passed, and this although every effort was made to induce the Government to alter their minds."

Then, on the 10th of May :

"Laidlaw only got his Order passed this week, and he had to get me to help him: so you see who had the influence with the Government after all."

On the 8th of August he writes :

"It will be satisfactory to know, after my hard fight with the Government, that I did get what you anticipated. I would not go through the same difficulty again for twice the amount. I never spent such six weeks before as I did while endeavoring to force the Department to do justice. The fact of their having refused McCarthy before had a great deal to do with the delay and refusal. Poor Laidlaw, I am pleased he did not get the start of this child. He thought he was very smart and had all the influence of the country at his back. I think another time they will recognise the fact that J. C. R. is not very easily defeated at anything."

Of the hon. gentleman's skill in wire-pulling in every direction, perhaps the hon. Minister of Customs may find it convenient to speak before the debate is over. But there is one particular phase of it which, perhaps, deserves a little notice. As the House will perceive, the hon. member for Lincoln is nothing if not a good family man. The hon. gentleman, judging others by himself, thought the influence of parental feelings was likely to be very strong in certain hon. members of the Government: and finding that there were difficulties—and I give this as an instance to show that the hon. gentleman, as he would say himself, was up to every move on the board—he proceeded to inform Mr. Adams on the 12th February, 1883 :

"I have not yet succeeded in doing anything, but I am pulling wires in every direction. John A.'s son from Winnipeg, McCarthy's partner, is here, and I intend employing him to go for his father. I think if you had young Tupper here, and paid him pretty well, he would help us materially."

Mr. MITCHELL. He draws a distinction between them, does he ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Apparently.

"The C.P.R. has a great hold on the Government, and we must counteract this in some way."

On the 5th of March, 1883, he writes from Ottawa :

"I have not yet succeeded in getting anything done in the limit matter. I have brought Macdonald and Tupper from Winnipeg, and hope they will be able to induce their fathers to act promptly in the matter."

And he proceeds to deliver himself, on the 8th of March, of a statement of a remarkable sort :

"I find difficulties surrounding us in every way in reference to the limit, and I find that the C.P.R. have certain Ministers working for them. I am afraid it will cost us each six or seven thousand dollars to get this made all right. I have five or six at work for me, and have agreed to pay them well if they succeed."

On the 28th of March, 1883, he writes :

"I am having a hard time with the limit matter. It will cost us each at least \$5,500 to get this through." And the House will remember that they only made \$100,000 apiece.—

"I have laid my ropes, so that I expect to have it settled in a few days. I have a dozen at work for us. You must be prepared to pay the amount of your share at any time, as it will have to be all cash. When this is settled we must get rid of all the notes and have an end of it. It has completely used me up. The excitement and strain is too much for me. I had Tupper and Macdonald brought from Winnipeg, and they have been working hard for me."

Now, I accept frankly and fully the statement made by the hon. Minister of Customs, speaking, I presume, for himself and colleagues, that he did

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

not take, and did not expect or intend to take, one farthing from the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). I do not believe that, to put the thing mildly, there was the smallest foundation in facts for the statement in these letters to that effect. But, what I do believe, and what I say is the clear and obvious inference from these letters, is that the hon. member for Lincoln designed to impress on his partners the fact that he would be obliged to corruptly expend a large sum of money in Ottawa in influencing Ministers or other parties. That is the construction I put upon it, and I will say that, for my part, knowing Mr. Hugh Macdonald, I believe and entirely accept his statement in preference to that of the hon. member for Lincoln. It may possibly be some consolation to the Minister of Customs, and, peradventure to the Premier, to know that in the course of this, which, I fear, I must characterise as a very fraudulent transaction, somebody overreached himself—and hence the suit which was brought by the representatives of Mr. Adams against the hon. gentleman, and which led to these disclosures that are now staring us in the face in all these proceedings. But there was something more. Cleverly as the hon. gentleman had concealed his facts, he had not absolutely and wholly concealed them. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Charlton), being a lumberman, had obtained some little information as to the hon. gentleman's proceedings; and in the *Hansard* report of the proceedings of this House under date the 2nd May, 1883, the then and present member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), rising in his place, asked :

"I want to know if the hon. gentleman did not negotiate the transaction in connection with the timber limit in the Cypress Hills? I want to know if he did not, as agent for other parties, get a timber limit there at \$5 a square mile, and sell it at \$2,000 a square mile?"

"I want to know if he did not get that on behalf of one Adams; if he did not go to Winnipeg in person and sell it to Louis Sands of Michigan?"

"I want to know if the price was not \$200,000; if \$90,000 was not paid in cash, one-third of which he put in his pocket?"

In reply to that, the hon. member for Lincoln made the following statement, and I call the especial attention of every hon. gentleman here to the statement. I invite them to compare it with the correspondence, and I leave it with them as honest and honorable men to say what they would think of a man who, in his place in this House, made this statement :

"The hon. gentleman has asked me several questions, and I propose now to answer them. I neither directly nor indirectly drew the money he spoke of, nor put any sum in my pocket except professional fees, and professional fees only. I deny that I negotiated any timber lease for Mr. Adams, or any other person. On the contrary, Mr. Adams had his own agents to negotiate for him; he made his own bargain, and I had nothing to do with it, and did not pocket the money the hon. gentleman has spoken of. On the contrary, I advised Mr. Adams not to dispose of the limit, but to work it. The hon. gentleman on several occasions has made remarks outside of the House to the same effect, and I am glad now to have an opportunity to give it an emphatic denial."

This is the statement of the hon. minister made three months after he had signed the following receipt :—

"WINNIPEG, MAN., 16th Jan., 1883.

"Received from John Adams thirty-five thousand dollars in cash by draft on the Bank of Montreal, and four notes of Louis Sands for thirty-nine thousand two hundred dollars, payable in one and two years. All payable

to the order of Mrs. N. M. Rykert, and in full of the moneys payable to her under agreement.

"J. C. RYKERT,
"Her Attorney."

Now, the last point to which I want to call your attention, Sir, is the opinion which the hon. gentleman himself, all things considered, seems to have entertained of this transaction. I find on the 25th December, 1882, under date from St. Catharines, the hon. gentleman writes as follows:—

"ST. CATHARINES, 25th December, 1882.

"MY DEAR ADAMS,—What is the reason that some person writes the full particulars of our business to some parties here? Mercer or some member of the family has written all the facts to Seymour, and he is telling them all about the city. This is very injudicious and contrary to what I asked you to do. It is of the utmost importance to keep the sale out of the papers, or we may be injured at Ottawa. Already they are threatening the Government to bring the matter before the House, and, if they do, it will perhaps hurt us very much. If Sir John knows the facts, he may prevent the transfer being recognised."

He did not do it.—

"Now let me again urge you to see that this is kept quiet. Why does Mercer want to tell all the Seymour family? You might as well publish it in the *Globe* at once, as they tell all they know on the streets. Let me know as early as possible the day Sands will go up, so that I can be prepared."

On 28th January—and I may observe that the hon. gentleman, in some of the statements on the Table, declares there was no impropriety whatever in these proceedings—he proceeds to write:

"I have to go to Ottawa to-morrow night to fight the matter out, which I do not like. I seem to have all the hardest part of it to do. I have Bowell working for me. And if we succeed in beating the railway, we will have to pay the amount we agreed to pay, as you recollect, when we two were at the Queen's Hotel. I have not slept any for a week on account of this. We must keep perfectly quiet."

And on the 23rd of January the hon. gentleman, in another remarkable letter, expresses the opinion that if these particulars come out there will be the devil to pay in the House.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am quoting from matters on record in our proceedings, and I presume I am perfectly in order. However, as the hon. gentleman doubts whether I am, I shall read the statement:

"HOUSE OF COMMONS, 23rd January, 1884.

"DEAR MERCER,—I wrote you yesterday at the Hotel Baltimore as requested. I mentioned the fact that Sands had been to see me, and tried very hard to have the notes renewed. I told him they were in the hands of the bank, and he finally agreed to pay them, which he did five days before they were due.

"I fully satisfied him as to the whole matter, otherwise I am afraid he would have repudiated. So you will find that you have been paid the notes. This is really a grand thing for us. There is the devil to pay in the House about the whole affair, and it is really too bad that I am compelled to bear all the brunt of it."

Now, here arises an interesting psychological problem. When the hon. gentleman spoke of there being the devil to pay, was it second sight on his part, was it a guilty conscience, or was it simply that the fiend had been bought off for a season? I think, Sir, that I have established tolerably clearly from the evidence of the hon. gentleman's own written statement, and by agreements signed by his own hand, all the facts in this transaction upon which I intend to invite the judgment of the House. It now remains for me to deduce certain inferences from these facts. The House has estab-

lished before it, from the hon. gentleman's own written statements, what he has done. This hon. member, a representative of the people, a trustee of the people, under pay by the people, or, at any rate, indemnified for all charges in attending to his duties here, thinks it consistent with his duty to devote his whole time, during two whole Sessions, to engineering an Order in Council through the House, by which a very valuable property, a property belonging to Canada, the property and inheritance of the whole people of Canada, is bartered away for nothing after an agreement had been made by him with Mr. John Adams, in accordance with which he was to receive half of all the proceeds. Looking on the hon. member as a trustee, I say it is a deliberate fraud on the *cestui que trusts*, and I say here—and I think no one will contradict me when I make the statement—that, if this had been a transaction between an ordinary trustee and his wards, there is no court of equity that would not have compelled the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) to refund to his wards the whole \$200,000, with compound interest. Now, there is another, and a vastly more important side to this matter. I propose to ask your attention, and the attention of the House, to certain propositions which appear to me to underlie the whole theory of representative government. I will lay down the propositions by which I am willing to be judged, and by which I propose to judge the hon. gentleman. I say, in the first place, that every member of Parliament—whether he may admit it or not—is a trustee in the strictest sense of the term. I say he has no right to use his position as a member of Parliament for his own private gain or advantage. I say that, if he does use his position for his private gain, he cannot possibly discharge his duties as a representative of the people, and as a trustee of the people. And I say that, unless those principles are clearly understood and fully recognised, first, by this House, and then by the people who send us here, parliamentary government here or elsewhere is a farce and a fraud. I challenge contradiction of these statements. I do not think I have gone one bit too far, and, if any hon. gentlemen feel disposed to contradict those propositions, I hope they will do so here and now before this debate is over. Now, what is the corollary to be drawn from this? The corollary is, that if any member of Parliament has a transaction of any kind with the Government, the onus lies upon him to show that he made no attempt to use his position as a member of Parliament for his private gain or advantage. This is the case even where the dealings would otherwise be legal. That is the position which I take. Many things have been absolutely prohibited, and wisely prohibited, to members of Parliament. There are many things with which they are not allowed to meddle in any shape or way, but, beyond that, there lies the unwritten law of England providing that no trustee is justified in using his position to the detriment of the *cestui que trusts*. I apply that in the case of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) as I am willing to have it applied in my own case. If you admit—and I defy any hon. gentleman to deny it—that this proposition is sound, then the hon. gentleman is condemned from start to finish of his whole correspondence, for his whole correspondence shows that from first to last he traded

on his position, that he used and abused his position as a member of this House, in order to put money into his own pocket. Now, let us glance for a moment at the defence that has been put forward. The hon. gentleman has made a statement in his place in Parliament, and has published and caused to be put on record, a long letter in which he deals with these transactions. He admits the facts. I render him no thanks for that. Those facts were established in a court of law and could not be denied. But he pleads three things. First he pleads that he has successfully evaded the law. He tells us that he is not brought within the provisions of the Independence of Parliament Act. That may be or may not be. That is a matter for the courts and for lawyers to decide. But what on earth does this House, what on earth does this country believe to be the object of any Independence of Parliament Act? That Act in its terms explains what it is. It is an Act for the better securing of the Independence of Parliament, and for that purpose it prohibits absolutely the dealings of members of Parliament with certain things which might in some cases be innocent; but that law does not abrogate the right of Parliament to protect its own independence or with the jurisdiction of the House in such matters; nor is it just, or right, or proper to imply that the meaning of the Independence of Parliament Act is that, if any skilful lawyer or jurist can evade the exact terms of the Act, its letter and its spirit, he is, therefore, to go harmless and not to be dealt with by Parliament. I say that the terms of the Act do not bar the jurisdiction of this House. I say this House has a perfect right to deal with offenders who have committed discreditable or scandalous acts, and though I shall not detain you now by reading all the authorities that might be cited, I shall refer to the "Parliamentary Procedure" of our clerk, Dr. Bourinot, in reference to the disqualification and expulsion of members. He says:

"The power of Parliament to expel a member is undoubted. This power has been repeatedly exercised by the English and Colonial Parliaments, either when members have been guilty of a positive crime, or have offended against the laws and regulations of the House, or have been guilty of fraudulent or other discreditable acts, which proved that they were unfit to exercise the trust which their constituents had reposed in them, and that they ought not to continue to associate with the other members of the Legislature."

Such is the language of Dr. Bourinot, of the late Mr. Todd, and of Sir Erskine May. That view will commend itself to every lover of representative government in this country or elsewhere. There is one other thing to which I will call the attention of the House. Whenever we meet together for the first time in any Parliament, it is the habit of the Premier to read over to the House the following declaration:—

"That the offer of any money or other advantage to any member of this House for the promoting of any matter whatsoever, or pending, or to be transacted in Parliament, is a high crime and misdemeanor, and tends to the subversion of the Constitution."

Sir, is it the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite to move, when this motion is put, that a rider be added to this declaration to run as follows:—

"But that any member of Parliament may take all and everything that he can lay his hands on, by the use of his influence with the existing Government, whether in the way of land grants, timber limits, railway subsidies or

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

otherwise, either as a provision for his old age, or for other purposes."

Now, Sir, I apply the principle. Had the hon. gentleman taken \$100 for his vote in this House, and had that been proved, no man would say but that the hon. gentleman must have been instantly and unceremoniously expelled. I would like to know in what respect taking \$100 for his vote is worse than what has occurred? Let any hon. gentleman show me, if he can, the moral difference between a member of Parliament exacting money from a suitor who is applying for an Act of Parliament, in return for his vote or influence, and a member of Parliament exacting money from a suitor for the purpose of obtaining an Order in Council? Show the moral difference, if you can. I say that it is in reality a far higher crime and misdemeanor, that it tends far more to the subversion of the Constitution, for a member of Parliament secretly to use his influence with the Government of the day for such purposes as the hon. member for Lincoln declares he has used his to obtain the grant of a very valuable tract of public land for an utterly nominal consideration; I say that it is ten times a greater crime and misdemeanor, and ten times more dangerous to the liberty of the subject, to do this than to take a few hundred dollars directly for his vote in Parliament. In one case we have some chance of knowing what is done, in the other it is almost impossible for us to know, except by some accident, or to find out what the hon. gentleman has been about. The hon. gentleman relies upon another plea. He maintains that although it is quite clear that the timber limit was extraordinarily valuable, its value at that time was moderate, that it was a mere lucky accident by which he was enabled to realise a profit of \$200,000 for what he had paid \$500. Now, the letters which I have read from the hon. gentleman, under the dates he has given, show conclusively, that before he obtained that Order in Council he knew right well that it was a very valuable property. The letter of the 10th April contains a statement that he estimated the property at \$40,000, a week before the Order was passed; but he has expressly stated in his defence that the great value was caused by the deviation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, he says, was known to be likely to take place in May. Now, I have taken the trouble to look up the records; I remember something of that same deviation. It was perfectly well known in the House to many members on both sides, long before the 17th April, that the Canadian Pacific Railway contemplated diverting their line; it was particularly well known to members of the Government. On the 13th April, four days before the Order in Council was passed, Sir Charles Tupper introduced an Act into this House, providing for a deviation to the south, and allowing the Canadian Pacific Railway to find a pass, if they could, within 100 miles of the boundary; so that the statement, that the value of this land was caused by an unforeseen deviation of the railway, has, also, no foundation in fact. It was perfectly well known that the company was going to apply, and both the Government of Canada and the hon. member for Lincoln knew perfectly well, that there was a strong probability, to say the least of it, that the company's line would go close to these limits and make them enormously more

valuable. Now, here arises a point to which I call your especial attention. Here is a great public question,—because the deviation of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the south was a matter of great public comment. In what position was the hon. member for Lincoln to give an impartial vote on that subject? It might well have come to pass that the decision of Parliament would have hung on the vote for the member for Lincoln and one or two more—and I ask what position had the member for Lincoln taken himself in to give an impartial vote on the question of the deviation of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the south, when, by his own showing, it would probably put \$100,000 at least into the pockets of himself and his associates? Sir, the third defence of the hon. gentleman, the third and innermost line of his entrenchments, is one that deserves a little more than a passing notice. The hon. gentleman admits the fact, he cannot deny the fact, but the hon. gentleman pleads, and with some show of truth, that he is not alone, that others were as bad. Well, I do not know that in the abstract I would dispute that proposition; but I have this to say: If all that was true, if he could show that others were as bad, it would be no defence whatever for the hon. member for Lincoln; but it would be a just ground of censure on others who had committed like improprieties with himself, whether Governments or private individuals, though it would be no sort of defence for him, if it were true. But the hon. gentleman goes on into particulars, and he designates as the offenders who were as bad as he, my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) who presided over the Administration at a previous period, and by way of awful example, my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Cook). Now, I remember perfectly well what the Mackenzie Government did; I remember the grounds on which we did it, and I am prepared to take my full share of responsibility for all we did in that matter. Sir, what that Government did was this: In 1874, looking at the position of the North-West, finding that we were daily and hourly assailed with petitions from settlers to induce, almost to compel, in some way, lumbermen to go into that territory, to reduce the price of lumber, the excessive cost of which was a great obstacle to the settlement, my hon. friend beside me passed a permissive Bill by which, under certain restrictions and conditions, he asked power, in view of the then exceptional circumstances, to grant licenses without tender. That, so far, is perfectly correct. But the Bill is purely a permissive Bill, and I think, unless I am gravely mistaken, that all that Bill did was to give my hon. friend and his Administration the right to do by an Act of Parliament what his predecessors, in their Administration, had done without any such formality. I think that is the case, and there are proofs of it; but that part of it I will leave to my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is more conversant with those matters than I am. Now, I have this to say: What we did, I declare, was done by us wholly and entirely in the interest of the settler, and not of any private individual whatever. Lumber in the North-West was selling, to my certain knowledge, at \$60, \$70, \$80, \$90, and in some cases \$100, per thousand. We were assailed by petitions—and my hon. friend is here to testify to them—time and again by settlers in those distant regions, to bring in lumbermen and

cause them to manufacture in competition; and it will be found that my hon. friend has the proof here that when he granted those limits, as the correspondence shows, we took excellent good care that a limit was placed to the price of lumber which was to be manufactured. Sir, I note one further thing: I note that while the Prime Minister took away licenses from the hon. member for North Simcoe, he appears shortly after to have granted these identical limits, or as nearly as possible those limits, to other parties on far less stringent conditions than the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had attached to them. Now, I say that the conditions had greatly altered between 1878 and 1882. In 1882 the country was swarming, as we all know, with parties who were seeking for limits; and I say it was the duty of the Government to have recognised that fact, and when they had a number of applications for those limits, to have put them up at once at public auction, with due restrictions and conditions, and made the most they could of the property of the people. But another thing. Not only was that the duty of the Government, Mr. Speaker, but I find, on reference to *Hansard* of 1882, that the attention of the Government was called in the strongest possible manner to those facts, and to the extreme danger of such transactions as those in which the hon. member for Lincoln was engaged. On March 27, 1882, twenty days before the passage of this Order in Council, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) moved, and it is on record, that the condition of the case had altered, and that it was imperatively necessary in the public interest that those limits should be put up to public auction, and my hon. friend showed there were 150 applications for timber limits pending before the Government at the time. To put the case briefly, I say that in 1882 it was the duty of the Government in power, no matter what Government it might have been, to have caused the permissive Bill to cease, and to have had recourse to the principle of selling by tender. Had my hon. friend remained in power, I should say he would have deserved severe censure if he had not done so, and I only apply to the hon. gentleman the same rule which he would, beyond all question, have applied to us under the same circumstances. There is but one other excuse made by the hon. gentleman, or rather made by one of his friends, that may deserve a little notice. I observe that the Statute of Limitations is pleaded, and it is said that, as six years have elapsed, the hon. gentleman should go free. It is a legal maxim, which, I think, will not be denied by legal gentlemen in this House, that the Statute of Limitations cannot apply to cases of breach of trust; but, apart from that point, the hon. gentleman has put himself entirely out of court, for the simple reason that when the attention of the House was called to those matters, the hon. gentleman, as I have stated, rose in his place and solemnly repudiated all complicity in this transaction, solemnly denied all the charges made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and on the fact of that denial the House made no further movement in the direction of an enquiry. And now let us consider where we stand. We have got the facts admitted; they are not denied, and cannot be denied. We have the defence of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). I say no man in his position was a free agent, or could be a free agent; that a man who

placed himself under such obligations and assumed such relations to the Government has, *ipso facto*, ceased to be a representative; that he, *ipso facto*, became the mere bond-slave of the Government of the day. It is not my intention to dwell further on the language used by the hon. gentleman with respect to members of the Government. That language has been formally repudiated by at least one of them; nor do I myself attach any weight to the statements made by the hon. member. I repeat, it is for the Ministers to take what action and what notice they see fit with respect to that matter. For the same reason, I am not now going to enlarge on the contradictions between the statement of the hon. gentleman and the statements made by Messrs. Macdonald and Tupper of Winnipeg. They contradict each other in terms: the House and the country can judge which is the better entitled to credence. Nor do I intend to dwell on the affidavit of Mr. Sands, in which he imputes serious charges to the hon. gentleman. These appear to me to be private matters, and I am not concerned with them. I take my stand in this matter wholly and solely on the admissions made by the hon. gentleman over his own hand, on the agreement and on the receipt signed by the hon. gentleman with his own hand, and I say that, under these circumstances, our clear duty as members of this House is to punish the offender, or to admit that we are accomplices either before or after the fact. This is not a question of precedent, it is a question of principle in the highest degree. I believe that no precedent can be found for such a transaction as that of which I am now speaking being brought before Parliament, because I cannot conceive that in any other country having representative institutions, when such facts had been published throughout the community as have been published with respect to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), the offender would have invited the judgment of his peers. I believe that in any other country public opinion would have at once compelled the offender to retire from Parliament and anticipate the judgment that might be pronounced on him. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that, on the lowest grounds of self-interest, they should sustain my motion; I say it is to the interest of the whole party that they should sustain my motion. If they fail to do so, with the knowledge of these facts, the offence of the hon. member for Lincoln to a great extent becomes theirs, and by their action they will do more than I or any one else can do to confirm every charge ever preferred against him; and more than that, they will cause honorable men everywhere, in speaking of Canada, to assert that, by their own act, the majority of the House of Commons have declared that Canadians are highly corrupt, and that the House of Commons is, at best, but a place for division of the spoils. And now it may be asked, why, if I entertain these opinions, why, if I believe the hon. gentleman's conduct is such as I have stated, I have contented myself with moving the comparatively mild motion of censure with which this motion closes? I make no disguise whatever of the fact, that, in my judgment, the hon. gentleman's conduct well merits expulsion, but I am well aware that if I moved for expulsion, in all human probability I would open the door wide to endless wrangling; and I am aware that

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

the legal gentlemen on this side of the House and legal gentlemen on the other side would have proceeded to bury all the facts beneath a mountain of precedents from which it would have been very difficult for the community at large to extract the true facts. I have done violence, I must say, to my feelings in contenting myself with the very moderate motion I am about to place in your hands. Now, the facts admit of no sort of denial. You have the bargain with Mr. Adams admitted and placed on record. You have the payment by Mr. Adams likewise admitted and made on record. You have the use of influence by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) admitted and boasted of. You have further on record the denial, in his place, by the hon. gentleman of the facts which are clearly proved out of his own mouth and established by his own correspondence and his signed agreement. Is there, or can there be anything more at variance with the duty of a member of Parliament? How, I should like to know, could the hon. member for Lincoln rise and pretend that, after such transactions as he is shown to have engaged in, he any longer in a position to oppose any act of the Government of the day? How could the hon. member for Lincoln, no matter how clear and convincing the evidence might be, rise in his place and oppose any act of the Government to which he owes his fortunes? How could he pretend to have free power to use his own judgment, or pretend that it was in his power any longer to perform any useful function as representative or trustee of the people? Sir, the point in this whole matter, to which the attention of the people has got to be principally drawn, is this. As I said at the commencement, I do not know by any means that the hon. gentleman is the only offender. The hon. gentleman, I fear, is but a type and a specimen; I fear there are many such in the House. I fear there are many constituencies which are perfectly willing to return members as guilty as the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), provided only that the member is skilful enough to obtain some advantage for them from the Treasury of the Dominion, or, possibly, provided the hon. gentleman is willing to share his plunder freely among them when election time comes round. But although I do not deem that the hon. gentleman is much worse than some other hon. gentlemen, although I hold he has been a little bolder and more successful, and possibly a trifle more unscrupulous than some others would have been, although I must say I do not consider that in one sense it is quite fair to single him out as a scapegoat, yet, in the interests of the whole community, we must do so, if we would try to arrive at some understanding of the principles on which this Government is to be carried on. In the hon. gentleman's case that is still more important, because we are justified in pointing out to the community that of such, as the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), are the men whom this Government delight to honor. With knowledge of the material facts, though not of all the facts, the Government sitting opposite to me have thrice selected the hon. member for Lincoln as chairman of one of our most important Committees. Twice further, it is well known to this House, the Government intended to bring forward that hon. gentleman's name for a position of dignity in this House, second only to your own, Mr. Speaker,

and only withdrew under threat of exposure. It is also perfectly notorious that the hon. gentleman for many a day has made his public boast, and I believe truly, that he was Senator, designate and elect, as soon as, I suppose, he had got too good for the atmosphere of this House. It is as well for future historians to know—and it is in part my reason for placing this motion on the Votes and Proceedings, that they should have an opportunity of knowing—how majorities are made, and how majorities are paid under the existing régime; how the inheritance of the people of Canada has been squandered and is being squandered; how the independence of Parliament is being secured; what a noble example is being set to inferior legislative bodies; how the Government and their supporters interpret their duty as trustees and wards of the people, and how the right hon. Premier interprets the Duke of Wellington's famous statement: "That it is necessary that the Queen's Government should be carried on." I beg to move the motion of which I have given notice, and I now, Mr. Speaker, place it in your hands.

Mr. RYKERT. Mr. Speaker, according, Sir, to the Rules of this House, and according to the rules of Parliament, I am compelled to make my statement and my defence, in answer to the charges made by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and then, Sir, unfortunately for myself, I am compelled to withdraw from the House until judgment is passed on the resolution he has offered. I say it is unfortunate for me, for I would like to have heard, as any one charged with so serious an offence would like to hear, what my accusers may say against me, and then put my answer upon record. After the extraordinary indictment of the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright), and after the extraordinary exhibition of temper by the hon. gentleman in preferring that indictment, one would almost be supposed to be afraid to stand up in his place in Parliament to answer the hon. gentleman. But, Sir, when we find that his closing argument gives away the whole of his case, I think, perhaps, it is some encouragement for me to place my case before the House. I have, Sir, from the very outset been desirous that this House should pass judgment upon the charges made by the hon. gentleman. I was not in a position, as a member of Parliament, to challenge his statement at the commencement. I was not in a position to ask that the matter should be referred to a Committee to discuss it, and to examine whether or not I have placed myself outside the bounds of parliamentary practice or discipline. I was not in a position to do that, because there is no direct charge made against me, and day after day, and for months, I was subjected to the abuse poured upon me by the Grit press of this country, which declared openly and boldly that I dare not face the matter on the floor of Parliament. I feel it my duty, as an honest man, and as a man representing the people of my constituency for the last thirty years—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes, I say as an honest man; and the best evidence that I am an honest man is the vote of the people which gave me 500 majority, in spite of the declarations of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the horde of Grit canvassers who ran through my county

during the last election, and to which I shall refer before I sit down. I was desirous from the beginning of placing my position upon record. I desired that it should be scanned critically, and that everything that I have done should be carefully weighed by this Parliament; but I was not in a position to do so, because my accusers did not formulate a charge against me. I felt it was my duty, at the earliest possible moment, to answer the hon. gentleman who has, to-day, placed before this House a resolution—I will not say an untruthful resolution, because it would be unparliamentary to say so—but a resolution economical of the truth, and a resolution containing statements entirely at variance with the facts. I felt that it would be my duty at the very first opportunity to endeavor to have these matters fully and properly investigated. It cannot be wondered that the hon. gentleman would place such a resolution before the House. The record of the hon. gentleman himself shows that he is not capable of formulating a proper resolution which the hon. members of this House could consider intelligently. He carries in his pocket a certificate given by the paper which described him as the great mixer and muddler, and he could not be expected to place questions of this kind before the House in a way that even a school boy could understand. The House knows that, even after the lapse of four or five weeks, he has been unable to bring the matter properly before the House. So anxious was I to have this matter investigated, that I appealed to you, Mr. Speaker, and I consulted the clerk, to ascertain what course should be pursued; and having had a large parliamentary experience myself, I felt it my duty to search precedents to find out what should be done, because I felt that if I could in any way bring this matter before Parliament, it was my duty to do so at the earliest possible moment. I also consulted one of the leading parliamentarians of this country, a man of great constitutional knowledge, the Hon. William Macdougall, to see if he could point out a way by which I could speedily bring the matter before Parliament, and I will read the opinion given me by that hon. gentleman, to show that I had no desire to shirk the responsibility of my position, but was ready to meet the charges made against me as a member of this House. He says:

"OTTAWA, 22nd Feb., 1890.

"MY DEAR MR. RYKERT.—I have read carefully the letters, speeches, &c., in your case as they appear in the 'Debate' and 'The Votes and Proceedings.' I am clearly of the opinion:

"1. That no statements and admissions made by you prove or imply corrupt dealings with the Government or any member thereof.

"2. Your professional services in procuring the grant of a timber limit to Adams *et al.*, was not a violation of any provision of the Act securing the Independence of Parliament.

"3. It has been the practice since Confederation, as well as previously, for members of both Houses to promote the applications of their constituents and friends to the various departments of administration, and especially for the purchase of public lands and timber.

"4. I can recall many instances (when Commissioner of Crown Lands and Minister of Public Works) of members of Parliament, in and out of Session, appearing as counsel and arguing in support of the claims of their clients.

"Whether specially retained and paid for the service, I do not know; nor do I know of any rule, order, or statute which then prohibited, or which now prohibits members of Parliament of the legal profession from advising their clients in the matter of such applications. If the Minister or responsible head of a Department favors

an applicant, with a member of Parliament at his back. (whether of the legal or any other profession), at the expense of the public treasury, or to the disadvantage of an earlier applicant ready to comply with the conditions of the Department, he is guilty of a gross wrong to the first applicant, and commits an offence against the public. An honest Parliament would treat an offence of that kind with prompt punishment. My experience leads me to believe that applications of the class in question are hindered, rather than promoted, by the interference of members of Parliament, especially where there are prior applicants. The facts developed in the present case corroborate this conclusion. The prior application of Laidlaw, which seemed to cover a part of the territory applied for by Adams, was the first obstacle. Then followed the Canadian Pacific Railway claim. These conflicting pretensions arrested action in the department until removed by arrangement between the applicants. I see no departmental wrong in the ultimate solution, and no evidence of loss to the public treasury.

"As regards the sale to Sands, I fail to discover any ground for parliamentary interference or question on that matter. There was no stipulation against transfer of the right to cut timber by a sub-lessee. Whether he paid too much or too little, was of no consequence to the Department, and is certainly a dispute *ultra vires* of the Canadian Parliament.

"It seems equally clear that the re-publication in its 'Votes and Proceedings' of private letters surreptitiously made public for a political and party purpose is a waste of public money, and altogether beneath the dignity of Parliament.

"I predict that the Opposition will not provoke a comparison of the timber and land transactions of members of Parliament during the Mackenzie régime and the present one. History, in my opinion, will record mistakes and errors, if not misdeeds, in both.

"Believing that your case presents no legitimate ground for formal accusation in Parliament, I presume you will not need my professional services.

"You are much better able to defend yourself than any counsel unused to parliamentary manoeuvres, and even an old parliamentarian would probably make a poor exhibit in matters of detail in a case so many sided as yours.

"I remain,
Very faithfully yours,

(Signed) "WM. McDOUGALL

"J. C. RYKERT, Esq., Q. C., M. P."

I fortified myself, Sir, with this opinion, which I sought with the view specially of bringing this matter at the earliest possible day before Parliament. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in this exhibition of temper, has somewhat insulted members on this side of the House. He seems to think that I am not the only sinner, although I am the greatest sinner. Sir, the hon. gentleman might have discovered sinners on his own side of the House as well as on this, but he does not propose to let the House know who they are. But it is not an evidence that a party is in despair when it is obliged to expose before Parliament private and confidential correspondence which is eight years of age, for the purpose of casting obloquy on the member who has written it and driving him from Parliament. The hon. gentleman says that I am pleading the Statute of Limitations. I make no such plea or defence. I am desirous that the whole matter should be fully investigated and probed to the very bottom; but there are circumstances connected with this transaction which have not yet been brought to light, and which ought to be investigated by a committee, in order that the House may have full cognisance of all the facts. Does the hon. gentleman not know that the whole matter was discussed in 1882? Does he not know that it was discussed in 1887 before the electors of the County of Lincoln, whom I have represented in Parliament for the last thirty years? But now, with his party driven to the last ditch, he thinks he can

MR. RYKERT.

throw some obloquy on myself by dragging it before the public again. There is nothing more contemptible in an individual than to make public a man's private correspondence, and when we find that this whole arraignment against myself is based on some private and confidential correspondence, which was stolen from myself, it is not worthy of this Parliament to discuss it for one single moment. If hon. gentlemen opposite have any charges to make against my public record, why do they not bring them forward? I have been told repeatedly by the public press, and by parties supporting the other side of the House, that they were going to discuss my public record; but they have ransacked it for the last thirty years, and they have been unable to find a single vote which I gave contrary to my pledges or in violation of the principles of the great Conservative party which I have consistently supported. My whole record shows my consistency as a public man. If to support the right hon. gentleman, leader of the Government, and the Conservative party for the last thirty years, and to endeavor to make this Confederation a great and prosperous country, is a crime, I have yet to learn it; but hon. gentlemen opposite do not point to my public record. I should like the hon. member for South Oxford to name a day for the purpose of discussing our political records, when I should be prepared to challenge the hon. gentleman on his past history, and show what kind of a man this gentleman is who now constitutes himself my public prosecutor. I should like to know how the hon. gentleman would like to hear read his private correspondence with "My dear Boyle," and with Campbell in the city of Winnipeg, with regard to half-breed lands?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perfectly willing; read away.

Mr. RYKERT. No, Sir; there is no man on this side of the House who would be guilty of making public the private letters of the hon. gentleman. But, Sir, they are well known. There is one thing, however, that I would say: I have never dragged money out of this country or out of my party, and then gone and deliberately vilified and run down my country. I hope the hon. gentleman can say the same thing, but I do not think he could stand up here and say truthfully that he has not done that. This is not the first instance that we have had in this country of private correspondence being exposed; but the records of the English Parliament are barren of anything of that kind. No person in the English House would dare to stand up and make use of private correspondence for the purpose of formulating a charge against an hon. member; he would be hissed out of Parliament, and would not dare to make a second appearance in the House of Commons. But, unfortunately, in this country we have a precedent for the act of the hon. gentleman. This is not the first instance of stolen letters being used on the floor of Parliament, and of the hon. gentleman having allied himself to letter stealers. We well recollect that some years ago, when an attack was made against the right hon. the leader of the Government, based upon the Pacific Railway charges, those charges were formulated upon private correspondence stolen from an office in the city of Montreal; and we know very well that the gentleman who was most prominent in that attack

was the same gallant knight who, to-day, has addressed this House. We know he took the most conspicuous part on that occasion, and here, for the second time in the history of Canada, we find that hon. gentleman has again allied himself with letter stealers with the view of driving me from Parliament. It is a very singular circumstance, but we have the fact before us. I have the right to know, when standing here accused and making my defence before my peers in Parliament, who are my accusers? I have the right to know what reputation, as public men, those men have, who are standing here as my accusers; I have the right, before the verdict of this Parliament is passed, to point out that the witnesses who are brought against me are not credible. The hon. gentleman, I am glad to know, has very little sympathy among his own friends in his present course, because I know that members on the other side have expressed their abhorrence of this motion. Every person who knows the political history of Canada for the last thirty years, knows well that I have been made a target by hon. gentlemen opposite, because I have had the courage of my convictions, because I have dared to stand up, in Parliament and out of Parliament, in season and out of season, to defend the acts and the administration of the Conservative party. This is only one of a series of attacks made during the last thirty years. The County of Lincoln bears evidence of the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite, during the past twenty-five or thirty years, have done their best to drive me from public life; but I can say, with regard to my constituency, what the hon. gentleman who attacks me cannot say of any constituency that he has ever represented, that I have represented the County of Lincoln for the past quarter of a century, in spite of all his efforts, while the hon. gentleman has been driven from pillar to post, rejected by every constituency, until at last he was dropped into a hive of Grits in South Oxford. Hon. gentlemen opposite have fought me in the County of Lincoln, and I enjoy the proud distinction of having had two protests against me at the same time, both of which I defeated. It does seem to me that the slander which the hon. gentleman has cast upon the County of Lincoln is not deserved. That constituency, which is not inferior in intelligence to any other in this Province, has, year after year, elected me to Parliament. In spite of what the hon. gentleman and his friends could do, for over a quarter of a century I have represented the people; and they must lack that order of intelligence which they are supposed to have to allow a member so corrupt and dishonest, as the hon. gentleman says I am, to represent them so long, and to return me year after year by acclamation. It was given out at the last elections by these hon. gentlemen, that I was to be driven out of Lincoln; and they came down, twenty-seven of them, headed by the hon. gentleman, bent on destroying me in my county. The hon. gentleman came to Beamsville and made a tremendous speech, in which he talked of thieving and bribery, and all that sort of thing, and he arraigned me on the very question we have before us to-day. He charged me with robbing the country of \$200,000 and with robbing a poor old Dutchman of \$200,000, and when some man asked him how it was I could rob the country and

the Dutchman both, the hon. gentleman was somewhat abashed and could not answer. He could not understand that argument at all. On that occasion, he took the opportunity of informing the electors that I had no right to be elected because I supported this rascally Government. He talked at great length on the blind share scandal, in reference to which the hon. the Minister of Customs came in for a lashing at his hands. I defended the Minister of Customs on every platform in the county. But even if there was a charge made against me, there was no foundation in fact for it. He charged the hon. the Minister of Public Works with having received presents from contractors. He charged the late John Henry Pope, formerly Minister of Railways, with having put in his pocket \$166,000. He charged the Government with all kinds of rascality, and then turned round and asked the people how they dared to submit to such a state of things; and for the first time in the County of Lincoln, I had a majority at the place in which the hon. gentleman spoke of 96 votes in my favor, although on every previous occasion I had had a majority there against me. That shows the people thought very little of what the hon. gentleman said. That hon. gentleman and his friends, headed by the notorious Preston, scattered broadcast all over the county this same literature. We saw them going from pillar to post with these same documents charging me with rascality in every shape and form. They called on the people to rise in their might and drive me from Parliament, because, they said, I had violated the Independence of Parliament Act, and had forfeited my position as a member of Parliament; and yet the people declared they did not believe in his word. They charged me with having robbed different persons, and yet the people declared that they did not believe one word of the story. A person who was standing in the crowd asked: Who was that gentleman, who it was, who was roaring and bellowing? And when the people were told that he was the man who had wrecked the Commercial Bank, and had wrecked the Mackenzie Administration, they stood aghast, and said: This is not the man we want; and the result was I had ninety-six majority in a place where in all other elections the majority had always been against me. I have a right to know who are my accusers, and if they are not men who have a record which cannot be attacked, they have no right to come here and attack me in the manner the hon. gentleman has done. If the hon. gentleman had been desirous of treating me fairly, he would have taken up the matter more temperately; and I am perfectly justified in asking what kind of a special record the hon. gentleman has? The hon. gentleman has accused me of treachery and rascality of every description, but I recollect when he was accused of treachery by his own organ and of voting money for his own pocket. He has been accused over and over again of other corrupt practices, all of which I shall take the opportunity of enumerating, perhaps, before Parliament closes. At any rate, I know this much, that the hon. gentleman stood convicted before the people as being one of the most corrupt men who ever sat upon the floor of Parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. RYKERT. Of course the hon. gentleman does not coincide with that, but the records of the

House will show it. I stated that this correspondence was of a private and confidential character, and it was either stolen or was obtained by the grossest fraud. This correspondence was in the hands of only five persons. My opponent, Mr. Patterson, distinctly repudiates having given it, as I showed a few days ago in the House. He telegraphed me that it was a gross breach of trust, and that the correspondence should have been destroyed. Mr. Ritchie, who had an interest in the suit which was brought, though—as the hon. gentleman was probably not aware—it was not tried, had a copy of it, and Mr. Mercer Adam had also a copy of it. They all repudiate having had anything to do with this. The only person who was concerned in the matter who has not stated anything in regard to its publication is Mr. S. H. Blake, Q.C.; and, if it was not taken from his office, it was obtained in some way which was not very creditable to anybody. I do not think the exposure of private correspondence should be encouraged, or that it should be received with favor by this House. I think I might fairly claim, if I chose to do so, and chose to screen myself under the technicalities of the law—not by the Statute of Limitations, for the hon. gentleman is probably not versed in law, but by precedent and by custom—that matters which took place so many years ago should not be brought forward under any circumstances at this time; that the hon. gentleman, being in possession of these documents, should have brought this matter up before. I complain of a judgment being rendered which is based on private correspondence, and I think the hon. gentleman cannot find any precedents for this course in the records of Parliament. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman has had under his observation the question of the *Times* newspaper which was discussed in the Imperial Parliament a few days ago, when it was unmistakably admitted that time was of the essence of the matter. An attempt was made to have the *Times* brought before Parliament for breach of privilege, for publishing private correspondence, and it was admitted that time was of the essence of the matter. But I do not want to screen myself under any technicality. I have not violated the Independence of Parliament Act, I have done nothing of which I am ashamed, and I have done nothing which would cause my suspension or expulsion from the House; but there are facts and circumstances and documents in connection with this matter which should be investigated, and I shall ask the House to refer the question to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, so that we may have a fair and full investigation, and may see if I have done anything which is contrary to the privileges of Parliament. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) must stand or fall by the proposition which he has put before the House. He asks the House to declare that my conduct was corrupt, and yet he admits that my action was not corrupt, that no action was taken by me with the intention of corrupting Ministers. Still he asks the House to say that my action was corrupt. The evidence destroys his assertion. Then the question is whether my action was discreditable or scandalous. I do not think this House, in view of the past record of the hon. gentleman, will make such a declaration, especially when this is a matter which is confined to private conversations. The

Mr RYKERT.

hon. gentleman has abandoned his argument that members of Parliament have no right to get limits. He has endeavored to draw a distinction between the case of the late Government and the case of the present Government. In 1872, a law was passed by this Parliament, at the instance of the Government of Sir John Macdonald, declaring that no limits should be granted except by public competition. For reasons best known to the hon. gentleman, no doubt importuned by hungry supporters, the law was altered by his Government so that the Governor General was allowed to grant limits to any one to whom the Government might choose to grant them. The hon. gentleman says there was a great difference between the times when the regulations were made. I would like him to tell me how many inhabitants there were on the Saskatchewan or at Edmonton when limits were granted to Messrs. Cook and Sutherland. I think he will find there were no persons there at that time interfering with timber or lumber of any description. The hon. gentleman says that I, as a member of Parliament, had no right to act as agent for Mr. Adams or any one else. He says that I prostituted my position as a member of Parliament in doing so, and yet he says that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie had a right to give limits to Mr. Cook and Mr. Sutherland. He (Mr. Cook) says the statement I made some time ago was false. Upon the occasion when he made that remark I was not present and could not refute the statement made by the hon. gentleman, but if any hon. gentleman will consult the *Hansard* of 1886, he will find that, upon that occasion, the member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) referred to by the hon. member who has just spoken, stood up in his place in Parliament and admitted that he got the timber limit while he was a member of Parliament and said he had a perfect right to do so, and that his constituents knew it. I have the speech of the hon. gentleman before me, and defy any one to contradict me. Looking at the resolution proposed, I would like to know what is the offence with which I am charged. I am charged with using my position and influence as a member of Parliament for pecuniary advantage. Will the hon. gentleman show where that advantage occurred? Will he point to the evidence which shows that I have used my position for pecuniary advantage? Does he not admit that I had a right to buy that limit? He admits that members of Parliament had a right to do so four years before. Where is the evidence that I used my position for my pecuniary advantage? Then he says that I made a statement which was entirely at variance with the statement which I had previously made in Parliament. If any one will read the statement which I made in 1883 in answer to the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), he will find that I stated the facts as they are—the truth and nothing but the truth—and any hon. gentleman will see that my answers were perfectly correct. The hon. gentleman has stated that I was obliged to resort to corrupt practices with Ministers. Well, Ministers deny that statement, and I deny it also. Ministers have unequivocally stated that upon no occasion was any corrupt influence used or exercised towards them, and I have said the same thing. I say the letter which the hon. gentleman has quoted does not bear that construction, but that it shows conclusively that no improper

influence was brought to bear upon Ministers to have these matters rectified. The hon. gentleman has referred to the subject of Mr. Laidlaw's limit. Let me again briefly state to the House the facts in connection with that limit. The hon. gentleman is wrong in his dates. He states that, in the month of April, 1882, I applied for a limit to be granted to Mr. Adams in the North-West Territories. If he referred to the documents, he will find that he is just six weeks astray. On the 18th February, I applied for the limit, and on the 6th March, information was conveyed to me that the limit would be granted. That was made by Mr. Adams, and at that time nothing was known of that country. Mr. Adams was in entire ignorance of the position of affairs in that country, in entire ignorance of the value of that timber limit; although the hon. gentleman says he knew the value of it, I say he never knew the value of that limit until months after. It was only after the Canadian Pacific Railway deflected its line and made it valuable, that enquiry began to be made with regard to the value of that limit. That limit was granted by the Government long before that agreement was signed, and Mr. Adams made that agreement upon the day he left Ottawa, some time after having been informed by the Department that his application was granted. At the time that limit was granted the Canadian Pacific Railway was obliged to go to the Yellow Head Pass. On the 13th April, a Bill was presented to the House, long after the Minutes of Council were prepared, asking this House for power to change the line southward, making no particular point except the objective point, that instead of going to Yellow Head Pass they might go to the Kicking Horse Pass, or some other place south of the Yellow Head Pass. This Bill was not passed until 18th May following. Some time after the limit was granted, it was found that the Canadian Pacific Railway, in locating their line, had run some forty miles from that limit, and had commenced to cut down the timber therein, in order to make a bridge at Medicine Hat. As soon as the survey was completed, and as soon as the license was issued, Mr. Adams called upon me, as solicitor, to go to Winnipeg and compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to give remuneration to him for having destroyed that limit. The limit was cut down by the lumber agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who was in league with parties who were interested in that limit; he cut that down ostensibly and with the view of compelling the Canadian Pacific Railway to buy that limit, and when Mr. Van Horne was asked to pay compensation for the destruction of the timber, he agreed to pay it; he made no claim whatever for the limit until long after the limit was sold. In the month of January the limit was sold to Mr. Sands, sold without my knowledge. I did not know who Mr. Sands was, never knew who he was until I saw him in Winnipeg after the bargain was concluded. I went to Winnipeg to act for Mr. Adams, as solicitor, to pass that title, to see that the title was properly arranged; and then, for the first time, I saw this gentleman. When the money was sent to Ottawa to renew the license, I learned that the Canadian Pacific Railway had set up a claim to a portion of that limit. I contended then, as I contend now, that the Government had no

right to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to infringe upon that limit, to interfere with it at all, because, at the time the limit was granted they had no rights there at all, and according to Act of Parliament they could only take such lands as belonged to the Crown, or were not under license of occupation. Although the Canadian Pacific Railway was determined to hold that limit, I used every effort in my power to induce the Government to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to abandon its claim, and also to renew the license. Now, I wish to explain how I came to make use of the name of the Minister of Customs as having helped me in that transaction. My first intimation that the Minister of Customs had interceded on behalf of Mr. Adams, was a telegram that I received from Mr. Gouin of the Russell House in Ottawa, telling me that Mr. Bowell was interesting himself on behalf of Mr. Adams. That was the first intimation I had upon that point. I made the first use of his name in the year 1882, when I stated he was helping me as regards the issuing of the license. I received in that year from Mr. Bowell a telegram as follows:—

"Telegraphed you last week that neither Sir John nor Russell were here. Will give it personal attention as soon as Sir John returns; have seen papers; think it is all right."

That was the paper sent down by the Surveyor General in order to have the license completed. That was the first time that I heard that the Minister of Customs was helping in this matter. He did what he had a perfect right to do, and he did it voluntarily, after everything was satisfactorily arranged, after Mr. Lindsay Russell had made his report in favor of the license being issued, and he did nothing more than his duty in that respect. Again, in the early part of 1883, I received a telegram from Mr. Gouin, in the city of Ottawa, stating that Mr. Bowell was doing what he could to have the license renewed. So you will see that in using his name I simply used the information I got from other people, which information was correct. Whatever the Minister of Customs did, was simply done in order to help the matter on, but not with a view of using any particular influence in my favor either one way or the other. I entirely exonerate him from that, as I have always done. It has been stated by the hon. gentleman that I made an effort to defeat Mr. McCarthy as regards the Laidlaw limit. Now, there are facts in connection with that transaction which I have a right to ask this House to consider; there is evidence to be produced which cannot be produced here now—it is utterly impossible for me to go into the whole evidence—but there is evidence to be produced which, I think, will justify me in saying that my whole course throughout that transaction was strictly honorable, and if the hon. gentleman will call for other reports sent by Lindsay Russell in reference to that transaction, they will show that my course was straightforward and honorable, and everything I did was strictly in accordance with law, and I did nothing outside. But the hon. gentleman has been pleased to read certain expressions in my letters, certain garbled statements; and if he had wished to be fair and candid to this House, and desired to do justice towards myself after accusing me of a serious offence and crime, he would have read the whole correspondence, he would have read the letters written

to me which show conclusively why I wrote those answers. The hon. gentleman has, upon this occasion, as upon former occasions, endeavored to distort the facts, endeavored to make this House believe that certain things took place that did not take place, whereas I contend that the letters addressed to me and to Mr. Adams, and my replies thereto, go to show why I made the observations I did make. The hon. gentleman says I used an extraordinary influence with the Government in reference to the action to the Canadian Pacific Railway. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, I had fortified myself with the opinion of Mr. Lash, an eminent counsel, in reference to the matter, and I conveyed that opinion to the Minister of the Interior, at that time Lieutenant Governor of the North-West in reference to that transaction, and he entirely concurred in what I had done. Although I am not going into the evidence—because we have not time to do so tonight—I wish to inform the House that I have evidence to show beyond all question that I neither was a suppliant at the feet of the Government, nor tried to influence them beyond what any member of Parliament or any other person had a right to do. I say that everything I did in reference to that transaction was straightforward and honorable. I pointed out to the First Minister, and he will recollect it distinctly, that the Canadian Pacific Railway had no right to that territory, and no right to encroach on the limit; I pointed out to the hon. gentleman that Mr. Sands was willing to put up money as security to indemnify the Government against the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway, if they would only renew that license. That is the course I took, and I will be able to show that fact when the matter is properly investigated; I can show that, instead of my being a suppliant, I put myself in a position to claim as a right what the Government also recognised was a right. It is not my duty on this occasion in making a general defence to read over the correspondence, and I do not think it would be right and fair to the House to do so. But there are facts contained in it which justify me in asking this House to hold its hand and not render judgment until I have had an opportunity of being heard before a proper Committee of this House. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the fact that there has been placed on record a statement showing that Mr. Sands had been robbed. He has placed on record a document to show that I had bribed the surveyor who was sent by Mr. Sands to explore the territory, although he must have known that a document rebutting that statement had been sent broadcast about the County of Lincoln when the hon. gentleman was there. I published during that contest an affidavit made by that surveyor, Henry S. Udell, on February 15, 1887, to the following effect:—

“That he is engaged in the business of surveying and pine land estimating, that he has been so employed for about twenty-five years on Manistee River and in other localities; that he had heard read the affidavit of Louis Sands made 3rd February, 1887, taken before Adolphus Magnon, a Notary Public at Manistee, Michigan, U.S.A., and knows the contents thereof. That the statements made therein, as far as they refer to and reflect upon him calling him by the name of Henry S. Udell, are absolutely false; that, at the request of the said Sands, he went to Cypress Hills limit and estimated and made a report to Sands of the amount of pine timber standing upon said lands; that he made the estimate carefully and honestly

Mr. RYKERT.

and according to his best judgment, based upon his experience; that for such service he was paid by said Sands the sum of ten dollars per day while engaged in the work, and his expenses; that he was not paid or offered any other or further sum by John Charles Rykert or any other person whomsoever, either directly or indirectly, for such service, or for making any report or doing anything connected with said transaction; that he never had any conversation or dealing with said John Charles Rykert. That since mailing said report to said Sands he has done other work for him on other lands, on which reports said Sands has bought and sold said lands so estimated, and satisfied with his work; that the estimate he made of the Cypress Hills limit was true in every particular, according to the best of his judgment; that he has understood from said Sands that there has been a falling in the price of lumber at Cypress Hills, and that fire had got into that limit.”

Although the matter is extraneous to this discussion, and although this House has no power to consider the matter as to whether Mr. Sands lost money or not by the transaction, I wish to place on record this affidavit in rebuttal of the charge of the hon. member, and I ask to place it on record to show that his statement is entirely untrue. I have here a statement made by young Sands on 20th June, in which he states that his father has got a regular bonanza there, and is likely to make money out of the transaction. And when the hon. gentleman opposite and his friends had this evidence cast in their teeth, there was a regular panic among them. Then they turned round and said that it was not Sands that was being robbed, but the Government was being robbed. That was the ground they took. I ask to put in as evidence a letter written by Mr. Sands himself, dated 5th June, 1883, in which he says:

“MY DEAR SIR,—I trust, and I am in hopes still, that you will succeed in getting a license for the whole limit, in which case I will have lost nothing in the transaction.

(Signed) “LOUIS SANDS.”

On 23rd September, 1883, he wrote to me the following letter:—

“MY DEAR SIR,—Let me hear from you if anything turns up. Also, if you can receive for me permission to locate a new limit as you spoke about. I and my family are well, and my business fairly prosperous and good here. Hoping you may have the same blessing,

“I remain,

Yours very respectfully,
(Signed) “L. SANDS.”

I think it is a most extraordinary thing that, if I had robbed Mr. Sands, he should call the blessings of Heaven down on my head. If hon. gentlemen could only have seen the look of consternation on the face of the hon. gentleman and his friends when this record appeared during the election, they would be astonished. I do not intend to go over any more of the facts of the case. I say that the statement which the hon. gentleman has placed before this House is not a correct statement of the facts. I have pointed out its untruthfulness as regards the application for the limit. I have pointed out that, instead of the limit having been applied for in 1882, it was applied for in the early part of February, and in fact long before that time permission was given to go and make a survey of that limit, but the Order in Council was not issued until 17th April. The hon. gentleman further states in his motion that an agreement was signed whereby a consideration was to be paid to J. C. Rykert, and I was to obtain a certain sum for that limit. I have denied emphatically, and I repeat it, that when the limit was granted to Mr. Adams I knew nothing about its value, and in fact I knew nothing about it; and

that, after it was granted, it was offered in this city and all over the Province for a small sum, it being believed to be of no value. There is another statement to which I will allude, for when the matter is properly and thoroughly investigated, which I hope it will be, and when all the facts have been obtained so that hon. members can pass an intelligent judgment on the case, I venture to say hon. gentlemen will find that this motion is a tissue of misstatements from the beginning to the end. The hon. gentleman in his motion states :

“The said John C. Rykert did agree with the said Adams to use, and did inform the said Adams by letters signed with his own hand that he was using, corrupt influences—”

The hon. gentleman cannot lay his finger on proof of that—there is not one word of truth in the statement. He says I was using corrupt influence

“—with certain members of the Government of Canada and of the Parliament thereof.”

There is not a word about members of Parliament in this correspondence. There is no evidence that I told Mr. Adams I used corrupt influences; but, on the contrary, there is evidence that I used influence, not as a member of Parliament, but that influence which any one had a right to use, in order to have a wrong corrected. That is my position. I will show to a committee, if one is granted, that everything I have done was in every way honorable. The hon. gentleman, in formulating a lot of charges, has made the statement which in effect is, that I wrote Mr. Adams long after the old gentleman was dead; for he died in 1883. I can show a committee of the House, and I can show the country, that the indictment framed by the hon. gentleman is a tissue of falsehoods and misstatements, and I claim that this House has no right to pass judgment on me on a one-sided statement. If this House is to pass judgment on the evidence, it must be considered as a whole. The hon. gentleman himself admits that I have not been guilty of any corrupt act; I deny that I have been guilty of any corrupt act, and the hon. gentleman admits it, and this House must take the whole evidence. The hon. gentleman cannot take a portion of the evidence and throw aside the balance. Taking the whole evidence, this House cannot say that I was guilty of any corrupt act: it can only do so through a committee; and if the hon. gentleman thinks he can establish this charge before a committee, he is at liberty to do so. I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman in the statements he has made with respect to hon. members of this Parliament and hon. members of the Government, as to their rascality, and so forth. I do not propose to follow him in his vile abuse of the constituencies, and his declaration that where hon. members have been guilty of offences, the constituencies are equally guilty with them; but what I do say is this, that the hon. gentleman's statement is a most discreditable one. If the hon. gentleman had chosen to make a fair and proper indictment against me, if he had desired to give me fair play in this free country, he would have prepared a record containing all the facts of the case and have had it submitted to a committee of the House, in order that I might have an opportunity of defending myself and of submitting evidence in rebuttal of the charge of corrupt practice. I have not, since I have been a member of Parliament, in any way infringed the privileges of members of

this House, but I have always conducted myself otherwise, and the hon. gentleman cannot lay his finger on a single act I have committed since I have been in Parliament in which I have done any injury to my constituents; but the hon. gentleman has dragged in private and confidential correspondence, and has thus been enabled to formulate charges which are not borne out by the facts. Let me have a fair and impartial trial, let this question go before a committee of this House, where it can be properly investigated—that is all I ask hon. members to do. It is not fair or right that this House should seek to condemn me without my being allowed to be properly heard. My proper course would have been to have simply denied the statement and allowed the case to go to a committee of the House, but I felt, in justice to hon. members and to the Ministers, that I should exonerate them entirely from any connection with this matter, in so far as any charge of corruption may be made. I maintain that no man can truthfully say that in any one of these letters I endeavored to act corruptly towards the Government, and no man can point his finger to any evidence which will satisfy the House and the country that Ministers went out of their way in doing anything I asked them to do. I have letters and evidence of importance to place before the House, and in order that I may justify myself, I ask the House to appoint a committee for the purpose of considering this whole matter. I believe, and I am confident, that I can justify my conduct in Parliament; I am not afraid of the hon. member for South Oxford, or of his friends, for I have met them often on the public platform, but I simply ask to be put in a position to place before the country the entire facts in regard to this matter. If the judgment of the House is a condemnation of my course, I shall abide by it, and I will resign my trust into the hands of my constituents if necessary, but before the House resorts to any extreme measure, it should say “we will give the member a fair and honest trial, in order that the people of the country, and the constituents of Lincoln, whom he has represented for thirty years, may see if he has acted improperly or not.” The House should give me an opportunity of defending myself against the slanders of hon. gentlemen opposite, who have accused me of crimes and misdemeanors. I feel proud of the confidence reposed in me for the last quarter of a century by my constituents of the County of Lincoln, and I should be the last man to hold my seat for a minute if the House should decide that I was not fit to retain the trust which those constituents have placed in my hands. I simply ask the House for justice; I ask hon. members to give me the opportunity of defending myself before a committee, where I can have the charges investigated.

Sir. JOHN THOMPSON. The manner in which this charge has been brought before the House, and the manner in which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has replied to it, constitute to some extent, a departure from the usual course of proceedings in investigations of this character. I think the House will agree with me, that the usual course of procedure is, that a charge involving the character, or the seat, or the standing of a member, whether in the form of a resolu-

tion or otherwise, should be moved and spoken to with restriction to the subject-matter of the charge itself. It is exceedingly rare, if not entirely without a precedent in Parliament, that a speech is made on such a question of the inflammatory and impassioned character of that addressed to the House this afternoon by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in which he not only stigmatised in the strongest terms—as he had a right to do, with perfect relevance to his motion—the conduct of the hon. member for Lincoln; but in which he stigmatised the conduct of the Government in the severest terms, even as to its fiscal policy. I say that a speech like that, in support of a resolution challenging the conduct and character of a member of this House, is, I think, absolutely without precedent. The hon. member for South Oxford called the attention of the House to what he called the state of degradation into which the country had fallen, into which our system of government had fallen, and the danger into which the Constitution had fallen, by reason, as he indicated, of the line of policy of the Government, tending to debauch and degrade the country, tending to debauch the constituencies of this country; and resulting, as he claimed, in the absolute debauching of this Parliament. The hon. gentleman went so far as to declare, that a great number of the members who composed the last Parliament were amenable to charges which I remember having heard discussed upon the floor of this House with great acrimony, and which most of us thought were amply refuted at the time. I will pass from that. The hon. gentleman sought to attach a stigma, not merely to members of the late Parliament, but to the constituencies themselves, by his declaration that the people of Canada were to blame, inasmuch as the members of this House were as honest as the people desired, or expected, them to be. The hon. member for South Oxford went a step farther, and, referring to the members who compose the House at the present time, made the astonishing declaration—a declaration which, in my humble opinion, ought not be allowed to pass unchallenged—that the incidents which have given rise to the present motion, the incidents contained in the correspondence and documents to which he drew the attention of the House, showed, to use his own words, a whole mountain range of undiscovered rascality. The hon. gentleman went farther, and impugned the past policy of the Government in regard to their management of the timber limits and Dominion lands, for the purpose of indicating that a policy of corruption had been adopted as the settled policy of the Government, and he stigmatised the Government for having granted the application which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) had made on behalf of his friends for a timber limit of 100 square miles. He called the attention of the House to the atrocity committed by the Government, in having ventured to give without tender, this tract of 100 miles, to the friends of the hon. member for Lincoln, when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows that we have on our desks an Order in Council, passed by his advice and on his recommendation, by which one of his supporters who sits behind him to-night was given 200 square miles of timber without tender or competition of any kind.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

I have only spoken of the attack made by the member for South Oxford for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that it is of an unusual character, that it is almost without precedent, if not entirely so, and that it invites discussion, and necessitates considerations beyond the range of the resolution which the hon. gentleman has submitted. I would now call attention to the observations made by the hon. member for Lincoln, in support of his defence. An hon. member charged with an offence against the dignity or privilege of the House, or assailed by a resolution, as to his seat, or his character, or his standing in the House, is, according to the usual practice here, heard in his place in his own defence, and the House generally passes judgment, or orders a further enquiry upon the statement which the hon. member makes from his seat in response to the accusation. I am not here to defend the hon. member for Lincoln. I am not here to apologise for a single expression of the extraordinary correspondence, which is almost, if not entirely, unequalled in parliamentary annals, but I listened to him carefully, and in paying attention as I did, and as I suppose we are all bound to do, to the statements which were made by the hon. member for Lincoln, and on which he expects the judgment of this House; I understood him to appeal to Parliament, to give him an opportunity of being further heard before a committee of the House. The hon. member (Mr. Rykert) stated that there were circumstances connected with this matter which had not been brought to light. He asked that a committee should investigate, not only the correspondence which is before the House, but all the transactions concerning it, and he asserted that he had documents bearing on the question which had not been laid before the House; that there is evidence of others which he can produce, and which would tend to exculpate him, or tend, at any rate, to mitigate what appears to be reprehensible in his conduct or his correspondence; and he has intimated that he has letters or statements of the person whom it is alleged he had more particularly wronged in this transaction, which would indicate that one charge in the resolution at least—the charge of his having used his position as a member of this House corruptly—is a charge which is not well founded and which cannot be sustained. I forbear, at this stage of the debate, to enter on a discussion of the merits of this correspondence or the merits of the charge against the hon. member, or to indicate what my own personal vote on the case will be. The question to be considered now is, what course should be adopted in dealing with this matter calmly and with the judicial responsibility which will now certainly devolve upon the House, notwithstanding the impassioned statements which were made in support of the resolution, and the equally impassioned statements which were made in reply. In consideration of the great field which the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution went over in making his charge, and in making at the same time his attack on the Government, and in view of the statements which were made by the hon. member for Lincoln, in which he earnestly solicited to be further heard in his own defence before a committee of the House, I ask the House at the present moment to pause, to consider the question, to avail itself of the opportunity which can be given in a short

time of perusing the statements which have been made by the hon. member for Lincoln in his own defence, with the view of arriving at a proper judgment, deliberately and calmly, and free from the passions with which the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution sought to blind the judgment of the House; and with that purpose, I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should like to address to the House a few observations with reference to what the hon. Minister of Justice has said, and the allusions made by the hon. member for Lincoln, but as I shall not be able to finish before six o'clock, and as I shall not continue very long, I hope the House will be willing now to call it six o'clock, and permit me to make my observations afterwards.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, we have before us, in the resolution submitted by my hon. friend from South Oxford—one question, but we have had in the discussion, in addition to that, the question of the relative merits or demerits of the policy of the present Administration and that of the Administration which preceded it, with regard to the granting of timber licenses. Now, I think it is to be regretted that questions of public policy should be mingled with questions affecting the personal integrity and conduct of a member of the House. But as these questions have been raised by the hon. member for Lincoln in his defence, and by the hon. Minister of Justice in defending the conduct of the Administration—

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The other way.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, perhaps I should more correctly say, in censuring the conduct of the preceding Administration, I shall be permitted to make some reference to this question. If any hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches should dissent from the statement of facts I make or the views I enunciate, I trust that that dissent will be expressed, but I trust that that will be an end of the discussion of these questions of policy, and that we shall have an opportunity of returning to the consideration of the very serious question involved in the resolution of my hon. friend from South Oxford. Now, Sir, shortly after the acquisition of the North-West Territories and the establishment of the Province of Manitoba, the Government which was led by the present Prime Minister introduced and carried into law an Act relating to Dominion lands, especially those situated in the North-West Territories, in which Act provision was made for the leasing of timber limits. The 50th section of that Act provided that the right of cutting timber on such timber limits should be put up at a bonus per square mile, varying according to the value of the limit, and sold to the highest bidder on competition, either by tender or at public auction. However, when timber limits came to be leased, the right hon. gentleman's Government found it impossible to give effect to that provision, and a number of licenses were granted—amongst others, to Macaulay and Ginty, Buchanan and Green, Fowler, and Fuller—for I think a period of 21

years, for tracts of land as large as 100 square miles, from which the mills of those parties were to be supplied with timber, and from which lumber was to be cut for the people of the North-West Territories and the Province of Manitoba. Now, the right hon. gentleman's Government did not comply with the provision of the statute which I have quoted. Those limits were not put up at public auction, nor were tenders sought for the sale of them. The sales were made, not under the statute, but wholly regardless of its provisions; I suppose the hon. gentleman found it quite impossible to comply with them. At all events they were not complied with; and I make this statement, not by way of censure at this moment—for I think if I were disposed to do that, it ought to be dealt with by a proper motion and not incidentally on the motion now before us. I say further, that when the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) came into power, they repealed this provision—not because they considered it an improper provision, under circumstances where it could be practically given effect to, but because they found it impossible to act upon it in the condition of things then existing in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. There was carried through the House in 1874, during the régime of Mr. Mackenzie, an Act providing that:

"In cases where applications may be made for limits on which to give timber, after a survey of the territory had been made, the Governor in Council may, on recommendation of the hon. the Minister of Interior, authorise the same to be leased for such bonuses as he may deem fair and reasonable."

Now, the reason of that was, that after the Government came into office they found it impossible to act under the law as it then stood. It was before I was a member of the Administration that this change was carried through the House without any opposition. I think the hon. gentlemen who are now sitting on the front benches were members of the House, and they did not oppose the change; and, by giving their assent to the operation of the law which was carried through Parliament, they, as members of Parliament, assumed the responsibility, along with the Government, of the change which was actually made. That change, I say, was made because it was found impossible to give practical effect to the law as the right hon. gentleman had submitted it, and as Parliament had adopted it. It was impossible to get tenders; it was impossible to make a sale in the way proposed; there was no competition. The difficulty was to get lumbermen to erect mills in that section of the country, and to manufacture lumber for the use of the settlers, because, as every hon. gentleman knows, the population there was still very scanty in numbers; it was not exactly known what the future might be; it was, to some extent, a leap in the dark on the part of any lumbermen to make a very large investment in the country, under the circumstances; and so the Government, anxious to supply building material for the population, found it necessary for that purpose, rather to persuade those engaged in the lumbering business to erect mills there than to keep them in restraint by any law requiring competition for the purchase of timber limits. Now, it has been said, and said, no doubt, truly, that we, in this particular case which has been referred to—and which I will discuss more at length soon, the sale of

the timber limit to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland—carried this Order in Council after our defeat at the polls; that it was between the 17th September and the 17th October—the period of our resignation—that this Order in Council was adopted. Now, that is true; and I will state by-and-bye what were the circumstances that, I think, justified our Government at that time in so acting. But, in the first place, I would say that the right hon. gentleman who led the Government in 1873 set us the example in this particular, for I find that timber limits were granted to various parties—to Fuller, to Fowler, and others—between the 22nd October and the 3rd November. I think it was upon the 3rd of November that the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues resigned their positions in the Government; and on that day an Order in Council was carried granting timber limits to various parties. I will also say this, because I do not wish to misrepresent the matter, or to create a false impression with a view of promoting controversy, that the hon. gentleman had applications from Mr. Fuller and others for timber limits between Lake Superior and the Red River settlements, and that when this application was made for a timber limit, after some correspondence on the subject, the Government informed Mr. Fuller and others that the Indian title had not yet been extinguished—this was in February, 1873—but that, as soon as it was extinguished, if Mr. Fuller and the other parties chose to go on and erect mills, the Government would then be prepared to consider their application. Well, it was between that period and the resignation of the Government that the Indian title was extinguished; and so the Government, although it was the 3rd November when they carried the Order in Council giving effect to the policy which had been at an earlier period determined upon—that is, at the period while they still enjoyed the confidence of the people as their representatives in Parliament. Now, I will say this, that we did exactly the same thing. When Mr. Sutherland applied for the limit on the upper waters of Saskatchewan, which was during the office of my predecessor, Mr. Laird, the Indian title had not yet been extinguished in that section of the country; and almost the same answer was conveyed to Mr. Sutherland that the previous Government had, some years before, under exactly the same circumstances, given to Mr. Fuller, namely, that the Indian title had not been extinguished, but that, as soon as it was, consideration would be given to the application. After the Indian title was extinguished Messrs. Sutherland & Cook renewed their application. The observation made by the hon. the Minister of Justice, that we granted 200 square miles, whereas in the case of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), they only granted 100 square miles, seems to me to be altogether beside the question raised by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It was not a question whether the limit was large or small. Whether the transaction was proper or improper did not depend on the size of the limit. The hon. gentleman will see, if he looks at the Orders in Council brought down in 1882, that some hon. gentlemen, who had limits of very considerable extent, were granted additional limits; and I find that in one case an additional limit of 100

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

square miles was granted to a party over and above what they had before. That was in the case of Messrs McLaren, Peels, Haggart & Nichol. The hon. the Minister reports that Messrs. McLaren & Co. also asked to have granted to them, in the vicinity of Shell River, an additional limit of 100 square miles. Then, when we look at the limits these gentlemen had before, we find they also had 100 square miles. Now, whether that was too an extensive territory or not depended altogether on certain circumstances. I find in the returns brought down that some lumbermen, who had limits acquired only three or four years before, informed the Government that the timber on their limits was exhausted. Here is a mill, the machinery of which is scarcely worn at all, that will become useless unless an additional limit can be acquired. Now, I remember very well that at the time this limit was granted on the upper waters of the Saskatchewan, a report was made. That report if not ought to be among the papers of the Department. Col. Dennis, who was the Surveyor General at the time, made an estimate as to the proper length of time the timber should last on a limit of 200 square miles, with such a mill as these gentlemen proposed to establish; and, if I remember rightly, it was something between twelve and fifteen years. At all events, it was a period considerably short of twenty-one years for which a lease was granted. It was not in the public interest that the limits should be sold, that large expense should be incurred in the erection of mills where the timber would only supply a mill for a very short time. I wish to notice another thing which has been discussed in the press supporting the Administration, and occasionally by members in this House—the statement which has been made that we authorised Messrs. Cook & Sutherland to acquire the territory of 200 square miles in blocks not less than twenty miles in extent. That matter was well considered. I remember that it was discussed again and again in view of the extent of the timber area in those districts; and that provision was made after full consideration. We found that on many rivers emptying into the Saskatchewan, especially those which were not near its source, the timber was only a fringe extending about a quarter of a mile, sometimes half a mile, and rarely a mile in depth. It seemed to me, and also to the Surveyor General and to the Deputy Minister at that time, with whom I discussed the matter before bringing it to the attention of my colleagues, that it was not desirable that the lumbermen should be encouraged to cut off these areas of timber which formed the fringes along the rivers, but that this timber should be left in a large measure for the supply of the settlers in the way of fencing material and other things which they required, as well as the timber which they might find on their homesteads; and that, therefore, if we said that no plot to be taken by lumbermen should be less than 20 miles in extent, the lumbermen would not infringe on that timber because they would not care to pay the dues on an area of 20 miles when perhaps the timber would not cover more than one third of that ground. The object we had was to force the lumbermen to go into those districts which were generally covered by timber, which were properly timber districts, in contradistinction to these timber fringes which were found along the

margins of the rivers. We also found that at that time there was but one mill in the whole of that country. Hon. gentlemen will remember that, at the time this license was granted, the settlement of the North-West was in the direction of Battleford and Prince Albert and other points along the Saskatchewan River. The surveys of the Canadian Pacific Railway lay in that direction across the river in the vicinity of Battleford, and the settlement, in advance of any work being undertaken upon the road, was along the line of country through which it was supposed the railway would run. We had no reason to suppose that the settlement would cease to flow in that direction, because it was not contemplated by the then Government, nor for some time afterwards by our successors in office, that there would be any change in the location of the railway in that district. Therefore, there being only one mill in the district, where lumber was sold in many cases at a price as high as \$100 a thousand, it was desirable to induce other lumbermen to locate in that section. At that time the Surveyor General entered into communication with several parties, and he also communicated with Messrs. Cook & Sutherland, each of whom had applied for 100 square miles of timber limit, and both of whom agreed to unite in order to secure a limit between them. It was under these circumstances, when application was made, that the letter I have in my hand of the 6th June was addressed to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland by the Surveyor General. And he says :

"SIR,—I have the honor, by direction of the Minister of the Interior, in reference to your application dated the 14th ultimo, for a timber limit of one hundred square miles to be selected and surveyed at your cost in the vicinity of the Saskatchewan between Edmonton and the Rocky Mountains, the same having had the consideration of the Minister of the Interior, to inform you that, under certain conditions, he would be disposed to recommend the same to the favorable consideration of the Privy Council. As the great object of encouraging a proposal of this nature is to cheapen the price of lumber to settlers in the North-West Territories, the Minister would desire to receive an assurance from you that, whereas he understands that at present the price of lumber at the mills in Prince Albert is from \$35 to \$45, you should agree not to charge more at your mills than from \$25 to \$35, which he considers would be very profitable rates. In case the limit should be granted to you, a bonus per square mile would be required, in addition to which you would require to conform to the terms and conditions as regards payment of ground rent and royalty, as set forth in section 51 of the Dominion Lands Act, a copy of which is herewith transmitted."

That communication was sent to these gentlemen who had applied for this timber limit, and, when they agreed to the proposition there suggested, the Order in Council of the 7th October, 1878, was adopted. The right hon. gentleman will see that this order was adopted ten days before we retired from office. If that Government had followed the usual constitutional rule, they would have met Parliament. They did not do so. They followed the more recent examples set them by Lord Beaconsfield and by Mr. Gladstone, of retiring on the adverse expression of opinion by the country, without waiting to meet the House. But the hon. gentleman carried his Orders in Council, which I believe were undisturbed, on the 3rd November, which I believe was the very day his Government retired from office, but that was in pursuance of an intention which had been expressed at an earlier period. This Order in Council was also in pursuance of an intention which was expressed as

early as the 6th June. It was the year of the election. A great deal of business necessarily accumulates during the period when an election is being held which Ministers may or may not deal with after the election is over. The Government, or, at all events, I, as head of that Department, acted upon this principle: that all business which the Government had before them before the elections were held, which had been considered by me, which I was prepared to dispose of, should, in the public interest and to the public advantage, be disposed of before retiring from office, because that related to matters with which my successor in office was not likely, at all events for some time, to be as familiar with as I was myself. The Order in Council reads as follows:—

"On a memorandum, dated Oct. 4, 1878, from the hon. the Minister of Interior, representing that being of opinion that it would encourage and facilitate settlement in the valley of the Saskatchewan if facilities were afforded for obtaining lumber at a reasonable price, which he learns cannot be done at the present time, he recommends that a timber limit, to the extent of 200 square miles on the Saskatchewan River and its tributaries in the North-West Territories, be granted to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland, the same to be selected by them in blocks of not less than twenty square miles, the bonus payable on the said limit to be at the rate of \$15 per square mile.

"And further recommending that the applicants shall have a period of three years within which to make selections of the limit, which shall not interfere with any lands which may be set apart for the Canadian Pacific Railway, or for reserves of Indians or with school lands, or with any other timber limits which may have been previously granted or which may be hereafter granted and selected prior to the selection by said Cook & Sutherland, and shall in all respects be subject to the conditions contained in the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act."

Now, I do not very well see how greater restrictions could have been imposed; I am certain that the restrictions imposed in this Order in Council are very much greater than those which were imposed in Orders in Council subsequently granted. I know that in some of those granted before 1874 under a prior Government, of which the right hon. gentleman was the head, there were no such restrictions, and we provided here, contrary to the wishes of the parties themselves, that the privilege of making a selection should not stand in the way of any other party who might subsequently require a timber limit, prior to its being actually selected, holding that there was no pre-emption right existing over the territories of the Upper Saskatchewan which would prevent anyone else, who subsequently acquired a right to a timber limit, from making a selection simply because those parties had not selected all the lands they were entitled to select. Now, the right hon. gentleman, or his Government, repealed this Order in Council. I do not know by what authority; I do not know whether my friend behind me (Mr. Cook) ever took legal advice in regard to that; but I understood that he had employed parties to explore the country to make that selection on that Order in Council—that he incurred large expense; and I do not think it was in the power of the Government to do what they did, to undo what had been done legally, in my opinion, by their predecessors in office. But, however that may be, I simply call attention to this fact, that after that Order in Council was repealed, or action upon it suspended, the same territories were granted to other parties for a much less sum, and on much less stringent conditions. I think my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Dewdney) acquired a limit; I do not

know whether he is a lumberman or not, I am not sure as to that; he is here and can speak for himself. Now, we never sold a limit to any one who was not a lumberman; we never sold a limit without the condition of erecting a mill and cutting lumber for the use of settlers; we never recognised the right of any party who is not a mill owner or not engaged in the lumbering business, to acquire a limit, because if we did we were sure it could only be acquired for speculative purposes, and we did not think it was right or ought to be the policy of the Government to encourage speculation in the public domain. Then I find also, in looking over the returns that have been brought down to the House, that those who subsequently acquired limits were allowed to select areas as small as three square miles. Now, I do not think that was in the public interest. I am not questioning the motives or the moral conduct of the Government in reference to the matter at all, I am simply speaking in this respect in regard to the public policy of allowing areas to be obtained of such limited extent, and I think that the effect would not have been in this respect in the interest of the settlers. Now, the next matter for consideration is this: Whether the time had come when this policy of permitting the private sale of timber limits ought to have come to an end. The hon. gentleman had, in his Bill of 1872, expressed what his view of the public policy was; the right hon. gentleman showed that he could not give effect to what he regarded as the ideally perfect—or approximately so—system of public policy with regard to timber limits. He was obliged to make sales in contravention of the terms of the statute, by private understanding with parties, without competition, either by tender or by public auction. When the hon. member for East York came into office he found exactly the same condition of things existing. Now, in this very correspondence, when application was made to me in the first instance, in 1877, for this timber limit, I informed the parties that it was the intention of the Government to sell these limits, if possible, by public auction. That was the answer given in the first instance, but upon enquiry we found that impossible. As far as the territories of the Upper Saskatchewan were concerned, situated remote from any means of communication, knowing that the lumber cut there would be cut only for the use of settlers, that the extent of the market would depend wholly upon the progress of settlement, we found it so much a leap in the dark on the part of lumbermen that we could not get parties to compete with each other, and so we were obliged to press parties to purchase the timber limits and to erect mills, rather than to hold them in restraint. Now, that was the condition of things existing in 1878 in that territory. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was surveyed further south, when the railways were being pushed on westward from Winnipeg, you had a different state of things existing, and that different state of things is disclosed by the correspondence that has been put upon the Votes and Proceedings. I have made a statement with regard to the conduct of the previous Government, and with regard to the conduct of the right hon. gentleman himself, and his colleagues, with reference to these timber limits. We may differ as to what is the proper public policy to adopt with regard to this question. That is a fair subject

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)

for a resolution. It is a question to be argued and voted upon, but that is not the question now before us, and I ask the House not to confound, nor to confuse, a question of public policy in regard to the conduct of the Administration, with the question of the personal conduct of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). They are different questions altogether. If we had the question of the public policy of the Government before us, we might very fairly point out, what is the necessary outcome of the policy which the Government have adopted, and contend that it ought to be changed or modified, or superseded by the policy which we have often held to be in the public interest. The wisdom or fault of the public policy of the Administration is one thing; the personal misconduct and misrepresentations, and the attempt to use his position, as a member of this House, for the purpose of making enormous gain at the expense of certain parties, is a question which this House should not ignore. I do not say that correspondence is reliable, and I suppose the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches would not declare that they have the most implicit confidence in every statement made in these various communications that have been published, and which have been made the subject of the resolution that is now before the House; but it does show that there was existing at that time what had not existed a year or two earlier—that there was competition, that parties were ready to bid against each other for timber limits; that the practice of selling at a fixed price, which was a matter of necessity so far as the Government was concerned, from 1872 to 1880, was a condition of things that no longer existed; that a change had taken place, and that that policy which the hon. gentleman desired to adopt when he proposed, in 1872, the clause in the Act of 35 Vic., which I read, was possible in 1882. That is perfectly clear from what has happened; it is perfectly clear that when the Government sold this timber limit at \$5 per square mile, and the hon. member for Lincoln sold it at \$2,000, there was a considerable demand for the acquisition of timber limits, and that the condition of things that existed in 1877, and in 1878, did not exist in 1882, so far as that particular district was concerned. Now, that is, in my opinion, a reason for having changed the policy and returned to that policy that everybody admitted was desirable, but that everybody had found at an earlier period was impracticable. I have said this by way of explanation, and by way of defence of what was done. A more straightforward transaction, one, in my opinion, more in the public interest, one more calculated to facilitate settlement and promote the interest of the settler, was never made, than that Order in Council that granted the 200 square miles to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland, on the 7th October, 1878. It was adopted after very careful consideration, it was adopted in the public interest, and it would, in my opinion, if the hon. gentleman had allowed it to go into operation, have operated in that interest. And he will see that his proposal to divide that limit and sell it in smaller areas did not accomplish the end he had in view; for I observe, by the returns brought down, that Captain Moore, who had already a limit of very considerable extent, acquired 100 square miles of the territory proposed to be disposed of; and the sales made to the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Dewd-

ney), and to Mr. Farrar of the *Mail*, then residing in the North-West Territories, were sales to men who were not lumbermen, who had no intention of working the limits themselves, and who acquired them for the purpose of transferring them to someone else. As the hon. gentleman will see, instead of limiting the limit to 200 square miles, there was nothing to prevent 500 square miles passing into the hands of any one party under the regulations adopted. But all this, Mr. Speaker, is beside the motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says "hear hear," and I am glad he agrees with me. But, of course, he will understand that when the Minister of Justice insinuated that we had acted most improperly in granting this limit, and when the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), undertook to make the granting of this limit a defence of his action, then it was necessary that I should say something in defence of the Government of which I was a member, and the one chiefly responsible for that particular act. Now, with respect to the motion of the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Minister of Justice has proposed an adjournment of the debate. To what end, to what purpose? What is the object of the adjournment of the debate? I listened very attentively to the explanation made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), and that hon. gentleman did not controvert anything that was said. Why, if the hon. gentleman intended to controvert anything contained in the letters, and intended to repudiate any of them as being spurious, the opportunity occurred when the hon. member for South Oxford first proposed to place them on the Votes and Proceedings. If the hon. gentleman had said that these letters are not genuine, or that some of them were spurious, then an enquiry would have been proper for the purpose of ascertaining which were genuine and which were spurious. An enquiry would have been necessary under those circumstances; but the hon. gentleman admitted that they are all genuine publications. For what purpose does the hon. gentleman ask a committee? Is it for the purpose of disproving anything the hon. gentleman himself has said over his signature? Is it for the purpose of showing that he did not tell the truth in regard to his own conduct in the matter? Surely not. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Sands is satisfied with the transaction, and that he is not disposed to charge him with fraud and misconduct in the matter. That question is not before the House. It is not a matter of any consequence what Mr. Sands' views are on the subject; it is not a question whether the hon. gentleman acted properly or improperly in dealing with Mr. Sands. That is not the question at all. One question is, whether an hon. member of this House should, for the purpose of his own profit and advantage, undertake to act as agent or intermediary between the Government and any outside party. I can well understand how a member of this House may be applied to by his constituents to make application for this or the other thing; but I do not understand how an hon. member may undertake to make professional charges for such service. That is a wholly different matter, and that is an important

point involved here; it is, at all events, one of the important points involved in this case. There are a number of cases to show that a member is not allowed to promote business in Parliament in his professional capacity. This has been ruled over and over again. It is true that among English precedents we have nothing which says that a lawyer may not act professionally before any Department of the Government. But look at the principle, and you will find that exactly the same reasons which would prevent a member acting professionally before any committee of the House, or in the House itself, applies to a member acting professionally before any Department of the Government for hire or for fee, as he would before a court of law operate here. The reasons for the rule are the same in both cases, and the reasons which influence the action of a member in the one case should influence his action in the other. Take the case of Mr. Isaac Butt, the case of Mr. Bird, discussed by Lord Brougham and Sir Robert Peel, when both were members of the House of Commons, and take other cases which I might mention. In the case of Sir Isaac Butt, Sir Hugh Cairns, who was then Solicitor General, spoke in vindication of his legal brethren in the House, and said:

"That every member of the profession who entertains that feeling of honor, which he believes was common to the whole body, would at once declare that he could not advocate or even vote for any question in the House in which he had been professionally engaged, lest he might unconsciously, perhaps, be biased by the opinion which he had, as an advocate, expressed outside the House."

That is the rule laid down. If you wish to ascertain how far a member should be precluded from acting before any Department of the Government with a view to influencing the Administration for pay, you have just to look at the reasons which prevent a member from acting in Parliament, and you will see they are exactly the same in the one case as in the other. It is true the member has not to vote when he is before a Department. But he may go before a committee of the House of which he is not a member, and undertake to advocate any measure, but if he does it for hire or fee he comes within the rule laid down by Lord Cairns. In this respect the hon. member for Lincoln is within the reason of the rule. Then the hon. gentleman has shown that he himself felt that he was not acting in accordance with what he considered defensible or he would never have substituted his wife's name for his own as the party who was to receive the pecuniary advantage. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the question, but I think it is not in the public interest that the Government should ask for an adjournment of the debate and that they should propose to refer the question to a committee. The facts are before us. The hon. gentleman in his explanation has not proposed to introduce anything to controvert what we have here. This is not in the position of an ordinary case in this respect: if he proposed to produce evidence by way of rebuttal it would be to refute evidence given by some other party than himself. But the charge made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is based on the testimony of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert); it is based on what the hon. gentleman himself has said. It is not based on what has been said by some one else. There is no other party giving testimony except the hon. gentleman, whose testimony he may seek to con-

trovert. The testimony to be so given would be testimony against that furnished by the hon. gentleman himself, and it would be an extraordinary state of things if he were allowed to undertake to show that every statement made against himself was an untrue statement. This endeavor, if successful, would only go to prove the charge. We have had the statement made by the Minister of Customs. The Minister of Customs felt that the statements made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) were untrue statements, and statements calculated to damage him personally as a member of the Administration. He combatted them, he denied them, and the hon. member for Lincoln admitted the accuracy of that denial, and the inaccuracy of the statements made by himself. What, then, can you say when you look at these letters? When you examine their contents, when you listen to what has been said by the Minister of Customs, and to what the hon. gentleman has himself stated as against his own testimony, we must conclude that these statements are false and scandalous; that they are, as they are described in the motion, and that it is not in the public interest that his conduct should in any way be upheld or extenuated. I hope that the Government will neither postpone the debate nor refer the matter to a committee, but that they will deal with the question courageously and honestly upon its merits, as the conduct and character of this House require it should be dealt with. It seems to me that there ought to be no differences of opinion on the two sides of the House with regard to this matter. The character of the House is involved, and the confidence which the country has in public men is involved. I am not disposed to create a greater suspicion, or a greater distrust in the honesty of public men, than that which exists in the public mind at the present time. The way in which to create greater confidence among the people in the administration of our affairs, is that when misconduct is established it should be dealt with as it deserves. If we postpone the debate, or undertake to shelve the responsibility of deciding this question, we will not create greater confidence among the public. I do not think it is desirable to let the hon. gentleman down by degrees, and to get rid of the question by a postponement. In my opinion, the public expect the House to deal fairly with the question, and, as we have it now before us, we ought to dispose of it.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not rise for the purpose of expressing a positive opinion with respect to the guilt or innocence of the hon. member for Lincoln. I presume the question as to whether that hon. gentleman has violated the Independence of Parliament Act or not, is one which may be properly relegated to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, if the House so decides. But, Sir, I could not listen to the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, without saying a word or two in respect to the provisions of the law which has brought the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) into the position he stands to-day. When I listened to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) defending the acts of the Government, of which he was a member in 1877, and defending more especially the acts of the Department of which he himself was Minister, I wondered in my own mind, as to whether the hon. gentleman had

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

not been the party accused by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) instead of the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) have laid down the proposition, that those timber limits ought to be submitted to public competition—at public auction. That proposition is one in which I entirely and fully concur. But, when the hon. member (Mr. Mills) laid down that proposition, he ought to have admitted that the same principle should have guided the Government of which he was a member, when they controlled the destinies of this country, just as much as it ought to guide the present Administration.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We tried it and failed.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). What was the condition of things in regard to these timber limits when the hon. gentleman and his friends came into office? I will read, with permission of the House, the clause of the Act of 1872, having reference to that particular matter. The 50th section of the Dominion Lands Act reads as follows:—

“The right of cutting timber on such limits shall be put up at a bonus per square mile, varying according to the situation and value of the limit, and sold to the highest bidder by competition, either by tender or at public auction.”

In addition to that the 51st section of the Act provides as follows. I shall only read the first subsection, which has reference to this matter:

“The purchaser shall receive a lease granting the right of cutting timber on the land for twenty-one years, and containing the following conditions, with such others as shall have been embodied in the notice of sale, that is to say:

“The lessee to erect a saw mill or mills in connection with such limits and lease, and subject to any special conditions which may be agreed upon and stated in the lease, and such mill or mills to be of capacity to cut at the rate of a thousand feet, broad measure, in twenty-four hours, for every two and a half square miles of limits in the lease, or shall establish such other manufactory of wood goods as may be agreed upon as the equivalent of such mill or mills, and the lessee shall work the limit, in the manner and to the extent provided in the lease, within two years from the date thereof, and during each succeeding year of the term.”

Now, the hon. member for Bothwell has stated to the House that the Government found it impossible to carry out that condition, as they could not obtain competition for these timber limits, and that, as a matter of fact, between the time of the passage of this Act and the time when the hon. gentleman's friends came into power, the then Government did grant timber lands to lumbermen in the Lake of the Woods district, without competition. I say that, if that was done by the Government, it was done in violation of this Act, and done contrary to law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Was it not done contrary to law?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that the Act of 1872 was repealed, and the Act of 1874 enacted.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am not speaking of the acts of the hon. gentleman and his friends when they came into office. I am speaking of the statements the hon. gentleman made in reference to the acts of the present Administration, when in office prior to 1873; and I say that if such licenses were

granted, they were granted in defiance of this Act, and in violation of the law. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that, finding that condition of things to exist when the Administration of which he was a member came into office, they deemed it necessary to modify the Act in such a manner as to enable them to grant leases without public competition. The hon. gentleman has stated to the House that this change was made in the Act for the purpose of enabling the settlers in the North-West Territories, and in Manitoba, to obtain cheaper lumber than they could obtain under the Act of 1872. But what did the hon. gentleman and the Government of which he was a member provide for by the Act of 1874? They provided this:

"The 51st section of the said hereinbefore first cited Act is hereby amended by inserting after sub-section 9 the following as sub-section 10:—

"Provided further, that in cases where application may be made for limits on which to cut timber in unsurveyed territory, the Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister of the Interior, authorise the same to be leased for such bonus as may be deemed fair and reasonable,—such leases to be subject, nevertheless, to the foregoing conditions of this section, except as to that part of sub-section one which provides for the erection of mills, which provision, in respect to limits in unsurveyed territory, may, if considered expedient by the Minister of the Interior, be dispensed with."

Thus, instead of amending the law so as to provide the settlers with cheaper lumber, they took power by this very Act to grant licenses without imposing on the lessees of the limits the condition which had been imposed by the previous Administration, that they must erect mills within a certain period of time and of a certain capacity. So the hon. gentleman, by his own Act, has taken out of his mouth the defence he has made here to-night for modifying the law as it was modified in 1874. Now, he says that, in compliance with that law, and having in view the interests of the people on the Saskatchewan, the Department of which he was the head, in 1877, agreed to grant to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland 200 square miles of limits in the Saskatchewan district; and he states—and the hon. member for South Oxford made the same statement—that that grant was made for the purpose of giving to the people of that district cheaper lumber than they were able theretofore to obtain. But the hon. gentleman read the Order in Council on which those licenses were authorised to be granted, and there is not in that Order in Council a single word restricting those gentlemen as to the price they were to charge to the settlers for the timber they proposed to grant to them out of the public domain.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if there is a single word in that Order in Council restricting them as to the price they were to charge to settlers? On the contrary, the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member granted to those gentlemen a valuable concession, in the shape of timber lands on the Saskatchewan River, and further, made a provision in the Order in Council by which those gentlemen could select those lands in blocks of twenty square miles, and by which they could select all the best timber lands on the Upper Saskatchewan.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I should like to know whether any other construction can be put upon that Order in Council? The ordinary course is to lay out the timber limits in blocks of 25, 50 or 100 square miles, as the case may be; and the purchaser has to take the lands just as they are, paying, not only for the areas covered by timber, but for the barren areas and those covered by water; but the Order in Council which my hon. friend authorised as Minister of the Interior gave those two gentlemen power to select, in blocks of twenty square miles, the best timber lands to be found on the North Saskatchewan, and to take only lands covered by timber. The hon. gentleman has also stated that it was desirable, in the public interest, that those timber lands should be granted only to gentlemen engaged in the lumber trade; but it is a rather singular circumstance, that the Government of that day were able to find, amongst all the lumbermen of this country, only two gentlemen who met the conditions required—of being lumbermen—and were at the same time active supporters of the then Administration.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not a bit of it.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). My hon. friend says: "Not a bit of it;" and yet the fact remains that one of these gentlemen was a member of this Parliament, actively supporting the Administration, and that the other gentleman, though not a member of this Parliament, was also an active supporter of the Administration. In view of these facts, I say that the defence which my hon. friend, with all the specious sophistry of which he is a master, and which he exhibited in so high a degree to-night, makes of this transaction, which he contends to have been in the public interest, was no defence at all; and whilst I agree with that hon. gentleman, and with the hon. member for South Oxford, that the condition of things which existed at the time the hon. member for Lincoln was enabled, without any violation of the law, to obtain a concession of timber lands, ought not to continue—ought never to have existed; but I say that those hon. gentlemen are the men to blame for having placed the law permitting it on the Statute-book. While I do not exonerate the present Administration for continuing that law on the Statute-book, I say it does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to attack the present Administration for continuing on the Statute-book the law which they themselves placed on the Statute-book. I have only a word more to say on this matter, and it is this: I regretted, when the hon. member for South Oxford delivered his speech this afternoon, that he did not confine himself to the matter under consideration, but went beyond it for the purpose of accusing other hon. members of this House of corruption, and the people outside of this House of condoning corruption. If the hon. gentleman desired to accuse the hon. member for Lincoln, either of having violated the Independence of Parliament Act or of having been guilty of conduct that was scandalous and unjustifiable, he ought to have confined himself to that accusation, and have omitted reference to other members of this House until they should be accused directly of some violation of their duties as members of Parliament.

Mr. CHARLTON. The question under discussion seems to have drifted away somewhat

widely from the starting point when my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) introduced his resolution this afternoon. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken seems to imagine that the question under discussion is as to whether there is any precedent in the action of the Mackenzie Government for the course adopted by the present Administration in dealing with timber limits. Now, it appears to me that, if my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White) has succeeded in establishing the fact, if such a fact existed, that the Mackenzie Government had been guilty of wrong in this matter, and had pursued a policy which was wrong, the existence of that would not justify wrong on the part of the First Minister.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew.) I do not pretend to say it would.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is useless to discuss the question upon this basis. If the grant of a limit of 200 miles on the Upper Saskatchewan, in view of the circumstances under which it was made, to two lumbermen for the purpose of securing the manufacture of lumber in the North-West, happens to have been wrong, that does not justify the Government that followed in granting 23,000 or 24,000 square miles to a hoard of camp followers, not one or twenty of whom were lumbermen at all; and the Government cannot be justified by this sort of special pleading. I find, however, that when we attempted to condemn that policy, on the 4th May, 1886, by a motion which I made in this House, when I laid before the House the fact that hundreds of Orders in Council had been granted—550 I think in all—when I laid before this House and the country, the fact that over 23,000 square miles of timber limits had been granted by the Government, that numerous members of Parliament had applied in their own names and obtained limits, that other members of Parliament had applied and obtained limits for their friends, I find that the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), voted against that motion condemning the policy of the Government in that regard.

Mr. COOK. He was in sympathy with them, because he had timber limits himself.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). That is not true.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), informs us to-night that he is in favor of the policy of inviting competition by public auction for the purchase of timber limits, that he does not approve of the conduct of any Government which pursues the opposite policy; and yet, he did approve of their conduct in following the opposite policy when, upon the crucial test of the motion I made condemning the policy of the Government, he was found voting to sustain it. I propose to say a few words to-night about this matter. I should not have done so if the discussion had not taken the direction it has since the motion was introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I may say with regard to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), that his conduct in this matter is scarcely defensible. I do not think any particular attempt has been made to defend it. The hon. the Minister of Customs, in a very frank speech, and a speech which did him honor, the other day, did not attempt to justify the conduct of the hon. member for Lincoln. The hon. the

Mr. CHARLTON.

Minister of Justice to-day has not attempted to justify it, and I do not think it is justifiable in any sense. His letters, of course, were private letters. It is unfortunate for the hon. member for Lincoln that they were made public, and I can sympathise with that hon. gentleman to some extent, in the circumstances in which he is placed; but I want to point out one thing. I want to point out, that the conduct of the hon. member for Lincoln is a natural result of Government teaching, of the Government policy, and of the Government example. I want to point out that he is an apt scholar, who has graduated in the school at the head of which stands the Ministry of the day, and the chief teachers in which have been the members of this Government. Now, as to the political practices of that school, take their whole history of the management of affairs of this country since 1878. Take the Gerrymander Act, take the Franchise Act—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. CHARLTON,—take the squandering of an empire, the granting of timber limits, the absurd land grants, the colonisation grants, the mineral grants,—the whole of this enormous amount of swag—playing ducks and drakes with an empire—all these things used for political purposes. Why, the hon. gentleman graduated in this school, and it is the natural result of the teaching of the Government which we see in the transaction brought to light to-night. I propose to call attention to some of the things done under this Government, some of the things that the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) voted were right and refused to vote were wrong when a motion was made in this House in May, 1886, concerning them. I found, on examining the records of the Department of the Interior, that there had been timber limits granted, upon the personal application of members of this House and the Senate, to seventeen different members of those different bodies. I found that Mr. Montplaisir had received a limit at Rainy Lake; that C. C. Colby had received a limit on the 3rd January, 1883; that the Hon. G. W. Howland had received two limits; that M. K. Dickinson had received a limit; that John White, M.P., had received two limits; that the Hon. Wm. Muirhead had received two limits; that Jno. Rochester had received one limit; that L. McCallum had received one limit; that Duncan McMillan had received one limit; that J. B. Daoust had received one limit; that H. A. Ward, M.P., had received one limit; that C. E. Hickey was an applicant, in connection with his partner, Wm. Brodeur, for one limit; that Wm. W. Elliot, ex-M.P., had received one limit; that the Hon. A. W. Ogilvie had received one limit; that Oscar Fulton, ex-M.P., had received one limit; that David Blaine, ex-M.P., had received one limit; that L. H. Massue had received one limit—total, seventeen limits granted to members of this House, and the other House, comprising an area of 850 square miles; granted without competition and upon which, on a motion condemning the policy of the Government, the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) voted that the policy of the Government was right. Then we had a list of members of the Local Legislature, seven in number, who had received limits from this Government, upon their own application, amounting to 350 square miles.

Then we had a list of members of the Senate and House of Commons who had made applications for friends, and we had the results of these applications. We had, for instance, the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) who had made application, first, for his son-in-law, Mr. Symonds, and received a limit for him; and for James Robb, and received a limit for him; and for S. S. Fuller, and received a limit for him; and for Graven Smith, and received a limit for him; and for William Morten, and received a limit for him; and for Jas. P. Ward, and received a limit for him. I find that he secured six limits for his friends, comprising an area of 300 square miles. Then we had Mr. Hector Cameron, an applicant for friends, who received three limits, and Mr. McCallum, who applied for three limits for his friends and received them; and Mr. C. C. Colby, who applied for one limit for friends, and received it; and J. Royal, who secured for his friends two limits; and J. C. Rykert, who received for his friends the modest amount of one limit;—

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Was that his friend Adams?

Mr. CHARLTON—and John Costigan, who made application for his friend Major John Lewis, was granted an extension of time; and the Hon. G. W. Howland, who secured three limits for his friends; and John White, M.P., who made four applications for his friends and was granted four limits; and T. S. Sproule, who applied for two limits for his friends, and was given them; and Duncan McMillan, who made six applications for his friends, and was granted them;—

Mr. SPROULE. My applications were not for Conservatives at all, but for Reformers.

Mr. CHARLTON—and Geo. B. Orton, who was granted six applications for his friends; and J. B. Daoust, who secured one limit for a friend; and F. Vanasse, who made two applications, and was granted two limits; and the Hon. Mr. Pope, who made one application and was given one limit; and Hon. John Carling, who applied for his friends in four applications, and secured four limits; I find that A. Boulton, ex-M.P., made three applications and secured three limits; Joseph Tassé made three applications and secured three limits; F. E. Kilvert, M.P., made five applications and secured five limits; H. A. Ward, M.P., made three applications and secured three limits; John Bryson, M.P., made two applications and secured two limits; Hugo Kranz made one application and secured one limit; Sir Adolphe Caron made one application for his brother-in-law, Mr. Sharples, and secured one limit; J. S. MacCuaig, ex-M.P., made one application and secured one limit; Thos. Farrow made three applications and secured three limits; John Small, M.P., made two applications and obtained two limits; S. J. Dawson made one application and secured one limit.

Mr. DAWSON. It is utterly and absolutely untrue.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have the Order in Council to that effect.

Mr. DAWSON. You cannot produce any proof that I got a limit.

Mr. CHARLTON. I had a denial of that kind from the Postmaster General—before. Then we have the Hon. Thomas White, who made one

application, and secured one limit. Thus, on the application of members of Parliament, or ex-members, for themselves or their friends, we find there were 3,550 square miles granted. Then, among the supporters of the Government, I find a great cloud of witnesses as to the liberality of the Government towards their friends. I find that Nicholas Flood Davin obtained one limit. Joseph Gibson, a Tory candidate for South Oxford, obtained one limit. R. S. White, of the *Montreal Gazette*, obtained one limit. F. W. Gibbs, a son of the Hon. T. N. Gibbs, received one limit. Charles J. Campbell, a brother of Sir Alexander Campbell, received one limit. Col. David Tisdale received one limit. James McKnight—my own county seems to have been particularly successful in this matter—a Tory candidate there, received one limit. William Wilson, another Tory candidate in that county, received one limit. John Wilson, chairman of the Conservative Association there, received one limit. Alexander McColl, a Tory aspirant for political honors in North Norfolk, received one limit. J. C. Boyd, an election worker of great efficiency, who is known as "Coon-skin Boyd," received one limit. W. H. Teeter received one limit. Frederick Cope received one limit. James Robb, a law partner of Colonel Tisdale, received one limit. Chas. P. Young received one limit, and so on through a long list of 550 Orders in Council which were issued up to the end of February, 1885, granting 25,300 square miles of timber limits, making a total of 16,192,000 acres which were granted by this Government, in almost every case to its own favorites, a great many granted to members of Parliament for their own use, a greater number granted to their friends for purely speculative purposes. Those limits were taken, I venture to say, with the intention on the part of most of the applicants to do what the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has done, to make a profit out of them, granted without competition, granted in the face of repeated protests from this side of the House that the policy of the Government was wrong and wasteful of the public domain; and yet we now have a member rising in his place and justifying this wholesale granting of the public property on the ground and with the paltry excuse that 200 square miles were granted by the previous Government to two lumbermen who were to work them on the western waters.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The hon. gentleman entirely mistakes the position which was taken by me. I did not justify the course of the present Administration; but I said that those who introduced this law and gave effect to it should be the last to condemn the action of the present Administration.

Mr. CHARLTON. On the only occasion when the hon. gentleman for Renfrew (Mr. White) was asked to pronounce a verdict as to the conduct of the Government, when a motion was made condemning the conduct of the Government, the hon. gentleman justified the conduct of the Government by his vote, and how can he now defend it?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He will find that, on a motion made by Mr. Blake that it was expedient that this course of action should cease, that the policy of

granting timber lands by private arrangement should cease, I voted with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have not looked at these records; but when this motion was before the House to which I refer, the hon. gentleman's course stands on the records. As to this conduct of the Government in reference to timber limits, which is now condemned by such a supporter as the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), a course which the Government has itself admitted to be wrong by bowing to the demands of the country and introducing a more healthful system, the system of competition, I may point out that the Government did, in 1882, institute what was known as Colonisation Plans No. 1 and No. 2, and the influence of those plans was very greatly to aid the Government in the elections of that year. Under the operation of Colonisation Plan No. 1, within one year and eight months there were applications received from 251 individuals for 2,295 townships. Among the applicants for these colonisation grants of land were 23 members of this House supporting the Government, whose applications aggregated 135 townships. The conditions were the sale of these lands to those applicants at half the price which was charged to the hardy settlers who were going into the North-West. Although the profits which were anticipated were not made, yet the influence upon the political fortunes of the Government was very marked, this policy having been adopted on the eve of the elections of 1882, and, until it was proved that the speculation would be a failure, the Government reaped the advantage. Then we had the policy of the Government in regard to pasture land leases, leasing lands in great blocks, the only restriction being that not more than 50,000 acres should be granted to one man. These were leased without competition at one cent an acre, when probably four or five times that amount could have been obtained if competition had been asked for. I say that the whole policy of the Government in regard to the leasing of timber limits, in regard to their colonisation plans, in regard to their dealing with mineral lands, in regard to their pasture land leases, was all of a piece, and was calculated to have the most corrupting influence upon their followers and upon the public at large; and I say further, that the conduct of the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) is but the natural outcome of the action of the Government, and that the Government is responsible for that and for numberless other cases of the same kind. I felt it to be my duty to rise and to condemn the conduct of the Government in this matter; for, I think, it deserves the most serious condemnation of the public. It has debauched public sentiment, it has debauched the followers of the Government themselves, and it will be a shame and a disgrace to Canada as well as to the Government when its history is written.

Mr. TISDALE. I had no intention of taking part in this debate, until I was informed that the hon. gentleman had introduced my name in connection with this matter. I understood that the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was made for a specific object in reference to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). But, I find, so far as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is concerned, it is an old arrangement that he had published largely at the expense of this Parlia-

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

ment years ago, and, so far as I am concerned, I had the honor of contesting that question with him in my election. I have only this explanation to make in regard to that matter, that I did apply, with a number of other gentlemen, for timber lands in the North-West. We formed a syndicate there, and we applied for a quantity of timber lands as lumbermen, as competent lumbermen, I believe, and with capital at our backs, and the intention was, if there had been timber on these limits, to construct a branch railway from the Riding Mountains to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. We ascertained, and I suppose many other gentlemen have ascertained, who have endeavored to operate in timber limits in the North-West, that it was a dream. We obtained several hundred square miles under the regulations, and we obtained a railway charter from the Manitoba Legislature, and when we sent out an explorer to ascertain whether there was sufficient timber to pay for operating mills, as the regulations required, we found on all the limits about 4,000,000 feet of lumber. Now, the hon. gentleman has not only been answered by me, but he has been answered by the electors of the riding which I represent. The hon. gentleman knew, further, that those limits, years ago, were cancelled. He may, if he sees fit, drag in the names of parties after he has been corrected, but I want to say this in regard to him. Under the policy of the Ontario Government, which was the matter discussed as contrasted with the policy of the Dominion Government, he and his brother have been enabled to get a limit for which the Ontario Government got less than \$5,000, for which they would not take a profit of \$100,000 today. I regret that the hon. gentleman saw fit to drag these things into the discussion, because I believe that in this House, as in any other place, we had better stick to the question. I had no desire to make allusion to these things at all, but if he will bring them up, after being corrected, and after knowing all the facts, he must stand the consequences. I believe that hon. gentlemen on both sides in this House have a desire to stand well in all matters of business, or timber limits, or anything else, with which they have been connected, and I say that it was uncalled for on the part of the hon. gentleman to bring up these charges. The hon. member has, as it were, compelled me to rise and to contradict the impression that he sought to convey to the House that there was something improper in what I had done. I was desirous of lumbering; I am lumbering now to an extent, probably, equal to that of the hon. gentleman; and if I could have found a profitable investment in the North-West Territories under the regulations of the Dominion Government, that would have enabled me, with those associated with me, to invest my capital there, I would have done so instead of lumbering, as I am now, in the State of Michigan, where I can find a profitable investment, because, after all, that is what business men are looking for. Now, in regard to the matter under consideration, I wish to say that I have not sufficiently read or considered the evidence presented to this House to be able to say, if the matter comes to a vote, how I ought to vote. Accusations have been brought against the hon. member for Lincoln, and in my opinion the least this House can do is to allow him, what a man

charged elsewhere would be allowed, a proper tribunal, where the evidence can be presented which he says he has in his possession, whether it is true or not. I say in all fairness, in all sense of judicial responsibility, and in all sense of justice, we should give him every opportunity to produce the evidence that he says can be produced in this House. I do not care on which side an hon. member may be charged with anything improper, I say we owe it to ourselves and we owe it to the hon. member who may be charged, to allow him a chance to produce his evidence— whether he can produce it is another matter; if he cannot, so much the worse for him. I say then that, in my opinion, we should delegate this question to a committee, and give him the opportunity he asks for.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a personal explanation. I was called out for a few moments and did not hear the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), but I understand he has stated that I got a timber limit from the Ontario Government on private terms.

Mr. TISDALE. What I stated is this: that you took advantage of the opportunity which the Ontario Government allowed for acquiring timber limits in the North-West. I did not say or insinuate that you had, in any way, acquired a limit except according to the regulations of the Ontario Government; but I did say and I repeat, that, under the arrangements of that Government, the ill-advised arrangements of that Government, you had been able to acquire a limit on which you, or your brother, taking the Government's price at which you had acquired it, made a profit of more than \$100,000. But I never did say, and I will have to live a long time yet before I will say, on hearsay evidence, and I would not insinuate, that you had acquired it in any improper manner. I say you acquired it under their regulations; and I say that the Ontario Government, in dealing with their timber limits, on the figures they have quoted in discussions throughout the country, if they had held those limits, instead of disposing of them as they did, against the protest of John Sanfield Macdonald and the old leaders of the coalition Government, could realise from 40 to 50 million dollars more than they did realise.

Mr. CHARLTON. The statement made by the hon. member for South Norfolk, as I understand him, is that I acquired, under the regulations of the Ontario Government, a timber limit for a small sum, upon which I made \$100,000.

Mr. TISDALE. Do not mistake me.

Mr. CHARLTON. Now, with regard to this matter I will say that upon one occasion I was the purchaser of a timber limit in Ontario at a public auction, where there were hundreds of men gathered together, after an advertisement of the sale for several months, and where the limits sold at an extreme figure. My brother and I bought one limit at about \$5,000 more than it was worth, and another limit we paid full value for. Besides that I acquired some property at private sale.

Mr. TISDALE. Timber limits.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, timber limits that had previously been bought from the Government at public auction by the parties from whom I purchased, and I never acquired any timber limits in

the Province of Ontario that I did not pay full value for. I never went to the Province of Ontario to get a timber limit at \$5 a square mile without paying any bonus, making private application, and not being obliged to compete with somebody else. With regard to the policy of the Ontario Government, they have placed under license a little over 8,500 square miles, or about one-third the amount of territory placed under license by this Government between 1880 and 1885. They have received as bonuses upon that 8,500 square miles of land, over \$3,000,000 in cash, besides the actual rental, and every dollar of bonuses they have received is so much more money than the Dominion Government have received at all in granting limits; and the policy of the Ontario Government with reference to timber limits, is a careful and conservative policy. They have brought very little land into the market: their last sale of any consequence was several years ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. CHARLTON. The policy has been attacked.

Mr. TAYLOR. If you rise to a personal explanation, you must confine yourself to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member must confine himself to an explanation.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to ask the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) if he wished to give the House to understand that he purchased limits by private sale from the Ontario Government, or at public auction when they were sold to the highest bidder?

Mr. CHARLTON. I purchased on one occasion, at private sale, from an individual who held a limit which had been bought at public auction, and I purchased on another occasion a limit at public auction.

Mr. TAYLOR. You made \$100,000 out of it.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not my intention at this time to enter into any discussion of the question before the House, but I desire to say a few words in defence of my late colleague, the Hon. Thos. White. If the hon. gentleman's statements in regard to other members of this House be as untrue, as uncharitable and as incorrect as the references made to the late Hon. Thos. White, very little reliance ought to be placed on any statement he has made. This same statement was made while that gentleman was alive and sitting on the floor of Parliament. He gave a full explanation, which satisfied every reasonable man, not only in this House but in the country. The whole head and front of that gentleman's offending was the sending in of an application when he was an independent member of Parliament recommending a gentleman to the Government, saying he was a respectable man, and that if anything could be done to assist him in his application, he (Mr. White) had every reason to believe he was well worthy of it.

An hon. MEMBER. And a Grit, too.

Mr. BOWELL. And he was a Reformer at that. That gentleman with whom Mr. White had personal acquaintance, applied to the then hon. member for Cardwell to forward his recommendation, and he did so. That is the whole charge which could be brought against the conduct of

that gentleman, who is not now here to defend himself. I repeat again that, possessing that knowledge, I do think, with due respect for those whom that gentleman has left behind him, the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should not, if he had any truth, honor and sense of fair dealing, have introduced that gentleman's name.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no desire to cast aspersions on the conduct of any one, more especially on the conduct of one who has passed away. In searching these returns, when I found that Orders in Council had been issued to and applications had been made by members of Parliament, I had to make notes of these matters in preparing the record.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman heard the explanation, and is as well acquainted with it as I am.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The debate has wandered so very far from the subject-matter of the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that I venture to ask the indulgence of the House while I try to bring it back to the subject-matter of the resolution. If the hon. gentleman, whose conduct has been impugned on this occasion, had sought to lead the House away from the subject-matter of the resolution, and to mislead the judgment of the House, he could not have found a counsel who could have given him more astute advice than that followed by some hon. gentlemen to-night, because an onlooker could not tell what we are now discussing. Parliament has been asked by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to affirm a resolution that an hon. gentleman has been guilty of conduct, disgraceful, discreditable and corrupt. The evidence on which that resolution was based was evidence printed in the Votes and Proceedings three or four weeks ago. That evidence has been before the House. It has been read by every hon. member, and has been perused, no doubt, by the entire reading public of Canada. That evidence is evidence furnished by the hon. member whose conduct is impugned. The hon. gentleman was very properly given every opportunity to meet that evidence some time ago. He published in reply to that evidence a very long letter in one of the city newspapers, and his defence is published in the Votes and Proceedings side by side with the charges made against him. At a subsequent stage, when the hon. gentleman thought he had obtained further evidence either to excuse or palliate his offence, he came before the House and very fairly asked the House for, and the House very fairly granted him the privilege of inserting further correspondence in the Votes and Proceedings, in order that the House, before it was called upon to decide the question and pass judgment, might be seized of the whole facts. I think I am in the judgment of the House when I state that no application has been made by the hon. member for Lincoln with respect to the charge brought against him which has not been acceded to by the House. After a period of three or four weeks, during which the charges have remained on the Votes and Proceedings, the House was asked by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to declare that that evidence, embodied in our Votes

Mr. BOWELL.

and Proceedings, and embodied in the letters of the hon. member, also in our Votes and Proceedings, is sufficient to warrant it in concluding that the hon. gentleman's conduct was discreditable and disgraceful. We are now asked not to pass judgment on these letters; we are asked by the Minister of Justice to say that this debate should be adjourned, and I call the attention of the House to the fact that that is not a proposal which comes from the incriminated party. That proposition comes from the Minister of Justice, and I must say it strikes my mind at least that when a very serious and grave charge has been made affecting the honor of a member of this House, and when it has been before the country three or four weeks, and the House at the end of that time is asked to pronounce judgment on it, if any hon. gentleman seeks to secure further delay, the onus lies on him to offer some reason why delay should take place. The Minister of Justice did not in my hearing present any reason, further than that we were sitting in a judicial capacity, and we should act wisely, calmly and without passion. I hope we are prepared here to act calmly, wisely and without passion; but I also hope we are prepared to act with proper regard to our dignity and the respect which we ask the people to pay to the highest assembly in the Dominion of Canada. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), with a singular inappreciation of the question before the House, asks us to say whether the conduct of the hon. member for Lincoln is within the Independence of Parliament Act, and he suggested it would be well on that point, that a reference should be made to some committee, either the Committee on Privileges and Elections or some special committee. Why, the hon. gentleman must know that the question before the House is not whether the Independence of Parliament Act has been violated or not. The conduct attributed to the hon. member for Lincoln never was alleged to be within the Independence of Parliament Act. That Act does not deal with thousands of acts which may be committed by members of the House of a discreditable and corrupt character, and may deserve the severe condemnation of this House; but such acts neither come within the letter nor the spirit of that law. The Independence of Parliament Act merely provides that no member shall hold an office in the House to which emolument is attached, certain special exemptions being made. It goes on further to provide that no member of Parliament shall be a party to a contract under which the public money of Canada is paid to him. But does the hon. gentleman mean to intimate that there are no other acts disgraceful, discreditable and corrupt, and that, forsooth, because they do not come within the terms of the statute it never was intended that the conduct of members of Parliament who may have been guilty of such acts should not be dealt with? The question of reference to a committee is not now before the House. The Government as a Government, I understand, have not dealt with this question, nor has any individual member except the incriminated party moved that the case be referred to a committee. But we have heard the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), in the course of his defence this afternoon, suggest to the House that this would be a proper course to take, and I propose to offer a few observations to

show that, in my humble opinion, it would not be a proper course to take. The hon. gentleman who asked us to take that course asks us to take it on the ground that, with respect to a charge which has been proclaimed against him outside the House, and which has not been preferred against him in the House, and which is not embodied in the resolution now before the House, he could give, if the matter was referred to the committee, a quantity of exculpatory evidence. That charge now before us is not that he had been guilty of defrauding Mr. Louis Sands in the sale he made to him of a timber limit. This House is not dealing with the question whether the member for Lincoln acted honestly or dishonestly with Mr. Sands. We are not dealing with the question whether he defrauded Mr. Sands or not. That branch of the case is not before Parliament, and is not contained in the resolution, and the House is not asked to pass judgment upon it. Therefore, there is no use in the hon. member whose conduct is attacked, asking that the matter on which he is attacked be referred to a committee, in order that he may give evidence in reference to some other point, on which no attack is made on him at all. The question before this honorable House is, whether the charges preferred against him are true, and whether the evidence contained in our Votes and Proceedings is sufficient to justify us in voting that they are true. If that is so, there can be no necessity or excuse for deferring it to a committee, and a reference to the committee would merely be an excuse to shelve the question. The reason for that is that the evidence on which the hon. gentleman is held, in this resolution, to be guilty of conduct discreditable and disgraceful, is not evidence which comes from a third party. It is not evidence which depends upon the recollection, or letters of a third party. The whole evidence consists in correspondence signed by the hand of the hon. member himself, in an agreement to which the hon. gentleman himself is a witness, and in a document signed by his own hand, acknowledging the receipt of his part of certain moneys. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) does not come into this court, and declare that any one of these letters is a forgery, or that it is incomplete. He does not come into court, and declare that some letters, throwing light upon the particular charges preferred against him, have been omitted, but he acknowledges frankly and fully, not only in the defence he made here to-day, but in the defence he made in the *Ottawa Citizen* newspaper, and also in the explanation he made in this House, when the charges were first formulated, that every letter there, purporting to be signed by his own hand, that the agreement purporting to be signed by him and that the receipt showing he received some \$74,000 of money, are all proper, and correct, and right. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) reminds me that these charges were made as far back as the 13th February. It would be very discreditable to this House, if it proceeded with undue haste in this matter, or in the absence of evidence which might throw light on the conduct of the hon. gentleman, or which might excuse or palliate that conduct; but, when we are enquiring into the whole question, and when we are informed by evidence which we cannot refuse to respect, that the whole case is before us, we have one duty to perform, and that duty is to pass judgment

upon it, according to the best of our conscience. It may be that some hon. gentlemen can see nothing wrong in the conduct of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). If so, let them stand up in their places and defend it; let us hear what defence there is for it. The hon. member for Lincoln spoke this afternoon, and I followed his remarks very closely, in the hope that he might be able to state some facts which, if they did not entirely excuse him, would, to a certain extent, palliate his conduct, which to my mind seems to be disgraceful in the extreme. But I listened in vain. The hon. gentleman after indulging in some vituperation, which, under the circumstances, might possibly be excusable, passed on to speak of the charges made against him. He said he was not going to take advantage of the Statute of Limitations, and to plead that so long a time had elapsed since these transactions, that we could not fairly attack him to-day in the House. He told us in one breath that the elections had taken place in his constituency, that the matter was placed before his constituents, and that they had condoned his conduct. That was told us on the assumption that the electors had had before them the facts we have before us here. In the next breath the hon. member for Lincoln told us that the documents before us were stolen documents, and private documents, and that Parliament should not deal with them. In the first place, it appears that the electorate passed judgment upon him at the last election, in ignorance of these documents, and, therefore, no condonation, if that could be said to be condonation, can be pleaded by the hon. gentleman. In the next place, I care not from what source the documents came, or where they were obtained; I want to ask the simple question are they genuine, and are they now before the House, and if they are, we cannot escape the responsibility of passing an honest and square judgment upon them, by attacking the quarter from which the documents were obtained. What does it matter to me whether or not these documents were purchased with money, by some persons who had a bad motive in so doing? Put the case as strongly as you like in reference as to how they were obtained, the question which we must answer is: are the documents genuine? Do they disclose a state of facts which show the conduct of a member of this House to be discreditable? And, if so, we must pass an honest judgment irrespective of the quarter from which they come. An hon. gentleman has said there are no precedents upon which Parliament can act. I do not agree in that. Parliament has acted upon private letters; and the members of this House and the people of the world have been reading the most notable precedent that ever occurred in British history, where a gentleman was attacked in Parliament on account of an alleged private letter, which letter turned out, after a costly investigation, to have been an infamous forgery. I refer to the alleged Parnell letter. An investigation was held before three judges of the land, and the gentleman accused was cleared of the charges, which would have resulted, if proven, in his expulsion from Parliament. Happily for Mr. Parnell, happily for the British Parliament, happily for free government, the letter was shown to be an infamous forgery, and that gentleman's character, to-day, stands clear before the world. What have

we in the case now under discussion? We have private letters, the authenticity of which is not denied; we have a correspondence, the completeness of which is not attacked, and, therefore, I hold that we are in a position which not only solicits but demands from us the judgment: guilty or not guilty. I will not occupy the time of the House much longer, for two reasons. In the first place the hon. gentleman who opened the debate this afternoon in an exhaustive and lucid speech, brought before the House the more salient points contained in these letters. It appears to me that they divided themselves into two charges. One is that the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) being a member of Parliament, improperly made use of his position, and the power which attached to that position, to obtain for a gentleman with whom he was in partnership, a valuable timber limit, and that he prostituted the influence which his position as a member of Parliament gave him to obtain public moneys. That is the first charge and the question is, do hon. members believe it? We have got the evidence of the hon. gentleman's own statements contained not only in one letter, but in dozens of letters, and the extracts from them, embodied in the resolution before the House, shows that the hon. gentleman boasted to his colleague, Mr. Adams, that he, and he alone, had influence sufficient to obtain this timber limit, and that others had applied for it who were not members of Parliament, but they had been refused; that he had taken the Department of the Interior by the throat, and such was his influence over the Department, and over the Government, that they could not resist it; that J. C. R. was too powerful, quoting his own words, and that he had done, in obtaining that limit from the Government, that which no other man in Canada could do. Sir, no honest man can read that correspondence without coming to the conclusion that the hon. member made use of his influence in what I call—speaking in a parliamentary sense—a corrupt way, to obtain that timber limit. Argument would be wasted on any one who should deny it. I have not heard any one on this side, or on the other side of the House, or any one in the public press, or any one outside of the House, whose opinion is worth listening to, contend that the hon. gentleman's conduct in the matter could be defended. What is the next charge made against him? We find, that after the hon. gentleman obtained this timber limit, the moment he finds that it has any value—because, be it remembered, when he applied for it in the first instance, he considered it was of no value at all, and his services were then granted gratuitously—before the Order in Council issues for it, he stipulates with his partner that he shall be entitled to half the proceeds. That agreement is under his own hand; there is no questioning or denying it; we have only to read it to see what it means. That agreement, drawn up by the hon. gentleman himself, sets forth that, in consideration of the services of the said Rykert, voluntarily given him, Adams agrees to give to Rykert's wife one-half of the proceeds of the said limits; and the witnessing part of it states that, in consideration of the sum of \$1 paid, and in further consideration of the premises, Adams agrees to assign and transfer what he had promised for the services of the said Rykert, voluntarily given him. We find in that agreement

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

that the hon. gentleman had become a partner of the gentleman to whom the limit was granted; we find that he afterwards sells that limit, and signs a receipt for \$74,000 of hard cash as his share of the proceeds; and we find the hon. gentleman coming back and standing up in his place before the assembled Parliament of Canada, in the year 1883, and telling them, without hesitation or reservation, that the charges against him in respect of that limit, are one and all baseless. The hon. gentleman then said he rejoiced in the opportunity which was afforded to him by the action of the hon. member for North Norfolk, to assure the House and the country that he had nothing to do with that matter from beginning to end, that he had not pocketed a dollar of the money, that his hands were clean, and that he stood here in the same honest and independent position as other hon. gentlemen who sat to the right and the left of him; and to-day we are confronted with the fact—which would never, perhaps, have been disclosed but that those papers were obtained by somebody, and published—that instead of the hon. gentleman's statements being true, he had in his pocket at the very time he spoke \$74,200 of the money. Sir, can conduct of that kind be excused? Do you want to refer that to a committee to ascertain the fact? The hon. gentleman tells us himself: "I did get the money, I signed a receipt, my statement in the House was untrue." What more do you want? What do you want to delay for? What do you want to seek for or to cover up by delay? Why seek to avoid responsibility by postponing this matter at all? I was asked by an hon. member the other day—it does not matter on which side of the House he sat: "How can you justify voting for that resolution which charges a member with being guilty of corrupt conduct?" I said: "I suppose you believe the man's own statements;" and what does he say: "When we come to the second part of the charge made against him, that in connection with the claims made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, what do we find? We find him coming to Ottawa, and writing to his colleague that it was necessary to spend a very large sum of money for securing the claim he got; we find him stating that six members of the Government were in sympathy with and acting for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that he was going to obtain the services of six others, and that it would take \$14,000 to accomplish this object; we find him afterwards suing his partner for his proportion of the money which he had alleged he spent; and we find the members of the Government rising up and declaring that every word of this statement is absolutely untrue from beginning to end. We find the hon. gentleman himself admitting that the charge he had preferred against the members of the Cabinet was untrue; but he does not deny that the \$14,000 which he had spent was spent for the purpose of improperly influencing the officials of the Government. That charge stands on record to-day, and, if it is true, it is corrupt conduct. If he went to the Department of the Interior and, as he said, pulled wires, the pulling of which cost \$14,000, in order that the Government might be improperly influenced, I say that that conduct can only be characterised by one word. He admits to-day that the statements he made with reference to the

members of the Cabinet were untrue, that the money was not spent to buy them, but was spent to buy some who had influence with them. Is that conduct to be condoned or excused? Does the hon. gentleman deny it? If he did, I should vote for the reference of this matter to a committee, or vote for delay; but it is all admitted, and what more do you want? I do not know that the conclusion which I draw will be the conclusion drawn by others from that correspondence; but, whatever conclusion they draw, the evidence is complete before them. I will not weary the House any longer. It appears to me that not alone the member for Lincoln, but the Parliament of Canada is on its trial to-day. A member of that Parliament is accused of conduct which, if true—and it is admitted in its salient points to be true—deserves condemnation. Parliament may shirk its responsibility, and may refuse to condemn conduct of this kind, but if it does so, I venture to say that the verdict of the country and the verdict of history will be opposed to the vote of Parliament. Sir, the responsibility resting upon us in this vote is a very serious one. The integrity, the honesty of the people's representatives is at stake, and if we condone, if we excuse or palliate such conduct as we find embodied in the resolution before us, and in the Votes and Proceedings of this House, then, I say, there will be an end to free government in Canada.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I rise to make a personal explanation. My hon. friend from North Norfolk accused me of inconsistency in taking one position to-day on the question of granting timber lands and a different position on a former occasion. If the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to examine the records of Parliament, he would have found that my position to-day is exactly the same as the position I took on former occasions. It will be found, on reference to *Hansard*, that on 27th March, 1882, Mr. Blake moved this specific resolution:

"That in the opinion of this House the existing system of granting timber limits is liable to result in gross abuse, and in the cession of valuable interests in the public domain for inadequate consideration to favored individuals. That it is expedient to apply the just principle of public competition to the granting of timber limits."

There was a distinct proposition laid down by that resolution submitted to Parliament, and I voted against my own political friends in favor of the principle there laid down; but the motion that I voted against was this one, moved by Mr. Charlton in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply:

"The practice of members of the House applying for and becoming personally interested in the disposal by the Crown of those public resources, which are dealt with by the Executive, or by Parliament on its recommendation, has grown to alarming proportions, is in its nature liable to abuse, has in fact been abused, and should be checked, in order to avoid lasting injury to the public interest and to restore and maintain the independence of this House."

Against that resolution I voted. There was no proposition there to change the law as it stands on the statutes at all. It was simply a declaration that members of Parliament had been influenced in their votes in this Parliament by the operations of the law. But when the proposition was laid down, as it was by the then leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake), in 1882, to change the system in regard to the granting of those timber limits, and to put it upon the basis which I thought then and think

now it ought to be placed upon, I voted for that resolution.

Mr. MACDOWALL. As the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has already stated, this discussion has taken a very wide range. The question before the House has not been very strictly adhered to, and as it has not, I may be pardoned if I go possibly a little beyond the mark. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) produced a list of timber limits granted to members of this House and the Senate, with which he endeavored to bring a serious charge against the Government. I can say, as a representative of the North-West and as a resident there, that the granting of these timber limits has really had no effect at all. As the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has said, if, when a timber limit was granted to him and his friends, he had found he could make profitable use of it, he would have invested his capital in setting up mills and carrying on a large lumber business. But the lumbermen found there was not likely to be a profitable market out there, and that I am afraid to say has been the cause of preventing many of them from giving practical effect to their grants of limits which were consequently cancelled. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who read out this list of limits granted, omitted to read the list of the limits cancelled. I think that all the limits have been cancelled on which no serious work was done, or money expended. But when the hon. gentleman went so far afield, and when he raised this question, he raised a question of the deepest interest to the people of the North-West, namely, why was it that when those limits were applied for and when they were granted, there was not a profitable field for those who desired to invest their capital? The Parliament of Canada has itself to blame for this, because the members of that Parliament had stated over and over again, in this House and out of it, that we were the landlords of the North-West. This House passed resolutions referring to the Irish question and the treatment of Irish tenants by their landlords, a matter with which they had nothing to do; yet, although they acknowledge that they are the landlords of the North-West, they have never had the manliness to come forward and deal with that question in a proper way. I maintain that when the people of Canada bought the North-West at such a low price, they also bought the responsibilities of governing it; and I think that, when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) brought those charges against the Government, he should have looked about him, for those charges could not only be brought against this Government, but against the previous Administration, neither of which did anything rightly to develop that country. We have heard brilliant speeches in this House about the future of the North-West. I maintain that its future is as bright to-day as it ever was. I believe in the possibilities of that country, and the probabilities are as great to-day as when these speeches were made; but we must have a proper means of developing that country. You cannot expect an engine to go unless you give it fuel and keep the steam up, and you cannot expect a country to be developed when the landlords do not take proper methods to develop it. With regard to

this question, I will now adhere, as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) did, very strictly to the point, and for my part I will not commit myself to any expression of opinion as to the merits of the case, but I believe a motion to refer it to a committee will have the support, not only of members on this side but of those opposite. You know, Sir, that it is only a few days ago when a very serious charge was brought against one of those in a very high station in the employ of the Government, and members of the other side were endeavoring to get a committee of enquiry into the matter. If they think it necessary to have a committee to enquire into the one case, they ought to give the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) an opportunity to bring his evidence before the committee. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says that the conduct of the hon. member for Lincoln can only be characterised by one word. Well, in so saying, he is prejudging the case before the House. None of us know what the nature is of the defences of the hon. member for Lincoln, and he should have an opportunity of pleading his own case before we proceed to criticise his conduct, and I understand him to say that he has evidence to lay before us. The hon. member for Queen's has also said that this question has put Parliament upon trial. If that is the case, I think the proper way for members of this House to defend themselves is to do it in a straightforward manner. Why not give every man that justice which is meted out to every British subject, and should be meted out to every member of the House of Commons.

Mr. BERGIN. From the moment that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) introduced his motion, I had no doubt as to the object proposed. But any doubt I may have had has been set at rest to-night by the speeches of the hon. gentleman and of those behind him. The animus is plain and unmistakable, and the acerbity with which the hon. gentleman read his motion, and pressed his resolution shows that he had at heart, as much the destruction of the character of the Government, as that of the hon. member for Lincoln. The hon. gentleman, the moment he passed from the consideration of the letters, entered upon a tirade, in his usual vigorous style, against the policy of the Government in connection with the timber limits. The hon. gentleman spoke with an appearance of horror of corruption that would impress all who had forgotten his history and the history of the Administration of which he was a prominent member, with the belief that he was sincere and honest in his professions of horror at corruption; but we, who remember the career of that Administration, those who remember the position in which six or seven supporters of his Government were placed, those who remember that the Speaker of this House, after it had been shown, by his own receipts, that he had received thousands and thousands of dollars of the public money with the knowledge of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), those who remember that Mr. Workman, Mr. Jones, Mr. Vail, and many others were driven from this House for actions of this kind—and remember that their conduct was justified by the hon. member for South Oxford—will be astounded to find that that hon. gentleman would refuse to the gentleman

Mr. MACDOWALL.

who is accused to-day, a committee of enquiry into his case, before which he says he can produce verbal and written evidence to show that he is not blamable. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was the member who had the case of the Speaker of the House at that time sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections in order that he might disprove the evidence given by himself in his own receipts, parallel to the letters in this case. That case was sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and it was kept there until the end of the Session, and was not tried by this House. This is the kind of justice which hon. gentlemen opposite would deal out to the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). They gave this opportunity to the men whom they had purchased—shall I use the words of hon. gentlemen opposite, and say the men who were bought and paid for by the Administration, they kept them in their seats until, by the expression of public opinion and by the honest expression of parliamentary opinion, they were obliged to leave them. The hon. gentleman says he regrets—and I believe him, it was the most sincere portion of his speech—that he could not move for the expulsion of the hon. member for Lincoln from this House; and what reason does he give? Ought he not to hang his head in shame when he is obliged to acknowledge that the legal men on that side of the House would have brought forward precedents to show that it was impossible to carry any such motion. He proves by the authority of the gentlemen learned in the law on his own side of the House that it would be impossible for him to carry out that which would have done him little credit. Mercy is a virtue which he does not appear to know anything about, but it is a virtue which, if he had shown he had any possession of, would have done him a great deal of credit. My hon. friend the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has, I admit, been somewhat unfortunate in some of the expressions contained in his letters, but he has told this House that he could show that some of the expressions were not used by him, that some of the words or sentences had been misplaced or transposed, and that the sense in many cases was very much altered. If we desire to be fair and just, I think we ought to give the hon. member for Lincoln the opportunity before a committee of this House to show that he is not the guilty or dishonorable man that hon. gentlemen opposite try to make him out to be. While describing the member for Lincoln as a bond slave, the member for South Oxford carried it a little further, and insinuated, if he did not boldly state, that every member on this side of the House is also a bond slave. He said that the majorities on this side of the House are made and paid for by limits, by subsidies and by other means of that kind. I, for one—and I know I speak for every member on this side of the House—repudiate any such doctrine as that. We are made—I was going to say of the same material, but I will say a little better material than that of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and yet there is not a gentleman on the other side except—I will not particularise the exception—who could, I think, be bought by a limit or a subsidy or anything of that kind. I do not think this system of throwing charges of corruption across the floor without particularising any one is conducive to the honor

of Parliament or to its good name either in Canada or abroad. Following the hon. gentleman came the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) with a very labored argument, which was most effectually disposed of by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), in support of the timber policy of his Administration. He concluded briefly by giving his reasons why the member for Lincoln should not have the advantage of a reference of this case to a committee. The member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) did not specify the sort of committee which he desired. He did not state whether he desired a special committee or a reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. All he asked was British fair play, that a man against whom these charges were only brought before the House by a motion to-day, should have a little time to meet his accusers, and to show that his case was not that which his accusers stated it to be. The member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) gave us a very unfair and a very disingenuous statement of the policy of the late Administration. Like the gentleman who preceded him, he was not giving his attention to the question before the House, but was attacking the policy of the present Administration. In the course of his remarks, he exonerated the member for Lincoln—if anything he could say could exonerate any one—because he said that the conduct of that hon. member was the outcome of the Government practice and teaching, the Government being the teachers; and, with that classical language which always distinguishes that hon. gentleman, he characterised us on this side as camp-followers, and stated that we were looking for swag in the shape of mineral lands, timber lands, &c., &c. He read a long list of members of Parliament and of the Senate who, he says, had been corrupted by timber limits and mineral lands granted them by the Government. Well, I suppose there can be no great sin, at all events, committed by a member of Parliament who, at the request of a constituent, makes application for a timber limit. I will not say in all cases, but in the majority of cases, the man who applies for a timber limit from the Government, in the North-West, intends to go there and to work that timber limit, to make money out of it, and whilst doing so, he will be certainly advancing the interest of the North-West. In good faith, I believe, nearly all those applications were made. They were made in the interest and at the request of his constituents; and I go this far, that if a member of Parliament refused to make application for a timber limit for one of his constituents who had gone to the trouble and to the expense of searching out timber limits in the North-West, he would not be discharging his duty to his county or to his constituency. As to the boodle—or the swag—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon—that has been made out of these timber limits, I believe there is scarcely a record of a limit in the North-West out of which any elector of a constituency of Ontario has made a single dollar. So far as I have been able to learn, those gentlemen have gone to the expense of prospecting these limits, and they have received letters and memoranda from men in the North-West who were looked upon as good wood rangers &c., advising them there were timber limits in such and such quarters. They applied to the Government, limits were granted them after making visits to Ottawa at great expense. They organised sur-

vveying parties and sent them up there, and when they reached it they found the limit was an arid waste, without a tree or a shrub; and this is the sort of swag which, it is said, corrupted members upon this side of the House. I do not intend to discuss the question of timber limits granted to gentlemen upon the other side of the House. I assume, as I am positive is the case with gentlemen upon this side of the House, that they acted in good faith in asking for limits in the interest of their constituents. A most monstrous doctrine was laid down by the hon. member for North Norfolk a little while ago, when he would forbid members of Parliament from being promoters of colonisation companies in the North-West. Some men, in becoming shareholders in colonisation companies, may have had no purpose whatever of improving the North-West Territories. There may be men who have joined such companies without having that idea; but the majority of men who join these colonisation companies intended not only, perhaps, to make some little profit upon the money they had invested in shares, but they hoped to colonise the North-West and thereby to add to the prosperity of the whole Dominion; and when the thirty-five members of Parliament and Senators who, he says, became members of these colonisation companies did so, they did so in the interest of the country, and I have yet to learn that members of Parliament, because they have the honor to occupy seats in this House, are to be debarred from taking any steps towards promoting the prosperity of this country. I think if there is one class in this country, more than any other, who ought to engage in such efforts to promote the interests of the country it is the members of Parliament, and they should show the outside world, by investing their limited means in these companies, if they can, that it is the interest of the capitalist to forward the interest of the country in that way. Perhaps, however, the best practical commentary made upon the speech of gentlemen opposite was that made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who very properly and very truthfully said that although he had been listening to the gentlemen on his side for some time previous to his addressing the House, he had been at a loss to know upon what subject the House was being addressed. Why, there can be no difficulty in knowing that they were all speaking as to the policy of the late Administration; they were defending the policy of the Mackenzie Government; they were not attacking the member for Lincoln or the statement that was laid before the House. It was quite evident that the whole thing was a preconcerted and a preconceived attack upon the present Administration, and I think about as ingenious and adroitly carried out as any attack I have witnessed for many a long day. That hon. gentleman says we are asked not to pass judgment on the letters before the House. Well, we are not asked to pass judgment upon present evidence, upon the letters now before the House, but we are asked to give the hon. gentleman who is accused an opportunity to put in such evidence as he says he has to show to the House that he is not guilty of the acts charged in the resolution of the member for South Oxford. He says that no reason has been given for the adjournment of the debate. He tells us, also, that we ought to act without passion, without prejudice,

calmly, in discussing this question before the House. Well, I think he did not give us a very forcible illustration of a man discussing a question dispassionately, calmly, and without prejudice. As strong a partisan speech as I have listened to in Parliament for many a day was his speech upon this question, and he supplied, in the course of his speech, strong reasons why this matter should go before the Committee of Privileges and Elections. That committee is composed, I believe, almost entirely of legal gentlemen, with trained minds, who will make a judicial decision in this case, and he supplies a strong reason why it should go before a board of that kind. He says the question before the House is not a breach of the privileges of Parliament. Well, the hon. member for Lincoln, in the opinion of the hon. gentlemen opposite, committed no breach of the independence of Parliament, for which he is arraigned to-day; and if it is not a question of the violation of the principles of Parliament, the conclusion is irresistible that the conduct of the hon. member was not in his character as a member of Parliament, but in his character as a member of the bar of the Province of Ontario. A reason given by the hon. gentleman why a committee should not be given is, that no one but the hon. member for Lincoln asks for that committee. If the man accused, and the man who sees that every technical objection will be taken that can be taken to prevent his having fair and impartial trial, cannot ask for a committee, I want to know who should ask for a committee? The hon. gentleman has endeavored to induce the House to understand, moreover, that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) in his statement that he had further evidence to adduce, wished to confine that evidence to matters that occurred outside this House and not embraced in the charge before the House. I could not help thinking, when I observed the heated manner in which those two hon. gentlemen opposed the granting of a committee to the hon. member for Lincoln, that they had not so much in view the honor of the House and the independence and dignity of Parliament as they had the destruction of the character of one of the most able members on this side of the House, and, perhaps, the man most dreaded by them during elections. If they could besmirch the character of the hon. member for Lincoln, deprive him of the opportunity of presenting before a committee evidence which he could not possibly present before this House as now assembled, why, they would destroy his political influence as well as his private character, and he would cease to be the great factor in the Dominion elections he is to-day. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says he does not care in what way the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), came into the possession of these documents. He does not care whether they were stolen or not, he does not care that they are private letters, but what concerns him is that those letters be genuine, so that he may—I do not think it will be a parliamentary expression, perhaps, but it will be a thoroughly literal interpretation of his words—hang him. He says do not give him a committee—hang him. I am not about to say that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) is as pure and as incorruptible as are hon. gentlemen opposite, judging them by the acts of the previous Administration, but I venture

Mr. BERGIN.

to say this, that the hon. member for Lincoln has not knowingly or wilfully violated the independence of Parliament, and if he has not violated the independence of Parliament, that part, at all events, of the charge brought against him by the hon. member for South Oxford, ought not to be considered. Again, I venture to say that the hon. member for Lincoln has not endeavored in any way to corrupt the Administration of this country. There is nothing before us to show that he did so, and, therefore, so far as the Government are concerned, or any member of the Government, the hon. member is not guilty, and he has exonerated them from any corrupt charge. Then, again, it is said that the hon. member for Lincoln obtained these limits by corrupt practices. There is no evidence to show that he obtained these limits by corrupt practices. The only evidence there is to show it is, and the only evidence that can be construed into anything of that kind, so far as I have seen, is a statement by the hon. member that he would require to use sums of money in the endeavor—

Mr. MITCHELL. To corrupt the members of the Government.

Mr. BERGIN. The hon. gentleman says "to corrupt the members of the Government." I do not think it would be worth while for the hon. gentleman to attempt that. The members of the Government are incorruptible. No man knows it better than does the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who was for many years their colleague, and who would not have been one hour in their Government if he believed them to be corruptible.

Mr. MITCHELL. So I said when the matter came up. I, however, saw you were at a loss for a word, and I thought I would supply it.

Mr. BERGIN. Such being the case, it would be a piece of cruelty, a breach of parliamentary courtesy, and a breach of parliamentary law, to deprive the hon. member for Lincoln of a committee. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says there are two charges before the House, one of which is that the hon. member for Lincoln, as a member of Parliament, got a limit for his partner. I submit there is no evidence before the House to show that, when he obtained that limit, Mr. Adams was partner of the hon. member for Lincoln. On the contrary, I think the evidence goes to show that he was not a partner. The member for Queen's finished his oration by asking us at once to decide this question. He says, why delay? The evidence is before you; the hon. member has been convicted by his own statements; you must hear no explanation from him, you must not allow him to supplement this testimony or bring any verbal testimony forward, or present anything before a committee which would enable this House to understand really and truly the position in which the hon. member for Lincoln was placed and the character of his acts. I say that British fair play demands that we should not hurry this man to his political or professional death, but we should consider carefully what we have already before the House, and what he says he is prepared to submit to a committee. If the statement of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) be correct—and I take it to be correct as he is a lawyer in good standing and one eminent in his profession—that

the hon. member for Lincoln has in no way violated the independence of Parliament, then his conduct in this matter was absolutely blameless, he was acting solely in his professional capacity and not in his capacity as a member of Parliament, and this is a matter with which we have nothing to do and one with which the Journals of the House ought not to have been encumbered. For these reasons and for many others which, but for the lateness of the hour, I would have submitted to the House, I propose to support the motion for the adjournment of the debate as proposed by the hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not intend to occupy very long the time of the House in discussing this very important question. I very sincerely regret that the House should be called upon to deal with such a very important subject as that discussed this afternoon and to-night. It is very much to be regretted that any member of Parliament should have so far forgotten the dignity and responsibility of the position he holds as a member of Parliament to have permitted himself to be drawn into the transactions into which the hon. member for Lincoln has been proved to have been drawn, and he has placed on paper himself over his own signature the evidence that a corrupt act, an act that is undoubtedly one that is improper for a member of Parliament to do, should have been committed by him. But in my humble opinion the action of the hon. member for Lincoln is only an outcome of the policy that was adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1882. You cannot possibly expect that members of Parliament will apply for timber limits, merely for the curiosity of being recognised as owners of the limit, and for no other purpose. It has been said that these gentlemen applied for the purpose of erecting mills, and becoming lumber manufacturers in the North-West; but, if we look at the list of names presented to this House by the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) any one who states that these men intended to become lumber manufacturers will assume a very serious responsibility. I do not think any one of them ever had the most remote idea of lumbering in the North-West. I sympathise somewhat with the hon. member for Lincoln, because he has been virtually led into a trap by the policy of the Government. The temptation was held out, and he appears to have been more susceptible to it than perhaps a great many others. At all events, he had not taken the trouble to cover his tracks, and the whole thing has come up in the light of day. I do not know if the hon. member for Lincoln is going to permit himself to be a scape-goat for the Tory party. He may possibly have to submit to a position of that kind, but knowing what I know of the man, my impression is, that if he is forced into that position, he will open the bag and let the cat out, and there will be a bigger racket than even the one now before the House. The whole policy of the Government has been to secure the absolute, and blind, and continuous support of their followers, and, if necessary, that the resources of the country should be divided up amongst them in order to secure that. It appears that the hon. the First Minister was quite willing to discharge that particular duty. Why, Sir, when you take the history of the transaction in the timber limits, the coal lands, the ranching grounds, and the

North-West lands, the hon. the First Minister appears to have performed the duty of the farm-yard hen, of scratching up all the corn and dividing it amongst his flock. I am not going to say that every member who follows the right hon. gentleman is guilty to the same extent as the hon. member for Lincoln, but I do say, that it has been clearly proven to the House that there were no less than twenty-three who were willing to be guilty as the hon. member for Lincoln was. It is not many years ago since we had this question up before the House, and the hon. member for one of the Hurons, who, I regret to say, is not a member of the House now, had in his possession certain documents filed in a law case in the city of Winnipeg, where a certain law firm had quarrelled, and the result was found that "two worthy sons of two worthy sires," as he called them, were mixed up in this very timber limit business. It was shown that, in some cases, they had stipulated that in consideration of the powerful influence they could exercise in Ottawa, they were to have 25 per cent. of the profits in some cases, in other cases more, in others less. I ask any man if the action of these two men is any worse than the action of the member for Lincoln? I ask any man if the actions of these two men, using their influence with their fathers, who held high positions in Ottawa, was any worse than the action of the hon. member for Lincoln, in securing a limit and selling it to the best advantage? I do not think so. It is clearly shown that these young men exercised their power for that purpose. The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin) has said that we, on this side of the House, charged that hon. members opposite were bought and paid for. The hon. member for Stormont is the very last man who should have used that expression. It will be remembered that at the time of the troubles in the North-West, that hon. member discharged the duties of Surgeon General of the North-West contingent; and I find from page 540 of the Auditor General's Report that he drew \$1,861.40; 153 days pay at \$12.50 a day, while he was sitting as a member of this House, and discharging the duties of a representative in Parliament. That is the man who gets up to defend the conduct of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) and throws back in the teeth of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House the statement that hon. gentlemen opposite are bought and paid for. I would like to know if it was not a breach of the independence of Parliament, on his part, to accept from the Government, pay for acting as Surgeon General, while at the same time he was sitting in this House? I have simply to state again that this matter under discussion is only the legitimate outcome of the policy that has been adopted. I say that during the last Parliament and the present one, it has been undoubtedly the practice, and most unbecoming—if I am not permitted to use a stronger expression—that the Government of the day have kept themselves in a position to corrupt their followers as they have done. When they found that there was competition for timber limits in the North-West, they should immediately have altered the policy that had been laid down, and placed these limits on the market to be purchased by the highest bidder. It is no argument to say that the law was passed by a previous Government. I believe that the pre-

vious Government passed that law to suit the circumstances of the time ; but the moment that this Government found it did not suit the existing condition of affairs, they should have changed it. But even if it was considered an imprudent law, it was their duty to amend it and put it in such a shape that the abominable transactions which have taken place would not take place. But it appears to me that the hon. First Minister made up his mind to hold office at all hazards, and for the last eight or ten years every resource of this country has been brought into action for the purpose of securing that object. The credit of the country has been subjected to an enormous strain, and our indebtedness has been increased by a million a month while he has been in office. Every advantage which any follower of his might demand has been granted to him, and the result is that we have this exhibition of the abominable and corrupt condition in which the affairs of this country have been carried on for the last ten years. I hope the day is not far distant when the people of this country will open their eyes and see the unfortunate gulf of corruption which they are drifting into, and will hurl the men from power who are permitting this thing to go on from year to year. It is time we had a change, and it is earnestly to be hoped that the people of this country will not permit this condition of things to last much longer. Now, I think it is unfair to ask this House to consent to an adjournment of this case. The facts are all before the House. The hon. member for Lincoln has had four weeks in which to lay his evidence before the House ; not a document nor a letter has been refused ; every piece of evidence which he had to bring before the House, he has had the fullest opportunity to bring ; and if we consented to an adjournment, and the case came up again, it would probably be sent to a committee, where it would lie and rot, because the Government would have a majority on that committee, and they would so direct their men there that it would not be brought back to the House. I say we should not consent to a delay, for the credit of this country and the honor and dignity of this House require immediate and prompt action in this matter, so that we may clear ourselves of the stigma which undoubtedly will rest upon us if this matter is allowed to pass over without receiving from this House the punishment which it justly deserves. I sympathise with the hon. member for Lincoln to some extent, for he has no doubt been tempted into the action he has been guilty of, but having permitted himself to be drawn into it, he has to bear the consequences ; and if he consents to be made the scape-goat of the Tory Party, he must bear the consequences. I trust that the House will deal with this case as it deserves, and if any other case should come up, if any other man's letters should fall into the hands of some one who will publish them, I hope the same punishment will be meted out to him which ought to be meted out to any one guilty of the same offence.

Mr. HICKEY. I understand that when I was out of the Chamber, the hon. member for North Norfolk said that I had been an applicant for a timber limit. I wish to say that I never made an application for a timber limit in the North-West or in any other part of this country. The same statement was made by the hon. member for North

Mr. McMULLEN.

Norfolk a few years ago, before the last election, and it was brought up against me in my county, where I challenged the men who brought it up to give any proof of it, and they offered to get an affidavit from the hon. member for North Norfolk, but it was never produced. I did write a letter urging the Government to see what they could do with reference to a claim Mr. Brodeur had made, and that is my only crime. It is well understood everywhere that a person who tells a half truth is guilty of an untruth, and is a scandal-monger and a first-class liar ; but it would not be parliamentary to apply that term to the hon. member for North Norfolk for having circulated untruths throughout the country and in this House.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Before the question is put, I feel bound to say a word upon it, for I am not in a position to give a silent vote without being misunderstood. I had hoped, when the hon. member for South Oxford about four weeks ago gave notice of his intention to submit the charges made against the hon. member for Lincoln to this House, that he had risen to the height of his great argument, and had undertaken to defend the dignity of this Parliament, and to establish on a higher plane the purity of public life in this country. I followed the movements made by that hon. member—made once, twice, three times, four times—which satisfied us that he was following this matter up, and firmly intended to deal with it. But, after having heard that hon. member's speech, and the most regrettable speeches of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I regret that those hon. members have by their unfairness striven to drive me, and it may be some other hon. members, from the path of duty and the path of honor. I confess that, more than anything that has come within the range of my knowledge since I have been a member of this House, this matter has given me pain. It is a painful thing for a member of this House to have to deal with a brother member in the way of punishment, especially one who is following the same political leader ; but there are painful political duties which, as brave men, we must face, and from the discharge of which we must not be deterred, even though we may be called upon to inflict pain upon one whom we should gladly save if we could. Insinuations against other hon. members were hurled across the House by hon. members opposite, notably by the hon. member for South Oxford—unjust and unfair insinuations, which I indignantly repudiate. I say that there are on this side of the House a large number of men as honorable, as high-minded, possessing as high a regard for public duty, as that distinguished gentleman himself ; and it was unworthy of him, and the high position he occupies in this House, to throw the wretched taunts he did across the floor. But to come to the question before us. I regret that I am not in a position to vote for the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice. I read with due care the letters signed by the hon. member for Lincoln ; I heard that hon. member ask for delay that he might put in more letters which would be explanatory and would weaken the charge against him ; those letters were put in and placed on record ; I heard the hon. gentleman's statement in that connection weeks ago ; I heard the hon. gentle-

man only yesterday ask for permission to put in additional documents, and the courtesy of the House was extended to him and he was allowed to do so, and to-day we heard the full explanations of the hon. member, and I am compelled to say that when the hon. gentleman now tells us that he has additional evidence, I can hardly take that statement on its face, and I am therefore obliged, though much against my feelings, to vote for the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford. I quite agree with every word uttered by the hon. member for South Oxford towards the close of his speech, when he spoke of the duty of a public man in discharging a public trust. I am persuaded that in this statement the overwhelming majority of this House and the country are with him. I do not think he stated his case extremely. I think he stated it accurately; and it seems to me that it is a crime of crimes in politics for a member of this House to go to his people on the hustings, as we all must go, and ask for their votes and promise them his best support, and afterwards take advantage of his position to make money for himself. I cannot but expect that an indignant people, and we may fairly hope an indignant House, will scathe and blast one who has so prostituted his position. I feel the more keenly this because I hope in this young country of ours in the north, that the reputation of our public men, which is the best and most precious property we can possess, will be kept clean and pure. We know what has followed from the opening of campaigns of calumny and slander in the great Republic to the south; we know that in these later days that Republic is not distinguished by the splendid names in Congress which shone there thirty or forty years ago; we know that high-minded and proud men who are careful of their good name are unwilling to be forced into public life and be borne down by that pitiless storm of calumny and slander which assails them in that country; and in voting in a straightforward way for the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) we will be doing in this country what we can to preserve the dignity of Parliament and the purity and good name of the people's representatives.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to an explanation in answer to the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey). The return to my motion for the names of those who had acquired timber limits was received in 1886. There are some 400 or 500 pages foolscap to examine. I went through these returns and selected out the correspondence and Orders in Council making grants to various members of both Houses. I did this in discharge of a public duty, and endeavored to do it impartially; and among the Orders in Council, I found one for C. M. Hickey, M.P., coupled with the name of Wm. Brodeur. The Order in Council was granted for a timber limit of 50 miles on a lake in Manitoba, and was dated 30th April, 1884. I was governed by the document.

Mr. HICKEY. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that that is his own language. I do not believe that any such Order in Council was ever issued. It is not right to say it is an Order in Council. It is some time ago since this happened, and I have not looked the matter up, but I know I never made an application. All I did was to urge the application of Mr. Brodeur on the Govern-

ment, and they would decide as to whether he should have it or not.

House divided on motion of Sir John Thompson that the debate be adjourned:

YEAS:
Messieurs

Audet,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Barnard,
Bell,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Boisvert,
Bowell,
Burns,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cimon,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Colby,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Coulombe,
Curran,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis,
Dawson,
Denison,
Desjardins,
Dewdney,
Dickinson,
Dupont,
Earle,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Freeman,
Gigault,
Girouard,
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hesson,
Hickey,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Jones (Digby),
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Landry,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Lépine,
Macdonald (Sir John),
Macdowall,
McDonald, (Victoria),
McDougal (Pictou),
McKay,
McKeen,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Moncrieff,
Montague,
Pope,
Porter,
Prior,
Putnam,
Riopel,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross,
Scarth,
Small,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thérien,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tyrwhitt,
Vanasse,
White, (Cardwell),
White, (Renfrew),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wilson (Lennox),
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland)
Wright.—94.

NAYS:
Messieurs

Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain (Wentworth),
Bécharé,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brien,
Burdett,
Cambell,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Cagrain,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Chouinard,
Cook,
Couture,
Davies,
De St. Georges,
Dessaint,
Doyon,
Edwards,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,
Fiset,
Fisher,
Flynn,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Jones (Halifax),
Kirk,
Landerkin,
Lang,
Langelier (Montmorency),
Langelier (Quebec),
Lavergne,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lovit,
McIntyre,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,
McNeill,
Meigs,
Mills (Bothwell),
Mitchell,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Platt,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Ste. Marie,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Trow,
Turcot,
Waldie,

Gillmor,
Godbout,
Gusy,
Holton,
Innes,

Watson,
Weldon (Albert),
Weldon (St. John),
Wilson (Elgin),
Yeo.—72.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) and the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Ward) have not voted.

Mr. BARRON. By accident I did not hear the division bell, and, therefore, was not in the House when the motion was put. The hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Ward) was in the same position as myself, so we paired with each other. I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. WARD. After I attempted to vote and my vote was not taken, I made the arrangement with the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron). I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BROWN. I was paired with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). I would have voted for the amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the right hon. the First Minister prepared to say when this question will be resumed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. the Minister of Justice explained his reasons for moving the adjournment of the debate. They were that, upon considering the serious nature of the charge and the serious consequences to the hon. gentleman originally concerned, and the importance of considering what the precedent would be, sufficient opportunity should be given to the members of this House, after having heard the statement of the hon. gentleman who moved the motion, and the statement of the hon. gentleman accused, to read the statements, and to form their judgment as to what their vote would be. The Minister of Justice took occasion to say that he would not even say how he would vote. He would not in any way commit himself to the defence of the hon. gentleman accused, but he said, as a matter of justice and reason, that opportunity should be given to every member of the House to read the debate in *Hansard*, so that he could make up his mind fully acquainted with all the circumstances. We will say Monday for the closing of the debate.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think Monday ought to be taken, because it is a private members' day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot give a Government day, as we have given one already.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a proper motion to be taken on a Government day, and I do not think the only day private members have next week should be taken.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would call the Prime Minister's attention to a statement in the *Toronto Mail* as follows:—

"WASHINGTON, D.C., 10th March.—The report reaches here to-day that the Canadian Pacific Railway has in contemplation the stoppage of traffic on its line to the seaboard through Maine, owing to the decision of the United States Senate to refuse a continuance of bonding privileges."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have no information of that kind, or of any kind. The first Mr. HICKEY.

I heard of it was from a gentleman in the corridor just now, who asked me if I had seen the article.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 12th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 116) respecting the Department of the Geological Survey (from the Senate).—(Mr. Dewdney.)

Bill (No. 117) further to amend the General Inspection Act, chapter 99 of the Revised Statutes (from the Senate).—(Mr. Costigan.)

Bill (No. 118) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, chapter 78 of the Revised Statutes (from the Senate).—(Mr. Colby.)

EXPERIMENTAL FARM REPORT.

Mr. BERGIN moved the adoption of the third report of the Joint Committee on Printing of both Houses of Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Explain.

Mr. BERGIN. The report refers principally to the printing of returns of the House; and it also authorises the publication, in pamphlet form, of 100,000 copies in the English and French languages, in the usual ratio, of Professor Saunders' report on the Experimental Farm, it being an appendix to the report of the Minister of Agriculture.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know anything about the merits of the recommendation respecting the printing of the report of Professor Saunders, but I understand that 100,000 copies are to be printed. It might be well, before the report is passed, that members of the Printing Committee should state what the cost would be, and also give the House some information as to the nature of the report. It appears to be a large order, and we should like to have further information, in order that we know what we are doing.

Mr. BERGIN. I am not in a position at this moment to state what the cost would be; but, I may say that the Printing Committee ask power to print this document, on the recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture, it having been stated by the Committee that the matter is at present in type as a portion of the Minister's report.

Mr. DAVIN. We were informed, and I believe informed correctly, that this report is in type, and that the only cost would be presswork and paper. The cost of the 100,000 copies would have no reference to the cost of composition; the cost would be only that of placing it on the press and the paper used, and the expense could not, therefore, be much.

Mr. MITCHELL. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is in his place, and perhaps he could give the House some information as to the value of this report, and whether it is worth

while to give it a circulation of 100,000 copies throughout the country.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation consider this to be a very valuable report, and one that it is very desirable should be circulated largely throughout the country. It was upon a motion, passed unanimously in that Committee, that the Printing Committee were asked to go to the expense of having 100,000 extra copies struck off, as it was represented to the Committee that the type was still standing, that the only extra cost of furnishing this information to the public through that means would be the presswork and paper required.

Mr. MITCHELL. Might I ask how voluminous the report will be ?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It would be about 142 pages, including index and all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not mean to say that the report of the two Committees are not deserving of consideration ; but, I really think, that in a matter of this kind the House ought to know what the cost will be, and I might suggest that this report be delayed for twenty-four hours, in order that we may ascertain approximately, at any rate, what the cost would be.

Mr. CARLING. The House last year ordered 60,000 copies, which were printed and circulated through the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it printed at the Government printing office ?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The cost could be ascertained in the course of twenty-four hours, and then we would know what we are doing.

Mr. BERGIN. I will communicate with the Printing Bureau at once.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the objection taken by the hon. gentleman is a little ungracious, when such an important committee, as the Standing Committee on Agriculture, comprising a hundred members and embracing nearly every hon. gentleman in this House at all conversant with agricultural subjects, have thought it so valuable that they unanimously desired that it should be printed. When we consider the quantity of documents that are printed of comparatively little value, I think it might be as well to allow this to pass without opposition. However, as the hon. gentlemen have asked for it, it would be as well to have the cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My objection is not taken to the thing itself. It is a question of principle I raise. I desire to know before I vote on this, what the cost will be, and that, I think, we have a right to know.

Mr. AMYOT. Is it generally understood that a certain proportion of these documents will be translated and printed in French.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is contained in the report.

Mr. AMYOT. In spite of that, of late years we have received them in English. I have piles of these documents in English, in my office, and as I have not one single English-speaking elector, they are of no value. If we want our farmers to have the benefit of them we should receive them in French.

I received lots of those documents in English, and I have a great admiration for that language, but my electors cannot use it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report recommends that it be printed in English and French.

Mr. AMYOT. I hope the hon. gentleman will recommend that the recommendation of the Committee will be executed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The officers of the House will attend to that.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would suggest that when these pamphlets are printed, a list be supplied by each member of the names of parties he wishes them sent to, and then they could be distributed from the House. There is great delay and expense, when they are forwarded to members for distribution.

Mr. TROW. It is unnecessary to do that, because members can send all these documents, free of postage, from their residences. If there were wrappers put on each pamphlet, and they are then sent in bundles to the members, that is all that is necessary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear. That was done last year.

Mr. MITCHELL. Besides, we have not that confidence in the administration of affairs by the Executive, which should lead us to make this suggestion. I have no doubt that the Minister would execute the commission all right, but it establishes a bad precedent, and it is better we should address them ourselves, and give some work for hon. gentlemen to do.

Mr. TAYLOR. When this order was made in both Committees, it was expected that these pamphlets would be printed and given to the members before the House rose. If the objection raised to-day is maintained, it will probably throw the matter back another week. This is a book purely in the interests of the farmers, as it gives them a report of the working of the Experimental Farm, and I am sure that the whole cost would not amount to much. We have three or four hon. gentlemen, who are conversant with printing matters, on the Agriculture Committee, and we were informed that the type was now set, of the Report of the Minister of Agriculture. I do not think the cost will amount to as much as some returns passed by this House which are of comparatively no benefit to the country. This book is of a great benefit to the farmers of the country, and it should be rushed through and distributed while the report is fresh, and not delayed until the members have returned to their homes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Some hon. members of the House wish to give the impression that the setting of the type forms the principal part of the work. That is a mistake. The setting of the type is the smallest item in the publication of this book, or any book, especially one with a large number of pages. The presswork and cost of paper is the largest portion of the expense. I have no objection at all to the report being printed, but I think if the chairman of the Committee had been very anxious to forward the work, he would have presented the report before now. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says this will delay

the work a week; well, it is a week since the report was made. Why did not the chairman of the Committee bring his report to Parliament sooner, and then we would not have so much delay.

Mr. BERGIN. If the hon. gentleman had taken the objection to the printing, in the Committee, which he takes here, there would be no delay.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have no objection to the printing, and the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin) knows that. He need not put a wrong construction on what I have said.

Motion allowed to stand.

SEED BARLEY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, About what date do the Government expect the promised seed barley to arrive? Is it in bags in transit? Will it be forwarded immediately on arrival to the several applicants? Do the Government intend to distribute any portion of it to the several agricultural societies, free? If not, why not?

Mr. CARLING. A portion of the barley we expect to arrive next week, and the rest before the 1st of April. It was shipped at London in two-bushel bags. It will be forwarded immediately on its arrival to those who have applied for it. It is not the intention of the Government to distribute any portion of it to the agricultural societies—only to farmers.

FLAG'S COVE BREAKWATER.

Mr. GILLMOR asked, Whether the Public Works, or any member of the Government, has received a petition from the inhabitants of Grand Manan, Charlotte County, N.B., asking for the erection of a breakwater at Flag's Cove, north head of Grand Manan?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A report was made in 1875 on harbors of refuge in Grand Manan, Flag's Cove being one of the harbors mentioned. The cost of the works required was estimated to be very large, namely, \$90,000. A petition from the inhabitants was forwarded by the hon. Minister of Finance, on the 17th of February last, to my Department, praying for the construction of a breakwater at Flag's Cove; but we have had no additional information about it since 1875. If any other information is required, we shall require to have a new survey.

CROFTER IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin) asked, Whether the attention of the Government has been called to an article in the issue of 18th February of the *Glasgow North British Daily Mail*, a journal which has an extensive circulation in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, describing the condition of crofters at Pelican Lake, brought out under special Acts of British and Dominion Governments? If so, if statements therein contained, that crofters are starving for lack of food and that appeals for aid are being made in Ontario for relief of these people, and if statement of Rev. Dr. Robertson, Superintendent of North-West Presbyterian Missions, that these people have been lured from their homes by misrepresentations made by Malcolm McNeil, Joint Commissioner for British and Dominion Governments, sent to Island of Lewis

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

and other Islands of the Hebrides Group, are correct?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The attention of the Government has not been called to any article of the nature referred to in the *North British Daily Mail*; but attention has been directed to a letter of the Rev. Dr. Bryce, Chaplain of the St. Andrew's Society of Winnipeg, which appeared in the *Winnipeg Free Press* of the 1st instant, and in which the reverend gentleman states that the report that any of the Scotch crofters in the North-West are in a starving condition, is a tissue of falsehood; that they are being well looked after; and that the Rev. Dr. Robertson has not been in the North-West since the 1st of October last. It will thus be seen that Dr. Robertson has no means of knowing what the condition of the crofters is except by hearsay, and that the allegation that they are in want has been denied in the strongest language by one who may safely be assumed to speak with personal knowledge of the facts. Dr. Bryce's statement, it may be added, is confirmed by numerous reports received during the winter from the agent of the Colonisation Board, who resides among and is in charge of the crofters. The Government have no knowledge of any misrepresentations made to the crofters by Mr. McNeil or anybody else. All that was ever promised to them on behalf of the Dominion Government was land to the extent and on the conditions as to the actual residence and cultivation mentioned in the homestead provisions of the Dominion Lands Act, and that promise has been faithfully kept.

AGRICULTURAL BULLETINS.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the Minister of Agriculture intends to act on the suggestion of W. B. Scarth, member for Winnipeg, and have the bulletins from the Agricultural Farm printed in German?

Mr. CARLING. Considering the sparseness of the German population at present in the North-West, it is not the intention of the Government to have the bulletins of the Agricultural Farm printed in the German language.

I. C. R.—FREIGHT CHARGES.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) asked, What is the rate of freight charged per ton on coals carried on the Intercolonial Railway from Stellarton to Londonderry, for the use of the Steel Company of Canada at that place?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Thirty cents per ton.

I. C. R.—SUPPLIES.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) asked, Whether all supplies required for the Intercolonial Railway are secured by contract? If so, is it by public notice, or by private notice sent only to friends of the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Supplies are secured by tender and contract. It is not done by public notice, neither is it by sending private notice to the friends of the Government only. Circular forms of tender are sent to those in the various trades.

MR. P. R. A. BELANGER.

Mr. DESSAINT asked, Whether Mr. P. R. A. Belanger, civil engineer, of L'Islet, is in the employment of the Government of Canada; if so, what is the nature of his work? Has he any contract with the Government, or with any of its Departments; if so, what is the nature of that contract, and when does it expire?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Belanger is not in the employment of the Government of Canada. He has not any contract with the Government, nor with any of the Departments, so far as I know, at present.

ACCOUNT OF ELIE MOREAU.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government soon to pay the account of Elie Moreau, advocate, of Sorel, for fees *in re* The Queen *vs.* Boucher?

Mr. HAGGART. A cheque for the amount of Mr. Moreau's account, \$300, was to-day sent to the Department of Justice for payment to Mr. Moreau.

ROTARY SNOW-PLOUGHS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether P. S. Archibald, of the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton, has reported upon the "Rotary" snow-ploughs as being inefficient—in fact, useless? If these are not his words, what were the words used by him in reporting on them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. P. S. Archibald's statement is as follows:—

"It is quite evident, from our trials of these machines and the admissions of the engineer sent from New York, that they are of no use to us."

The Chief Engineer and General Manager of Government Railways does not concur in Mr. P. S. Archibald's statements. He is satisfied that they will prove of very great service. The Rotary snow-shovel has done splendid service on the Central Pacific Railway, the Union Pacific Railway, the Northern Pacific Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and other lines of railway, and there is not the slightest doubt that it will do so on the Intercolonial Railway. The trial reported on by Mr. Archibald was made on the River du Loup Town Branch in the approach of spring, no train having been over the road during the winter; hence thick layers of ice were found, which the machines could not cut.

CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN COUNCIL.

Mr. DOYON asked, Whether the Government, in January last, instructed the Indian Agent on the Caughnawaga Reserve to write to certain members of the Council of that Reserve the following letter:—

"I have the honor to inform you that there will be a meeting of the Council of the Indian Reserve of Caughnawaga, on Monday, 27th January instant, at 11 a.m., for the general business of the tribe, at which you are requested to attend, and that I am instructed by the Department to notify you that, unless you attend the meetings of the Council of the reserve, so as to conduct the affairs of the tribe, a recommendation will be made advising your removal from your position as a member of the Council, and another person will be elected in your place.

(Signed) "A. BROUSSEAU,
"Indian Agent."

If so, for what reason, and at whose suggestion or recommendation? Is it the intention of the Government to execute the threat, and what are their reasons for so acting?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Department of Indian Affairs instructed its agent at Caughnawaga to inform certain members of the council of the band to the effect of the letter addressed to such members by the Indian agent. The suggestion or recommendation was made on the report of the Indian agent, who stated that the members in question would not attend the council meetings, or, if they did, that they left without taking any part in the proceedings, thus rendering the meetings of the council inoperative. A recommendation will be made to the Honorable the Privy Council that the obstructive members of the council be deposed from their position and an election of other parties in their places be held.

LUNDY'S LANE.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps as soon as possible to enquire how best to honor and perpetuate the memory of the men who lost their lives in defending their country at the battle of 'Lundy's Lane,' and to preserve from desecration their last resting-place in the Military Cemetery at Niagara Falls, in accordance with the prayer of the petitions presented to this House.

He said: I would ask the indulgence of the House while I make a few historical references with regard to the war of 1812, and the battle of Lundy's Lane in particular, for the purpose of showing that it was not a war of our choosing, nor was it a war sanctioned by the majority of the better thinking people of America. Hon. gentlemen will remember the condition of things at that time and the position of England. England was well nigh exhausted by a twenty years struggle against the continental powers of Europe, in which she had been fighting for constitutional liberties and the freedom of mankind against the greatest military genius of that day, Napoleon I. It will be remembered also by the House that the irritation in the United States caused by the War of Independence had not yet subsided; and the world saw the extraordinary spectacle of the new Republic of the West joining hands—and I say it without any desire to cast any reflections upon him—with the arch-despot of Europe, for the purpose of fighting the only one power then existing which was struggling for constitutional liberty and the freedom of mankind. The House will remember also—and I make these few references as briefly as possible—the decree of Napoleon issued at Berlin, in which he declared all ports of the British Empire blockaded, and prevented any letters written in English passing through the post offices, not only of France, but of any other country of Europe over which he had control—and he had control over most of them; and in which he made liable to arrest and imprisonment every British subject and every man who spoke the English language on the Continent of Europe, and declared that all goods coming from Great Britain or any of her colonies were subject to confiscation, and the vessels which bore them subject to destruction. This decree was issued in 1806, and in 1807 the celebrated Orders in Council were passed by the British Government retaliating on Napoleon for this decree. The action of the United States at that time will also be remembered,

with regard to seamen found upon British vessels; but when I say the United States, I mean only a political party of the United States, for the people as a whole were averse to that action. The United States Government encouraged the desertion of British seamen; they put them upon American vessels and declared them to be American subjects. Great Britain had at that time, and all times previous, asserted her right to search vessels for deserters of that kind; and in order to do away with this difficulty between the two nations, a treaty was entered into between Great Britain and the United States. This treaty was passed by the United States Senate and by the House of Congress, but President Jefferson refused to ratify it, and so it became inoperative. Matters thus went on until 1812, in July of which year war was declared by President Madison—a defensive war, as he called it, but the first act of which was to invade Canada with a large army which had been for months prepared for that purpose. The Emperor Napoleon in 1812 rescinded his decree so far as it affected American vessels; and he dated back his rescission some twelve months, so that it appeared to have been rescinded in 1811. The Orders in Council, so far as they related to American shipping, were revoked on the 24th of June, 1812, and on the 18th June, six days prior, war was declared by President Madison. An armistice was entered into between Sir George Prevost, Governor General of Canada, and General Dearborn, of the United States Army, to give the two nations time to come to some mutual arrangement and prevent bloodshed if possible; but President Madison again refused to ratify the arrangement, so that war was forced upon our people. I desire to show to the House that it was not a war endorsed by the best thinking people of the United States against Canada or Great Britain at that time. In the Senate of the United States that declaration of war was only carried by six of a majority—thirteen having voted against, and nineteen in favor of, the war. The Legislatures of Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Jersey, all passed resolutions condemning the war; and I desire to read to the House the celebrated resolution passed at Albany by representatives of nearly every county in the State of New York. The resolution reads as follows:—

“That without insisting on the injustice of the present war, taking solely into consideration the time and circumstances of its declaration, the condition of the country, and the state of the public mind, we are constrained to consider, and feel it our duty to pronounce it a most rash, unwise and inexpedient measure, the adoption of which ought forever to deprive its authors of the esteem and confidence of an enlightened people; because, as the injuries we have received from France are at least equal in amount to those we have sustained from England, and have been attended with circumstances of still greater insult and aggravation; if war were necessary to vindicate the honor of the country, consistency and impartiality required that both nations should have been included in the declaration; because, if it were deemed expedient to exercise our right of selecting our adversary, prudence and common sense dictated the choice of an enemy of whose hostility we had nothing to dread. A war with France would equally have satisfied our insulted honor, and, at the same time, instead of annihilating, would have revived and extended our commerce; and, even the evils of such a contest would have been mitigated by the sublime consolation that by our own efforts we were contributing to arrest the progress of despotism in Europe, and effectually serving the great interests of freedom and humanity throughout the world. That we contemplate with abhorrence even the probability of an alliance with the present Emperor of France, every

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).

action of whose life has demonstrated that the attainment by any means, of universal empire, and the consequent extinction of every vestige of freedom, are the sole object of his incessant and unbounded and remorseless ambition. Whereas, the late revocation of the British Orders in Council has removed the great and ostensible cause of the present war, and prepared the way for an immediate accommodation of all existing differences, inasmuch as, by the confession of the present Secretary of State, satisfactory and honorable arrangements might easily be made by which the abuse resulting from the imprisonment of our seamen might, in future, be effectually prevented.”

I read this to show that the better class of the American people, the thinking class of people in the United States, had nothing against Canadians, and nothing against Britain as a whole, but the Democrats at that time were eager and anxious for a war, they were eager and anxious to estrange these colonies from Great Britain in order to connect them with the United States. At that time there were only 6,000 British regulars in Canada to defend a frontier of 1,500 miles. It is well known that the population was only about 300,000, while the United States had a population of 8,000,000. Every member is aware that, when war was declared, there were no people in Canada who took such active and energetic steps to defend the country and resist that invasion as the people of French Canada. The Government of Lower Canada passed army bills amounting £250,000, or about \$1,000,000, and not only that, but Lower Canada took vigorous steps to organise its militia and to place them at the disposal of the military authorities in order to defend this country against foreign invasion. While Lower Canada had a larger population at that time than Upper Canada, the French Province not only contributed towards defending their own part of the country, but all the means they could afford in addition to that were sent to Upper Canada to assist those people who were suffering distress in consequence of the war. I will speak cursorily in regard to the troops who were assembled upon the frontier at that time by the Americans. Those troops were intended to invade Canada at three points, Detroit, the Niagara River, and Lake Champlain. Niagara stood the brunt of the whole war, and the gallant volunteers on the field of Lundy's Lane ended the fight. The American general had 11,162 men under his command. The full strength of the British force distributed from York to Long Point did not exceed 3,000 men. The number of regular troops was only 1,800 to guard the Niagara frontier, and, in addition, they had only 450 militia and Indians along a frontier thirty-six miles long. After Fort Riall, Fort Erie and Fort George were garrisoned, only 700 men remained of the regulars available on the Niagara frontier. The American troops, under Generals Winfield Scott, Brown and Ripley, crossed at Fort Erie with 5,000 men and nine field-pieces, and reduced Fort Erie, which was garrisoned by 121 men. They marched to Chippewa, where a desperate struggle ensued, General Riall losing 500 men, or one-third of his whole force. General Drummond sailed from Toronto and joined Riall at Lundy's Lane. Riall was retreating from General Scott, but he was recalled and they again engaged the enemy. The whole British force at Lundy's Lane, was 2,800, of whom 1,500 were volunteers. They consisted of boys and men raised in the neighborhood, the descendants of the old U. E. Loyalists, and the blood of former days, of the days

of the Independence fight, rose in their veins and they showed all the valor of their forefathers. The American force at Lundy's Lane under Generals Scott, Brown and Ripley, amounted to 5,000 men with 9 field-pieces. The British volunteers were badly equipped, and ranged in age from boys of 15 up to men of 50 and over. The farms were deserted, and left in the hands of the women and the girls. A story was told me by the grandmother of a foreman who works for me, that, during the day's battle, she was on the ground herself with girls and women of the neighborhood, carrying water to the soldiers who were their fathers, their sons, their husbands and their brothers, and were nursing and taking care of the wounded and the dying. When only 10 years of age, she helped to carry her brother, 16 years of age, who had been shot, from the field of battle. The fight was very deadly, it was probably the most deadly that ever took place on this continent in proportion to the numbers engaged, and the loss of the British was very severe. Of the British troops, 5 officers and 76 men were killed, 30 officers and 532 men were wounded, and 14 officers and 219 men were missing, having been taken prisoners. Of the Americans, 11 officers and 160 men were killed, 50 officers and 520 men were wounded, and a great many prisoners were taken. It will be remembered that Newark and St. David's were burned, and that nearly all the houses in that neighborhood were destroyed by fire. There is no use in now attempting to show what were the fighting qualities of the volunteers who were engaged on that occasion, but I desire to give you the last words of that celebrated soldier, General Brock, after he fell in ascending Queenston Heights. He had proceeded with a few men from the 49th, and a few who were gathered on the way, to ascend Queenston Heights, in order to dislodge the enemy. He was shot and wounded and died at the foot of the hill. His last words, when his soldiers were endeavoring to care for him, were: "Never mind me; push on the York volunteers." So that he was depending entirely upon the York volunteers to fight the great battle of Queenston Heights, which was, as we all know, afterwards won. It was won by the York volunteers, by the men and boys with shot guns in their hands, that were gathered in from the surrounding country. General Brock also said that:

"Had not the men of western Canada rose in their might in the defence of their rights and in support of the British Constitution, his hands would have been tied, being without the aid of British regulars."

General Drummond said of the volunteers during that war:

"The bravery of the militia on this (Lundy's Lane) occasion could not have been excelled by the most resolute veterans."

Now, Sir, the loyal inhabitants of this country in those days of trial and distress stood well by their country and by the British Constitution, and I say they deserve well at our hands, for had it not been for the bravery of these men and boys and women, this country to-day might have been in the hands of the American Union. Some people might say that would not have been a great loss to us, but I say it would have been a great loss to us, because it is my conviction that the institutions of this Dominion have succeeded in moulding the institutions on the other side of the line. We have

maintained that liberty and that freedom for which Britain has fought for the last thousand years, and during many of those centuries Great Britain stood alone in a great conflict for parliamentary institutions and for the freedom of mankind at large. Now, there is no place where, during the war of 1812-13-14, a battle took place in which the volunteers were so well represented as at Lundy's Lane; they were so well represented that 1,600 out of the 2,800 of the home force who fought that battle were volunteers. Sir, in conclusion, I think I can appeal with confidence to this House, in the names of our self-sacrificing forefathers, to preserve in some way from desecration, their last resting-places, I think we ought to recognise in some way the services of our fathers, and our forefathers, and of our mothers and their children, in defending our native land in those days. I think I can appeal with confidence to this House and to this country to take some means suitably to perpetuate their memory, and to mark with honor the resting-place of those who fought in the battle of Lundy's Lane.

Mr. HICKEY. I have the honor to represent a county in which a memorable battle was fought on the 11th November, 1813—I refer to the battle of Chrysler's Farm. I do not intend to go into the particulars of this battle, as was done by the mover of this resolution, in the battle of Lundy's Lane. We are glad such places are few and far between in Canada, but we recognise not the less clearly, because three-quarters of a century and more has passed by, that these battle-fields are like corner stones in our national edifice, corner stones which have been well and truly laid, and cemented by that blood which, all over the world, has been freely shed for the flag that is the emblem of liberty and freedom, and the superstructure which has been reared upon this foundation, we rejoice to know, has from year to year become more beautiful and grand. These historic fields of Mars are not peculiar to Canada. Every country has its special scenes of triumph, and while these have been marked in other countries by suitable memorials, we have yet many fields of honor to decorate. Sympathising, as I do, with the mover of this motion, in the motion itself, and with the words he has uttered, I wish to endorse most sincerely his arguments and his prayer. I would like to see monuments erected on all our battlefields, not only on account of the national sentiments they would engender, but also in order to reflect the gratitude of the people over the graves of those who sleep in honor, though under the unhallowed grass of a neglected cemetery. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the dead sleep in honor, the wounded bled for their country, and both deserve the gratitude of those who possess their heritage. Nor must we forget those few veterans who still survive, fighting in memory their battles o'er again; while their shadows are nearly paralleled by the rays of the setting sun. It is true they have received some recognition from this Parliament by a small pension which has been paid them for some years, but it is due to them also, that they may see that their fallen comrades are remembered by a grateful country. Theirs were noble hearts—brave men who, against great odds of over two to one, in

the battle of Chrysler's Farm, maintained their country's honor and achieved a famous victory; and I would like to realise, that over their graves will blossom flowers that bloom not over slaves. I have said it was a famous victory, and I will trouble the House with a few citations from history in reference to that famous battle. I will quote from a sketch of the County of Dundas by Mr. James Croil, who, after describing that battle, says:

"Thus terminated the battle of 'Chrysler's Farm,' and, with the defeat of the American army here, vanished all hopes, during that campaign at least, of carrying out their designs upon Lower Canada. The conduct of British troops, regulars and militia, was beyond all praise, and elicited the encomiums even of their opponents. The devoted loyalty of the militia is thus noticed by Wilkinson in his report from Salmon River, dated the 16th of November, 1813: 'The enemy deserves great credit for their zeal and intelligence, which the active universal hostility of the male inhabitants of the country enabled them to employ to the greatest advantage.' Ingersoll, the American historian, speaks in terms of the highest praise of the conduct of the British and Canadian troops. For the persevering and invincible spirit in which they met a formidable invasion, and forced Wilkinson to a dishonored retreat, when, had they been well led, there was every pledge of victory.' Morrison (who, by the way, was a U. E. loyalist from Rhode Island), in his report of the battle to head-quarters, testified to the distinguished bravery of the regulars and militia under his command. * * *

Allison alludes to the battle thus: 'The glorious defeat of an invasion so confidently announced, and so strongly supported, diffused the most heartfelt joy in Lower Canada, and terminated the campaign there in the most triumphant manner.'

"Christie says of it: 'This, called the battle of Chrysler's Farm, is, in the estimation of military men, considered the most scientific military affair during the late war, from the professional skill displayed in the action by the adverse commanders; and when we consider the prodigious preparations of the American Government for that expedition, with the failure of which their hopes of conquest vanished, the battle of Chrysler's Farm may probably be classed as the most important, and best fought, that took place during the war.'

Thus, Mr. Speaker, you will see that the motto of Canada for Canadians, is not a new one. Our fathers adopted it, their bravery enshrined it, and shall we, their loyal and dutiful sons, forget to do honor to whom most honor is due? I hope not. The request which has been made in this motion, to build some suitable memorial at Lundy's Lane, and on our other battle-fields needs no argument from me or from any one else. History, which teaches by example, is our best philosophy, and to history we appeal. If it is called sentiment, we say all the best thoughts and actions of our lives have had a similar origin. These ties of sentiment which keep and preserve nations as well as families, are more indissoluble bonds than laws can possibly create, and which, if crystallised or made manifest in some substantial way, lay the foundation of a nation's pride, of a nation's enthusiasm and of a nation's patriotism. What British boy, as he stands and reads the inscription on any of the many monuments erected to the memory of Lord Nelson, does not feel his bosom swell with pride when he thinks of his glorious deeds, and when he remembers that, as his fathers were, he, too, is his countryman? Only a few days ago a large deputation waited upon the Minister of Education in Ontario and asked that our country's flag might be hoisted over our collegiate institutes and high schools on the anniversary days of these important events. I have no doubt the request will be granted. This fact is an indication to this House, and to the Govern-

Mr. HICKEY.

ment, and to the Minister of Militia, that this country expects and demands that this regard shall be paid to its dead heroes. It behooves us, then, to make "Canadian" a still prouder name by discharging this well demonstrated duty of veneration and of gratitude to departed worth.

Mr. DENISON. After the eloquent speeches of the mover of the motion and of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, I intend to occupy the time of the House but a few moments while I add a word endorsing this resolution. When we reflect on the condition of Canada in 1812, when we consider there were less than 6,000 British troops in all Canada and less than 4,000 militia, when we reflect that the population of the United States was twenty-six to one as compared with that of Canada, the victories achieved show what can be accomplished by an united people defending their homes and firesides. It affords conclusive proof as to what a small population can do if they work unitedly. In visiting in the summer 1884, the cemetery where the heroes lie who were killed in the action in Lundy's Lane, I regretted to observe the dilapidated condition of the graves. The monuments are out of place, and generally the whole place has an untidy and a neglected appearance. I hope this House will grant such a sum of money as will place these monuments in order now. When they will remain good during the next fifty years. I also wish to endorse the idea thrown out by the last speaker, that something should be done, not only to mark the spot at Lundy's Lane, but also Stoney Creek and Beaver Dam and other memorable places. It is greatly to be regretted that any student of history, on visiting these grounds, has difficulty in ascertaining where the actions were fought; and a very small sum placed in the Estimates would mark these spots, so that in future no such trouble could arise. I hope this House will in its wisdom see fit to do something towards this object.

Mr. EDGAR. I sympathise, to a considerable extent, with the motion that has been made and with the speeches that have been delivered. While it might be well for the Government to give a small sum towards this object, I think it should be supplemented by voluntary contributions from the people of Canada, and I believe that could easily be done. I know very well the battle-ground of Lundy's Lane, which is in the constituency of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), and I have often traced on the ground the course of that fierce conflict, and I do not think in the whole range of history we can find a description of a battle more bravely fought than was the battle of Lundy's Lane. It was fought in the darkness of the night, within the sound of the falls of Niagara, and the field was contested for hours and hours, one army holding possession of it after the other; and I am sure it would be impossible for us to do justice to the bravery of our own Canadian volunteers and the British regulars who were engaged there, without also doing justice to the bravery of their opponents, of their enemies, of the American soldiers who so bravely fought there. And we also should remember that in this same graveyard at Drummondville, there rest the remains of the brave American soldiers who fell on that field, and I think, it would be only a graceful act, if our Government chooses to contribute something towards

the purpose suggested to-day, if the American Government and the American people were asked to contribute something also, to place the names of their soldiers who fell in that fight, upon that monument. We see, in Quebec, the names of Wolfe and Montcalm inscribed on the same monument, and I am sure it would tend towards smoothing the feelings between the Americans and the people of Canada if, in the event of our Government doing something of this kind, they would invite the American people or the American Government to place the names of their dead upon the memorial that may be erected there.

Mr. COOK. I have much sympathy with the proposition made by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson). I believe it is in the interests of the country that we should mark with some monument the place where lies the dust of the heroes in the battle fought at Lundy's Lane. But I would extend the suggestion further. The decisive battle was fought at Chrysler's Farm, and that was the end of the war. On the morning of the battle they retired to Bouck's ravine. The British forces attacked them there, they being only one to eleven of the American forces. After struggling for some time at that point, the British, under a feint, retired. The American forces, thinking they had won the day, followed up with cheers what they supposed to be a victory, until they arrived at the intervening point of Chrysler's Farm, a 200-acre farm surrounded by a large stone wall. The British forces had retired behind that wall, and when the Americans arrived within two or three yards of the wall, the British troops rose, fired and cheered—and that was the end of the war. While I submit it is right and proper that a monument should be placed at Queenston Heights to commemorate the great battle there, I think a memorial should also be placed at Chrysler's Farm in the County of Dundas, which is represented by the hon. gentleman who addressed the House a few moments ago. As one who was brought up in that county and whose ancestors fought in that battle, I have very great and strong sympathies with this proposition. We know that the U. E. Loyalists were the principal parties who were engaged in that contest, and some honor should be done to them, and while I believe we should commemorate the Queenston Heights struggle, we should not forget the decisive battle at Chrysler's Farm.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am sure we are all very much indebted to the hon. gentleman who has brought before the House in such an interesting manner the historical reminiscences of one of the most glorious pages of Canadian history. I preserve the most lively recollection of one of the most pleasant visits which it has been my good fortune to pay, to the historical battle-field of Lundy's Lane. It was made on 25th July last, and I had the pleasure and advantage of being accompanied on that trip by my hon. friend the member for Welland, by the hon. member for Hamilton, and by other hon. gentlemen who for years have taken such a deep interest in this subject and have displayed so much zeal in bringing before the House and before the country the importance for us as a people, and as Canadians, of perpetuating the memory of those brave deeds of our ancestors and of commemorating those passages of our history which have cast so much glory upon

the Canadian people. I was on that occasion the guest of the Lundy's Lane Historical Society, and if I may be permitted to take advantage of this opportunity, I should like to express the opinion, that to the Historical Society of Lundy's Lane, every true Canadian patriot, and every student of history, is largely indebted for the zeal and energy they have shown in accumulating, and preserving for the inspection of the public, the souvenirs of that memorable battle. Their museum, which it was my good fortune to visit, is most interesting from an historical standpoint. The descendants of those who bled and died at the battle of Lundy's Lane handed over to the Historical Society, from patriotic motives, family heirlooms which had been treasured by them ever since the battle. Other relics of the campaign of 1812, and other relics of this battle, were collected by the zealous secretary of the Lundy's Lane Historical Society, and by the other gentlemen who have combined together to contribute their mite towards giving a new lustre to the history of Canada, and towards commemorating the deeds of the British troops and the Canadian volunteers at that battle. I cannot better express to this House the views which are entertained in relation to the battle of Lundy's Lane, and in relation to the other battle-fields of Canada, than by reading one of the petitions which has been forwarded to the Government of Canada, and by telling the House what course has been taken by the Government in relation to these petitions. I will read the following petition:—

"To the Honorable the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, in Parliament assembled:—

"The petition of the undersigned loyal subjects of Her Majesty, Queen Victoria, humbly sheweth as follows:—

"That within the boundaries of the village of Niagara Falls, formerly Drummondville, Ontario, on the highest point of land along the frontier of Niagara River, is situated the battle-field of 'Lundy's Lane,' whereon was fought the most severe and decisive battle in the war of 1812-14. It is a matter of history well known to Your Honorable House that this battle decided the issues of that eventful war; that there were engaged in the battle, on the British side, 1,600 volunteers, with Indian warriors, chiefly of the Home, Gore and Niagara districts, besides 1,200 regulars (of Regiments 89th Royal Scots, 41st, 3rd Buffs, 19th Light Dragoons, 104th N. B.) under Generals Drummond and Riall, while the American forces were 5,000 strong, under Generals Brown, Scott, and Ripley. The British loss was 870 killed and wounded; the American loss 930, and 300 taken prisoners. The number of the dead was so great, and the heat of summer excessive, that the British, who held possession of the field, were unable to bury friend and foe alike, and accordingly, on the second day, sent a message to the enemy, who had retired three miles to Chippawa, to send back a detachment to bury their dead. This duty the American General was unable to fulfil, leaving it to General Drummond to order the burning of some 200 American bodies, of which fact there are at this date a few witnesses living. There was at the time a village burying-ground on the hill, which then became a military cemetery. It is seventy-five years since that memorable battle—July 25th, 1814—and in all these years no care has been bestowed on the burial trenches to preserve them from desecration, and no public memorial to mark the place, or to honor or perpetuate the memories of those regulars, Indian warriors and volunteers, who fell then and there in defence of their King and country, and of this key to Western Ontario, save the erection of a very few headstones by friends of individuals among the gallant dead.

"Your petitioners would respectfully draw the attention of your honorable House to the fact that during the past year the residents in the neighborhood of this historical battle-field have, with some success, endeavored to arouse the interest of the Canadian militia and people in the work of the preservation of the ground and in the erection of some suitable public memorial to the honor, not only of British regulars, but of our Canadian volunteers, who died fighting in defence of their homes—and with that end in view have formed a local society known as the 'Lundy's

Lane Historical Society.' They feel, however, that a movement of this nature should not be local, but national; and we draw the attention of your honorable body, the representative assembly of Canada, to the patriotic duty of perpetuating the memories of those loyal defenders of our country who fell on the battle-field of Lundy's Lane, and, similarly, the memory of Mrs. Laura Secord, the heroine of Beaver Dam, seven miles distant, who rendered valuable aid to a small British garrison there, 23rd June, 1813. She died in later years, aged ninety-three, and is interred in Lundy's Lane cemetery, without any public memorial at her neglected grave.

"Your petitioners would respectfully ask your honorable House for a grant of money towards Lundy's Lane Memorial Fund, to be entrusted to the County Council of Welland, Ont. (who have consented to act on the Executive and Trust Committee), or as may otherwise seem best in your wisdom.

"And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Sd.) "COL. DUNCAN MACFARLANE,
"Present at the battle of Lundy's Lane.
"WM. KING, Niagara.
"GEORGE STEELE.
"And nineteen others.

"NIAGARA, 16th February, 1888."

These petitions, one of which I have read, have not been overlooked in any way by the Government. They thought it would be better, in dealing with a question of this kind, to appoint a sub-committee of Council, and a sub-committee was consequently appointed, consisting of my hon. and esteemed friend and colleague, the Minister of Customs, and myself, to consider this question. I must say (and it is a very great pleasure to me to be able to give testimony to the House on this point) that these deeds of our forefathers, these memorable acts of valor which were displayed on this battle-field, and so many others in Canada, are every day attracting more and more the attention of the Canadian people. I am one of those who believe that a people who has a history is a fortunate people, and I believe it is the bounden duty of every man, who feels in his heart a love for his country, that he should by every means in his power contribute to give to that history all the lustre it can possibly acquire, by being transmitted from generation to generation, as an example to those who will follow us, and who will learn from these deeds of valor, the acts of patriotism which those who fought at Lundy's Lane, and at other battles, have handed down to posterity. I express my personal views upon this question, and I say, that we, as an assembly, constituted as we are, should contribute to a certain extent to build up monuments upon these places which have been celebrated by acts of valor and deeds of heroism, such as have taken place at Lundy's Lane, at Chrysler's Farm and other memorable spots. I believe it is of the greatest importance that we should perpetuate the memory of those loyal defenders of our country who fell on the battle-fields of Canada. But I think that my hon. friend's motion may not possibly go just as far as it should. As the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) has said, great as was the day of Lundy's Lane, great as was the lustre cast on our history by the deeds of our Canadian volunteers, and the Imperial troops and Indian warriors who aided them on that occasion, if anything is done, I think it should apply not only to Lundy's Lane, but to all the battle-fields we have in Canada. It may possibly be of some little interest to this House and the country to know that for many years past—as far back even as the time when this country was handed over from France to England

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

—we have been progressing in that direction. We have in Canada to-day several monuments, the erection of which has been instigated, no doubt, by the same patriotic feelings which instigated the hon. gentleman in making the motion he has done to-day. We have at Quebec, that old battle-field of Canada—on the Plains of Abraham, and also in the city of Quebec itself—monuments to the memory of the two great warriors, Wolfe and Montcalm, who fought at that time on opposite sides. We have at Ste. Foye the monument erected to the memory of the braves of 1760, who fought in about the last battle that took place on that old historic battle-field between the French and the English; and hon. gentlemen who have visited that city of Champlain may remember, that that monument is crowned by a bronze statue, which was presented to Canada by Prince Napoléon, shortly after a visit by him to this country. We have a monument erected to the memory of that hero of Canadian volunteers, DeSalaberry, at Chambly, near Montreal. We have one erected in Montreal to that hero of so many naval battles, Nelson. We have the monument erected on Queenston Heights to the memory of Brock. We have in Halifax one to the memory of Welsford and Parker. We have one to the volunteers of 1885 in Winnipeg. We have, at Port Hope, the monument to Lieut.-Col. Williams, one of our colleagues in this House, who has cast his share of glory on the name of our Canadian volunteers. We have the monument at Brantford erected to Brant. We have one erected to Sir George Cartier, on Parliament square in Ottawa, showing that not only is military valor appreciated in Canada, but that civil service also finds a reward among the people of Canada, whom he served so faithfully and well. We have another erected in Toronto to that other great political name, George Brown, who fell a victim to an assassin. We have one erected in Three Rivers to Laviolette, that discoverer in our early history. We have one to Jacques Cartier in Quebec. We have one on the Saguenay, erected to the memory of the Honorable David Price, who for many years was a member of the Legislature of the Canadian House of Commons, and afterwards became a member of the other House. We have the monument of the Sharpshooters at Ottawa, which I am glad to say not only does honor to the valor of two of the Ottawa boys, but as a work of art casts a great deal of glory on the gentleman who moulded it. These are the monuments which have been erected in Canada; but I would ask the House, and the country, whether, having erected all these, we are going to stop midway? We know that there are only a few more to be erected to commemorate the deeds of those who have distinguished themselves in the history of the country. We ought to have monuments, I think, on the Burlington Heights, at Amherstburg, at Lundy's Lane, at Stony Creek, at Chrysler's Farm, at Chateauguay, at Beaver Dam, at Odelltown, at Lacolle, and at Montreal to Maisonneuve, the founder of that city. So far as my historical recollection goes, without having had time to prepare myself—and I am quite open to correction if I have left out any—I think that we have to erect altogether about ten monuments, not to cover the whole of our history, but to follow in the wake of those who have given us the example by erecting

the monuments of which I have given a list to the House; and I sincerely hope that this design will appeal to the patriotic feeling of every true Canadian, whether on one side of the House or on the other, whether being a member of Parliament or being outside of Parliament, and that the work will be taken up as soon as possible and completed. In carrying out the views of the sub-committee of which I have spoken, I thought I might possibly help the historical societies who so kindly invited me to meet them, by having a small plan prepared in my own Department by the architect, which might be sent to the historical societies, and which I intend to submit to my colleagues in Council, with an estimate of what these monuments would cost. I think we should not go in for anything in the way of very expensive monuments. What we want to do is to educate our people in our—their own history. What we want is to put up monuments, so that when people visit any of our battle-fields, they will find a monument with an inscription, having the date of the action, if it is to commemorate an action, and a few details about it. Such monuments would be a practical lesson in history to those who will follow us. In having the plans for these monuments prepared, which I shall have much pleasure in placing on the Table of the House, I was told that they would cost about \$1,000 each. I do not say that we should build all these monuments in one year, but I consider that this is a very small amount of money, considering the good it would do. If we teach patriotism to our people, and educate them to love their country and to revere the deeds of those who have preceded them, it would be a practical lesson in everything which makes a man better, in everything which makes him love his country more intensely; and I think we could very well afford to contribute that small amount of \$10,000 to achieve so much. Now, Sir, if my hon. friend would permit me, I would beg leave to propose that his motion be amended so as to read as follows:—

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps as soon as possible to enquire how best to honor and perpetuate the memory of the men who lost their lives in defending their country during the war of 1812, and to preserve from desecration the last resting-places of those brave men on the battle-fields where they gave their lives for Canada.

I think that would cover, without mentioning all the different places which I had occasion to refer to, the whole ground, and would permit us, if it be considered advisable, to have a small, inexpensive monument built at each place where one should be erected.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has not mentioned the name of Tecumseh.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is one I left out, but it should not be left out, because he took great care of Canadian interests when called on to do so. I will add his name to the list I have just read. I was happy to hear my hon. friend refer to the part which French Canada, as he called it, took in the memorable campaign of 1812. French Canada was then merely doing its duty in defending the country which we claim to be ours, and which we love to the same extent as any other nationality in Her Majesty's dominions; and possibly the successful solution of the troubles

of 1812 was due to the fact that in the presence of immediate danger, French, English, Irish, Scotch and every nationality in Canada forgot their own individual nationality and remembered only that they were Canadians. It is sufficient but to read a list of names to show that these battles were fought by every nationality composing the Canadian people at the time. I will only mention those who appear to have shone in the front rank:—Generals Brock, Vincent, Drummond, Riall; Colonels Taschereau, Godefroi de Tonnacour, Chartier de Lotbinière, Leprohon, Desrivières, DeLery; Major de Salaberry; Captains De Barch, Viger, Fitzgibbons, Rouville, Duchesne, Panet, de Beaujeu, d'Orsemens, Taché, Papineau, de Boucherville, Cuvillier; Commodore Yeo; Captain Frederic Rolette, the most glorious seaman of that period on the great lakes, and Captain Toussaint Pothier, also of the great lakes. The names of Voltigeurs Dubois, Pelletier, Caron, Vincent and Vervais, who distinguished themselves at Chateauguay, might be given. The lesson taught us by our success in 1812 we should not forget. That success was due to the union which existed among all the different nationalities composing our people, and as long as we do remain united, our successes of the past will be quite insignificant compared with our successes in the future.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I beg to accept, with the permission of the House, the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Militia.

Mr. CURRAN. I do not wish to add anything to what has been so admirably said by the speakers who have preceded me. I merely wish to state, that I heard with a great deal of pleasure the mention of the name of the founder of Montreal, M. Maisonneuve, amongst those who the hon. the Minister of Militia thought should be commemorated in some substantial way by public monuments. I may say, that the question of erecting a monument to Maisonneuve is now in the hands of a committee of the citizens of Montreal, composed of the Mayor and Aldermen of that city, the members of the Board of Trade, and the Chamber of Commerce, and various other bodies, who have taken up this matter in a very active spirit. I may also say, and I say it with a great deal of satisfaction, that amongst the most generous contributors to the monument to Maisonneuve are people of the English-speaking races in our city. The subscription list has gone on very successfully, and I had the honor of placing in the hands of the Minister the other day, an application from Mr. F. X. Perreault, the secretary of the Maisonneuve monument, for such assistance as the Government might think proper to ask from the Parliament of Canada, in order to make this monument even more beautiful than was contemplated originally by those who undertook the work. The Minister of Militia has stated, that the sum of \$1,000 would be sufficient to erect a monument suitable for the purposes of commemoration, but, if he could induce his colleagues to ask the House for that amount to embellish the monument which is already in contemplation in honor of the great founder of Montreal, I am satisfied that, in doing so, they would receive the hearty assent and approbation of the members of this House and the people generally.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not propose to take any part in the discussion now going on, but simply to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to the fact, that what he proposes is hardly consistent with what the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) asks. The resolution of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) points rather in the direction of taking care of the cemeteries, because it speaks of preserving from desecration the last resting-places of the dead, whereas the remarks of the Minister of Militia have been directed altogether to the propriety of erecting monuments to their memory.

Mr. AMYOT. There was the war of 1775 in which very memorable events took place, and I think it would be as well to lay down the principle that all of those glorious events—the first war as well as the second—should be commemorated.

Mr. BROWN. It gave me great pleasure to listen to the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Militia. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but merely to say that, in erecting monuments perpetuate the deeds of those brave and heroic men who fell in defence of their country, we should not forget the battle of Stoney Creek, where really the termination of the war of 1812 took place in that part of the country. I hope the Minister of Militia will bear that in mind.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ARTIFICIAL FERTILISERS.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) moved :

That it is expedient to remove the duty on artificial fertilisers and to place them on the free list.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow that to stand, as the Minister who should answer him is not here at present.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I would ask the hon. gentleman if it is the intention of the Government to place this on the free list. If so, I will allow it to stand.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid I will have to defer my answer until the Budget comes down.

Motion allowed to stand.

BOUNTY ON PIG IRON.

Mr. EISENHAUER moved :

That, whereas the Dominion of Canada in 1873 received four and a-half millions of dollars from the United States for the use of our fisheries, the interest on which from 1873 to 1889 amounts to about two millions; and whereas the Dominion has paid as bounty to the fishermen since 1882, \$1,050,000, leaving about \$1,000,000 in the Treasury of the interest on said four and a-half millions; and whereas the manufacturers of pig iron were allowed a bounty of \$1.50 per ton in 1883 and a further protection of \$4 per ton on imported pig iron in 1887; and whereas our fish are subject to heavy duties in the West Indies and United States, to which countries the largest portion of our fish are exported; that, in view of the foregoing facts, it is, in the opinion of this House, expedient that the Government should increase the bounty now allowed our fishermen in that proportion to the increase allowed on pig iron, and thereby, to some extent, compensate them for the heavy duties on their fish in foreign markets.

He said : It will be remembered that, since the adoption of the protective tariff, or the so-called National Policy, the manufacturers have approached the Government from Session to Session asking for an increase of the tariff on such wares as are

Mr. CURRAN.

manufactured by them. We know very well how they have succeeded in inducing the Government to increase the tariff so that now, instead of having a revenue tariff of 17½ per cent. as we had in 1878, we have a protective tariff ranging from 25 to 35 per cent., which the fishermen have now to bear along with all other classes in Canada. In 1883, the pig iron industry were allowed a bounty of \$1.50 per ton, and in 1887 a further protection of an import duty of \$4 per ton on imported pig iron. The Government having so largely increased the tariff for the benefit of manufacturers, and having also given the pig iron industry a further protection besides the bounty of \$1.50 per ton, I think it is only fair to the fishermen that the Government should give some consideration in the shape of an increase to the present bounty. There are 61,000 men employed in the fisheries, the yield being about 17½ millions in 1888. The present bounty allowed to our fishermen is only about ½ per cent. on the total yield, while the pig iron industry gives employment to about 750 men and the value of the product is only \$337,000, and the bounty allowed on the productions of pig iron in 1888 was \$37,000, equal to about 12 per cent. on the value of this product. Now, while the Government have been protecting the manufacturers so largely by increasing the duties on foreign goods, they are allowing fish to come into Canada from Newfoundland free of duty, and the consequence is that large quantities of herring, also codfish, herring and oil, come into our markets, and in consequence of the competition with Newfoundland fish prices of Canadian fish are much reduced. The duties on Newfoundland fish were removed some years ago by the Government, in order to have Canadian flour, pork, beef, &c., go into Newfoundland free of the duty which that Government were about imposing on Canadian flour and other provisions; so the fishermen of Canada have suffered by the Government allowing fish from Newfoundland to come into Canada free of duty. Then, the fishermen have to contend against a bounty of 10 francs per quintal on French codfish, which find their way into the West Indies markets in competition with Canadian codfish, both direct from French ports, and also from Canadian ports where French codfish are imported and reshipped in bond, and which greatly reduce the price for our Canadian codfish in those markets. Our exports of fish are about twice the amount of manufactured goods, that of fish being about eight millions, while the exports of manufactured goods are only about four and a-half millions. I think none of our industries are so uncertain of yielding good returns as that of our fisheries. Some seasons there are almost total failures in the catch; during other seasons only a partial catch is obtained, and on the whole, this industry is far behind many other industries in Canada as regards being remunerative. I have taken the trouble to collect statistics which show that in 1888, the number of vessels engaged in fishing was 1,142; number of boats, 27,408; tonnage, 16,597; men employed, 60,900; capital invested, \$6,139,416. The decrease in the value of vessels is about 10 per cent. per annum, that of boats about the same. The decrease in the value of the appliances, including nets, lines, seines, hawsers and other gear used in fishing, is estimated at about 20 per cent. It would seem at first sight that fishing was a profitable business. But

when we take into account the cost for wages for catching, curing, drying per season, and which is estimated at \$200 to \$250 per man, making about \$15,000, also the loss of appliances by storms, which is a large percentage of the capital employed, so it is evident that the profit on the capital invested in this industry is not equal to the profits realised from many of the other industries fostered by the Government by a high protection tariff and bounties. There is no other class of our people who are so exposed to storms and risk of life and property as are our fishermen, and I am sure that the members in the House, representing counties where the fishing is prosecuted, will bear me out in what I have said in this respect, as they know full well the hardships these people have to endure in prosecuting their business on the sea. The fishery is generally carried on during summer only, giving the fishermen about six months' employment, and the greater portion of them have to live on what they can make during that time, and during poor seasons have hard work to get themselves and families through the long winter, and on the whole our fishermen are not nearly so favorably situated as most of the other classes in Canada. In 1878 the Government received four and a-half millions from the United States for the privilege of fishing in Canadian waters for twelve years. The Commissioners who awarded this sum, considered that the privilege of fishing on our waters was worth about half million per season to the American fishermen. Now, while it was of immense advantage to the American fishermen to enjoy this privilege, it should not be overlooked, that the rights and privileges enjoyed by the American fishermen were a great disadvantage to the fishermen of Canada. The right to fish in our waters enabled the American fishermen largely to supply their own markets, to which a large proportion of our fish was then shipped for want of other markets, and where our fish came in competition with the American fish taken in our waters, and reducing very much the prices of our fish. I do not claim that the fishermen have an exclusive right to our waters where the fisheries are prosecuted, but I think it will not be denied that they have an equitable right to these waters, and that when these rights and privileges are partially taken from them, by allowing a foreign nation to participate equally with themselves, that any compensation for such rights and privileges received by the Government, should, in all justice, be expended for the sole benefit of the fishermen of Canada. The interest on the four and a-half millions received in 1878, from the United States Government, amounts to about two millions, while the total amount paid for bounty to the fishermen amounts to only about one million, leaving a balance in the Treasury of the Dominion of about one million dollars. Now, I contend, that they should have received at least the whole of this interest, which would have been one million more distributed among them than was paid them for bounties during the years since bounties were paid by the Government. It may be argued that the cost of protecting our fisheries should have been taken into account, when contending that the whole of the two millions of interest should have been paid the fishermen for bounty. But it should be remembered that, during the twelve years of the treaty, our coast

fisheries were not protected, and, therefore, it did not cost Canada anything for this service. It may also be contended that the cost of erecting and keeping the lighthouses along the coasts should be taken into account in this connection. This, I think, could not be maintained, as the Government would have to provide and keep about as many lighthouses if the fisheries were not prosecuted at all, as they are necessary for navigation, and must be kept up for that purpose, if for no other. And, further, the Government of Canada have recently subsidised steamers to run between St. John and the West India Islands, and between Halifax and the West India Islands, which, to a large extent, supply those markets with fish and articles that could be carried to these markets by our fishing vessels when the fishing season is over, and the subsidies, which are over \$60,000 per year, could be all saved to the Dominion. I have watched the shipments by the subsidised steamers from Halifax, and I find that every shipment is almost, and sometimes entirely composed of fish, which could all be carried to the West India markets by the vessels employed in that trade; but the quantity taken by this steamer is so large, that the markets to which she runs often get completely glutted and the sailing vessels in the trade have to lay at the wharves idle, or be sent out only to meet glutted markets, and the shippers sustain heavy losses. The steamer running between St. John, Yarmouth, and the West Indies gets about \$4,000 per trip subsidy. Her cargo consists chiefly of such articles as our regular traders carry to these ports. The amount of her cargoes average about \$6,000, while the country has to pay \$4,000 to export about \$6,000 worth of our products. This is most unfair to those engaged in this line of business, as, in order to get these steamers filled up with cargo when there is no inducement to ship, the owners or managers take fish and other of our products at very low freight. I am informed, on good authority, that the *Portia*, one of the subsidised steamers, took fish at 50 cents per tierce freight, equal to 12½ cents per quintal. Now, taking all these facts and figures into consideration, I think hon. gentlemen cannot but come to the conclusion that the resolution that I have submitted to the House is a reasonable one, and that in all justice to the fishermen of Canada, who need the fostering care of the Government more, or at least fully as much as any other of the industries of Canada, they will give this resolution their favorable consideration, this being a matter for the consideration of the Government more than for the House, I will leave it in their hands.

General LAURIE. Few men are more competent to speak on the subject of the fishing interests of our country than the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenbauer). As a large outfitter, as a large exporter from what is really the banner county of the Dominion in this matter, he is very competent to offer an opinion. But the hon. gentleman has been misled on one point, and to that point I will presently refer briefly. I do not think that the interests of our fishermen suffer intentionally by the action of the Government, or by the action of members of this House, or by the feeling of the country generally. On the contrary, if we compare the position of our fishermen, in what are even now the early days of our Confederation,

with the position of the fishermen, and the interest aroused in their avocation and the protection they received from their fellow-countrymen, in the early days after the formation of the United States, I think our fishing interest occupies a most favorable position, and the country does not fail to support it. While the United States were still fighting for what they called their liberty against Great Britain, the Central States of the Union were prepared to throw over the New England fishing interests rather than fight for them, so much so that the New England States proposed to return to the allegiance of the mother country; and twenty or thirty years subsequently, in 1814, the events of which time have been referred to this afternoon by hon. gentlemen who have spoken on a very interesting subject, the brilliant deeds done by Canadian volunteers; the commissioners of the Central and Southern States of the Union were authorised to entirely ignore the claim of the New England States to their fisheries, so much so, that again the New England States consulted as to whether they would not return to their allegiance to Great Britain, as they found their fellow-countrymen were not prepared to protect their interests. Compare that with the position taken by this country when the fisheries question stirred Canada and brought the mother country almost into collision with the United States, and we will find that not one word was said on any political platform or in Parliament in the direction of finding fault with the Government for the action they adopted towards protecting the interests of the fishermen. This shows me, in the first place, that we have developed a national spirit. It shows that every part of this country is prepared to stand by the rights of any one part of it, and in that sense I maintain it has developed a true national spirit; and, speaking as a representative of the fishermen, I thank the members of this House and the country at large for the staunch manner in which they have stood by that interest and the men who obtain their livelihood from it. I now come back to the question covered by the motion now before the House. Without following the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) in detail—for, no doubt, the subject will be discussed by other hon. members—I propose simply to deal with the question which he considers of the highest importance, namely, that part of the resolution which says:

“It is, in the opinion of this House, expedient that the Government should increase the bounty now allowed our fishermen in the proportion to the increase allowed on pig iron, and thereby, to some extent, compensate them for the heavy duties on their fish in foreign markets.”

What does the hon. gentleman propose? That we should reopen the question of bounties given to fishermen. I should be exceedingly sorry, speaking as a representative of the fishermen, if this were done. What is the argument used by the hon. gentleman in regard to the bounty on pig iron? It is, that last year, on the 30th of June, the bounty was reduced instead of being increased, and I am not prepared to reopen for reconsideration the question of the bounties paid to the fishermen, for possibly they might be reduced,

Mr. EISENHAUER. The amount is not reduced.

General LAURIE.

General LAURIE. The amount of the bounty on pig iron has been reduced since 30th June.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I thought you were alluding to the bounty paid to the fishermen.

General LAURIE. The hon. gentleman proposes, in consequence of the manufacturers of the pig iron having been allowed a bounty of \$1.50 per ton from 1883 to 1886, and a further bounty of \$1.00 per ton from 1886 to 1889, to reopen the question of the bounty paid to the fishermen, with a view to its being increased. But so far from this if we reopen the question, based on the bounty on pig iron, we would be reopening it with a view to the reduction of the bounty, and for that result I am not prepared. When we consider the fact, and I quote from the statutes that the bounty on pig iron was reduced from \$1.50 to \$1 in June last, and that the bounty of \$1.00 per ton will continue only up to 1892, when it will be abolished altogether, I am not desirous that the question should be reopened. On the contrary, I think it would be disadvantageous to reopen it at present. The whole question of bounties is one not acceptable to this House. That being the case, and as we have on the Statute-book authority to pay \$150,000 to our fishermen, I consider this question should not be reopened, and, therefore, much as I would have desired that some action should be taken to aid our fishermen in every possible way, I do not think this is the wisest way in which to secure further assistance. I believe there are other ways in which we can assist them more effectually. A large proportion of our fishing is conducted from small harbors along the shore, and as near the fishing grounds as possible. The harbors are exposed to certain winds, and when the gales come from certain quarters the men are obliged to empty two or three tons of ballast from their respective boats and haul them on shore until the storm is over. Consequently, very often when storms occur in the middle of the week the men do not consider it worth while to return the ballast for one or two days' fishing, and accordingly they are not able to pursue their industry continuously. By affording more protection to these harbors much greater benefit can be conferred on the fishermen than by adopting the motion now before the House, and I do not think we should reopen the question of bounties. I should be exceedingly sorry if this resolution should pass, because I do not think it is in the interests of the fishermen. By giving further protection to our harbors, endeavoring to prevent by our shore fisheries being interfered with and keeping our shore fisheries for our own fishermen, in these directions can the public money be best expended and the interests of our fishermen best protected.

Mr. ELLIS. I desire to draw attention for a moment to the remarks which have been made with respect to the subsidy paid for the steamer from St. John. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Eisenhauer) has pointed out that the vessels engaged in carrying fish to ports in the United States and the West Indies lose greatly by the subsidy paid to this steamer, which carries fish and other goods from St. John, Yarmouth and Halifax to the West Indies. He has stated that as much as \$6,000 worth of goods have been carried in one cargo. The greater portion of such cargo is not fish; and I do not see the force of his argument, even supposing that \$6,000 worth of fish were carried, that the

trade is seriously injured by granting this subsidy to the steamer. The quantity is not sufficiently large to affect the general trade. I am very glad the hon. gentleman does not propose to press his motion. The hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) has stated that the feeling of the House is against bounties. I fail to see that such is the case, for the hon. gentleman and those associated with him in supporting the Government are always ready to vote in favor of a bounty proposed by the Government. I regret the Minister of Marine is not in his place, so that we could obtain some idea, if it were possible to get an idea from him on the subject, of the views of the Government with respect to the fisheries. The main requirement is the adoption of some policy on the part of the Government which will keep the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces in the Maritime Provinces. At the present time a large portion of our fishing population are employed on board of fishing vessels belonging to Massachusetts and Maine. They sail under the American flag, they give their skill to American owners, they possess a knowledge of our coasts and other matters which go to make up a fisherman, and their services are given almost entirely to the United States. The hon. gentleman who has introduced this motion, and some other gentleman living on the Nova Scotia coast, put forth considerable efforts to promote our trade. There is no question whatever, that a large proportion of fisheries carried on in the deep sea, is carried on by colonial fishermen sailing under the American flag. If the Government can reach that point in any way, something good would be done. I believe that the whole question of the fishery bounties deserves to be gone over, and some rectification of it should take place. The amount given in these bounties, and the mode in which it is distributed, does not now fill the bill, whatever it may have done when it was originally granted. I would like the Government to direct themselves to this point, but, so far as the motion of the hon. gentleman is concerned, it would, I think, be better that it should not be pressed.

Mr. KIRK. I do not know what effect the motion of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) will have on the fishermen if it be adopted by the House and carried into effect by the Government. I really do not understand the principle of his motion; but it is quite clear, from the frequency with which this question comes up in the House, that something is necessary to be done in order to relieve the fishermen. It is not many days since we had a resolution before the House respecting purse seines, and we know, as a matter of fact, that the fisheries are becoming more and more a failure, that fish are becoming scarcer every year, and that unless something can be done to assist the fishermen in some way, the result will be, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) has said, that our people will have to leave for the United States to find employment there, instead of engaging in the fishing business in this Dominion. Notwithstanding the aid the Government has given to the fishing industry in the shape of bounties, I notice that there were not as many vessels employed in the fishing business, in the Province of Nova Scotia last year, as there were before that bounty was given. In 1879,

there were 745 Nova Scotia vessels employed in fishing, and in 1888, the last year for which we have returns, there were but 690 vessels so employed. This shows that the assistance given for the purpose, as it is said, of encouraging the building of vessels to prosecute the fishing industry in the Maritime Provinces, has not had the desired effect; at any rate, it has not increased the number of vessels engaged in the fishing industry in the Province of Nova Scotia. That the fishing industry is becoming less profitable every year is quite clear. To-day I presented a petition to the House, signed by about 500 of the fishermen of the county which I have the honor to represent, asking that certain regulations be altered with regard to the lobster fishing. It is pointed out in that petition that the herring, cod and mackerel fishing is falling off year after year, and that the fishermen are more and more driven to the necessity of fishing for lobsters, in order to obtain a livelihood for their families. The reason given for this falling off in the mackerel fishing, by Mr. Bertram, fishing inspector for Cape Breton, is to the effect that purse-seining has been the cause, so far as his district is concerned, and I have no doubt that Mr. Bertram's opinion on this matter is quite correct. The fishermen on the southern coast of Nova Scotia, from Halifax east to the Straits of Canso, complain that the regulation which prohibits them from fishing for lobsters during the summer season is detrimental to their interests. They claim, contrary to the opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the lobsters are not becoming scarcer every year, but the fishermen are obliged to go further out to sea, in order to catch them. It is well known that the lobster is a deep-sea fish, and although they may be scarcer in shallow waters in the harbors than they were in former years, in the deep sea they are as plentiful as ever they were. The regulation with regard to the lobster fishing at present in force, confines the fishermen to practically two months in the year, May and June. These months are so stormy that the fishermen, perhaps, lose one-fourth of their time, and frequently they have not more than six weeks in the year to fish for lobsters, by which to maintain themselves and their families. This regulation is so stringent that the Government have found themselves unable to enforce the law, because it is a well-known fact that on the eastern coast of Nova Scotia, lobsters were taken from the 1st October, every day down to the end of the year. I have not heard that the Government ever interfered with this. It is a well-known fact that some of the fishermen—I will not say all, because there are many who are law-abiding,—but that some of them did, in spite of the law, catch lobsters out of season, and pack them too. They were not packed in their regular canning establishments, because the owners were prohibited from opening their factories, and they did not do so. Some of the fishermen, however, found means by which they could can their lobsters, and they very easily found a market for them. Therefore, I say, the regulation, as it stands now, is practically of no value, for it is so stringent that the Government have found they are unable to enforce it without distressing the people. Although the hon. Minister of Fisheries has already declared in the House this year, that he does not intend to allow fishermen to catch lobsters in the fall of the year, I think the

Government had better reconsider that determination, and allow the fishermen to fish for at least six weeks in the fall. The poor fishermen will then have an opportunity of earning something on which their families can subsist during the long winter months. I do not wish to take up the time of the House to this question of the bounty. The Government first adopted the principle of giving the fishermen the interest which would accrue from the four and a-half million dollars obtained from the Americans for the right of fishing in Canadian waters during the twelve years they had that right. It is well known that \$150,000 is not the interest on the four and a-half million dollars; and what I claim is, that if the Government would do as they at first intended, and give to the fishermen in bounties the full interest on this \$4,500,000, they would do their full duty to the fishermen in this matter.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman who has brought this matter to the attention of the House, has stated very correctly that the avocation of the men engaged in our deep sea fisheries, is one which naturally enlists our sympathies. There is an amount of risk, I might also say a tinge of romance, connected with it which appeals to our sympathies. My hon. friend, the gallant member for Shelburne (General Laurie), has also stated that the Government and Parliament of Canada have recognised the claims of the fishermen; and the appeals that have been made on their behalf generally met with the unanimous support of the right hon. Prime Minister and the party which surrounds him, and sometimes—but I regret that I cannot say that their views have been always endorsed by hon. gentlemen who sit on the opposite side of the House. There is no class of our population who, *per capita*, contribute more to the revenue than our fishermen. They are consumers of the productions of our factories; all they require in the way of food and clothing is supplied to them by the millers and the manufacturers of the other Provinces; and their occupation is one which adds materially to the national wealth. Therefore, in addressing the House on this matter, I feel that the House should be indulgent to me because it is a matter of very great national importance. The county in which my hon. friend who has moved this resolution resides, is one of the most prosperous counties in the Province of Nova Scotia, and the fishing industry is the predominating industry in that county. Indeed, it is a great industry in the Province of Nova Scotia, and we all read with pleasure recently that the Lieutenant Governor of the Province, when opening the session of the Local Legislature in reading the address which was placed in his hands by the Local Government, composed of friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, announced that he was happy to say that the fishermen had been prosperous throughout the year, with some slight exceptions. I mention this, because, from some remarks which fell from the mover of this resolution, perhaps inadvertently, one would have almost inferred that the fishermen of Nova Scotia were not in a fairly prosperous condition. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Shelburne that the regulations relating to the lobster fishing on the southern shore of Nova Scotia might with advantage be revised; and I know that the views he has expressed on this subject are the views which

Mr. KIRK,

are entertained generally by practical men throughout the Province. From the early days of our Confederation the fishing interest has always been cared for and watched over by the Government of the right hon. the First Minister, and the Parliament of Canada. Hon. gentlemen know that immediately on the formation of the first confederated Cabinet one gentleman was assigned to the duty of looking after the maritime and fishing interests of this Dominion. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) had charge of that department, which he created, and which, I believe, he conducted in a manner which reflected very great credit upon him. Subsequently, the fisheries were efficiently protected by the Dominion Government, and I think that we may, to some extent, attribute the fishing clauses which were inserted in the Washington Treaty to the energy with which our fisheries were protected by that Government. Hon. gentlemen will remember, looking at this matter historically, that when the right hon. Prime Minister returned from Washington, and submitted to this House, for its approval, that treaty, which secured to our fishermen the free admission of their fish to the United States, it was opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), on that occasion voted against the Washington Treaty. It is true, his colleague, the late lamented Mr. Power, differed with him, and I think Mr. Power was right in doing so; and it is some slight consolation to me, who have to differ occasionally with my hon. colleague, to know that I may be sometimes right, and that my hon. colleague, as in the case of the fishery treaty, may be wrong. I refer to the action of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to that treaty specially, because the hon. mover of this resolution has inserted in it a reference to the disabilities which our fishermen labor under in regard to the duty imposed on their fish going into the United States. That disability, however, cannot have much weight with hon. gentlemen opposite, because their vote on the Washington Treaty showed that they did not value the provision in the treaty stipulating for the free admission of fish to the United States. One hon. gentleman, who still occupies a seat in this House, stated in the debate on that occasion that the free admission of our fish to that country was no very great privilege to us, for the reason that the Americans alone paid the duty. That is an answer to some extent to one portion of the resolution of my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), but I believe the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty were an advantage to the Maritime Provinces and to the men engaged in the deep sea fisheries. Consequent upon that treaty, which was opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, we had not only free access to the American market for our fish, but we had also the Halifax Commission. As hon. gentlemen now listening to me, who were members of this House at the time, will remember, the most prominent members of the Opposition stated broadly that, as regards the Halifax award, nothing would ever come of it—that it was perfectly worthless. Well, Sir, those hon. gentlemen were wrong. It is true that award did not give to Canada the full value of her fisheries, or full compensation for the injuries she had sustained. But the commissioner who represented Canada on that occasion accepted the sum which was pro-

posed, as a compromise for the sake of peace and harmony between the two nations. In this way the Washington Treaty secured to us, notwithstanding the hostility which it met from the political associates and friends of the mover of this resolution, the very sum of money from which the bounty has been paid. I may say, *en passant*, that, as regards territorial rights, that subject was discussed in this Parliament and finally disposed of in 1880, when, on the motion of the right hon. the leader of this Government, the principle was settled that the money belonged to Canada, and that, as Canada had assumed certain obligations in connection with the protection of our fisheries, the money belonged exclusively to the Dominion, and the different Provinces had no special right to it. If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to look up the proceedings of this Parliament in 1880, they will find that by a vote of 120 or 130 against 30—in fact, all the House except the representatives of the Maritime Provinces—that principle was established. In 1882, a bounty was enacted as a recognition of the fishing industry, and the sum of \$150,000, which was then proposed by Sir Leonard Tilley, Finance Minister, as the bounty to be paid, became a fixed and permanent charge. It is a statutory charge, and in this respect its position is entirely different from the position of the pig iron bounty; and, therefore, I quite agree with the gallant and hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie), that there is nothing analogous between the two bounties. I must protest, therefore, in the interests of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, against any attempt being made to establish a similarity between the conditions on which the pig iron bounty stands and those on which the fishing bounty stands. Let us see how Sir Leonard Tilley was met when he introduced the measure which provided for \$150,000 to aid the development of our fisheries in 1882. I do not know that my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) has taken the trouble to read that debate. If he has, he must have found that it was insinuated by hon. gentlemen opposite, first of all, that the money never would be paid to our fishermen; that possibly it might be paid for one year and then the payment would cease. Hon. gentleman will remember that this resolution, which was proposed by Sir Leonard Tilley, was called a political bribe and an election kite, because it happened to be proposed on the eve of a general election. Now, far be it from me to imagine or to insinuate that my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), in making this resolution, is influenced in the slightest degree by partisan or party motives; but it is a curious coincidence that this impracticable resolution should be placed before this Parliament on the eve of general elections in the Province of Nova Scotia; and there is just this risk, that if the resolution had emanated from this side, that if any such measure was brought down by the Government, we would still find in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite some uncharitable people who would say it was a mere political bribe and a mere election kite. Those were the insinuations with which Sir Leonard Tilley's motion was met. Now, Sir, it is a fact that the motion has never been assailed by hon. gentlemen on this side, but I regret that it did not meet with such fair play from hon. gentlemen opposite, as a reference to the

debates to which I have referred will show. In referring to this coincidence, I may say that I did hear from an hon. gentleman, who is very high in the councils of the local party in the Province of Ontario, that we would not have the elections in Nova Scotia until the fishermen came back. I do not know to what extent the fishermen would be influenced by such a proposal as this, but that statement in reference to the date for holding the local elections was made to me very positively before I left Halifax. The object of this bounty was to develop the fisheries of the Dominion, and I think hon. gentlemen will recognise that, in that respect, it has been eminently successful. I find that, in 1868, the total value of our fisheries in the whole of Canada was only \$4,376,000, and that in 1888 they had increased fourfold, and amounted to \$17,415,000. To some extent, I have no doubt that that increase was due to the bounty, and the encouragement which the fisheries received from the vote proposed by the Government led by the right hon. the present First Minister. We are all anxious to develop our export trade, and I find, on investigating our fishery statistics, that we exported from 1874 to 1878 a total of \$27,000,000, and from 1884 to 1888 a total of \$37,000,000. During the years 1884 to 1888, we enjoyed the bounty which hon. gentlemen opposite said was not going to be of any benefit to the fishermen—which they said might be paid one year, but would not be paid another year, and which they called a political bribe and a mere election kite. Our fishermen have had the full benefit of the bounty, and the Government of our Province tells us that they have had general prosperity and there has been a large accession to the fishery business of the Dominion. Allow me for a moment to look at the question statistically and from the standpoint of my native Province, Nova Scotia, which is much more interested in this question than any other. I find that, in 1879, the total value of the fisheries of Nova Scotia was \$5,700,000, and in 1888, \$7,800,000.

Mr. KIRK. You are speaking of the exports?

Mr. KENNY. No; I am speaking of the value of the fisheries of Nova Scotia solely.

Mr. KIRK. How were these values obtained?

Mr. KENNY. I refer the hon. gentleman to page 313 of the Statistical Abstract and Record of Canada.

Mr. KIRK. I know where the hon. gentleman got them, but how did the Government get them?

Mr. KENNY. If the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with the information which we derive from the various Departments and has been compiled in these books, I really cannot tell him where to go for it. If he asks me where I got my information, I refer him to page 313 of the Statistical Record. I think this shows a very gratifying result. From 1874 to 1878, the total value of the Nova Scotia product amounted to \$30,000,000, and from 1884 to 1888 it amounted to \$41,000,000. I think this shows a very gratifying increase, and I think that the fishermen of Nova Scotia will recognise that the bounty which was given to them in 1882 was something more than a mere political bribe and something more than a mere election kite.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 106) respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 99) An Act to incorporate the Owen Sound and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 5) to make further provision as to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.—(Mr. Brown.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TISDALE. I beg to move that the Committee rise.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Committee rises I should like to make a few remarks on this Bill. I think the Committee should apply itself to consider the clauses of this Bill, to amend the clauses, if it should be found wise to do so; but to ask the Committee to rise when so important a Bill as this is before it—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When it cannot fly.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Bothwell is always witty. I think the Committee should apply itself to this Bill for the reason that I have looked carefully through it, and I cannot find that there is in the Bill any attack on real sport. Nobody in this House has more sympathy than I have with real sport, but there is nothing more antagonistic to real sport than false sport—sport that has not the conditions that real sport should have, and which when indulged in, hits at real sport in two ways. In the first place it takes away the man from the indulgence of real sport, destroys the taste for real sport, and withdraws from real sport the time and the attention that would otherwise be given to it. Now, the word "sport," like the word "manly," or the word "gentleman," or any other word in the English language, can be abused. Sport such as hunting the fox, or shooting, going off for a run over the stubble—that is sport calculated to invigorate the frame, to give courage, to give readiness, to give quickness, and develop all those faculties, physical, intellectual, and even moral, that have made the English, the Irish, and the Scotch, aye, and the French people, the heroic peoples they are, capable of fighting in war, full of resource, full of activity, with iron frames, capable of enduring fatigue—that, Sir, is a sport we should always encourage. Sir, I am going to take the Committee into my confidence, and tell it that I attribute the excellent constitution that I have to the fact that in my boyhood I was an eager sportsman. But did sport consist in taking a trap—

Mr. TISDALE. You have got too old now.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says that I have got too old for that sort of sport. I am not too old for it; if I had two months in Ireland, or England, I would be as ready to follow the hounds to-day as I ever was. Sir, what sort of sport did we indulge in when I was addicted to those lighter enjoyments of life?

Mr. MITCHELL. Don't ask us.

Mr. DAVIN. We hunted the fox, or we went shooting. If you hunt a fox you have to be a good

Mr. KENNY.

rider, you have to endure fatigue, you have to cross the country on a good mettled steed; and you develop those qualities that, if your country were ever to call on you, would enable you to go into the field of war. Again, if you go shooting you also develop those qualities that give endurance, physical and moral.

Mr. MITCHELL. Moral?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, Sir; moral qualities. My hon. friend, the leader of the third party, is so delicate in his perceptions of the nice relations that exist between all members of the human family, that he seems to think that the word "moral" is confined to one relationship, but I can assure him that it has a wide range; and when my hon. friend passes across the House and leads a Government, I have no doubt whatever, that, should any measure like this come before the House, he will give it his consideration, as I understand, he expects to give to this. Now, there is an element in real sport that is most important, that is to say, you give the animal that you hunt a chance for its life. Suppose, for instance, that my hon. friends, who are so bent upon killing pigeons, wanted some real sport, let them come out west, let them bring their dogs, and we will give them coyotes to hunt. These coyotes are very quick, and it will try all their breathing power. My hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale), who has just interrupted me, can fight gallantly. I know he can do so in an election, and if he can hunt as gallantly as he can fight in elections, I should like to be with him for a day's sport; and if he brings his dogs out to the west, we will give him the coyotes to hunt, we will give him the wolves to hunt, and after he has hunted these with dogs for three or four hours a day for a month or so, I will venture to say, that he will come back having added ten years to his life, and thus having conferred an incalculable benefit on Canada. Well, Sir, I was saying that there are two things that you must have in real sport. The reflexive influence on the man engaged in the sport should be of a wholesome character; and the animal that you hunt, that you fight with, so to speak, should have fair play. These two principles must be held constantly before you when you ask this question: Is that real sport, is that sport of a legitimate character that men should engage in, and that we, in this House, should look on it with approval? If these two things are wanting, what will be the result? You will have to eliminate from your sport the element of manliness; and when I consider the one feature in this Bill to which my hon. friend has drawn attention, that is to say, the shooting of tame pigeons from traps, I can see no element of manliness in it. There is no exercise of any of those qualities, physical or moral, that I have referred to. The poor pigeon has no chance whatever; it has not a fair deal; and I cannot suppose for a moment that there is any manliness in the spectacle of a man trained to shoot with a deadly aim at a poor pigeon having been placed for a time in a trap and allowed by the pigeon-keeper to escape. Then what is the great aim of those men who engage in pigeon shooting? Why, it is to make a big bag; it is to make a holocaust; it is to have a massacre of these doves; that is, the more you shoot, the greater sportsmen you are at this game. Now, contrast that with the real and legitimate

sports that make men with iron muscles, that give men readiness, that give men strength. On the one hand, you have a fox that is chased—a single animal which has a good chance of escape, and frequently escapes, eluding all the powers of the dogs and all the skill of the huntsman. There is a chance in that case for the life of the animal, and so there are strong qualities developed in that sport. There is hardly an hon. member of this House who is opposing the Bill of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown), who does not condemn any elements of cruelty that are said to be connected with pigeon-shooting at traps. They will say to you that they condemn and would punish twisting the tails of pigeons; they would condemn and punish putting out one eye of the pigeon, in order that it may fly in a given direction, because these skilful trappers, when they want the pigeon to fly to the right, put out the left eye, and if they want it to fly in the opposite direction, they put out the other eye. Sometimes, in order to give pigeons that sufficient wildness or scare which they have lost owing to tameness, they stick pins into them, and, in fact, the tortures to which those little birds are subjected at different times are great indeed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIN. I am far from saying that any hon. gentleman would sanction such conduct; I am far from saying that such conduct would meet with their approval; I know my hon. friends too well, and I know they are humane. But can they prevent those men who have charge of the pigeons, and the gamblers who are betting on the shots, sometimes betting on the pigeons, sometimes betting on the man who shoots, introducing that pestilential element and all its foul accessories into this sport? My hon. friends raise a laugh when I talk about gambling being introduced. They laugh and flaunt and jeer when I talk of that, partly because they are conscious they would not stoop to anything so vile themselves. But every hon. member, if he is in a candid mood, will admit that you cannot have a sport of this kind, once gambling is admitted into it—and gambling attends it as its shadow—without having all those surroundings that cling to and disgrace even the sports that might be considered legitimate. Take, for instance, horse-racing. Horse-racing is, in my opinion, a legitimate sport. But even a sportsman like the late Lord Derby, who was fond of running his horses and kept a stable, but never bet himself, could not keep away even from his own horses the pestilential influence of those men who were engaged in betting on horses. We know very well, that horses have been made ill before the day of the race, in order that men who had bet heavily against them might win. And, in the same way in regard to pigeon-shooting. Those gentlemen who are hon. members, and would hesitate to see cruelty of any kind practiced, cannot prevent rascals and ruffians appearing on the scene, and, in spite of themselves, perpetrating what they abhor. Let me point this out about the pigeon-shooting: There are, even about inanimate things, certain elements that create sentiment in the human mind. The form of a flower, some delicate shrub, the color of the horizon, will beget a certain sentiment in sensitive minds; and, in the same way when you go higher in the

scale and come to the lower animals, as we call them, there are certain animals, which, in sensitive minds, will create a suitable sentiment. Take these little birds—the dove, the pigeon. You cannot look at one of these graceful and beautiful birds, if you have a mind properly constituted, and a mind of due sensibility, without having a suitable sentiment of sympathy, a sense of its ineffable grace, of its beauty; and to think of those little birds being imprisoned in order that gentlemen may drive to a certain point—a “hot corner” as they call it in England—and there fire at them as they escape from those traps, is revolting to the human mind. Escape how—with what feelings? With feelings of dread and of torture, in consequence of the imprisonment to which they have been subjected. I grant that the shooting of a dove, if it is killed immediately, is no cruelty. I give that admission to those hon. gentlemen who are opposing my hon. friend's Bill. But what is the state of that little bird before the shot is fired, and afterwards? Before the shot is fired it is imprisoned sometimes for hours. Does it suffer no torture in that prison house? We know now that, although a little bird or any of the lower animals may not have as an extensive surface of sensibility as a man, it has its own sensibility, it is capable of torture, pain and sorrow. Take the dog. We know very well that a dog will grieve almost with human tenderness for the life of a master or mistress. And so it is when you go down the scale. A bird has been known to be so fond of its master or mistress that the loss of one or other has caused its death, showing that those little lives have within the narrow scope of their existence a deep-seated tenderness, and that they are capable of great mental pain. It is all very well to jeer and to laugh; but I say this to hon. gentlemen, that this is a subject which, from their point of view or from any point of view, must be discussed seriously, and it is worthy of being so discussed in this Parliament of Canada, the first Parliament, after the Parliament sitting in Westminster, in the Empire; and if they want this Committee or this House to approach this subject with the least sympathy for their views, they must discuss it seriously. The Imperial Parliament in 1883 discussed this question, and I find that some of the first sportsmen in England and in Ireland expressed their views. Take Colonel King-Harman, one of the finest sportsmen I ever saw in my life, a man who follows the hounds to this day, and who goes shooting and fishing. He rose in the Imperial Parliament, and said he would not shoot a dove, he would not go to Hurlingham and drive out with the body of gentlemen who drive from London to the place of rendezvous for this ignoble slaughter, because he thought it unmanly. Lord Percy, who also declared himself a sportsman, went to Hurlingham once and shot a pigeon, but he felt so ashamed of himself he would never do it again. Now, I have spoken of the sufferings of a pigeon before and after the firing. But what is seen at these matches? Why, after the match is over, you can go to a trembling heap of half living birds. They are all quivering with pain, and the brutal manager who takes charge of these matters makes no attempt to kill them. How long they remain in torture is no concern of his; his sensibilities are brazen; they are doubly steeled against the least

sensibility for those little creatures. Lord Randolph Churchill is no sentimentalist and no humanitarian. He spoke on this question, and he spoke strongly, and as I admire Lord Randolph a good deal, and as he is a man who generally stands up for what he thinks, I will ask the House to bear with me while I read one or two weighty sentences which fell from the noble lord. Lord Randolph Churchill said :

“ He saw the birds taken out of the basket, and before being put into the trap a man cut their tails with a large pair of scissors. That, probably, was not very cruel, because he only cut the quills, though at times he seemed to cut very close. But worse follows. After cutting the tail, he saw the man take the bird in one hand, and with the other tear a great bunch of feathers from the breast and stomach of every pigeon. On asking the man what he did that for, he replied that it was to stimulate the birds in order that, maddened by excitement and pain, they might take a more eccentric leap into the air and increase the chance of the pigeon gamblers. He saw another very curious thing, too. One of the pigeons was struck, and fell to the ground ; but, when the dog went to pick it up, the wretched bird fluttered again into the air, and for an apprehensible time it remained so fluttering, just a little higher than the dog could jump. While the bird's fate was thus trembling in the balance, the betting was fast and furious, and when, at last, the pigeon tumbled into the dog's jaws, he never would forget the shout of triumph and yell of execration that rose from the ringmen and gentlemen. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of pounds changed hands over the dying agonies of the unfortunate creature. They were told that there was actually no difference between that and other kinds of sport ; but the fact was, a pigeon-shooting now was kept up simply for the sake of betting.”

I need hardly tell you, Sir, that Lord Randolph Churchill is no sentimentalist. I shall now point out what is a far greater evil than the suffering of the pigeon, and what is a far greater evil than the taking away of men, who might be engaged in legitimate sport, to this effeminate and disgraceful pastime. I shall point to the reflexive influence of such scenes, and such sports, on the minds and character of those who engage in them. All history is open to us, to show us what this reflexive influence is on the character of men who engage in cruel sports. We can go back to the times of the decadence of the Roman Empire ; we can go into the arena there, we can see that arena “ ringed around with a flame of fair faces, and splendid with swords,” and we can see the brutal bull-fight, and the gladiators fighting. What was the result of all that ? Were the Romans able to repel the Barbarian, when the Barbarian came. Did the ancient valor of the Roman arms remain ? No, Sir ; it did not. When the Barbarian came he was able to get entrance at their gates, and when the time of trial came these men who could look on torture, dared not look on war. Then, Sir, look at the Spanish Peninsula. We are told of the time when the Spanish galleons floated all over the seas ; when Spaniards were amongst the first seamen, and when they were able to grapple with the warlike marine of England herself, at a time when that marine was commanded by men equal to the heroes of her best days. We are told of the time when the Spaniards were able to contend in a hand-to-hand fight, so to speak, with all the English chivalry of those heroic days. Well, Sir, what has happened ? At that time of her greatness, was it the chief delight of Spaniards to witness bull-fights ? Was it the chief delight of Spanish women to look on these brutal scenes ? No, Sir ; at that time the chivalry of Spain was engaged in quite a different work. When Spain

Mr. DAVIN.

decayed, when she lost her power in war and on the seas, what did she become remarkable for ? She became remarkable for a brutalising sport, something similar to this which we now seek to condemn. If a man goes to Madrid now, the chief thing he wants to see is a bull-fight ; and a friend of mine who was recently there tells me, that now the Spaniards are fighting with tame bulls, just as some of our friends here want to see the sportsmen of this young country (who ought to have all the power, and strength, and manliness of the English race in its best days) fighting with tame pigeons. Spain has decayed, and the degrading bull-fight flourishes there. If you want to fix on one spot of the earth more degraded than another, and where the passions of men get freest play, and where the effeminate inclinations run riot, that one spot would be Monte Carlo. Read about Monte Carlo, and you will find that what moonlight is to sunlight, Hurlingham is to it in pigeon-shooting. You will always find, Sir, that in proportion as men become effeminate, in the same proportion they have degenerated to sports which lack the elements that manly sports should have. We talk about hunting. One of the chief sports of our great forefathers was hunting the wild boar. That was a noble sport. In India, to-day, they hunt the tiger. That is true sport. It is a mimicry of war ; you have an animal that when he stands at bay your life may be endangered, and the man that will face the wild boar or the tiger must have that which Horace said the man must have had who first launched a frail ship on the sea ; he must have a heart bastioned with triple brass. The man must have had a bosom trebly fortified who first faced these raging elements, and the man who faces the boar or the tiger, taking his life in his hands when he enters on the encounter, must also have a stout heart. What happens to that man when he comes away from such sport ? Not merely has his physique been strengthened, not merely have his muscles been steeled, so to speak, but the moral force of the man has been increased, and if he should meet with danger in another form—for instance, if his country should call on him to defend her, then, Sir, that man has been prepared by that sport to enter on her defence. I heard with some surprise, in the course of this debate (I know it is but a *lapsus lingue*) reference made to the sympathy of sentimental ladies with the Bill of my hon. friend from Hamilton. He could have no better omen of success than in the sympathies of the ladies. I know that if I were running an election, and I felt that all the ladies were with me, I would snap my fingers at the men, because I should be sure that it would be all right. It is not merely that women are a great power, and a subtle power ; they are like the atmosphere, they are pervasive. You do not know where their power impinges, but as to the reality of the power of women, why, Sir, no man—well, no man who has a heart—can doubt it. Certainly, no man who has been a student of politics in the past or present can doubt the enormous power of woman. But, Sir, I do not now wish to dwell on that power. What I dwell on specially is this, and it is a good augury for this measure. As a rule, Sir, on a question of this kind the sympathies of women are unerring ; their sympathies are nearly always instinctively on the side of what is right and good ; and I confess that I have always felt myself that they are much better than

we are—that they are in advance of us in their moral feelings. My hon. friends laugh, but there is no laughter about this matter. Any man who observes life, who has observed the past and the present, will agree with me that their sympathies are quicker for good than ours. That is a rough way of saying what a great man, Lord Tennyson, has said in immortal verse; and I say it is of good augury for my hon. friend's Bill that the ladies, according to the confession of those who oppose it, are on his side. Now, Sir, when the ladies are on his side he has a *prima facie* case made out, because it is, after all, the side on which the best instincts of humanity will be found; if that is not the case now in this Dominion, certainly it will be in a few years hence. Now, Sir, I spoke a moment ago about the reflexive influence of cruel sports on men. I did not exhaust that point. If men indulge in cruel sports, they become cruel, and a man cannot become cruel without falling in the scale of humanity. So far as I have read the accounts of those pigeon-shootings, the desire is not to have a struggle with some other force, a struggle of skill or fleetness, but the desire is to kill as many birds as possible; and the reflexive influence of that sport is to make the man who indulges in it cruel, and if he becomes cruel he falls in the moral scale. This is a serious matter, and I am not sure that the demoralisation has not shown itself already in some of my hon. friends, which will account for the laughter with which they have met some of the propositions I have advanced. Now, a man may become callous in witnessing suffering in lower animals, and that will make him callous in witnessing suffering among men; and it would be an evil day for us, at this time in the world's history, if there were to be developed among our people, in any widespread manner, a callousness to suffering. After all, we are not to compare the way in which we should regard a sport like this with the way in which men who had not the blessings of Christianity, or men who believed in a less enlightened Christianity than we do, regarded the sufferings of the lower animals. Christianity, enforcing as it does pity and all the tender qualities of the mind, embraces in our benevolence, not merely men and women, but the whole animal creation; and no man can be said to be a man of refined instincts who can witness the unnecessary sufferings of the humblest of God's creatures without a pang. Sir, we have had to-day in this Chamber a debate—which I am not going to refer to in any unparliamentary manner—with regard to honoring those men who died in defence of Canada. We have had a debate about our duty of attending to the places where their heroic bones repose, and erecting some monuments to their memory. Do you suppose, Sir, that if you could eliminate from men those qualities to which I appeal in this case, there would be any regard whatever for considerations which would lead them to pay any attention to the feelingless bones of the heroic dead? Why, Sir, that is mere sentiment. You cannot suppose for one moment that attention to the bones of a dead hero will do him any good. Do you suppose he can look back from where his spirit may be on anything you may do for certain chemicals which remain, and which once were associated with his life? No, he cannot; and yet it appeals strongly to the highest sentiments in your breast, that you

should not allow those honored bones to be disturbed or to be carelessly exposed. It is but a sentiment; and, Sir, the sentiment which recoils from inflicting pain upon these harmless little lives is just as true to the best instincts of any man as the sentiment that we should care about the bones of our past heroes. Sir, we had in England, something over a century ago, a man who changed the character of our literature, who was foremost in the forces which broke the spell of the mistaken classicism of Alexander Pope, and restored to our literature its original freshness; and that man wrote words which will remain as long as the English language lasts with reference to this very question. The poet Cowper said:

“I would not enter on my list of friends
(Though graced with polish'd manners and fine sense,
Yet wanting sensibility), the man
Who needlessly sets foot upon a worm.”

If this is a true sentiment—and it has evoked from the heart of humanity an echo which will probably last as long as humanity has a heart—a *fortiori* how much more wanting in sensibility—because, after all, that little invertebrate life which is crushed on your path we know cannot feel as much as one of those pigeons must feel—must be the man who, for the sake of making a large score, or killing a large number of birds, or winning a certain sum of money, or proving his prowess in marksmanship, which he could better prove at butts—may, by an artifice to which I will refer presently—will shoot down those innocent creatures; and it is our duty to see that that want of sensibility does not deepen and harden until it does incalculable harm. Now, there is a device which will give my hon. friends all they desire. There is the imitation pigeon, made of clay which is thrown to a certain height. It gyrates just the same as a wounded pigeon would, and I am told by competent marksmen that it tries the skill in firing just as much as would a live pigeon escaping from the trap. If you want to try your skill in firing, fire at this lifeless piece of clay; but if you want to kill, if death should be necessary, then the proper thing is for the Legislature to step in and put its veto on the immoral and degrading sport. If I did not feel deeply on this question, I should not have troubled the Committee. It is not a question in which my pursuits or my studies lead me to take much interest. We are engaged up in the North-West in labors that are foreign to these amusements, and as yet this so-called sport has not obtruded upon us; but, hearing it discussed here from time to time and reading the Bill, my attention was diverted to it. I recall the time I used to visit in London the gun club myself. I saw there what the character of the sport was, and I will say I never saw any of those cruelties of which I have heard. They may have escaped my notice, but Earl Percy and some of the first men in England—you have it here—describe what they actually saw. Lord Randolph Churchill describes what he saw, and I have been told that similar cruelties have been practiced in Canada. I am not, however, incompetent to form an opinion on this subject, because I have, myself, been fond of coursing and hunting in other days, and if I had the time I would indulge in the sport again; but I will say this, that I could never think that there could be any element

of genuine sport in shooting tame pigeons from traps. I make a broader proposition. I say, whether you are dealing with pigeons or not, shooting or hunting any tame animal cannot be called sport. It lacks the first great element of sport, which is manliness. For those reasons, I hope the Committee will discuss seriously the clauses of the Bill, and if those hon. gentlemen who are opposed to my hon. friend will show me any reason for supporting any clause they may propose, I shall be prepared to vote with them; but so long as I see the matter in its present light, so long will I give my support to the principle of the general clauses in the Bill of my hon. friend.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When this same Bill, which is moved by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown), was before the House on former occasions, I always voted for it, and I intend to vote for it now. Not because I have no taste for sport, for I think I can say safely there are few men in this House who have killed more wild pigeons than the humble individual who now addresses you. But there is one thing I can say, that I never yet shot at a poor fluttering dove, which had been confined probably for hours, and let loose all of a tremble, to become the object of my aim. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has dealt with this subject most eloquently. He has shown us the demoralising influence which sport of this kind has upon the human mind and character. So far as we can learn from indications, Providence has given to man all these things for his use, and in exercising that right, it becomes necessary for us to slaughter living organisations; but we also learn that these things were not given to us to trifle with or to torture. I hold that such conduct on the part of human beings is wrong in itself, and has demoralising tendencies on those who indulge in it. Generally the poor bird is shot dead at once, but even when that is the case, that does not do away with the demoralising influence which the hon. member for Assiniboia has so clearly pointed out. Unfortunately, however, there is a marked proportion of these poor birds which are not killed, but simply maimed. I have had many opportunities of seeing that, and am competent to bear witness to it. I have lived for the greater part of my life about a couple of miles from grounds where these matches were held, and my experience, and that of all those who live in that neighborhood, is, that it is nothing unusual to see a poor wounded bird fluttering through the air, and dropping down exhausted, to lie there and die a lingering death from torture. It is nothing unusual to see the poor creatures trying to alight on the farm building with perhaps one leg broken by the shot, or perhaps both broken, and then the poor helpless, crippled thing will fly away again as far as its strength will carry it, only to drop helpless and die. As the hon. member for Assiniboia has pointed out, such methods of sport are quite unnecessary, the object being simply a trial of skill and not to learn shooting, the same result can be obtained just as well by other devices. I am so fond of seeing experts practice with the gun that I have walked out to the far side of this city to see the St. Hubert Gun Club practising. They did not use living birds but clay pigeons, and I have stayed by the hour watching them.

Mr. DAVIN

I know something of these matters, and I say distinctly that this sport is just as exciting as though living birds were used. A great deal has been said in former debates as to this being a manly sport. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has drawn our attention to the sort of manliness which is cultivated by this kind of sport, and I think he was right. Take Spain for example. There, from time immemorial, the habit of bull-fighting has been indulged in, and it was not only patronised by the hardened part of the community, but the most refined gentlemen and ladies did, and do still in some instances, grace these sports with their presence. I need not say that the Spanish national character is not one which its people can be very proud of. It does not seem to have developed in them the elements of national greatness because of the sports which they have indulged in. There is another country lying very close to Spain, and that is France. These sports have never gained a foothold in the habits of the people of France; they have no liking for cruel sports. Has that made the French less manly or less warlike? Are they worse soldiers or worse citizens because of their abstention from such degrading sports? All history shows that they have left traces of their valor on a hundred fields, and we know what they have done in this country by their intrepid courage, by their system of colonisation, and by the courageous conduct of their missionaries who have penetrated every part of this continent in order to carry the Gospel to the heathen. The French people have proved that it is possible to be gentle and to be manly at the same time. I need not point out to this House that the taste of the public and the thought of the public are changing very rapidly in regard to these matters. There was a time in Britain when all this class of sports was indulged in. There was a time when bull-baiting—chaining a bull to a stake and setting dogs to worry him—was popular; there was a time when dog-fighting, badger-drawing, cock-fighting, and other sports of that kind, were considered legitimate sport, in which all classes could mingle without any deterioration to their character. I need not say that that time has gone by, and, it is to be hoped, that it has gone by forever. These things have been interdicted by law. If you take Scotland, perhaps there is no country in the world in which cock-fighting was more indulged in than it was there. Even the late Professor Wilson, who was known as "Christopher North," a man of great learning and of exquisite sensibility, was a great cock-fighter. We find that he kept sixty or seventy birds always on hand, and indulged in cock-fighting whenever he got the opportunity. Even schoolmasters, who had to train the young mind, were addicted to the sport. We find, that on Saturday afternoon, which was the only half-holiday in the week, any boy who had a fighting-cock was expected to bring it to the school, and after school they fought those cocks, and the birds which happened to be killed in fight became the schoolmaster's perquisite. Would that now be tolerated anywhere? The views of men are changing as the poet laureate states:

"The thoughts of men are widening with the progress of the sun."

In our country, if a school-teacher were to engage in a sport of that kind, his engagement

would not be worth a day's purchase. At the last meeting of the Teachers' Association of East Middlesex, in which inspectorate there are over one hundred young men and women engaged in teaching the youth of the country and training their minds, when they met in convention in the city of London, a few days ago they unanimously passed this resolution, which was sent to me by the secretary of the association :

"We, the members of the East Middlesex Teachers' Association, sympathise with the Bill respecting the further prevention of cruelty to animals, introduced by Adam Brown, Esq., M.P., and hope that the members for this county may see their way clear to support it."

That is the opinion of these men and women who are engaged, in East Middlesex, in moulding the young minds in that part of the country. I do not desire to detain the House, but I will now read the decision of a judge in one of the Pennsylvania courts in a parallel case. I have already said that the moral sense of the people in all civilised countries is becoming adverse to the continuance of this class of sports. In many of the States of the Union laws have been passed prohibiting these sports. In Pennsylvania, a law was passed in 1869 prohibiting them, but in 1887 some gentlemen belonging to a gun club wanted a day's sport, and concluded that shooting pigeons from traps should be a part of the programme. Some members of the Humane Society went there and forbade these gentlemen to do so, and one of them, Mr. Lewis, said he would let two birds go in order to test the question. He shot at two birds, one of which was killed and the other wounded, but afterwards killed. The case came before Judge Yerkes, who gave the following judgment :—

"We are inclined, however, to the opinion that all animals, whether noxious or not, which are in the dominion or custody of man, or in his captivity, are comprehended by the Act. But there is an important distinction to be observed, which we will notice when we come to consider the subject between the right to shoot animals while in their natural wild state and when in captivity. It has been said of a statute similar to ours, that it does not define an offence against the right of property in animals, nor against the rights of the animals that are in a sense protected by it. The offence is against the public morals, which the commission of cruel and barbarous acts tends to corrupt. To make out the offence, the commonwealth must show, first, that the pigeon was ill-treated or abused; second, that the manner of the treatment was wanton or cruel. One of the pigeons was wounded, and alighted upon a tree, and as soon as its wounded condition was discovered it was killed. Is it ill-treatment or abuse to wound a living creature so that it lingers in that condition for a period long or short? In the case of the Commonwealth *vs.* Turner, it is intimated that holding a fox in captivity, in the presence of dogs seeking to destroy it, was a circumstance by which suffering by the animal might be inferred.

"The circumstance that all animals, whether domesticated or not, make violent efforts to escape from their natural enemies, or those who apparently would injure them, shows that they are deeply susceptible to the sense of fear, and that they suffer from injuries to their bodies.

"Whoever has observed at a shooting, amidst the heaps of sportsman's victims, the winged and wounded birds, causing the whole mass of dead and dying to quiver and move, by their striving and efforts to crawl away, will not doubt that pain, suffering and torture, follow as the result of wounding them.

"The natural instinct, either for freedom or of fear, would have impelled the bird, which the defendant wounded, to continue its flight had not the pain or exhaustion from the injury prevented. We are clear that this result amounted to ill-treatment and abuse in the meaning of the statute. We cannot undertake to measure the degree of this pain and abuse.

"Was the act wanton or cruel? As I regard the statute, the meaning of these two words, as used in it, is substantially the same.

"A licentious act by one towards another without regard to his rights or whatever is done sportively, loosely, without regularity or restraint, is wanton. Any act unjustifiable by the circumstances is wanton.

"The word cruelly, as applicable to similar statutes, has repeatedly received judicial definition.

"Taking up the question whether there was 'adequate reason or necessity for submitting the pig on to the pain and punishment inflicted upon it,' the judge says:

"According to the finding of the jury it was, primarily, for test of skill in marksmanship; secondarily, to prepare the bird for sale for food."

"In favor of the first, it was urged that this exercise should be encouraged as tending to promote strength and courage. And to render the citizen more official for those services which he may be called upon to render the State in time of war.

"Conceding that those recreations which serve as manly exercises and do not necessarily lead to protracted pain, should be encouraged to develop soldierly qualities, is shooting pigeons from traps the recreation calculated to best promote those qualities? Courage, endurance and steady marksmanship are among the most necessary requirements of the good soldier.

"It would be offensive to any citizen possessed of a spark of manhood to assert that his courage has fallen to so low an ebb as to require the exercise of shooting at helpless tame pigeons to qualify him to meet a foe in mortal combat, unless, indeed, he is lacking in that brutish instinct which inclines men to shed blood notwithstanding the nobler impulse which impels mortals to shrink from the infliction of pain. But we have progressed too far in civilisation to now wish to develop the brutish instincts of men that in time of war they may possibly make better soldiers.

"Neither can it be said that shooting at birds, as they are liberated from a trap, calls for such active exertions as would augment the citizen's capacity for endurance. The open chase, rowing and gymnastics are far better calculated to develop muscular action and strength. As for marksmanship, shooting at the clay pigeon or glass balls, is quite as good a means of testing quickness of the eye in following moving objects. The sportsman who would enter the modern battle-field with the expectation that his agility in using a shot gun at short range would be regarded of value, would be equally disappointed with the small boy with his pop gun.

"The army regulations do not provide for tests of marksmanship with shot guns, but with the rifle and ball. All the States use the rifle range and target practice with fixed ammunition, as the best adapted to train men as soldiers. We are, therefore, bound to conclude, that test of skill at marksmanship is not such a necessary or adequate object as will compensate for the infliction of pain, by wounding pigeons at trap shooting.

"We cannot agree that the demands of fashionable sport warrant the practice.

"In *Ford vs. Wiley, Hawkins, J.*, said that while docking horses might be justified he held a very strong opinion against allowing fashion, or the whim of an individual, or any number of individuals, to afford a justification for such painful mutilation and disfigurement.

"Was it necessary to shoot or attempt to shoot the birds to prepare them for food?"

"The learned counsel for the Commonwealth admitted that the defendant is not answerable for shooting the bird that was innocently killed, because, as the right to kill existed, and as no unnecessary or lingering suffering was inflicted, there was no cruelty under the Act.

"Here is where an important distinction arises, as affecting the manner of killing captive or free animals. The right in man to kill, in order to render the animal more serviceable for his use, is undisputed. Therefore, one may inflict such pain and suffering as may be necessary to kill the animal for his use, as for food, without being chargeable with cruelty. He may shoot or otherwise take animals in their wild state, although it may result in lingering pain, because the animals, not being under his control, it is the only practicable way to obtain their use. In such case the necessity justifies the probable infliction of pain. But when the animal is in captivity man, in the exercise of his right to kill, is required to use such methods, having them in his power, as will avoid unnecessarily prolonged pain. All the cases cited agree to this proposition."

I will not detain the House in reading any more. I will only say that the hon. judge sustained the indictment and found the defendant guilty. In a few minutes we shall be called upon to vote upon this question. I referred to the lines of the poet

aureate to show that men are progressing. I pointed out the increase of kindness and humanity among men, with the increasing predominance of the higher feelings over the lower, all which are against the continuance of the practice aimed at by this Bill. The Bill itself, as it stands upon the paper, may seem but a small matter, but we have to decide the question whether the Parliament of this country represents the feelings of the people, whether Parliament is a fair index of the humanity of the people, and whether the people of Canada are abreast with the best feeling and the best sentiment of the age, or whether we are lagging in the rear.

Mr. BROWN. I ask the indulgence of the Committee while I make some remarks in connection with the subject before us. I was not at all surprised at the proposal of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) in following out the tactics which he pursued on a former occasion, in moving that the Committee rise without reporting. I venture to say that the majority of hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House are disposed to have this Bill sifted and examined in a full House, clause by clause. My hon. friend from Norfolk seems to desire that the Bill should be killed without proper discussion. He has repeatedly stated in his addresses on former occasions that there is no cruelty in pigeon-shooting from traps. When I addressed the House on a previous occasion on this subject, I desired as much as possible to economise the time of the House, and I did not then give the evidence which I had in my desk, to prove the statements which I had made. I am going to give these statements to the House to-night, and to prove from the pens of true sportsmen who are well known in this country, that they denounce the practice of trap-shooting, and while that some of them have followed it, they ultimately became disgusted with the practice. Statements have been made in this House that the practice is not cruel, and that the birds are either killed or retrieved, or if not retrieved by dogs they are lit with sticks or stones by boys. I made a statement on my own authority, that within my own knowledge in the city from which I come, that a mile and a quarter from a shooting match grounds doves were found in the agonies of death. Yet the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) would seek to make this House believe that there is no cruelty practiced, that the birds are killed on the spot by sportsmen, or that they are retrieved by dogs or killed by boys with sticks and stones. Let me read to the Committee a few letters from men who have a right to speak on this question; men who know what they are talking about. I wish to say that I feel deeply and keenly the subject that is engaging the attention of the House to-night. I have thrown my whole energies into this measure, and although I hope for victory on this occasion, yet if the measure is defeated I shall bring it forward again. Here is a letter from Danville, P. Q., addressed to myself, and under the signature of Geo. O. Goodhue, any sportsmen of the Province will no doubt recognise the name. He writes:

"DANVILLE, P. Q., 28th February, 1890.

"A. BROWN, Esq., M. P.,
"OTTAWA, Ont.

"DEAR SIR.—For many years I have devoted a considerable part of each shooting season to the pursuit of snipe, Mr. ARMSTRONG.

woodcock, duck, and partridge and sometimes quail, of this health-giving recreation I am passionately fond, and there are few prominent sportsmen in Montreal or Quebec who shoot game, who have not heard of my skill as a wing shot in these game birds, although they may not know me personally.

"I never attended but one pigeon shooting match and although I killed 23 out of my 25 pigeons, I was heartily ashamed of the whole business and know nothing that would now induce me to try it again, aside from the degrading influences of gambling and liquor which usually to some extent, prevail at these gatherings.—trap-shooting of live birds is in itself entirely indefensible from any fair-minded sportsman's point of view. When we go out after any of the game birds that I have mentioned it is a reasonably fair contest of the skill of man aided by his trusty friends, the keen scented pointer or setter, against the wariness and cunning of the free bird in the full strength of all his powers out in the open field or lake as under the grand old times.

"How different from the murdering of poor, frightened, dazed pigeons suddenly thrown from the darkened trap into the broad glare of the sun: How such degrading work can ever be called sport by any one who knows what sport really is, is beyond comprehension. The plea that pigeon shooting is necessary to prepare young shooters for shooting at game is also totally indefensible. Before the invention of the clay pigeon, this argument might have had some force, but it is now a well known fact among practical shooters that it requires fully as much skill to make a good score at clay pigeons when properly thrown from a first class trap as it does at live birds themselves and besides, the small expense of the former is not to be compared to the cost of live pigeons. There is therefore no possible plea that can be urged in defence of pigeon-shooting except the brutal one of blood which will find no response in any real sportsman's heart. While we like to kill game when in pursuit of it, still we try to do so by giving as little pain as possible, and it is the only way to get the game. How often have I spent a whole hour aided by my good dogs in searching for a wounded bird, the main thought being to put it out of suffering. I trust your Bill to prevent pigeon-shooting will receive such a majority as to convince its opponents of the utter futility of another appeal against the better feelings and enlightened consciences of this country.

"Respectfully yours,

"GEO. O. GOODHUE."

A gentleman living in the Province of Ontario writes:

"Perhaps no man enjoys field sports and the delights of outdoors in Canada more than I do, but how men can enjoy the butchering of birds from the trap, I cannot understand.* * The shooting of pigeons from the traps, is a practice which cultivates a depraved taste, and which cannot be dissociated from a species of cruelty. I used to shoot pigeons from the trap many years ago, and I found that it was means to gambling and the cruel slaughter was something which no man of refined feelings but must surely become disgusted with.* * There are such inventions now, glass balls, clay birds &c., &c., that any person wanting to learn how to shoot ought to show their skill, have plenty opportunity without taking the lives of tame birds, in many places, I am sorry to say, bred for the purpose.* * I think any one attending a pigeon shooting match and see the medium which is generally made for gambling, must, if they reflect at all, come to the conclusion, that it is degrading to the participant and demoralising to the spectator, especially to the useful portion of the community."

I have here a letter from Toronto, pointing out another view of the question. The writer says:

"Pigeon stealing in Toronto has become so general that it is of no use to try to keep fancy birds. Boys steal them in the most barefaced way. They seem to think it no crime, but it is the one thing that starts them on the wrong road. They commence with pigeon burglary when they would be afraid to take anything else. They find a ready market among the shooting gentry and no questions asked. I have known birds worth \$10, sold for 25 cents; what I write about I know for a fact. It may be of use to you,

"Trusting your much needed Bill may carry.

"I remain, yours sincerely,
"F. CASTON."

Here is another letter from Mr. A. G. Chisholm, barrister, of London:

"After referring to the interest that he was taking in the struggle then going on in this honorable House in connection with this subject, and stating that he had been connected with a gun club for a number of years, said: 'During the whole course of this time I have no recollection, although during that time we shot every week in reasonable weather, and sometimes even more frequently that we used live birds. Speaking for myself, I say that better practice can be had from shooting at clay birds now made, using the improved traps, than from live birds, and I have no doubt that if you were to take the sense of the club on the question, they would agree with what I say. Generally, when birds are shot at, for days before, the men who make it their business to organise these shoots, have had the birds cooped up, till they can get a sufficient number to make a success of the shoot, and the consequence is that the poor bird, when put in the trap and released, is in such a dazed condition that it is in no state to take advantage of the wings which nature has provided to take it out of danger. The consequence is that stones, sticks, or whatever is convenient are thrown at the unfortunate bird to compel it to fly and the bird goes off painfully flapping its cramped wings, only to be mowed down by a discharge from the sportsmen. I have never seen the eyes of the birds put out, although I have heard of it being done, but I nearly always saw the tail feathers plucked clean, that the flight of the bird may be more eccentric. I say unhesitatingly, that it is a cruel sport which does not fit one to be a good shot in the field, and should be condemned by law.'"

Here are some testimonies from men who are recognised sportsmen, who have practiced pigeon-shooting from traps until they became disgusted with the practice, and not only with the cruelty attending them but also with the surroundings of gambling. I wish it to be distinctly understood that I know there are many clubs where there is no gambling and no intoxication, and I am not here, while promoting this Bill, to make any charges whatever against any of those clubs. All I say is, and I said it before, that I do not blame the participants so much as the practice under which they are tempted to go to those matches, and as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has said, you cannot disassociate wrong-doing and cruelty practiced in order to secure the objects of those interested, so long as you have gambling connected with it. With reference to gambling, I may say that on Long Island the other day a pigeon match was held at which \$16,000 were staked in bets for the slaughter of poor innocent doves. One man bet \$5,000, another \$3,000, another \$1,000, and another \$100 against a bottle of wine, and so on. These great sportsmen, who claim to be sportsmen stand at their ease there, while these poor birds, dazed from confinement—if nothing worse is done—fly into the full glare of the light. But there is no use saying that nothing worse is done; we know that worse has been done, and what has been done in the past will be done in the future. I would be the last man to say that any hon. gentleman in this House who opposes this measure, would be a party to preorganised cruelty to the bird in putting it into the trap. But they cannot shut their eyes to the fact that cruelty has been perpetrated and will be perpetrated in the future, so long as trap-shooting is allowed. We are seeking, by the introduction of this measure, to effect a good for our country; we are seeking to begin with the tuition and the education of the young people of the country, to abominate and execrate any practices which will cause cruelty to the meanest and lowest of God's creatures. No truer statement can be made, than that the first lesson a child learns, be it for good or for evil, remains with it, and I can tell you, that of all the lessons which can be taught

in infancy to the child will take a deeper root than that which teaches kindness to animals. That principle is buried in the heart in future scenes in after life. The member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) in his address the other night in connection with this debate, made sneering and satirical remarks in reference to certain ladies who have chosen to lend their assistance towards the passing of this Bill. He spoke, I quote his own words, of "a number of sentimental ladies, bless their dear hearts," writing letters in favor of "dear Mr. Brown's Bill." He said something about "their precious little hearts, and their dear tenderness of heart," and then again he said "that the only reason why the Bill would be passed was that the ladies were asking members to vote for 'dear Mr. Brown's Bill.'" Again, with very questionable taste, the hon. gentleman chose to make satirical remarks on the names of two most intelligent and most amiable public school teachers of the city of Hamilton, which was altogether unbecoming, not only from a member of this House, but from any one else. I tell the hon. gentleman that I am proud that this measure has secured the sympathy of women. I believe, as firmly as I ever believed anything in my life, that in any movement for the good of humanity, if we have the sympathy of the women of the land with us we may depend that we are right. My hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and my hon. friend who looks at me now (Mr. Bergin)—

Mr. BERGIN. You need not refer to me.

Mr. BROWN. I am not referring to you, in this debate, it was to your remarks of last session and I want to touch you up a bit. My hon. friend must remember that when he chooses to sneer, and to cast ridicule on the influence of the women of Canada, he must remember that the Queen of England has set this noble example to the whole world. She made the statement that no civilisation was complete which did not include in it mercy and kindness to the lowest and meanest of God's creatures. When my hon. friend makes satirical remarks on the influence of the ladies, he must remember that he has to begin with the Queen of England, great as a queen, but greater still in the true nobility of her womanhood: the virtues which adorn her character become her better than her crown. The less the hon. gentleman says in reference to that influence in supporting this measure, the better. While I am proud that I have had the support and sympathy of all the humane hearted women, from ocean to ocean, with this measure, I am as proud that I have had the support of all the humane people of Canada. The press has spoken of it, and I will venture to take up the time of the House while I read one or two extracts, I have a score of them, from newspapers on this question. I wish the hon. leader of the third party was in his place, for I intend first, to read an editorial from that distinguished journal which he controls, the *Montreal Herald*. In the course of a very admirable article on the subject, the *Herald* states:

"This is a question which cannot be made a party one, and therefore every member will vote as he thinks. It is to be hoped that in defence of pigeon-shooting from traps the sacred word 'sport' will not be used. Nor will it be possible to defend it on the ground of improving anything. It is simply, avowedly and unmistakably a vehicle for matches and handicaps for money. Clay pigeons would do equally well. Some people say that glass balls

are a sufficient substitute; but they are not, for at present they can be thrown only directly, and therefore do not in any way resemble the flight of a bird. But clay pigeons or stuffed birds flying round a revolving post do answer the purpose. Pigeon-shooting at Hurlingham in London and other places was stopped, and, generally speaking, the idea is gaining ground that shooting birds from a trap lacks the first and essential element of sport—that of allowing the thing pursued to use its instinct of self-preservation—and is altogether unnecessary cruelty. Trap-shooting is about on a par with coursing hares in an enclosed field, an amusement which attracts the roughest of the roughs, but which disgusts those who delight in coursing proper. If there is any reasonable argument to be advanced in favor of pigeon-shooting from traps, we shall be glad to hear it. At the same time, something might be advanced in favor of tying up a cat to be worried by ferriers."

The *London Free Press* says:

"It is a cruel form of entertainment, if entertainment it be. Most people will incline to the view that it is the betting and prize list which form the chief attraction, rather than the recreation which is afforded. There is no relation between genuine sports, with their vigorous exercise in the forest and by the stream, and these back yard shooting competitions. Happily, trap-shooting is on the decline, as much because of the opposition of popular sentiment as anything else."

My hon. friend from North Middlesex quoted the decision of Judge Yerkes of Pennsylvania, on a case which was brought before him in connection with the shooting of a pigeon from a trap. That decision shows conclusively that cruelty does exist in trap shooting. In a pigeon match, it is presupposed that some birds will be killed, that some will be wounded and that some will escape. There is no use of any hon. gentleman pretending that all the pigeons are killed, because they are not, but they are subjected to great suffering. I have in my possession a letter from a gentleman who is conversant with shooting matches in Canada, and he declares that the practice of putting Cayenne pepper into their eyes, in order to make them eccentric in their flying, so as to increase the difficulty of the shooting, has prevailed in Canada. I am far from stating that the clubs in Ottawa, or any of the clubs in Canada, are guilty of anything of that kind; but that is the statement, and what has been done may be done. Now, we have been told by hon. gentlemen that they have a strong sentiment from the country at their back in opposition to this Bill. I do not deny that they have presented many petitions to this House, and I will not in any shape or way disparage those petitions; but I may be permitted to criticise the prayer of the petitions. One hon. member has chosen to criticise the prayer of a petition in favor of the Bill; he says it simply prays that a Bill may pass for the further prevention of cruelty to animals. Well, that is a very proper prayer; but let us see what is the prayer of the petitions prepared by my hon. friend, or by one of his friends, and sent through the country to be signed. Listen to it for a moment. It says:

"That your petitioners are informed that certain persons are seeking to obtain amendments to the law for prevention of cruelty to animals for the purpose of preventing the shooting of certain birds."

Now, it was for the preventing of the trap-shooting of certain birds. Then they say:

"That gun clubs and sportsmen take pains to avoid the practice of any cruelty in regard to birds used in trap-shooting, and that with modern close-shooting guns, birds are usually killed instantaneously, but if wounded, are retrieved and killed with the least delay possible."

Now, I am not going to say that some of them are not killed; I am not going to say whether they

Mr. Brown.

kill many or kill few; but I say this, that if only one bird out of five or ten is left to flutter away and fall on the roof of some barn at a distance to die in agony, the principle is the same, and this House should stamp with its condemnation any such barbarous and degrading practice. Listen further to what they say:

"That the use of the birds mentioned for trap-shooting affords the only efficient and comparative humane means of checking their increase."

Whoever heard the like of that?

"That to stop such shooting would be a great and unwarrantable interference with the business of those engaged in the gun trade and manufacturers and dealers in shooting materials."

Here we have the opponents of this measure coming down to this base and low level, and saying that you must continue to permit a degrading and brutal sport, because if you do not, you are interfering with the manufacturers of guns and shot. Let me tell my hon. friend that since this discussion commenced, I had a visit from a gentleman who manufactures shot in the city of Montreal, and he said to me: "Mr. Brown, I came up last Session and did a good deal of lobbying against your Bill; the boys got me up, and it had to be done." There was a good deal of that done by "the boys" last Session. Last Session they had some fun in connection with this measure, but the days of fun are past. This gentleman told me that he was not going to take any further steps to oppose the Bill, that, as a matter of fact, if it passed, he would sell less shot, but that he was entirely with me on the morality of my measure and he would be done with it. Another shot manufacturer in Montreal told me that he opposed this measure, and had lobbied members and had done all in his power to defeat it last year, simply because those to whom he sold shot had asked him to do it; but this year he told me: "Mr. Brown, I tell you distinctly that you are right in the stand you are taking; whether I sell or do not sell, the moral position you take is the right one." I know there has been an active lobbying in opposition to this measure, both inside and outside of the House. I have no fault to find with that although I might if I choose. One of the parties in the Province of Quebec hoped I would not be too severe on them for their interference. I have had a hard battle to fight in connection with this matter, but my hon. friends in this House have stood nobly by the measure. But when people talk of the member for Hamilton and his pigeon-cranks, they must remember that ninety-one members of this House who voted for the second reading are cranks if I am one; and they have as good a right to exercise their judgment on a matter of this kind as those who think differently from us. There has been a great deal of misconception and misunderstanding about this Bill. One hon. gentleman tried to cast ridicule upon it, saying that under it a man could be fined \$50 because he turned out a cat on a cold night. Let hon. gentlemen view this matter in a serious light; let them view it in the light in which it is presented here. I do not come before this House with any proposal for an Act which is going to be of no benefit to the country. I ask you to pass an Act which the testimony of the whole country, with the exception of this little interest, declares will be productive of good. My hon.

friend has chosen to say in his speech—I hope he is prepared to substantiate it—that the petitions sent down to me from Toronto were hawked around the streets by a few small boys. The petitions that came to me from Toronto were signed by the faculty of Trinity College, and by the faculties of four other colleges, by the public school teachers, by the judges, and by the most prominent men in the city; and I ask how an hon. gentleman could have the audacity to rise in this House and say that these petitions were hawked about the streets by a few small boys? When he goes to Toronto, let him try to prove to these people that a few small boys were able to get their signatures, and I fancy he will soon get an answer that he will not relish. The petitions from the city of Toronto would be an honor to any measure ever introduced into this House. The petition that came from St. John, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) and my hon. friend (Mr. Skinner) told me, was the most influentially signed petition they ever saw. I am not going to speak of that which I presented from my own city, except to say that it was very influentially signed, and I will also admit that the one presented by my hon. colleague also bore the signatures of many prominent people. I cast back with scorn the imputation of the hon. gentleman that the petitions in favor of the Bill were not obtained in a regular manner. I have presented petitions in favor of this measure to the number of fifty-five, containing about 3,900 names, which must be evidence to the House of the strength of feeling which exists in the country in its favor. Archdeacon Farrar, one of the greatest authorities in England, and a man of great learning, has had occasion, in the course of his public duties, to refer to the cruel sport of killing for killing's sake. When the lower creation was placed under man's control it was not so placed for mere sport and wanton killing, but for the needs of man, and wherever that killing is due to any other cause than the needs of man, the person who kills incurs a responsibility beyond conception. Archdeacon Farrar, speaking of the disgraceful sight which he beheld, and which he said still haunted him, when he saw a number of harmless birds lying in a confused mass on the sand, their white plumage tinged with blood, sacrificed and tortured, to furnish a day's amusement, under the guise of senseless, miserable sport, said:

"Not once or twice only, at the seaside, have I come across a sad and disgraceful sight—a sight which haunts me still—a number of harmless sea-birds lying, defaced and dead, upon the sand, their white plumage red with blood, as they had been tossed there, dead or half-dead, their torture and massacre having furnished a day's amusement to heartless and senseless men. Amusement! I say execrable amusement! All killing for mere killing's sake is execrable amusement. Can you imagine the stupid callousness, the utter insensibility to mercy and beauty, of the man who, seeing those bright, beautiful creatures, as their white immaculate wings flash in the sunshine over the blue waves, can go out in a boat with his boys and teach them to become brutes in character by finding amusement—I say, again, dehumanising amusement—by wantonly murdering these fair birds of God, or cruelly wounding them, and letting them fly away to wait and die in lonely places."

In the city of Paris, in France, a few years ago, in one of the great public gardens, a man who had been so kind to the wild birds there that they would light on his hands and feed from his

fingers. In the city of Venice, in Italy, the people fed the pigeons every day at noon, in the great public square of Saint Mark, and when it is near the hour of noon, you will see the pigeons flying from all parts of the city, over the roofs of the buildings, to be fed. It is a crime in Venice to harm a pigeon. Walter Von Vogelweide, the great lyric poet of the middle ages, so loved them that he left a legacy to the monks of Wurtzburg, on condition that they should every day feed the birds on the tombstone over his grave. As I stated a little while ago, in condemning trap-shooting matches, the Bill has a wider scope than that. It provides for kindness to animals in general. The humane societies which have been started in this country and England, are doing a great deal of good. In all our cities in which these societies have been established, those who have to do with horses and cattle, understanding that if they are unkind and cruel to the animals under their charge, they will be punished, are more careful in their treatment of the brute creation than they were formerly. In Hamilton, now that they understand clearly what the society requires, the Street Car Company will not work any horse which has a galled shoulder, and in Toronto, I am pleased to see, that there is a great body of men who favor every description of kindness to animals. The Hon. Frank Smith, a gentleman for whom every man in this House, on both sides has the highest respect, has a good deal to do with the street railway and he says:

"Regarding the treatment which our horses get, it is as follows: They are only worked not quite four hours out of the twenty-four—not quite twenty-four hours in a week; they get all they can eat; are well cleaned and groomed; a first-class bed and warm stable in winter; their food is of the choicest kind that can be procured, and their owners give them every attention and care possible; in fact they are better provided for than are a large portion of human beings known as servants."

I draw attention to this matter because I feel bound to do so. There are brutes in human form who do not treat their horses in the same way, and it is to deal with these men that this Bill is introduced. As I have already said, we never can repay the debt we owe the horse or any domestic animal. I might add that we can never repay the debt we owe the dog, for its fidelity and attachment to us, yet there are brutes in human form who would lash a dumb animal, whose suffering is all the more piteous because it is mute. The same fellow who would do that to a dumb animal would not do it to a man servant, because he might retaliate, while the mute and patient beast would not. All we ask is that acts of cruelty which are not already provided for by law should be so provided. Some of my hon. friends belonging to the legal profession ask what I contemplate. They say that, if a bird is caught wounded a mile or two away from the place where it was shot, the law would help us. What a long chase it would be for my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) to run a mile or two when some one had wounded a pigeon, and to trace the so-called sportsman while the pigeon that had escaped was fluttering and dying in agony. We have to go to the root of the matter. There must be in the minds of some hon. gentlemen a misapprehension as to the provisions of this Bill, because it seems to be supposed to have a wider scope than it has. This Bill describes

what an animal is, and proposes to put a stop forever to trap-shooting. In Australia, where they have a very good idea of things, the board of education for Victoria, in one of their annual reports to the Governor, thus refer to the discouragement which they have given to the school boys' cruel habit of destroying birds :

"Considerable mischief having been caused by the wilful destruction of birds and plants by children, we have issued a circular calling the attention of teachers to the subject; and in the case of our model schools, we have directed that the masters shall frequently assemble the children, for the purpose of pointing out to them the wrongfulness of such conduct; and we have further ordered, that any boy so offending shall be expelled from the school."

I have endeavored to show the objects we have in view in connection with this Bill; I have endeavored to show the cruelty which is practiced by trap-shooting, and I have shown that the objects of this Bill are in the direction of everything which is humane and good. I will not at this stage detain the Committee very much longer; but I hope that, when this matter comes to be decided by the Committee, they will take a reasonable view of the matter. I regret, from unavoidable circumstances, that the House is so thin, as I desired a full House for the discussion. I know that this Bill has caused a good deal of excitement, perhaps more than was necessary, amongst hon. gentlemen here. I have endeavored to be calm throughout the whole of this discussion and this contest. I felt that I had right on my side, and any man who feels that he has right on his side, although he may not succeed, feels that he can struggle on and battle for that right with a stout heart. I have done that in regard to this matter, and I hope that, when the Committee take a calm and dispassionate view of the whole subject, they will render a verdict which will show that the sanction of the law will be given to everything which tends to educate the people in the line of loving kindness and mercy to those who cannot plead for themselves. Again, I appeal for consideration for dumb animals, and I hope I shall not have spoken in vain and that the sanction of law will be given to sustain gentleness and mercy to the weak and reverence for the life of even the lowest of God's creatures.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not rise to speak in favor of the resolution that the Committee do now rise. My feeling in regard to this Bill, as in regard to other Bills, is that it should be treated with respect and consideration. But in reference to the question which has been discussed throughout this evening—that is the question of pigeon-shooting from traps—I desire to say a word or two. Whether we agree or not with all that my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Brown) has said on this subject, we will all agree, I think, that he has introduced this Bill from the very best possible motive, and has conducted the discussion from first to last with the best possible temper and the greatest possible courtesy. For my own part, I must confess that I have a little difficulty in opposing my hon. friend almost in anything, and especially in a matter of this kind, where he is engaged in what is really a good work, a work of benevolence, a work of mercy to dumb, innocent creatures; but, so far as this particular matter which we are at this moment discussing is concerned, I am, for my own part and according to my lights, constrained to oppose him

Mr. BROWN.

in regard to this clause of the Bill in reference to pigeon-shooting from traps which is the one that has taken up the consideration of the House during this evening. I do it for this reason, that, if we decree, on the score of cruelty, that it shall be unlawful to shoot a pigeon as it flies out of a box or a trap, it will be impossible for us consistently to stop there. Hard-hearted and cruel it is, I admit, to find pleasure in a sport which involves the taking away of the life of a harmless creature; but I say that, if on that ground we decree that it shall be unlawful, we cannot consistently stop there. Because upon precisely the same ground almost every field sport which involves the taking away of life must also be declared to be unlawful. A great deal has been said about the cruelty incidental to trap-shooting of pigeons; a great deal has been said about the mutilation of pigeons, the torturing of pigeons, the putting out of the eyes of pigeons, and the pulling out of their tails—all of which are atrocious acts. It would be perfectly right for us to deal with that, because we have already stated that it is wrong to torture any animal. But the torture of pigeons is not necessarily a concomitant of shooting them from traps. That matter was tested in the mother country, and it was decided there that the shooting of pigeons from traps was not necessarily cruel, and that this torture, in regard to which a great deal of eloquence has been unnecessarily employed, could be dealt with separately and by itself. And that, I think, is what we ought to do in this case, in order to be consistent. But I say it is no more cruel to shoot at a pigeon as it flies from a box or trap, than it is to shoot at the same pigeon as it flies out of a tree, or any other pigeon that flies out of a tree; I say it is much less cruel than it is deliberately to level your gun at your victim and calmly to murder it as it sits in trustful confidence, looking at you from a branch of a tree; I say it is not at all so cruel as it is to set your relentless sleuth hounds upon the trail of a noble deer, and while he is putting forth all his splendid power of fleetness to free himself from the fangs of the dogs that are in full cry upon his track, to conceal yourself, rifle in hand, by a runway, and shoot him through the heart from your ambushade; I say that is much more cruel than to shoot a pigeon as it flies out of a box or trap; I say it is much more cruel, to slip two dogs upon a poor little hare, the most timorous, probably, of all God's creatures—I do not speak of hares enclosed in a field, as I think my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Brown) did, I speak of hares in the open—to slip two dogs upon a hare and to stand by and watch her struggles, her futile struggles, her desperate struggles, for dear life, to stand by and to take pleasure in watching this, to watch her straining desperately, all in vain, to escape those dogs that are pursuing her, to watch her windings and her turnings, all in vain, until at last you hear, coming down the wind, the strange and human-like cry that tells you that her race is run and her sufferings are at an end; I say that is very much more cruel than it is to shoot a pigeon as it flies from a trap. Now, the mere killing of the hare by the dogs, the worrying of the hare by the dogs, is of itself much more cruel. In all probability the hare suffers very much more in the jaws of the dogs than the pigeon does when

it is shot, and still that is a small part of the sufferings of the hare. So desperate are her struggles to escape that it is well known that if she has had a hard run, even if she does escape, she seldom survives. She almost invariably dies merely from the effects of the physical exhaustion; on dissection it will be found that her lungs are almost filled with blood and lymph. From this we may form some idea of the agony endured by the hare from the mere excess of physical exertion, in her frantic efforts to escape. But I say that even that is as nothing, and vanishes altogether from the consideration of the matter, when we have in view the mortal agony of terror she endures when she feels, in spite of all these desperate struggles, in spite of all her straining to escape, that the dogs are surely closing in upon her. I say it is, in my opinion, absurd to attempt to argue for one moment that in the case of a pigeon, fired at as it flies from a trap, the cruelty is anything when compared with the cruelty of coursing a hare in the open, not in a closed field. Then, if that be so, how can it be consistently urged that it shall be considered so monstrously cruel and so wicked to shoot a pigeon as it flies from a box or trap, that a man shall be subjected even to imprisonment, while another is allowed to carry on these other sports without let or hindrance, which are very much more cruel than pigeon-shooting? The fact is that pigeon-shooting—I do not speak of the abominations which have been referred to by my hon. friend beside me, and by my hon. friend opposite; I speak of pigeon-shooting from traps, such as it is known in this country, and such, as I believe, it has become in the mother country since the law dealing with that species of cruelty has come into existence—I say that in point of fact such pigeon shooting is one of the least cruel of sports involving the destruction of life. Certainly shooting is very much less cruel than hunting, and the thing connected with shooting, which involves the most cruelty, the most suffering, is the escape of the wounded birds to die in agony, as the hon. member for Hamilton has just mentioned. That is reduced to a minimum in the case of pigeon-shooting, because, while in the case of shooting wild birds, many wounded birds escape; in the case of pigeon shooting, as I said, there is an opportunity of reducing it to a minimum by reason of that fact that there are many people around the ring who put these wounded birds out of pain at once. Therefore, I say it is one of the least cruel of the so-called sports. Now, for my own part, I would have no pleasure in shooting pigeons from traps. I have never fired at a pigeon flying out of a trap in my life, it is not at all likely that I will ever do so; but I know I should very much enjoy other field sports which are much more cruel, from my point of view, at least, than trap-shooting. I think that we ought, in dealing with such a matter as this, have in mind the advice given to us by our old friend Hudibras, when he tells us that we ought to take care that we do not

“Compound for sins we are inclined to,
By damning those we have no mind to.”

It seems to me that there is a good deal of that in connection with the arguments which we hear bandied about in reference to this shooting of pigeons from traps. The time may come when it

will be considered immoral to pursue any of the field sports involving the death of an animal. The time may come when all field sports shall be considered immoral. That is really the question that we are here face to face with. That question is a very large one, and a very wide-reaching one; it is the question which is necessarily involved in this discussion. My hon. friend who spoke last clearly enough brought this proposition to the surface, because he quotes as a portion of his argument from Archdeacon Farrar when he laid down the proposition that, unless it were necessary, all killing of the lower animals was wrong. Now, that is a logical proposition, and it is perfectly consistent. I think this House would be perfectly consistent to lay down such a proposition as that, if it felt so inclined. But that is a proposition which will include, I think, this consequence among other propositions which are also far-reaching. Among other propositions which it will include is this: That it is immoral to eat animal food at all, except just in sufficient quantity to maintain the human frame in health and strength. That is a proposition which will necessarily follow from the other. It is quite clear, at all events, that the man who eats animal food for the mere pleasure felt in the eating of it, is pandering to a very much lower appetite than the huntsman who indulges his passion for the chase. The difference is just that between the eagle that strikes his quarry among the clouds, and the vulture that batters upon the carcasses of the slain. It does seem to me that it is illogical, that it is inconsistent, to say that we shall fine and imprison a man for firing at a pigeon as it flies from a trap while another man shall be allowed to shoot an unfortunate partridge which is sitting upon a branch of a tree, or a pigeon sitting upon the roof of his own barn, the all sufficient excuse in this case for the sportsman being that he wishes to add to the pleasures of his table, to batten upon the dead body of his victim, and perhaps to fill his stomach to repletion. I do not think that it is a legitimate conclusion for this House to arrive at, and I, therefore, shall feel it my duty, when the clause comes up, to vote against it. The time may come when all field sports may be considered immoral, though I believe, notwithstanding all my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has said so eloquently, when that time comes, the day of national degradation will not be very far distant. My hon. friend has spoken of bull-baiting in Spain, and he has drawn an argument from the fact that the Spaniards, who are now indulging in bull-baiting, do not hold the commanding position among the nations of the earth, they held in former days. But I do not think that argument is altogether sound, and for this reason: When England was in the zenith of her glory, strength and manhood, bear-baiting, bull-baiting and cock-fighting prevailed. For my own part, I think that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) is doing a good work in taking up the cudgels in defence of our dumb friends, a work in which, I think, he should be supported; but, so far as regards this particular matter, pigeon-shooting from traps, I think he has been altogether led astray. If there is any special cruelty in connection with the matter, if any one is so atrociously wicked as to torture these birds, by all means punish him with the utmost rigor of the law, and, if the law is

not sufficiently rigorous, let us make it more so, but do let us try to be consistent.

Mr. GUILLET. I had hoped that the hon. members opposed to this Bill, would have been prepared to justify the motion made, that the Committee rise without any progress being made with the Bill, the object of which motion is simply to kill it. That is not a sportsmanlike act; it is not fair play to seek to prevent the House giving a fair and free expression to its views on this Bill, but it is an attempt to take a mean and unfair advantage of the fact that a number of hon. members who favor the measure are absent for good cause. I had expected that some hon. gentleman in favor of the present motion would have been prepared to justify their course in supporting it, and I am surprised they have not seen fit to do so. An hon. member who addressed the Committee a few minutes ago, explained that he does not favor the motion that the Committee rise, but he desires that the Bill should be further considered and any objectionable clauses removed. That is British fair play, and it is a position which all true sportsmen should adopt in order that this House may have an opportunity of fully considering this Bill. I think the feelings of sportsmen are not fairly represented by hon. gentlemen who are opposing this Bill. In my opinion many sportsmen are not entirely opposed to its provisions, and in fact gun clubs are adopting resolutions in favor of the Bill. But I cannot understand why the practice of shooting birds in traps should promote clever shooting more than shooting at glass balls or clay pigeons. I am satisfied that the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tisdale), who has taken such a prominent part in opposing this Bill, does not represent the correct views of his constituency, for I understand that the gun club in his own riding are in favor of the Bill by a large majority. I understand this from a telegram.

Mr. TISDALE. Read the telegram.

Mr. GUILLET. The telegram handed to me by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) is from the secretary of the gun club of the Town of Simcoe. It reads:

"Simcoe gun club pass by three-fourths vote resolutions commending your Bill."

Mr. TISDALE. There is no gun club in the town.

Mr. GUILLET. I will give you the name of the secretary. It is F. S. Wade.

Mr. TISDALE. No such man lives in Simcoe.

Mr. GUILLET. The telegram purported to have come over the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph line, and has the sanction of the company. Many gun clubs have adopted the use of glass balls and clay pigeons, and the marksmen have proven quite as successful as those who shoot pigeons from traps. I am not surprised there is considerable opposition to this Bill, for there has always been opposition to Bills of this kind, not only when introduced into this Parliament, but also in the Imperial Parliament. There was the strongest possible opposition to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act when first introduced in the British Parliament, and every measure for the prevention of cruelty has been opposed at every stage. Among savage tribes great and revolting cruelties are practiced on their captives or slaves.

Mr. McNEILL.

As we advance in civilisation you find gladiatorial contests, bull-fights and pugilistic competitions, and all these sports mark the progress made in civilisation among the nations. There is to-day a larger number of the people of this country and the members of this House in favor of this Bill, than when it was introduced some six or seven years ago. Each time the Bill has been brought before the House, a much larger support has been given to it than on previous occasions; and it has never had before so many sympathisers as it has to-day in Parliament. I have no doubt, that if we have a full and fair discussion, the majority will be in favor of the Bill. I think it is unfair that advantage should be taken of the absence of a number of members to kill this Bill. I hope the gentlemen who moved this motion will give some reason to justify their action.

Mr. FREEMAN. I had made up my mind to give a silent vote on this question, but I must say that the Bill before the House has my utmost sympathy, and that the hon. member for Hamilton, who is pressing this measure, deserves the support and consideration of every member who has regard for persistence in a good cause. I am proud to say, that in the part of the Dominion from which I come, we have no acquaintance with this kind of cruelty, which seems to be practiced in this portion of the Dominion. I am astonished at the course hon. gentlemen take who seem to be opposed to the Bill. I believe that the speech of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) presented this matter in a most convincing light, and in a most eloquent manner, and the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill has supported it by arguments that have not been attempted to be gainsaid. I expected to hear from the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. McNeill) with his logical mind, and his ability to present things philosophically, some cogent reasons why this Bill should not be passed. But, to my perfect astonishment, he made an argument which was certainly not worthy of the hon. gentleman's intelligence. He admits that there is cruelty in this trap-shooting, but he contends there should be no law passed against it, because there are some other practices that are still more cruel; that argument is not worthy of the logical mind of that hon. gentleman. It will, I am sure, not be seriously contended that because animals are killed for human food, birds may be killed for sport. When we take the lives of animals for human food, we derive our authority for doing so from the Bible, but we cannot find in the laws or precepts of that blessed book, that these dumb animals, whether the beasts of the forests or the birds of the air, have ever been given to us for sport. I hold that life is precious in the sight of God and in the sight of man, and that the man who trifles with life, whether it is human life, or the life of the dumb beasts of the forests, or the life of the birds of the air, does so in direct opposition to the divine precept. And I do believe that he breaks not only a divine law, but that he breaks that law written in the conscience and in the heart of every good man who desires to act righteously and honestly and fairly. If there is cruelty in taking the life of the animal for the support of man, we are permitted and allowed to do that, but it is nowhere

permitted to us to take the life of animals, or the life of birds, for the purpose of the sport of man, for the purpose of cruel sport, for purposes which give no real pleasure to a man who is properly constituted and whose life is actuated by proper motives. Therefore, I contend that while we are permitted to take the lives of animals for our food, we are not permitted to sport with the lives of these birds. Who will dare to justify cruelty, because the degree of cruelty practiced is not so great as it might be? I am sure that such reasoning will have no influence on this House, but that the majority of hon. members are prepared to pass the Bill of my hon. friend from Hamilton, as a step in the right direction—a step, not only to put down cruelty, but to put an end to the vicious practices connected with pigeon-shooting. I am told that these practices are not supported by sportsmen who go out into the fields, as we might go to shoot a hare or a partridge, but by men who, for the purpose of making money, carry on an immoral trade which every honest and righteous man should condemn. Very valuable testimony has been brought forward during this discussion in support of this Bill—the testimony of good men and educated men, of men whose hearts are in sympathy with everything that is amiable, benevolent, kindly and beneficial to the human family, as well as to dumb animals. What have we had from the other side? We have had the support of no influential men—we have had nothing, Sir, to pit against the very important testimony that has been given in favor of the Bill. Now, I have already said that the laws of this noble land in which we live are founded upon the principles of the Bible. Our grand and glorious Queen, Sir, in reply to a question that was put to her as to what was the cause of the prosperity of Britain, pointed to the Bible; and I think no hon. member of this House need be ashamed to follow her example, or to say with me that the laws of this country are based on the Bible. Now, I wish to call attention to one statement in that book, which I trust guides every one of us on his way to the future. The divine Savior said: “Not a sparrow falleth to the ground without His notice.” I hope the majority of this House will ponder that, if they have not already done so; and if the divine wisdom takes notice of the sparrow, it also takes notice of pigeons and of the smallest of God’s creatures—I will not say the meanest, because who will undertake to say that the birds, which with their music and harmony bring so much that is elevating to us, are the meanest of God’s creatures? Not by any means, Sir; and I say it becomes our bounden duty to do everything we can, not only by our examples and precepts, but by the laws we pass in this House, as far as we can to see that there is no waste of the life of these animals—that there is no infraction of those laws by which we are all bound and will be judged, and to see that our laws are in conformity with those laws. Now, I felt in duty bound to place my views before the House, and having done so, I have discharged that duty. I have no doubt that a number of hon. members will oppose this Bill, and I should like to hear the grounds on which they justify their votes, so that we may see that they are consistent, and that they have something to say that is worthy of being called an argument. If the opponents of this Bill wish to be consistent,

let them meet the arguments of the hon. member for Assiniboia and the hon. member for Hamilton. With these remarks, I beg to say that I will support the Bill.

Mr. TISDALE. I have very little to add to the lengthened debate which has taken place upon this motion to-night; but I wish to answer one or two hon. gentlemen who have asked why we bring the motion up in this way. They challenged that so many times that I will tell them now in a very few words the reason. It is because we thought that every hon. member of this House, before the long discussion we had to-night, thoroughly understood the discussion. We thought that three or four hours might have been saved to-night, and several hours previously, during which this Bill claimed the attention of the House after it had been thoroughly understood. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who is generally a logical man, in pointing out the wickedness and gambling which accompanies the shooting of pigeons from traps, forgot that these will also accompany the shooting of clay pigeons.

Mr. BROWN. I simply wish to say that I handed my hon. friend behind me the telegram after I had received it.

Committee divided: Yeas, 52; nays, 47.

Committee rose.

ALIEN CONTRACT LABOR.

House resumed debate on proposed motion of Mr. Taylor for second reading of Bill (No. 8) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor in Canada.

Mr. TAYLOR. A few evenings ago, when this Bill was before the House, the debate was adjourned. I presume there are other members who wish to speak on the subject, and if so now is their opportunity. If not the motion is before the House, and I ask that this matter may be referred to a special committee which will deal with the subject. Since I spoke on a former occasion, I have received petitions from a great many societies from all parts of Canada, in favor of the Bill I had the honor to introduce, among which are the following: Toronto Trades Council Legislative Committee; District Assembly No. 128, Toronto; Districts Nos. 1 and 2, Montreal; Cigarmakers’ Union, Montreal; Typographical Union, Montreal; Local Assembly, No. 7628, Montreal; Local Assembly, No. 7025, Montreal; The Dominion Trades and Labor Congress.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Bill is declared read, I think the Government should declare their policy on the matter, as to our relations with a foreign country, and I think the Prime Minister should state to the House what their policy is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill was declared to be read a second time, before I had an opportunity of stating our view. I do not think it is advisable that this Bill should be adopted, although the legislation on the other side, has been extremely unfriendly. I should not say unfriendly to Canada, because I think that, at the time the law was passed in the United States

Congress, they did not have the intercourse with Canada before them at all. I believe the Act was passed there in order to prevent the influx of foreigners, in order, using an expression which I used the other day, to prevent the scum of Europe and Asia coming into the United States. I do not believe there was any reference to Canada during the discussion of that measure, but all the same it operates against us in the manner which has been described, and I think that is exceedingly unfortunate. I do not, however, believe that we ought to imitate the legislation of the United States in that respect. In the first place, we have not the same reason. The United States do not desire, they do not require, an addition to their population. The natural increase is sufficient of itself, and they find, from the fact of the heterogeneous mass who are coming into the country, that there are sources of disturbance which they wish to keep under control. On the other hand, we in Canada are a much younger country with a smaller population, and we require a large influx of settlers to occupy our great west. For that reason I do not think that this Bill should become law. At the same time, the proposition made by my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) that the Bill might be read a second time, *pro formâ*, and then referred to a special committee to consider the whole subject is one which I would not regret to see adopted. A report on the subject from a special committee, pointing out in proper terms the unfriendly aspect of this legislation as applied to Canada, pointing out its effect on the commercial intercourse along our frontier, and suggesting some remedy for that, might be of advantage, because, if that report were carefully prepared, as it would be no doubt, if the committee were properly chosen, might be of considerable service. It might have some effect upon the public mind in the United States and it could not do much harm. The Government, however, do not approve of the principle of this Bill, and it could only be by the assent of the House that the Bill should be read a second time, *pro formâ*, simply for the purpose of getting a report from a special committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will supplement the remarks of the hon. gentleman so far as to say that I entirely agree with everything he has said, but I will go a little further in regard to the legislation in the United States. I do not believe it was ever contemplated by the Congress of the United States that this measure should be put in force in regard to Canada. I believe the officers of the United States on the borders have put a construction on that law which was never contemplated by Congress or by those who advocated its passage in Congress. I desire that this Parliament should avoid doing anything to promote or to aggravate the unfriendly feeling which crops up now and then in regard to these international questions. We are called upon, with the view of advancing the interests of this country and its peace and prosperity, to cultivate the most friendly relations between the United States and Canada; and, while I agree with the right hon. gentleman that it might be of service that this Bill should be read a second time and referred to a special committee, I think that special committee, which should be composed of the best men in this House, should place upon the records of Parliament our desire to maintain friendly relations with our neighbors, should show

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

that the application which has been made of their legislation as against Canada is unfair, and should call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that that application has been unfriendly to this country. I believe that that would do great good, and I, therefore, support the motion of the right hon. gentleman as to the appointment of a special committee. I am opposed to the passage of this Bill, and I only support the second reading for the reasons which have been given by the Premier.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I cannot agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) in the course which he proposes. I was glad to hear the leader of the Government state that this Bill did not meet with the assent or approval of the Government, and I think I am safe in saying that it does not meet with the approval of the large majority who sit on this side of the House. However, I believe that a second reading of the Bill would be taken in the United States as meaning an assent to the principle of the Bill, and I think that is a very undesirable thing, particularly at this time, when negotiations are in progress for a settlement of pending difficulties, and when we have a Minister at Washington concerned in looking after them. I think it would be suicidal for us now to adopt the principle of this Bill which is calculated only to cause unnecessary irritation. I cannot see that any good can be attained by assenting to the principle of the Bill and then appointing a committee in the hope that that committee will present a report which will be antagonistic to the lines on which the Bill is founded. I am sure that we all desire to promote friendly relations with the United States; but that is not to be done by passing a Bill of this kind, but is to be accomplished by friendly negotiations. I think it would promote good feeling on both sides of the line if a large majority of this House refused to give this Bill a second reading. If, after that, the Government thought that the relations between the two countries were such that a committee carefully chosen to consider those relations could advise the Government with respect to the relations between the two countries, that would be another thing, but that is an entirely different and separate matter, and I cannot see on what ground the second reading of this Bill should be assented to, on the suggestion that a special committee should be appointed to make a report with the view of ameliorating the conditions which exist between this country and the United States. I agree with what the leader of the Government said, that the Bill itself is not one which should receive the assent of the House, and I hope the House will refuse to give it a second reading.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I must confess that I entirely disagree with the proposition made by the First Minister to give this Bill a second reading, and to let it go to a special committee. That is abdicating the authority of the Government, and I believe it is the duty of the Government to say distinctly whether they are ready to allow this measure to receive its second reading and thus to affirm its principle. I cannot go so far as my hon. friend who last spoke. I am not prepared to say that there may not be some reason why we should pass a Bill of this description. My hon. friend thinks that the United States never intended to

make their law apply against the people of Canada. I cannot agree with him in that respect. If they did not intend that the Bill should operate against Canada, if they were desirous to encourage amicable relations between Canada and the United States, they would long ere this have signified their intention, and have modified their Bill. They have not done so. The First Minister said that he did not think it was prudent that we should exclude labor from Canada, because, having a large country, we required, to use his own expression, all the labor we can get from the United States or any other country. I think that view is not in harmony with the policy of protection for the laboring people of Canada which that hon. gentleman had promised. He has inaugurated a policy by which laboring men have to pay more for everything they consume, by which they are heavily taxed, but when the just and proper claims of the laboring men are to be considered, then, forsooth, they are not to be protected, they are not to have the same rights and privileges as the manufacturers, or the farmers, or any other class. I say that if the hon. gentleman feels that protection to be good, if he feels that the laboring men are entitled to the same privileges as others, he ought to allow a Bill of this kind to pass.

Mr. GILLMOR. I agree with the leader of the Government that we should not dispose of this Bill quite so readily as my hon. friend at my left desires. This is a pretty serious matter. Every one knows my policy with regard to these matters. Here on the border we have been living in a social way, there has been no difficulty for many years. Down in the county I represent, bounded by the St. Croix, the people have, for all social purposes, been one community. Workmen from both sides have been in the habit, for many years, of going across the line without any interruption. In our lumbering operations in the winter time especially, our laborers were in the habit of taking contracts on the other side, and going with their teams into the State of Maine for the winter. Now, it has been nearly two years since this law has been put in force, and it has been exceedingly annoying to our people. We have suffered very much from it, and there is an intense feeling of anger in the way it has been enforced. I believe it was intended to be enforced against Canadians. The officials there are very zealous in enforcing the law, and have caused our people a great deal of annoyance. Since the cotton mill was built in St. Stephen, N.B., every day we find two or three hundred operatives in that mill coming across the line into St. Stephen to work and going back to live in the State of Maine, and in that community where the Americans have never been stopped from coming over to our side, the operation of the law is exceedingly annoying. I desire to see the leader of the Government pursue the line that he proposes, and at least let them understand that we are considering the subject, and that we are not going to dispose of this Bill so summarily as my hon. friend here proposes.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me that this is a very important question, and as the House is very thin to-night, and owing to the gravity of the question, I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 13th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. BROWN moved:

That this House do, on Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee, to consider further the Bill to make further provision as to the prevention of cruelty to animals, and to amend chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Mr. TISDALE moved in amendment:

That all the words after the word "Monday" be struck out of the main motion, and the following substituted: "That the Bill be referred to a Committee this day six months."

Mr. BERGIN. I ask the House to reject this motion, for the reason that I think motions of this character are calculated to bring legislation into contempt. The people of this country are not at all satisfied that so much of the time of this House, to the great expense of the country, should be consumed in the discussion of this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. BERGIN. When these hon. gentlemen get done shouting, I shall speak. I can stand here with as great comfort as they can sit there and shout. The country does not approve of this sort of tinkering with legislation. The hon. gentlemen who favor this Bill ought to be satisfied, at all events, for this Session. It has been twice defeated in this House, and I think they ought to be satisfied with that defeat, and not take up any more of the time of the House with it. We have been over six weeks in session now, and if we spend our time on such trumpery legislation as this, we shall not get through before midsummer.

Mr. BLAKE. Although I am in favor of the Bill of the hon. member for Hamilton, I have no idea that the motion he has brought, if pressed, will result in anything but another evening such as I understand was spent yesterday, to the detriment of the passage of other measures, which might possibly secure the consideration of the House. I think the only way for the hon. gentleman to obtain a favorable result for the Bill, after the reception it has met with on two occasions, is to bring it forward at the earliest possible period next Session, and press it on the House when it is likely to carry; and I do not think we ought to waste more time—for I believe it will be wasted—on the subject this Session. Therefore, I will vote for the amendment of the hon. member for South Norfolk.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I desire to say that a great deal of the time of this House will be occupied if this Bill, which has been already rejected by the House on two separate occasions, is again pressed upon our attention. I have not taken any active part in the discussion upon it, but, if it is again pressed, I will, and the rest of

us will, obstruct this Bill for the rest of this Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Order.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I withdraw the word obstruct. But I think, the hon gentleman is not treating the House fairly, in moving that the Bill should be re-introduced. It is not fair, either to the House or to the country, that so much of our time should be wasted on a Bill which has nothing to it but mere sentiment. If I were so disposed, and had time, I think I could show that a great deal of what has been said with regard to gentlemen who take part in sports has been grossly exaggerated, and that many of the statements made have not been in accordance with the facts. I know a good deal about this subject, having seen a great deal of pigeon-shooting; and I think it is a pity that gentlemen, many of whom I know, and many of whom stand as high, socially and otherwise, as the gentlemen who have attacked them, should be characterised as drunkards and scoundrels, and that every crime in the calendar should be charged against them, because they see fit to take part in, what I consider, innocent sports. I think it is a pity that the advocacy of this measure should be placed on the ground that none but scoundrels have been associated with this sport. I have been a president of a gun club for many years, though I am not now, and I think I am as tender-hearted towards the animal creation as any of the gentlemen who support this Bill. I have witnessed these sports, and I have seen nothing of the cruelties which these hon. gentlemen have spoken of. I do not want to take up the time of the House, and I think it is a pity that its time should be wasted on a measure of this kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I voted for this Bill last Session, and also this Session, and if I live I shall vote for it until it becomes law. I regret very much that I was in my room and did not arrive in time last night to vote for the Bill, but everybody, I fancy, knows how I should have voted if I had been here. However, that is not the question now. I would mention to my hon. friend from Hamilton, that after the statement made by the hon. member for West Durham, who has supported his measure, it is quite clear that by no possibility can the Bill get through this Session, and, therefore, there is no object in his pressing his motion, and I would suggest that he should withdraw it.

Mr. BROWN. My only desire in bringing forward this motion was this: The subject had excited a very widespread interest throughout the whole country, and I knew that I had a very large support for it in this House, indeed, I am certain I had a majority, and that the sense of Parliament was not expressed in the vote last night; and as it is quite proper for hon. gentlemen to use all the forms of Parliament in order to defeat a measure to which they are opposed, it is equally proper for those who promote a measure to use all parliamentary forms to further the end they have in view. That is my case. My only desire is that a Bill of such importance as this—should receive consideration from a full House, and not be decided upon by a very thin House, such as we had last night, and, under the circumstances of last night, I know the sentiment of the House and of the country is in favor of this Bill.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).

and that is the reason I desire that it should be restored to the Order paper; and I hope, hon. gentlemen will not consider me as over-persistent in seeking to obtain that which I knew was right and for the public good. I know I have the sentiment of this House with me, and I appreciate the very kind feelings of the hon. member for West Durham and of the right hon. Premier; and I trust that I shall be spared to bring the measure forward again at another Session, when it will have proper consideration and assured success. Having done my duty, I will take the advice of the hon. gentleman who have just expressed their strong support of the measure, and I beg leave to withdraw my motion.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. I am in favor of the Bill of my hon. friend from Hamilton, and had I been here yesterday, I certainly should have voted for it. I hope, however, to have another opportunity of supporting it, and I am very glad to see that the question is in so advanced a condition this year.

Amendment and motion withdrawn.

PRINTING COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

Mr. BERGIN. In moving the adoption of the third report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, I may say that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture has handed to me a letter received from the Superintendent of Printing, in which it is stated that the cost of printing the Experimental Farm reports and barley bulletins, making altogether 160 pages royal octavo, will be about \$7,000. I move that the report be adopted.

Motion agreed to.

COST OF MAILING ENGLISH PERIODICALS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, The organ of the Book, News and Stationery Associations of Canada having made the following statements:—

"The cost of mailing one copy each of the following English periodicals for one year from Toronto and from Buffalo is as follows:—

	From Toronto.	From Buffalo.
" British Workman	12c.	3c.
Family Friend	12	4
Children's Friend	12	4
All Id. Monthly	12	4
Good Words	24	4
Sunday Magazine	24	4
Sunday At Home	24	4
Leisure Hour	24	4
Family Herald	24	4
Chambers' Journal	24	4

"It will be seen from the above partial list, that the cost of mailing English magazines from Toronto is just six times as much as the cost of mailing from Buffalo. The Canadian dealer must pay as much for mailing a magazine for two months as the American dealer pays for a whole year. Is this not very unjust? Are we asking anything unreasonable when we seek to be placed in a position to compete in our own country for trade that rightly belongs to us? We certainly are entitled to at least as favorable facilities as are given to foreigners.

"There is no prospect of the American Government increasing their postal rate to equal ours, which is an excessive rate on this class of matter. The only remedy is to reduce our rate to the same as theirs. Until this is done the American dealer practically enjoys what is equivalent to an export bounty of 15 per cent. on all English magazines sent into Canada.

"But when we consider the facility afforded the Americans for mailing English newspapers into Canada as compared with our facility for mailing them into the

United States, we find ourselves still more unfavorably situated. In Canada each weekly newspaper has to be prepaid by stamp. It may only weigh 1 or 2 oz., yet 52c. per year must be paid on it. A glance at the following comparison of the cost of mailing one copy of some of the leading English weekly newspapers for one year in the two countries will convince any one how utterly unfair the position of the Canadian newsdealer is:—

	Cost of mailing from Can. to U. S.	Cost of mailing from U. S. to Can.
"Lloyd's Weekly.....	52c.	8c.
Reynolds' Weekly.....	52	8
Despatch.....	52	8
All Id. weeklies.....	52	8
Illustrated London News.	\$1 30	28
Graphic.....	1 30	28
Pictorial World.....	2 08	52
The Queen.....	2 60	65

"While the American Government throws no obstacle in the way of our sending periodicals into the United States—all periodicals being admitted free of duty—the Canadian postal law practically prohibits it. The postage on Id. English papers is 52c. per year—more than 50 per cent. of their real value. An export duty of from 20 per cent. to 50 per cent. on all English newspapers sent into the United States would seem unreasonable, and yet the Canadian newsdealer has actually to pay this, in the shape of extra postage."

If the foregoing statements are correct, do the Government propose to remedy these inequalities and remove the burdens complained of?

Mr. HAGGART. The organ of the associations mentioned by the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken, as he will see if he will read clause seven of the Canada Postal Guide, which says:

"British newspapers and periodicals, however, brought by mail to Canadian booksellers or news-agents, and re-posted by them to regular subscribers in Canada, may be mailed by such Canadian booksellers or news-agents free of postage."

In answer to the second paragraph, in which are quoted the different prices paid by the different papers, I may state that if these newspapers are mailed to regular subscribers by booksellers or news-agents they go free of postage.

TREATS, INTIMIDATION, &c.

Mr. COCKBURN asked, Will the Government, during the present Session of Parliament, introduce any measure amending chapter 173 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting threats, intimidation and other offences? If so, when? And whether such measure, when introduced, will contain a provision that no prosecution shall be maintained against any person or persons for conspiring to do any act, or to cause any act to be done, or who refuses or refuse to work for any employer or with any workman?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No answer can be given on that subject yet. It is under consideration, whether the application of the Labor organisation for an amendment to the Law of Conspiracy may not be dealt with this Session. I cannot describe what the contents of the Bill may be. It may possibly be introduced as an amendment to the measure now before the House.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE IN THE CITY OF OTTAWA.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, The amount of money expended on public highways within the city of Ottawa during the year 1889? Was said expenditure made under public tender, or how? And why made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount of money expended on public highways in Ottawa during the year 1889 is as follows:—

Wellington street.....	\$6,636 23
María and Elgin streets, fronting	
Cartier square.....	421 28
Sappers bridge.....	98 60
Dufferin bridge.....	142 00
María Street bridge.....	30 00
Chaudière Slide bridges.....	120 54
	\$8,348 65

The work was not done under public tender, but by a staff under the direct control of the Department.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, The amount paid the city of Ottawa for water supply for the several public buildings? The gross amount paid annually for water supply? The amount paid for water supply for Rideau Hall, for Major's Hill Park, and Parliament Square, separately, if separate accounts are kept?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Department of Public Works has an agreement with the corporation of the city of Ottawa for the fixed amount of \$14,500 annually for the supply of water to the following buildings and property actually owned by the Dominion Government:—Parliament and Departmental Buildings, Supreme Court, City Post Office and Custom House, Drill Hall, Geological Museum, Rideau Hall, Fish Hatchery and Art Gallery, the new block on Wellington street, new Printing Bureau and Major's Hill Park. Other premises rented by the Dominion Government for public offices are paid for on the same rating as charged to citizens. The gross amount paid on account of these rented buildings, including street sprinkling, during the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1889, was \$1,298.34.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, The amount paid the city of Ottawa or the Gas Company of Ottawa for gas, annually? Is there a fixed sum for annual service, or is it paid for at the same price as other consumers? If any contract has been entered into, when does it expire?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Department of Public Works has no contract with the gas company, and pays at the rate of \$2 per thousand feet for gas supplied the following buildings—price to ordinary consumers being \$3, subject to discount:—Parliament and Departmental Buildings and grounds, Supreme Court, Geological Museum, new block on Wellington street, Art Gallery and Fish Hatchery; leased buildings, including Printing Bureaus on Wellington and Sussex streets, Savings Bank Branch, Post Office Department, Ottawa Bank Building, and the Indian Affairs, in Durie's and Lee's buildings. The total amount paid for gas during the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1889, was \$18,908.50.

OUTRAGE ON THE STEAMER BALTIC.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Has the Government yet taken any action in relation to the outrage which was last season committed upon a young man on the steamer *Baltic*, which subsequently resulted in his death, and do they intend to continue the license to Captain Tait Robertson, who was in charge of the *Baltic* at the time the outrage was committed?

Mr. COLBY. A commissioner has been appointed to hold an investigation into the conduct of the master of the *Baltic* in reference to this matter, and the action of the Government will be determined by the facts when they are ascertained.

NEW DEPARTMENTAL BUILDING,
OTTAWA.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the new buildings on Wellington street are completed? What is the entire sum paid on the buildings up to 1st March, 1890? Have any of the contractors put in claims for extras? If so, how many, and to what amounts? How much has been paid on account of extras?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The chief architect has sent me this statement:—The buildings are completed. The entire sum paid on the building up to 1st March, 1890, is \$608,096.70, exclusive of land purchase. In reply to the third question, Yes—Mr. Charlebois, the contractor for the building, has put in claims for extras amounting to \$393,954.19. I understand that Mr. Charlebois is ready to reduce his claim to \$200,000. Mr. Garth has put in claims in connection with his contract for the heating apparatus which amount to \$9,233; and Mr. Fensom, the contractor for the elevators, has claims amounting to \$3,015. The claim of Mr. Garth was settled, and that of Mr. Fensom is under consideration.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Can the hon. gentleman state the total amount of the claims—has he got them added up?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; but I have stated the different amounts.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has not answered the question: How much money has been paid on account of extras?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I said that the account of Mr. Garth for \$9,000 had been settled. The claims of Mr. Charlebois and Mr. Fensom are the only two that remain. Those are not settled, and they have been sent in quite lately, especially that of Mr. Charlebois, and they have asked that these matters should be investigated in order to see how much of the claim is in accordance with the contract, and how much is for additional works. None of these claims will be settled unless they are in accordance with the contract, or are declared to be legal claims in the opinion of the Minister of Justice. The remainder of the claims will have to be settled, if they are pressed, by a court of justice.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood that the First Minister was to state this afternoon when the adjourned debate on the motion which I made on Tuesday would be taken up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will inform the hon. gentleman to-morrow at 3 o'clock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In view of the length of time to which the Session has now extended, I would ask the Finance Minister if he can give any information now as to when the Banking Bill will be introduced, and as to when the Budget speech will be made?

Mr. LANDERKIN.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope to be able to lay the Banking Bill before the House early next week, probably next Tuesday. As to the Budget speech, I gave my hon. friend the information some time ago, that I would give him a week's notice before the introduction of the Budget. I am not able to amend that statement yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, I suppose the hon. gentleman can state that the Budget speech cannot come on next week? He is scarcely likely to bring it down on Friday.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not impossible.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I should like to know when the Minister of Public Works will bring down the agreement between the Government and the city of Ottawa, by which he said we were bound to pay the expenditure, year by year, on certain roads and on the bridges crossing the canal.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is being prepared and will probably be brought down to-morrow.

SUPPLY—PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before that motion is submitted to the House, I desire to address to it some observations upon the subject of which I gave notice some time ago, when certain public expenditures were under consideration. I think it is highly desirable that some general rule should be laid down in these matters, where it is possible, which will preserve, as largely as it can be preserved, the control of this House over those expenditures which are made for public improvements. We have had many attacks made recently on the system of party government, and, if the public revenues of this country were to be treated simply as being within the patronage of a party, I think a very serious objection would lie against the principle of party government. Those views of government which are recognised under that designation have always seemed to me to be entitled to the support of those who favor parliamentary government, as they have obtained in every country where the English system has been established. There are important functions to be performed not only by those who are entrusted with the public confidence, or with the royal confidence for the time being, but also by those who represent in the Legislature Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. Perhaps one of the most important functions that an Opposition performs is the careful criticism and amendment of those measures which are from time to time submitted to us by the Government. The Opposition also, where the principles of parliamentary government are fairly carried out, are enabled to exercise a wholesome check and control over the exercise of patronage and the expenditure of public moneys. In fact, the Government is again and again importuned by its friends to make expenditures and appointments which can scarcely be justified on the ground of public necessity; and the vigilant exercise of supervision by an Opposition, where fair play is given to the discharge of its functions, enables it to strengthen the hands of the Government in resisting pretensions that are not capable of justification on the grounds of public policy or public

necessity. But if a Government is to treat the public revenues, in so far as they are expended on public works and undertakings, as so much patronage in the hands of the Government, to be employed in the promotion of the personal interests of supporters of the Administration, then the system of party government would be open to very serious objection indeed. Sir, the public funds that are at the disposal of the Administration and under the control of Parliament, are in the highest and strictest sense, trust funds; they are held by the Government subject to the control of Parliament in trust for the public good; they are to be employed in the promotion of the public interest, and in so far as any expenditure cannot be upheld and justified on the grounds of public interest, it is an expenditure that ought not to be made, it is an abuse of a public trust. Now, we were told in a discussion that took place in this House two or three years ago, that the representatives of the people who were opposed to the Administration had no claim to be consulted with regard to the public expenditure and the public requirements in the constituencies which they represent. I deny that proposition altogether. I maintain that those who are elected here to represent the people, those who sit on this side of the House, and who advocate a policy different from that which is supported by the Administration and those who sustain them, are as much entitled to have their representations fairly considered as are those who are elected to support the Administration, and that any indifference to their representations, any disregard to the views which they put forward, is not simply an indignity to them, but it is an indignity to the constituents who have seen proper to return them here as representatives in Parliament. Now, that I do not misrepresent the views that have been expressed by some Ministers of the Crown on this subject, I will call the attention of the House to observations that were addressed to it by the late Minister of Finance, Sir Charles Tupper, on one occasion when an enquiry with regard to a public expenditure was being made in the House. He said, in reply, I think, to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) :

"The hon. gentleman knows that they consulted those in whom they had confidence, those in whose advice they could repose confidence, because they were supporters of the Government. The hon. gentleman, therefore, must not sneer at the presence here of the gentleman who so long and so ably represented the County of Lunenburg in this House. All I can say is, if the hon. gentleman who now has the honor of representing that county in this House is half as zealous, and takes half as much interest in the progress of that county, as Mr. Kaulbach took when in this House, it will be greatly to the advantage of the county, and the county will have nothing to complain of on the part of the hon. gentleman."

The doctrine there laid down by the hon. gentleman was, that in case the representative agreed with the Government in regard to their general public policy, they were entitled to take his judgment upon the requirements for public expenditure, but that if a representative was returned to this House by a constituency opposed to the views of the Government on questions of public policy, the Government were not entitled to attach, or ought not to attach, any weight to his views with regard to the public requirements in the way of public expenditure in his constituency. Now, I say that is a wholly indefensible doctrine; it is one which makes the public revenues mere matters

of party patronage, that the Government have the same right to make public expenditures upon the representation of their friends that they would have to make official appointments upon those representations, and that it is only the friends of the Government whose representations are entitled to weight. Now, at that time I repudiated the doctrine then laid down by the then Minister of Finance. I said :

"It is the duty of the Government, it is a duty required of them by their oath of office, to make those public expenditures where the public needs require, regardless of the political complexion of the constituency; and the hon. gentleman when he comes here and lays down the doctrine that because a constituency returns a member in opposition to the Government, that member is not to be heard, that his opinion is to have no weight upon any question affecting the interests of his constituency, he lays down a doctrine for which he can find no support in the constitutional history of the mother country."

I still maintain that position. That the hon. gentleman may consult the defeated candidates who were supporters of the Administration, I do not deny. I say that hon. gentlemen are entitled to consult those who are the representatives of the people in Parliament, with regard to the public expenditure, and to ascertain the exact claims that any locality may have to a public expenditure which has been asked from the Administration. But to lay down the proposition that those only are to be consulted, then we have a representation with regard to public expenditure, so far as nearly one-half of the country is concerned, not by the representatives in Parliament, but by those whom the people refuse to return to Parliament. Those who have failed to be returned to Parliament here, are those who are to control the expenditure or to determine the conclusion arrived at by the Government in nearly one-half the entire country. The hon. Minister of Customs, on that occasion, laid down very nearly the same doctrine which was laid down by the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Customs, as I understood him, treated the public expenditure as a matter of party patronage, and he made these observations :

"Everything in the whole system of Government, in connection with patronage, is carried on upon this principle: You consult your friends when anything is to be done in a constituency, and it is the merest hypocrisy to preach or lay down any other doctrine, as being practiced by any political party in this country."

That was the position taken by the hon. gentleman; and so it is perfectly clear that, so far as the Minister of Customs is concerned, he maintains the doctrine that with regard to public expenditure in any constituency represented by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, those representations are not to have the least weight with the Administration.

Mr. BOWELL. Will you give me the date?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). July 11, 1887. The parties to be consulted are the friends and supporters of the Administration; and the hon. gentleman, of course, throughout his whole argument, uses that expression in such a way as to show that they are not merely to be maintained along with others in any subordinate sense, but that they are to be the advisers of the Government, to the exclusion of those who belong to the opposite political party. The Minister of Customs proceeded to say :

* "There is no doubt Sir John's Government is going out of power, and Dr. Sutton—who was my opponent, a very respectable man—will have the patronage of the riding. True, Bowell may be elected, but if Blake comes in, if we have anything to get, we will get it through Dr. Sutton. That is the principle upon which you all act.

"Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

"Mr. BOWELL. We do not desire to hide it. The hon. gentleman says no. I was going to say that I was rather surprised, but I am not. But the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do, and as every member in this House does, that all party governments are carried on on that principle."

I deny that. I say that all party government is not conducted on that principle, and that all party government ought not to be conducted on that principle. I freely admit that, as regards appointments to official positions, it is the duty of the Government to appoint friends rather than opponents, that those persons are more likely to loyally carry out the wishes of the Government than those who are politically opposed to them. But I deny altogether that the rule with respect to party patronage is to be extended into the domain of public expenditure, and that the expenditure of the public money, which is the common contribution of every section of the people without reference to the party to which they belong, is not to be conducted according to the common judgment of the entire representation of the people in this House. Any other rule would not be a fair rule. If hon. gentlemen were to confine their taxation to their own friends, then they might use the money collected from their friends for the purpose of promoting their party interests; but when they impose taxes indiscriminately on the entire population, it is a gross abuse of political power to use the revenues of the country, which are to be devoted to public improvements, merely to improvements in the constituencies represented by their friends, while nearly one-half of the country, although a contributor towards the public revenue, is denied its fair share of those improvements. I know the rule, and I have met it in my constituency; and almost every hon. gentleman on the Opposition side has met the same arguments addressed by Government candidates to their constituents. It is this: You should return a candidate to support the Administration if you want your fair share of the public expenditure; you need not look for the erection of a post office, or the improvement of your harbor or river, so long as you return an opponent to the Administration; if you want such public expenditure in your constituency, if you wish to obtain your fair proportion of the public money, you should return to Parliament a friend and supporter of the Administration. That is treating the public moneys as so much party patronage; it is treating the public moneys as if they were held, not in trust for the entire country, and to be expended in the public interests, but as held in trust for the party of which the Prime Minister for the time being is the head. Let that fact be known, let it go abroad to the country that it is the well understood and settled doctrine of the Government that the candidate who supports the Government, whether in or out of Parliament, is the person who controls the expenditure for public works and undertakings, then the constituency will hold that individual responsible, whether in or out of Parliament, as to expenditures made by Parliament in that constituency. The people would then know that a failure to secure their fair

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

share of the public expenditure was because the Administration was undertaking to punish the constituency because that constituency has failed to return a supporter of the Administration. I do not intend to lay down in the resolution I propose to submit to the House any hard-and-fast rule with respect to public expenditure generally, beyond this: That the public money shall be expended in the public interest, and not for the purpose of mere party favoritism, and that so far as the erection of post offices, Custom houses, buildings for Inland Revenue purposes are concerned, regard shall be had for the amount of revenue collected and the public business done in that particular locality. How can it, for one moment, be said that the public interest has been considered, when in a small town, a mere village, in the constituency represented by the Minister of Finance, a large expenditure has been made on a public building, while in the constituency represented by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) there is a town with ten thousand inhabitants without any such public convenience. Why, I could enumerate a number of towns and places of importance where a considerable amount of revenue is collected, and where the amount of public and private business done is large, and where no such public improvements have been made. Why is this? The hon. gentleman cannot find such towns and places within constituencies represented by hon. gentlemen opposite; they are all found in constituencies represented by hon. gentlemen who sit on the Opposition benches. And it is impossible that a matter of that sort can be mere accident. Douglald Stuart said on one occasion:

"If the same thing occurs under like circumstances over and over again, it cannot be regarded as a mere matter of accident."

And when you find all places entitled to public expenditure upon a reasonable rule are represented by hon. members on this side of the House, it is perfectly plain that the Government have deliberately adopted this as a line of public policy, that they will make expenditures in constituencies returning supporters to the Government, which they will not undertake under like circumstances in constituencies represented by hon. members on this side of the House. The First Minister shakes his head. Let him peruse what I read from the speech of his late colleague, Sir Charles Tupper, and the speech of the Minister of Customs. There are several important matters to be considered prior to an expenditure for public buildings. There is the question of the facilities for renting; there is the value of the capital invested in the building; there is the wear and tear upon the building, the cost of taking care of it, the expenditures for fire, and light, and so on; but all these considerations the Government had set aside as having no weight. The rule the late Government laid down is, that the expenditure shall be made in those places where the largest revenue is collected, and the largest volume of public business is done; but that rule, although generally admitted as the rule is, in practice, is absolutely disregarded, for I have already mentioned an instance in a constituency represented by the Finance Minister, where, in a place with a population of less than 1,000 souls, a village, considerable expenditure has been made, whereas, in the constituency represented by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House,

having 8,000 or 10,000 of an urban population, no such expenditure has taken place. I do not propose to weary the House with a long and detailed statement of the abuses that have taken place, and of which complaints have been made during the past seven or eight years. There are many hon. gentlemen, in whose constituencies those acts of neglect, those sins of omission, have occurred. That being the case, I leave it to them to bring forward specific instances, where no such expenditure has taken place. We have had, during this Session, and during the two previous Sessions, the statements made over and over again by representatives of the various constituencies in Prince Edward Island, showing an almost total disregard by the Administration of all public works and public undertakings in that Province, and no other reason can be assigned for the absence of expenditure there compared with the lavish expenditure elsewhere, except that that Island has returned six representatives who were opposed to the Administration. I move in amendment:

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be Resolved, that in the expenditure of public money, the public interest, and not party favoritism, should control, and in the choice of places for the erection of public buildings for post offices, Custom houses, and Inland Revenue purposes, regard should be had to the amount of revenue collected, and to the public business done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend, in his very moderate and statesmanlike speech, has laid down certain rules with which I agree, and in which I cordially join him. He has stated that Government should treat the public funds as trust funds, to be applied for the benefit of the people, and not for purposes of mere patronage, or of helping the friends of the Government. I quite agree with that principle, and I do say, notwithstanding that it will probably not meet with the assent of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills), that this Government has carried out that policy fairly and straightforwardly. To be sure, we have been liable to attack, more individual and particular, than the general statement of my hon. friend in this House, ever since 1878. I cannot complain of that, inasmuch as, from 1874 to 1878, the Opposition of that day brought, and they thought on good grounds, similar charges against the Government of the day, and in some cases the charges were, *primâ furie*, so good, and, in my opinion, so substantiated, that they had a very considerable effect on the country, when there was an appeal to the people in 1878. I, therefore, cannot complain, that the hon. gentleman and his friends opposite are treating us to a dose of the same medicine that we administered to them, I think, more effectively than the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is administering it to us now. I believe that ours was a more potent medicine, and that it had a greater effect than this is likely to have. My hon. friend says that the continuance of this practice, and the assertion of this principle, makes one fear that it raises great objection against party government. Well, party government is the same all the world over. Under the British system of responsible government, or under the American system, where there is party government, but without a responsible Administration in both countries, and in all countries, whether it be England, the United States, or any of the European nations, who have adopted in principle the representative system, it is a charge that is always

brought by the Opposition of the day, that the majority are not governing according to principle, but on the basis of favoritism, and of promoting the interests of their friends. These general charges do not, I think, amount to much; and they are of no value, unless they are brought down to particular cases, in which particular improprieties are shown on the part of the Government. In days of old, when we were on your left, Mr. Speaker, we brought some particular cases against the Government of the day; but I quite agree with what I have so often heard from the other side, that the fact that former Governments have acted improperly, is no argument in defence of impropriety by an existing Government. Still, it is open to this consideration, that party government has its great advantages and has some defects. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) complains very much of the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, and also by Sir Charles Tupper when he was Minister of Finance. Now, in my opinion, the principle laid down by these two gentlemen is perfectly correct. I agree with what my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has stated, that every expenditure of public money should be based on good sound reasons, that it should have a justification, that it should not be for the purpose of helping one's friends. That is quite true, and I do not think that either Sir Charles Tupper or the Minister of Customs infringed upon this rule by their statements. What they stated was: that they did not consider that any member who is opposed to the Government, who has no confidence in the Government, and who desired that the Government should be defeated and replaced by friends of their own—that no member of Parliament who expressed an utter want of confidence in the Government should expect confidence from the Government. The hon. gentleman opposite, it is an open secret which my hon. friend will not deny, would displace the present Administration if he could, and it is quite right from his point of view, that he should do everything possible in that direction. But how could any Ministry consult an hon. member who desired to defeat the Government, who held up to the country that the policy and the practice of that Government were equally objectionable? How could the Government consult a member who adopted that principle, and act on his advice? No, Sir; a member of Parliament in Opposition, having no confidence in the Government, is simply in the position of any other Canadian. His views, on any subject whatever, if he chooses to lay them before the Government, should receive every consideration and respect; but it is too much to say that the Government should actually consult a member as to what they are to do in his particular constituency, when it is in the interest of that man to carry that constituency at the next general election against the Government. I am sure the hon. member opposite, when he is a member of a Government, will not adopt that policy. He is too able a man, too good a politician, and too sound a statesman, to take the position that we are bound to consult a man whose business it is to turn us out, and to hold up to unfavorable criticism the policy of the Government. So far as we are concerned, I can say that the present Government—I believe every one of

us—receive with respect and give due consideration to every representation that is made by any hon. gentleman in this House. I know that I have had most pleasant relations with many of the hon. gentlemen opposite; I have had occasion to agree with their views and to carry out suggestions made by them, but not as members of Parliament opposed to the present Government. I could not reciprocate their confidence; it would not be a reciprocity of confidence; it would be a jug-handled policy—my hon. friend will remember the old phrase—for me to give an hon. member sitting in Opposition, a confidence which he would not accord to us. But I would listen to his reasons, and if they satisfied my judgment, and the judgment of the Cabinet, we should act without reference to what his political proclivities might be. This very Session I have had occasion to meet some hon. gentlemen opposite: they have pressed for certain developments and improvements in their part of the country, and I have had great pleasure in putting mind to mind with them, and considering the various questions that were brought before me. But, Sir, the hon. member has spoken especially about public buildings, and in proposing this resolution—which I must say is an objectionable resolution, with one slight criticism upon it—he has said that in some small places, with a comparatively small population, buildings have been erected, while in larger towns no buildings have been erected. But, Sir, in the case of many large towns where no new buildings have been erected, perhaps, on enquiry, it would be found that they did not want, or did not require, new buildings. For instance, in a large town where a very large and commodious and comfortable building may have been rented for a post office, there is no necessity for erecting a new building. Then, in the case of very many of these places, there have been no applications to the Government for buildings. Whenever the Public Works Department is informed that the existing accommodation for a post office, or for a custom house, is insufficient, and an application is made for a new building, and it is found requisite, or expedient, to provide better accommodation, the matter is taken up and the building is erected; and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the present Government will last long enough to erect a great many more public buildings in other places. After this discussion, I dare say there will be a considerable flood of applications for new buildings. Perhaps, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will come with some suggestion for a custom house, or a post office, or some other little advantage for his constituency; and I can only tell my hon. friend, that among the Opposition there is no hon. member, the interests of whose constituency I would be more happy to promote, even at the risk of getting him a little extra popularity. However, Sir, although a motion of this kind, moved in amendment to going into Supply, is, in a way, a motion of want of confidence in the Government, yet, I have no doubt, from the whole tone of his speech, that the hon. gentleman did not desire that it should be so considered. To prevent any misapprehension on that point, I should have preferred that my hon. friend had made his motion as a substantive motion; but I wish to say that I have not the slightest objection to it, and I shall vote for it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. LAURIER. It is an old saying, "that it is never too late to repent," and I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman is realising that saying, and is prepared to vote for this motion. Well, Sir, I expected no less from the hon. gentleman than that he would vote for it. But if he would only act upon it, that is what we want. The hon. gentleman stated that he was always ready to accept the suggestions of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not accept, but consider.

Mr. LAURIER. To consider them, and accept them when he finds them reasonable. Well, of course, when a suggestion is made from this side of the House, such as this one, which is so reasonable that the hon. gentleman cannot find any loophole to escape, he accepts it; but when anything is offered from his own side of the House, even though it is unreasonable, he will act upon it, and that is what we object to. That is the reproach we make against the present Government, and it is the basis of the motion of my hon. friend. It is because the hon. gentleman has again and again violated this principle, which he knows to be true, and which he accepts to-day, that my hon. friend is obliged to affirm it. What is it, my hon. friend complains of? That the Government, in the distribution, not of their patronage, but of the public expenditure for the public works of the country, has not followed that sound principle which the hon. gentleman now admits is right, and which he is forced to accept, but has violated it. It is because he has listened to the voices of his friends calling for things unreasonable, and refused to listen to the voices of his opponents, who ask for things reasonable. What can he say to this? As we have had shown a few days ago, public expenditure for post offices is made in localities which do not give \$1,000 of revenue, and it is denied in other localities which give \$4,000 or \$5,000 revenue. Under such circumstances, what can the hon. gentleman say in his own defence for the course of his Administration? What can he say to vindicate expenditure in building post offices in localities such as Laprairie and St. Jérôme, which do not give more than \$1,000 or \$1,200 revenue annually, when he refuses to build post offices at places such as Woodstock, which give a revenue of \$14,000 a year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At Woodstock, the people do not want a post office.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand, the people at Woodstock and other places have asked for public edifices, but were not given them simply because they had returned members who were not in accord with the policy of the Administration. This is the charge made by my hon. friend behind me, and this is the reason why he offers this motion to the House, which the hon. gentleman is forced to admit, but upon which he will not act. Of course, there must be a distinction drawn somewhere, but the only principle upon which public expenditure should be made is that accepted by the hon. gentleman himself—that it should be made according to public interest. And the public interest is to be decided—how? Exactly as stated by my hon. friend—according to the revenue collected. This should be the rule on which the Administration should act. But there is more

than this. Public expenditure should not be a consideration at elections. I know it has been the practice again and again to say: If you support the Government you will get a post office, or such and such a public edifice. Well, we object to this. Whenever an election takes place, the country has to judge upon the policy of the Administration; and if you allow the consideration to go to the electors, that they are to be favored with public edifices provided they will return a supporter of the Government, then the electorate must be biased. They are bribed, to a certain extent, to give an unfair verdict. The hon. gentleman now has accepted the motion. It remains to be seen whether he will act upon it or not when the occasion offers.

Mr. FLYNN. As the principle involved in the resolution moved by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is an important one, I deem it my duty to offer a few observations on the course pursued by the Government in the erection of public edifices. In the views laid down by the hon. member for Bothwell, I entirely concur, and I will endeavor to follow the example he set of occupying but a short time of the House in the discussion of this question. As my hon. friend stated, he simply laid down the general principles, and invited hon. gentlemen on this side, who had particular reason to complain, to give their experience and views. I intend, therefore, furnishing the House with an illustration of the policy of the Government taken from cases in my own county. During last Session I had occasion to bring to the notice of the Minister of Public Works the position of a public structure in that county, a work of very great importance to the people of that section—I allude to the L'Ardoise breakwater. On that occasion I drew the notice of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the fact that very many years ago, when he held the position he now occupies, he recognised the importance of this work and the necessity for its construction by consenting to place in the Estimates a vote of \$30,000 for that purpose. But before the hon. gentleman was enabled to carry out the promise he had made to that constituency, the Government of which he was a member, had to resign, and it was left to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when he obtained power in 1874, to construct the work. That hon. gentleman, seeing before him in his Department, the surveys and plans connected with this work, unhesitatingly asked Parliament for a vote to construct it by sections. A section of 400 feet was constructed, at a cost of about \$11,000, which, I need not say, afforded great protection and shelter to those who frequented that harbor. But, some six or seven years after it was constructed, owing to the seaworms and ice, it became out of repair, and the necessity of repairing it, if the total destruction of the work was to be avoided, was brought to the notice of the Minister of Public Works by one of the subordinates in his Department. I hold, that the necessity for immediate repair having been called to his attention, and not attended to, the hon. gentleman is responsible for that neglect and the consequent damage to the structure. In order to sustain that pretension, let me read the letter I refer to. It is a copy of the report of the Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department, dated Ottawa, 6th February, 1883. He says:

"During the year 1876-77 a breakwater 400 feet in length was built by the Department at L'Ardoise, Richmond County, C. B., N. S., at a cost of \$10,330. An examination of this structure lately made shows that the portion of the work below the line of half-tide has been badly damaged by the seaworm and is in a very weakened state, and liable to serious damage at any time by gales or ice. To protect and preserve this work, which affords the only shelter for fishing boats and vessels on the L'Ardoise shore, it will be necessary to place about 5,000 cubic yards of heavy stone in the form of slopes all around, as shown in the plans herewith, the cost of which will amount to \$5,000, and I have to recommend that the work be proceeded with as it is not in fit state to withstand the heavy gales."

I stated that after the officer of his Department had called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to that work without avail, it was carried away that fall by a heavy gale. After it was carried away, the condition of the structure having been called to the Minister's attention at the next meeting of Parliament, the sum of \$5,000 was placed in the Estimates and voted for the purpose of repairing that work, but not a dollar of that money has ever been expended. Such was the condition of affairs up to 1887. When I came here in 1887, I could see that there was nothing of greater importance to the people I represent, than the re-construction of this work, and it was my first duty to bring its neglected state, and the necessity for repairing it, to the notice of the Minister of Public Works. I did so, and have done so every subsequent Session, including last Session, when I again brought it under the notice of the hon. gentleman and discussed the whole matter over again, and received from the Minister of Public Works some assurance that it would be attended to. I bring again to the hon. gentleman's notice the fact that this is no new work. I am not asking for a new expenditure. This was a work, the necessity of which was recognised by the Government, and which was built at a cost of \$11,000, and when damaged by ice or worms, or any other cause whatever, I hold it was as much the duty of the Government to repair that breakwater as to repair any other breakwater in any other part of the Dominion. It was as much their duty to repair it as it would be to put a new roof on this building if the old one were destroyed. Having brought this matter to the notice of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, I trust that he will take proper measures to have it attended to. The people are leaving that place for the want of this, and I hope it will be looked after in future. There is another matter of which I have to complain, as to the unfairness with which my county has been dealt with in regard to public buildings. Some years ago, a site was purchased for a public building in the town of Arichat—custom house, post office and savings bank. The site cost \$1,000. There were several surveys, there was a good deal of correspondence, and I believe there was a good deal of expense in addition to the \$1,000. Tenders were invited for the erection of a building, but no contract was ever awarded and no building was ever erected. I have to complain of that, and, if the Minister of Public Works can offer no other reason than that it is because I sit on the left of the Speaker and am a member of the Opposition, then I hold it is no reason at all, for we are as much entitled to the expenditure of public money as the constituencies which send members to support the Government. The First Minister said that he agreed perfectly with the resolution of the

hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I am glad to hear it, but, as the leader of the Opposition said, will he act upon it? I will call the attention of the House for a moment to the expenditure on public buildings and public works in Nova Scotia. I will show the House that for the last four years, including the present Session, with the exception of a small sum which has been voted for the County of Yarmouth, every dollar which has been voted for public works or buildings has been in counties which send to this House supporters of the Government. During that time, not a dollar has been placed in the Estimates for counties representing those who sit on the left of the Speaker, from Nova Scotia, excepting this small amount in the County of Yarmouth. I find that, in 1887, there was voted for public buildings in Nova Scotia \$25,925, and for public works \$76,950, making a total of \$102,825. In 1888 there was voted for public buildings \$31,000, and for public works \$33,800, making a total of \$69,300. In 1889 there was voted for public buildings \$31,675, and for public works \$22,000, making a total of \$53,675. Then in this year, 1890, we find a vote for public buildings in that Province of \$23,000, and for public works \$20,000, making a total of \$43,000. This makes a total for the four years, voted for public works and buildings in Nova Scotia, of \$268,900, and, with the exception of the small amount which has been voted for the County of Yarmouth, not a dollar has been granted to any county which sends an Opposition member to this House. I hold that this is not exactly fair. I contend that the only sound principle is that public moneys should be spent wherever the public interest requires them to be spent, regardless of the political proclivities of the county itself, or of those whom the electors may send to represent them. Again, when I or any other hon. gentleman in Opposition have occasion, as we have had in the past, by petition from our constituents or by letter to the Minister of Public Works, or by personal interview, to show him the necessity for a public work in a certain portion of the constituents which we represent, I hold that it is the duty of that Minister to make enquiries as to the truth of the representations which were made in the petition, or as to the truth of the statement made by the representative of the county, in order to discover the necessity for the construction of that public work. If he should find, after proper investigation, that there is a public necessity for such a public work—for harbor protection, or for a breakwater, or anything of that kind—it is the bounden duty of the Minister, at the next meeting of Parliament, to ask for an appropriation for that public work. As was stated by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the people in counties which send members of the Opposition contribute their share of the revenue. If the money which is in the hands of the Government belonged to themselves, or if it were paid simply by the constituencies which send gentlemen to support the Administration, that would be another thing. But, when the public funds which are at the disposal of the Administration are contributed by the people generally in this Dominion, I hold that those who are in Opposition are as much entitled to consideration as those who support the Government. The Government hold the money simply as trustees. It be-

Mr. FLYNN.

longs to the people, and unless the people, irrespective of their political views in any constituency, get their share, get what they are reasonably entitled to, then that trust is not honestly discharged. Have not the Opposition rights as well as duties to perform in this House? We have seen the Opposition, as well as the gentlemen on the other side, giving their best attention to the conduct of public affairs. Have we not seen, day by day and night by night for a number of years past, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), with his great talent, with his cultivated mind, with his legal knowledge and experience, helping hon. gentlemen opposite to perfect their measures? Have we not seen the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), with his breadth of view, with his quick apprehension and his grasp of thought, lending his abilities also to the Government. Have we not seen the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), lending their great experience and their undoubted abilities to help the Government to perfect the legislation of the country. Then, Mr. Speaker, have not the Opposition some rights? Should their constituencies be made to suffer if, in the exercise of their opinion, they disagree with the Government or with the fiscal policy of the Government, or with some other matter of that kind? Is it not the right of every British subject to exercise the franchise in the way which he thinks right in the interest of the public, and is the constituency which he represents to be told, year after year, that, as long as it opposes the Government, it need not expect any expenditure for public works? Such principles are slavish principles; they are debasing and demoralising to any people. Every constituency, no matter what may be its political views, should understand that whenever it requires a particular amount of public money to be expended for a necessary public work, it should have it. Under our system of government, an Opposition is a necessity. Under our system a party is necessary, and that an Opposition is as necessary as a Government is a proposition which no one who is acquainted with the history of parliamentary government, will deny. With all the evils which attend parliamentary government, it has been acknowledged by one of the greatest writers on that subject that an Opposition is a necessity. Let me read what was said by Sir Thomas Erskine May, as to the rights and duties of an Opposition. After speaking of the evils that necessarily spring from party government, and deploring those evils, he goes on to speak of the Opposition:

"But, on the other side, we find that government, without party, is absolutism—that rulers, without opposition, may be despots. We acknowledge, with gratitude, that we owe to party most of our rights and liberties. We recognise, in the fierce contentions of our ancestors, the conflict of great principles, and the final triumph of freedom. We glory in the eloquence and noble sentiments which the rivalry of contending statesmen have inspired. We admire the courage with which power has been resisted, and the manly resolution and persistence by which popular rights have been established. We observe that, while the undue influence of the Crown has been restrained, the democracy has also been held in check. We exult in the final success of men who have suffered in a good cause. We admire the generous friendships, fidelity and self-sacrifice—akin to loyalty and patriotism—which the honorable sentiments of party have called forth. We perceive that an Opposition may often serve the country

far better than a Ministry; and that, where its principles are right, they will prevail. By argument and discussion truth is discovered, public opinion is expressed, and a free people are trained to self-government. We feel that party is essential to representative institutions. Every interest, principle, opinion, theory and sentiment finds expression. The majority governs; but the minority is never without sympathy, representation and hope. Such being the two opposite aspects of party, who can doubt that good predominates over evil? Who can fail to recognise in party the very life-blood of freedom?"

Such, Mr. Speaker, is the opinion of an eminent writer on party government, and the rights and duties of an Opposition. Now, I would make this distinction as regards patronage and public expenditure. In the distribution of patronage, I acknowledge that the Government would be unwise, perhaps, to give it to their enemies. I do not complain, where a vacancy takes place in any public office in my county, that I should not have the nomination of the person who shall fill it. I am willing the Government should give their friends in the county the right to name the persons who shall fill those offices. But that is quite a different thing from the expenditure of public money. I hold that if in any portion of my constituency, or any portion of Nova Scotia—where we know the difficulties our fishermen have to contend with—I say, that if we bring to the notice of the Minister of Public Works that there is a necessity for harbors, piers or breakwaters in those places, it is the duty of the Government, after proper enquiry and investigation to ascertain that they are in the public interest, to go on and erect those structures. Now, Sir, we have spent a good deal of money in this country since Confederation; we have spent a good deal of money in acquiring and developing the North-West; we have spent a good deal of money in railways, and particularly on the great Canadian Pacific Railway. I know that hon. gentlemen in this House entertain great hopes for the future of this country. I am not here to say that there is not a great future for this country; I know there are great possibilities before this country. We have heard a great deal of eloquence for a number of years regarding the future of this country, regarding its development, and its material prosperity, and I say that if all these hopes are to be realised, it can only be by an honest administration of public affairs, and by the Government paying due regard to the interest of every section of the country, irrespective of its political proclivities, by a due regard to the expenditure of public money, in an honest manner, wherever it is required, no matter whether that section of the country is represented here by a gentleman who sits on your right, Mr. Speaker, or on your left.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The leader of the Government having accepted the motion now in your hands, I do not propose to detain the House at any great length. The hon. gentleman took very great pains to fasten upon the opposite side of the House a view which we do not for a moment entertain. The hon. gentleman asked the question quite triumphantly: "Do the Opposition expect we are to consult them regarding the expenditure of money? Do they expect that we are going to take them into our confidence? Do they expect we shall go to them in preference to our own friends in the country, and do they expect we shall, in fact, treat them in this matter as if they were supporting us in this House?"

Now, I say most emphatically, No, we do not expect anything of the kind. I, for one, expect nothing of the kind. I endeavored, the other night, when a similar question was before the House, to lay down the views and the policy which are embodied in this resolution. My duty then I felt to be this: That in the event of any public work being required in my own or any neighboring county with which I was familiar, it was my duty, as a member of this House, to bring it to the notice of the Government. I do not expect for a moment that if the Government are going to carry out that work, they will consult me with regard to the expenditure; I do not expect they will take me into their confidence and ask how it is to be expended, and who it is to be given to. That is their own look out. I discharge my duty when I bring to their notice the fact that a work of a public nature is required in a certain locality, in the public interest, and it is their duty to see that it is carried out. Now, so much for that point, which was the main point in the contention of the right hon. gentleman. My hon. friend on my right (Mr. Flynn) has pointed out the manner in which this subject has been treated in our own Province, and he has shown that during the last four or five years the entire expenditure has been made in counties represented on the Government side of the House. We will take the County of Antigonish, for instance. For many years it was represented by the present Judge McIsaac. For many years that hon. gentleman, I know, made strong and urgent application to the Government for an expenditure in that county, but he never had one cent expended on that county, there was never a public work undertaken there, until the Minister of Justice was elected for Antigonish, and represented that county in the House and in the Government, and then we found that, year after year, large public expenditures were made in Antigonish. I pointed out last year that there were five or six public works going on at one time, and I pointed out this year that there were four or five further expenditures proposed for public works in Antigonish County. I do not object to expenditure in Antigonish County at all, but, as I said then, it is a small and not a very commercial county. Then take the County of Guysborough, alongside of it. My hon. friend who represents that county in this House for so long a time, has never been able, up to the present moment, to have one cent of public money expended in that county. Why? Simply because he is not a supporter of the Government. The right hon. gentleman said that they had spent money wherever, in their judgment, it was required in the public interest, but it is a most singular coincidence that wherever they selected a county where public money was required to be spent, it was always a county the representative of which was supporting the Government. Then, take the County of Richmond, to which my hon. friend has referred. Take the County of Lunenburg. It was for a time represented by a supporter of the Government, and the Government went so far as to purchase a lot for a public building in the town of Lunenburg. But since the last election, when the hon. gentleman who now represents that prosperous county was returned to oppose the Administration, they have taken no action whatever. The money they

spent for the lot has remained idle. They have never proposed an appropriation for the post office, simply for the reason that they have not a supporter in this House from that county. Then you take the County of Queen's, long represented by a Liberal, and during all that time no expenditure was made in that county, and it was only when the present member came here that, year after year, very considerable amounts were voted for expenditures there. Take, also, the Counties of Shelburne, Digby and Annapolis. When these counties were represented during a great many years by hon. members sitting on this side of the House not one dollar was expended there, although year after year the matter was brought to the notice of the Government; but the moment the representation was changed the policy of the Government was changed also, and expenditure was made for those works which had been neglected so long. I am glad to see that the time has arrived when the Government are going to deal with the question in the public and not in party interests. If the Government have accepted this amendment in good faith, and in good faith are disposed to carry it out, we shall have done a very good work to-day. We do not expect, I do not expect, to be consulted by the Government regarding the expenditures, and in regard to whose hands they shall be placed. All I desire to see is, that if the money is required to be spent in the public interest it should be expended, and these important counties should not be neglected simply because they returned members to this side of the House and not supporters of the Government.

Mr. IVES. Hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavored to make it appear that the Government have adopted, as a general principle, that if a county sends a member in opposition to the Administration that county does not benefit by the expenditure of public money. I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that the converse is not established, and that it does not at all follow that because a county is represented by a supporter of the Administration, that county receives an expenditure of public money to which it might claim to be entitled. The hon. member—it is a strange coincidence that the hon. member for Richmond, N.S., (Mr. Flynn) and I represent constituencies similar in name—has complained that no expenditure has been made by the Administration in that county. Without being liable to the charge of boasting, I may say that the County of Richmond, in Quebec, is a far more important constituency, from every point of view, than the county represented by my hon. friend from Nova Scotia. For several years I have had the honor of presenting petitions and requests to the Minister of Public Works for the erection of a public building in the town of Richmond, and so far these petitions and requests have not received the recognition which I had hoped they might have received from the Minister and the Administration, and I think that very fact should show the hon. member for Richmond, N.S. (Mr. Flynn), that it does not at all follow, that, because he opposes the Administration, no expenditure is made in his constituency. I think I have been a consistent supporter of this Administration, and certainly I have for many years forwarded petitions and supported petitions asking

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

for the erection of a post office and public building in Richmond, but so far no heed has been paid to these representations. I may say to my hon. friend from Richmond, N.S., that the town of Richmond, in the Province of Quebec, is a place of very considerable importance; it is a division point on the Grand Trunk Railway, a town of 5,000 inhabitants, a town having a post office revenue of considerable importance, it is an outpost of Customs, and also an office under the Department of Inland Revenue, and a public building has been needed there for many years. I can only express the hope that the time is not far distant when the prayer of those petitions, which, from year to year, have been sent in, will be acceded to and an expenditure made in that county; but it is unfair to the Administration and to the Minister of Public Works, to make the charge that an expenditure is not made in counties which send opponents of the Government to this House, because I can assure the hon. gentleman that expenditure is frequently not made, even when valid claims exist, in constituencies which have sent members supporting the Administration.

Mr. DAVIN. I have to complain, in common with the Opposition, that I cannot get the Minister of Public Works to give me a post office. I have been at the Minister for three years on behalf of an important town in my constituency, which has strong claims upon the consideration of the Government, as I have urged upon the Minister of Public Works. It needs a building for its post office badly, and there are reasons connected with the town, as the hon. Minister knows, why this request should be granted; and yet, notwithstanding that I have been pressing the Minister, and I have been pressed strongly from behind myself, I am in the same box as the Reformers—I cannot get a grant for a post office at Moose Jaw. I hope the Minister of Public Works, having heard the admirable argument of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the clear, silvery eloquence of the leader of the Opposition, when he comes to consider the claim I am pressing on him, will give us a post office at Moose Jaw.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to take advantage of the offer made by the Government respecting the resolution now before the House. The Minister of Public Works has invited hon. members to lay their claims for important public works before the Government. I have not only to complain in regard to the county I represent, that the Government do not carry out any public works there, but, that the public works already there, and which were built by the Local Government, are not even kept in repair. In this regard, I desire to bring to the attention of the Minister the break-water at Little Sands. It was built at considerable expense by our Local Government, and it proved a very great advantage to the fishermen and farmers of that section of the county. It was useful to the fishermen in severe weather as affording a harbor of refuge, and it was useful to the farmers as providing a place from which they could make shipments of produce and of fish. A light was kept on the pier by the Local Government to enable the fishermen to land in safety. Although great promises were made to the Island before it entered Confederation, and although Mr. Pope, one of the

delegates to Ottawa, on his return promised that our public works would be maintained in a good state of repair by the Dominion Government, this pier has been allowed to fall into a state of decay. This important work, which was built at a very large expense, is now very much out of repair, and if repairs are not carried out by the Dominion Government very shortly, it will be carried away. This is one of the important works which I desire specially to bring to the notice of the Minister, and I hope that, as he has in his possession petitions numerously signed by the inhabitants of the county and also a petition from the inhabitants of Pictou Island, who largely use this work for their shipping business, he will pay a little attention to these representations. I do not expect to be consulted on these matters; I only ask the Minister of Public Works to take into his consideration the petitions which I believe and know he has in his possession with regard to this work. Another public work in my county which is entirely out of repair is the pier at Greek River. This is a wharf which was built at considerable expense by the Local Government, but it is now falling into ruin, and will soon drift into the river, if it is not repaired. One of the oldest wharves in my county, and, perhaps, in the Province, and a most important wharf, is the one at Aitken's Shore, on the Montague River. This wharf is exceedingly useful for all kinds of shipping, especially for late shipping in the autumn season, when the harbor at the head of the river is frozen over. It was built at considerable expense by the Local Government, but it is now falling into decay, as not a cent has been expended on it by the authorities at Ottawa. There are some other very necessary works, to which I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works, and I do not wish that it should be supposed that I intend to make any political capital out of this matter—I know the Minister of Public Works has got in his possession petitions largely signed, not only by Reformers, but by Conservatives, asking for a breakwater pier at Bay Fortune. So much is this work required, that the inhabitants of that section of the country themselves subscribed nearly \$1,000, and petitioned this Government for a grant to enable them to finish it. They have petitioned, I believe, two or three times, and so careful were they in forwarding these petitions, that they did not place them in our hands, but sent them to supporters of the Government. In that section of the country, the Government has a large majority of supporters, who have subscribed towards this work and who are desirous of obtaining it. I do not expect that the hon. Minister will yield to anything I may say, but I wish to bring to his notice the importance of the work, and the fact that it is his own supporters who have asked for it, and who have been denied it over and over again. I think the Minister of Public Works has in this case treated his friends badly. I wish also to call his attention to the necessity of erecting a breakwater at Naufrage Harbor, where he ordered a survey some two years ago, and the report of which stated that the work could be done for \$8,000 or \$10,000. This place is on the north shore of the Island, where fishermen fish with hooks, and they only ask that a boat harbor for shelter in stormy weather should be made. At present they have to haul up their boats at night, and launch them

in the morning, which causes considerable trouble, and frequently great loss, to the poor men. There is a similar work to this required to be done at North Lake, for which the people have petitioned, but have received no assistance from the Government. I have to complain that in my own county we have had no expenditure of public money in any shape or form from the present Government, except a small post office at the village of Montague, where I live, and which cost only a few thousand dollars. The Mackenzie Government built us the Souris breakwater, and the present Government has merely kept it in repair. I have also to complain of the manner in which the Minister of Public Works carries out any works which are done in that Province. He generally appoints an inspector, at a good salary of \$2 or \$3 a day, who employs men to perform the work by days' labor. In a great many cases, this position is given to some favorite of the Government, and he generally employs men who happen to be indebted to him, or some supporter of the Government, and who, when they are working to pay off an old debt, do not generally work very well. I believe that in the majority of cases the hon. Minister could have the work done for two-thirds or one-half the cost, if he caused a proper survey to be made, and called for tenders. The latter course would be much more satisfactory to the people generally, and to his own supporters in that part of the country. It should be remembered by the House that the moneys expended on these particular works I have mentioned, are not bonuses. When this Government took over the piers, they selected the best paying ones, and let the others go adrift; and I find that they are receiving a revenue from these few piers of about \$1,200 a year, after paying all expenses in connection with them. A computation would show that this is a very large interest on the money the Government has expended there. We occupy a very exceptional position in Prince Edward Island. We are in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, in what is called the North Bay, and a large number of vessels from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and all parts of the world, come there every season for fishing purposes. Yet, along the whole north coast of Prince Edward Island, a distance of about 150 miles, we have no harbor except Cascumpec, which was referred to the other evening. I think it is of vast importance that the Minister of Public Works should take this into his consideration, and expend some money in making a harbor of refuge on the north side of our Island, so as to prevent in future a disaster such as occurred to the fishing fleet some few years ago. We have the harbor of St. Peter's there, which can be made into an excellent harbor for a comparatively small sum of money. The only harbors we have on the north-east side of the Island, are Souris and Georgetown, but the fishing fleet may be caught in a storm on the north side, and serious disasters occur, if the Minister of Public Works does not make such provision to avert it. I find that in the Counties of Restigouche, Gloucester and Kent, N.B., some \$49,000 have been expended during the last two or three years, while in my county only a very few dollars have been contributed by the Government for public works. Of course these three counties are represented by supporters of the Government, and Prince Ed-

ward Island has returned supporters of the Opposition. I am glad to see that the leader of the Government agrees with the policy laid down by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and we hope that in the future something more will be done to encourage our public works, than has been done in the past.

Mr. PERRY. This resolution is one of great importance, and I am very happy to be able to agree for once with the right hon. gentleman who leads the House. I cannot speak for him as to whether he is in earnest, or whether his speech is only a bit of hypocrisy. I only speak for myself, and I agree with the resolution honestly, fairly and squarely, and endorse every word in it. With regard to the expenditure of public money in Prince Edward Island, we are not getting nearly as much as we are entitled to. A return which was submitted to the House a few days ago—and I suppose we have to take for granted that the figures in it are correct—purports to show the amount of money expended by the Dominion in each Province since Confederation, to the 30th June, 1889, under the following heads:—

“1st. Subsidies to railways in each Province, excepting the Canadian Pacific main line and Sault branch.

“2nd. The several railways built by the Dominion in each Province, including the Intercolonial branches and extensions, but not the main line as originally constructed.

“3rd. The buildings erected or purchased in each Province, their location and cost.”

This return contains the following statement of subsidies to railways in each Province since Confederation, excepting the Canadian Pacific main line and the Sault branch:—

Ontario.....	\$3,061,905
Quebec.....	2,428,344
New Brunswick.....	888,731
Nova Scotia.....	26,138
British Columbia.....	750,000
Total.....	\$7,155,118

We have in it a further statement of the money spent for building railways in each Province by the Dominion, including the Intercolonial Railway branches and extensions, but not the main line as originally constructed:—

Quebec, including the purchase of the Rivière du Loup branch.....	\$5,520,323 26
New Brunswick.....	3,371,854 74
Nova Scotia.....	7,821,070 19
Total.....	\$16,713,248 19

This makes a total of something like \$24,000,000 or \$25,000,000 expended in those Provinces, and I fail to see Prince Edward Island getting one cent. Now, if this is correct—although I have my doubt whether it is or not—where is the justice done to Prince Edward Island? Do not the people of that Province pay their share of the revenue? Are they not taxed the same as the other people of the Dominion? Are they to be told that because they send six members here to support the Opposition, they are not entitled to any consideration. The right hon. gentleman says that he is not to come and consult members of the Opposition about these public works. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would not expect it would be unreasonable for me to expect for one moment, that the right hon. gentleman or any of his colleagues should come across the House and ask us what we want for Prince Edward

Mr. ROBERTSON.

Island; but the soles of my boots are worn off travelling to the Departments, and the skin of my knuckles is worn off rapping at the doors of their departments asking for what we require, and what answer have I got? Have I been answered yes in one case? I have not, either by the Minister of Public Works or by the Postmaster General. They have denied me every time. They do not know me, or where I come from. They do not know that there is an Island called Prince Edward Island in the Straits of Northumberland. I cannot point to one post office which the hon. Postmaster General has established in Prince County at my request. I defy him to mention one. More than a month ago, I asked the hon. gentleman to bring down a return to the House showing the correspondence that had taken place between his Department and some gentlemen outside, which prevented certain post offices being established there; the House made an order that those documents should be brought down, and I have not got them yet, and I suppose I shall not get them before next year. Well, it is hard to tell whether the hon. gentleman himself will be here or not next year. Not one post office has been built by the Government in that county outside of Summerside. It is true, there is a respectable post office building there, and it answers the purpose well. But is Summerside the only place entitled to a post office? Look at the beautiful settlement of Kensington with no post office building. Look at the thriving settlement of Alberton with no post office building, the postmaster keeps the office in a building of his own. Look at the rising settlement of Tignish; I know the postmaster there has erected his own building and keeps the post office in it. Is that fair? Do these places pay no revenue? They pay a handsome revenue. I am not going to travel outside of Prince County; it is large enough for me, and I will leave the hon. member for Queen's and the hon. member for King's to represent their own counties. But we, in Prince County, have a right to complain. How often have I asked the Government to rebuild West Point wharf, which the Dominion took from the Local Government and paid \$6,000 or \$7,000 for, and they have not taken one step. Did they even take a chain, as I suggested last year, and tie it to the breakwater, to keep it to the Island side, instead of letting it drift across to the New Brunswick side where the people would use it for firewood. It is all gone. I have endeavored to draw the hon. gentleman's attention time and again to the necessity of expending some money on the breakwater at Miminegash. Thanks to the Administration led by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), they voted the money and engineered that work; but since it has been built it has been an eyesore to the Department of Public Works, and they are letting it go to pieces because Miminegash was not converted to Toryism. The hon. leader of the Government stated a little while ago that the Government did not refuse to spend money in a constituency because it was represented by a Liberal—that they did not use the public moneys as political machines. How is it that two or three weeks before the last general election the right hon. gentleman himself held out such a bait to the people of Prince Edward Island, as to say to them, “If you vote strongly for the

members supporting the Government, we will give you the subway." But they cannot deny the public records, and it is a good thing we have these public records. The most prominent man then in the right hon. gentleman's Government, next to himself, the Minister of Finance, now High Commissioner, telegraphed to Charlottetown, stating that all the Island had to do was to return a solid phalanx of six members supporting the Government, and they would get the subway or the tunnel. I hold that to be bribery and corruption, and I am proud to say that the people of Prince Edward Island were so independent that they could not be bribed. They were prepared to stand by their rights and liberties, as British subjects, and by their franchise, although an attempt was made to cut that short, and they preferred to vote according to their conscience than to support a corrupt Government. I think they deserved credit for that, and it is hard that they should be rewarded for their honesty by being deprived of what they have a right to expect out of the public moneys of this country. In the motion I made for a return of expenditure, I asked for a detailed account of the expenditure on Tignish breakwater, but the return of the Minister of Public Works, which has been laid on the Table, gives merely the total cost of repairs, amounting to \$534.32, and does not say whether this includes the pay of the inspector or not. It merely states that the work was commenced in March and ended in June, without showing the date in either case. So that it might have been commenced the 1st of March and ended the last of June, or commenced the last of March and ended the first of June, and there would be a difference of two months between the two. I want to find out how many days the inspector spent there, and how much he got out of this \$534.22, if his pay is included in that. This return is not worth the paper it is written on; it is a mere skeleton; there is nothing in it, and I say it is an insult to the members of Prince Edward Island to treat them in that way. No doubt, if we supported the Government, we would have received a proper return, showing the day of the month the work began and ended, and how many days the inspector was paid. I suppose he was paid \$2.50 per day, and I want to have this information to show the people how many days he was paid for inspecting this work, that cost a few hundred dollars. Now, with reference to the dredge, I find by the blue book that the Prince Edward Island dredge earned, last year, \$1,500. But the return brought down shows that it earned \$2,857.50. That is to be accounted for by the fact that the blue book is only up to the last of June, 1889, while the return shows the account to the end of the work last fall, and, no doubt, the latter is correct. But I wish the House to understand that this dredge belongs to the public, that it was paid for by the people of Prince Edward Island, and purchased from them by this Government, which charged the amount against Prince Edward Island in the general account; and I would ask if there is any justice in allowing that dredge to work for private parties and earn for the Government \$2,800, when it should be employed in doing the work of the people of the Island generally. The hon. gentleman knows well that that is unfair and unjust. If I could go behind the screen,

and see the secret correspondence which was sent to Charlottetown from the Department here, no doubt I would find that certain supporters of the Government down there—for instance, the defeated candidate in 1887—told the hon. gentleman where to put his dredge at work, and that, as Tignish did not return a supporter of the Government, nothing should be done for them. I do not believe that is the right way to treat the people. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the Cape Traverse case. Cape Traverse pier is just opposite the great Government wharf at Cape Tormentine, and though the Government took over the Cape Traverse wharf from the Island, they have hardly done any repairs to it. They built a branch railway from Emerald Junction on the main line, through the extreme east portion of Prince County, to Cape Traverse; yet, in this return which has been handed to me, I find no account of any subsidy given to Prince Edward Island. I find no account given there of the branch railway; and, therefore, I have my doubts as to the correctness of this return. These public works were built on both sides in order to keep up continuous communication, but the Government were more generous on the Cape Tormentine side, for they expended on public works there something like \$250,000, not so much, I am sure, for the accommodation of the public or for the public welfare, as for the sake of keeping the County of Westmoreland solid in their favor. That cannot be denied, for it is too plain to admit of contradiction. A little before 1882 the Government built the Cape Traverse branch, as a matter of expediency, in order to keep the electors of my county favorable to them; but, since 1887, they have allowed the work of the Cape Traverse wharf to go out of repair. The other day a meeting was held composed of the people of both sides of politics on the Island. Members of the Local House, the Hon. Mr. Bentley, Commissioner of Public Works on the Island, Mr. Laird, and many others, were present, and the meeting passed resolutions and decided to send a delegation to wait on the Minister of Public Works, and ask for a grant of from \$30,000 to \$50,000 to repair the wharf at Cape Traverse. But, in the meantime, bear in mind, Sir, the people on last Saturday turned out *en masse*, and hauled a lot of brush and piles to repair the work, thus paying out of their own pockets for work the Government should have done. It is a good job that I have a pass on the railway, for I have to attend so many meetings of the people, calling on the Government to do them justice, that otherwise I would have been ruined. But, as the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) has asked: is this the reason why we are not to get justice because we do not support the Government? Are we to be bought like sheep? I will compare my loyalty to-day with that of any hon. member of the Government. I am not only loyal to the Crown of England, but I am loyal to my people, I am loyal to Prince Edward Island. I am a little selfish that way, and I say it is disgraceful for the Government of Canada to allow such injustice to be practised against Prince Edward Island. The Government need not be surprised if, some day, they find that Prince Edward Island is drifting away.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. PERRY. Yes; we have seen greater wonders than that. We know in that Island how to shoulder muskets; not small muskets, but the muskets of common sense. We know where to apply to get our grievances rectified, and in order to obtain justice. While we have such men at our backs as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and the hon. leader of the Opposition, there is no fear that we will not get justice in time. They will unquestionably navigate the ship properly and bring her safely to the port of justice. I did expect at one time to get the correspondence which I have asked for from the hon. Postmaster-General, but I am disappointed, and I know I am not going to get it.

Mr. HAGGART. What correspondence?

Mr. PERRY. The correspondence about the post office at Kensington.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it not brought down?

Mr. PERRY. Not as far as I know. The soles of my boots are worn out, as I have already stated, in going up and down stairs, and always getting the statement, There is nothing for you; and my hon. friend knows that there is nothing for me yet. He need not say that he will ask his subordinates to supply the information, because the order must emanate from himself. I do not know much about the secrets of these officers, but I know that the hon. gentleman must give the order, and he has not given the order. It is only a work of a few minutes, and, if his Department is short of hands, I will go myself and do the work for nothing. I do not believe I shall get that information, or that, if I do, it will be complete. The Baltic post office is in the same position, and I know that he will not give me that return. I asked for that a year or two ago, and I have not got it yet, and I shall not get it now. The hon. gentleman knows that he ought to establish that post office. Every county which returns Conservatives gets a post office, but how many did my hon. friends from King's County or Queen's County get? I know I got none, and I suppose they are in the same position as I am. We have a right to have post offices built by the Government in the thriving village of Kensington, in Alberton, in Tignish, and I do not know in how many more places. I would like the hon. gentleman to state, if he knows anything about his Department, what are the revenues from those places. It is certain that he cares very little about doing justice to the people of the county I have the honor to represent. If he thinks that the people of Prince County are going to be frightened or bought by such tricks as he is adopting, he is very much mistaken. We are not made of that kind of metal. We are determined to take the administration from the hands of the hon. gentleman. For my own part, I am prepared for a fight any day, to-morrow if he likes. I have forgotten to mention some breakwaters which are required in my county, but I will leave that to my colleague, who, I know, is itching for an opportunity to speak. I am very thankful to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) for giving me an opportunity to state the wants of my people. Their demands are genuine, and, if the Minister of Public Works does not do his duty, I am not responsible for it, and if the Postmaster

Mr. PERRY.

General is of the same stamp, on him will lie the responsibility, and he will have to answer for that when he is tried before a jury of the country.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has referred to the request for post offices at Alberton, Tignish and Kensington. I will see that he shall have the correspondence at once, but I may say that, in regard to his statement that there ought to be post offices at these places, and his challenge to me to state the revenue from them, I will do so now and leave the matter to the judgment of the House. At Tignish, the total revenue is \$668, the expenditure on the post office employés is \$251, leaving a net revenue of \$417. At Alberton, which is the principal place in his whole constituency, where he claims a post office building should be erected, the gross revenue is \$1,034, the expenditure for employés is \$452, leaving a net revenue of \$582. At Kensington, the total receipts are \$571, and the expenditure is \$275, leaving a net revenue of \$296. These are the three places which the hon. gentleman says the Post Office Department has so much neglected by not having erected post office buildings.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They average as much as Cayuga.

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

After Recess.

Mr. YEO. I desire to say a few words on this question, to show the way the Government have treated Prince Edward Island. In doing so, I will commence with the breakwaters on the east side of the Province, at a place called Malpeque. There is a breakwater there which cost this Dominion several thousand dollars, but as very little has been done towards keeping it up, it has nearly gone to wreck. It is a work that has been of great benefit to that section of the country, and, indeed, to the whole of that coast. This is a good harbor on the north side of Prince Edward Island, but if a vessel gets overtaken by a storm in a north-east wind, it is bound to go ashore, and lives are likely to be lost. This is a place where protection to the shipping ought to be provided after vessels get into port. What little money has been spent there to keep it in repair, has been spent by days' work. The work has been given into the hands of some friends of the Government, who proceed very slowly with it. Those who have the work on hand get so much a day, and the longer they keep the work on hand the more money they earn. I think the Government should ask for tenders, and get one of their party to inspect the work, and bind the contractors who tender to finish it at a certain time, and let the inspector see that it is properly done, so that the public money will not be wasted in the way it has been wasted elsewhere. There is also a Dominion wharf at Keer's Shore, towards which little or nothing has been done. Then we go round to Tignish, where there has been some little work done, but not judiciously. It has been put into the hands of partisans, who go along slowly, so much so that when they have done the work they have to commence over again. Then we go on to Miminegash. There has been a large expenditure of public money at this point—some ten or fifteen thousand dollars; and the money for this work

was voted by the late Government and completed by this Government. It was repaired about two years ago, but nothing has been done to it since. Petitions and letters have been sent to the Government, and I, myself, have brought it to the notice of the Minister of Public Works, but it was all of no use. Now it is going to pieces, and I would not be surprised if the whole thing was swept away this spring. A few hundred dollars spent upon it now would secure this work. Last summer we wrote to the Public Works Department several times, and the Minister gave us fair promises; but these promises ended there. We then go to West Point, where there is a wharf built by the Local Government, which cost a good deal of money. The Dominion Government took it into their hands, and since then it has all gone to pieces. It is several miles from a railway, and there is no other way of shipping produce. Then, go a little further out to a place called Brae. Several petitions have been sent to the Government, calling their attention to the wharf. Engineers have been sent down to survey it, but nothing more has been done. Several parties started business there, and one man, a strong friend of the Government, who was at one time a member of the Local House and a member of the Government, started business there. He petitioned to get some aid to assist in making it a shipping place. The Government paid no attention to it, and, finally, for want of shipping facilities, the saw mill and other buildings of this man went down, and he had to go away. This winter the people in the neighborhood subscribed about \$500 to build a breakwater there. They built about five chains in length and nearly one in breadth. They petitioned the Government, and also wrote letters to my colleague and myself, asking us to secure a small amount in carrying out this work, so that they could ship their produce. I hope the Minister will put a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for that purpose. Then, we come on to Sheep River, where there is another wharf that was taken off the hands of the Local Government. It cost a large amount of money, but it has been neglected in the same way as the others. I think, two years ago, a small amount of money was given for that work, and a man sent down there, an employé of the Government, I think, who took his own team and a boy, and began to draw sand, instead of stones, from the shore for ballast, but after awhile the sand washed through and filled in the channel. I think it is a great misfortune that the Government have neglected that work. Then, there is Summerside, a great highway for shipping and passengers to Point Duchene. In this House, eight or nine years ago, I asked the Government to give us a small amount to build a couple of breakwaters to protect the harbor. It lies open to the west and north winds, and the shipping is unprotected. A breakwater is needed to protect the shipping inside, as well as the railway wharf. The Government never paid any attention to this work. Last winter a petition was sent asking for a survey; an engineer made a survey, and reported that it would cost about \$70,000. I think that is an over-estimate, but even if it would cost that, what signifies \$70,000 to improve such a harbor as that? The people held a meeting about it, the Government supporters there cannot believe that the Government treated them in this way. There is plenty of material on the shore, brush and stone, and plenty

of men who will work at a cheap rate. If the Government will only take this matter into consideration, and build these works, it will keep the harbor open much later in the fall, and earlier in the spring, it would be of great benefit to the inhabitants of the Island. Then, leaving Summerside, you come to Cape Traverse, where there is a large wharf. It has cost the Local Government a large amount of money, but since the Dominion Government took it over nothing much has been done on it. There is also a railroad to Cape Tormentine, on the New Brunswick side. A large amount of money has been spent there in building a breakwater, and I do not see why the Government do not repair the Cape Traverse wharf, so that steamers may run across the Straits with mails and passengers between these two points, the distance being only nine miles, and do it in one hour, instead of four or five hours as at present. It would also increase the trade of the Island and be a good thing for the railways. I hope the Government will take this into consideration and lose no time in doing something in this way. Now, I do not ask for any favors; I only want the Government to do what is right and just. I have been a member of this House for a good many years, but since the change of Government we have never got anything to speak of for the Island. We are differently situated in Prince Edward Island from the people of any other Province in the Dominion. We are surrounded by water; many ships come to the Island from all parts of the world, but they have not the proper harbor accommodation, and I think it is too bad that the Government do not provide better harbor accommodation. We pay a great deal more money into the Dominion Treasury than we get out of it, for we cannot even get a post office established. I do not see the Postmaster General in his place; but I may say that the late Postmaster General, before he became Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia promised that he would have one or two post offices established. I and my colleague visited the Deputy Postmaster General, and I was told that I could write and tell the parties that the offices would be established, but they would not be established until after the 1st July. I did so, on his word; but up to this time it has not been done. Last winter I and my colleague went to the Department, and we found a slip of paper there from the defeated candidate, to the effect that those offices were not wanted. And in that way they have not been established. I saw that gentleman during the summer, and I asked him, he came to do such an act, as the offices how were wanted. He said: Yes, but he was working for himself; he wanted to get another office. I asked him if he would write to the Department and request that the office be opened. He told me he would do so; but up to this time he has not done so. It is very unfair and unjust to the people of Prince Edward Island, that they cannot obtain even such a small grant as a post office. I have also presented a petition that the mail bag he dropped at a station on the line, where there are two or three mills, a church, school house, and two stores; but I do not expect to obtain even this accommodation, which would be useful to 200 or 300 people. The same unfair treatment is extended all over the Island. I hope the Minister of Public Works will not forget these matters, but that he

will do something to meet our request. If he did more to help the Island as regards our public works, the Government might obtain additional support, but as they do nothing to further our interests they cannot expect support from us. I hope the Minister of Public Works and Postmaster General will do justice to the Island, and give the people the facilities and accommodation they ask and require.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I desire to say a few words, before the House passes into Committee of Supply, on this question, which affects my constituents to a very great extent. I was glad that the leader of the Government accepted the amendment moved by my hon. friend, and if we can only be satisfied of the sincerity of the hon. gentlemen's repentance, they might be granted to some extent absolution for their past misdoings. But whether the hon. gentleman's repentance is sincere or not, I suppose we will have proof when the Finance Minister brings down the Supplementary Estimates. The hon. gentleman complained that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) dealt altogether in generalities, and he invited from hon. members details of the complaints they had to make. I think the hon. gentleman must have been satisfied, from the speeches delivered this afternoon and the remarks of the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Yeo) this evening, that we not only have general ground for complaint, but we have specific grounds, and those hon. gentlemen must have satisfied him that our complaints are well founded. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that if he was convinced by the reasons of his political opponents he would be obliged to submit, but he drew a distinction between his opponents and his friends, for, as regards his friends, he only seemed to want their wishes and not their reasons. As regards political patronage in respect to appointments so far as that matter is concerned no one doubts that the Government will exercise their patronage in favor of their political friends. Any Government in power would do that, but, with respect to the expenditure on public works of public utility, it is, I believe, essential in the public interest that they should be constructed irrespective of party purposes, and that all parts of the country should have fair play. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has stated that no part of the Dominion has suffered so severely from the rule adopted by the present Government as the Province from which I come. We have been treated shabbily and shamefully in regard to public works. Hon. members who have been in this House eight or ten years will be aware that we have been obliged to complain annually during many years, no less than fifteen years, of the failure of the Government to carry out the terms of Confederation. It took us fifteen years of constant work to induce the Government to put on a respectable steamer in order to try and carry out the terms of Union with respect to the winter crossing. I am glad to say, as I stated last year, we have now an exceedingly good boat, one which reflects credit on the Department and does its work remarkably well, and as regards that matter I have now no complaint to make. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that not only those who are opposed to him in politics complain of the manner in which the Island is treated, but our political

Mr. Yeo.

opponents, the supporters of the Government, are themselves obliged, when they have to speak on the question, to admit sorrowfully that the Island is badly treated. A year or two ago, the Conservative Government had to send a deputation home to England to lay a petition covering the grievances of the Island at the foot of the Throne. There they met the High Commissioner, and a conference took place as to whether the Island was properly treated or not, and in order to show the House that the action we have taken is not confined to opponents of the Government, but is shared in by their supporters, I will quote a sentence from the memorial submitted to Lord Granville by the deputation that went to lay the memorial of the Island Government at home at the foot of the Throne:

"The Committee of Council speak of the 'liberal treatment' of the Island by the Dominion Government, and that it has received especial consideration, on account of its isolated position, though possessing a population less than some cities on the mainland. To this statement the undersigned desire to except. They have clearly proved, as they believe, that Prince Edward Island contributes to the general revenue more than is returned in expenditure. The unfortunate misapprehension that the Island is being treated with exceptional liberality, and that it does not return to the general revenue one-third of the amount expended, is probably due to the invidious distinction made by the General Government in the remuneration of their officials on the Island. The same erroneous impression has possibly influenced the General Government in declining, up to the present time, to maintain many of the public piers in the Province although expressly bound to do so by the British North America Act."

The hon. gentleman will see in the extract from that memorial that the same complaints we have made in Parliament year after year were made officially and publicly by two of the strongest supporters of the Government in the Province from which I come; and they complained, not only that the piers were not maintained, as the Government were bound to maintain them, but further, that an invidious distinction was made with respect to the payment of the officials on the Island. That invidious distinction is maintained to this day. I do not complain of it so far as the leading officials are concerned. I recognise the fact, as will every honest and candid man, that as regards the higher offices we cannot expect, in a small Province, that the holders of offices should receive the same salaries as occupants of the same offices in the larger Provinces, for they have neither the same responsibility nor the same labor. That I recognise, but the complaint I presented to the Government before, and which I beg to repeat in the hearing of the Minister of Railways, is this, that a common laborer working on the railway should receive a much less sum per day for the same work than a laborer at Moncton, across the straits. That is indefensible, unjust and unfair, and it is felt to be unjust and unfair, and the hon. gentleman will see that a workman taking his spade and shovel, and going to work in the morning at \$1 a day, when another laborer across the straits is receiving \$1.25 or \$1.35, deservedly feels he is suffering a great injustice. Passing away from that matter, I want to meet the invitation which the hon. Premier indirectly extended to those who might have complaints to make of unfair treatment with respect to their public works. I do not intend to refer to King's County, which has been so ably referred to by my hon. friend from the south end of that county, this afternoon, or to Prince County, the

wants of which have been put before the Committee by the hon. gentlemen who represent that county. I will confine my remarks to the county which I represent myself. I wish again to call the attention of the hon. Minister to four works which I have spoken of a number of times in this House. It is not my habit, as some hon. gentlemen have said it is theirs, to wait on the Minister at the Department and submit complaints about this and that work. I do not conceive that to be my duty as a member of Parliament, but I have availed of every opportunity in this House to calmly and quietly, and I hope, distinctly, state to the Ministry, what I conceive to be the improvements and public works required for Queen's County. These works to which I intend to refer have been called to the attention of the Minister time and again. Two of them are on the north side, and two on the south side of the Island. The two on the north side are right in the midst of the fishing fleet; one of them is the very important harbor of New London, and the other is a harbor more for small fishing boats than for vessels. I am not going to give the hon. Minister my own personal views on what is required to be done to these harbors, but I hold in my hand a report from the engineer who surveyed that harbor only last year, and as the report is a very clear and good one, I shall read some of it to the hon. gentleman. It says:

"The harbor of New London, or Grenville Bay, is situated on the northern coast of Prince Edward Island, about 10 miles south-east from Richmond Bay.

"New London harbor is a convenient fishing port, and also an important shipping point for the produce of a large and fertile farming district.

"The works constructed by the Department for the improvement of the entrance into the harbor of New London consist of:

"1. A breakwater 1,050 feet in length, on the sand beach at the eastern side of the entrance, built partly of piling, brush and stone, and partly of crib-work.

"2. A breakwater 460 feet in length on the beach, at the western side of the entrance, consisting of pile-work, brush and stone, with a squared timber block at the outer end.

"3. A dam 1,600 feet in length off Campbell Point.

"The breakwaters were constructed with the intention of confining the ebb current, and direct it on the bar outside the harbor, as well as to prevent the sea from washing the sand into the navigable channel. The results obtained have been so far very satisfactory, the depth of water on the bar having increased from six to fourteen feet in a channel about 400 feet in width, thus making of the harbor of New London one of the best on that coast of the Island.

"In file No. 96,123 it is asked:

"1. That repairs be made to the eastern breakwater.

"This has been made the subject of a special report, dated 20th January.

"2. That the eastern breakwater be extended further seawardly.

"A small channel is forming past the end of the eastern breakwater, running in an easterly direction, which channel may assume larger proportions to the detriment of the main channel, which runs in a north-easterly direction, by dividing the volume of the ebb current, and therefore diminishing its beneficial effect on the bar.

"To remedy this possible occurrence it will be necessary to extend the eastern breakwater in a northerly direction, a distance of 200 feet.

"The cost of this proposed extension I estimate at \$3,500, made of pile work with brush and stone, and a stone slope on the seaward side."

The special report which is referred to has not been brought down. The hon. Minister has had this report of the surveyor in his Department for some time. It goes on to say, that if these repairs are not made, very serious damage will result to this important harbor, and an expenditure of ten

times the amount now required will be necessitated. The engineer states, that if \$3,500 was spent in improving the extension to this breakwater, it would make a pretty complete work. Considering the favorable report made by the engineer, considering the importance of the harbor itself, and considering the very large number of the farming population who have to ship their produce from that harbor, I do not think it is asking anything unreasonable or unfair, that the recommendations of the engineer should have met the approval of the Minister of Public Works, and that we might have seen in the Estimates some provision made to repair this breakwater. There is, however, not an appropriation of one single dollar for this work. I have been at this place, and I have seen the work myself. I have talked to the leading men of the vicinity, and I have not a shadow of doubt, that unless repairs are made there within next season, the Government will require to spend three or four dollars for every one dollar that would be required now. If the work is neglected, and this result follows, it will be a very serious matter. I urge this necessary work upon the Minister with all the force I can command. That harbor is a long way from any railway; it is the only shipping port which thousands of farmers can avail of, four rivers enter into the harbor, and up to quite a late period in the autumn of the year, it is a very fair port for large ships. The other harbor on the north side of the Island, to which I wish to call the attention of the Minister, is the harbor of Tracadie, which only requires a very small expenditure, and which, although not so important as New London, is yet a very large fishing place. The bar of that harbor requires deepening, and a survey made a few years ago, reported that it would not require much expenditure to make that a safe and commodious harbor for the smaller fishing fleet. I do not ask any expenditure for the purpose of making it a harbor for large vessels, but we should make it safe and commodious for the hundreds of fishermen who take their lives in their hands while pursuing their calling in the fall of the year. On the south side of the Island there are two harbors, both of which we have reports upon. One is the harbor of Pinette. I have here a report on this harbor from a gentleman who seems to understand his business very well; at all events, he makes very lucid reports and knows what he is talking about. He says:

"The river is about 200 yards wide, and carries a depth of about 3 fathoms at low water up to the wharf, where vessels can lie in safety and load in all kinds of weather.

"The mouth of the river is obstructed by a bar, which at low water springs, carries from 3 to 5 feet of water, to take advantage of the deepest portions of which, vessels have to take a very tortuous course, as may be seen on reference to the plan herewith (fig. 2).

"What is asked by the persons interested is to have the channel across the bar straightened and deepened, so as to permit ocean-going vessels entering and leaving at high water springs.

"On the accompanying plan, fig. 2, is shown in red (I, II), the proposed channel through this bar, and one which will give the accommodation required, the cost of which is estimated as follows:—

"I. A channel, 200 feet in width, 7 feet deep at low water or 15 feet at high water spring, would necessitate the removal of 17,355 cubic yards of material measured in the scows, which, at 30 cents per cubic yard, amounts to \$5,206.50; or

"II. A channel, 200 feet wide, 8 feet deep at low water or 16 feet at high water spring, would mean the removal of 33,340 cubic yards, at a cost of, say, \$10,000."

That is the entire cost at which he estimates the deepening of that harbor to 15 feet at low water and some 20 or 25 feet at high water, so as to accommodate ocean-going ships. Now, I will not say any more about that, because my hon. colleague has had charge of it for some years, and has pressed it upon the attention of the Department time and again. He knows every inch of the ground, having often navigated his own ships in and out of that harbor; but I think, after reading the report made by the hon. gentleman's own officer as to the desirability and necessity of these improvements, that no fair-minded man would hesitate to grant the sum required to make them. The last matter I will refer to is the one to which I have called the attention of the hon. gentleman year after year; I refer to the Wood Islands breakwater. The hon. gentleman knows that that is a small artificial harbor, which was commenced by the Local Government as far back as 1859; a large part of the work was completed when the Province entered Confederation; and since then the Dominion Government have taken up the work, and have built a second breakwater on the southern side, which they did make a pretty good work of at one time. But for the last six or eight years it has been almost entirely left to run down. The hon. gentleman has spent a few hundred dollars on it every year to keep it in repair; but, as I have told him repeatedly, the money was absolutely squandered; and if he voted \$1,000 or \$1,500 now, it would not do a single bit of good. In that part of the Island, there is no other harbor from which the farmers can ship their produce. Hon. gentlemen may wonder to hear us complain that within a radius of fifteen or twenty miles the farmers have no shipping place; but they must recollect that no part of the Dominion is settled nearly as thickly as that Province. Nearly every acre is settled; the farms succeed each other, and every one of them has a farm house with a farmer in it. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the report of his own engineer on this harbor. After reciting the history of the breakwater, the report goes on to say:

"The depth of water required by those interested in shipping at Wood Islands is 6 feet at low water springs, or 12 feet at high water. The width to be 60 feet, and the channel to be along the southern face of the northern breakwater, commencing opposite the loading place."

After speaking of the different modes suggested, which I will not trouble the House with, he gives his conclusion in the following words:—

"The best mode of improving the navigation at this place would be by the extension of the southern breakwater as far as the northern, and the removal—by dredging—of the material between them, which the tide cannot force out. The portion of the northern breakwater which was not carried to the proper height should be raised."

That portion never was raised to its proper height at any time, and now you cannot walk over it, and how anyone can land or ship goods there is a wonder to me:

"If the southern breakwater is extended 400 feet, it should be done by degrees to enable the tidal current to scour away the bar, and so obtain a deeper and firmer foundation. I estimate the amount required to raise the northern breakwater on a length of 1,200 feet to the height shown (fig. 4) and to extend the southern breakwater a distance of 400 feet, as follows:—

Raising northern breakwater.....	\$2,600
Extending southern do	6,500
Contingencies	900
Total	\$10,000

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)

Now, that sum is not asked to be spent in one year; the engineer says it ought to be done by degrees; but I do think that the hon. gentleman, after the claim we have made here for the past six or eight years on behalf of the large number of people whom the improvement of that harbor would serve, cannot resist the appeal we make now, when it is backed up by such a report from his own engineer. The hon. First Minister, assuming an air of great innocence, remarked to-day that he was not aware that injustice was being done to any particular district because it was represented by a Liberal; but I look across the Straits, and I find three counties of New Brunswick, the County of Restigouche, the County of Gloucester and the County of Kent, all represented by Conservatives, received in the last three years no less than \$62,000. I am not referring to Custom houses or railways; I am referring to wharves, piers and improvements to harbors alone; and I do not include in that sum the cost of building Cape Tormentine wharf, because it was built to carry out the terms of union with Prince Edward Island; whereas the total amount the Island receives this year is \$6,000, an amount which is of no consequence at all. It is really too bad. However, I am in hope, judging from the expression of repentance made by the hon. gentleman to-day, that we shall now get some small modicum of justice. I do not expect to get full justice, or anything like it; but I do expect some modicum of justice, and I think the four harbors I have mentioned—New London, Tracadie, Pinette and Wood Islands—should, at least, be dealt with by the hon. gentleman this year. If they are not, at least two of them will deteriorate so much in value, by the action of the currents, that next year, if he does anything on them then, he will have to spend two dollars where one dollar would do the work now. Having said so much on these piers and harbors, I will conclude by referring to an improvement for which I hope to catch the ear of the hon. First Minister, who is now Minister of Railways. The hon. gentleman knows that we have a railway on the Island, and I find, from conversation among the hon. members of the House, that it is generally believed by them that that railway was built at the proper expense of the Dominion of Canada. I took up a book of railway statistics the other day, and in glancing over the list of railways alleged to have been built by the Dominion Government I find put down among them the railway of Prince Edward Island, at a cost of \$3,250,000. That is most unfair and unjust, and leaves a very wrong impression on the minds of the public. The Dominion of Canada did not build one mile of that road; it was built entirely out of the money of the people of Prince Edward Island; and when the accounts between the Island and the Dominion were adjusted at the time we entered Confederation, every dollar of the cost of that road was charged to the Province. I do not complain of that, because that was a portion of the terms we agreed upon; I am only speaking of it to remove a misconception that exists so largely among the members of the House. But since that time the Government of the Dominion have taken a new departure, and have been building railways here, there and everywhere in the different Provinces. We have a contract for a railway in Cape Breton that is going to cost two or three

millions of dollars. I find in a return, which was brought down the other day in answer to a request by an hon. member, that the money voted for railways built by the Dominion Government, up to the end of June last, amounted to \$16,713,000. We expended \$5,323,000 in the Province of Quebec; we expended in New Brunswick, \$3,371,854, and in Nova Scotia, \$7,821,070; making a total of \$16,713,247 spent by this Government during the last few years in constructing railways in Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Of that amount the Cape Breton Railway cost \$2,302,000; the Oxford and New Glasgow line, which is a competitor to the Intercolonial Railway, \$1,394,156; the Pictou Town Branch, which is a competitor to the Intercolonial Railway, \$503,000; the Eastern Extension of the New Glasgow to the Gut of Canso, \$1,284,495. But that is not all. Under the new system introduced in 1882, we commenced to subsidise roads in different parts of the Dominion; and I find that in subsidies alone to railways we have paid:

Ontario.....	\$3,061,905
Quebec.....	2,428,344
New Brunswick.....	888,531
Nova Scotia.....	26,138
British Columbia.....	750,000
Total.....	\$7,155,118

And the amount of subsidies yet unpaid, because unearned, but which are being earned daily, is \$2,105,989. This will be paid in a short time. Adding these unpaid amounts to those already paid, we have a total of \$9,261,107. We have, in addition, the subsidy of \$1,525,250 paid to the Canada Central, and the subsidy of \$1,500,000 paid for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec, and money subsidies voted to lines, the contracts for which have not yet been signed, amounting to \$2,892,500, making a total in subsidies, including the \$2,105,989 which we are liable to pay, and will pay, during the next year, of \$15,178,857. So that I find that since Prince Edward Island came into the Confederation, and since we have adopted this new policy of constructing competing lines to our existing lines, and subsidising other lines throughout the Dominion, we have actually paid and become liable for an expenditure of \$16,713,247 for roads built by the Government, and \$15,178,857 for subsidies to other lines, making a total of \$31,892,104. Hon. gentlemen know well, from the peculiar situation of the Island, that we do not share any of the advantages which will be derived by other parts of the Dominion from the construction of these roads. We are isolated, and although we do contribute our fair share per head of the cost of these roads, and of the cost of building the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, we do not derive, and never can derive, any benefit whatever from them. Therefore, I submit that, having built our own road, and having had it charged to us, every dollar of it, we are entitled to very generous consideration at the hands of the Government. I submit to the Minister that the demand I make with respect to a railway is very small indeed. The hon. gentleman knows, for he has been in the Province, that the Island is divided into two parts by a large river, and that the portion lying south of the river, embracing what is known as the Belfast and Murray Harbor district, com-

prising fifteen or sixteen townships, with a population one-fifth that of the whole Island, has no railway communication whatever. It has been suggested by some surveyors that, for a very small cost, a small feeder could be built, running from one of the stations on the road through these two districts of Belfast and Murray Harbor, touching somewhere near the great village of Montague, and going down from Belfast towards this Wood Islands breakwater. I believe that could be built for about \$7,000 per mile, and it would not require any additional rolling stock, because we have rolling stock there already. The total cost of the branch alone, which I ask the hon. gentleman to build, would not be one-sixth of the cost of the Pictou Town branch. Now, I submit the hon. gentleman would do well, in the interests of justice and fair play to that little Island, for which I know he has some kindly feeling—for it benefited him some years ago—to have his engineer consider fairly that proposition, and give it serious consideration. When we come to compare the way our Island is settled with other parts of the Dominion, hon. gentlemen will be surprised to learn that while the population of the Island per square mile is fifty-two, the population of the rest of the Dominion is a little short of five. We are, by long odds, ten times as thickly populated as any other part of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman will see further, if he looks at the statistics, that there are very few parts of the Dominion where farming is carried on as it is with us. I find, on looking over the statistics, that Prince Edward Island owns fifty-five head of live stock for every hundred acres of improved land, while the rest of the Dominion only owns thirty-eight head. Our field products are 108 bushels per acre of improved land, while those of the other Provinces are only 61. This shows what a rich and valuable island it is. If the hon. gentleman will build that small branch from the main line to this harbor of Wood Islands, it will run through a fertile country, every inch of which is settled by well-to-do farmers, and it will be a most valuable feeder to the trunk line. No doubt the existing line has not paid heretofore, but there is this to be said of it, that it pays better than the Intercolonial Railway; and whereas the Intercolonial has a very large amount of expenditure from year to year charged to capital account, every dollar expended on the Island Railway is charged to running expenses, so that the loss is larger than it would be if the same system were adopted which is followed with regard to the Intercolonial Railway. I do not think I have put forward a claim on behalf of the Island which is not reasonable and just. I have been talking to a great many members on both sides, and I believe the members of the Government, if they could spare the time to give this matter a little consideration, would acknowledge the justice of these claims; and I am in hopes, as far as the Minister of Public Works is concerned, that these four particular works—New London, Tracadie, Pinette and Wood Islands—this Session—not next year—will be put down in the Supplementary Estimates for a sum sufficient to carry them to completion. I may not have any influence with the right hon. the leader of the Government, but he has many warm friends on the Island, as he knows—men who fight very hard for him, as I know to my cost—and if the Government would construct this branch line, their action

would meet with the approval of their friends as well as opponents, and be an act of simple justice. The road would be a valuable feeder to the existing line, would not require additional rolling stock, would tend largely to reduce the deficit which year by year, unfortunately, appears in our account, would open up a valuable stretch of country, and would confer a lasting benefit on a great many people.

Mr. WELSH. You have heard me speak about this matter for some time, and I have now to congratulate the Minister of Public Works that he has taken a step in the right direction. I feel considerably mollified this evening. I have been rather rough with the Minister lately, and he deserved it, but I am getting better now. Here are the reports which I moved for two months ago, and I must say that they are very creditable, and that it is very creditable to the Government to have an engineer who can go there and make such a report as that. The Minister of Public Works will remember the two hours' interview we had in his menagerie when we discussed all these matters, and entered into them very fully. The hon. gentleman was so much interested in my description of the wants of Prince Edward Island, and of the harbor of Wood Islands, and the harbor of Pinette, that he was going to get a dredge from British Columbia to be sent down there to do the work. He will not deny it. He may ask Mr. Perley about it. I told him I had been in all these harbors, and that I had bored and tried and proved them, but I said: I would not like you to promise to undertake that work unless you had your engineer to certify that it is feasible and necessary. He promised that that should be attended to. Well, better late than never. It has come at last, and the report corroborates my statements to the minutest tittle. There is no difficulty in making these two harbors right, and there is no difficulty in improving the harbor of New London. Now, I appeal to the Government, and to the Minister of Public Works, and to the right hon. the leader of the Government, for I know that he has a warm feeling towards Prince Edward Island as I have a warm feeling towards him, and, if he will say that Prince Edward Island shall have this small measure of justice—I will not promise what I will do. I expect to get an answer from the right hon. gentleman in reference to this work.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As soon as I know what you are going to do.

Mr. WELSH. I am not going to be sold before I am bought. Now, my hon. friend will remember that in the Estimates we have \$8,200 to repair thirty or forty piers in Prince Edward Island, to keep up nine or ten fine breakwaters, to keep up our harbors and everything. I see that in this motion there is something about favoritism. Let me give you an example of favoritism. Last year there was an item of \$4,000 to build a pier at a place called Kouchibouguacis. This sum was to build a pier at this place, which is now, I think, called St. Louis. I happened to be loading a ship there at the entrance to the place called Kouchibouguacis about forty-nine or fifty years ago. I know the place, and I can speak from experience. The entrance to this place at Kouchibouguacis is in side of a place called Escuminac.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. WELSH. I will give any of you gentlemen who are laughing half-a-dollar if you can spell the name. There was eight feet of water there then, but now there is no water. Inside there is a lagoon which runs about fourteen miles to Richibucto, and at the mouth of a harbor called Kouchibouguacis—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. WELSH. Well, the hon. member who represents that district is there in his seat, and, if I state anything which is exaggerated, I hope he will contradict me. That lagoon is used only for the purpose of rafting deals down from the rivers and the mills inside of the lagoon. The Government took this \$4,000 to build a wharf at the mouth of this Kouchibouguacis River. I opposed that, and the Minister of Public Works withdrew the vote from the Estimates. I naturally thought I had saved the country \$4,000, and I went down below and treated some of the fellows to the extent of two or three dollars because I thought I had saved this amount. Will you believe that we have now a vote to build that wharf! It appears that they built it without a vote, and now they say: We gave the contract, and you have to pay for it. When I ask, Why is such a thing not done, what is the invariable answer? No money, no money. And yet, the Minister of Public Works could build a wharf at a cost of \$4,000 without any vote of Parliament. Do you call that favoritism? It looks very much like it. I do not know that I am going the right way to get a vote.

An hon. MEMBER. Take it back.

Mr. WELSH. No; I will not take it back. Now we have a vote of \$8,200 to keep up all these piers, and breakwaters, and harbors in Prince Edward Island. That does not look well, but I have not heard the Minister of Public Works give an explanation why his long-deferred promises have not been fulfilled. There is the harbor of Pinette and there is the harbor of Wood Island, which are incomplete, and what is the consequence to the people? The people are removing from the Island. I ask them why they do not cultivate their farms, but the young men are going away to the United States because they say they cannot get proper shipping facilities. We have a longer coast in proportion to our size than any other Province in the Dominion, and the Government ought to remember that we are frozen up five months out of the twelve. Our shipping season is very short, and the people want all the facilities possible in order to get their stock to market in the spring and fall. If the piers and harbors are not kept in a good shape, it is a bad thing for the people of the Province, and it is a bad thing for the people of the Dominion, because when one part of the country suffers, the whole country suffers. If you have a pain in your eye, the whole body suffers; if any member of your body suffers, the whole body suffers with it. We are a limb of the Dominion, a member of the Dominion, and if we suffer, the whole Dominion suffers accordingly. I really think it is a disgrace for the Government, and to every hon. member on the floor of this House, if they do not stand up in their places and demand that justice be done to Prince Edward Island. We do not want any favors, we want simple justice. Here goes five or six millions to

Cape Breton, so many millions to build a railway going down through those rocky shores. How many of the members who voted for that Railway Bill ever saw the country through which the road runs? What is the population in proportion to that of Prince Edward Island? What is the population of the North-West that we hear so much about? What is the population of Manitoba? What is the population of those sections compared with that of Prince Edward Island? Look at the vast sums of money spent in those Provinces, and then see how much money we get? We do not get a cent on the dollar. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I tell the Minister of Public Works, whether he is asleep or awake—I guess he is listening now, he is in good humor, and I hope he will feel better—I tell you that it is a disgrace to the Government, it is a disgrace to this House, to allow this injustice to be done to Prince Edward Island. The Government have made a report, they have made a survey; here it is, and it speaks for itself, and if hon. gentlemen will look at it, I am sure there is not one of them on this side of the House, at all events, whether there is on that side or not, who will refuse to grant a vote to pay all the expenses required to carry out the recommendations of this report. My colleague has spoken about a railway branch from the main line down to Murray Harbor. I think myself it might possibly, in the end, be profitable to the country at large. It is a fact that a large portion of the people in that section are without any railway accommodation. I have heard a good deal of chaffing from hon. members about building a railway in Prince Edward Island, and spending some \$3,000,000. Why, this Government never paid a shilling of it. When we went into Confederation, Prince Edward Island was out of debt. Prince Edward Island owed about \$8 or \$9 per head, if I remember aright, and they had assets to more than counter-balance that. When we built this railway it cost us \$32.50 a head, and when we went into Confederation accounts were squared, and a balance came to Prince Edward Island of a million of money, which was deposited to our credit in the city of Ottawa. The people of Prince Edward Island paid for that railway, every dollar of it, themselves; and while you have been expending millions in Cape Breton, in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, in Quebec, and all over the Dominion, you have not given anything to Prince Edward Island. If the Government wishes to be an honest Government, as I should hope it does, if it wishes to do justice fairly with every Province in this Dominion, then let them take this matter into consideration and see that justice is done in the premises. I have read this report, and I will return it where it belongs. I recommend the Government strongly to consider this matter and to give me a fair and square answer; and if they will promise to do all that their surveyor or engineer has recommended, and to improve this harbor and give the people of Prince Edward Island facilities for doing their commercial business and shipping their produce, they will mollify me a good deal, and I shall feel much better towards the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PLATT. If Prince Edward Island has got through with the discussion, I would like to say a

word or two. I was just going to suggest to the Government that if there was any hope of our getting away from here before the dog days, we had better do something for Prince Edward Island.

Mr. WELSH. Yes, you had.

Mr. PLATT. Certainly, if the members from that little Province cannot secure what they are asking at the hands of the Government, it will be no fault of theirs. I was very much gratified this afternoon when the First Minister accepted the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills.) There was not as much in his acceptance as I hoped when he came to explain the position which he took upon it and other questions in connection with it; but we are very much pleased to know that he has taken a position upon this question, at last, which must mean something, and I wish to analyse, for a moment, what must be the meaning of the hon. gentleman's position. If his acceptance of that proposition means anything at all, it must mean that he is willing to proclaim to this Parliament, and to the people of this country, that the charge that has been levelled against himself and his followers, of being guilty of political favoritism in the distribution of the public funds, if it has been true in the past, is not to be true in the future; in other words, he wishes to proclaim to this country that the different constituencies need not expect public patronage to be distributed amongst them simply because they send a supporter of the Government to Parliament. If his declaration means anything it means that, and if we can only get that much from the Prime Minister it will be a great achievement. The result of the First Minister's acknowledgment cannot be otherwise than beneficial to the country. In the first place it disarms those of his followers who have been in the habit of going through the country in the past, during bye-elections, and proclaiming that the only way in which the people could secure their share of the public patronage was by sending to Parliament a supporter of the Government. It is too late in the day for hon. gentlemen opposite to deny that that has been done. The history of every bye-election during the last several years has proved conclusively that the strongest argument that came from Ottawa, at any rate, if the election took place during a Session, was that public patronage to that constituency would depend upon whether the electors sent a supporter or an opponent of the Government to Parliament. Those who have had to run bye-elections during the last several years can fully corroborate my statement if necessary. The Premier's position to-day is a rebuke to those who have used this argument in the past, and it disarms those who may wish to use it in the future. The position taken by the First Minister, however, is somewhat weakened by his following it immediately with an endorsement of the assertions and statements made by a former Minister of Finance, and the present Minister of Customs. They simply leave the question in this position: that, in theory, the First Minister accepts the proposition of the member for Bothwell, but, in practice, he is bound hereafter, of course, to distribute the patronage in accordance with fair play, but he is to base his judgment as to what fair play is upon the opinion of his supporters in the counties; that is, that he is not to consult with members upon this side of

the House, who, upon general policy, are opposed to the Government, but he is to frame his judgment upon the opinions received from his supporters in those counties that are so unfortunate as to be represented by opponents of the Government. All that weakens, of course, his acceptance of the proposition, but it does relieve members on this side of the House, to a large extent, from the accusation made against them in some of the constituencies, that they are powerless while at Ottawa, or at home, to get anything done for their county, or to have any influence whatever with the Government. The First Minister has relieved members of the Opposition from that charge, and has relieved us also from the necessity of urging on the floor of this House, as some hon. members do, the requirements of their particular counties, so far as public works are concerned. The First Minister has plainly told the Opposition, that the matter of patronage, as well as the matter of the general policy of the country, are subjects on which he cannot be expected to consult with them as freely as he does with members on his own side of the House. If the Government intend to take their information from their friends in the constituency, we are justified in throwing the responsibility entirely on the supporters of the Government in each particular constituency; and, so far as my own constituency is concerned, I have simply, then, to remind the Minister of Public Works of the necessity of constructing public buildings, or draining the harbor, not to urge him to do so; but he is to take his advice and form his opinion from what he hears from his particular friends in the county, and from the statements made by delegations largely composed of his own supporters as regards the necessity of harbor drainage. He need not take my opinion or listen to my advocacy of those claims; I only ask him to remember what his own friends have said on the question, and upon them rests the responsibility in regard to the matter. Do not let it be said that the fact that there was an Opposition member, a man without influence, who raised his voice as representing the constituency, constitute a reason why Picton harbor was not dredged, when it was simply because the hon. gentleman's own friends were not sufficiently influential to secure that much needed work. I will not detain the House by detailing the public works required in my own county, and I refrain largely for the reason I have already indicated. I feel somewhat relieved by what the First Minister has told us, that he is not in a position to consult us very largely in matters of interest to the country, or even on matters respecting our own constituencies. I might be able to agree with him in regard to the general policy of the Government. We do not expect to be consulted with regard to that general policy; but I think I am justified in holding this opinion, that their policy belong to themselves, they have a right to consult whom they please concerning it, but in the expenditure of public money, which stands on a different footing from the policy of the Government, and belongs as much to members of the Opposition and the people they represent as it does to members of the Government and their supporters—it is public money—they are as much bound to listen to members of the Opposition in regard to its distribution as they are bound to listen to their own supporters. They do not see

Mr. PLATT.

fit to do it, however; the First Minister prefers not to do so. If that be the case, we may be as independent as he is, and say that we do not care very much whether we are consulted or not, and that if he is independent we can be equally independent with respect to the distribution of public money, and still more independent with respect to his policy, and the policy of the Government, and if he does not like to ask our support, advice and counsel, and is so very independent now, I hope it will last, and that in future when he gets in a tight place and there is a threatened revolt among his followers, he will remain on his own side of the House and fight it out, without asking from this side of the House counsel, advice and assistance.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am very much pleased that the First Minister has seen his way to accept the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I think this House and the country will have reason to congratulate themselves if the resolution arrived at by the First Minister should be followed in the selection of sites or places where public buildings are to be erected throughout the Dominion. One of the great difficulties and great scandals in connection with the administration of the Government here has been the way in which public money has been expended for the purpose of meeting party exigencies in the past. If the hon. gentleman adheres to this resolution he will prevent a tendency in that direction, he will prevent public money being expended for the purpose of buying support for the Government, and we may look upon this as being a step in the right direction. We will watch with a good deal of interest and pleasure the adhesion to this rule which the First Minister appears to have laid down. It would have been well had the First Minister, the Minister of Public Works, and the Government generally, adhered always to this well-established principle as to the expenditure of public money. If you take the records and examine those of the Department of Public Works, and confine your examination to public buildings erected since Confederation, you will find that public buildings have been erected where they were not absolutely required, and that other places which required public buildings in the public interest failed to get them erected there. In many instances they were erected before the elections in the different ridings, and the fact that public buildings were to be erected by the Government was held out as an inducement to the people to return supporters of the Government. This principle is one that should not be entertained by either party in this House. It is essential to our well-being that the principles of fair play should prevail, not only among the people but among representatives in this House. It should be understood that fair play should characterise the expenditure of public money, and it must be remembered that the money does not belong to the Government any more than to the Opposition; and if you take the returns you will find that, although we are in a minority in this House, we represent within a thousand votes as many people as do the Government. If we examine the return showing where public buildings have been erected we will find a state of things not very salutary or pleasant to those who are Canadians and who will regard

anything like a stain on Canada with abhorrence. There has been an abrogation of principle on the part of the Administration in the expenditure of public money. We believe that money should be expended where the public interest demands it, and that that principle should be strictly maintained and carried out. For instance, I find in the return brought down last Session from the Public Works Department, that in Nova Scotia there was a post office building erected at Amherst costing \$38,331.67; it is in the County of Cumberland, and the yearly revenue from that office is \$6,819.20. This appropriation was made in 1883-84. For a post office at Antigonish \$5,346.85 was appropriated in 1883-84, and the revenue of the post office there was \$2,740.10. That constituency is represented by the Minister of Justice in this House. For a public building in Bathurst \$14,074 was appropriated in 1883-84, for the building of the post office there. I find that that office is in the County of Victoria, N. S., and that the revenue from that office is \$1,375.80. In the years 1881 and 1882, a post office was erected at New Glasgow, Pictou County, the revenue of which is \$4,486.48. In North Sydney, C.B., in the year 1883, \$25,769.80 were expended on a post office, the revenue from which is \$2,346.95. At Windsor, in the County of Hants, in 1883 and 1884, an appropriation for building a post office was made, amounting to \$32,347.29, and the revenue from this post office, last year, was \$4,158.83. In the Province of New Brunswick, an appropriation for \$29,863 was made for a post office at Bathurst, Gloucester County, and the revenue from which is \$1,611.13. In Carleton, St. John's County, \$14,121.64 were appropriated, in 1883 and 1884, for the building of a post office. At Dalhousie, Restigouche County, an appropriation of \$2,069.06 was made for the building of a post office, and the revenue from it, this year, was \$1,247.65. At Sussex, King's County, in 1881 and 1882, there was an appropriation made for a post office there, of \$23,325.65, and the revenue from that office is \$2,881.27 a year. In looking through the Province of Ontario, I find that in many small places, post offices and other public buildings have been erected, while other places of importance, great trade centres, have been neglected, and if you enquire into the cause, you can come to no other conclusion than that these large centres have been passed over because they did not send to this House supporters of the present Government. I find that for Amherstburg, in 1883-84, an appropriation of \$34,570.33 was made for building a post office, the revenue from which was \$2,000.30. An appropriation of \$4,381.77 was made for the building of a post office in Brampton, in 1888, and the revenue from that was \$5,025. For Cayuga, in the County of Haldimand, in 1888, an appropriation of \$9,198.88 was made for the building of a post office, and the revenue from that office, last year, was \$1,402.06. In Prescott, where the revenue from the office was \$4,912, an appropriation was made of \$6,906 for a post office. In Trenton, in 1886, \$22,572 was appropriated for building a post office, the revenue from which was \$5,187. I find instances of that kind throughout this Province, and in every one of these places where post offices have been built, and which gave only a small revenue, they have returned a member to support the present Govern-

ment. In large centres of trade and population, where progress has been rapid, and where the towns have developed very rapidly, we find that they have not been aided or encouraged, because they did not return Government supporters into this House. In the town of Woodstock, in the County of Oxford, one of the most thriving towns of Ontario, no appropriation has been made by the Government, up to the time this return came down, for the building of a post office there, although the revenue from that town is \$14,751.48. In the town of Ingersoll, situated in another riding of Oxford County, the revenue is \$9,903, but there is no public building there. In the town of Waterloo, with a revenue of \$4,148.68, no building has been erected there. In the town of Paris, with a revenue of \$4,022.77, no building has been erected there. And it is the same with Picton, which gives a revenue of \$5,506.60, and Seaforth, the revenue from which is \$5,289.45, and Bowmanville, the revenue from which is \$4,897.24. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the conduct of the Government which preceded the present Government, and I think that a comparison will show that the former Government, whatever sins they might have been guilty of, in the expenditure of money for public buildings, selected these places where it was in the public interest that public buildings should be erected. Take, for instance, the city of Kingston, Ontario. What did the Mackenzie Government do for that city? It was represented by the then leader of the Opposition, who is now the leader of the Government. In Kingston, in 1874-5 there were appropriations for military buildings and fortifications of \$113,105.55; for a military college building, of \$110,149.09; and for an addition to the penitentiary, of \$147,417.78. The Government, having selected a place where they deemed it in the public interest that the money should be spent, expended it irrespective of the character of the representative. The Government also made large expenditures in the city of Toronto, the city of St. John, and in other centres, such as Guelph, St. Catharines, Brantford, Windsor, and other towns and cities east and west, consulting the public welfare and nothing else. Now, if this Government will adhere to the resolution which they appear to have arrived at to-night, of granting public money where it is demanded in the public interest, it will be a good day for this country, and a system of log rolling and bribing of constituencies will be blotted out. I think it is high time that the Government should awake to their responsibility in this matter, and, by the resolution we have before us to-night, abolish a system so pernicious in its character and so greatly calculated to destroy the independence of the members of this House. Before I sit down, I should like to say that I have a return here which I will hand to the reporter if there is no objection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is too long to read.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. What is it about?

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is a return which was brought down from the Public Works Department last Session, but which was not printed. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) states that he will bring it before the Printing Committee with the view of having it printed, and therefore, I will not insist.

Mr. DALY. I would not have taken up the time of the House on this question were it not for the fact that in the estimates of this year, as well as in those of each year since 1887, there has appeared an appropriation for the Brandon Post Office. I believe the subject of that expenditure has been brought up to-night, and I desire to explain the reasons which actuated the hon. Minister of Public Works in granting the appropriation for it. When I went to that hon. gentleman in 1887 and requested him, if possible, to erect a post office and public building there, I had in my possession facts to show him, as I will show this House, that from the amount of revenue which was derived by the Post Office Department and other Departments of the Government at that point, the hon. Minister was perfectly justified in appropriating the money which he did for the erection of that building. At that time I was able to show to the Minister that the revenue of the post office at Brandon was exceeded by that of only fourteen post offices in the Province of Ontario, only three in the Province of Quebec, only one in the Province of Prince Edward Island, only one in the Province of British Columbia, and only two in the Province of Nova Scotia. I did not ask for a building merely to accommodate the post office, but also the other departments of the Government represented there. For instance, we had a land office, the revenue of which exceeded by \$25,000 or \$30,000 in that year the revenue of any other land office in the whole of Manitoba or the North-West Territories, and we had an Inland Revenue office and a Customs office. Under the circumstances, I felt perfectly justified in going to the Minister of Public Works and asking him, in the interest of the public, to erect a proper building for the accommodation of the people who had to do with those different departments. I pointed out that in the land office and the post office particularly, letters and other valuable articles might possibly be destroyed by fire if proper accommodation was not afforded; and, strange to say, within a few months afterwards the building in which the post office and land office were located was one night destroyed by fire, and valuable documents belonging to the Department of the Interior were destroyed. Three or four books were saved, but all the correspondence that had taken place with the Department for several years was destroyed, and the public were put to a considerable amount of inconvenience. If we had had a proper building, such as we are about to have, the letters and also the books and papers of the Departments would have been placed in a vault, and the destruction I speak of would not have occurred. As the hon. member for Queen's (P.E.I.) has to-day questioned the appropriation for the erection of this building at Brandon, it may surprise hon. gentlemen who have not looked at last year's report of the Postmaster General to learn that the revenue of Brandon post office for the last fiscal year amounted to \$11,099.75, while the revenue of the post office at Charlottetown, the capital of Prince Edward Island, only amounted to \$12,233.99, about \$1,000 more. I do not know how old Charlottetown or Prince Edward Island is, but I know that Brandon is only nine years old, and yet to-day its revenue is only \$1,000 less than the revenue of the Charlottetown post office. I do not take up as much of the time of this House as the hon. gentle-

MR. LANDERKIN.

men from Prince Edward Island; but I claim that I was justified in asking the Minister of Public Works to erect the public building at Brandon. If hon. gentlemen see fit to examine the reports of the Department of Customs and the Department of the Interior, they will find that the revenue derived by those departments at Brandon is almost proportionate to the amount derived by the Post Office Department. Consequently, the Government are only doing what is right in erecting that building. Further, I find that the total revenue derived last year from the post offices in Manitoba and the North-West Territories amounted to \$196,146.27, while the total revenue derived from the post offices of Prince Edward Island amounted to \$34,304. There is a slight difference, as hon. gentlemen will acknowledge. I simply brought these facts before the House to show that if any exception is taken to the amount found in the Estimates for the building of a post office at Brandon, those facts which I have given fully justify the Minister of Public Works in undertaking to erect that building. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down made an unfair comparison between the appropriations of the present Government and that of the Government they succeeded, with reference to public buildings. He referred to the city of Kingston, and to the appropriations made for the building of the Military College there, and the improvement of the penitentiary. These are not fair comparisons. The penitentiary existed long before the Mackenzie Government took office, and those appropriations had to be made, and as for the Military College, they were justified in locating it there, and no matter where it was located the same expenditure would require to be made. I will not take further time of the House except to say that, so far as our little Province in the west is concerned, the only thing the Minister of Public Works has done towards erecting public buildings in that Province since 1887 has been to make this appropriation for the post office at Brandon. I would ask the hon. gentleman to seriously consider the immediate necessity and the importance of erecting an immigration building at Winnipeg. If there is anything more necessary than another for the accommodation of those people who come to our country to settle there, it is that they should have proper accommodation when they arrive; and I am sorry to see the hon. gentleman has not seen fit to go on with this building. I hope sincerely that during the coming year he will proceed with its construction, and afford that accommodation to foreigners and others who come to our shores which they are entitled to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No doubt the hon. gentleman who has just spoken was justified in asking the Government to erect public buildings in the town of Brandon, but I cannot understand how the right hon. the First Minister could have stated that the present Government have been carrying out the spirit of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) since they have been in power. I have taken several occasions during the last ten years to lay before the Government the receipts in connection with the post office and Customs department in Woodstock, and the necessity of erecting a public building there. The hon. the Minister of Public Works has had those figures brought to his notice almost

annually for the past ten years, and yet nothing has been done. There is just this difference between my hon. friend, who has spoken on behalf of Brandon, and myself—and it is a difference which goes to strengthen the position of hon. members who have spoken on this side, that favoritism has been shown in this matter—that while during the past ten years I have brought to the notice of the Government the necessity of doing justice to the town of Woodstock, they have not seen fit to make any move to erect public buildings in that prosperous commercial and manufacturing centre, whereas, in the case of my hon. friend from Brandon they have taken steps to meet his demand. This would rather tend to prove the accusation against the Government of favoritism. It is not my intention now to delay the House, as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has given the figures to the House; but any hon. gentleman who wishes to inform himself on this matter can see by the figures that the Government have not in the past carried out the spirit of this resolution. I hope it is their intention to reform, and that they see the error of their ways; and I trust that in the future they will take into consideration the revenue from the post offices and Custom houses in the different towns, and, in expending public money, do so in a proper and just manner, and not lay themselves open, as they have done, to the accusation of being solely guided by partisan considerations. I am sorry to know that the figures do not bear out the statement of the right hon. the leader of the Government. They show that those large centres yielding large revenues—centres such, for instance, as the town of Woodstock—do not receive the attention which is given to comparatively insignificant places. Suppose, for instance, that a fire were to occur in Woodstock, such as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) mentioned might occur in Brandon, there is no protection whatever in Woodstock for valuable papers, because no accommodation is furnished for preserving them, except that provided by private individuals. I think this system ought to be changed. It is one which is demoralising the country. It is no recommendation, as regards the administration of affairs by the present Government, that, as has been shown by the figures submitted to the House, the public moneys are expended for political reasons or favoritism, rather than to meet the wants of, and do justice to the different localities. I trust, if it is the intention of the Government to accept this proposal, that in the towns of Woodstock and Ingersoll, and several others I could mention, they will see that proper public buildings are erected. If this return which the Government have promised to have printed be circulated, the people will find that the revenue derived from the post office and Customs in the town of Woodstock, where there is no public building, is thousands of dollars, while only tens of dollars have been received in other places where public buildings have been erected. I sincerely hope it is the intention of the Government to change the policy which they have hitherto followed in the expenditure of public money in erecting public buildings.

Mr. WATSON. It was not my intention to take up the time of the House on this question, as I have already repeatedly called the attention of

the Minister of Public Works to the importance of building a post office in the town of Portage la Prairie, but as I see the hon. gentleman taking notes of the complaints of different members, and as the right hon. the First Minister has given his approval of the resolution of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I hope the hon. the Minister of Public Works will take a note of the claims of Portage la Prairie. That is a town of some considerable importance, containing about three thousand inhabitants, and, according to last year's returns, the receipts from the post office there amounted to \$6,927.06. It is also necessary that a building should be erected there, not only for the post office, but the Custom house, as at present the only accommodation the Custom house officer has is in the end of the freight shed of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is also an Inland Revenue officer there who requires accommodation. In a great many instances, public buildings have been erected in places which have far less claims than the town I speak of. We find that post offices which have cost thousands of dollars have been erected in towns where the post office revenue did not exceed a thousand dollars a year. That is not right, and if it were in order to move an amendment to the resolution now before the House, I should feel inclined to propose one, to the effect that public buildings should not be erected out of public money until the revenues exceeded a certain amount. That would be a safeguard against useless expenditure. A town like Woodstock, where the receipts are something over \$14,000 a year, ought to have a post office. Speaking of public buildings, it is very necessary that at Portage la Prairie a drill shed should be built, because that town is the headquarters of the 95th Battalion, and the Minister of Militia knows the value of keeping that battalion together. I might also state, following the line of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), that the erection of an immigration shed in Winnipeg is a matter of immediate necessity. There are a large number of immigrants coming there from foreign countries who have to stop in Winnipeg or at some place in the Province for some time, and there should be a good public building erected to receive those immigrants, whereas there is now little or no accommodation. Last year, I was in hopes that the Minister of Public Works, having put a sum in the Estimates for this purpose, would have proceeded with the erection of the buildings, but for some reason which I cannot understand and no one in the west can understand, those buildings have not been proceeded with. I hope the Minister of Public Works will dot these items down in his note book, and that we may see these buildings erected in the near future.

Mr. SCARTH. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) for taking Winnipeg under his protection as well as Portage la Prairie.

Mr. WATSON. I referred to the interests of the whole Province.

Mr. SCARTH. I thought he might have left Winnipeg to me. The question which the hon. gentleman refers to shows that the Government have not been in the habit of giving their supporters everything and their opponents nothing. I have been a strong supporter of the Government

ever since I have been in the House, and I have pressed them to erect these immigrant sheds at Winnipeg. During this Session I have still been pressing them, and I hope that, with the influence of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) and myself combined, they will see that Conservatives and Reformers are unanimous in regard to this matter, and that we shall very soon have the immigrant sheds erected in Winnipeg.

Mr. CASEY. In regard to this question of the distribution of public works and public buildings, I wish to refer to a matter which I have more than once brought to the attention of the Minister of Public Works. In my constituency there is the town of Ridgetown, which is a place of considerable population, rapidly growing, and the centre of a large and prosperous district, in which there ought to be constructed a post office and Government buildings. Ridgetown is a sub-port of entry, and there should be a Government building there containing the Custom house and post office. I come to that conclusion from the fact that similar buildings are being erected at smaller places which are not the centre of important districts, such as Amherstburg, Aylmer, P.Q., Cayuga, in the celebrated County of Haldimand, and other places of much less importance. If, as we must believe after the remarks of the right hon. the Premier this afternoon, it is the policy of the Government to construct public buildings where they are needed, without regard to the political complexion of the constituency, then the claims of Ridgetown become irresistibly strong. I do not desire to detain the House, but I content myself with entering a protest against the delay of the Government in carrying out the intentions which they must have if the statements made by them this afternoon are correct.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Have they applied for a building?

Mr. CASEY. I am not aware that any petition has been sent in asking for this building, or that any has been sent in in the other cases to which I have referred. As to Cayuga, I do not think the application came from the constituency, but from the member, or rather the would-be member for the constituency, and I think the buildings were constructed there in order to further his interests in the numerous contests he has had to undergo. I do not know whether petitions were sent in from Amherstburg, Aylmer, P.Q., and the other places to which I have referred. But I do not think that the Government should wait for applications when they know that an important place has a population which would justify the construction of public buildings. I think, if the official records would justify it, the Government should go on and construct those buildings. I am not prepared this evening to give the figures as to the collections at Ridgetown. I have given them before, and I know that they are considerably in excess of the amount collected at other places where buildings have been constructed. I now call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the matter, with the full confidence that he will have the figures submitted to him, and that, if he is satisfied that Ridgetown is a place of more importance than those in which buildings have been erected, he will put an amount in the Supplementary Estimates for this year, or in the Estimates for next year, for that purpose.

Mr. SCARTH.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I was glad to hear the First Minister state that he intended to vote for this motion, and that, if the public moneys were not distributed properly or fairly to both parties, it was from want of information. I would, however, remind the hon. gentleman that this cannot be the case in regard to the county which I represent, as the Government purchased a site there for the building some years ago. I would remind the hon. gentleman of what the good book tells us of those who, having put their hand to the plough, and who look back. The Government profess to be progressive, but in the matter of erecting a public building in the town of Lunenburg they have not moved forward, but have remained just where they were in 1886.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I find that hon. members are making applications for buildings in their constituencies, and I think I might call attention to the town of Blenheim, in the County of Kent, which I represent. It is an important centre, with good railway facilities and it is not in the position of some others that have been referred to, because it has made an application. The present post office there is altogether too small for the accommodation of the people, and an application was made some time ago for better facilities for handling the mails. The revenue is nearly \$3,000 a year, so I think it is entitled to some consideration from the Government. When we remember that other places with revenues ranging from \$1,000 to \$1,200 and \$1,400 a year, have been granted large post office buildings, it is surely only right that an important town like Blenheim should have better post office facilities, and I hope the Minister of Public Works will take a note of it, and that, if it be possible, he will bring down an item in the Supplementary Estimates this year. I would also call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the great necessity of removing the bar at the mouth of the River Thames. He has already given it his attention, and has promised to go on with the work. I trust he will not forget that this will be of great importance, I can assure him that it is of the utmost importance, to the people of that part of the country, that it should be completed at an early day. Now that steamers are navigating that river, the people are anxious to know what is going to be done, so that they can make their arrangements accordingly. Unless the bar is removed, it will be useless for them to attempt navigation. The work was commenced last year and partially completed, but on account of the money voted having run out, the work was not completed; but I trust a further vote will be found in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was very much pleased to hear the hon. member for Bothwell read that motion when the Finance Minister moved the House into Committee of Supply, because the hon. gentleman recognised at once the policy that had been followed for years past by us. That policy, I am glad to say, is endorsed by hon. gentlemen opposite. Every one of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject, has admitted that this was a good motion, and that the policy was a proper one. I am glad of it, because we are of the same opinion on both sides of the House, in

so far as the policy of the Government is concerned, relating to public works.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Why don't you carry it out, then?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is the principle we have adopted from the beginning, and in practice we have followed it out. The motion of the hon. member for Bothwell is to this effect:

"In the expenditure of public money, the public interest and not party favoritism should control—"
Exactly what we have done.

"And in the choice of places for the erection of public buildings and for Post Office, Custom House, and Inland Revenue purposes, regard should be had to the amount of money collected and to the public business done."

We have done that, but we have not only looked to these two points; we have looked to something else. We have not only looked to the amount collected, to the public business done at any place. That does not show the whole case. Sometimes a post office does not return a very large amount, but it may be a distributing office, a place where a great many mails arrive, and from which a great number of mails may be sent to other places. The revenue may be small at that place, and still a great amount of business may be done there, and, therefore, that point is to be considered as well.

Mr. CASEY. Cayuga, for example.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If you please, allow me to proceed. I listened with the greatest patience possible to hon. gentlemen opposite, and did not interrupt them. The hon. member for Bothwell called the attention of the Government to what Sir Charles Tupper had said; and as the First Minister stated in reply, the principle laid down by Sir Charles Tupper, and by the Minister of Customs at that time, is exactly the principle that forms the basis of our action, and has formed the basis of our action until now. Some hon. gentlemen were very independent this evening. They would not lower themselves to go to a Minister of the Crown and lay their case before him. Oh, no; they never do that; they never have done that; they speak from their places. Nevertheless, if my memory does not fail me, I have seen a number of them coming to me and laying their case before me. I did not find they were lowering themselves in coming to a Minister of the Crown. I did not feel that they were lowering themselves when they came and laid their case and their reasons before my colleagues. But hon. gentlemen should be fair—*francs et sans dol*—I beg pardon; I forgot I was speaking English. When they come to a Minister of the Crown, they should not afterwards say to this House that they never lowered themselves to do so, that they are too independent; they want no favors. What do they want? They say they want justice. That reminds me of a story of an old contractor who is now dead. He came to me one day, years ago, with a claim, and after laying his claim before me and explaining the whole thing, I said to him: "Sir, you will have justice." He answered: "Thank you for your justice. It is not justice I want, it is money." Well hon. gentlemen say it is justice they want, but we know perfectly well it is money they want—not for themselves personally, I know. Well, hon. gentlemen have tried to show that in the selection of places where public buildings were

erected at different times, the Government have selected only the counties that were represented by ministerial members. It happened, no doubt, that a number of counties represented by ministerial members were favored in that way, because public buildings were required there. Their case was laid before the Government, the Government looked into the matter and considered the question of revenue, but, as I showed just now, the amount of revenue was not the only question considered when a post office was required. An hon. gentleman opposite mentioned a case just now where we had erected a building at a cost of \$25,000, and where the revenue from the post office had been so much. The building was not alone for a post office, but it was also for a Custom house and Inland Revenue office. I will take now some of the cases mentioned by hon. gentlemen. For example, one hon. gentleman spoke of Bathurst, and he gave us the revenue of the post office, but he never spoke of the revenue from the Custom house, increasing that amount by over \$6,000. Then an hon. gentleman spoke of Dalhousie, and gave us the revenue of the post office; but he forgot that the revenue from Customs increased that amount by \$7,492. There were a number of others, with which I will not trouble the House this evening. The hon. gentleman insisted very much that it was only favored counties where our friends were elected, in which we erected public buildings. That is not so, and I will give some instances to the contrary. Last year and this year again, we voted a sum of money for a post office and Custom house at St. Hyacinthe. St. Hyacinthe is represented by an hon. member who constantly votes against the Government. But I do not find fault with him for that, I have no doubt he votes according to his convictions. The hon. gentleman is opposed to us and is free and independent to vote against us. That will not prevent the Government voting money for a post office and Custom house there. We purchased the land last year, and now we are placing an amount in the Estimates to erect the building. The hon. gentleman spoke of Laprairie. That town is represented by an hon. member who votes against the Government constantly, for which purpose he was sent here by the electors. But that did not prevent the Government expending the amount necessary to erect a public building there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When was he elected?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He was elected at his election. Then there is the town of Orillia. I do not think that is in a county represented by an hon. member sitting on this side of the House, but it is represented by an hon. member who sits behind the mover of this resolution and always votes against the Government. That did not prevent the Government placing a sum in the Estimates last year and this year to erect a building there. I want hon. gentlemen to quote these facts, and when they repeat their speeches to their electors, I trust they will incorporate a part of my speech in them, and admit that when they delivered those speeches in the House they were not fully supplied with data, but that the Minister of Public Works subsequently furnished the information. Next take the St. John Dominion building. We did not forget that the hon. gentleman representing that constituency, who, I think, should sit on this side of the House,

votes against the Government. Nevertheless, we treated that constituency as well as we treat one represented by a Government supporter. Take the Negro Point breakwater. Did we refuse a grant to that? The hon. gentleman told me the other day across the floor that a break had occurred in that work. I thanked him for the information, which had not reached my ears—and I will take care that the work is placed in proper repair. Next comes the Rimouski pier. That is not in a county represented by an hon. member supporting the Dominion Government. We decided, however, to expend a large sum to place the pier in proper order. A contract has been given, and the contract will go on as soon as possible. Next, the pier at St. Laurent, Island of Orleans, in the constituency of Montmorency, which is represented by an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. Nevertheless we place a sum in the estimates for that pier. Longueuil pier is situated in another county represented by an hon. gentleman opposite. Boucherville pier is also in a county represented by an hon. gentleman who sits on one of the front benches opposite. In a constituency represented by an hon. gentleman opposite, there is a pier built by the Government of the Province of Quebec, and it is a public pier. We have voted money year after year to place that pier in order. Kincardine and Penetanguishene are other examples, and those towns are not in counties represented by hon. members sitting on this side of the House. I wish these facts to be reported and to be circulated throughout the country so that the imputation cast upon us by hon. gentlemen opposite, that we show favoritism in such a way as to do nothing for counties represented by hon. gentlemen opposite may be refuted. Of course, the hon. gentlemen may be sorry that we do not do that work for them; but we do it for the country, for the counties they represent and for the people, because we believe it should be carried out. I should be glad if I could say that we did it for hon. gentlemen opposite, but they have no confidence in us, and we have no confidence in them. The leader of the Opposition said it was never too late to repent, and that remark was uttered in reply to the hon. First Minister. He has forgotten that that was our principle, that we had followed that principle since we were in office, and if he had remembered that fact it would not be necessary that he should say it was never too late to repent. That statement might apply to his own side of the House. But the hon. gentleman said, what about the practice? I have shown what the practice has been, and that practice we intend to continue, because we know that the action of the Government since we came back into office—I will not speak before that time—has been in accordance with that principle. The hon. gentleman also said that when the elections came on that promises of the Government to erect public buildings influenced the votes. It may be so. I wish to say to the hon. member for Richmond, Nova Scotia, that when he spoke of the harbor breakwater at L'Ardoise he said it had been under the consideration of the Government for a long time. That is true, but he evidently was not aware of the true facts of the case. In 1883, \$5,000 were appropriated for repairing the breakwater at L'Ardoise, Richmond County, Nova Scotia, but

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

before the tenders were advertised it was reported that a large amount of damage had been done during a gale, and, therefore, tenders were not invited. That is the position in which the matter stands. The estimated cost of repairing the breakwater according to the report of my engineer was \$20,000. That matter is still receiving my attention. My attention was further called to the works a month or so ago, and I have given instructions to have the matter further investigated in order to ascertain whether the repairs could be made for a lower sum than \$20,000. The hon. gentleman also spoke of Arichat, and said we had purchased a site for a public building there for \$1,000, and he could not understand why we had not erected a building on the site purchased. The hon. gentleman is not altogether ignorant in regard to the matter. If he had endeavored to recollect the circumstances, he would remember that although we bought that site, there were buildings on it, and we had those buildings repaired, and used them as a post office, and I think it will do for some years yet. That was the reason we did not expend money, in the way suggested by the hon. gentleman. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) also affirmed that we had expended money only in ministerial counties. He must have seen from my statement that he is mistaken, and no doubt he will be most happy to correct his error in this instance. The hon. gentleman spoke of Antigonish and of a building being erected, and of money being expended there. And of course that was all expended, according to the hon. gentleman, in the county represented by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. No doubt money has been spent in that county, since it has been represented by the Minister of Justice; but if the hon. gentleman will look at the Public Accounts, he will find that between \$10,000 and \$15,000 were expended in that county while it was represented by Mr. McIsaac, who certainly was not a friend of the Government. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) complain that they cannot have some necessary works in their constituencies. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe said, that he could get no public building, though his county is more important than the County of Richmond, N. S. I think so, too. Richmond is a thriving town, and a very important place, and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman, using his well known energy, will convince the Government that something ought to be done at that place. My friend the member for Assiniboia says he cannot obtain a public building for Moose Jaw. I am sure that if he uses for some time longer, that eloquence of his, and that power of persuasion for which he is remarkable, Moose Jaw may find itself ornamented by a public building. Of course, that has to be decided by my colleagues as well as myself. I must say to my right hon. friend the First Minister, that his statement in accepting that notion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has brought down upon me an avalanche of demands for public buildings, wharves, piers, and I do not know what else besides.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. And fortifications.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; and fortifications, as the hon. Minister of Militia suggests.

After the hon. member for King's (P.E.I.) had given me the names of six places in which he wanted public works, he ended up by saying: "And a number of harbors of refuge besides." I have no doubt that, if we put all these requests together, we will find that it will cost a very respectable amount to satisfy him. I thank the hon. gentlemen who have made me the recipient of their complaints, and thrown all the responsibility on my shoulders.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are broad.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. First Minister says, they are broad; but, perhaps, hon. gentlemen would be kind enough to suppose that my colleagues have a little share of the responsibility also. The hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry) in repeating his complaints, for the purpose, no doubt, of engrafting them on my mind, wound up by saying that, after using all the expressions which the English language placed at his command, he really could not find an English word to express what he thought of the Government. Why did not the hon. gentleman pick out one of the French words that he used in his infancy, and it might have helped him out of his difficulty? If he did so, I have no doubt but that he would be understood by some of us, at all events. The hon. gentleman spoke of every cove, harbor, wharf, and creek that he could think of. He knows that we are building a pier at Cape Tormentine, and that to have a ferry between the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island side, we must have a pier on both sides. Let him have a little patience; Cape Tormentine is being built, and I have no doubt that Cape Traverse will be looked after, too. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), in his kindness of heart, gave us absolution for the past. How kind he is! I am sure that the hon. gentleman must have thought that he required some absolution himself. If he reflects a little on what he has done and said in these debates, about the public works of the country, perhaps he may think that a little absolution will not do him any harm. He may be sure that if he requires only me to give him absolution, he will have it. The hon. gentleman said that after the acceptance of the resolution of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), he is waiting for the Supplementary Estimates. If he had done that in the beginning, perhaps he would have avoided a great many of his speeches, and perhaps he would find, at last, that he had not so strong a ground to make complaints as he thinks he had. The hon. gentleman says that the patronage is in the hands of the Government. No doubt it is, and where else would it be? He says, we should have public buildings in every part of the Dominion, and that every part of the Dominion should have fair play. That is what we have been doing all the time; that is what we are doing now, and that is what we will find in the Supplementary Estimates. We intend treating every part of the Dominion fairly, but we cannot do everything in one year. He must remember that London was not built in a day or a year. Let him have a little patience, and he may be sure that during the next five years, we will give him a good many buildings.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We may have something to say to that ourselves.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is to be seen. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to admit that we had done justice to the Island by providing an excellent boat. It cannot be better, because the hon. gentleman has no complaint to make of it. That is a relief to me at any rate. He may now put all his complaints on my shoulders, as he will not have any to make against the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will not make any against you if you do as well.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman says that the supporters of the Government in the Island have themselves complained; he says they complain of the remuneration of the officials on the Island. Why did he mention that, when immediately after he himself admitted that those complaints were not founded in fact—that the officials there should not be remunerated as they are, for example, in Ontario and Quebec, where the population is larger, where the business is much greater, and so on. He did that only to show that there were complaints. Well, we know that the hon. gentleman, and perhaps the other five members from the Island, complain. I am very sorry that they do complain; we do not want them to complain; we want Prince Edward Island to have justice, as well as all the other Provinces. But the way to have justice is not to refuse to acknowledge the good we do; and if there is something that is really required, let it be put before the House, though not as it was three or four days ago, in the way of recrimination and hard words, and insults poured on my head. But, I must say, that the tone to-day is improved very much, and I must congratulate hon. gentlemen on a change of language. The hon. gentleman says that common laborers receive less in the Island than they do at Moncton. That may be. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will find that laborers in certain parts of Ontario or Quebec do not receive as much as they would, for example, in Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Ottawa, or other large towns; but the laborers know perfectly well what they are about. If they do not receive sufficient pay for their work, they go elsewhere; if they accept the pay, it is because they consider it sufficient for the work they give. The hon. gentleman spoke of a number of works which he thinks should be attended to. I took a note of all those mentioned by him and other hon. gentlemen; I thought it was a proper thing to do. The hon. gentleman spoke of the harbor of New London, which he says will cost \$3,500 more. He mentioned Tracadie, but did not tell us what the work there would cost. The harbor of Pinette was mentioned by him and another hon. gentleman; that will cost \$5,500. Wood Island was also mentioned by two hon. gentlemen; that would require a further expenditure of \$10,000. To hear the hon. gentleman mentioning all these works, one would have thought they would require a very small amount of money, and in speaking of them he had that air of innocence which he attributed to the Minister on this side. Well, I do not see that Minister, but I see the hon. gentleman, and I think he was really describing himself when he uttered those words. Other hon. gentlemen spoke. The hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) stated his case. I had the pleasure of

seeing that hon. gentleman at my public office on deputations, and I think he had no reason to complain of the way he was received. At all events, that hon. gentleman thought he should come and lay his case before the Minister of Public Works. Then, the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) mentioned a number of places where we had erected public buildings, and told us the revenue received from those places. He mentioned, for example, Bathurst, New Glasgow, North Sydney, Carleton, Dalhousie, Windsor, Prescott, Cayuga, Amherstburg, Brampton, and Trenton. Well, as I showed just now, a number of these buildings were not erected on account of the post office revenue alone, but also on account of the Customs and Inland Revenue. All these should have been put together to ascertain the revenue from those places, and it would have been fair to show that the revenue was not only \$2,700, but in several cases \$6,000 or \$8,000 or \$10,000. The hon. gentleman, in order to show how the preceding Government had acted, spoke of Kingston, Ontario, among other places. We know perfectly well that the money voted for improvements at Kingston had only one object, and it was voted just at the proper time. It was just to affect the election of my hon. friend the First Minister, and it was so well expended that it did it. Nevertheless, it was money lost, because my hon. friend found a seat immediately in another county, and he would have found ten if necessary, and notwithstanding that attempt, he has been here for the last twelve years. The hon. gentleman said the expenditure was for the good of the country, but he missed the mark.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We will have him over here very soon.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hon. gentlemen said that in 1882 and 1887, but they were not good prophets, and I do not think their power of prophecy has increased since then. The hon. gentleman spoke also of the immigration building at Winnipeg; so did the hon. member for Marquette; and so did the hon. member for Winnipeg. The hon. member for Winnipeg, whose duty it is to look after his constituency, has not ceased to ask for that building, and that is the reason why the attention of the Government was called specially to that work, and we have determined to have that building erected; we know that Winnipeg is a centre for the distribution of immigrants, and the hon. gentleman must have seen that item in the Estimates. The hon. member for Prince, P. E. I. (Mr. Perry), spoke of three places—Tignish, Kensington, and Alberton—which he thought, on account of the revenue they produced, and in accordance with the principle we have acted upon for the last twelve years, should have public buildings. What do we find? We find that Tignish has a total collection, by the hon. gentleman's own showing, of \$668, Kensington, \$571, and Alberton, \$1,054; and when you deduct from that the expenditure, you find in the one case, \$416; in the second case, \$298, and in the third case, \$581. These are the models that the hon. gentleman wishes us to follow when placing public works! We will take a note of that, as it may be useful in time to come. I have answered in as few words as I could the remarks made by the hon. gentlemen. If it were not so late, I would continue my remarks; but I

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

have said enough to show to hon. gentlemen that they are mistaken when they say that our policy is simply to give public buildings and works to the constituencies represented by members on this side. We have done otherwise; we are giving public buildings and other works to counties represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. We try to do justice to all. That was our intention in the past; it is our intention now, and it will be our intention in the future.

Mr. HESSON. I am very glad to hear the hon. Minister's remarks with reference to the expenditure in the different counties, represented by gentlemen on both sides of the House. I can myself bear testimony to the fact that I have not been able to bring influence upon the hon. gentleman with reference to two places—one the sister town adjoining my own county, the town of Woodstock. I am sorry the hon. the Minister did not refer to that, in reply to what had been said by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), who spoke so ably with reference to the erection of a public building in that town. I regret that the hon. Minister did not refer to that town, and I presume he omitted to make a note of it, and omitted it unwittingly. This question was brought to the attention of the House before, and I then took the opportunity of stating that I thought that Woodstock ought to be considered in the erection of public buildings. I was led to make these remarks from the kind attention bestowed on my riding by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who referred to the large, important town of Listowel, where the revenue from the post office alone is \$4,380. It is a town which has grown very rapidly indeed, and where there are large collections from Custom and Excise, as well as from the post office. I have been endeavoring for some time past, in a quiet way, and not by pressure in the House, to direct the Government to the necessity of erecting a public building there, and I trust the Minister of Public Works will see his way to do so.

Mr. McMULLEN. I simply desire to make a few remarks in reply to the Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman has drawn the attention of the House to some cases in which, he said, post offices were erected, not altogether because of the amount of revenue from postal service, but because of the revenue from Customs and Inland Revenue as well. I would like to ask him how it is that he did not name such places as Joliette, in the Province of Quebec? Is there any revenue collected there from Customs or Inland Revenue? Not a cent. He referred to the erection of a post office there, because that was a constituency represented by an opponent of the Government, and he said the Government had the right to take the credit for being so generous as to grant a post office to that county. What is the fact? The fact is that, in order to try and keep that county from being represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Neveu), the Government made an arrangement to erect a post office here when Mr. Guilbault was its member. They went so far as to buy the ground and let the contract, and then they dared not back out. What has the hon. gentleman to say with regard to Aylmer, Quebec, where there is no Customs, or Inland Revenue. Why did they erect a post office there, when the revenue is only \$1,345? The hon.

the Minister of Public Works wanted to leave the impression on the House that he was not guided merely by the receipts of the post office service, but that he took into consideration the receipts from the Customs and the Inland Revenue, and he mentioned two cases. But he did not give us the case of St. Henri in Quebec. There is no revenue from Customs or Excise there—not one cent; and the postal revenue is only \$1,289.69. Yet the hon. gentleman leaves a place like Woodstock, which has a postal revenue of \$14,000, without a post office, and he leaves a place like Listowel, which has a revenue of \$4,500, without a post office. He professes to say that the expenditure is not for political services. Sir, it is for nothing else. It is plain on the face of it that it is for political services. The fact of the matter is that the Public Works Department, as regards the erection of public buildings, for the last ten years, has been nothing short of a political slopshop for party purposes. In every case where the Minister of Public Works thought it would bring support to the Tory party, he put up a building. Take St. Jérôme. How much Customs and Inland Revenue was collected there? Not one cent. Why did the hon. gentleman not mention St. Jérôme? That would not have suited his argument. There is only \$1,299.78 collected there from the postal service, and not a farthing for Customs and Inland Revenue. Take Lachine. How much is collected there for Customs and Inland Revenue? Those places are all in the hon. gentleman's own Province, and not one cent is collected in any one of them, for Customs or Inland Revenue. The hon. gentleman has said that several parties had asked him to erect public buildings, and he had seriously considered their applications, but I defy him to name one instance to-night in which a Reform constituency, represented by a Reform member in this House, made an application for a public building, such as a post office, and in which he acceded to the application. Not one single instance. I dare him to name one. Not in one single case have they erected a public building unless they saw that it would bring political support to the party of which the hon. gentleman is one of the prominent leaders. He gave an instance of a contractor who applied to him and said that what he wanted was not justice, but money, and he said that we wanted post offices, whether just or unjust. I think the hon. gentleman has dealt very generously with contractors, and, if I am rightly informed, the contractors have dealt very generously with him. Generosity on the one side has induced generosity on the other. I brought this matter before the House on a previous occasion, and I say now that some principle should be laid down whereby the Government would be confined to the construction of public buildings where they were absolutely necessary, and that the places that merited the erection of those buildings best, by the amount of revenue which they contributed to the funds of the Dominion, should be first considered, instead of having these buildings peddled round to one place and the other in order to try to get some political support or to please political friends. This is not fair. For ten years past we have had that system pursued, and the Minister of Public Works has been the chief instrument in the hands of the Tory party to carry it out. Still, he has the face to rise here and

say that he has been so generous and has been trying to be so honest, and has been following out the principle which we now say should be adopted. There ought to be a model post office and custom house building of reasonable cost prepared, and, wherever it is necessary to erect a building, that model should be followed, the contract should be let by public tender, and not a farthing of extras should be allowed. Take the case of Napanee. There was a contract for a post office building for \$23,000. By adding the extras to it, it has now cost \$37,404. I would like to give the House an idea of these extras. In regard to the paving in front of this building, it cost to prepare the ground for the pavement, \$523, and it cost \$1,500 for the pavement itself—\$2,000 for a pavement in front of a country post office. This is absurd and wasteful extravagance. Then they thought the building was not quite right yet, and, in order to complete it they decided to chisel off the corners and dress them, \$893 was expended. I say it is a disgrace to the Department of Public Works and to the Government, that the public money should be squandered in this way. A model office should be designed and, wherever it is necessary to erect a building, that should be the model and tenders should be asked, the whole work should be let to one man, he should be kept closely to the terms of its contract, and should not get a cent more. It is preposterous to think that over \$13,000 are paid for extras on the construction of a post office and Custom house in a place like Napanee. It is disgraceful that these amounts should be expended in order to satisfy those who are sucking round in order to get a little pap. One man is appointed as clerk of works, and another is appointed to inspect the clerk of works. Any one who will take that account for Napanee—and it is, in the hands of the Public Accounts Committee now—and will go over the extras which are allowed in connection with that building, will come to the conclusion that gross extravagance and recklessness characterises the action of the Government in these matters, and that the expenditure is made altogether for political purposes. I did not intend to detain the House to-night, but, when I listened to the barefaced speech of the Minister of Public Works to-night, I could not resist the opportunity of replying to his insinuation as to the honesty which characterised the course of the Government.

Amendment of Mr. Mills (Bothwell) agreed to, and main motion, as amended, agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that this House do, immediately, resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring before the House a matter which I have already referred to. It will be remembered, that this afternoon I asked a question of the Postmaster General, which I had taken from the organ of the Book, News and Stationery Associations of Canada. It had made certain statements, and I asked the Postmaster General if they were correct. These statements were in regard to the postage charged on English periodicals sent by dealers in Canada. The Postmaster General stated that the organ was misinformed. Since that I have received a telegram from Toronto, which I will read to the House :

"Article in Book and Stationery organ regarding postage on periodicals correct in every particular. Have seen Bain, Hart, Winnifith, Allan and other leading booksellers here. All say they are paying postage on English magazines. Clause 5, under third class matter in Postal Guide, does not cover the point. Magazines are brought to Canada by freight, and we cannot conscientiously mark them re-mailed unless received by mail at double present expense. Have sent copy of this to Postmaster General.

"J. McLEAN, *Secretary Treasurer*
"Ontario Booksellers Ass'n."

I thought I would read this telegram so that the Postmaster General may have an opportunity of reconciling his statement with that of the dealers in these periodicals. I gave him notice that I would mention the matter, and he is here and can give any explanation if he sees fit.

Mr. HAGGART. My statement this afternoon was strictly correct. If you read the question put by the hon. gentleman, you will see that he asked in reference to the cost of mailing the English periodicals named for one year from Toronto and from Buffalo. What I stated in my answer was that any periodical that had been sent from the old country to this country by mail to any news agent or vendor, being afterwards re-sent to any subscriber in this country was sent free. The hon. gentleman has quoted a telegram from the news-vendors in Toronto from which it is inferred that they get their newspapers or these periodicals by other means than by the post office, and then they expect them to be sent free. The question which was put to me, and the statement in the paper, are entirely divergent from that. You will find, if you read it, that the inference to be drawn is that they receive their papers from the old country by mail, and then these being re-sent to subscribers, they have to pay certain rates. I stated that parties who get their newspapers from the old country by mail re-send them to all their subscribers free.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Postmaster General has not apprehended the question that I put to him and of which I gave notice. The question is in the following words:—

"The cost of mailing one copy each of the following English periodicals for one year from Toronto and from Buffalo is as follows:—"

I did not say re-mailed; I did not ask about re-mailing. The Postmaster General apparently has not understood the question, and has not answered the question, but he has answered a question that I did not ask.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must see that the cost of mailing a British newspaper would be the same as our own periodicals, and that we could not send them if they had not come through the mail from the publisher to the vendors. We cannot send them on any different terms from what we send our own periodicals.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I did not ask for a statement of re-mailing, I only asked how they went: whether the author of this newspaper had been misinformed or not? It appears he has not been misinformed, and that the Minister misapprehends the question.

Mr. EDGAR. The question that has been raised by my hon. friend is important. It does seem from the statement made here, at any rate, that the cost of mailing English magazines from Toronto is just six times as much as the cost of mailing the

Mr. LANDERKIN.

same English papers from Buffalo. That, surely, is a matter worthy of consideration. What the Postmaster General has said does not answer that at all, and does not show any good reason for it. He does not deny that that anomaly exists, and he has not given any good reason, that I have heard, why it should continue to exist.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not understand the hon. gentleman. Does he mean to say that a cent, or whatever it may be for three or four ounces, is too much for periodicals that are re-sent through the post office? I am only following out the law.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps he is following out the law, but I venture the suggestion that the law is an improper one that gives people an opportunity of sending from Buffalo for half a cent what costs twelve cents to send from Toronto. It is discriminating heavily against our own newsdealers in this country, and discriminating grossly in favor of newsdealers on the other side of the line; and surely that is not the National Policy.

Mr. HAGGART. No; you do not understand. The newsdealer who gets a periodical from the old country to Buffalo or New York, pays the mail across from London to New York, and, besides that, he pays the postage. If they be mailed from the old country to Toronto or Montreal, he pays no postage in this country; therefore, it is cheaper in this country than in the other.

Mr. EDGAR. The Buffalo man did not pay the mail any more than our man.

Mr. WALDIE. The Postmaster General is mistaken as to the course of the dealers. The dealers in Buffalo, get their periodicals from the old country by express, in just the same way as our dealers in this country. I am compelled to say, that our postage rates are a great deal too high, and discriminate against the dealers of this country.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Intercolonial Railway..... \$187,100

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Increased accommodation at Halifax, \$150,000—Perhaps the hon. gentleman would give us some information as to what course the Government intend to pursue with reference to the expenditure of this sum. It has been in the Estimates now for some time, and when the office was under the charge of the late Minister of Railways he promised, on several occasions, that that money should be expended in some way, either in the acquisition of land opposite the present deep water terminus, or in carrying the railway down along the wharf. There are two ways of spending that money, and I think the general impression in Halifax is rather in favor of having the road extended down along the wharf. The present deep water terminus has not much sea accommodation and if the road was extended along the wharves it would thus open the whole harbor of the city for the use of the railway, and would also give them the use of all the private stores along the line. I hope the Government will now deal with this matter promptly, because it has been standing over three or four years. The matter is of great importance, and the people are

regarding it with great interest. The amount has been there so long and the people have been so anxiously watching what course the Government were going to pursue, that I hope that the hon. gentleman will be able to give us some indication of the intentions of the Government.

Mr. KENNY. The item has stood since 1887, as my hon. colleague has stated, and the late Minister then recognised that more accommodation was requisite at Halifax. The necessity for increased accommodation is greater to-day than it was at that date. My hon. colleague has explained that two projects were placed before the then Minister of Railways, and that probably may have been caused the delay in some part, by the Department not being able to come to any definite agreement. I may say, as the Intercolonial Railway expenditure is sometimes rather severely criticised here, that the additional expenditure is to enable the Intercolonial Railway better to handle the freight which comes from the western Provinces, particularly flour. My hon. colleague has pointed out that one idea seemed to be dominant in the mind of the late Minister, and it was, that by the extension of the system along the whole of the water frontage, additional storage accommodation and greater wharf accommodation might be obtained at less expenditure to the Dominion Government. At the same time, it is only fair to say that a very elaborate plan was prepared by the city engineer, contemplating the acquisition of property in the immediate neighborhood of the present freight terminus. Extra accommodation is required for freight. As my hon. colleague has mentioned, this vote has stood now for some years, and I would respectfully suggest to the Minister of Railways that the engineer should make an early and careful survey. I am quite sure my hon. colleague and myself do not desire one dollar to be spent in Halifax unless it results advantageously to the whole Dominion. That some additional accommodation is necessary is proved by the fact that the Minister, in 1887, placed this amount in the Estimates.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite true that this sum was placed in the Estimates in 1887, two years ago, for the purpose of supplying increased accommodation. A difficulty arose from there being two schemes open. One was to extend the railway along the wharves in front of the harbor. That seemed to be a very sensible plan, because it would give an opportunity for Government stores and warehouses for freight traffic purposes, and it would give access to the different stores and warehouses along the front. The other scheme was to extend the station yard along the west side of Water street to the deep water terminus. It was found, however, to be almost impossible to obtain the consent of the parties owning property along the wharves, and, as I understand it, an alarming amount was demanded for the property required. It has also been found that this sum asked will not be sufficient to carry out either project. But one of the two plans must be adopted. There is, I understand, and I am happy to learn it, such increased traffic to Halifax that enlarged accommodation for freight purposes is absolutely required. All I can say is this, let this vote be passed, and I will carry out, if I live to do it, the suggestion of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and see that one course or

the other will be adopted. As I understood from the hon. gentleman opposite, he favors the line along the front. I think my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Kenny) also does so.

Mr. KENNY. If I am appealed to, I may say that I think the engineers of the Department should decide it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well; I will see that it is pressed forward without any delay.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). With regard to the matter of the Intercolonial Railway, I would also impress on the First Minister the great necessity that now arises with respect to accommodation at the Western Counties Railway at the North street terminus. This has been the subject of discussion in this House in previous Sessions, when it was pointed out that, under the original agreement with the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, they were to have access on the Intercolonial as far as Richmond, and also an extension made into Halifax. The hon. gentleman is aware that that is some distance from the city, and, consequently, all the trade is handicapped by the very considerable expense of carting freight to and from the Richmond station to the city. The Chamber of Commerce at Halifax and the mercantile community generally have been very anxious about this matter, perhaps more anxious than about almost anything else in connection with railway, because it interferes so much with our trade with the western part of the Province. Moreover, if a train comes in from the westward there is a charge of \$2.50 to shunt the car down to the deep water terminus. This is a considerable item on the large quantities of potatoes and apples sent, and the large quantities of apples sent for shipment from Halifax to the English market. I hope the Government will see their way clear to carry out what is evidently the object of the original arrangement. The late Minister of Railways acknowledged they were bound by it; but he said that until they obtained additional accommodation, they could not carry it out. I hope no further delay will occur, because it is very important to Halifax that this arrangement should be carried out. I desire also to ask the Minister of Railways what is the object in keeping the Eastern Extension Railway account separate from the general Intercolonial Railway account. I cannot see the advantage of it. On the contrary, it appears to be a disadvantage. I know, from being connected with a line of steamers and having freight for Annapolis and that end of the Province, that, when it goes over the road to Pictou, it is then subject to an arbitrary rate over the Eastern line. It appears to me that the whole line should be worked under one general system. I should think it would be more economical, and certainly more satisfactory if the rates were under one management and shippers had not to deal as it were under two separate railways. I pointed that out also to the late Minister of Railways, and he promised to look into the matter, but the accounts are still made up in the old way. I would also say to the Minister of Railways that considerable complaint has been made lately with respect to the very important increase in the rates for local traffic over the Intercolonial. The changes have been made, I believe, by adopting the Grand Trunk and Cana-

dian Pacific Railway classification of freight. For instance, what on the Intercolonial was considered as fourth class has been put into the third class, and this, in many instances, has largely increased the local rates. Leather shipped from Pictou was formerly charged twelve cents for one hundred pounds to Halifax; by the new arrangement it is seventeen cents, and a large quantity of bulky articles have been increased from thirty to forty per cent. by the changed classification, which is a pretty large advance. I fully recognise the advantage of having one classification over all the roads, but this has been a very large advance that has been made. Another matter that has been the subject of very considerable complaint in Halifax is that the railway is largely used for storage purposes by the western millers. Millers sending carloads of flour are allowed to keep it at the depot for 30 days, while the local merchants who are getting flour at the same time can only keep it there 48 hours. I am aware that that system obtains in the United States where flour or goods are sent for export; but we have no export in that sense in Halifax. The western millers merely send the flour down, and it is kept in the cars there practically for their benefit, and if a man in Halifax desires to buy a cargo of flour it is on hand in the cars. I repeat that we have no export in the sense in which that word applies in the United States. Of course many goods are sent to the United States for shipment abroad, and that concession is made to them. But here, unless for something along the coast occasionally, there is no export whatever, and our merchants complain that they are handicapped in that way. I think that whatever applies to one, should apply to the trade generally. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he does not think, that our merchants should be placed at least in the same position as those in the west, who are sending their flour, not for shipment but for speculation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So far as regards the extension of the accommodation on the Windsor and Annapolis road, I made a note of the hon. gentleman's statement, and I shall make immediate enquiries about it. The accounts of the Eastern Extension are kept separate from the Intercolonial Railway accounts, because the Eastern Extension, although a Government road, is not by law a portion of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It could be made so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It could be made so, but that is the reason the accounts are kept separate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) has correctly mentioned the reason for the increase of rates. There has been a complete and thorough classification of the different articles of transport by all the railways in Canada, and the Intercolonial Railway is only adopting the rates that are charged on every other railway. It would, of course, seem to be absurd, and unjust to the public revenue, that the Intercolonial Railway, because it is a Government railway, should be charging cheaper rates than all the other railways. I am told also that although the rates have been increased on some articles in consequence of the readjustment of the classification, yet, that on the average, the tariff is at least as low, if not a little lower than before. There has been a good deal of dissatisfaction, and, very naturally, persons in trade, who

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

have been paying a certain rate for a given article, for a certain number of years, feel aggrieved at having the rates increased. So much has that feeling existed, that I made special arrangements with some of the parties who are most interested in the matter, or who represent those who are interested, to meet me on Saturday morning, when I will go over the whole tariff with them, and hear their complaints. On enquiry from the chief engineer, I understand that the thirty days which are allowed for the use of the cars, bringing flour down to Halifax, is only given for flour to be exported to Newfoundland and for no other purpose. I dare say that some of the merchants who have got possession of the cars, keep possession of them for their own purpose, and it may have the effect of handicapping as the hon. members say, to a certain extent, the merchants in Halifax. After all, it is only bringing down an increased quantity of flour, and putting up another establishment on the wharf, instead of putting it in a store. I understand it to be a fact that permission to retain possession of the car is only granted for the purpose of flour to be exported to Newfoundland.

Mr. KENNY. I can inform the right hon. the Premier that, if that is the storage privilege, it is abused; and as my hon. colleague, Mr. Jones, has said, it is abused to the detriment of the merchants of Halifax. The principle of it may be a wise one, if it was to divert to our Canadian railways a certain amount of the traffic in Canadian flour which otherwise would have gone by way of Boston. However, from what I heard, from the merchants of the city, I believe this privilege has been abused.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman has been misinformed entirely with regard to the arrangements for the Newfoundland freight. There may be the last year, or the year before, one or two cargoes of flour exported to Newfoundland, but the hon. gentleman will find on further enquiry that most of the flour which goes to Newfoundland is American and not Canadian. At all events it would only be brought on the railway during the short time that navigation is closed, but the complaint which I bring to the notice of the Minister is, that it applies during the summer as well as during the winter. The hon. gentleman has been misinformed entirely, because practically there is no export of flour from Halifax to Newfoundland.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will enquire.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The permission was intended, I think, to cover some exports to our own coasts.

Mr. BORDEN. I wish to add a few words to what has been said by the hon. members for Halifax, as to the importance of increased terminal facilities for the Intercolonial Railway at that city. It is a question which concerns the western part of Nova Scotia very seriously. As the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has pointed out, a large part of the trade of Nova Scotia goes to Halifax over the Western road, and the only avenue by which it can get into that city is by the Intercolonial Railway, as the Western road ends at Windsor Junction. There has been an arrangement made, by which the freight coming by the Windsor and Annapolis road should be carried to the terminus at Halifax; but when the

Intercolonial Railway was extended to deep water terminus, they charged more for cars coming from the west than they charged on cars coming from the east. They charged \$2.50 from the west, and \$1 from the east, and the result of that is very obvious. Take the case of a car load of apples, for instance, coming from the east, the charge would be \$1, and from the west \$2.50, which means a direct discrimination against the farmers of the west in favor of the farmers of the east. I do not believe that the Government desires to perpetuate that kind of thing. The question has been brought up here several times, and the answer given was that there was not sufficient accommodation at Halifax to do the business. That did not seem to me to be a very good answer, because if there was no accommodation to do the business at \$1 a car load, how could there be sufficient accommodation to do it at \$2.50? Nevertheless, that was the answer given, and, therefore, I presume I am right in assuming that when the increased accommodation is provided, the cars from the west will be allowed to go in on the same terms as the cars from the east. Now that the right hon. Premier has the matter in his own hands, I trust that he will give consideration to this important question, as he promised to do. I can assure him that the people of western Nova Scotia are very much excited over it. On every occasion that our fruit-growers and agricultural societies meet, this question is brought up. It is a burning question in Nova Scotia, and I trust that it will get its solution now.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In reference to the accommodation at Halifax, I think, as the hon. senior member for Halifax has said, that thirty days free storage ought to be given, for this reason: A great deal of flour from Ontario goes to Halifax by way of Boston, and on all the flour that goes to Boston for export to the Maritime Provinces, thirty days free storage is given. The merchant at Halifax can have his flour sent to Boston, let it remain there for thirty days, and then bring it over to Halifax, by steamer, whenever it suits him; whereas, if he brings it over the Intercolonial Railway, he has to unload it within forty-eight hours, or after that pay demurrage upon it. I think shippers by the Intercolonial Railway should have the same advantage in the way of free storage as they would get by sending their flour by way of Boston. The quantity of flour sent to Halifax, and kept there for the requirements of that city, is not very large; probably at no time is there more than 10,000 barrels stored there. The storage for that quantity would not be very great, and I think it would be in the interest of the Intercolonial Railway if this concession of free storage for thirty days were granted to the merchants there; and, after that, charge them 2 cents a barrel a month—the same as the lines running into Boston. Another system has been in vogue on the Intercolonial for some time, that is, the granting of rebates on freight sent to Halifax and St. John. The arrangement made by the Intercolonial Railway and the receivers of flour at Halifax and St. John was that the party who got in 2,000 barrels per month, got a rebate of 10 cents per barrel on his freight, and if 1,500 barrels, then 7½ cents per barrel, and if 1,000 barrels, 5 cents per barrel, and if 500 barrels per month were brought in they got a rebate of 2½ cents per barrel; but, under 500 barrels, they got

no rebate. That is a perfect nuisance, and I do not think the Government should allow that system to exist at all. It simply places the whole trade of Halifax in the hands of two or three men. The man who brings in only one or two car-loads of flour a month cannot afford to bring it over the Intercolonial Railroad; he has to bring it *via* Boston, because the man who brings the larger quantity gets the rebate and can undersell the man who brings the smaller quantity. I think the Intercolonial Railway should adopt the system that whether a man brings in one car or five cars a month, he shall pay the same rate. Last summer I was speaking with Mr. Taylor, the general freight agent of the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton, with reference to this very matter, and he was of the same opinion, that this system was a nuisance and ought to be done away with. Last Session the subject of the freight charges on flour passing over the Intercolonial Railway for Prince Edward Island came up in this House, and I pointed out to the Government that I thought they should give as low a rate to Pictou Landing on flour as they do to Halifax. If they did so, all the flour for Prince Edward would go *via* the Intercolonial Railway instead of *via* Boston, and by the American line of steamers, as it has done for many years. I am glad to say that last fall, though rather late in the season, a rate of freight was given to Pictou Landing, which enabled us to send all the flour for Charlottetown over the Intercolonial Railway and across on our own steamers. But afterwards that rate was withdrawn, but I hope that before navigation opens this spring, the Government will renew it, as there will be a very large quantity of flour going to Charlottetown from the Upper Provinces. For my part, I never could see the reason why the Government should carry flour to Halifax and St. John at a less rate than to Pictou Landing, more especially when such an enormous quantity of flour was going to the Island every year. If the same rate that prevailed last fall is renewed, I venture to say that nearly all the flour from Ontario for Prince Edward Island will go *via* Pictou Landing, and, of course, it is better for it to go over our trans-continental line than over the American lines. I think in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick many places have rather high rates as compared with other points on the Intercolonial Railway. For instance, the rate on a barrel of flour to Campbellton or Newcastle is very much higher than it is to points at the extreme end of the line. I think the Government should reduce the rates to those points a little more, especially as we know that the Americans are sending their cornmeal and flour from Chicago over the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial Railways, and laying it down at Halifax at a lower rate than that at which we can send it from Chatham. That is not right, that from Chicago, which is 400 miles farther west, the rates over the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial should be less than they are from Canadian points. This is a matter that the Minister of Railways should take up with the view of seeing whether some justice cannot be done to our Canadian manufacturers. I do not see any reason why corn and cornmeal should be carried from Chicago to Halifax for 60 cents a barrel, while from Chatham to Newcastle it is charged say 70 or 75 cents a barrel.

General LAURIE. The fruit-growers of Nova Scotia have asked me to support the proposition of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), that equal facilities should be afforded to produce going over the Windsor and Annapolis Railway for shipment that is afforded to goods going over the Intercolonial. We recognise that we shall never have the trade with Halifax unless we provide outward cargoes, which we are able to do if facilities are afforded for shipment; but if obstacles are placed in the way, we shall find, as we did three years ago, that large portions of the produce of the Annapolis valley will be sent by steamer to Boston to be shipped to England. That should not be. Our produce should go out of our own ports, and, if it does, inward cargoes will come and Halifax will then become a terminal point—and will travel over the Intercolonial Railway, which will thereby have less of a deficit, if it does not pay.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). These gentlemen have forgotten that the Intercolonial Railway has to compete with Boston, and if the flour trade does not go by the Intercolonial Railway it will go by Boston, so that the managers of the Intercolonial Railway must necessarily make the rate pretty well what it would be *vis-à-vis* Boston. There is great force in what the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) said with reference to the rate charged to Pictou Landing. I cannot understand why a road which carries to Halifax, sixty miles from Truro, should not carry at the same rate forty miles to Pictou Landing. I notice in the report of the Intercolonial Railway referring to the general result of the year's work:

"The improvement in the net result of the operations of the Government Railways is almost entirely due to the Intercolonial, the loss on operating which having been less by \$105,093.42 than during 1887-88. This result is partly due to the favorable character of the last winter, and partly to the reduction in the quantity of coal carried to points west of Chaudière."

It appears the less coal is carried from Spring Hill to Chaudière the better for the country. I suppose there has been no change in the coal rate since the previous year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Stairs from Halifax Station to North St... \$600

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that this is almost a farce, to put such trifling items to capital account.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a portion of the extension of the accommodation at that particular place, and, though small an amount, is on the same principle as the larger sums. It is to accommodate the passengers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disputing the fact that the accommodation is required, but I really do not think we ought to favor this idea on the part of officials that trifling things of that kind should be charged to capital account.

General LAURIE. This was an omission at the time of the construction of the station. It should have been done then.

Increased accommodation at Moncton... \$2,000

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Does that include the expenditure for electric light?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. It is for blacksmith shop, machinery, moving building and Mr. CAMPBELL.

levelling ground, paint shop, printing apparatus, engine house and engine shop.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have often called the attention of the Minister of Railways to the condition of the platform at the station. It is uncovered, and when people have to wait is, in bad weather, very unpleasant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will see about that.

Intercolonial Railway—Rolling stock... \$10,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What amount of rolling stock has been provided during the last year to take the place of stock worn out? Some years ago, Sir Charles Tupper laid down the principle that when a car gets worn out and is replaced by a new car, the latter is charged to working expenses. What amount of new rolling stock was purchased last year and charged to working expenses and how much charged to capital account?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When a car is worn out and a new car substituted, the cost of the new car is charged to working expenses.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to enquire how many new cars have been bought and put on the road during the last year and charged to working expenses, in place of cars which have been worn out?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend will find that in the annual report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I see that the amount charged last year to capital account for rolling stock was \$327,789. It did not appear to me that the amount that should have been charged was more than \$17,000 or \$18,000. This capital account of the Intercolonial Railway is assuming alarming proportions. On the 30th June, 1889, it amounted to \$46,542,000, and I think there is too great a disposition to charge to that account expenditures that should be charged to current expenses. In that way the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway is reduced as compared with that on the Island road. In Prince Edward Island everything is charged to running expenses, but on the Intercolonial Railway \$656,000 was charged last year to capital account. Some of that is properly charged—such as the increased accommodation at St. John and Halifax; but I think the amount charged for rolling stock is beyond the mark, and also the cost of lighting the cars by electricity. It seems to me that we are presenting a false balance to the country. While the deficit is put down at only \$250,000, it is really much more than that, and there must be something more in the supplementaries.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I fancy the report to which my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) refers extends to the 1st July, 1889, and the vote of which he is speaking is the vote for the present year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When this matter was up last year, the impression left on the Committee was that we were not any more to have the cost of the rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway charged to capital account. Some years ago, Sir Charles Tupper charged the rolling stock to capital account, but he explained that it was for new cars to carry coal to the west.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the condition of the claims in regard to the St. Charles Branch?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That matter is not closed, but I hope it is approaching termination.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are the outstanding amounts of these claims large?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are large. Some of them are before the Exchequer Court.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I should like to know in what position the question stands as to the running powers of the Canadian Pacific Railway over the Intercolonial Railway. By the arrangement of last year, in reference to the Harvey and Salisbury branch, which fell through, the Canadian Pacific Railway were to have running powers over the Intercolonial Railway from Moncton to Halifax. Since then, public attention has been drawn, on several occasions, to a reported misunderstanding between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government as to their running powers over the Intercolonial Railway from St. John to Halifax. Of course, they would be, in that case, competitors with the Intercolonial Railway, but, while they have not those running powers, we are losing, to a great extent, the advantages which were supposed to arise from the construction of the Short Line. If the right hon. gentleman could give any information in regard to that, it would be satisfactory, but I know that questions of that kind are of a delicate nature, and, if he is not in a position to give the information, I cannot expect it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In regard to the running powers from St. John to Halifax *via* the Short Line, the Canadian Pacific Railway desired to have the same powers as were given to them under the arrangement between Harvey and Salisbury. The Department did not think, under the circumstances, that the same powers should be given. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company contended strongly that they should get the same powers and privileges as it was arranged they should have by the other road. A substantial understanding, however, has been come to, although it is not finally closed, and the Canadian Pacific Railway is running under certain limited powers over that part of the Intercolonial Railway—limited powers in the sense that they are not so extensive as they were in regard to the Harvey and Salisbury line. I have been discussing the matter this very evening with the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of finally closing the matter.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand they are not carrying freight but only passengers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are carrying both.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). From St. John to Halifax?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are sending it through. They are not carrying any local freight, but they are sending through freight to Halifax, say from Montreal.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension. I think there has been some difficulty in the way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Canadian Pacific Railway bill their freight from Montreal or west of that through to Halifax. Their cars bring it to St. John, and the Canadian Pacific Railway en-

gines convey the Canadian Pacific Railway cars into Halifax.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was informed the other day by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) that the management of the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal were offering rates over the Intercolonial Railway to St. John at the same amount as by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I could hardly believe that statement, as the distance by the one is about 250 miles shorter than by the other, and it would hardly be worth while competing for traffic on such terms. I do not know whether it is true or not, but I was informed by my hon. friend that he had the information from reliable sources.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The rate from Montreal *via* Intercolonial Railway to Halifax is 10 shillings. I understand that for the majority of articles of freight the Intercolonial Railway is carrying at the same rate as to St. John; though there are some articles that the Canadian Pacific Railway are carrying so low that the Intercolonial Railway management decline to accept it at the same rates.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will it not be in the interest of the country in such cases to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry the freight? Because surely the Intercolonial Railway cannot compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway to St. John; to Halifax it is a different matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I heard the hon. gentleman say that the Canadian Pacific Railway used their own engines and cars. Does he mean by that that they are practically running a train each way from St. John to Halifax on the Intercolonial Railway without charge?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Canadian Pacific Railway cars are drawn from St. John to Halifax by the Intercolonial Railway engines.

Mr. McMULLEN. I put a question to the Minister of Railways with regard to the number of cars that were supplied and charged to working expenses, and the hon. gentleman said that it was found in the report. I cannot find any cars charged to working expenses in the Minister of Railways' report. Certainly there must be a number of cars supplied each year, charged to working expenses, to take the place of cars that are used up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will get an account for it.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) On that point of charge to capital account, I was under the impression that the \$327,000 that I spoke of, as charged to capital for rolling stock, embraced rolling stock on the branch lines. I find on another page of the railway report that it does not. On page 18 I find that the total amount charged to capital was \$656,328. Of that, increased accommodation at terminal stations took up \$29,108; branch lines, including rolling stock therefor, \$258,443; rolling stock for the Intercolonial Railway proper, the old road, \$327,789. That is for rolling stock charged to capital account. If you turn to the preceding page, although you will not get the amounts, you will find a statement showing the rolling stock:

"The following rolling stock has been rebuilt during the year at the cost of working expenses to maintain the stock."

Then it gives four engines, two second-class passenger cars, two baggage cars, six conductor's vans,

one box car, 59 platform cars, and 52 coal cars, charged to working expenses. But it does not give the amount at all. But the items giving \$327,000 for the rolling stock charged to capital account, can be found in the Auditor General's Report, page D 128. It appears those items ought to be charged to working expenses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As regards the question whether they should be charged to working expenses or capital, the principle is simply this: That when one car is worn out and another substituted, that is charged to maintenance, but if there are any additional cars wanted, they are charged to capital account. I do not think there is any fear that there will be an excess of locomotives or cars; in fact there is a complaint that there is not sufficient rolling stock. With regard to the question asked just now, about the haul of freight from St. John to Halifax: the freight is drawn from St. John to Halifax in the Canadian Pacific Railway cars, but by Government engines, and the Government gets the freight for the articles so carried from St. John to Halifax.

Extension along City front at St.
John..... \$17,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know what was done with the rolling stock that was taken from the Onderdonk's. Where is it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the Inter-colonial Railway.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has it been used there?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The Minister a little while ago spoke of paying for land damages at Halifax. When this vote was first proposed for St. John, it was upon the condition that the city should provide for right of way, and other necessary lands free of charge, and assume all liability of claims for damages for accidents. It seems to me, by the same principle that prevails at Halifax, the Government should take charge of the whole thing. I do not think it is fair to saddle the city of St. John with conditions which do not apply to other places. This \$17,000 would go a small way towards having that built, yet the Minister says \$150,000 is necessary to do the same thing in Halifax. Of course, where the extension is necessary, I do not object, but as it is equally necessary in St. John, I think we should be treated in the same way as Halifax, and that the city should not be compelled to buy the right of way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, the hon. gentleman will allow us to take this vote of \$17,000 to extend the Intercolonial Railway along the harbor front at St. John, exclusive of the right of way. The hon. gentleman desires that the city should be relieved of any claim the Government may have if they furnish the right of way.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The city has got to find the right of way and other necessary lands free of charge, and assume all liability by reason of the track running along the side of the street. Last year, at my request, the Minister made that vote on the same terms as it is here. I do not object to aiding Halifax, but I want precisely the same rule to apply to St. John. If the Government is giving railway and wharf accommodation to Halifax for freight, it seems to me the Government should

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

not saddle the city of St. John with the right of way, and make it responsible for all damages.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will see what the reason of the difference is.

Mr. ELLIS. Why has this matter been standing so long? Last year there were negotiations between the Government and the city, but no one appeared to understand why the Government did not go on with the work. This grant has been standing for two years, and it is proposed to revoke it this year. The Board of Trade of St. John makes deliveries on this subject, but they do not seem to advance the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reason is that the city has not given the right of way. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) says the city should not be asked to give the right of way. I will enquire into it, and see whether there is any reason for the difference between Halifax and St. John in that regard.

Mr. McMULLEN. With respect to the Onderdonk rolling stock: has it been charged to the capital account of the Intercolonial, and if so at what sum?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is still in the Canadian Pacific Railway account and has not been adjusted.

Mr. McMULLEN. It has been used on the Intercolonial.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. There is a very considerable unadjusted account with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and this is part of it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Last year \$35,000 were voted for increased accommodation at St. John. Has that been expended, and in what way?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is being expended now on the purchase of the Moore property. The purchase is just about completed.

Cape Breton Railway..... \$50,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman inform us as to the condition of the road, when the road will be open, and if this amount will close the account?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is to complete the road and rolling stock.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When will the road be opened?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. About August next.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) In a return brought down to the Public Accounts Committee during the present Session the total expenditure on that road, up to the 31st December, was shown to have been \$2,333,061. We are now about to vote \$50,000 to complete after 1st July next. What will the expenditure be between December and July?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole of the cost will appear in the Supplementary Estimates, which will be brought down in a few days.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Do I understand that this will complete?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There will be a sum in the Supplementary Estimates. That sum will be expended after 1st July; the Supplementary Estimates will be for the expenditure up to 1st

July. There will be a sum in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) There appears to be \$246,000 left to expend after 31st December last. Will that be sufficient to cover the expenditure up to next July?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; there will be a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the current year. This amount of \$50,000 is principally to furnish rolling stock, as the road will be finished next August. The present sum and this vote and the Supplementary Estimates will show the whole cost of the road as it will stand at August next.

Oxford and New Glasgow Railway. . . \$30,000

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I desire to ask the right hon. gentleman a question which I asked Mr. Schreiber when he was before the Public Accounts Committee. I asked the chief engineer, what was the highest grade on that road. I understood from him that the highest grade, at Stellarton towards Pictou, was 110 feet to the mile. I have ascertained since, from authority which I think is almost unquestionable, that the chief engineer must have been astray in that statement, and that there is a grade on the first mile of not less than 150 feet to the mile.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I lay on the Table a plan showing the grades.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) In connection with that road it was proposed to run a loop line between Pictou Town branch and New Glasgow, and Mr. Archibald was requested to make a report on the cost of such a road, and the chief engineer brought down a report, which showed that the cost of running another road to avoid that heavy grade, from somewhere near Westville, near the iron bridge, to New Glasgow, would cost from \$35,000 to \$40,000. I desire some information on this point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no present intention to build a loop to the iron bridge. It is under consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that, in addition to what has already been expended, a further outlay is contemplated, after the egregious misrepresentation as to the distance of this road, which was intended to be used by every pound of freight and every passenger, to quote the words of the High Commissioner delivered from his place in this House, and that the road contains a grade of 140 feet to the mile.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It contains a very high grade.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me, that of all the extraordinary transactions ever palmed off on this House, this is the worst.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think it is generally understood that the road, as it now stands, without a new piece to avoid these heavy grades, would be perfectly useless. If there is any traffic to go over the road, the sooner the matter is considered the better.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can well remember, that when Sir Charles proposed the construction of

this line to the House, he gave as a principal reason for its necessity, that on the line of the Intercolonial Railway between Oxford and New Glasgow, going the round-about way the Intercolonial ran, there were grades there on which it was almost impossible to run a heavy freight train, and that it became an absolute necessity either to build the new road or to reconstruct the Intercolonial Railway so that it would be a possible route for heavy freight trains. After spending an enormous amount on that road, is it possible that we have on this new line grades of 150 feet to the mile?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When Sir Charles Tupper was speaking about the very high grades, he was speaking of the grades to the coal mines. As my hon. friend from Halifax has stated, it is all down grade from the coal mines, and after that the average is 15 feet to the mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is not a question of the average.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should have said the maximum.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is well known that the drawing power of an engine is measured by the steepest grade on the road, and if you have any grade which will prevent an engine drawing more than ten or twelve or fourteen cars, it is a matter of little importance whether the balance of the road is a low grade or not. When Sir Charles Tupper proposed that this new line should be built, he declared there was one grade on the Intercolonial Railway which prevented the moving of heavy freight trains, for the reason that that grade was the measure of the power of the engine. It appears now, that in the new line constructed for the special purpose of getting over that difficulty on the Intercolonial Railway as originally constructed, we have one grade of 140 feet to the mile. This line is virtually a duplicate of the Intercolonial Railway, and if we duplicated it for the purpose of allowing heavy freight trains to pass over without subjecting them to risk there would be some excuse. Now, after spending so much money, we find we are in the same difficulty as we were in before.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). I think an examination of the chart submitted by the hon. Minister of Railways will show that there is a great improvement effected by the new line, as compared with the old one. Some confusion has arisen in discussing this Oxford and New Glasgow road. The road constructed under that name only extends from Oxford to the Town of Pictou, and the grades over that line do not exceed in any place 65 feet to the mile. The balance of the line, from Pictou to Stellarton was constructed before the Oxford and New Glasgow road was taken up as a Government work. Towards the construction of that road the county of Pictou gave the right of way, and gave up a ferry service between Pictou Landing and Pictou Town, which had cost the Intercolonial Railway some \$12,000 a year to maintain. That capitalised, would represent a sum of \$300,000. If we compare the grades of the two lines, it will be found that the new line has a great advantage over the old road, with the exception of a very short distance, not exceeding a quarter of a mile, and even that is at a place where there is a round

house, and where engines can always be found to help a train over the grade. The Pictou Town branch on which this grade is, was not built originally as part of the Oxford and New Glasgow road; it was built as the Pictou Town branch of the Intercolonial Railway, and although that is at present used in connection with the line, it is not part of the line referred to in the original statement made by Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is right in one sense and wrong in another. Every one knows that it is not part of the original line. It never was intended that the Oxford and New Glasgow road should run the way it does at all, but now the Oxford and New Glasgow has been connected with the Pictou Town branch, within a short distance of Pictou Town, and then it runs along the Pictou branch until it strikes Stellarton. You cannot get to Stellarton without going over that grade, so that the hon. gentleman (no doubt unintentionally) is misleading the House. The reasons given to justify the House in spending that large amount on the Oxford and New Glasgow line, would not have been successful with the House, had it been known that that line was to be connected with the Pictou branch, and that on the Pictou branch there was a grade of 150 feet to the mile, which precludes any ordinary engines from hauling freight there. The whole trouble has been, that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDougald), was exceedingly anxious to capture the vote of the villages of Stellarton and Westville. That is the secret of the whole thing, and in order to do that the line was diverted there. We practically abandoned eight miles of road running down to Pictou Landing, with the wharves and everything else complete. We lengthened the Oxford and New Glasgow line some three or four miles, and we built a road into Pictou competing with the old line we had there, at a cost of \$503,827. That is the plain English of it. The hon. gentleman is perfectly correct that this was part of the old Acadian Mine road, but the Government bought it and made it part of the Pictou branch, and now it is part of the Oxford and New Glasgow.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). If there is any gentleman misleading the House, it is the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). This railway was not originally a part of the Oxford and New Glasgow line. It was built by the Government before the Oxford and New Glasgow was undertaken as a Government work, and on entirely different grounds, and in lieu of the ferry service across the harbor of Pictou.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has stated just what I said. This was not intended originally to be part of the Oxford and New Glasgow line, and the House would not have voted for it if full information had been given to them that it was only going to shorten the distance seven miles, and was to have a very heavy grade. The fact is, that in order to procure the election of the hon. gentleman and his colleague, this country has spent \$503,000 on the Pictou Branch line, and the Government have sent an engineer to survey a new line to avoid that heavy grade, and the estimate is before us that it will cost \$40,000, and I suppose that before another election takes place we shall have two lines, one to Westville and one

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou)

to Stellarton. I think the hon. gentleman is likely to turn out a very expensive luxury.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). If there is anything in the hon. gentleman's argument, it is that the line should be completed, because there was no reference to this line when the vote was taken for the line from Oxford to New Glasgow.

Eastern Extension Railway..... \$3,500

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I would like to ask whether it is the intention of the Government to replace the steamer which was burnt down at Port Mulgrave by a boat which will carry a train of cars. A large amount of freight arrives there which cannot conveniently be transferred in boats, that will require the breaking of the cargo.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There must be steamers that will carry cars to a certain extent, but that must be hereafter. The Government do not intend during this Session to ask for a vote for that purpose.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 14th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved:

That the notice required by the 60th rule to be given by Committees prior to the consideration of private Bills, be reduced from one week to three days, for the remainder of the Session, in accordance with the resolution of the Select Committee on Standing Orders, as contained in the 13th report.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved:

That the 49th and 51st rules of this House be suspended in relation to the petition of the Dominion Mineral Company, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Committee on Standing Orders, and that the leave asked be granted, to introduce a Bill to amend the Act incorporating the Dominion Mineral Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It will be remembered that the hon. First Minister was to make a statement at three o'clock to-day with respect to the course the Government proposed to pursue as to the adjourned debate on the motion presented by me on Tuesday last. I suppose some of the hon. gentlemen will be able to state, as the Premier is not here, what the Government mean to do.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. First Minister desired me to say, in answer to the question of the hon. gentleman, that the Government wish, if it is the will of the House, that this matter be taken up on Monday at eight o'clock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, probably, the hon. gentleman had better cause it to be made a special Order.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved :

That the Order for resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright, with respect to the conduct of John Charles Rykert, Esquire, member for the Electoral District of Lincoln and Niagara, declaring it to be discreditable, corrupt and scandalous, be made an Order of the Day, to be taken up at eight o'clock in the evening on Monday next.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY--BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to call the attention of the House to the manner in which the Government have been conducting the business of the House during the present Session. We are now in the ninth week of the Session, and I submit it to the calm and impartial judgment of hon. members on both sides, that the Government have been remiss in the discharge of the duty which they owe to the House and the country. In the first place, it is to be remembered, that the period for the meeting of Parliament in this country is not fixed by law. The time at which Parliament shall be summoned together for the despatch of business is altogether at the option of the Administration. They themselves select the day on which they ought to be ready, and they declare practically that they are then ready to meet the representatives of the people. It is, therefore, nothing but fair to expect, under the circumstances, that every measure of the Government, and every report which by law they are required to bring before the House, and every announcement of their policy, should be ready at that time. Even if the period of the meeting of Parliament were fixed by law, if it had to come as in other countries, within a certain period well known in advance, still the duty of the Government would be the same; whenever the time came, they ought to be ready with everything which is within their domain to facilitate business, and to afford to the representatives of the people an early opportunity to discharge the duties imposed upon them. Still more pressing must be this duty upon the Government, when, as I have said, the period at which Parliament assembles is not fixed by law, but is determined by the advisers of His Excellency themselves. Now, there is a universal wish among the members of this House for an early meeting of Parliament, and what is the reason? The reason is, that it is supposed that if we have an early meeting of Parliament, and the Session extends to its normal length, which, I suppose, in this country is about three months, then the members of the House would be able to return to their private business at the time of the opening of navigation. It is to be remembered also that, with very few exceptions, the members of this House are not men of leisure, but are all engaged in the active pursuits of life. Their time is precious, they cannot afford to give more than the country absolutely requires of them, and to keep them a longer time here than is absolutely necessary is not just to them. This year we have been summoned earlier than usual, but what will be the consequence?

Will it be that the members will be discharged from their attendance here at any earlier period than usual? No; the only consequence will be simply to prolong the Session for several weeks longer than it ought to be prolonged. I charge this on the Government, that they have been altogether remiss in discharging the duties they owe to Parliament and the country. They have not yet brought down any of the reports which they should have brought at an early day; they are not yet ready to bring down their Budget; they have not even brought down the measures which they promised, at the opening of Parliament, in the Speech of His Excellency. It is one of the obligations which is made imperative on the Government by law, that they should bring down the reports of the various Departments, and reports containing other information, yearly, as Parliament is called together. Some of the reports have, of course, been brought down, but in this the ninth week of the Session, several of the departmental reports even are yet wanting. We have not yet received the Report of the Department of Agriculture, the Report of the Department of the Interior, the Report on Chartered Banks, the Report on the Fisheries, the Report on Insurance, the Report on the Mounted Police, or the Report on Railway Statistics, all of which certainly should have been laid on the Table of the House in the very first week after Parliament was called together. They are all necessary to the proper discussion of the questions which come before Parliament, and unless we have every one of them, it is not possible to discuss effectively the different subjects to which they refer, and therefore those subjects have to be deferred from week to week, and month to month, until the reports are laid before the House. So it is with the measures of the Government. The Speech from the Throne announced that they were to bring down several very important measures, with some innocuous ones. Some of the latter have been brought down, but we have not yet seen one of the important measures. For instance, on that very important question, the labor question, His Excellency was made to say :

"The report of the Royal Commission on Labor, which was laid before you during the last Session, has been distributed throughout the country. I have reason to believe that the information which it contains will be found eminently useful in suggesting improvements in the administration of the laws which affect the working classes. Measures for the amendment of these laws, so far as they come within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, will be submitted for your consideration." That Commission, if I remember aright, sat for a year or two; afterwards several months were occupied in hatching the report, and then it was distributed. The Government have had it for a year or more to consider; when Parliament was summoned, legislation based upon that report was announced which certainly from its nature ought to be brought down this Session, and yet, in the ninth week of the Session, we are still without it. I submit it to the intelligence and common sense and impartial judgment of every member of this House, is this a proper discharge of the duty the Government owe to this Parliament? In another paragraph His Excellency is made to say :

"The early termination of the Acts of incorporation of the principal banking institutions of the Dominion necessitates a review of our present system of banking and an adjustment of the terms under which the charters of

these corporations should be renewed. Your attention will be drawn to this important subject."

Nay, a very important subject; I suppose no more important subject than this can be brought before Parliament during the present Session. Yet, after nine weeks of deliberation, the Government are not yet ready to bring down to Parliament the Bill which they had under consideration on this most important subject. I understand that we are to have it next week. It would have been important for us to have had it long before to-day, not only because members of this House would have had the opportunity to read and consider it, and to form an opinion upon it, but because it is also of the greatest importance that the public at large should have had an occasion to look into the measure offered by the Government upon that subject, in order to see what is the new policy which the Government propose. I say again, that the Government are most remiss in the duty they owe to Parliament and to the country at large, when they have allowed eight weeks of the time of Parliament to elapse, before they are in a position to submit this measure. Look at the next paragraph:

"Certain amendments to the Acts relating to the North-West Territories, calculated to facilitate the administration of affairs in that region, as also a Bill further to promote the efficiency of the North-West Mounted Police, will be submitted for your consideration."

Anything which touches the Mounted Police is certainly of a character to invite considerable discussion. It has been a matter which has been adopted on both sides of the House. But still more important is the proposed legislation in regard to the North-West Territories. It is within our recollection that the Legislature of the North-West Territories have represented that they were in need of certain legislation more suited than the present state of the law to the advanced stage of civilisation which they have attained. Under such circumstances, I say it is most important that this legislation should have been brought down at an early stage. If this legislation is proposed now, even within the ninth or tenth or twelfth week of the Session, it is not possible for Parliament to give it the attention which it deserves at our hands. The Speech goes on to state that:

"Measures will be laid before you relating to bills of exchange and promissory notes,——"

We have had that; it was not new, but was only a re-hash of the measure of last Session, and probably that is the reason why it was brought down so soon.—

"—to improve the laws respecting patents of invention and discovery,——"

We had that, but it only contained one single clause.—

"—to amend also the Act respecting the Geological and Natural History Survey of Canada,——"

This was brought down to us from the Senate within a day or so.—

"—and to provide for the better organisation of the national printing establishment."

As to that, we have not yet heard a single word. So that, of all the important measures which were announced by His Excellency in his speech at the opening of the Session, not one has been brought down, and I again ask the fair-minded members on both sides of the House, if the Government have

Mr. LAURIER.

been discharging in a proper manner the duty they owe to this Parliament? Another question, which is, perhaps, more important to us than any, is the consideration of the Budget. There is no reason, in my judgment, and there can be no excuse, if that is not brought down at an early period of the Session, certainly not later than the third week. And why? The reason is obvious. In this country, the questions which affect the people most are trade questions, and these are intimately connected with the Budget statement, and cannot properly be taken into consideration until the Budget is brought down. We have had many instances of that this Session. Several motions have been made on this side of the House giving instances where the tariff oppresses certain sections of the community, especially where it is oppressive to the farmers, and to all these motions there was but this answer given from the other side of the House—that they were not ready to give an answer at all. Wait till the Budget comes, they said, that is the only answer. If we have to wait until the Budget comes, why should not the Budget have come long before this date? If we cannot consider properly the questions which most deeply affect the people of this country until we have the Budget, that is all the more reason that we should have the Budget early, and that we should condemn the Government for having been so dilatory in that respect. What excuse can there be for the delay? If I am to speak my mind and state what I believe, I will say that, in my opinion, the only reason of the Government is that it is a part and parcel of their policy to delay the submission of important measures until such time as members have become weary, until they have become exhausted, and are called by their own business away from Parliament, so that those measures cannot receive the consideration which they ought to have. I believe that this neglect is wilful, and deliberate, and designed. If it is not wilful, or deliberate, or designed, what can it be? It must, then, be the result of incompetency on the part of the Government to form an opinion. If the delay is not wilful, we must come to the conclusion that gentlemen on the other side, though they are a pretty numerous body, are not able to form their minds on a question of public policy; that measures are considered, and then the effort is too great for them, they cannot decide, but put them off from to-day to to-morrow, and from to-morrow again to to-morrow, and so on for weeks. I think the reasons which I have given justify me in moving that you, Sir, do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved:

That the failure of the Government to bring down the Budget, several of the departmental reports, all the important measures announced in the Speech of His Excellency at the opening of the Session, and to discharge the duties which they owe to Parliament, is highly prejudicial to the public interest.

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel that every word that has been uttered by the leader of the great party on this side of the House is susceptible of being endorsed by myself as an independent man outside of the influence of either party. I think it is discreditable to a Government—especially a Government possessing, as they believe they possess, which I do not believe, the confidence of a majority of this House—to delay the conduct of public business in the manner which has been described. It is the duty of a Government not to delay, and practi-

cally to obstruct, the conduct of public business, as this Government has. As the hon. gentleman has correctly stated, we are now in the ninth week of this Session. We were called together early, the nominal reason being that it would enable us to get through the business of the country, and enable the members who are farmers, and the business men, to get home to their duties before the spring business opens, which demands their presence at their homes. So far from that having been the case, there has been nothing but the most reckless neglect. No consideration has been paid, either to the convenience of the members, or of the people whom they represent. Sir, it is time this kind of thing should be put a stop to. These important measures to which my hon. friend has referred ought long since to have been laid before this House. He has referred to the banking measure. That is a measure which will require a great deal of consideration, not only by the members who are representing their constituents here, but it should have been down long since in order to enable the members to take the advice of their constituents upon one of the most important measures that could be submitted to the House. Then, with regard to the Budget and the changes that are likely to be made in the tariff, as has been rumored abroad in the country. It is time that business men should know on what they can rely, so that, in sending out their spring orders, they may know whether there is to be an increase of duty upon any particular article; it is time the people should know, when they are sending their money and making investments in the trade of the country, upon what they can rely in reference to the tariff; and I desire especially to charge the Finance Minister with having been remiss in his duty in not having, weeks ago, submitted his Budget scheme for the consideration of the House, so as to enable the members to reply to the numerous letters coming up from all parts of the country, asking whether there are going to be changes in the tariff, and whether the Government have decided upon their policy. I do not want to know what the changes in the tariff are going to be, because I know what answer would be given to me; but I think the people have a right to know at the earliest day what the policy of the Government is in relation to the changes that are to be made. Sir, there is an unsettled feeling in the trade of this country in relation to the rumored changes in the tariff, some expecting that there is going to be an increase in the tariff on several items. I hope that the friends of the Government have not received information in relation to these increases, by which they would be enabled to have an advantage over the gentlemen who have not, shall I say?—the good luck to be in a position to get such information by supporting the Administration. I do not say that the Government would do a thing of this kind, but I mean to say that their course excites very grave suspicion that such things are done. It is very well known that this House has been flooded with delegations, some of whom want one thing and some another in relation to many items in the tariff. Sir, I wish to express my grave dissent from the course of the Government in permitting the delays that have arisen, and I think the Government are justly subject to public condemnation for those delays, and for the manner in which they have failed to progress with the

public business that they intimated they intended to submit for the consideration of this House. What have we found on former occasions? Delays have occurred, just as they have occurred this Session, and then, in the last two or three weeks of the Session, business is rushed through, it is shovelled through the House. People have not an opportunity to consider it, the members' attention is distracted by their interests drawing them towards home, and they desire to leave earlier than they should leave; and when they have been here nine weeks diligently endeavoring to attend to their duties as legislators, there is no business laid before them to consider. If there is one thing that makes one doubt of the correctness of the system of responsible government and departmental government, and government under the rules of Parliament such as prevail here, according to which everything relating to financial matters and to public revenue must first be submitted by the Government of the day—I say it is the course this Government has pursued during the present Session. If, under our system, the private members were enabled to bring in resolutions dealing with the revenue, we could very easily elicit the policy of the Administration, but we are precluded from doing so. I will conclude the remarks I intended to make by saying that I justify the hon. gentleman in making his motion, and I entirely approve the course he has pursued in condemning the Government for their dilatoriness in the conduct of public business.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a little amusing to hear our hon. friends opposite attempting to score the Government for not having the business further advanced than it is. I think a little reflection on the course which has been run in Parliament from the 16th January till the present time, will bear me out in stating, as a fact, that the Government has been ready with business from the very first week of the Session, that it has had its business every Government day before the House, and that the reason Government business is not further advanced than it is to-day, is because the time has been taken up by dilatory motions from the other side of the House. The Government certainly would have been derelict in its duty, and would have been liable to censure, and should have been censured, if the House had been meeting here day after day, and week after week, and upon the Government days there had been no business ready for the House. But such has not been the case. There are three divisions of the complaint. One is that the reports have not been brought down. Now, it is quite true that the reports ought to be in the hands of members of Parliament just as soon as they can possibly be brought down after the opening of the Session; and if you will look at the records of the House you will find that all the important reports, with one or two exceptions, were down very early in the Session, and in the hands of members. Some of these reports differ from others in the period to which they bring down the record of transactions, and therefore it is not possible to have them ready for the House so early as others. Take, for instance, the Report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries upon the fisheries. It may be open to question whether the plan pursued regarding that report is a wise one or not, but the plan has been for that report to bring up the proceedings to the end of

ne year, and if proceedings to the end of the year are to be reported, they must come in from the different fishery officers in various parts of the country, after the end of the calendar year, and it is impossible for these officers to make up their yearly reports after the 31st December and have them transmitted to the Department, and then for these reports to go through the process of collocation, of printing, and of proof-reading, and be ready to be presented to the House at an early period. I remember the difficulty that met me in that respect when I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Though I started out with the best intentions to have that report down early, in two cases at least it was very near the end of the Session before it was possible for me to bring it down. The same is true, and to a greater degree, with reference to the chartered banks and the insurance societies. I think my hon. friend ought to have remembered to state that abstracts of these reports have been laid upon the Table of the House. These reports are also brought up to the end of the year, and it is not until after January that the inspections are made, and that the reports begin to come in. It has not been the fact in the history of the House that they have been down until nearly three months after the beginning of the year. With reference to the Department of Agriculture, I think the Minister explained, the other evening, to the House the reasons for the delay in the appearance of that report. It is a very bulky volume, and it is brought up to the 31st December. It has been put into the hands of the printer, and he is trying to facilitate the work as much as possible. It will contain 600 pages, and, as he informs me, he hopes to have it ready in two or three days. That disposes of the grievance with reference to the reports; and taking all things into consideration, and the system adopted by the different Departments as to the period of ending the reports, I do not think the delay has been such as to constitute a grievance for the House. With respect to the measures which have not been brought down as promised in the Speech, I find that the principal measures which have not been brought down are, among others, measures with reference to banking, the North-West, and to labor legislation. On looking over the record, I find there stood for second reading as early as 21st January, Sir John Thompson's Exchange and Promissory Note Bill, which was certainly a very important measure, and it engaged the attention of the House for several Government days. The Bill to amend the Adulteration Act stood for second reading on 22nd January. The Bill respecting the Patent Act also on the 27th; Bill to amend the Copyright Act on the same date; Bill to amend Trade Marks and Industrial Designs also on the same date. There have been, in all, fifteen Government Bills which have stood for second reading, the majority of which were early on the Order paper, and there are nine of them yet on the paper; and the reason they are still there is because, on Government days, there has not been sufficient time, owing to the motions made by the Opposition, for considering those measures. They have been ready for consideration and discussion, but they have not got that consideration and discussion simply because hon. gentlemen opposite have taken up those days. Then the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party were especially

Mr. FOSTER.

exercised because the Budget speech had not yet been delivered. It will be remembered by the House, that three years ago a change was made in our practice, and the British method was introduced; that is to say, the Estimates are brought down at an early period of the Session, so that they can be considered from time to time as available occasions arise. And when this is done and the Estimates are before the House and ready for consideration, it is not of such pressing importance that the Budget speech should be delivered at an early period. By our former practice the Estimates were not discussed until after the Budget speech had been delivered, and if that was delayed a late period was reached before the House was able to undertake the discussion and consideration of the Estimates. If I mistake not, the British Parliament meets in the second week of January—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Second week of February.

Mr. FOSTER—and the Budget speech is seldom delivered before April, probably in the middle of April. The Imperial House is in Session two or three months before the Budget is brought down, but, in the meantime, the discussion of the Estimates proceeds *de die in diem*, and the time of the House is not lost. I find, in looking over the records, that the Estimates were submitted to this House on 30th January, the House having met on 16th. Every one knows, that for the first week or ten days of the Session the Committees are not ready, and very little business is done by any House. On 30th January, I say, which was specially early, the Estimates were submitted. From that time up to the present there have been fourteen Government days. The House was not willing to give more days to the Government, and it was only after spirited discussion last week that a third day was taken. On 31st January, twenty-three items of the Estimates were passed, which was, I consider, a good day's work. On 4th February, six items only were passed, the whole afternoon and evening having been occupied by a desultory discussion on one or two items of contingencies. It was not the fault of the Government that more progress was not made. On 7th February, nine items only were passed, because a debate was commenced by the leader of the Opposition, with respect to the rebate on corn to distillers, the product of which might be exported from the country. On 11th February, the next Government day, the debate was continued, and occupied the greater part of the day, after which sixteen items only were passed. On 14th, the next Government day, nine resolutions only were passed. It was not the fault of the Government that more were not passed, for we were ready with our explanations, and it was due to the indiscriminate attack made upon the different items and the great range of the discussion which took place upon the items from the benches opposite. On 18th we went into Supply, but the whole of that day and 21st, two Government days, were taken up by a debate on a North-West matter. The House decided to take that time, and hon. members cannot, therefore, hold the Government responsible for greater progress not being made on those days. On 25th, the next Government day, seven items only were passed, a long discussion taking place on some items under the head of Public Works. A

great deal more work might have been done on that day and night, with as trenchant and effective criticism, it seems to me, but the time was taken up in discussion. On the 28th, twenty resolutions were passed, there being a long discussion on the various items under the Militia heading. On 4th March, there were four resolutions passed. On 6th March a long debate took place on the Harvey Branch survey, which lasted until midnight, and, as a result, only two items in the Estimates were passed. On 7th we again went into Supply, and a debate took place on Mr. Fisher's motion, a debate which resulted in nothing, so far as a vote was concerned, the amendment having been withdrawn; and after that only thirteen items were passed. On 11th inst., the next Government day, the whole time was taken up by a debate *re* the hon. member for Lincoln; and on the 13th, yesterday, the time was almost entirely occupied by the debate which took place on the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell. So that, of the fourteen Government days, two-thirds or three-fourths of the time was taken up with debates on motions proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. leader of the Opposition has complained that, the Budget not having been brought down, and the tariff resolutions not being placed before the House for consideration, hon. members were precluded from discussing tariff matters. It must strike hon. members that there has been no lack of discussion on tariff matters. And if it were true that the Government in each case had declined to state their position, and declined to be drawn into a discussion previous to their policy being brought down as a whole, such statement or declaration had no influence in stopping the torrent of debate. Discussion went on all the same, and whatever information could be gathered has been gathered, and some of it may be found useful in enabling the Government to come to an ultimate decision with regard to tariff matters. I may say, with respect to tariff matters, that no matter how far in advance of the opening of the Session, the Finance Minister may undertake his consideration of possible changes, it is a fact, which will be attested to by all who have held this position, that not until the House meets, and possibly until some time after the House has met, do the deputations and representations which come from the different parts of the country, which have a perfect right to come and represent their views and give information from their standpoint, as those practically engaged in the different businesses and pursuits, reach Ottawa. It is necessary that they should be heard, it is right that their representations should be listened to, and that a fair and full consideration should be given to the statements that are made *pro* and *con* on all those important subjects. I think the Government would be liable to greater censure, if it undertook to press with undue haste its decision upon these matters, and without giving a fair and full opportunity for the various interests of trade and business in this country, to lay their views fully before the Government. So much with reference to that. I will grant, and grant at once, that the Budget, at the end of which the tariff resolutions are to be brought down, should not be delayed any longer than it is possible to have conclusions arrived at. In the general interest, and for the information of the House, this course ought to be pursued. I do not charge myself, nor

do I think the Government can properly be charged, with being dilatory and with being neglectful of its duty in this respect. An immense amount of attention has been given by the Government to these matters, and they have been pushed with all the speed which can be used, consistent with coming to proper and well based conclusions. My hon. friend, the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), in a jocular way I think, alluded to the possibility of the Government having given pointers to some of its friends with reference to tariff matters, and with a smile on his face, he ventured the assertion that he had grave suspicions that this was the case, and that it was the cause of the delay. With all due deference to my hon. friend, who, I am sorry, is not now in his place, I do not think he entertains any such suspicions, and if he or any other member of this House does entertain such suspicions, I would be glad if they would dismiss them. I do not think that hon. gentlemen consider that that assertion was made in any other than in a jocular way. One important measure foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne, namely, the Banking Act, I hope to introduce on Tuesday next. It would have been impossible for the House to have given it any extended consideration and discussion, while so much which they thought necessary to be discussed was being disposed of. I think hon. gentlemen will find, after the political atmosphere in this House has been relieved of all that surcharged it upon these different matters which have been discussed on motions from members of the Opposition, that the House will now have been cleared, and will be in a better position to come down to hard work and thorough consideration upon this important measure; possibly more so than if it had been earlier introduced. With reference to the Budget, I may state to my hon. friend opposite, that it is possible I may introduce the financial statement a week from to-day, and if not on that day, then on the next available opportunity of the succeeding week.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may be, and perhaps it is, very amusing to the members of the Government of this country, who reside at Ottawa, and who are subjected to no personal inconvenience by remaining here, to find that nine weeks of this Session have elapsed, during which very little business has been done; and that by consequence, after the expiry of two or three weeks more, hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will be remaining here at very great personal inconvenience, and often at serious detriment to their business. The fact is, and every one of practical experience knows it, that looking at the avocations of the great majority of members of this House, it is on the whole possible for them, without serious injury to their respective businesses, to spare something like a hundred days or thereabouts, to attend to their parliamentary duties. Of course, having undertaken the position of members of Parliament, it is, and very often may become, their bounden duty to stay here a much longer time, and that duty they ought to discharge. But, at the same time, the Government of the country, knowing very well that four-fifths, and possibly nine-tenths of the House would be exceedingly inconvenienced if the Session seriously exceeds three months, ought to study the convenience of the members for the sake of hon.

gentlemen opposite, quite as much as for the sake of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Under existing circumstances, it appears to me that the Government are, as my hon. friend said, liable to serious censure for not having their measures ready when the House met. The English practice is that no measure is announced in the Queen's Speech, until all the details of the measures therein announced have been repeatedly and thoroughly considered in Council and settled on. I believe, Mr. Speaker, although I speak under correction, that in every case where a measure is announced by the Queen from the Throne, that measure has been put in type for confidential consideration. I think I am right about that, although I will not insist on that point. As to these departmental reports, the hon. Minister is right enough in saying that they differ materially as to date, and that those which are brought down to the 1st January cannot be very well laid on the Table of this House before the 1st February. But, Sir, the Ministers knew a good while ago that Parliament was to meet in the middle of January, and they ought to have taken extra precaution, and made extra exertions, to have these reports down in proper time. The result of their not doing so has been, that time and again we have risen to consider important items in the Estimates, and the Government have had to withdraw them because their reports were not ready; so that the delay has been caused by their own dilatoriness and that of their own officials.

Mr. FOSTER. There were others always ready, though.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not matter. The House has been told they were going to consider certain items, and hon. gentlemen have been at the trouble to study the question, and, to my knowledge, were ready to discuss the items when they were called. If the Government were ready, these items would have been discussed then, and a long subsequent discussion would have been saved. When the hon. Minister told us that in the early stage of the Session there were fifteen Government Bills ready, he ought surely have informed the House that of these fifteen there was only one that could, by any possibility, be considered a measure of real importance: that was the Bill regulating promissory notes and bills of exchange. The others were small amending Bills of no very great practical moment, nor, so far as I recollect, involving any important principle. That one measure which was ready was a measure which had been very largely discussed, and had been in type the Session before this, and was brought down to us with hardly any alteration, or with very slight alteration. The most important part of the hon. gentleman's defence is this: The hon. gentleman, truly enough, states that three years ago the English method was introduced here. I approved at that time, of the introduction of the English method, because I thought it was going to tend to greater activity on the part of the Government; but I certainly did not understand that the introduction of the English method would be made an excuse for deferring the Budget to such a late period of the Session as this. What is the practice in England? The hon. gentleman knows that the English House of Commons meets, not, as he supposes, in the

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

second week of January, but usually in the early part of February, and he knows that the House usually expects to sit for six full months; the English House rarely rises till August, and it has been known to protract its sittings beyond that month. It is true that the discussion of the Estimates is commenced before the Budget statement is made, but as a rule the Budget is brought down before or about Easter, that is to say, when the Session has advanced to one-third of its length. What do we see here? This House, from custom, has come to consider that three months, or three months and a-half is about the period of the Session. Two-thirds of that time has elapsed, and the hon. Minister is not yet in a position to name positively the date of his Budget speech. There is no comparison whatever between the practice which he uses in this House, and the practice which is used in the English House of Commons. The hon. gentleman, by delaying the Budget, provokes of necessity these discussions which he deprecates. Had he brought down his Budget in good time and stated what the Government were going to do, beyond all doubt those discussions would not have occurred. Why have those discussions been brought forward? Because my hon. friends, who are anxious and interested about these matters, knew perfectly well that if they waited for the Budget, the House would by that time be so impatient, so tired by this unnecessary delay, that it would be almost impossible to get a hearing; and they were forced by the hon. gentleman's dilatoriness to bring on those discussions at a time when there was some chance of interesting hon. gentlemen in them. But I must take serious objection to the statement of the hon. gentleman that it is his duty, forsooth, to delay the whole business of this country in order that deputations may come and recommend to him certain corners in the tariff. I dispute that altogether. I say he has no right to delay the business of the country for any such purpose. I say emphatically that it was the bounden duty of all those deputations of merchants and others, who desired to have changes made in the tariff, to have communicated with the hon. gentleman before Parliament met, so as to give him an opportunity calmly and quietly to hear their views, and afterwards inform himself on the various subjects brought before him; and I say, speaking with knowledge on the subject, that a very unfavorable condition of things exists for the hon. gentleman to consider calmly trade questions while Parliament is sitting. In the first place, he has not the time; in the second place, all sorts of unreasonable influences are likely to be exerted at that time. It is far better, for hon. gentlemen's own comfort, and in the public interest, that they should cause it to be understood distinctly that, although parties may communicate with them, they will not consider important tariff changes after the House has met; for the simple reason that, in the great majority of cases, however important the questions, or however industrious the hon. gentleman may be, that time is very unfavorable to calm consideration and enquiry. As the hon. Minister knows very well, many of the requests preferred by the deputations are in conflict one with the other, and they involve the consideration of intricate questions, requiring sometimes weeks, and sometimes months, before he can obtain that information which he ought to

have when he attempts to deal with such matters. Therefore, I say that the excuse the hon. gentleman makes, that it was his duty to meet those deputations on matters of comparatively minor interest, and to keep Parliament waiting until a time when, in all probability, a great many important questions may have to be hastily discussed and summarily disposed of, is entirely at variance with proper constitutional usage; and the hon. gentleman will do a service to the country, as well as to himself and his successors in office, if he will cause it to be distinctly understood in future, that parties who desire to have changes made in the tariff should communicate with the Government before Parliament meets. As to the Banking Act, I must say that the hon. gentleman's policy appears to me to be almost equally without foundation. If there is any measure on which it is desirable that the country, as well as the gentlemen composing banking deputations, should be advised in good time of the intentions of the Government, it is just this Banking Act. If there is one measure which the House ought to have before it for a considerable time, in order that it could weigh and consider the several proposals of the Government, it is just such an Act as the Banking Act. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that when he brings down the Banking Act, as he promises to do next Tuesday, it will be at a period of the Session most eminently unfavorable to its full and ample consideration. Within a few days he expects to introduce the Tariff Bill, which, if it contains any important changes, will undoubtedly provoke many discussions, and draw men's minds from the consideration of the Banking Act. Therefore, in these particular cases the hon. gentleman is doubly at fault. The only case in which I should excuse delay in bringing down the Budget would be when no changes, or only insignificant changes, are to be made. In such a case the particular time for bringing down the Budget is a matter of comparatively small moment; but whenever important changes are to be made, seriously affecting the trade and commerce of the country, then it is the duty of the Government, and most especially the duty of the Finance Minister, to have considered those charges carefully before Parliament met, and to bring down the Budget at a particularly early period, so that full and ample time may be afforded for their discussion. That has not been done, but the reverse, and ten weeks of the Session will have elapsed before the Budget reaches us; and, except by subjecting the members on both sides to very serious inconvenience, it will be quite impossible for these matters and the balance of our Estimates to receive anything like the consideration they deserve.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Laverne,
Armstrong,	Lister,
Bain (Wentworth),	Livingston,
Barron,	Lovitt,
Bécharé,	Macdonald (Huron),
Blake,	Mackenzie,
Borden,	McIntyre,
Bourassa,	McMillan (Huron),
Brien,	McMillen,
Campbell,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mulock,

Charlton,	Neveu,
Couture,	Paterson (Brant),
Davies,	Perry,
Dessaint,	Platt,
Doyon,	Robertson,
Edgar,	Ste. Marie,
Eisenhauer,	Seriver,
Ellis,	Semple,
Fiset,	Somerville,
Gauthier,	Sutherland,
Geoffrion,	Trow,
Gillmor,	Waldie,
Guay,	Watson,
Innes,	Weldon (St. John),
Jones (Halifax),	Welsh,
Kirk,	Wilson (Elgin),
Landerkin,	Yeo.—57.
Laurier,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archibald (Sir Adams),	Kirkpatrick,
Audet,	Landry,
Bain (Soulanges),	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Baird,	La Rivière,
Barnard,	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Boisvert,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Bowell,	Macdowall,
Boyle,	McDonald (Victoria),
Brown,	McDougald (Pictou),
Burus,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cameron,	McKeen,
Cargill,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Carling,	McNeill,
Carpenter,	Mudill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mura,
Cimon,	Marshall,
Cockburn,	Mason,
Colby,	Massue,
Corby,	Mills (Annapolis),
Costigan,	Moffat,
Coughlin,	Moneriff,
Curran,	O'Brien,
Daly,	Porter,
Daoust,	Prior,
Davin,	Putnam,
Davis,	Robillard,
Dawson,	Rome,
Denison,	Scarth,
Dewdney,	Small,
Dickey,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Dickinson,	Sproule,
Dupont,	Taylor,
Earle,	Temple,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Thompson (Sir John),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Tisdale,
Ferguson (Welland),	Tyrwhitt,
Foster,	Vanasse,
Freeman,	Wallace,
Gigault,	Ward,
Gordon,	Weldon (Albert),
Grandbois,	White (Cardwell),
Gillet,	White (Renfrew),
Haggart,	Wilmot,
Hesson,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Hickey,	Wood (Brockville),
Jamieson,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Jones (Digby),	Wright.—95.
Kenny,	

Motion negatived.

THE TORONTO UNIVERSITY.

Mr. BLAKE. I beg to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to a question of public interest, which, it seems to me, ought to be considered by us for a moment at this stage of the Session. I refer to the matter which was brought up in the House yesterday by an hon. member for one of the divisions of Toronto, and which the right hon. the First Minister asked to be allowed to stand. I mean the question as to whether the Government intended to submit to Parliament some proposition with reference to the recent conflagration at the University of Toronto. I have some reason to believe that suggestions have been made from more than

one quarter to the Administration on that subject; and, following the course which it has always seemed to me more expedient to pursue, I am anxious to make any suggestions I have to make with reference to a money grant, here openly and under my responsibility as a member of this House. I wish to submit that the circumstances of the case are such as may not unreasonably induce the favorable consideration of those who are responsible for the administration of public affairs, and of the House at large, to some exceptional proceedings on this particular occasion. The institution, whose loss gives rise to my present observations, is one which may not unfairly be described as of a national character. It is one wholly unsectarian, and whose benefits are participated in by all citizens, of whatever creed or origin, of the large Province to which they belong; and in a community like ours, which is, and is long destined, I hope, to be a democratic community, without any enormous accumulation in individual hands of property, composed mainly of men who are dependent for their maintenance upon their own labor and exertions, it is of peculiar importance that institutions of the highest class for learning should not suffer serious impairment, but, on the contrary, should be efficiently promoted. The character of the calamity to which I refer is so exceptional that a remarkably marked and far extended interest and sympathy have already been exhibited. In the neighboring Province, a proposition to grant aid, as a mark of sympathy, is now far advanced and will doubtless become effectual, and in the city of London a committee has been formed, comprising the names of very distinguished men, with whom we are familiar as having filled, some of them, the highest station in our country, as the representatives of our Sovereign, and others as former Colonial Secretaries, with the view to signify, in a substantial, tangible manner, that a bond of sympathy exists, even between us and that remote community. I may say that, after a very careful consideration of the situation, which my own relation to the University rendered it my duty to give, I am convinced that the peculiar position is one which entitles us to say that the exigency is great. Contemporaneously with the loss of the library, to which I am about more particularly to refer, has occurred the destruction of the main portion of the fabric; and the restoration of that portion, without any unnecessary expense whatever, in the most economical manner possible, consistent with the efficiency of the institution as it now stands, will involve a very large expenditure for the old and the new necessary buildings, beyond all the public or municipal and all the private assistance which we can now fairly expect. A large public grant has been made, a municipal grant is hoped for, and the liberality of the friends of the institution, including the graduates, has been appealed to, and appealed to so far with gratifying results. But from what I know of the situation, I am convinced that all possible resources which are available will have to be applied in order that the efficiency of the institution in its present condition, and looking to its present needs, may be maintained. I am not at all insensible of the difficulty and the delicacy of the situation in more than one respect. A question may be raised with reference to our interference with educational institutions, a question may be

Mr. BLAKE

raised also with reference to money grants, which may form an inconvenient precedent; and to these considerations I am myself disposed to attach—although this particular institution is one which would naturally induce me to think lightly of them—all due weight. But it seems to me that the case, in the particular aspect to which I am about to allude, is not, after all, a difficult one, and is open to a solution which relieves us from difficulty, because what is suggested, and what seems to be the most practical method of affording relief, is that the Government should propose to the House some relief in respect of that duty—that very onerous duty, as I venture to conceive it is, the duty on knowledge—which is imposed in the shape of the tax on books. We have a library to replace which will cost more than \$150,000, and that at prices and values irrespective of duty, or, at any rate, having regard only to the light book tax which prevailed formerly. The book tax is now, as well as I can remember, at the rate of 15 per cent., and it seems to me that no inconvenient precedent would be created, owing to the exceptional character of the occasion, and the almost impossibility—I hope the impossibility, or, at any rate, the extreme improbability, of its recurrence—if the Government would make up their mind to propose such a grant, based on such a view, as would involve the remission of the tax on the books to be supplied. It is with a view of making that suggestion to the Government that I have ventured to interpose for a moment between you, Sir, and the adoption of the motion now before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Every one in the House will agree with the hon. gentleman that the recent conflagration of the University of Toronto is a great blow to education in the Province of Ontario, and indeed in the Dominion, by the destruction of that noble building, and of the magnificent library which had there been collected; and I can assure the hon. gentleman that this subject is occupying the attention of the Government. I see that my hon. friend is conscious of the difficulties which arise with regard to pecuniary assistance being given by the Parliament of Canada to this institution, and I need not allude to them any further. My hon. friend has made a suggestion as to one mode by which this House could show its sympathy with the university in its disaster with as little inconvenience as possible. All I can say now is that the subject will receive the immediate attention of the Government, and I hope on Monday to be able to make a satisfactory statement to the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to supplement the words which have fallen from the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). I trust that the relations between the Dominion Parliament and the Province of Ontario are not such as will limit our relief even to that mentioned by the hon. gentleman. The Parliament of Canada has on many occasions granted aid of a money character, not strictly within the obligations of the Dominion. We have, on occasion, relieved distress in Provinces where disasters such as the conflagration in question have taken place. It is but recently we granted \$10,000 to relieve the people of the city of Hull when they were visited by a conflagration, and on a former occasion we granted aid to relieve the distress in St. John arising from a similar

cause. Therefore, I think that the Government will not find insuperable difficulties in the way of granting substantial money aid to the institution in question. I mention this now because a number of hon. gentlemen in this House, not on the Opposition side, have been good enough to tell me what their sentiments were on this subject. Perhaps I would not be altogether violating the confidence of some hon. members if I were to refer pointedly to the member for East Toronto (Mr. Small), who, the moment the conflagration took place, spoke to me on the subject, and intimated his desire that the Government of which he is a supporter should contribute to the relief of the university. I would rather desire to propose an enlargement of the suggestion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). While I am glad to see the relief which has been given by the remission of duty on books entering the country for that university, I hope it may be possible to go further and to do what has been suggested by some members of the House, and give some cash towards the restoration of the institution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was not aware that there had been any communication from the Government on the subject, but I have been reminded that we had a discussion of the matter in Cabinet. It was brought to our attention, in the first place, by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small), and we came to an informal conclusion to remit the duties on any books imported into Canada for that institution, and that communication was made informally by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. I had not that in my mind when I spoke, because there was no formal examination of the matter, but there was an informal examination.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Steam communication with the Magdalen Islands..... \$8,000

Mr. KENNY. Before that item passes, in the absence of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas), and with his permission, I desire to address a few words to the Committee in reference to the manner in which this contract has been carried out for some years past. I am reliably informed that five years ago, when the contract with the owners of the *Beaver* expired, the residents of Magdalen Islands, who, of course, are more concerned in this matter than those who live on the mainland, because it is the only chance they have of communicating with the mainland by steam, made known to the Government that in their opinion the *Beaver* was unsuitable for the work she was performing. If she was unsuitable for that work five years ago, it is very evident, and it is confirmed from all I hear, that she is still more unsuitable to-day. Unfortunately, the wishes of the people of the Magdalen Islands were disregarded five years ago, and my hon. friend, the member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas), and I, about two years ago, made it known to the Government that this steamer *Beaver* was not suitable for the work in which she was engaged; that she was a vessel of small power, and that, in fact, she was hardly safe. I then understood from the Government that it was

their intention to provide for a better service, and the hon. the Minister of Finance certainly gave me and my hon. friend from Gaspé to understand that every care would be taken to provide for a better service. I was, therefore, very much surprised to receive a telegram from Halifax within the last few days stating that the *Beaver* was to be put on the route again. I consider it to be my duty to bring this matter most formally before the attention of the Government and of the House. Whilst I have no personal knowledge of the *Beaver*, as I have never seen her, yet acquaintances of mine and correspondents of mine who reside on the Magdalen Islands, have asked me, when they were in Halifax, to bring this matter to the attention of the Government, and have told me, amongst other things, that the *Beaver* has to be eased down in any light head sea, and that, in October, 1889, it took this vessel, to which we were paying this large subsidy of \$10,000 a year, ten hours to go from Georgetown to Pictou, a distance which the *Stanley* accomplishes in two hours. Last year I called the attention of the Minister of Finance to this matter, and stated my opinion that the vessel was inefficient and too small and quite unsuitable for the work, and another hon. gentleman stated that he agreed with my remarks and could even go further than I dared go—and I presume he did so because he had a personal knowledge of the vessel, which I did not possess—and he stated that the vessel was actually unsafe, and that this subsidy was really more than the *Beaver* was worth. Another hon. gentleman, also possessing, I have no doubt, personal knowledge of the matter, and who, residing in Prince Edward Island, may have occasionally travelled in the vessel, brought to the notice of the Government the *Beaver's* inefficiency. The Minister of Finance then told us that the vessel had passed inspection, and, necessarily, must be safe. In 1889, this vessel took ten hours to go from Georgetown to Pictou, as I am informed, and that is sufficient to show that she is certainly not fit for the work.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the distance?

Mr. KENNY. It takes the *Stanley* about two hours. I may also say that a passenger, who was on board the steamer on that occasion, told me that the boiler of the steamer had been patched, and that the patch was actually leaking, and, therefore, it was impossible to keep up steam. Now, hon. gentlemen who are acquainted with this navigation, know that in the fall of the year, in that locality, gales suddenly spring up; and as this steam service is the only means which our fellow-countrymen who reside on the Magdalen Islands have of communicating with the mainland, common humanity demands that we should give them an efficient service. Now, as regards the inspection, I desire to speak with all due respect of any inspection which Mr. Stevens would make—I presume he was the inspector of boilers in that locality. I know him to be a most efficient and loyal officer, and I would be sorry to bring in question any statement which he would make. But I do say to the Government that this vessel is thoroughly unfit for the work, and that it is not fair for the people of the Magdalen Islands to put the *Beaver* on the route again. Last year the attention of the Government was called to the fact that this vessel was unseaworthy, and it is the very re-

finement of cruelty to put such a vessel on the service. I know that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is anxious to improve the service, but I must say that I think it would be a mistake for him to take this *Beaver* on, even temporarily. An impression seemed to prevail that I, in bringing this matter, as I have repeatedly done, to the attention of the Government, was influenced by a desire that the service should be extended to Halifax, and that Halifax should be made the terminal port. Well, Sir, it is true that that is the desire of the people of the Magdalen Islands, because all their trade is with Halifax, and my contention is that if we had a suitable steamer, she could perform the service within a week. But I recognise that the mails should start from Pictou, as they do now, and that they should go to Pictou, as they do now; but I go further, and say that if we had a suitable steamer she could make her weekly trips also to Halifax. I may also point out to the hon. the Finance Minister, that late in the fall the Magdalen Islands can be reached from the southern shore of Nova Scotia, when the harbor of Pictou is closed. This happened, I think, the year before last, when my hon. friend the Postmaster General engaged the steamer *Harlow* to carry the mails to the Magdalen Islands, because the harbor of Pictou was closed by ice, or it was not safe to send them in the *Beaver*. In the early navigation in the spring, sailing vessels frequently reach the Magdalen Islands from the eastern side of Cape Breton, from the south side of Nova Scotia, much earlier than it is possible for them to do by way of Pictou. But be that as it may, I do not press that point, although I think it is of some commercial value, and should be considered. At the request of my hon. friend the member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas), who is unavoidably absent to-day, I desire to record his protest against the employment of the steamer *Beaver* in that service. I consider, from the knowledge which has been given to me by reliable persons on this matter, that I cannot do so too formally, and I have no apology to offer to the House for detaining them in a matter which, perhaps, to many hon. gentlemen, may be considered of very minor importance.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend who has just sat down should have enlarged his information beyond the scope of a telegram that he received from Halifax, and should have let this House into a confidence which he himself possesses, and in giving which to the House, he would not have violated anything that has passed between himself and me. His telegram is this: That the steamer *Beaver* is to be put on to the Magdalen Island route. Now, everybody knows that the term of contract of the old steamer *Beaver* has expired, and that advertisements have been called for with a view of providing a new contract for five years. The telegram as sent to my hon. friend, and as it was read by him to this House, without any further explanation, would carry with it the idea that the Government, despite the protest of the people of the Magdalen Islands, and despite the interests of humanity, as well as of quick transit, had determined that the *Beaver* should go on again for a term of five years. Now, such is not the fact. I quite agree with my hon. friend, and I agree also with my hon. friend from

Mr. KENNY.

Gaspé, who has been very insistent and pressing in his desire to get for the people of the Magdalen Islands a better service—I quite agree with both gentlemen that the Government would be derelict in its duty if it did not give to the people of the Magdalen Islands the best possible service that can be given, consistent with a reasonable expenditure. When the question was mentioned to me by the hon. member for Gaspé, as well as by my hon. friend later, I stated to both of them, that it was the intention of the Government to give the people of the Magdalen Island a good service, and it is the intention of the Government to do that. The people of the Magdalen Islands, in their petitions to the Postmaster General, and to myself, through the member for Gaspé, asked that this service should not only be better, but they condemned the *Beaver*, because she was an unsuitable vessel, and asked that she be not put on the route again, and asked, also, that the route should be from Halifax to the Magdalen Islands *via* Pictou. As my hon. friend has pointed out, there were serious objections to that. Pictou is the nearest mail point, and for the better transmission of the mails, a vessel would have to call at Pictou, and the Government did not feel that it would be justified in giving a subsidy to a steamer to run from Halifax to Pictou, and then to the Magdalen Islands, thus coming into direct competition with the trade of our own Intercolonial Railway, over which a large amount of freight is taken to Pictou, thence to Prince Edward Island ports, and to the Magdalen Island ports. Well, tenders were called for, advertisements were published, and returns were received; and after a sifting of these returns they were reduced to three tenders, upon a range of prices not very different as to the amounts. One of the three afterwards withdrew his tender, and that left two available tenderers, one of which was from Fraser & Halliday, and the other was from a Pictou company. Of the two, that of Fraser & Halliday, if accepted and carried out, would cost the country between \$1,100 and \$1,300 per year less, and, I believe, would give just as good a service, and the Government, upon my own recommendation—and I think it was a proper one to make—did not think we ought to go to the expenditure of \$1,100 or \$1,300 a year more, for the sake of one single thing, which I will now state. The essence of the Fraser & Halliday offer is, that they shall build and put on the route, a new vessel suitable in every way and fulfilling the demands of the Government, and that they shall have that vessel on the route, on or about 1st July. Considerable time necessarily elapsed before the acceptance of the tenders was finally settled, and of course, it will be scarcely fair now to ask that this be done by 1st July. But the essence of the contract entered into will be this: that about 1st July or 1st August, giving them another month, they shall put on the route a new vessel, a speedy boat, to meet in every way the Government's requirements, and, I believe, the requirements of the people of the Magdalen Islands, but until that time they shall be allowed to use the steamer *Beaver*, which they have had on the route, provided she is a safe boat. It is impossible for the vessel to run until she is certified by the Government inspectors, and any hon. gentleman who knows either of them will be satisfied that a certificate will not be granted to that or any other vessel until it has been thoroughly

inspected and found to be seaworthy. I am quite willing to say this, that the *Beaver* is not a suitable boat to be continued on that route, and I am determined she shall not be continued on that route; but it is not unreasonable to allow the contractors who propose to put on a new vessel, suitable in every way, within three months from the time of opening navigation, and when they will do this at a figure about \$1,300 less than the next available tender, to put on the *Beaver* for that intervening time; or if the *Beaver* is not certificated and not safe, another boat which is certificated and safe. I believe the interests of humanity, the interests of the people of the Magdalen Islands, and the interests of the people of this country, will not be militated against by the Government taking the line of conduct which has been outlined.

Mr. KENNY. The Minister of Finance has almost insinuated that I was not candid in this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. You did not give all the information to the House.

Mr. KENNY. I told the House I quite recognised that the Minister of Finance was desirous of securing a better service.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, I desire to say that this is what I meant: that the information given by the hon. gentleman would lead the House to believe that the steamer *Beaver*, and the *Beaver* only, was going to be placed on the route, under the five years' contract. And that is not correct.

Mr. KENNY. I had no intention to convey any such information to the House. I thought I admitted that I believed the Minister of Finance was desirous of securing a better service. I do say, and I repeat it, that in view of the fact that although the people of the Magdalen Islands protested, as strongly as they do to-day, against the *Beaver*, she was still kept on five years. There is an element of risk that if she be allowed to start the service she may be kept on much longer than perhaps the Minister intends. That is what I wish to convey to the House, and I did so, for I thought I was simply discharging a public duty in conveying to the Government and to the House, and, through it, to the country, the information which had been placed in my hands, as a public man, to bring to the notice of the House. I think the Minister was perfectly right to accept, of course it was his duty to accept, the lowest tender; but I felt that if once the *Beaver* got on the route, she would be there much longer than 1st July, and that is the reason I felt, in the absence of my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Joncas), I was discharging a promise to him, and fulfilling a public duty, in bringing the matter most formally to the attention of the House, without the slightest desire or intention, on my part, of reserving any information which I ought to have given to the House. I know quite well that the Minister of Finance intends to get a better boat for the service, but I think it is a mistake, and I repeat it here publicly, to take the *Beaver* even to 1st July.

Steam communication between Grand Manan and the Mainland..... \$4,000

Mr. LOVITT. Why is this increase?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no increase.

Mr. LOVITT. There appears to be an increase of \$500.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole amount paid is \$4,000, of which \$400 was paid by the Post Office Department, on account of mail changes, the rest being paid out of the Finance Department. The whole amount this year is paid out of the Finance Department.

Subsidy to a line of Steamers between Liverpool or London, or both, and St. John and Halifax..... \$25,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The granting of a subsidy to a line of steamers like this is, I think, hardly defensible on public grounds. The steamer from Halifax and St. John is running in competition with other steamers, and as all these steamers would run under any circumstances, this vote means so much public money thrown away. On public grounds I cannot see that it is defensible. There are steamers coming to these ports all the time without any subsidy. Although these subsidised steamers come to Halifax, I cannot see why this particular line should receive a subsidy and other lines of steamers should not receive any subsidy.

Mr. WELSH. I have always opposed subsidies of this kind except where they are necessary for the conveyance of mails or passengers. When the public money is given as subsidies to steamers engaged in carrying freight a blow is struck at the marine interests of the Dominion. Direct injury is done to the private enterprise of vessel owners and to the marine interest generally, which is one of the most important in the country. A few days ago a question was raised as to the subsidy given to a steamer running from St. John and Yarmouth to the West Indies, the amount being \$4,000 a trip, simply for the purpose of carrying freight. By so doing the Government are handicapping the marine interests of the Provinces. Very many ships are laid up, and a number of fishermen who formerly were employed in that service during the winter are out of employment, and thus one of the first industries of the Dominion is injured by subsidies being granted to certain lines in the carrying trade. You can have merchandise carried by a hundred routes, and by almost a hundred different modes of conveyance, to any part of the world, without subsidies, and I fail to see where the public interests will be benefited by granting a subsidy of \$25,000 a year for a line between St. John or Halifax and Liverpool and London. It is a bad policy, and it injures the country instead of benefiting it. If a line of steamers was established between York Factory or some other port and Hudson Bay and England, to connect with a line of railway from Winnipeg to New York, by which route immigrants could be placed in the North-West at \$20 per head, and grain could be shipped from there to England at half the present cost, I would not object to a subsidy being granted to such a new enterprise, at all events, until it had become established and other lines had entered into competition with it. But where it is proposed to grant a large sum of money to subsidise a line of steamers from Halifax and St. John, when steamers are coming there without full cargoes, and are leaving without full cargoes, that is a waste

of the public money. I object to all these grants for purely trade purposes. Trade should be left to be developed by private enterprise. The Anglo-Saxons are not devoid of enterprise, and if there is any money to be made and any freights to be obtained in any part of the world, ships will be built to secure that trade. I think this is a bad policy, and I do not like to see it continued.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If the system of subsidies is to be maintained, I think that this subsidy is one which well deserves the attention of Parliament. The Allan and Dominion Lines go to Quebec and Montreal in the summer, and with the exception of a few freight steamers, the Furness Line, which runs direct from London to Halifax and St. Johns, is really the only passenger and freight line carrying on trade regularly with these two ports, and it has been a great accommodation not only for freight traffic, but for passengers as well. It seems to me that so long as subsidies are granted, this line is entitled to a subsidy, and that the granting of it is not unfair to other steamers. The Furness Line has carried out the terms of its contract remarkably well, and persons who have travelled by these steamers speak of them as being very good vessels. So far as the Province of New Brunswick is concerned, the Furness Line has been a great advantage and convenience to us.

Mr. KENNY. I heartily agree with the remarks of my hon. friend for St. John (Mr. Weldon). In the Maritime Provinces, no subsidy has been more useful, or has helped more to develop our export trade than the subsidy granted to the Furness Line. It is a fact that other steamers do occasionally, and not infrequently, call at Halifax, and some of them at St. John, N.B.; but every merchant knows that in the keen competition which exists to-day for foreign trade, and for which we are competing with other nations, nothing is so necessary as regularity of transportation, and that can only be secured by steam. I do not think there is any expenditure which we make in the line of steamship subsidies, which is more useful and more beneficial to the country than this very vote. We all know that, in the case of the other subsidised steamers which call at Halifax, it is sometimes impossible to ship even half a dozen barrels of apples to a friend in England, at Christmas time. They positively refuse to take any freight at all, and on their outward voyages they divert transatlantic trade from Canadian ports to American ports, to the detriment of Canadian labor. The Parliament of Canada, therefore, is actually voting subsidies to transatlantic mail steamers which are diverting all the trade they possibly can from Canada. I know that is due to the fact that these lines go to Portland, where they are identified with the Grand Trunk or some other railway system, to which they transfer their freight. We may hope that when the Canadian Pacific Railway is completed to the Maritime Provinces, and when the programme of 1885 is carried out—we have to blame only the present Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway for its incompleteness—or when the new branch of the Grand Trunk Railway from Edmundston to Moncton is built, these steamers will land all their freight in our ports. With regard to the Furness Line, and with all due respect to hon. gentlemen who entertain contrary opinions, I am strongly of the same

Mr. WELSH.

view as has been expressed by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon).

Mr. LOVITT. Would it be possible for the Finance Minister to give us the particulars as to the cargoes which are carried by the Furness Line steamers? If the greater portion of the cargoes carried by that line are composed of deals, then there cannot be any defence at all for granting this subsidy.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a condition incident to the payment of the subsidy, that we get the manifest of these steamers on their inward and outward voyages. I must say that the Furness Line has been, in the main, about as satisfactory a line as we have subsidised, both in the way in which it has conducted its business and in the development of trade. At the same time, it is only fair to say that the line has not yet developed business sufficient to pay for carrying on its monthly trips, unless aided by a subsidy. I looked very carefully into that last year, and I became convinced that, if the \$25,000 were taken off, the vessels themselves would be retired from that route. I do not, however, hold out the idea that these \$25,000 are to be paid always; and, in fact, I have informed the managers of the line that we look for it to be self-supporting. My great hope is that, when the Canadian Pacific Railway gets into thorough working order, and has its connections made, that there will be a large attraction of freight for that line of steamers, to St. John and Halifax, and by which their present cargoes can be largely supplemented. The company itself is looking towards that. We believe that in the course of time, trade will so develop that a monthly line, and I hope a fortnightly, or weekly line, self-supporting, will be found running between these ports and Great Britain. The only lines crossing the Atlantic, which we now subsidise, are the Allan and Furness Lines. The Furness Line visits these ports in the Maritime Provinces which the Allan Line cannot do the year through, going as it does a part of the year on a different route, for reasons which have been stated by my hon. friend. I do not believe that subsidies ought to be granted to steamship lines for commercial purposes to any greater extent than will enable them to develop a self-supporting traffic.

Mr. ELLIS. It is quite apparent that any line of steamers to the St. Lawrence, subsidised for the transport of mails and passengers, and carrying freight, must have the effect of discriminating against the port of St. John, N.B. I think this is the strong ground upon which the mercantile community of the Maritime Provinces place their claim for a subsidy. The effect of paying subsidies to steamers on the St. Lawrence route, was to cheapen freight to the St. Lawrence, and, therefore, to make it more difficult for the merchants of St. John to carry on an independent business.

General LAURIE. I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen can state in this House, that it is impossible to find cargoes for these steamers. I have crossed in them several times, and they have been filled with freight to the hatches, and also carried deck cargoes, while they have gone with full cargoes each trip. I know from the promoters of the line, that they are building an additional

vessel, because they are unable to transport all the freight that is offered to them. In fact, such an excess of freight has been offered, that they were unable to take some of it, and have been obliged to ship lobsters from New York.

Mr. BORDEN. If the statement of the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) is correct, and I believe it is, it is clear that the trade has been developed, and that there is no further reason for the continuation of this subsidy. In fact, I know that the subsidy is objected to on the ground that it really interferes with competition at Halifax and St. John, and that, instead of being beneficial to the persons who have cargoes to ship from Nova Scotia to the other side, it militates against them by enabling this line to keep out competing lines which would otherwise come to Halifax.

Subsidy to Steamer between Campbellton and Gaspé.....\$12,500

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What boat is on that route now?

Mr. FOSTER. The *Admiral*. She is under contract, as I explained last year.

Mr. FLYNN. I see that there is no vote this year for a boat between Port Mulgrave and East Bay.

Mr. FOSTER. The reason that has been left out is that it was supposed, at the time this vote was inserted in the Estimates, that the Cape Breton Railway would be opened by the 1st of July next. When that road is opened it will not be possible to carry out this subsidy. Whatever arrangements are then made will have to be on a different line. However, it is not probable that the road will be opened on the 1st of July, and the Government will take into consideration the continuance or renewal of the subsidy until the railway is opened.

Mr. FLYNN. Even after the road is opened a great portion of the Island will require a service such as is afforded by these steamers.

Mr. FOSTER. That will be looked after by the Post Office Department.

Steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the Mainland. \$5,500

Mr. ROBERTSON. What is the reason this vote is increased by \$500?

Mr. FOSTER. This amount is about what the contract will come to. We pay the boats, not by the year, but by the trip, between Summerside and Shediac, and between Pictou and Charlottetown.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was hoping that the Minister was giving this \$500 increase for the purpose of establishing the line between ports in King's County and Pictou which I brought to his notice last Session. The hon. Minister is going back on his promise.

Mr. FOSTER. I made no promise.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The hon. Minister said he would take the matter into favorable consideration. I wish again to bring to his notice the importance of establishing a line of communication between the terminus of the Prince Edward Island Railway in King's County, and the Intercolonial Railway at Pictou. The county I represent has not been

properly treated in this respect. We pay our share of the cost of the communication between Summerside, Shediac and Charlottetown, and receive no benefit from it, and, as the subsidy was cut down by \$5,000 last year, I think the hon. Minister might fairly appropriate a small sum to afford the communication I refer to. It would be a great advantage to the inhabitants of King's County, and I believe, with the aid of a small subsidy to start it, the line would be a paying one in a few years.

Mr. FOSTER. I find one thing in the way, that is, the strenuous opposition of my friend in my eye, who is opposed on principle to these subsidies. I am afraid he would be in my hair if I granted it.

Mr. WELSH. I still stick to the principle I enunciated just now, but the Government have established the principle of subsidising both freight and passenger services, and if they do it for Halifax, where twenty or thirty steamers go out every month, they are bound to give my hon. friend from King's the communication with the Intercolonial Railway which he speaks of. Hon. gentlemen may say that I am interested. So I am, but I do not care two-pence about it. The subsidy used to be \$10,000 a year, but last year the Government cut it down to \$5,000, paying so much per trip; but as we had a very early spring and a very late fall, there were more trips than usual, and the subsidy amounted to \$500 more than was voted. If it is right to grant this subsidy, I will support the claim of King's County to have a fair share of it. The hon. junior member for Halifax will know that I am fully alive to all the requirements of Halifax and St. John; and although it is not a good principle to subsidise steamers sailing from those ports, where so many sail to different ports in Great Britain, I am not going to make a particular objection to it. If it is the Government's policy to give subsidies for commercial enterprise, they ought to give a little to the sailing fleets of the Dominion. My hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) is largely interested in sailing vessels, and I would recommend him to propose a subsidy for wooden ships, so as to encourage wooden ship-building. It would be a very good thing to start a new ship-building industry in the Maritime Provinces, by means of subsidies. I wonder the hon. gentleman has not proposed it before, since he is so favorable to all those railway and steamship subsidies.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You are aware that the steamer *Stanley* runs only in the winter, and as soon as the summer navigation opens we have no steam service. In the Department of Marine and Fisheries there is a petition largely signed, sent to the Minister of Marine, who is the representative of Pictou County, in favor of this line of steamers to which I have alluded; and as this is a very important matter, I wish to press on the Minister of Finance the necessity of voting a small subsidy of \$500 or \$1,000 to start a line in that section during the summer season.

Mr. FOSTER. The petition of which the hon. gentleman speaks has been transferred to my Department and will be considered. When the Supplementary Estimates come down, my hon. friend will have an opportunity of seeing whether it is there or not.

Steam communication between St. John, and ports in Basin of Minas, Parrsborough, Maitland, Summersville, Hantsport, Avondale, Windsor, Kingsport, Wolfville, &c..... \$3,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think this is a wrong principle, and this amount should not be voted. These places are already connected by railways with the central part of the Province, and I do not think it should be the object of the Government to supply trading facilities where there is already railway connection.

Mr. KENNY. If my hon. friend would read the whole resolution he would notice that it includes Maitland, where there is a large ship-building industry, which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh) has so much at heart. I think this is a wise expenditure of money, because it reaches points where it is not possible to get merchandise—such as Maitland—without facility of communication by steamers.

Mr. BORDEN. I quite differ with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) on this point. This is a trade which is being built up by this subsidy, and which fills a great need. Moreover, the steamers engaged in this line are built at home—in Hanniford—by the Messrs. Churchill, and this grant is not only an encouragement to trade on the basin, and between the basin and St. John, but to the construction of steamships in our country.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to know what difference there is between granting a subsidy to a steamship line like this, and a line of railway? We build lines all over the country, and then we discover a shorter route and build a competing line. What difference is there between subsidising a line of steamers along the coast, which will carry goods and passengers, and subsidising a line of railway to carry them?

Mr. SCRIVER. The railways develop settlement.

Mr. ELLIS. And the steamers develop existing settlements. Steam communication will answer that purpose as well as railways, and answer it better along this line of coast, so that, by a parity of reasoning, you must stand by the steamers in a case of this kind.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not agree with the hon. gentleman, because it is always understood to be sound policy, where ports are entirely isolated, such as those along our western coasts, like Shelburne and Barrington, and which have not the benefit of railway communication, to grant a subsidy for steam communication; but in a case like this, where these counties are all intersected by railways, there is no need for subsidising steamers. It has been a source of complaint from Halifax generally—but, perhaps, my hon. colleague finds it so natural to differ with me that he did not remember it—that this steamer has been subsidised to take trade away from Halifax. With regard to our western trade, the complaint is that, handicapped as we are by the expense of bringing our freight to the Windsor and Annapolis station, we cannot compete with these places to which goods can be water-borne from St. John, by means of the subsidy granted by the Government. The merchants of Halifax are not much indebted to my worthy colleague for the views he has given

Mr. FOSTER.

on this question; but, independently of that, I think it is unsound in principle, where there is railway communication, that the Government should give subsidies to aid steam communication.

General LAURIE. The coast shore of Maitland and Summerville is not approached by railways at all. The northern coast of Hants County is very thickly settled, and not within twenty miles of a railway, and this line of steamers affords great convenience to the people residing in all those places.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. colleague, when he called attention to this matter, did so on the ground that these different places named had access to the railway system of the Province. What I desired to point out was that some of the places named—notably the port of Maitland—have not; and if my hon. friend had handled ships' outfits in the fall of the year, and wanted to get them transported to Maitland late in the season, when it was necessary to get a ship off in a hurry, he would find this steam communication a great convenience. I quite agree with my hon. friend that, in this matter of the distribution of public moneys, the city of St. John in much more favored than Halifax.

Mr. WELSH. You are grabbers, both of you, in that respect.

Mr. KENNY. It has been a mystery to me ever since I came here why such should be the case; but, as a matter of fact, if hon. gentlemen would take the trouble to examine the list of subsidies, they will see that St. John receives a great deal more than Halifax. I rise merely to point out that I defended this on the ground that points are reached by water in this way which are not reached by rail.

Mr. WELSH. I notice that in political matters when one of these hon. gentlemen stands up to advocate a measure, the other gets up to oppose it, but when it comes to be a case of grab they are united solidly. They do not stand up when a reasonable question is brought up from Prince Edward Island. I see an item here of an increase of \$2,500 to two lines of steamers running between St. John and Halifax. There will not be a word against that.

Steam communication between Halifax and Newfoundland, *via* Cape Breton at \$200 per trip, not to exceed..... \$2,000

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) How often does this steamboat run?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the information here, and, therefore, I cannot speak by the book; but I think that last year she made a good many more trips than, at the rate of \$200 per trip, would amount to \$2,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That service is not at St. Johns, Newfoundland?

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is to the west coast.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) To what ports?

Mr. FOSTER. It stops at three or four of the smaller villages on the west coast.

Mr. KENNY. That contract practically brings to Canada the whole of the trade of West Newfoundland.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I should like to know what trade is brought ?

Mr. FOSTER. The manifests show that during the last year the trade has increased very largely.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The trade may have increased very much, but it may be like the statement made in regard to one of the boroughs which was to be disfranchised under the Reform Bill in England. One hon. member stated that the voters had increased 100 per cent. When asked to explain, he said that originally there was only one voter, who was a turnpike man, but he got married, and the voting power had increased 100 per cent. There may have been a large increase in the trade, but I should like to know what the actual increase is.

Mr. FOSTER. I will bring down the statement. It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Board of Trade of Toronto.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 113) to authorise the Toronto Savings Bank Charitable Trust to invest certain Funds.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Confederation Life Association.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Central Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Corby.)

RELIEF OF GEORGE T. SMITH.

Mr. SMALL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 98) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George T. Smith.

Mr. WATSON. Before you leave the Chair, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he thinks it is good legislation to revive patents that have practically lapsed. The patentee in this case, George T. Smith, is a manufacturer of bolting machines, and, I believe, he has failed recently. I think we ought to be very careful about reviving patents that have lapsed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that, generally speaking, any legislation of that kind is very much to be regretted, and very much to be guarded against. I must say, with regard to the last Bill that passed, I had a good many misgivings on the subject. I believe it was very carefully examined in the Committee of Private Bills, and I think that the applicant made a case on which Parliament, after the fullest enquiry, might accede to the application to have his patent renewed—although I think still that it was not a case free from doubt. This one, I think, was a pretty clear case. Under the circumstances, I think the patentee was not guilty of any neglect at all. In due time he gave his solicitor the amount to be remitted to the Commissioner of Patents, and the solicitor was in due time to remit the amount to Ottawa; but I understand that, through a fraud on the part of his clerk, only half the amount reached Ottawa, the remainder being kept. Under these circumstances, I

think the patentee was not guilty of any neglect, or any abandonment of his patent, and that the solicitor was not in fault; and the question is, whether this party should be deprived of the renewal of his patent by circumstances over which he had no control. Still, I agree with the hon. gentleman that we ought to be very careful about making precedents of this kind.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I understand the Minister to say that the fraud had been committed by a clerk in the office of the solicitor?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I agree with my hon. friend who spoke first, that this is a very dangerous precedent to set, when the rule is so closely observed in the Department with regard to the prepayment of fees. I believe these parties have had the benefit of this patent for a long time, and I am informed that the renewal is strongly opposed by other parties who are interested in the business, as being unjust to them, and detrimental to the public interest. I think the Minister will acknowledge that the general public should have the privilege of using this patent after a certain time, and the millers, I understand, object to this Act. Some questions have been raised with which I am not familiar, as to whether the patent should ever have been granted, but, of course, that is not a matter of consideration at the present time. I think we should not overlook the interest of those who are using, or who wish to use, or to take advantage of a part, or all, of the machines manufactured under this patent. I know there are serious objections raised by prominent manufacturers throughout the country, to this legislation. The hon. Minister will see that if the law is set aside in this case, it will afford a precedent for other parties in the future to seek similar legislation.

Mr. TROW. There is nothing irregular in reference to this patent. It was a branch of the business that was formerly carried on in Toronto by the Howland Company. I had the honor of purchasing from the Howland Company their right to the Dominion, for \$8,000, for which I gave them cash. This is a distinct branch of the business, unconnected with those parties who have become insolvent in Jackson, Michigan. They are a firm who are running entirely independent of Mr. Smith, and they are regular in every respect. As the Minister of Justice has just stated, the failure to renew the patent was owing to the fault or negligence of their own solicitor, otherwise no application would be made to this House at all.

Mr. SPROULE. The case spoken of by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) was brought before the committee, but as the committee understood the case it was something like this: The party whom Mr. Watson represented claimed that Mr. Smith was using his machine, and that he ought to have had the patent instead of Smith; it is a dispute between two individuals as to who should have the patent, and not as to whether the patent ought to be renewed or not. The question of renewal was brought before the committee by this Bill, and, as the Minister of Justice has very plainly stated, the patentee notified his solicitor to renew it in proper time; the solicitor instructed his clerk to send the money, the clerk sent only part of the amount, only \$10 instead of \$20; but believed he had sent \$20.

This was acknowledged by the Commissioner of Patents, who directed his attention to the fact that only \$10 were received, and that it required \$10 more to entitle him to a renewal of the patent. When perusing the letter he was suddenly called to the telephone and threw the letter down in a case; when he returned the paper was mislaid by some person shutting the case, and he forgot all about it for some days hence; the balance was not sent until the patent had lapsed by virtue of time. When the solicitor's attention was called to the matter the balance of the money was sent, this being only a few days after the lapse of the patent, but it could not be accepted by the Commissioner of Patents, and, therefore, the necessity for this legislation. I do not think the contention of Mr. Watson in regard to his friend has anything to do with the consideration of this case; it is a matter to be fought out in the courts.

Mr. WATSON. I did not say anything about any other patent or claim in my remarks.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that was your contention before the Committee.

Mr. WATSON. There are doubts as to whether, if the Commissioner of Patents had done his duty, this patent should have been issued, and as these machines are being manufactured by other firms the passage of this Bill will cause litigation. I believe it is in the public interest that this patent having been held by George T. Smith for five years, and it having now lapsed, the public should reap the benefit of it. The evidence produced by the solicitor for Mr. Smith went to show that the Department had notified Smith, 12 or 14 days before the time of expiration, to remit the amount for the renewal of the patent. Accordingly, there was neglect not only on the part of the solicitor, but on the part of Smith. In my opinion this is a small improvement to be covered by a patent, although it is a profitable improvement to the general public, and I do not think we should pass special legislation in favor of a man who has already had a patent for five years.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has erred in stating that Smith was notified. He was not notified, but the clerk of the solicitor was notified in reply to the letter when he sent \$10 instead of \$20, but the letter happened to be enclosed in a book accidentally and to be forgotten until the patent expired. In regard to the claim, that others are manufacturing and using the patent, the last clause in the Bill deals with any other persons using or acquiring any interest in the patent during the time the patent lapsed.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). This is a kind of legislation that should not be hastily adopted by this House. If people are so negligent, either by their solicitor or by their own act, as to allow a patent to lapse, it is the duty of this House to adhere firmly to the law, and not grant a renewal. The principal place of business of this firm is Jackson, Michigan, where they have carried on business for a long time. Smith was originally a Canadian, and lived at Aylmer, in Elgin County. He was engaged there in milling for some time, and afterwards removed to Jackson, where he carried on a very large business, stocking a company to the extent of half a million dollars. A few months ago he failed in business, but before that time he had

Mr. SPROULE.

established a Canadian branch at Stratford, and negotiations were in progress to establish branches elsewhere. The branch at Stratford is part and parcel of the business that was carried on in Jackson, Michigan, and I believe that to-day Smith, who is now applying for the renewal of the patent, has no interest whatever in it, and that it has become vested in the creditors of the firm. This being the case, and the patent being owned by an American company, which has a branch at Stratford, it is not in the public interest that the patent be renewed. It is the duty of the Minister of Justice to prevent legislation of this kind, and the Bill should be postponed until full enquiry be made as to the facts connected with it. I do not think the evidence given before the Private Bills Committee is sufficient to warrant this House passing the Bill. That evidence merely is, that the solicitor was notified to make application for a renewal of the patent prior to its becoming lapsed, that the solicitor sent a boy with \$20 to the post office for a money order, that \$10 only were sent and the boy returned with the balance to the solicitor, I suppose. He certainly knew whether \$10 or \$20 were sent, he also knew whether \$10 or \$20 were required for the renewal. If a closer examination is made of the matter it will be found that there is something wrong in it, and we should not deviate from the course we have so far adopted, of not renewing patents when the patentee fails to renew them in time. We cannot tell what injustice our legislation might cause, and, therefore, in the interests of all parties and the public, we should maintain that if patentees do not take sufficient interest to see that their patents are renewed in proper time, it is not in the interests of the general public that a renewal should be given, but that the public should benefit by the neglect. No injury will be done to Mr. Smith, as he has now no interest in the patent. Under the circumstances, the Minister of Justice should ask that the Bill be allowed to stand until full enquiries have been made as to whether injustice will be done to any parties. I, therefore, hope the Bill will not receive a second reading now, but be referred to a the Minister of Justice for a further investigation.

Mr. DENISON. The last speaker says he understands that the Smith patent did not really belong to the party who applied for it. I do not think that makes any real difference to the House. Mr. Smith applies for the extension of his patent, and under the law of the land he had a right to have it extended for five years, on payment of the small fee of \$20 on or before the 22nd January. He could have renewed his patent again for a further term of five years, on the payment of the same fee. It seems to me that it would be harsh treatment of a person applying for renewal of his patent, if we refuse to take his case into consideration. We must remember, that Mr. Smith put this case into the hands of a solicitor to attend to, and that he gave a cheque of \$20, which cheque the Committee saw was cashed on the 6th January. The accountant in the solicitor's office wrote a letter to the Department, stating that he enclosed the \$20, but through some error he only sent \$10. The reply was delayed, as explained by the chairman of Committee, and it did not turn up again until the 6th February, when the time had elapsed within which the fee should be paid. It is manifest that no solicitor would wilfully do a thing of this sort.

Mr. Smith is now mulcted to the tune of \$200 instead of \$20 to renew his patent, if he is allowed permission, because he has, as all applicants have, to make a deposit with the Government of \$200, for private legislation. In addition to that he has, no doubt, to pay a solicitor in Ottawa for looking after the Bill, so that, altogether, he is very handsomely fined for this mistake. It does appear to me that this is a case where the House of Commons should step in and see that injustice is not perpetrated upon a private citizen.

Mr. DAWSON. This matter has been very well explained, and I shall simply confine myself to remarking, that it would be an exceedingly hard case if a poor man were to lose his patent simply through a mistake on the part of his lawyers in neglecting to pay this small fee.

Mr. TROW. It would be very unjust if we should take an undue advantage of a respectable firm which has carried on a very extensive business, and which employs, to my knowledge, 150 workmen all the year round, and is doing a great benefit to the milling interest of the whole Dominion. I am surprised that my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson), who knows no more about this firm than the man in the moon, should try to take advantage of the mere negligence or carelessness on the part of a solicitor in not depositing the money in due time. The facts of the case have been thoroughly investigated by the Private Bills Committee, which has reported that everything is all right. The firm have done their duty in the matter. The patent has done great good to the milling business of the country, and why should we take this objection?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Trow) is mistaken with regard to the benefit that will accrue to the public, or to the milling interests of the country, if we grant a renewal of this patent. It must be quite evident that if this Parliament refuses to renew this patent, the general public will become possessed of all the interest there is in it, and so the manufacturers will have an opportunity of using this patent, and the millers throughout the country will get the benefit. I think it would be very bad legislation if we should initiate a principle of this kind. If this man neglected for five days, from the 22nd January to the 27th to pay the fee, some other man who neglects to do so for ten days will make a similar application, and by-and-bye it might be ten weeks, or ten months, or ten years, and there would be no certainty with regard to the patent law. I think the law should not be made flexible in this respect. If the law requires the holders of patents to renew them within a certain time, we should stick to it. If we make the law flexible, we should state just how many days a person will be allowed before he is required to put up his money. If Mr. Smith gets this advantage, all the other patentees should be notified that they can do the same thing. We should not pass special legislation for any one man in particular, and especially as this is a very important matter for the millers of the country, and if this Bill be not passed, all the manufacturers in the country will be allowed to make this machine, which is of interest not only to them, but to the general public as well.

Mr. ELLIS. Notwithstanding what my hon. friend says, it was clearly shown before the Com-

mittee that this is a case in which the error was made by a third person, not the patentee. While the person interested acted promptly himself, and, so far as he thought, fully complied with the law, his clerk made a mistake. Whatever may be the public interest, it is not fair that this private individual should suffer in this particular case.

Mr. SMALL. I would suggest that the Bill should stand until the Minister of Justice shall have an opportunity of examining the question. Some hon. MEMBERS. Very well.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Steam communication between Halifax and Newfoundland \$2,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I took exception to this item a short time ago, and I did so because I thought it was absurd that we should grant a subsidy to this small steambot. She does not carry mails, or passengers, and all the freight she carries, as I am informed by credible parties, is some herring from Newfoundland, which is brought in to compete with the herring caught by the fishermen of Nova Scotia. I think the subsidy is an entirely indefensible one, and I should like to know on what grounds the Minister can justify it?

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N.S.) I happen to know something about this boat, and I think if any subsidy is justified, it is this one. The boat leaves Halifax once a fortnight, and goes to the western shore of Newfoundland, and to the Straits of Belle Isle. She carries a great deal of freight from Cape Breton, such as hay and butter, and brings back lobsters and other fish which are cured on the coast by people from the Province of Nova Scotia. She calls at no less than half-a-dozen different places on the western coast of Newfoundland. She is subsidised both by the Local Government and the Government of Newfoundland. She carries also a great many passengers between various ports of Newfoundland and Cape Breton, and runs from June to the last of December. I think no subsidy given by this House is more beneficial to the people of Halifax and Cape Breton, and petitions were sent in this year asking that the subsidy should be increased, so that she could make a larger number of trips. The only trouble at present is that she does not call at a sufficient number of places in Cape Breton.

Mr. WELSH. I think this grant ought to be referred to the Government of Newfoundland, as it seems that it is most for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland, and I do not see that we should pay for that service. However, it is a small amount.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is just a large enough amount to enable the steamer to compete with the owners of small ships who are trading constantly between Newfoundland and the Dominion of Canada, and it handicaps them most unfairly. I see no justification for it whatever.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N.S.) I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. I know that she carries a large amount of produce that could not be carried by sailing vessels.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend is not quite full in his information with respect to that. Two years ago we granted this subsidy, and I must say that, at first, I was in very much doubt as to whether it should be granted or not; but, last year, I compelled the owners of the boat to give in manifests of their inward and outward cargoes, and I was very much surprised to find, not only the amount, but the assortment of the freight she carries. It is larger, of course, going to Newfoundland, because the fishermen and villagers of Newfoundland have a less assortment to send back, for they must send the wares produced there. The vessel carries passengers, and a good many. She stops at four or five ports between Halifax and Cape Breton, and is a great convenience to the people in that section. We get a good service for the money. We agreed to pay \$200 per trip, not to exceed \$2,000; but the vessel runs all summer, and last summer she gave some eighteen trips instead of ten, which were all that were necessary to earn the subsidy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) To what firm is this subsidy paid?

Mr. FOSTER. The steamer is the *Harrow*, and the subsidy is paid to Pickford & Black.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman know how many subsidies are paid to this firm?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say how many are paid, but I do not think that makes any difference. It is the services for which we pay.

Mr. KIRK. If there is so much business between Newfoundland and Cape Breton, as the hon. member for Victoria says, it ought to be able to support a steamer without the subsidy. It will be remembered that, a few years ago, the Government took the duties off fish coming into Canada from Newfoundland, and I suppose the \$2,000 is given to this steamer to enable it to bring in Newfoundland fish more cheaply, so that they may compete more successfully with the products of our own fishermen, as well as to cheapen the cost of sending flour from this country to Newfoundland. I have no doubt that this is the way this subsidy is given in the interest of the fishermen.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman know what subsidy this vessel receives from the Local Government?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Or how much it gets from the Newfoundland Government?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It would appear to me that the Dominion, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland Governments pay the whole charges for bringing a few traps from Nova Scotia to Newfoundland. You pay a small bounty to your fishermen with the one hand, and with the other hand you pay a large bounty to this vessel to enable it to bring in fish, duty free, to compete with the products of those fishermen.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend's argument turns against him. If a subsidy is given by the Local Government, it is voted by a Government who have the interest of the fishermen at heart, and who are on the spot, and ought to know whether it is for their benefit or not. That is an

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N. S.)

additional evidence that it is a service which should be encouraged.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman ought to be able to say definitely what subsidies are given for this service. The Local Government may give a subsidy for carrying passengers between Halifax and Cape Breton. But the hon. Minister cannot controvert what I said, that the vessel carries nothing but herring from Newfoundland.

Mr. FOSTER. I know she carries more than herring.

Mr. BLAKE. It does seem to me that it is not a businesslike way of proving the case for the subsidy, that the Minister is not able to tell us what other Government resources the vessel has. These matters ought to be dealt with on something like business principles; and it seems to me that if the Minister has not informed himself, he ought to inform himself, what her resources from the various Governments are, in order to see whether she is overpaid for the benefit she gives, or whether we pay an undue proportion.

Mr. FOSTER. I know this much, that she is not getting a very large subsidy in the nature of things. I think probably it might be taken as good ground that we ought to give, or ought not to give a subsidy, according to what we considered right, irrespective of what she may get from the Local Government.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not at all agree with that view. I do not know to what it may lead. The hon. gentleman says that we ought to give a subsidy which we consider right, irrespective of what the Local Government may give, but awhile ago, he indicated that the fact that the Local Governments were giving subsidies were reasons why we should give them. In the first place we should give subsidies independently of the Local Governments, and in the second place we ought to give them dependent on those Governments. The reasons seem to be rather self contradictory, but when you engage in the business of giving subsidies, I think, inasmuch as this business is capable of indefinite expansion as to the character of the enterprise and the facilities for trade, and the amounts of the subsidies, we ought to proceed cautiously and upon full information; and if it be the case that some firm—the name of which I do not remember, but which the hon. member for Queen's County, P.E.I., mentioned the other day—receives so many subsidies that the Minister cannot tell how many, it is almost time to ask what tithe they pay or what subsidies they pay, out of the subsidies they receive.

Steam service between San Francisco and Victoria, B.C. \$17,640

Mr. FOSTER. This is a subsidy which we are obliged to pay by the terms of the union between ourselves and British Columbia. It was dropped last year, but we found, after looking into the matter, that we had to put it back.

Steam communication between St. John, Digby and Annapolis, for a daily service, except Sunday, during nine months, and a daily or tri-weekly during three months. \$11,500

Mr. WELSH. I notice that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick draw from this Government about

\$160,000 a year in the shape of subsidies to steamers, and many of those subsidies are given to steamers to run in opposition to the Government railways. No wonder our people are getting poorer and our railways are losing money. The Government has a system of railways all over the Provinces. There are the Intercolonial Railway, and the Windsor and Halifax Branch, and the Annapolis Branch, and all around the coast there is railway communication; yet here I see subsidies to steamers to run in opposition to them. We will not hear a word from New Brunswick or Nova Scotia about this from the other side of the House. They are all now a happy family. And Prince Edward Island only gets \$5,500, although it has nearly as large a seacoast as both of them. I want to know on what principle you grant those subsidies? They do not appear to be for the convenience of mails and passengers, but merely for steam communication, while the \$5,500 voted to Prince Edward Island, which is the only subsidy voted to us in all these Estimates, is for the convenience of the mail service. It is a bad thing for a little Province to come into a big Confederation. You have swallowed us up, and you are treating us as a vanquished country. Talk about coercion in Ireland, it was never as bad as your coercion in Prince Edward Island. When the late Minister of Finance, Sir Charles Tupper, was in his place, I called his attention to a subsidy given for years to a steamer to run in opposition to the Government railway, and the minute he looked at it he withdrew it from the Estimates. Why does not the Minister of Finance follow his example, and strike out all those items which are an injury to the people of this Dominion?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is this contract for carrying mails between Annapolis and St. John for a term of years?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

For three lines of Steamers running between the ports of Halifax and St. John, N. B., or either, and the West Indies and South America. \$85,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Before we enter into a discussion of this, it would be well if the Minister of Finance would give us a statement of how this money is to be appropriated, what steamers are to draw it, and the tenders for the service.

Mr. FOSTER. All the papers which are in my possession and which are necessary to be laid on the Table, will be laid on the Table, and in the meantime I can give some explanations. Last year the sum of \$60,000 was voted for the steamship service between the ports of Halifax and St. John, or either of them, and the West Indies and South America. In pursuance of this authorisation, tenders were advertised for. I have a copy of the advertisement in my hand. After carefully considering the subject, I called for tenders for four routes, denominated A, B, C and D. "A" route was from Halifax or St. John to Cuba and return, calling at Havana and Matanzas. "B" route was from Halifax or St. John to Jamaica and return, calling at Bermuda and Turk's Island. Route "C" was from Halifax or St. John (*via* Yarmouth if sailing from St. John) to Demerara and return, calling at Bermuda, St. Kitts, Antigua, Guadeloupe, Dominica, Martinique, St. Lucia, Barbadoes and Trinidad. Route "D" was from Halifax or St. John to Buenos Ayres and return,

calling at Pernambuco, Bahia, Rio Janeiro and Monte Video, and such other convenient ports *en route*, either in the West Indies or South America, as may be agreed upon in the interests of trade. It was provided that, for each of the above-mentioned services, proper accommodation for the transport of mails must be provided, that the above services were to be monthly and performed by steamships of a speed of not less than twelve knots an hour; and as regards the services marked "A," "B" and "C," of not less than 1,000 tons register, and with accommodation for at least thirty first-class passengers; and as regards the service marked "D," of not less than 2,000 tons register, and with accommodation for at least fifty first-class passengers. That indicated what we thought we would like to get in regard to the selection of routes, and as to the service which should apply upon those routes; but, bearing in mind that we had a vote of only \$60,000 and did not wish to go very far beyond that, there was also put in that advertisement the following clause:—

"As regards the services A, B and C, persons desiring to offer to perform the same with steamers of less capacity and speed than above mentioned, may submit their tenders, specifying the speed and capacity of the boats which they desire to offer, although the conditions above specified are those desired by the Government."

That, as will be seen, gave an option to the Government of taking upon these routes vessels of less capacity and less speed, provided that the cost of the vessels of the larger capacity and the higher rate of speed, when the tenders came in, was beyond the amounts which might reasonably be placed at the disposal of the Government. The tender for route "D" was not asked for under the supposition that we had sufficient money voted for a steamship line to run from St. John or Halifax to Buenos Ayres and return, but it was asked for in order that the Government might obtain an idea of the practical cost of a steamship line between those points. For that service no person tendered, and, therefore, the practical information which was desired, as to the cost of a service of that description, was not afforded to the Government by this means. For the other three services we had a number of tenders. We had a tender from a Glasgow firm for vessels which filled the requirements asked for in the advertisement, but at so high a cost that it put that offer entirely out of the means of the Government. The three services, as tendered for by that company, would have cost the Government yearly—I forget the exact figures—between \$300,000 and \$500,000. That was, therefore, ruled out. The other available tenderers were Messrs. Pickford & Black, of Halifax, and the Furness Co., which runs various lines of steamships, and, amongst others, the one between St. John, Halifax and London; and there was also Mr. Van Wart, representing a company which was to be formed to carry out those services. These tenders ran in this way: Messrs. Pickford & Black tendered for all the services from the port of Halifax, and from that alone; Mr. Van Wart tendered for the services from St. John on the three routes; the Furness Line tendered for the line from St. John and Halifax to Demerara—that is service "C." Mr. Furness's tender was—with vessels to fill the requirements, which were to be built new and put on the line within six or seven months, the service in the meantime to be carried on by vessels which he named, and which were of

sufficient capacity but of a less rate of speed—\$50,000 a year. The tenders sent in by Mr. Van Wart and by Pickford & Black for that service was not considered so favorable, taking into account the vessels which were offered and the amounts which were required, and the Government authorised me to accept the tender of Mr. Furness on the condition that, while the vessels of inferior speed were performing the temporary service until the others were built, the sum to be paid should be \$48,000, which was the amount of the tender of Messrs. Pickford & Black from the port of Halifax. Mr. Furness, however, declined to accept that offer, and the reasons he gave were that he found it very difficult to carry out his proposal, as he had not been able to hold the vessels he had temporarily engaged up to the time the award was made, and it was almost impossible for him to get temporary vessels to fill the service. After looking over the whole correspondence, it was my impression, judging from the tenor of the communications, that Mr. Furness was glad to be out of his offer. Then I opened communications with Messrs. Pickford & Black and with Mr. Van Wart. Before that was done, I was authorised by Council to take the tender of Messrs. Pickford & Black for service "B"—that is, from Halifax to Jamaica and return, calling at Bermuda and Turk's Island, for \$15,000 a year with vessels of about 750 tons and a speed of eleven knots. That was not equal to the requirements of the Government if the cost were not too large, but it was found that the difference in cost between a 750 ton and a 1,000 ton vessel was so great that Council decided to undertake that service with vessels of a less capacity. For the service "C"—from Halifax and St. John *via* Yarmouth to Demerara, calling at the West India Islands—I asked for amended tenders from Pickford & Black and from Mr. Van Wart. Messrs. Pickford & Black refused to undertake the service with vessels of more than 750 tons, and to carry out that from St. John to Demerara and return, unless they had the other services, and I think what they wanted for that was between \$45,000 and \$48,000. Mr. Van Wart undertook, on behalf of the company about to be formed by him, to do the service from St. John to Demerara and return, calling at these Islands, for \$49,200—a monthly service, to be carried out up to the requirements of the Government, that is, with vessels of a minimum registered tonnage of 1,000, and with the speed required, of twelve knots. After carefully considering the matter the Government came to the conclusion to accept that offer, and the only modification which has been made was this: New vessels to go on this service are to be built and to come up to the requirements of the Government; in the meantime a temporary service is to be provided for, to carry the work up to the time when the new vessels will be ready to undertake the service; and the only modification which has been made is to allow that temporary service with a vessel of less speed, and a little less capacity, for the first six months of the service, up to the time when the new vessels are built to take the route. That is the information in general, and I am willing to give any other information that I can.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). About the first route you mentioned?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. I forgot that. Afterwards I asked Pickford & Black to amend their tender, if they could give me a more favorable offer for the "A" service; and whereas they had asked for that service \$24,000 per annum for a monthly service, with a 750 ton vessel, they offered afterwards to do it for \$20,000, and the Government concluded to take that offer, subject to the approval of Parliament, and to give them the contract for that service. That will make three services a month, "A" service with 750 ton steamers, at a speed of eleven knots, for \$20,000; "B" service from Halifax, with the same quality of steamers and speed, for \$15,000, to Jamaica and return; and "C" service from St. John to Demerara and return, with vessels of a larger capacity and higher speed, for \$49,200.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Of course, the hon. gentleman is aware that I have always taken exception to that expenditure on its merits, and the explanation which he has given to-night in no way alters my views in that respect. Of course, this is just a question where the Government have stepped in and enabled certain parties to conduct the commercial interests of the country at an advantage over those surrounding them. If the principle which the hon. gentleman laid down was correct, if he was opening up any new trade, if he was developing any new trade, if these parties were going to extend our relations in other branches of commerce, then there might be some reason, according to his own views, although, even in that case, I claim that, for a purely business arrangement, it would not be justifiable. But in this case we will consider it for one moment in the way it affects the general trade of the country. Take, in the first place, the Jamaica route. I think, if the First Minister and his Government had understood the position of that trade, they never would have asked this House for this appropriation. We have had from time immemorial a very large trade with the Island of Jamaica in our natural products. We ship there about 100,000 quintals of fish per annum, besides large quantities of pickled fish. That steamer, which the Government have subsidised, makes a monthly trip and takes about 2,000 quintals of fish per trip. That would make 25,000 quintals of fish which she carries to the Island of Jamaica, for which she receives \$15,000 from this Parliament—that is what the hon. gentleman asks us to approve of to-night; for carrying out 25,000 quintals of fish he asks us to give that steamer a subsidy of \$15,000. Now, when you come to consider that the whole balance of 75,000 quintals is carried out in our own vessels, without any subsidy at all, that her going there does not in any way increase our trade with that port, that she carries out not one single article that would not otherwise have gone, and that has not been carried for these last sixty or seventy years—when you come to consider that out of 100,000 quintals of fish carried, sailing vessels take 75,000 quintals without a subsidy, and she gets \$15,000 for carrying 25,000 quintals, I do not know what stronger argument I need address to any assembly of reasonable, practical business men; if that will not satisfy them that it is an indefensible subsidy, why, of course, I cannot expect to influence them. In the first place that steamer is always full, and she always gets the

highest rate of freight. They carry out a box of codfish for two shillings sterling, at the rate of \$10 per ton, a barrel of pickled fish for three shillings, at the rate of 35 cents a barrel, and that is a larger freight than any ocean carrying steamer on the average, any Atlantic steamer, any steamer in any part of the world we know of, gets at the present time. She is always full, and still the Government give her a subsidy of \$15,000. The trouble is just this—and there is where the Government have, I think, not fully apprehended the whole question—there is nothing in return. The steamer goes to Jamaica and takes out a cargo for which she receives this \$15,000 per annum, and when she has delivered her cargo there and remains 48 hours, she returns to Nova Scotia; but she has not a cargo of 500 barrels of bulk at any one time. A few hundred barrels of oranges, or cocoa nuts, or 20 or 40 bags of coffee, compose that vessels cargo. The fact is, the subsidy which the Government pay here is just what pays her for coming back in ballast, and she could not run unless under these circumstances. Her outward freight is ample to pay her, but because she cannot get any return freight—because she does not go to that port in the Island where return freight is procurable, she cannot go to the outports on account of shallow water, and at Kingston there is no sugar shipped to any extent—the vessel is, therefore, obliged to come back in ballast, and to remunerate her for coming back in ballast, the hon. gentleman asks us to give \$15,000. I submit, Mr. Chairman, if such a proposition as that was submitted to any business company, or organisation, in this Dominion, from one end of it to the other, the man who would make it would be treated as a lunatic. I do not mean to say that the Minister of Finance is a lunatic; very far from it, because we know he is not, happily—but I say it is as absurd a proposition, for an undertaking of that kind, as was ever made. Then, again, the hon. gentleman was asked a little while ago, and I ask him the question now: Is he aware what subsidy the steamer receives from the other Island?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are you aware whether she receives anything?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then I think that proves how the hon. gentleman has rushed into a contract of this kind without making careful enquiry into all the circumstances surrounding it. She receives a subsidy from the Island of Jamaica of, I think, \$5,000, and from Turk's Island a smaller amount.

Mr. FOSTER. It must be a very small sum from Turk's Island.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am not sure but that she receives a subsidy also from Bermuda, although I am not positive as to that. By receiving those subsidies she is able to take a cargo out to pay expenses, and to have the subsidies to pay the expenses coming home and give profits. Does the Minister think this is a businesslike, statesmanlike, reasonable and sensible proposal? Would the hon. gentleman consider, in his own private affairs, this to be a reasonable and proper undertaking? Formerly the steamer was not making money. The reason was that all she earned on the out-voyage was expended in paying the expenses of the return

voyage; but as soon as it was announced that the Government would give \$15,000, up went the stock, and I understand the managers of the line bought up a good deal of the stock from the original stockholders at a very considerable advance. Then there is another view of it. The sailing vessels engaged in this trade are largely vessels which are engaged in banking during the summer months. These vessels of 100 tons go to the "banks" during the summer, and when the fishing season is over they are engaged in the West India trade from September to March; and by giving employment to these vessels, they are made profitable, and the people on board are kept employed, and interest is paid on the investments in the vessels. But this proposal kills out these people. A steamer going at a regular time prevents that competition and speculation in perishable articles, like fish, which always prevails in hot climates, and it has the practical effect of keeping down the price of fish at least 60 to 75 cents, and sometimes \$1 a quintal. That is the effect of an arrangement by which a steamer is known to be due at a certain time, whereas, when sailing vessels did the trade, the uncertainty of their arrival caused merchants to speculate, and they would cable to Halifax, and the merchants there would go to the market and buy at an increased value, the fisherman receiving the benefit. This is a blow at the interests of the fishermen, both directly and indirectly; indirectly, in the way I have just mentioned, and directly, by steamers taking the place of these fishing vessels. Again, these fishing vessels going to the West Indies bring back cargoes of salt. It is a bulky article, not very valuable, but it is necessary for our fishing interests on the Atlantic coasts. When these fishing vessels visit the West Indies during the winter they bring back salt and keep it for use on the "banks" in the spring; and if they are driven out of this trade, other vessels must be employed. That is another way in which the fishermen are injured indirectly. With respect to the Cuba contract, that is equally absurd. The steamer was running to Cuba and took cargoes of hay, potatoes and some fish. Those are the articles for which the Government are now paying \$2,000 to send to that island. Every one of those articles has been going to Cuba for the last fifty years; not one barrel of potatoes is going on account of the steamer, or one quintal of fish or one pound of hay. This steamer has gone to Cuba and has generally come back in ballast, taking on one or two occasions freight to the United States. Will the vessel be allowed to carry freight to the United States under this arrangement?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The vessel has had to come back in several cases in ballast; it has happened a few times that she has obtained a cargo for Halifax, but in three-fourths of the trips, she has had to come back in ballast. This bounty of \$20,000 will pay her expenses, and if she can pick up freight it will be so much profit. Since this subsidy has been granted, not an additional barrel of potatoes or quintal of fish has gone to Cuba, and the vessel has received \$20,000 to pay her expenses. If the subsidy were doing any service, and if any goods were being shipped outside of those which have been going to Cuba for the last

fifty years, then I could understand the reason of granting the subsidy, but we are not sending anything except our natural products, and we are not sending them in increased quantity. Absurd as are the proposals for these two lines, and unjustifiable as they are, the proposal respecting the line from St. John is more unjustifiable still. We have from Halifax a certain quantity of fish, potatoes and other articles to ship at certain seasons of the year, but from St. John there is nothing to ship to the West Indies except lumber, which can be carried in sailing vessels. One of these steamers, I was informed, took on one trip a cargo of the value of \$6,000, comprising hay, potatoes, a few apples, a few barrels of herring, and a few boxes of smoked herring, which made a great display on the manifest, and the Government paid \$4,000 for taking this cargo. If we have so much money to waste on such absurd schemes, we might as well have a grab all round and see who can get the most. New Brunswick, I repeat, has no natural trade with the West Indies, excepting lumber, and it can be sent by sailing vessels at cheaper rates than by steamer. When small cargoes are carried, the vessels go to small ports where the water is shallow, but when large steamers go to a port the prices of the local markets fall, and they fall when the day is known on which a steamer will arrive. In neither Nova Scotia or New Brunswick is there any increased trade in consequence of this subsidy. This money is so much thrown away—well, not quite thrown away, because it is put in the hands of political favorites of the Government, some in the House and some out of it, and of course these things must be considered and weighed. Considering the question upon any business principle which can for one moment be considered by reasonable and practical business men, the height of absurdity is reached. I did expect better things from a practical man like the present Minister of Finance. His predecessor, the High Commissioner, at one time spoke with regard to this matter, and it all originated out of a speech that he made in Halifax during election time. The old Cunard Line steamers had been taken off, and Sir Charles Tupper made a speech in which he said, that if his Government were sustained he was going to build up a large trade with the West Indies; and certain people outside, who had not any business occupation, and who are always ready to put their hands in the public chest for any subsidy which may be offered, raised considerable excitement over the matter then. To the credit of Sir Charles Tupper be it said, that he never proposed to this House a vote of one cent to carry out the project. When he came to understand how it would affect the various interests, he saw, as any business man must see, that it would be throwing away so much money. I am very sorry that the present Minister of Finance did not consult business men on a matter of this kind, rather than listen to political advice which has led him into a policy which is utterly indefensible,—not only indefensible, but unsound and absurd. I suppose that nothing which I say will alter the decision of the hon. Minister, but when the country comes to realise that they are paying these large subsidies, without trade being increased in any way, and without receiving any return whatever, they will, I hope, arrive at the conclusion, as I think we must all to-night, that

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

this vote ought not to pass, and that the arrangements which the Minister of Finance has announced he has made, are not in the interests of the country.

Mr. WELSH. For what length of time are these contracts given?

Mr. FOSTER. Five years.

Mr. WELSH. Well, I think the hon. Minister's explanations, as far as we ask, is quite satisfactory. I object to the principle of this subsidy, on the ground stated by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). I know that there are very few vessels belonging to the Maritime Provinces, engaged in the West India trade, compared with what used to be employed. At present, I am connected with several vessels, and they are all running between New York and the West Indies; whilst formerly they used to trade from ports in the Maritime Provinces. When this five years' contract has expired, I hope the Government of the day will consider this matter carefully before entering into a fresh contract. I think, however, that the explanation of the Minister of Finance is very satisfactory as far as the contract is concerned.

Mr. KENNY. I heard it remarked at a meeting which was held in Ottawa recently, in aid of some charitable association, and which was being criticised by an Irishman, that "if all the recipients of that charity were gathered into the Music Hall, at Ottawa, there would not be room enough for them." In Halifax, we have a very large lunatic asylum, but if all the people of that city, or of Nova Scotia, who are in favor of the subsidising of steamers to the West Indies, were gathered together into that lunatic asylum, I might repeat the words of my Ottawa fellow-countryman: that there would not be room enough for them. There must, indeed, be a large number of lunatics in Halifax, if every man in favor of this subsidy is to be termed a lunatic. Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the conditions of our trade with the West Indies? I know that in criticising it I shall likely be told that I am talking of what I know nothing about, and that if I were to address this House on matters concerning the particular business in which I am interested, then my opinion might be entitled to some consideration. I think it is a very dangerous doctrine to lay down in this Parliament, that a man should address the House only on a question in which he has a direct personal interest. Our competitors in the West India markets for the productions of which Canada had a surplus, are, as you all know, the people of the United States, and the business of the United States to the West Indies is conducted by steamships. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Welsh) referred, this afternoon, to the fact that I was interested in sailing vessels, and he thought I should do something in their interest. I should be very glad, indeed, if we could arrange that all the merchandise which Canada required from Europe should be carried in sailing ships which are owned in Canada, and such a proposal would be about as reasonable as to contend, that the sailing vessels of Nova Scotia could do the trade with the West Indies, in competition with the steamers from the United States. Unfortunately, perhaps, for us who are interested in sailing ships, we have to recognise that steam

is now the great motive power, and that this is quite as applicable to the trade with the West Indies as it is to transatlantic or the eastern trade. The object of this subsidy was not only to help the fishing business in Nova Scotia, but to develop the exports of Canada generally. It is true that at the present day the West India trade with Canada is almost exclusively confined to Nova Scotia; and, looking at the statistics of that trade for some years past, I am of the opinion that it has not increased, whereas the trade between the United States and the West Indies has immensely increased. That is owing to the fact that the United States had steamers to carry their products to the West India markets. The object of this subsidy was to increase our export trade, and my hon. friend, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), has just now told us that these steamers, at all events to Jamaica, have been immensely successful in that respect, for he has said that on their outward voyages they always have a full cargo. The hon. gentleman will remember that this is exactly what we desired, and that the object was to give our exporters every facility possible to place the productions of Canada regularly and rapidly in these markets. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has complained that the freight on those steamers amounts to \$10 per ton, while my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) complained in the House, the other afternoon, that these steamers from St. John to the West Indies carried fish at too low a rate. One hon. gentleman says they carry goods at too high a rate, and another hon. gentleman on the same side of the House, a few days afterwards, says they carry it at too low a rate; so that the House will see that, under any circumstances, it is very difficult to please these hon. gentlemen. Now, my hon. colleague left the impression on the House—I know it was quite unintentional—that those steamers carry so much to Jamaica and so much back again. They also call, however, at Bermuda and at Turk's Island. It is true, most of the trade is with Jamaica, and we trust and believe that it will be exceedingly valuable in the development of our fisheries and general commerce to all the points at which the steamers call. I do not remember looking over a Halifax paper at the exports carried by those ships without seeing that some of those vessels took an export of fish from the firm of the hon. member. I do not say every ship—

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Almost every one.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend says he was a shipper by those vessels, and we must infer that he would not have used them if they were not valuable to him in the conduct of his business. Therefore, when a gentleman of his business experience uses those vessels, I think it is a recognition of their general utility to the business community. In addition to the Jamaica trade, I pointed out their usefulness in developing a certain amount of business with Bermuda which I believe will steadily increase. My hon. friend took the hon. Minister of Finance to task because he was not able to state to us the exact amount of the subsidy which those steamers receive from the Governments of Jamaica and Bermuda. Well, the very fact that they receive any subsidy at all from those Governments is a recognition that they are useful. Now, I am of opinion that the United States fishermen of

Gloucester are just as vigilant in looking after their interests as the fishermen of Nova Scotia, and they have this advantage over our fishermen, that they are thoroughly organised. They have their societies and associations, they hold annual meetings, which are reported in the newspapers and copied into some of our Canadian papers. But I never yet heard that a Gloucester fisherman, or any one in the United States interested in the deep sea fishermen, complained because lines of steamers were carrying articles from the United States to the West Indies. Of course I shall be told that they are not subsidised; but it is also contended that the very fact of the steamers being engaged in the business is an injury. My hon. friend knows that in the early days of steam communication between New York and Jamaica, steamers were subsidised by the Jamaica Government, and their value was recognised.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman say that they are subsidised at present?

Mr. KENNY. I do not think they are, for the reason given by the Canadian Commissioner, that they have developed a trade which is now self-sustaining; and that is what we desire, and hope and believe, will be the result of these subsidies. Therefore, inasmuch as the American fishermen have not found these steamers to interfere with their business, I do not think that our Canadian fishermen need imagine for a moment that this subsidy is a blow at their interest. As regards the Cuba service, my hon. colleague is undoubtedly right that at the present moment there is a difficulty in getting return cargoes from Cuba; but we are in hopes that as the business increases, and the other portions of Canada avail themselves of these facilities for increasing their exports, the return cargoes will also increase. Of course, if our American rivals had not steamers, and continued to use sailing vessels, we might expect to compete with them with sailing vessels. My hon. colleague has also criticised the adjustment of the subsidies as made by the hon. Minister of Finance, especially the giving of one to the city of St. John. I quite agree with him, that at present the Canadian West India trade is nearly exclusively a Nova Scotia trade; but I hope that the business from St. John will increase and develop. A great deal of energy has been shown by the citizens of St. John in taking hold of this matter and arranging for the construction of steamers, and I hope that their efforts will be crowned with success. Now, I have stated on two or three occasions in this House, that I differ from my hon. colleague with regard to these subsidies. Of course, time alone can develop who is right and who is wrong; but, I think, in a few years hence we shall recognise, from the increased trade returns, that those subsidies have been of advantage to Canada, and particularly to the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When the hon. Finance Minister read the tenders for the line from St. John to the West Indies, I did not catch what tonnage of steamer was required.

Mr. FOSTER. A thousand tons.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What tonnage of steamer did he succeed in getting?

Mr. FOSTER. A thousand tons.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did he state that the vessel running from St. John, and receiving this subsidy, had a tonnage of a thousand tons?

Mr. FOSTER. I said before that a temporary service was arranged for, and that during that period the vessel which has been accepted by the Government for a certain time, is a little below 1,000 tons—about 800 tons, I think.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With whom is that contract?

Mr. FOSTER. I have already stated it is with a company represented by Mr. Van Wart.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who are the members of the company?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know all the members. There are Mr. Van Wart and his brother, and Mr. Kitchen, and Mr. McLean.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) a member?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure—the hon. member has just told me he is.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that an incorporated company?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, under the General Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When was it incorporated?

Mr. FOSTER. About two months ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So that last summer when the trip was made, under which the subsidy was paid last year, it was not an incorporated company?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend does not understand. No money was paid last summer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) She ran some trips?

Mr. FOSTER. She ran one trip.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did she run any trip before the company was incorporated?

Mr. FOSTER. She commenced her first trip about the middle of January.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When was the company incorporated?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot give the exact date.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How much per month is paid to that company.

Mr. FOSTER. \$4,100 per trip.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is currently stated every where that that company do not own this steamer, but have only chartered her.

Mr. FOSTER. I informed the House of that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And I believe the Government pay the company a larger sum than the company have chartered her for per trip?

Mr. FOSTER. In that you are quite mistaken.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What amount do the company pay for the charter of the vessel? If the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) is a member of the company, he can give us the information.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that is pertinent to the enquiry.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has challenged the correctness of my statement. He says it is quite incorrect. I have my information from a source I can rely upon; and as the Minister of Finance challenges the correctness of my state-

Mr. FOSTER.

ment, I challenge him to give his authority for his, and to tell the House how much that company pay for the charter of the vessel. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) is not only a member of the company, but all the maritime men know he is the manager of the company.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not know it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are many things known to the maritime members which the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) does not know.

Mr. CAMERON. There are more than he do not know them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A question has been put which, I think, ought to be answered. The question before us is whether this deviation made by the Government from the terms of the contract is warranted, and it is a material fact to know if the company have subsidised an inferior vessel, and at what rate they have chartered it.

Mr. FOSTER. We ought to be reasonable about this, and all that reasonable men can ask to know is this: The Government proposed to establish a steam service between St. John and Demerara, which requires a vessel of a certain style, capacity and speed to do the service as a permanent work. After looking into the whole matter, we proposed to give so much per month for the service. It is impossible to build vessels, even with all the energy and ingenuity which my hon. friend opposite possesses, by magic; and new vessels cannot be put on the service for six, seven or eight months. In the meantime the service has to be conducted, and it can only be conducted by vessels under charter or by vessels specially built. My hon. friend must know, if he knows anything about the state of shipping of late, that it is one of the most difficult things to obtain a suitable steamer on short notice for charter, and I think if he had to attempt within the last year to obtain a vessel for a short period of time and of a particular kind, for a particular service, he would find it was neither an easy nor an inexpensive work to get such a vessel. The promoters of the company, after having tried to get a suitable vessel, presented me, as the result of their efforts, with the most favorable vessel they could get. I laid the matter before the Council, and the Council, after taking the matter into consideration, determined, reasonably I think, that for the intermediate space of time they would accept the vessel which was less than the proposed tonnage and a little less than the proposed speed for the permanent service. They proposed to give so much for each trip of about six weeks during that temporary time. This was the reasonable arrangement made, and it does not matter whether they got that vessel given to them as a gift or gave \$10,000 a month for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a matter of some considerable interest to the taxpayers.

Mr. FOSTER. The only question is whether or not the subsidy given is an inordinate one for a permanent service, and whether the intermediate arrangement is an unreasonable one, taking all things into consideration. My hon. friend is on the scent for something, as I can quite see, but he will find he is mistaken in quarrying his game.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not on the scent for anything except that legitimate information which it is the right and bounden duty of a member of Parliament to obtain, when called upon to vote \$70,000 or \$80,000 of the people's money.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not legitimate information which the hon. gentleman asks, but he is asking to know the private concerns of a company about whose private business he has no right to know.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. Finance Minister is entirely out of order, and is endeavoring to suppress information we ought to obtain—

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—and which it ought to be his interest, as representing the people, to give. I am not so entirely ignorant of the matter as the hon. gentleman imagines. I happen to be somewhat largely interested in a steamer myself, which is trading between the West Indies and the Maritime Provinces and the United States, and I know a little of what I am talking about; and the steamer I am interested in is one which is not subsidised at all, but has to compete with those steamers that are so largely subsidised. The statement I made was this: That the vessel which the Government is subsidising is receiving a subsidy per month larger than the company, of which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) is the manager, are paying to the owners of that vessel for her charter. The hon. the Minister of Finance challenges the accuracy of that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not accurate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And I appealed to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) to reply, when the Minister of Finance rose suddenly to prevent the hon. member for Queen's from giving the information. The hon. the Minister attempts to suppress facts which ought to be within the knowledge of this Committee, and he has contradicted, without authority, the statement which I made on credible authority.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. My hon. friend may make misrepresentations, but I am determined that every one he makes I will bring to his mind. He has stated, as a second misrepresentation, that I rose when the hon. member for Queen's got up to give the information, and asked him not to give it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say that the hon. gentleman did rise just at the moment that I asked the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird).

Mr. FOSTER. I must have this thing settled.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You rose to a point of order and did not state it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is this: that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and who does not take his seat when a point of order is raised—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A point of order is not raised.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must take his seat until we hear the point of order raised.

Mr. FOSTER. The point of order is simply this: My hon. friend said that when the hon. member for Queen's rose to give the information, I rose and prevented him from giving it. That I

rose is quite true, but that I prevented his giving information which he may have thought fit to give, is not true. My hon. friend ought to do me the justice of taking that back.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has not taken any point of order. He took a most unjust advantage of his position when he said he was rising to a point of order, and raised no point of order. He had no right to do that. I stated that I was credibly informed that he was subsidising a steamer at \$4,100 a month, and that that amount was more than the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) was paying for the charter of the vessel. The hon. gentleman did not hesitate to contradict that statement most emphatically, and, when I asked the member for Queen's to state whether that was true or not, the Finance Minister rose and made a long statement which must have been intended to prevent the member for Queen's from giving the information which I asked. There is no error or misrepresentation in that, and I say that this is information which the Committee is entitled to receive. The Finance Minister is entirely mistaken in the view he has enunciated. He must know that, when such a large amount of money is to be appropriated to a service which everyone admits is one of a questionable character, the Committee has a right to be informed as to the data on which the Government acts. We want to know what cargo the vessel took to the West Indies, what return cargo she brought back, what is the character of the business which he says is to be developed. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) told us very plainly that he did not see what trade would be developed. He told us that all the fish trade with the West Indies was carried between Nova Scotia and the West Indies, and that none went from St. John. If this vessel is not intended to carry fish, what is she intended to carry? She may carry some small lumber, but nothing else that I am aware of. It is true that she went to Yarmouth, and almost paid people to put their small wares on board of her—some small amount of fish from Yarmouth to carry to the West Indies. The imports from the West Indies have been confined to rum, and molasses and sugar, but rum, molasses and sugar are not the kind of goods which are generally brought in steamboats. We know that the great export from the West Indies is fruit, and that it goes to the United States and will continue to go to the United States. The hon. gentleman does not expect to carry fruit by this vessel to St. John and the only result will be that she will return in ballast to St. John as vessels do return to Halifax. Because, however, a member of this House asks for information in regard to this, he is told that he has no right to do so, but I think it is due to the member for Queen's, N. B. (Mr. Baird), to give the Committee every information in reference to this steanboat. If my information is wrong, that the hon. gentleman is receiving more per month than he paid for the charter of the vessel, I will be happy to withdraw the statement I have made, but I do not want the Finance Minister to rise and instruct the member for Queen's, N. B., not to answer—

Mr. FOSTER. I did not do so.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)—by stating that the matter was irrelevant, and that it did not require

an answer. I say positively that the hon. gentleman stated that in his position as Finance Minister, and that that was an instruction to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) not to give the information which was asked for. This is not a matter to be kept secret. We know that it is a most questionable enterprise, and that the trade between this Dominion and the West Indies is not increasing. We know that, in 1873, the aggregate trade between the Dominion of Canada and the West Indies was \$6,163,000, while in 1889, it was \$6,138,000. Sixteen years afterwards, the trade was actually less than it was in 1873, and, although it has fluctuated between those dates, it has never gone beyond the first amount to any extent. If that is the case, if the hon. gentleman seeks to subsidise a steamboat at a large amount of money, and says he hopes to develop a new trade, we have a right to know what trade he hopes to develop, what exchange he thinks can take place between the surplus products of Canada and the surplus products of the West Indies. I hope we will receive the information for which I have asked from the hon. member for Queen's, N. B.

Mr. WELSH. I am sorry that I have to differ with my hon. colleague (Mr. Davies). I think he has no right to ask a question from the member for Queen's, N. B. (Mr. Baird), in reference to his private affairs. I agree with the Minister of Finance. I think this is irrelevant. I am opposed on principle to this grant, but, after the explanation of the Minister of Finance, I am quite satisfied. This contract is given for five years. The Minister of Finance has given a full and satisfactory explanation, to my mind, on all the points upon which we have questioned him. When my hon. colleague questions the member for Queen's, N. B. (Mr. Baird), in regard to his private affairs, I think he has outstepped the bounds. You have no right to do that. The member for Queen's has accepted the contract with the Government, and the Minister of Finance says he is bound to run a certain class of boats until he can put another class of boats on the line. That explanation was full and satisfactory to me. But I am opposed to the principle on which this subsidy is voted. I say it is ruinous to the best interests of the Maritime Provinces, and to the best interests of the Dominion as a whole, because, if we do not protect our marine industry we are doing wrong. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) spoke to-night, and spoke very properly in a great many ways, but when he talks about his lunatic asylum in Halifax, I think a great many members who support him ought to be put there if they agree with all he says. Steam is the motive power in the world now, but why should we help it? If steamers can compete with sailing vessels, why should we take money out of the pockets of the taxpayers to handicap the sailing vessels? That is wrong. I am sorry that I have to differ for the first time with my hon. colleague as to this matter. If the hon. gentleman from Queen's, N. B. (Mr. Baird), has entered into a contract with the Government to construct these boats, and in the meantime to run the line as best he can, that is a matter between him and the Government.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the position taken by my hon. friend the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh), is not a proper one. This is not a Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

private matter; it is a public matter. Here is a sum of public money asked for, to be paid to the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird), and the question is, whether this is too much or too large a grant. Has the hon. gentleman made a charter at a less price, and is the Government paying him more than the cost he has incurred? It is the duty of the Committee to enquire into all the particulars of this transaction, and I think this Committee should demand that the member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird), should make a statement in reference to this matter, and should say whether the accusation made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), is correct or not. Unless this statement is made, unless this Committee is satisfied that this amount is not an unduly large amount, unless this Committee is satisfied that the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird), has not got a contract which enables him to more than pay the expenses of that charter, the Committee will not be justified in voting this money. I want to know what there is about this matter. I want to know from the member for Queen's, N.B., whether he has received more than he ought to have received. We have a right to know all about it. It is not a private matter at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Queen's, N.B., was about to rise. I think the Finance Minister had better allow him to speak, it is not fair to shut him off.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, with all due deference to my hon. friend, when I wish to speak upon a matter which is going through as this is, and of which I have charge, I have a right to speak. I was going to say, if my hon. friend will allow me to do so, that I am surprised at the hon. gentleman, who is a fairly level-headed man, and a man who knows how to do business, taking the position he has with reference to this matter. I think my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island who spoke last took the manly, and honest, and businesslike position. I think my hon. friend has a right to enquire of me and get all the information he can, and I, as representing the Government, who is a party to this contract, must give it to him; but as to what the company pay for their vessels, what they pay for their captains, what they pay for their men, what they pay for any of their belongings—that is not a matter which he, as a member of this House, or as an individual, has a right to demand of those who are carrying on that business. If my hon. friend wants to know whether the Government, in paying \$4,100 for the round trip for a steamer of a certain kind, is paying more than the cost of a steamer charter there is a business way by which he can find it out. He can go into the market and he can find out the prices of charters of vessels of that description, for that kind of work, as they rule at the present time, and he can form his own conclusion as to whether the Government is giving more subsidy than the charter of a vessel will cost. But he has no right to make inquisition into the private affairs of any company, to get his information by force in that way. I am perfectly honest in this statement. Some hon. member on the other side has said this is a questionable undertaking. I am quite willing my hon. friends shall question me or the Government with regard to

this undertaking, in any way they think proper, and the information I have shall be given to them; but I do not think it is proper for them to insist that they shall know the private business of the company with which the Government makes this contract. When my hon. friend stated, with that confidence and certain air of his which almost always precede a statement which has to be taken with a good deal of discount by those who understand him, when he states in that positive and certain way that he knows that the charter—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not say so.

Mr. FOSTER—that he has reliable information—and he has so reliable information that he refuses to take the word of a Minister to contradict it; he has reliable information that we are paying more per trip than is given by this company for the charter of their vessel. Now, I happen to know just what they give for the charter of that vessel.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why do you not say so?

Mr. FOSTER. I will not say so, because it is not my business; it is the private business of the company, and I do not choose to give it away. But I happen to know that my hon. friend is entirely wrong, and on my responsibility as a Minister, I state it. Yet, my hon. friend will not take my statement of the matter; his reliable information is so great, his reliable information is so certain. He knows so definitely without a shadow of doubt of what he is speaking, that he believes we are giving more as a subsidy than the bare charter of the vessel. Now, I say the principle laid down by my hon. friends opposite I do not think is one which business men will consider a proper principle. Are we giving too much for this service? If we are, then censure us for doing it; but if we are not, then let us judge it on its merits.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have before heard statements made by an hon. Minister in the very place occupied by that hon. gentleman, by his predecessor, which we have found to be utterly without foundation in fact. It is no longer than twelve months ago since I, standing in this place, called the attention of this House to a statement by his predecessor by which two or three million dollars were plundered from the people of this country for the benefit of that hon. gentleman and one or two of his friends and constituents in Nova Scotia, by an infamous misstatement as was ever made in any assembly; so that if we do not feel always disposed to accept the statement of a Minister, it is because we have found—though I do not say the hon. gentleman has done it—because we have found statements made on the word and honor of Ministers in the most express terms, which were utterly disproved by the facts stated by their own colleagues within a year or two. However, I will not dwell further on that, except to remind the hon. gentleman that, as a colleague of the very man to whom I allude, he is not entitled to quarrel if we do not put implicit confidence in some of his statements. I come to a much more important matter. The hon. gentleman and his Government have entered into a contract in which the hon. member for Queen's, N.B., is an interested party. Now, Sir, it is possible, if there were only private individuals concerned, that there might be some shadow of justification for the position taken by the hon. gentleman,

though I do not admit it, even then. I say, when a member of this House makes a statement such as my hon. friend the senior member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), has made, the Minister, or any member in this House who has any knowledge of it, is bound to state the facts if he is called upon to state them. We are not here, Sir, to stand on these nice punctilios, when \$85,000 of the people's money is being voted away. We have a right to go to the bottom of this matter. This is a transaction which, on the statements made by the hon. member for Halifax and other gentlemen of experience here, is a questionable transaction, and some of the supporters of the Government admit it is so as regards the probable result. Now, our point is to find out whether the sum which we are asked to vote is out of proportion to the service rendered, and I contend it is a material fact to know what such a vessel as is now employed could be got for—a most material fact in judging whether this subsidy is too large or not. My hon. friend was, I believe, within his right in making the statement he did, he was perfectly within his right in wishing to know what this vessel was really chartered for. That is an important element in deciding whether this vote is a good one.

Mr. BOWELL. Suppose he got it for nothing?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I should object to paying \$49,000 for it, most undoubtedly.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose his grandfather made him a present of it?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. member for Queen's, N.B., whom I see here, will rise and state that his grandfather made him a present of it, that it was a bonanza which he obtained to recompense him for certain persecutions which he suffered in obtaining a seat in this House, I could understand something about it. But I say, under the circumstances, it is material to us to know the facts; we have a right to know what this vessel, and the inferior vessel, be it remembered, a vessel below the quality, below the size that you require—we have a right to know what she is chartered for. I cannot at all admit the principle that when members of this House are concerned in contracts with the Government, they should be allowed to avoid the responsibility, or to avoid giving information on points of this kind.

Mr. BAIRD. It is no great exertion for me to express myself fully and clearly on the question before the Committee. I can say with all honesty and candor, that I have never yet chartered any steamer for a Canadian, West Indian and South American steamship company. The steamer now chartered and on that route was chartered by Mr. Van Wart. After he sought incorporation for his company, he came to me and asked me to become a member of that company. I believe, if I read the law right, I had a right to do so. It was not a matter of my own seeking; it was not a matter of my own particular choice, although much interested in shipping, and although I had a somewhat personal knowledge of shipping. I may say Mr. Van Wart and his associates, having confidence in my knowledge of marine interests, insisted on my joining them in this enterprise. But if I felt that my appearance in that company was an interference with the benefits likely to result from, or with the proper standing of that company, I would rather be aloof from it. I will say

openly and fearlessly that although I appear as an owner of a large amount of the capital stock of this company, freely would I hand it over to any gentleman, or any number of gentlemen, in Canada, who would come forward and take it up with its benefits and its burdens. I have full faith in it. I fully believe it will be a great benefit to Canada, and I believe it will be, in time, a benefit to the company and to the stockholders. I say, as I have said before, that any one who sees fit to enquire into it may do so freely; I have nothing to hide, I have nothing to have hidden. It is well known all over the country that I am identified with shipping, and I am probably the first person that Mr. VanWart would apply to, I having been intimately engaged in shipping interests with him. While I am on my feet, I propose to deal with the question further. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to be opposed to the subsidy, some on principle, and some appear to be more opposed to this particular subsidy than to any other. In their arguments they appear to totally ignore the fact that there has been a complete revolution in the ocean carrying trade of the world; I speak now particularly of the change from wood to steel and iron as a means of construction, and from sail to steam as a means of propulsion. That has changed the ocean trade almost as much as the railway has set aside the stage coach, and it has been brought about almost entirely by means of aid in the form of subsidies. Some hon. gentlemen say there are no precedents or examples of granting subsidies. Let them take the great English-speaking nations, Great Britain and the United States of America. We find that Great Britain has subsidised largely and freely and has granted annual subsidies to some steamship companies, and it appears to have been a part of the policy under which she hoped to gain the control of the ship-building and ocean carrying of the world. She has followed that policy, and it is one which has always marked her course, and the result is quite plain. In trade and commerce she now outrivals the world, and everyone is ready to admit that she has earned the proud reputation of being mistress of the seas. The United States have been referred to to-night. They have steadfastly refused to grant subsidies, and the result is that their foreign trade has been driven from the ocean, and as a marine power they are a mere mendicant among the nations of the world. In discussing the question of subsidies this particular route appears to have been pitched upon by hon. gentlemen opposite, and they have said that the subsidy is not warranted. They have spoken of the trade that has existed between Canada and the Maritime Provinces and the British West India Islands, and, in fact, all the West India Islands. It is clear to my mind that a steamship route cannot be established without Government aid. The great disadvantage encountered by a steamship which has to travel between fixed and given points, when compared with a steamship which has her freedom and the world for her market, is obvious. Here are the two sides of the question. The one ship has to leave port at fixed dates and has to go, passengers or no passengers, cargo or no cargo; Her Majesty's mails are on board and sailing must be made at the appointed time. So it is necessary, in order to build up and develop a route of that kind, to give Government

Mr. BAIRD.

aid. In the other case the steamship goes abroad with the world for her market, and if she arrives at the West Indies and it will not pay to take a return cargo to Canada, she goes to South America or England to get freight. This route has been considered to be the most beneficial to Canada. Our eyes are being turned towards those tropical non-manufacturing countries to the south of us. They require our products, our lumber, coal, hay, oats, fish, potatoes, apples, the products of our factories and our looms, in fact nearly everything we produce. We, in return, require their molasses, sugars, tropical fruits, and other goods most of which now filter to us through the markets of the United States. The Government has, no doubt, been alive to the spirit of rivalry which pervades the different countries of the world and the nations of the earth. They know that we need outlets for our surplus products, that the profits of trade are so very narrow that much depends on the regularity and cheapness of the lines of communication between our home ports and foreign markets, and they have been driven to the irresistible conclusion that a country which does not hold its own lines of communications with foreign ports must ever contend ineffectually with the better equipped and more enterprising countries. Hence the subsidy system comes in. Hon. gentlemen opposite take their position from that of the United States. If there is no precedent in that country, I cannot give them a better one. I have instanced that country, and we there see the result of the policy of the last 100 years. England has pursued her policy, and the result is that she has charge of the world so far as shipping goes, whereas nothing is known of the United States in that regard. We are completely in the hands of the people on the other side of the water. There is not a good ocean-going steamer in Canada or the United States, and all the vessels united into one would not make a good ocean-going steamer. Is that condition undesirable? If we believe so, and if we wish to emerge from our present obscurity, it is necessary to grant subsidies, as other countries have done. What is the example of the United States? She commenced with her present policy nearly a hundred years ago, and has followed it down to the present time. A century ago her marine interests and foreign trade were greater than they are to-day. Then she carried 90 per cent. of her exports and imports, while to-day she carries only a paltry 14 per cent. Now she pays \$200,000,000 annually for carrying her exports and imports. And yet, in the face of these facts, it will be argued here that their's was the wise course, and that the course of Great Britain was unwise. Is it a matter of no concern that the United States are paying annually two hundred millions for carrying her exports and imports, when the marine authorities admit that 77 per cent. of whatever trade is done goes to the nation that does the carrying trade? England has paid large amounts for subsidies. I think it is computed that she has paid \$270,000,000 or upwards during the last century; and yet, although that appears to be a great amount, it can be proved that within the last two years the receipts from her marine interests would wipe out the payment of the total subsidies for a century. Look at the question from that standpoint, and you will begin to understand whether it is wise to keep in the background, whether it is desirable for us to stand as we are and remain inactive or

non-progressive in our marine industry. It may be I am speaking too fully the truth on this subject. However, those are my views and my honest views on the matter. I look upon it not only alone as a trade matter, but as a natural necessity that our marine interests be fostered; I look upon it that the best interests of the Canadian Dominion are interwoven with this question. That our sails should be unfurled to the breeze in every clime, and that the distant markets of the world should be visited by our steamships. We are essentially a maritime people. We have 10,000 or 12,000 miles of sea-coast, studded with magnificent harbors, many other thousand miles of lake shores and inland waters, and many other thousand miles of navigable rivers and arms of the sea, which are capable of bearing a commerce tenfold greater than has ever been found upon them. Are we to sit idly by, and allow this mighty water power to fall into the hands of strangers, as the United States have done? We have got to look on it from one standpoint or another. If we are afraid of these small amounts for subsidies—I say small and insignificant compared with the results obtained from them—then we must keep in the background. Nothing is thought of the country paying millions and hundreds of millions to subsidise railroads to carry the products of the forests, and the fields, and the factories down to the ocean shore. Here it is that navigation comes in to do its work, and to carry these products thousands of miles over the sea. Is it not important for us to see whether this ocean transportation is done under the Canadian or under a foreign flag? I maintain that this is a question of vast importance for us. Here are the four great industries: agriculture, manufactures, commerce and navigation; they are not rivals, they are identified with each other, and they are so completely interwoven that we cannot do injury to the one without injuring the other. If you withhold from your navigation proper encouragement, you have got to take a back seat in the transportation of your commerce over the sea. I say it is just as necessary to subsidise steamships, to enable us to carry Canadian commerce over the world, as that we should subsidise railroads to carry our commerce through the land. But, perhaps, I am diverging a little from the particular question at issue. The hon. member from Halifax (Mr. Jones) spoke of this trade, as an impossibility, and, together with the hon. member from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), complained of this subsidy. I can understand that both these gentlemen who have made fortunes out of the navigation and commerce of the country, and particularly of the trade with the West India Islands, just as the proprietor of the stage coach grumbled when the railroad came along, so do they grumble now. They do not wish to see this trade done by steamships. They had the monopoly almost, in sailing vessels, and they have done well by it. I am glad to know that they have been so prosperous, and that their enterprise and energy has met with success; but I think they ought to be more public spirited, and that they should leave aside their private interest to deal more fairly with a public question of this kind. The hon. gentleman says that this first steamer went out with \$6,000 worth of cargo. I am not prepared to go into that question defini-

tely, but, from my information, I would say that the value of the cargo was nearly double that amount. He speaks of that \$6,000 cargo as having cost the country \$4,000, but he does not for a moment take into consideration that that steamship had to disburse at the city of St. John, something like \$1,500 for labor and coal, and that her provision and supplies cost \$1,100, in all \$2,600. We have also to take into consideration that that steamship was fairly the property of Canadians, and was owned by Canadian stockholders and that her earnings would go to the Canadian people; so that that subsidy has not been utterly lost to the country, as the hon. gentlemen said. The hon. gentleman says that the trade was sufficiently developed. Nearly every man within the sound of my voice knows that we have but little knowledge of the West India Islands, or of the country to the south of us, and they have little knowledge of us. The trade that has been done with the West India Islands in the past was done in a narrow and contracted way, and the markets were kept in a speculative condition. A large amount of products would go to a single island, and if it was reported that the markets were high there, other cargoes were sent to the same island, and a loss probably sustained. If you mailed a letter perhaps it would be six weeks before it would reach the island, and a cable message would cost 75 cents a word. Now, the steamship comes in to equalise this condition of things, and to make known to the merchants of the different islands what products they can obtain in the Dominion of Canada. The representatives of the firms in Canada are now going to the West Indies, and, so far as I am able to report, the representative of a single House, who went in the first steamship of this Canadian company, reports sales to the extent of \$20,000 of manufactured goods from Central Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that does not amount to anything. Well, it was only a mere beginning, and the second ship that sailed almost doubled the cargo of the first steamer. The second steamship was loaded to its utmost extent by the products of Canada, nearly all of them ordered goods already sold in the West India markets, and ready to be delivered by this rapid means of communication. The people everywhere in the Maritime Provinces seem to be anxious for the development of this trade, and though the hon. gentleman may dispute its success, I give him the open challenge that he never saw a steamship enterprise inaugurated which gave better general satisfaction and brighter prospects of success. Some gentlemen appear to regard it in a sneering way that the steamship struck on a coral reef during her voyage, and they prophesied that this would be the end of the company. It is not the end of the company. I do not propose to come to the conclusion that the company will die out in that way, or that the loss of a steamship would drive them to the wall. I trust that is not the material they are made of. Although they may have had difficulty in establishing this route, although they have to visit twelve West India ports, although a long and expensive route of 2,400 miles has to be traversed, yet I think it is already clearly demonstrated that the enterprise can be successfully carried out. Perhaps the amount is too small for the development of the enterprise. Some hon. gentlemen may think that is a strange remark; but I do say that

the amount is too small, considering the extent of the voyage the steamship has to make. When we consider what other countries have paid, when we consider that Great Britain spent £240,000 a year for opening up her West India trade, that the Spanish Government does not hesitate to pay \$4,400 per trip for a line from Havana to New York, making fortnightly trips, it is not too much for Canada to begin with a subsidy of about \$49,000 a year. The United States is doing a very large trade with the West Indies. I think there are 34 steamers running from the port of New York to the different West India Islands, and a large fleet of sailing vessels leaving that port are loaded with products of Canada. There is no doubt in my mind that Canada can produce them more cheaply and in greater abundance than the United States; and if proper encouragement is given, Canada can drive the United States out of that market—there is no doubt about it, and the hon. member for Halifax knows that very well. He knows that the products which the farmers of Canada raise, such as hay, oats, potatoes, horses, sheep, butter, cheese, and all that class of goods, can be produced in Canada at a greater advantage; and with cheap and rapid transportation, we can go there and drive them out. We find it very difficult to force these products into the United States' markets at present; the prices are getting lower, and their duties are against us, with, perhaps, higher duties in the future; so that this West India market is regarded as a happy outlook for the people of Canada, and I trust that they will not be disappointed in their expectation, and that the Government will not be disappointed in the investment they have had the courage to make. Now, we see that our neighbors across the border are discussing this question from every standpoint. Some are proposing subsidies and some bounties; every one who has a Bill before the House acknowledges the fact that from their want of attention to their maritime industries, they have allowed them to be destroyed. But I should say that if the United States can become a maritime power again, Canada has tenfold its advantages. We have the advantage of them in cheaper material and cheaper labor; our men take more naturally to the sea; the Americans, for the last fifteen or twenty years, nursed in the lap of luxury and ease, have begot habits of extravagance; their men do not like the dangers of the sea; while we have on our shores, in large numbers, a class of men who have been reared in the school of adversity, who have learned the rules of economy, who are willing to face the dangers of the sea, who have been hardened by a life of exposure and inured to danger. One of our men is worth ten of theirs in actual service, and one dollar expended in the Dominion of Canada to-day would do more to build up a marine than ten dollars expended in the United States. Now, I will not detain the House any longer. I simply ask them to give this matter the fullest and fairest consideration. Remember that Canada, besides her other industries, has the foundation of maritime greatness, and I ask hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to build on that foundation as far as you can. Encourage it as far as you can by every means in your power—by every lighthouse or beacon or buoy which is necessary to be erected along our shores, by every wise, just and humane

Mr. BAIRD.

law you can enact for the protection of our seamen, and by the gift of every aid, bounty or subsidy you can afford for the encouragement of the ship-builders and ship-owners, who have established themselves on our high seas. I urge you to meet these aspirations of a maritime people, and prepare them as far as you can for the ocean race they have got to run.

Mr. BLAKE. I congratulate the hon. gentleman's county upon having returned to Parliament a member so patriotic and so broad in his views, and so liberal in his notions as to Canadian policy; I congratulate the Government on having such an ardent and enthusiastic supporter of the great National Policy; but, above and beyond all this, I congratulate the hon. gentleman's company on having such an able and earnest advocate of the policy which is to result in the granting of this subsidy to his company. The hon. gentleman said he might be regarded by some people as something of a crank on this subject. If he be, I take leave to say to him that the crank has been very well oiled by his friends in front of him this Session. Not a single revolution of the crank or of the crank's steamboat engines but is produced by the moneys of the Canadian people, to be voted at the hon. gentlemen's instance, and by his assistance. The hon. gentleman was asked a question, which I am told was greatly reprehended—it was said that it was his private business. It was alleged that the whole charter price of the steamboat was less than the whole amount of the subsidy to be voted. The hon. gentleman made an interesting speech; he touched on many topics, but he omitted that; nothing was said on that subject whatever. The common sense aspect of the question, which, perhaps, never forced itself on the hon. gentleman's attention, but which did force itself a little on ours, remains in the same obscurity in that regard, on which he could have given us the best of information, that it was in before he rose.

Mr. BAIRD. I really forgot that.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought so.

Mr. BAIRD. I know it will be a source of satisfaction to the hon. gentleman to learn that the amount paid for the use of the steamers will be nearly double what is received from the Government. The charter, as near as I can recollect—Mr. Van Wart made it and communicated it to me afterwards—was £850 sterling per month for the use of this steamer. Then add to that the steward department, the coal—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How much does the hon. gentleman get per month?

Mr. BAIRD. You must take it altogether, as near as I can give it to you. The trip occupies two months. In regard to these ocean steamers, there are two forms of charter: one is called net, and the other gross. Under the one form, you take the steamship as she is, provided with all that is necessary; under the other form, you furnish the captain and everything that is necessary to work the ship—you take charge of the steward's department, the purser's department, and the hands; and under the arrangement Mr. Van Wart made, I say it costs half as much, almost double what comes from the Government to pay for the use of that steamer. Now, that is as nearly as I can place it, and if any

hon. gentleman wants greater satisfaction let him come to the company and I will, although I am only what is called the marine manager of the concern, and not the business manager of the concern, give him the fullest and most ample information. There is not a thing I wish to conceal from any hon. gentleman, Liberal or Conservative. The whole business is perfectly open, and, if necessary, I will show the whole expenditure of the steamer and all relating to the business. There is nothing that we want to disguise or that we need to be ashamed of. At present, when ocean steamers are in great demand and freights are enormously high, it is absolutely necessary to yield to the demands of their owners, and we have to put as good a steamer on the route as we can get.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman must not suppose that I imagined he was ashamed of this or of anything. Not at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman done anything to be ashamed of?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing to be sneered at.

Mr. BLAKE. Then why should he be ashamed of anything? The hon. gentleman has told us that the charter price was £850, so that it appears the charter price was about the amount of the subsidy. He says it is true there is a difference between the net and the gross charter.

Mr. BAIRD. That is for the month. We only get paid \$4,000 per trip and we pay per month in advance for the steamer; so that two months have to be paid for the one subsidy.

Mr. BLAKE. So that according to the statement the Government pay a little more than half the cost of the charter.

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman in front of me denies it; but the hon. gentleman himself nods assent, and I prefer to accept his statement to that of the hon. member for West York.

Mr. WALLACE. He says about half.

Mr. BLAKE. The result, according to the statement of the hon. member for Queen's, is that the subsidy amounts to one-half the charter price and more, the trip not taking the full two months as I understood it—

Mr. BAIRD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I am right in saying it does not take the two full months, and, therefore, the subsidy represents more than one-half the cost of the charter. Under these circumstances, the public pay more than one-half the total expense of the charter of the vessel. So that I do not think it is very wrong to say that the crank is tolerably well oiled. The hon. gentleman alluded to great examples which were to be followed or shunned by Canada. He alluded to the marked experiences of two great nations with reference to the progress of their marine—Great Britain and the United States; and he told us that the painful decadence of the ocean marine of the neighboring Republic was due to its not having observed proper rules of development. I think he is quite right in that general proposition, but I wholly dissent from him as to the particular facts to which he refers. I am old

enough to remember when the American marine was strong and powerful upon the seas, and strong and powerful, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has alluded to, although, I think, in a wholly mistaken sense—the English mail subsidy policy, or, as he calls it, the policy of protection. Hon. gentlemen who have looked at the discussions in the neighboring Republic, are familiar with the arguments of those who have advocated these subsidies, and what they call the policy of protection for many years, and we know how utterly exaggerated and fallacious their views and arguments are; but I say that the English subsidy policy, such as it is, was far more extensive in early than in later days; and in those early days, the American marine was strong and powerful upon the seas. There was a time in which ninety per cent. of the American products were exported in their own bottoms. There have been changes, of course. They were twofold. There was, in part, the substitution of iron for wood, and of steam for sail, and in part, also, there was a change in the fiscal policy of the Republic. Those natural advantages which at one time the Republic had, when wood was the principal material, became, to some extent, changed and altered in favor of England, as iron became a substitute for wood, and, whatever advantage remained to the Republic, became lost by their high protective system, which rendered it utterly impossible for them to build ships. They can only build ships for their great coasting trade, because they forbid anybody else to compete with them in that,—because they do not allow any vessel under a foreign register, to partake of that trade. But they build no ships for the ocean trade, because they cannot. I believe that, at this moment, the main body of the stock of the Inman line is held in New York and elsewhere on this side of the water; but, of course, the ships are not built in New York, but where they can be best and cheapest built, that is, on the other side of the Atlantic; and though the Inman stock may be owned there, as well as that of any other line, yet they cannot build their own ships and cannot register them under their own flag. That is the condition of things in the United States. The arguments of the hon. gentleman are, to my mind, those of a gentleman who has a very strong feeling in favor of the policy to which he refers, a feeling it is impossible he should not have, seeing he is engaged in this business, not alone in this particular enterprise but in other enterprises of this character. He says the business is susceptible of great development, and he calls upon us all to help it in every way: by surveys, by buoys, by lights, by beacons, by humane and wise laws, and by subsidies, and yet more subsidies. He says his company is not subsidised enough as yet. I hope the Minister of Finance will remember that. He says they are not at all certain that they will be able, without more subsidy, to go on and develop the trade, and further the great and important mission for which they are incorporated, and in virtue of which he has joined them, but they will try and do their best. He says they are not made of such material—and we know that, because do not we see the principal corporator before us, the marine manager—that a trifle like a coral bank, into which the boat may run, will stop them. No, but a leak in the Treasury must subsist or the boat will go down. Let the Treasury leak, and the boat will run, and the coral bank will not

stop them, because a vote of credit will patch up the ship, and the company will be up and doing. I pitied the hon. gentleman for the unfortunate position in which he said in the opening of his speech he was placed. It seems that in this Canada of ours there was one gentleman, a member of Parliament, who was not a free agent. He did not go into this matter voluntarily; he did not seek it, but the company sought him, and persuaded and compelled him. Mr. Van Wart came to him and insisted on his joining the company; and so it was against his will, and by compulsion that he joined the company and took the position of marine manager. He reminded me of another famous character. You recollect, Sir, Mrs. Cluppins, in the famous trial of Bardell and Pickwick, who, being called to testify to a conversation which she heard through a chink in the door, was asked by the counsel: "And so you were listening?" "Not at all, Sir," she replied, "I would scorn the haction; the voices forced themselves on my hear." So it was that the hon. gentleman did not want to join the company, but was forced and compelled by Mr. VanWart into the painful, and disadvantageous, and unprofitable position he occupies to-day.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). It is glorious to have a giant's strength, but it is tyrannous to use it as a giant, and, when I heard an hon. member of the great eminence of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake)—of whom I heard but yesterday one of the most distinguished members of this House say that he regarded him as one of the three or four greatest speakers of our English tongue now living, and I heard that greeted with applause from many members on both sides of this House, though it was not said in this House—throw his whole weight and his whole strength against a young member who has only been here three or four years, I regretted that it was not parliamentary to use such terms as coward and bully on the floor of this House. Why does not the hon. gentleman measure swords with a hale and strong gladiator like himself? I remember that I had not been three days in this Chamber, bashful as a boy from school, when I felt the heavy hand of the hon. gentleman. I desired to rise, and it turned out that the Mace had gone on the table or off the table, I forget which. I was wrong in some point of order, no doubt, but I have nothing to say now in regard to the cowardly sneer which he then indulged in. I do not think it is worthy of that gentleman to pound and pommel young members as he has been in the habit of doing. I remember that the first three members of this House whom he raised his hands to smite after I was here were men who had not been three weeks in the House. I am sorry that I would not be in order if I went on and dealt with him in the personal way in which he has dealt with my young friend from Queen's (Mr. Baird). We know the member for Queen's, in New Brunswick. We know how he came from the country and made his way until the city of St. John is proud of the courage and the success and the business ability which he has brought to the town of his adoption. The hon. gentleman sneered at the hon. member for Queen's, and said it was evident that he could not be ashamed of anything. When history hides in her golden urn the deeds of all of us, small and great,

Mr. BLAKE.

I think the deeds of the hon. member for West Durham, are those of which we ought to be more ashamed than those of any other hon. member. Dowered by the gods with great gifts, has he made a good use of them? Mr. Forster, who used to be a lieutenant of Mr. Gladstone, said that the latter had been able to persuade his friends of many things and himself of anything, and that same gift of self-deception seems to have been the gift of the Liberal leader in this country. I am not going to rake up the events of 1870 and 1885, but, I think, the hon. gentleman should forbear to throw a taunt at any hon. member as being without shame. I will conclude by saying, that there is not one member here, when he has to go before the bar of history, and to be judged there, when the passions of this hour and this year have died out, who has as much reason to ask for forbearance as the hon. member for West Durham; for, in the hour of Canada's greatest trial in 1885, the country remembers that while the member for South Oxford and the old leader of that party like men stood by the cause of law, and will be held, therefore, in perpetual honor, the member for West Durham bowed the knee to Baal.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Of all the speeches to which I have listened since I have been a member of this House, the most extraordinary is that of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, Mr. Weldon (Albert). Unless it was to vent his spite against the honored and trusted leader of this party in the past, I do not know what his object was. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) simply ventured to criticise an item in the Estimates by which some \$85,000 was proposed to be voted towards certain steamships in which a member of this House is largely interested. He questioned whether it was a sound policy to vote that money, whether the expenditure would result in any good to this country, and whether it was not rather a subsidy to that gentleman by the party whom he supports. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) did not dare to take exception to one statement made by that hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake). He did not dare to say that the argument was not a cogent and a convincing argument. He did not say whether he himself, in his better mood, would not vote against such a grant. He did not tell us whether it was honest for us to vote \$85,000 to subsidise steamships, a large amount of which money would go into the pockets of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird). But he turned round, and in language very carefully studied, he sought to insult my hon. friend (Mr. Blake), and made use of expressions which I think, in calmer moments, he will regret. He holds up to our respect the career of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird). Is the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) aware that the member for Queen's came into this House under a subterfuge so disreputable on the part of the returning officer that he was called to the bar to be reprimanded, and was only saved by the slavish vote of the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite? Is he aware that the member for Queen's sat here for twelve months knowing that he had only a vote of the minority in his constituency, and that he pocketed his indemnity when he had no more right to sit here than any messenger who stands at the door? Is he aware that he trampled upon the voice and the vote of

the honest electorate of Queen's county, that he came here under a false return made by a partisan returning officer, and that he kept out Mr. King, who was elected by the people of Queen's, and who was one of the most respectable members who ever sat in this House, and was returned by the honest vote of the people? Is he aware that Mr. King was kept out of this House by a conspiracy which was entered into by the party opposed to him? And the hon. member himself was one of those who recorded their votes in support of that transaction. The hon. member is surprised that any man of honor should dare to refer to transactions which should bring the blush of shame to his own face as well as to that of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird). I do not want to rake up these matters now, but we cannot forget, when taunts of this kind are thrown across the House, and when the hon. member asks if there is anything that he ought to be ashamed of, we cannot forget that that gentleman sat here for twelve months when even his own friends were ashamed to acknowledge him as one with whom they could associate; we cannot forget that so high did public opinion rise in this Dominion that the hon. gentleman had to resign his seat; we cannot forget, furthermore, that the Supreme Court of New Brunswick have stamped with their judicial disapproval the return, which the bought returning officer made, the false return he made to this House—as being a false and illegal return. That hon. gentleman sat here for a year, not only under a return which was false and illegal, but which the Supreme Court, after having the matter fairly argued before them, have pronounced to be such, although it did receive the approval of the high and moral gentleman who assumed that mighty righteous and moral tone here to-night. Now, I will not pursue this matter any further.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on; go on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, I will pursue it this far; the hon. gentleman opposite of me talks about my hon. friend before me (Mr. Blake). It would ill-become me to defend him, he is able to defend himself; but I will say this to the hon. gentleman opposite who threw some aspersions upon his character, that to-day he stands higher in the esteem and in the regard of the good people of Canada whose opinion is worth anything, than any hon. gentleman on that side of the House. I say he has the entire affection, esteem and regard of the members with whom he has worked, and to-day there is hardly a respectable member of the Conservative party who does not entertain for him the very highest feelings, and they do so justly. Who is there in Canada who has made the sacrifices for his country that he has done? Who has given up so much of his time and his talents—

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. member for West York sneers. I would not mention him in a comparison of this kind; it would be derogatory to the whole argument to mention his name. But who is there who has given as much of his time and talents as the hon. member for West Durham has given to his country—given it freely and voluntarily? No one that I know of, and if he enjoys the esteem and respect of those who have followed him politically, if he enjoys the respect of those who are opposed to

him, he only enjoys that which is his due; and to-day, I say, he stands among the peers of the greatest statesmen that Canada has ever produced.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Mr. Chairman—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the House to return to the subject. If the hon. gentleman wants to speak upon the item he can do so.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I had not much to say in reference to the item in my last remarks; but I would crave the indulgence of the House to say a word in reply to the somewhat energetic remarks of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). He is quite wrong. He betrayed—if I am parliamentary in saying so—his customary inaccuracy in choosing to say that I had made any reference to the political career of my hon. friend from Queen's, N.B. I did not mention it; I did not even allude to it. I alluded to his personal career—to his good fortune, to his vigor in conducting his commercial enterprise. I am quite ready to open up the question of the Queen's county case and fight it over again, but I am reminded by the Chairman that it is not in point to do so. I gave a vote four years ago, and I would be very glad to give that vote again to-night—and never in the forum of conscience would I apologise for that vote. I would vote again to-night to say that we should have referred that controversy to the courts. That was the position I took then, and I take the same position now. I do not think the hon. member for West Durham will feel himself very greatly indebted to the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I., for the certificate of character he has received from him. Hardly a word he has said of the hon. member for West Durham which I would not endorse. I know he is held in great esteem by his party; I acknowledge his great abilities, but I did evince my sense of his lack of courage in speaking of the hon. member for Queen's, N. B. (Mr. Baird) in the manner he did, a manner not free from anger, jumping and pounding in so savage a manner as he did. If the hon. member for West Durham were wise he would retain his seat and let one of his dogs of war worry and bait my hon. friend; if he had let his lieutenant from Queen's, P. E. I., render that service we would have had our usual treat, and no one would have complained. For we know that hon. gentleman from Queen's, P. E. I., to be very kindly and worthy by nature. We know he simulates this rhetorical fury, but he does not frighten any one. We saw the pomp with which he stood up, the martial air and the scowling face, but I was not as terrified as I ought to have been. He did not even call out any reciprocal indignation from this side. He cannot even successfully simulate indignation, and we cannot take it seriously, we know him too well. I do think that, perhaps, the hon. member for West Durham in the future will be more kindly remembered by a good many of the members of the House, if he will pick his quarrels with his equals, men of his own age, of his own intellect, his own strength and his own experience.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Now that my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) has relieved himself of a little anxiety, which he seems to have cherished to show his feeling against the member for West Durham, perhaps we might proceed with the subject before the House. I have listened very carefully

to the speeches which have been made in the House on this vote. I listened particularly to the address of the manager of the steamship company, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird); and happening during the course of that lengthy speech to glance at the paper before me, my eye rested on a motion placed on the paper by the member for St. John, for correspondence between this Government and the Governments of the West Indies relating to the extension of our trade. I could not but think that the hon. member for Queen's had arrived at the conclusion that we were not likely to reach that motion this Session, and he took this occasion to give off a speech, which he had prepared for another occasion, and deal with the subject generally in that exhausting manner with which he favored the House. It is quite true he indulged in all kinds of prophecies. He told us that our hon. friend from Lunenburg and myself were making fortunes in the pursuit of West India commerce, and for that reason we were naturally opposed to any interference. Well, I may say to the hon. gentleman that whatever fortune, be it large or small, which my hon. friend and myself have been able to make during the course of fifty years of commercial experience, we made it by our own efforts, by our own brains. We never put our hands into the public chest, as the hon. gentleman is putting his to-night, to benefit himself and his company, at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. If the hon. gentleman would go to work, as we have done, with his vessels, or his steamers, both large and small, and develop trade with the West Indies, or any other part of the world, no man would rejoice in that enterprise and the success of it, more than I should; but when he stands up here to-night to defend a company with which he is associated, which he promoted, of which he is the manager, and which never would have existed but for his political influence with the Government, I say that he is standing in a very difficult position indeed. Why, the hon. gentleman, during a large portion of his speech, told us everything but that which we wanted to know, and he would not tell us that until it was brought to his recollection by my hon. friend, and then he was very unwilling to give it. He appeared to be very frank, and wanted to tell us all; but hon. members will remember how my hon. friend had to drag statements out of him and out of the hon. Finance Minister, who knew all about it. I knew what the *Portia* was receiving. I knew that she got less than the subsidy which was granted there. I knew she was getting less than \$4,000 per month, and I knew by the advertisements which those gentlemen inserted that they expected to make that trip once a month. And, therefore, there would be some additional expense in a small way, but the subsidy which they are deriving from the Government will go largely, if not almost entirely, to pay the whole charter of that steamer. The Committee will notice the care with which the hon. gentleman glossed over the statement made by my hon. friend, that the value of the steamer's cargo was only \$6,000, and that the Government paid \$4,000 to carry that to the market. He pretended not to know, he was not in a position to deny it; it might be so, and it might not be so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No; no.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.)

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman said he was not in a position to say that it was so, and he was not in a position to say it was not so.

Mr. BAIRD. I said I was confident from my recollection that it was more than \$6,000, and I believed it was twice \$6,000; and I think you were not in a position to contradict that statement from your recollection.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is quite right. He said he would not assert it, but he thought it was more than \$6,000; he was pretty confident of it and he was rather inclined to believe it was double that amount. What does that go for? It is a mere bald assertion; the hon. gentleman admitted he did not know. We know the cargo of the steamer, it was a public exposition, and it was not necessary to tell a man of business what the cargo consisted of. The hon. gentleman said in the course of his very lengthy argument that there was a great future in this trade with the West Indies, and there were few members in this House who knew anything about it. In that statement he was probably quite right, and in that category I will class the hon. gentleman himself and my worthy colleague who preceded him in his argument. There never were two speeches delivered in this House, presumably by intelligent men of business, on any business subject, which displayed such a lack of knowledge of the subject, as the speeches delivered by the hon. gentleman and by my hon. colleague to-night. The speech delivered by my hon. colleague was sort of off-hand special pleading. He said it is going to turn out all right, and the people are going to be benefited in that way. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird), in the course of his argument, pointed out how the trade of the United States had fallen off of late years, and how the vast commerce of that country was carried in foreign bottoms. Well, he received his answer from the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). So long as the United States adhered to correct sound fiscal principles and policy, they were able to maintain their supremacy at sea; but the moment they adopted that fiscal policy, which this country in the madness of political feeling has attempted to imitate, that moment the maritime decadence began, until they have reached the position which has just been described. But, after telling this House what a miserable position the commerce of the United States occupied, the hon. gentleman turned round and endeavored to make a case on the other hand, by showing the great advantage of trade in all parts of the world by steamers which had superseded sailing vessels. And then to prove his argument, he told us that from New York alone there were 34 vessels trading with the West Indies. This commerce of the United States which had declined to nothing at all, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman, required 34 steamers to conduct it between New York and the West Indies. He might have stated the number as more than that, because from every port in the United States they have trade with some of the West Indian Islands. They cannot have trade with the Windward West Indies. If the hon. gentleman knew anything about the trade, he would be aware that a steamer was formerly on the route from New York to the

Windward West Indies, the *Barracotta*, and she had to be taken off because she did not pay expenses; but if a paternal government would have given \$4,000 for every trip, as the hon. gentleman is taking out of the taxpayers of this country, the steamer would be running to-day. But if a steamer would not pay between New York and the Windward West Indies, how can we expect a steamer to pay from here? The hon. gentleman has talked of the products of the Maritime Provinces, and of the products they required from the West Indies, and he should know that we cannot, from our position here, attempt to compete with the United States. It would cost more to get the products down to our seaboard than to ship them to the West Indies. In a large market like New York, where they have all the natural products, these goods can be obtained for much less than they can be bought here, and they are, moreover, that class of goods which long usage and long practice has established as being wanted there. But the hon. gentleman says we are going to send the products of our looms and our manufactories. The hon. gentleman should be aware that under our present fiscal policy, the exports of our manufactured goods have fallen off, as was pointed out by my hon. friend near me. It is utterly impossible that the hon. gentleman could not know, if he was familiar with this branch of the subject, and if he was in communication with the West India Islands, as I have been every week of my life during the last forty years, that every article manufactured in Canada can be bought much cheaper, 10 per cent. at least, in the West Indies than they can be bought in Canada to-day. And why so? Because they come from the old world, from a free trade country, and because they are admitted to the West Indies at a very moderate duty. If we have to pay 30 or 40 per cent. on these goods to keep them out of our own markets and enable our manufacturers to live, how can the hon. gentleman expect for one moment that we are going to be able to compete in markets where all the goods enter at the same rate? I have long been engaged in trade with the various islands of the West Indies, and time after time I have sent samples of goods to ascertain if some trade cannot be opened out there, but I found in every case, not in one case but in every case, the prices of goods there were lower than with us. Therefore, those arguments which hon. gentlemen are using to-night are so completely without knowledge—I do not wish to be disrespectful to the hon. gentleman or to my colleague,—but I say without any disrespect to either of them that they do not and cannot possess that knowledge, acquaintance and familiarity with the trade and wants of the West Indies that a man possesses who has been forty years intimately connected with that business. I give it as my deliberate opinion, based on a long business experience, that unless this steamer is subsidised and receives enough money to maintain it, it will not run 12 months. There is nothing in New Brunswick to send to the West Indies, except lumber. Hay will not pay, potatoes will not pay, except at certain seasons, and they have nothing to send from that Province. I am not speaking against St. John; whatever applies to St. John applies to Halifax. The principle of subsidies is as indefensible when applied to Halifax as

it is when applied to St. John, while at Halifax, of course, there is more natural trade. But it is the whole principle I object to, and when my hon. colleague told this Committee that the people of Halifax want this line of steamers, he was speaking for a small political clique with whom he is associated, and through whose influence here he has been able to get this subsidy for a most improper object. I say it is improper, because it is injurious to the city he represents. I again say it is an injurious and unsound policy, and that the hon. gentleman is not wisely acting in the interests of the people of Nova Scotia, the people of Halifax, or the people of this country. The hon. gentleman asked: What do the American fishermen say about the American steamers trading with the West India Islands? Well, the United States Government give no subsidy to these steamers, and if a dozen steamers were to go from Halifax, or St. John, or any part of the Dominion to the West India Islands, on their own merits and without subsidies, it would be a perfectly legitimate undertaking. The hon. Minister of Finance displayed some warmth this afternoon when he was questioned by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) on the subject of the expense of these steamers. Now, I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Davies), and I can quite account for the warmth the Minister of Finance displayed, because of his apparent ignorance of the whole transaction. The hon. gentleman, from the commencement, was not able to tell us what the subsidies were to any one of these lines of steamers which he mentioned. He was not able to tell us what Jamaica was giving to the line from Halifax, or what Bermuda or Turk's Island were giving to these steamers which he subsidised. I say that the hon. Minister did not faithfully discharge his duty, if, in making the contract with these people, he did not demand from them the fullest and most complete account of everything connected with that enterprise. The hon. gentleman should have known what the ordinary expenses of a steamer of that kind would be. He should have known what the company was receiving from other sources, and how much Jamaica, Turks' Island or Bermuda were giving, if they were giving anything, and then the hon. gentleman ought to be in a position to say to this company: "After all these subsidies you do not require more than so much and I will not give you any more." But, in total ignorance of these particulars, as the hon. gentleman has admitted, and in total ignorance of everything relating to the financial part of this enterprise, he enters into a contract with these people, for a very large amount. I repeat, Sir, it does very little credit to his judgment, and less credit to his Government; and I am certain that every succeeding year, the hon. gentleman will find out that public opinion will condemn his conduct in this matter. My hon. colleague (Mr. Kenny) pointed in triumphant terms to the clearances for the Jamaica steamers, and stated that he noticed that my firm generally figured for some shipments. That is quite true, I admit that at once; but my business firm carries on a large business, and if we receive orders to send a large quantity by steamer, we do so and we get paid for it, and I presume that if the order were sent to the hon. gentleman he would do the same.

Mr. KENNY. Certainly.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We never, at any time, on our own account, shipped one dollar's worth by these steamers to the West Indies, and I do not think we ever shall. Under these circumstances, I repeat that this question has not been properly considered by the Minister of Finance. I do not think he has looked at the question in all its bearings, and I believe he has given these steamers an improper subsidy. I believe that neither the Jamaica steamers, nor the Cuba steamers, nor the steamer from St. John, should have one cent of subsidy. I cannot understand upon what principle the hon. gentleman is going to reconcile his sense of duty with such an appropriation of the public funds. He must remember that he is only holding his office for the time being. This is not his money; it is the money of the country which he is putting into the hands of political friends, and not expending for the benefit of the country. The hon. gentleman cannot show that this subsidy is going to increase the trade of the country. If he could point to any prospect of that, he might be right from his point of view, but I do not admit that either. He cannot show that we are going to send any new article to the West Indies which we did not send before, or increased quantities of anything we have been in the habit of sending. I repeat that this is the most indefensible act I have ever known to be done, even by this Government, which is so ready with their money for their political friends.

Mr. FOSTER. Although it is late in the evening, I do not think it is quite right to allow these remarks of my hon. friend, to go without a few words on my part. I do not think the hon. gentleman has treated this subject fairly, and I want to show very briefly to the Committee, in what particulars he has failed to treat it fairly. In the first place he has proceeded upon the assumption, that the Jamaica and the Cuba service was a Halifax service, and that the St. John and Demerara service is a St. John service. I am frank to say that if these three services were simply to be viewed as city services, and for these two cities alone, I should not have given them a subsidy.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is all they are.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman entirely mistakes the spirit which has prompted the Government in asking Parliament to give a vote of money for the opening up of these steamship services. They are for the whole of Canada, and not simply for the city of Halifax or the city of St. John. I can speak for both these services to-day, but in reference more especially to the service between St. John and Demerara, I know that a widespread interest has been taken in it outside of the city of St. John, outside of the Province of New Brunswick, outside of the Province of Quebec, and in the Province of Ontario. The statement that was made to-night, and which I believe to be true, that an agent in the city of Montreal, having gone out on the first trip of this steamer, has made sales of about \$20,000 worth of goods, not only shows the interest that is taken in this enterprise outside the city of St. John, but it also shows the benefit which is accruing, and it seems to prove what my hon. friend (Mr. Jones) was so anxious to have proven, that new trade will be started in that direction which has not been there before.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What were the sales?

Mr. KENNY.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will say what I have to say. The opening of this line of steamship communication to the West Indies has been for the benefit of the whole Dominion.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No.

Mr. FOSTER. It is for the benefit of the whole Dominion, and it will be taken advantage of by the Dominion largely. As the interest at present excited in these routes, and as the traffic which has already commenced shows, the whole of Canada, as well as the Maritime Provinces, is deeply interested in this question. My hon. friend said that we cannot raise anything to send to the West Indies. That is absurd on the face of it. The people of the West Indies have to live, and they must live upon food, a large proportion of which must be raised in a country like ours. The hon. gentleman states that you can buy things more cheaply in the West Indies than you can buy here.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Manufactured goods, I said.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman evidently forgets that in 1888 the United States exported more than \$30,000,000 of goods to the West Indies, and that these goods were of the widest assortment of kind and quality. Those goods, taken kind for kind, are similar to those which the Dominion of Canada produces, and it is fair to presume that if the United States, having as the hon. gentleman argues, the great disadvantage, as compared with Canada, of a protective tariff one-third or two-thirds higher than ours, can go into the West Indies and compete to the extent of \$30,000,000 worth of products in a single year, surely it is possible for Canada also to compete in that market in the very same qualities and kinds of goods, both manufactured and natural products. So that my hon. friend seems to have erred in two particulars—first, in confining this subsidy to merely local services, and, secondly, in denying that Canada has products which may be profitably exchanged with those of the West India Islands. Now, it is not necessary for me to allude to the points my hon. friend has brought up about political influence. I have frankly stated the course taken in the negotiations. Tenders were called for, the best were accepted and the contracts have been granted to the most advantageous tenderers, in the opinion of the Government; political influence, or other influence, did not weigh, one way or the other, as my hon. friend well knows. He says that it did, as he is bound to do, it is his stock-in-trade. Having followed the course of trade, though not to so great an extent as my hon. friend with his wider experience, and feeling the necessity of developing larger markets for the products of this country, I believe that between Canada and those countries there may be built up, by wise policy and prudent effort, a large and profitable business—profitable to us in both ways, of bringing in products which we need for manufacturing and to use, and taking from this country products which they need from us. By this policy we shall be opening up a beneficial trade to the whole country. It will give that which commerce to-day especially requires, regularity and despatch. We may talk about sailing vessels and steamship lines as much as we please, but the whole trend of trade to-day goes to establish the fact that in the competition of this

day you must have steamship lines, and regular and quick methods of transmission, and the country which does not have these will be left behind in the race for commercial wealth and supremacy. I believe, just as was stated in the singularly able and comprehensive speech of my hon. friend from Queen's, New Brunswick (Mr. Baird), that Canada has a great future in the line of her navigation and her commerce and the benefits which will accrue from development in that branch of effort: and I believe that by a wise and judicious method of fostering and opening up these lines of profitable traffic by subsidies—which are to be graded according to the necessities of the service, and which are to be taken off gradually as the lines develop a trade for themselves—Canada will be doing the best for herself as a country and for her future prosperity. My hon. friend says that the commerce has not increased since we have tried this subsidy. The experiment is just being tried.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I did not say that at all.

Mr. FOSTER. The very fact that our commerce with the West Indies and South America is not increasing as rapidly as we could wish is a proof that more should be done than has been done. With the competition that we have to meet with the United States in those markets, we must have equal facilities, sharp, quick and regular communication, and with such, I believe, our country can make a way for herself and hold it in the competition for commercial progress in those southern countries; and, however much our trade may grow in other directions—and I believe it will grow towards the Pacific as well as towards the Atlantic—in my opinion there is to-day no more profitable field for us to enter commercially than that which lies in South America and the West Indies.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman has made a lengthy speech, as did the hon. member for Queen's, New Brunswick (Mr. Baird), before him, upon the possibilities of trade that may exist between Canada and the West Indies. The hon. Minister of Finance tells us that if Canada is going to be a great country in the future, we must develop this trade. No one knows better than the hon. gentleman himself that commerce consists in the interchange of the surplus products of one country with the surplus products of another; and can the hon. gentleman tell me what surplus products we are going to bring back from the West Indies in exchange for the surplus products which we send them? There cannot be commerce without exchange; you may force it in certain ways by subsidies; but he has failed to tell us what trade we are going to develop from the West Indies in order that they may pay for the goods we send to them. That is the first question. The second question is this: He says that he hopes that we may be able to carry the war into Africa and send our manufactures into the West Indies to compete with those from Great Britain and the United States. The hon. gentleman year after year has proclaimed in this House that such is the weakness of the manufacturing industries of Canada that they could not exist, but would be driven to the wall and submerged under the avalanche of goods from the United States if we did not raise our tariff from 17½ per cent. to 30 or 35 per cent.; and will he answer this question—if we cannot compete in our own country with the manufactures of Great

Britain, handicapped, as they are, by the cost of transportation across the Atlantic, and with the manufactures of the United States, handicapped, as they are, by the cost of transportation from the centres of production, how does he expect us to compete with them in the West India market, when, in addition to the cost of the goods here, we have to add the transportation charges to the West Indies? The thing appears so simple to my mind that I cannot understand how the hon. gentleman can delude himself into the belief that we can do anything of the kind. If he thinks that by giving a subsidy of \$75,000 or \$80,000, he is going to reverse the natural laws of trade, he is a much simpler man than I take him to be.

Mr. FOSTER. I have just one observation to make. If the United States in 1888 sent \$30,000,000 worth of goods to the West Indies and brought back \$78,000,000 worth of products, it is equally possible for Canada to find something to bring back.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Does the hon. gentleman know that a very large porportion of the goods the Americans brought back consisted of fruit? If he does not know it, let him ask those in the trade, and he will find that the steamers which are employed in carrying the manufactures of the United States from Boston and New York to the West Indies exchange them for some of the finest fruits in the world, which the West India people want to export, and which New York and Boston want to take.

Mr. EISENHAEUER. As the representative of a country which will be largely affected by the subsidising of these steamers, I should like to say a few words on the question. The hon. member for Queen's, New Brunswick (Mr. Baird) has referred to me as having been connected with this trade, and the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) as having made a fortune out of it. I have been engaged in this West India trade for a number of years. We commenced this business without any Government subsidy, and I have no objection to the hon. gentleman or any one else substituting steamers for sailing vessels if they do it on their merits. If they think this is an enterprise worth going into, why do they not undertake it with their own capital? I certainly think my hon. friend and myself are entitled to more credit than is that hon. gentleman, for when we started our enterprise, we started it with our own capital and not with the capital of the Government. I am quite sure, if the Government attempted to introduce a subsidy in favor of a wholesale dry goods store at Halifax, which would compete with the business of the hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) you would find that hon. gentleman taking a different position from the one he is now taking. Although he is a very warm supporter of the Government, I would not be surprised in that case to see him come over on this side. There is logically no difference between the Government subsidising a line of steamers to compete with private enterprise and subsidising a dry goods store to compete with the junior member for Halifax. The hon. gentleman told us that we had to meet competition from American steamers, but he failed to tell us that not one of these steamers are subsidised by the American Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Many of them receive large subsidies from other Governments.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Very few of them.

Mr. FOSTER. The vessels from New York to the West Indies do.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They do not receive subsidies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I know they do not, for I am a shareholder myself.

Mr. EISENHAUER. The hon. gentleman also said these steamers were subsidised to develop the general trade of Canada. Now, it is well known that the principal trade between Halifax and the West Indies is the fish trade, and that if you put more fish on the West Indian markets than the people can consume, the price must come down, and that is the effect of these Government subsidies. The hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) will bear me out in stating that the result would be as beneficial to the country generally if the steamers did not carry any fish at all, for the country will derive more benefit from the sale of fish carried by sailing vessels than if steamers also are employed in this trade and over-stocking the markets, and thus reducing prices lower than if market was supplied by sailing vessels. The hon. gentleman said that the steamers always had full cargoes. Well, then, so much the worse for the sailing vessels and so much the worse for the price of fish. With regard to what my hon. friend has said as to the low freights benefiting the fishermen, he is altogether mistaken, because when a low freight is offered, as in the case of the *Portia*, which took freight, I am credibly informed as low as 12½ cents a quintal, the shippers were induced to ship more than the market could stand, and the consequence was that the low prices entailed on them a greater loss than they would otherwise have sustained. I cannot carry a quintal of fish to the West Indies at much under 40 cents freight, and if the Government are going to subsidise a company to carry it at 12½ cents they are introducing a very unfair competition, which must eventually drive sailing vessels out of the trade. We will, then, perforce, be compelled to go to the Government, and we will be just as well entitled to subsidies in order to develop this great trade with the West Indies as those who are now receiving them. I have been thinking for some months of procuring a steamer and thus acquiring the right to ask the Government for a subsidy in order to enable me to develop this trade, to the development of which the Minister of Finance assured us there is no limit. I only hope that our friends will be in power by that time. But, speaking seriously, I cannot see how the hon. Minister of Finance can take the view of this matter that he does. He talks about exporting goods to the West Indies, and asks why we do not do so. Surely he has brains enough to know that it will cost more to get these manufactured goods to the seaboard than it costs to bring them from New York to the West Indies, and that is simply the reason why we cannot develop this trade with the West Indies in competition with the United States. It is possible that we might send, to a limited extent, provisions there, but the hon. Finance Minister must see that the population of the West Indies is limited, and that we cannot, therefore, extend our trade beyond the require-

Mr. EISENHAUER.

ments of the people without injury to ourselves. This subsidising of these steamers is most unfair to those who have invested their capital in sailing vessels. I do not think these gentlemen who are subsidised are so anxious to develop the trade of the country as they would fain make us believe. We all know that their object is to put money into their own pockets without risking their own capital, and I do not see why we should give the public money to aid them in that purpose. And the promoter of this enterprise has given the Government a strong hint to-night that the subsidy is too small, so that the Finance Minister need not be surprised if next year he should find the companies asking for \$100,000 instead of the \$85,000 now being given to them. The whole policy of the Government in this respect is wrong. They are opening the door to further demands, for if these steamers succeed in crushing out the sailing vessels, those now engaged in that trade will be compelled to resort to steam, and what will the Government be able to answer when we ask them for aid to develop this trade? In the course of a few years there will be hundreds of thousands of dollars asked for subsidies. I think on the whole this vote should be struck out.

General LAURIE. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), has, to my mind, furnished the best argument that could be furnished in favor of granting this subsidy. He has shown from the trade returns that our trade with the West Indies has been falling off for some years, whilst it has been entirely carried on in sailing vessels.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They have carried all you had to carry.

General LAURIE. I will show the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) later on that he is not quite correct. In matters of this kind, two people have to be consulted in regard to trade—the two who transact the business—we and the West Indies. Two years ago there was a discussion in this House on this subject, and after the Session I sent to everyone holding a prominent position in the West Indies a copy of the discussion which took place and asked for their views in regard to the reason why the trade was not progressing. The answers were almost unanimous. They said: You must keep up with the times, you must have steamers to carry on your trade; if you do not send your trade by Canadian steamers, you must send it by American steamers. That is just what has been going on. We have had two steamers running from Halifax and carrying the trade, which should have gone direct to the West Indies, to New York whence it has gone to the West Indies. When a subsidy has been given for the carrying of that trade, the owners in New York have taken one of their steamers off the line to New York, and have placed it on the line to carry our trade directly to the West Indies, showing that they are aware that their trade would be cut off now that the alteration in the system has been made. Surely, it is better that our trade should go direct to the West Indies from our own ports than that it should go *via* New York. To go further, my correspondents in the West Indies said: You will have first of all to give a subsidy; follow our example in Bermuda; at first we paid tens of thousands of pounds to encourage the establishment of steamship lines from

Bermuda to New York; now, we only pay £500 a year for the carriage of the mails; the lines are self-supporting. I believe that would be the case with our own lines. To say that there was only a comparatively valueless cargo carried by the first steamer is nothing. She was simply the pioneer, and I am informed that she carried down men who were seeking business, and that they are going to bring business, not only to Halifax and St. John—for I do not regard them as being only interested on this matter—but to the manufacturing towns of Canada. I understand that already large orders have been given, and I congratulate the upper Provinces upon that fact, because our seaports are not only the outlets of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but are the outlets of the whole Dominion. I, therefore, think that it is proper that these subsidies should be given, and I am confident that in due time the trade will be developed.

Mr. BAIRD. I would like to say a few words in order to compare notes with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer). In dealing with this matter, they could not refrain from dealing with it from a personal standpoint. They referred to me, they referred to my business standing and their own, and they took credit for the way in which they had prosecuted their own private affairs, and claimed credit for the manner in which they sailed their own vessels and for the manner in which they had generally acted. I agree with them, but I am bold to say to them that I have had as little Government money in my possession as either of them. I have had less. Up to this moment, I have never received, either in the way of office or of subsidy, a single dollar from the Government except the indemnity paid in this Parliament. I think I am just as clear as those gentlemen are, and, although they boast of their honesty, I think, as many men in this country will say, that I have come by the little which I possess as honestly as either of them has. As to the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), who, I am sorry to see, has gone away, I would like to ask him some questions. He is one of those aggressive—one of those doubly aggressive—men that you meet sometimes. I would like to ask him if he is not directly interested in a company which is now seeking for a Government subsidy, and if he is not prepared to take all he can get in the way of a Government subsidy? If it is a crime for me, I suppose it is quite justifiable for him. If this matter is a source of envy to those hon. gentlemen, if they have any courage or would desire to deal with this from a personal standpoint, let them examine the books of the company—I will see that they have the opportunity—and, while we have a subsidy from this Government, we expect more from the islands to the south of us. If, after that examination, you feel that you can make more money than by your own sailing ships, come in and take some of the stock of the company, with all its bonuses and subsidies, rich as it may be in Government boodle, and I am ready to take the outside. If the hon. member for Queen's (P.E.I.), were here, I would ask him if he would do that. I am willing to divest myself of all shares in the company and to do anything in order to remove the envy which seems to exist in the minds of these

hon. gentlemen. Then I will have no hard feelings against them, but, on the contrary, anything I can do to remove their hard feelings and to assist the company, I will be happy to do. Either say that you will except that offer or say that you do not care to take the trouble and the turmoil because you think you can do better with your sailing ships. As to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), I admit the breadth of his knowledge, I have always acknowledged his learning and his eloquence, and, while we differ in principle and in the mode in which these subsidies should be applied and the benefits arising from them, I, nevertheless, have a great admiration for his views. If he wishes in the future to lay on the lash, let him do so, let him do it as hard as he likes. The party have undertaken that process with me, and they have carried it on, I should say, to their full satisfaction. But they have not driven me out yet, and they will never be able to drive me out. If it was a matter of my own choice, my own free will, I would not be in this Parliament; but while that course is pursued I will be here just as long as there is life in me. I think you have had your full swing, your full satisfaction, but if any more is necessary, go on with it, and when you succeed I will give you credit, but if you do not succeed, I will laugh at you to the last day of my life. You may say I did wrong. I have made political mistakes, I made a mistake that I regret. I fell in with political thieves, and I never learned to do good for evil, I did evil for evil, and, perhaps, I was pretty well punished in one sense, but not punished to the extent that hon. gentlemen would like to inflict punishment upon me. I never would be punished to that extent, I want you to understand that fairly; and while I admire the hon. gentleman's learning, there is no one that fears his biting sarcasm less than I do.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Finance somewhat misapprehended my argument in reference to the articles for the West Indies. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he understood me to say that there was nothing we produced here that would suit the West Indies. I certainly made no statement of that kind. What I was trying to show to the House was this: That as respects our natural products for the West Indies, it would cost more to take them to the sea-board and ship them at St. John and Halifax to the West Indies, than they could be sent out from New York, and on that ground we never could expect to have any large trade in our natural products. The observations of the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie), of course, settle the question. I suppose I should not offer any objection after that, for his remarks are conclusive, particularly when the hon. gentleman states so accurately that the *Portia* was taken off the New York route that she might be put on this route. Of course, the hon. gentleman was out of the country, I acquit him of any intention of misrepresentation, but it shows the difficulty of professional men when they attempt to deal with business subjects; and the hon. gentleman fell into one of those errors in which he is likely to fall again, when he speaks upon this subject.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there is one thing that has become pretty clear by the observa-

tions made by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side who are supporting this resolution, and that is, that we cannot reconcile the interests of the owners of sailing vessels with the interests of those who are engaged in running these steamers, supported as they are, by Government subsidies. The short speech that was made by the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) shows the House that he is quite ready to drive sailing vessels to the wall—in fact he thinks the days of sailing vessels have gone by, that their usefulness has gone, and so, if this country is to do a larger business than has been done heretofore, it must do it by taking money out of the public treasury to aid those who desire to become proprietors of steamers that cannot be run at a profit upon fair commercial principles. I can well understand that if this system was persisted in and generally applied, nobody would have anything, because the profits of everybody would be required to sustain the losses of those engaged in various commercial enterprises. The hon. gentlemen who are sitting around me, who are interested in the West India trade, and who are carrying on that trade without calling upon the Government for anything, have made it perfectly plain to everyone on both sides of the House, that this is a warfare waged by hon. gentlemen like the hon. member for Queen's, N.B., upon the proprietors of sailing vessels. My hon. friends near me are not coming here asking us for anything from the public treasury, they are doing, and they are ready to do, a commercial business between Canada and the West India Islands on commercial principles. The Finance Minister is not satisfied to leave this business in the hands of those who are specially interested in it, but he undertakes to turn it from the natural channels in which it would flow if there was non-interference, and to subsidise, at the expense of the whole country, steamers that can only be maintained at the expense of the sailing vessels of the Maritime Provinces. I think that is a most improper policy to pursue. The more this policy is discussed, the more obvious is it that it is indefensible. The Minister of Finance says there is a good time acoming, that Canada has a great future before it; but when we look at the failures connected with every one of these lines of subsidised steamers, I think every one here must be reminded of the story that Sydney Smith tells of his old horse calamity. He was enabled to have the old horse travel all day by fastening a peck of oats some distance before him, and the horse chased the oats. It had its provender before it, and the hon. gentleman tells us, that this country has its future before it.

Mr. FOSTER. Most countries have.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose that its future is before it, but whether that future is going to be any more profitable than the past has been, so far as the hon. gentleman has had anything to do with the past, I think is extremely doubtful. I believe the unprofitable character will attach to these subsidised enterprises in time to come that has attached to them in the past, and this Committee will be wanting in its duty if it does not record its opinion upon the impropriety of these subsidies.

General LAURIE. I must correct the impression which the hon. gentleman drew from my remarks. I certainly did not wish the House to understand that I thought steamers would supersede sailing
Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

vessels. On the contrary, what I said was, that if it were desired to preserve the trade of the West Indies, which is the point we were discussing, and to increase it, we must employ steamers, because sailing vessels have not been able to retain the trade.

Mr. BLAKE. Whatever relevance the suggestive parallel of my hon. friend from Bothwell may have as to the prospects of the country, I think it is very clear that it is extremely inapplicable to the vote before the Committee, because nobody will pretend that the oats are kept at a notable distance from the horse on this occasion. The Finance Minister knows and takes care that these oats find their way where they are intended to go. I hope the digestion of the animal is improved, and that he will get more sleek under the operation. I have no quarrel to make with what the hon. member for Queen's, N.B., has just said, so far as it relates to me; on the contrary, I rather admire the tone and spirit of his last speech, and I admire it most of all because the hon. gentleman did, as I understood him, express some regret for that event to which I alluded in the remarks I had made. I was very glad to hear that expression of regret. It is the first I have heard from the hon. gentleman, and I wish to say that if I had known he had made such an expression of regret before, or if I had heard such an expression from him before, I would not have made the allusion I did make. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has attacked me, and gone over a wide field in general terms in a manner to which I do not intend to respond. I intend to say only, that I have had a seat, with the exception of one Session, in this House since the Dominion of Canada was established. It has been my good or my evil fortune to have taken a somewhat active part in debate during these twenty-three or twenty-four years, and I never have been conscious of any reluctance on my part to meet any hon. gentleman in debate in this House. It has been my part from time to time and at various times to stand opposed in debate to hon. gentlemen opposite, and to take my part, as far as I could, with hon. gentlemen opposite, even with the ablest and best of them. I never felt apprehensive of the hon. gentleman's leaders, not from any consciousness of peculiar powers, but because I do not conceive that hon. members in this House stand in any such sense as the hon. gentleman avers, upon an inequality in debate. I believe that no man in this House need be apprehensive of standing up against any other man when he has honest convictions on any subject to which he has given his best attention, and is stating the conclusions to which his reason and judgment have led him. I do not think any man here, has, during my experience here, in dealing with public questions, had need to be afraid of meeting any other member. I should be sorry to regard the position of members of Parliament as different from what I have stated. I hold myself free to answer the observations of any man at any time and under any circumstances, and I believe the only serious inequality that subsists between one member and another is, not that inequality which may be due to his experience in debate, but that inequality which subsists as to the side he takes and the merits of the arguments he addresses to the House. That is the difference, from my view, in the position which

the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) and hon. gentlemen on the other side occupy in this debate, and the position which hon. members on this side of the House occupy. We differ in opinion on that subject, as the hon. member for Queen's has said; and the great questions involved have been debated for a great while, and I suppose will be debated for a great while longer before their solution is reached. But there ought not to be, and I repudiate for my part, the notion that there is any such inequality between any hon. member on this side of the House and any other hon. member as would render it unfit for any member to stand up and address his observations to those of any other hon. member, as would render it improper for one man to stand up against another; I repudiate the notion that we stand on such an unfortunate footing as regards the dignity and independence of members of Parliament, as has been suggested by the hon. member for Albert. The hon. gentleman has dwelt upon some grievance which he says I have committed against him—I do not know what—at a very early period, and which he seems to have cherished even to this distant day. I cannot express my apologies to the hon. member for Albert, because he has not told, and I really do not know, what the offence was. If I did, I would tender to the hon. gentleman's wounded, and apparently susceptible feelings, the same apology I would have expressed to him at that distant date, if he had communicated to me then this grievance which remains even yet quite unknown to me.

Mr. MARA. I notice that an item for mail communication between New Westminster and Victoria has been dropped. Is it intended to place that amount in the Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. FOSTER. That is an amount which heretofore has been paid for mail service by that route. The Postmaster General, in accordance with an arrangement made last year, is allowing a certain rate out of postal revenue, and that amount will be paid to the vessel. The hon. gentleman and others interested have drawn my attention to the matter, and I think I told them I would take up their case and submit it to my colleagues before the Supplementary Estimates were brought down.

Mr. MARA. I understand that is to be for a direct mail between New Westminster and Victoria?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the way the vessel runs.

Canadian Registration of Shipping..... \$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a very considerable increase here.

Mr. COLBY. The publication of the shipping list is made triennially, and this year the publication will take place.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are a great many complaints amongst people in the Maritime Provinces that copies of the lists cannot be obtained.

Mr. COLBY. I am told they are sent gratuitously to all who ask for them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Some merchants in Charlottetown have written to the Department, but failed to get them. Do I understand there will be no difficulty in getting them?

Mr. COLBY. Yes.

Quebec River Police..... \$12,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I thought it was understood last year that this amount would be omitted from the Estimates.

Mr. COLBY. The amount for the Montreal police, which was included in this item, has been dropped.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I thought it was stated by the Minister last year that the whole item would be dropped.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What are the duties of the police that are retained?

Mr. COLBY. They have to guard the harbor and the river to a very considerable distance to prevent crimping and so on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My recollection is that last year the Minister stated that it was his intention to drop the vote in future years.

Mr. COLBY. But we have made good progress in one year.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) But we have \$12,000 still.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the Minister promised that he would drop the whole item; but he said he would give his attention to it, and seek to reduce it. He may have gone so far as to have said that he intended in time to get rid of half of it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do I understand from the Minister that the item for the Montreal police has been omitted?

Mr. COLBY. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then this is an increase.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has been done with these policemen at Montreal who have been disbanded? Did they receive any pensions?

Mr. COLBY. Mr. St. Ormond, the inspector, was placed on the retired list, with a pension of \$308, and Mr. George Murphy, the chief constable, received a pension of \$269.94. These are the only two who received pensions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did the men receive gratuities?

Mr. COLBY. Nothing as yet; but it may appear in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that he should lay on the Table the actual expenditure on account of Consolidated Revenue up to date, 1st March, as compared with the expenditure last year. This is usually brought down, and is of very great convenience.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall do so.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I trust the placing of an automatic buoy at Black Point, to which I called the attention of the Minister of Marine before he left, will receive consideration.

Mr. COLBY. That is being considered by the Department now.

Mr. LOVITT. There was an appropriation for a light at Helen Wood's Island last year. I wish to ask if the Government intend to build it next season?

Mr. COLBY. There is a difficulty about the title there.

Mr. LOVITT. The Government can get over that difficulty by appropriating the land. I understand there is a piece there that does not belong to the proprietor at all.

Mr. COLBY. That has been the cause of the delay there.

Mr. LOVITT. I know that; but I wanted to know if it was going to be delayed much longer.

Pier and lighthouse in the Lower Traverse River (on account—estimated cost \$100,000)..... \$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How comes this to cost such a large sum of money?

Mr. COLBY. It is a permanent pier in deep water. There is a floating lightship there at present which is liable to float away. This work has been particularly asked for by the Quebec Board of Trade and others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much of this is to go to the pier, and how much to the lighthouse, and what is the depth of the water?

Mr. COLBY. The water is very deep there, and I believe \$80,000 will have to be spent on the pier.

Marine Hospitals and shipwrecked and distressed seamen..... \$49,000

Mr. COLBY. Arrangements have been made which will involve a reduction of the vote for the marine and immigrant hospital at Quebec from \$15,000 to \$5,000.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would suggest that a similar saving could be effected at St. John by pursuing the same policy there.

Mr. COLBY. I think the same policy is being carried out at other places.

Steamboat Inspection..... \$23,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to take this opportunity of referring to the appointment of the new steamboat inspector, Mr. Stevens, who was appointed about two years ago. He is a gentleman eminently well fitted, I believe, for the position, and he discharges his duties with very great care and attention. A number of those who know him and the work he is doing have spoken most highly of his inspection of steamboat boilers. I do not want to say anything disparaging of that gentleman's predecessor, but it is well known that there is no comparison at all between the efficient way in which the work is now done, and the perfunctory manner in which it used to be done, and I have been surprised to hear that the present official does not receive as much salary as his predecessor did. I heard of his inspection of one boiler, and if he devotes the same care and attention to every one that he did to that, he deserves to be very highly complimented; he made a most thorough and efficient inspection, one that satisfied me that when he inspects a boiler, the public can rely upon the work having been thoroughly well done.

Mr. KENNY. I have listened with very great pleasure to the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's. Before this evening I stated that I would have the most implicit confidence in an inspection made by Mr. Stevens. He served as
Mr. Lovitt.

engineer a long time in the Cunard Company and I do not think the Government of Canada has a more loyal and faithful officer. It is a position in which a weak man would be exposed to a great deal of temptation. I am glad to endorse the recommendation of the hon. member. I consider that Mr. Stevens is entitled to more remuneration than he receives at present.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I agree with what the hon. gentleman has said with regard to Mr. Stevens, and in justice to his predecessor I would say, that before the infirmities of his later years, he did his work very efficiently.

Mr. LOVITT. I am glad to endorse what has been said about Mr. Stevens. I had experience with him in Halifax on a disabled steamer and he is a gentleman worthy of every confidence and respect.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know the gentleman, but if he is not getting a large enough salary, and can do better anywhere else, let him go and do it. I do not like to hear hon. members standing up here and talking about efficient officers. I venture to say that he is doing better now than he could do in any other position, and if he is not, he is a fool.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is this to be remembered. The duties are of a most important character, and it is important that they should be efficiently discharged. I do not say that he is not well paid; but I took the opportunity of expressing what I believe to be true, that he devotes more time and attention to his work than any public officer who has come under my notice. I know that his salary is less than that of his predecessor, and his work is done five times as well, and I thought I would call attention to that.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 17th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 122) to prevent the disclosure of official documents and information—(from the Senate.)—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Bergin.)

JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to renew the enquiry which I previously made as to the return in reference to the reports made in regard to the Jesuits' Estates Bill to the Law Officers of the Crown. Some three or four weeks have elapsed since the hon. gentleman promised to bring down the return.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have just laid it on the Table.

Mr. BLAKE. It has been brought down today.

JUDGE'S RESIDENCE IN MONTMAGNY AND BEAUCE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to change the residence of the Judge administering justice in the Districts of Montmagny and Beauce, in accordance with the petitions received from the advocates practising in the said two districts?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not intended to take any action on that subject at present.

I. C. R.—STEEL RAILS.

Mr. LAURIER (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, What quantity of steel rails, or of iron rails, were purchased for the use of the Intercolonial Railway in the fiscal year 1889? Also in the fiscal year 1888? From whom were these rails purchased? Were they bought by tender? If so, were tenders advertised for, and how long?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There were 7,000 tons in the fiscal year 1888-89; and 5,000 tons in the fiscal year 1887-88.

Mr. LAURIER. Of steel rails?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Steel or iron. They were purchased from the Barrow Hematite Steel Company (Limited), and I have no doubt they were all steel. They were bought by tender and contract. Tenders were not advertised for. Circulars inviting tenders were sent to the following manufacturers: West Cumberland Iron and Steel Company, Barrow Hematite Steel Company, Blanford Steel Company, Steel, Peech & Tozer, Charles Cammel & Co., Moss Bay Company, Rhymney Iron Company. Offers are no longer asked of the Ebbw Vale Company, and the Dowlais Company, their rails having proved so bad.

STE. CROIX LIGHT.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. RINFRET) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to provide a floating light in place of the Ste. Croix buoy, located in the St. Lawrence, opposite the Church of Ste. Croix, in the County of Lotbinière, in compliance with certain petitions to that effect?

Mr. COLBY. No decision has yet been come to in regard to providing a floating light in place of the Ste. Croix buoy, but the matter is under the consideration of the Government.

DUNNVILLE DAM—DAMAGES AT LOOMIS CREEK.

Mr. HESSON (for Mr. MONTAGUE) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to refer the claims of the Township Council of North Cayuga township, County of Haldimand, in respect to damages sustained at Loomis Creek on account of the dam at Dunnville, to the Dominion Arbitrators for adjustment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention to refer the claims to the Dominion Arbitrators, but they will be referred to a tribunal which will deal with them in a more speedy form.

RONDEAU POINT.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked, 1st. How much land does the Dominion Government own on the Rondeau Point, County of Kent? 2nd. Has the Government ever had an estimate made of the value of the timber on the said lands? If so, when, by whom, and what was the estimate value thereof? 3rd. When, and to whom has the said timber been sold? And how was the sale conducted—privately, or by public auction? 4th. What was the amount received from the sale thereof?

Mr. DEWDNEY. 1st. The area is 500 acres. 2nd. An estimate was made of the value of the timber at Rondeau Point by the caretaker of the Ordnance lands there, and he represented that as the average size of such timber was small, and as its growth was dense, the growth generally would be greatly promoted if the older trees were cut out. 3rd. The fallen timber was sold in November, 1887, to Mr. John Witherford, by tender; and the standing timber was sold to Mr. T. L. Pardo, under the authority of an Order in Council, in March, 1888. 4th. \$41 was obtained for the fallen timber, and \$500 for the standing timber.

GUARANTEE OF REGISTERED LETTERS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, While the fee for registering letters was largely increased under the "Postal Act" of last Session, the safe transit of such letters with their contents not having been guaranteed to the public, do the Government propose, while they retain this high fee, to guarantee the safe delivery of all money sent by registered letters?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government do not intend to guarantee the safe delivery of all money sent in registered letters.

LITTLE MIMINEGASH HARBOR, P. E. I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether a survey has been made of Little Miminegash Harbor, P. E. I., with a view of deepening the harbor by building a breakwater? If so, has the engineer made a report? Is the report favorable?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A survey was made, the engineer reported, and the amount that he thinks would be required for that work would be \$3,500.

REVISING OFFICER FOR CHAMPLAIN.

Mr. AMYOT asked, What is the name of the present revising officer for the electoral district of Champlain? What is the date of his appointment? Has he resigned his office? If so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. David Trudel was the revising officer there. He resigned his office on the 16th October, 1886, and was re-appointed on the 3rd January, 1887.

MR. ARTHUR PRIEUR.

Mr. NEVEU (Translation) asked: Is Mr. Arthur Prieur, advocate, of Three Rivers, in the employment of this House and what are his duties? Or is he in receipt of any emolument, in any form whatsoever? What amount has he received since he has been so employed as a translator, or otherwise?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am informed that this gentleman is not employed by the Government.

N. W. T.—HOMESTEADS.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the present Minister of the Interior received, previous to the meeting of Parliament, petitions from agricultural societies in the North-West, urging, amongst other things, as follows:—

“That all who took up land subsequent to the 25th May, 1883, and prior to 2nd June, 1886, and have performed, or are performing their homestead duties in conformity with the land laws, are entitled to and should receive a second homestead; that the law anent second homesteads having been repealed is no reason why deserving settlers should be deprived of their guaranteed rights or suffer without receiving a full equivalent. That the parties, if any, who should suffer are the Dominion Government and Parliament, who solemnly enacted the second homestead law and placed it on the Statute-book, thereby pledging the faith of the Dominion to the settler. “We, therefore, respectfully urge that you draw the attention of your colleagues to the fact that many settlers are still deprived of their rights in this respect, and that good faith should be kept with them.”

From how many societies did the hon. Minister receive such petitions? Did the Minister of the Interior bring before his colleagues the subject of acting in accordance with the suggestion of the petitioners as to the right to second homesteads claimed by those settlers who came in between the 25th May, 1883, and the 2nd June, 1886? Has the Government arrived at any decision in the matter? If so, what?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Eight petitions containing the two paragraphs which are above cited, and three petitions of a similar import, making eleven in all, were received. Nine of such petitions were from agricultural societies. The other two were from delegates of settlers near Regina and Calgary, respectively. The present Minister of the Interior submitted the whole question of second homesteads to his colleagues, although it had previously been decided (upon the recommendation of his predecessor, the late Hon. Thomas White, who had given the matter much careful consideration), that the granting of second homesteads was not beneficial to the interests of the whole North-West. The Minister also specially referred the question of the right to second homesteads of those settlers who made entry between the 25th May, 1883, and the 2nd June, 1886, to the Minister of Justice. The decision arrived at by the Government with regard to the whole question of granting second homesteads, is that it is adopted, upon the recommendation of the late Minister. The decision arrived at by the Department of Justice, with regard to the right of the settlers before referred to, to second homesteads, is that they are not entitled to that privilege.

MR. JOSEPH DIONNE.

Mr. DESSAINT (Translation) asked, is Mr. Joseph Dionne, of St. Denis, County of Kamouraska, a permanent employé of the Government? If so, in what Department; what is the nature of his work, and what is his salary.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, I must say that he is not.

Mr. NEVEU.

I. C. R.—FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) asked, Do the Government intend, in view of the statement made by the Minister of Railways that the Intercolonial Railway is now carrying freight from the West to St. John at the same rate as the Canadian Pacific Railway, which line is 280 miles shorter than the Intercolonial, to apply the same rate to Halifax and put the merchants there on the same footing in this respect as those of St. John?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention to make the St. John rates apply to Halifax, but the merchants in Halifax will be put on the same footing as the merchants of St. John, by the Intercolonial Railway competing with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the business of those cities.

MR. P. R. A. BÉLANGER.

Mr. DESSAINT asked, Has Mr. P. R. A. Bélanger, surveyor, of L'Islet, received any money from the Government since 22nd February, 1887? If so, what amount, and for what service?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Bélanger received, for salary, in 1887, for sub-division survey Kootenay District, \$1,090.00, and in 1888, for inspection of surveys, \$1,338.75. He has also received to date on account of salary for road survey No. 2 of 1889, \$523.39.

ARTIFICIAL FERTILISERS.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) moved:

That it is expedient to remove the duty on Artificial Fertilisers and to place them on the Free List.

He said: In moving this resolution I shall have to repeat what I said in the discussion that took place last year upon this question: that I cannot see why the farmers of Canada should not be allowed this relief. One of the reasons urged last year why the duty should not be removed, was the very small amount of fertilisers that had been used in Canada. In studying the history of the use of these fertilisers, I find that it was only in 1842 that artificial fertilisers began to be used, and it was not until 1844 and 1845 that superphosphates were successfully prepared and used as an artificial fertiliser, and all that took place in Great Britain. It has been urged that Canada, being a new country, we have the benefit of a virgin soil, and we have had, as yet, no occasion to make much use of artificial fertilisers. Another reason why the duty should not be removed was given by both the Minister of Finance and the Postmaster General, which was this: We have phosphate mines of extraordinary richness, and we have all the necessary elements in an extraordinary degree for the manufacture of artificial fertilisers. I hold this is an argument that no protection should be given to the manufacturers of artificial fertilisers. We find that the quantity manufactured last year was only a little over 500 tons, so that but very little revenue would be lost. I hold that every possible encouragement ought to be given to the agricultural industry of this country. When we look at the records and examine into the condition of agriculture in the British Islands, as far back as 1820 we find that the Government and the municipal authorities of that country took so much interest in the agricultural industry that manures of every description were allowed to be conveyed

upon the highways all over the country, free of toll. They understood that one of the principal interests of that country was the agricultural interest. To show what is being done in the nations of Europe, allow me to read an extract which I found the other day in one of the newspapers :

"Prince Bismack, replying to an address of the Peasants' Union, promised to continue, as far as his strength will permit, to work in the interest of agriculture, fostering the farming industry by legislation as far as possible, and relieving it from unequal taxation."

Sir, will the Government of Canada take a lesson from Bismarck and remove from the agricultural industry all unequal taxation? I hold that to-day we are suffering to a greater extent than any other class in Canada, and we are getting a smaller amount of assistance, in shape of raw material, than any other class. It is a necessity for the farmers to-day to use all the artificial manure they can possibly find, as well as all the natural manures they can produce, and it is certainly the duty of the Government to give them this relief. We must consider that the use of artificial fertilisers is only experimental so far, and after all the advances that have been made in analysing the soil, it is impossible for any analyst to tell in reality what fertiliser is required on a particular soil, until an experiment has been made. It is true that they can tell the elements that are in the soil, but they cannot tell the amount of any element in the soil that is in a fit condition to be taken up as plant food, so that the use of fertilisers is, after all, only an experiment. I am sorry that we have not more correct returns of the experiments carried on at the Experimental Farm, near Ottawa, which experiments have been conducted at a great cost to the country. I find, in last year's report, that they had been experimenting upon thirty-three varieties of corn, with different kinds of fertilisers. But that is all the information we get from the managers of the Experimental Farm. They have failed to tell us what variety of corn has given the best results, and what variety of fertilisers has been most beneficial when applied to crops on the farm. It is no advantage to the agriculturists to know that the managers of the Experimental Farm have experimented with a certain number of varieties of corn, unless informed as to the variety which has proved most satisfactory. Undoubtedly, every farmer must experiment on his own farm, but it is the duty of the Government to give every possible encouragement to them. We have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the present tariff is a National Policy. If it is part of the National Policy to do nothing to relieve the agricultural community, the sooner the farmers know it the better, and I am convinced that when the farmers know that even this small request that I am now making is refused, they will teach the Government a lesson when they get the opportunity. If we have not to have justice done us, if we have not to obtain any relief under the National Policy, which was announced to be one adopted with the object of fostering and benefiting the agricultural interest, if the farmers are to have nothing but promises, the sooner the farmers know it the better. Our agricultural implements are taxed, our fertilisers are taxed, in fact everything we have to buy is taxed, and yet the Government will not take into consideration even a small measure of relief. I hold that if the Government will not give us justice

and a fair measure of relief in some form, we must come to the conclusion that the agriculturists are selected as a class to which the Government cannot give any consideration or relief.

Mr. FOSTER. I have simply to state, with respect to this motion, as I have been obliged to state in regard to motions of a similar nature moved by other hon. gentlemen, that it is impossible for the Government to discuss this subject in advance of the legislation which they hope to lay before the House in a short time.

Mr. LAURIER. That only justifies what I said a few days ago, that we should have had the Budget brought down long ago, for hon. gentlemen are told again and again that the question submitted cannot be discussed because the Budget speech has not yet been delivered.

Mr. FOSTER. We have, however, got all the information from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. In the interest of the Government, I may be allowed to say a word or two. I do not know what the cause of the delay is, and there is no cause to justify the delay except one, and that is, that we are threatened with retaliatory legislation, or an increase of duties on our agricultural products going into the United States, if we are to believe the American newspapers. It looks very much as if there was some fire where there is so much smoke. If the leader of the House will inform us if there is any foundation for this statement, it will afford some palliation for the delay; otherwise I cannot find any. I hope the First Minister will take the House and the country into his confidence in this respect, and not allow his reputation and that of the Government to be smirched, as the hon. member for West Assiniboia would say, by the unjust charge of unnecessary delay.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should be very glad to take the whole House, or the leader of the third party, into the confidence of the Government—

Mr. MITCHELL. It might be worse than that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—but we would do much worse by taking the whole of the United States into our confidence as well.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then there is some truth in the statement?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so.

Mr. HESSON. There is probably too much importance given by the hon. gentleman who has moved this motion, to the great necessity of fertilisers being admitted free into Canada. There are many members of this House who are interested in the prosperity of the agricultural greatness of Canada. I was led, owing to the notice given by the hon. gentleman of this motion, to make a brief enquiry into the facts as they exist. I was much surprised to find that the total amount of duty paid on artificial fertilisers imported into Ontario last year was \$207.80. I thought I would look further, and I found that the duty paid by the Province of Quebec was \$50.70, or a total for both Provinces of \$258.50. I think we have in this fact clear evidence that the tax is not a burdensome one, and further, that we do not import fertilisers to any great extent.

The subject, however, should be considered seriously by the Government, in view of the fact that we have enormous phosphate deposits in this country, which should be developed in a national sense as well as in a local or provincial sense, and also in the sense of producing a cheaper fertiliser than any we can possibly import, paying the freight, to say nothing of the duty. It must also be remembered that we have the finest salt deposits on the continent, and this is a cheap and valuable manure; and, under these circumstances, it is the duty of the Government to consider the advisability of admitting fertilisers free or not. They should also consider the possibility of producing more cheaply fertilisers at home, which will more than counterbalance the disadvantage arising from the two great Provinces of Ontario and Quebec having to pay yearly \$258.50 duty on imported fertilisers.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I suppose, probably, this is a matter that does not affect the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. But, if the argument he addressed to the House proves anything, it proves that the duty is prohibitive as regards the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, because I find, on looking over the gross imports of fertilisers into the Dominion, that artificial fertilisers of the value of nearly \$13,000 have been imported, showing that while the great Province of Ontario, under existing circumstances, has not imported very largely, whatever burdens the 20 per cent. tax imposes, they must be imposed on our friends in the Maritime Provinces. Is it fair, under these circumstances, that this burden should be imposed on those Provinces? If we have large phosphate deposits in Canada, how is it that we cannot develop them without adopting what are practically prohibitive duties? At the present moment, if I understand the attitude of the Government, they are apprehensive of a retaliatory measure being adopted by our cousins south of the line. Would it not be good policy to extend the hand of friendship and admit their fertilisers and adopt generally a conciliatory policy towards them, and at the same time give our agriculturists an opportunity of obtaining fertilisers where they please? It is perfectly true, that perhaps this imposition is not very much, but everyone who knows the rates at which agricultural products have been selling of late years, knows that 20 per cent. imposed on these fertilisers may be to the farmers, the difference between using these fertilisers at a loss and at a gain. I do not care from what standpoint you look on it, this question, even if some may consider it a trifling question, is a matter worthy the consideration of this Government. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Hesson) was very successful in his illustration about the salt industry, and his statement that salt was an agricultural fertiliser which was easy of access and abundant in this country. Does my hon. friend know the position of the salt industry in Canada, to-day? Is he prepared to say to us, considering the position in which that industry is, that our farmers would be justified in using salt as a fertiliser, or that they are offered that article at such a price as would enable them to use it for that purpose? Everyone who knows anything about the salt industry, knows that just now it is in the hands of a monopoly, and that the remarkable fact prevails, that when we

Mr. HESSON.

get west alongside of the American boundary, where they produce salt on the other side of the river, we find salt selling for 60 cents a barrel over there, while on the Canadian side the same quality is worth \$1.10. Yet my friend has the coolness to say that the Canadian farmers have a fair opportunity of using salt as a fertiliser. If that proves anything, it proves that we should have reciprocity of trade in salt, as well as in other agricultural fertilisers, so as to prevent our farmers being victimised to put money in the pockets of the monopoly. It does seem to me, that the sooner the Government takes in hand the interests of the great consuming population, and pays less attention to benefiting a few monopolies, the better it will be for the country all round. Those monopolies are, perhaps, useful about election times, when they contribute to the party funds, but during all other times of the year, they are drawing largely from the community and giving them no equivalent in return. If we take that illustration of salt alone, it will go to prove that, both in the matter of salt, as well as in other agricultural fertilisers, this Government cannot do better than to approach the Americans and offer them reciprocity in all these commodities in which the farmers are interested.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) has just shown his ignorance of the question with reference to the salt industry. Salt is not a real fertiliser, and when you use it alone you run the risk of injuring the land. It is one of those fertilisers which, to be of any use whatever, requires an extra amount of fertilisers of some other description to be applied along with it. In the County of Huron, where we were accustomed to buy salt at 75 cents per barrel, we now have to pay \$1.25 for it. Three gentlemen have formed themselves into a company, and have bought out all the salt manufacturers in the Province of Ontario; and they are charging the consumers of this county an enormous profit on what they sell. We must consider that the farmers of the Dominion have been ruined almost in growing grain. Take wheat, for instance, and we find that upon raising a fall and spring wheat, the farmers have been losing some hundred thousand dollars a year, during the last five or six years. The export of agricultural products for 1880, 1881, 1882 and 1883 amounted to over \$24,000,000; while in 1889 we only exported to the amount of \$13,000,000, or about \$11,000,000 less than the years I have mentioned. We find that in Ontario 4,610,017 acres are used in growing oats, fall wheat, spring wheat, barley, rye and peas; and if we take a published statement, which was collected from the best agriculturist in Ontario, we find that this grain cost \$15 an acre, on an average, to raise it; while the farmers have only realised, on an average, \$14.26 per acre; showing that there has been a loss of 74 cents per acre upon the 4,610,017 acres under grain crops. It is impossible that the agriculture of the country can be carried on, if every farmer had to pay for the amount of labor expended on his own farm; but on account of most of the farmers of the country having large families, the members of which labor on the farm, they are able, although barely, to make things meet. I hold that if the agriculturists of the Dominion do not get some immediate relief, the day is not far distant

when a very large quantity of the land, even in the fertile Province of Ontario, will not pay for the working. I believe that the extra fertility of the land of Ontario, which we have heard so much about, and the extra yield of both rye, barley and oats, is due not only to the fertility of the land, but as well, to the improved system of farming, and the very large amount of manure used by the farmers. I have a statement, taken from a return, which shows : that while it costs \$16.40 per acre to raise a crop of wheat in the Province of Ontario, in the State of Michigan it only costs \$14.20, and in Dakota \$7.56. The largest part of the excess required to raise a grain crop in the Province of Ontario, is, because of the extra quantity of manure put upon the land. This statement goes to show that there were \$5 per acre spent in applying manure to the land in the Province of Ontario, as compared with \$1.50 per acre in Michigan, and nothing at all for manure in Dakota. Taking even this as a guide, we find that it is of the utmost necessity that the farmers of the Dominion of Canada should get some relief from the Government in removing the duty from fertilisers.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I may say, in reply to hon. gentlemen opposite, that it is a well-known fact that there is no reciprocity between the different States of the Union, in this article of fertilisers. In no State of the Union are fertilisers, manufactured in another State, allowed to be sold unless there is a proper analysis of the fertiliser given by the State which manufactures it. The object of our putting a duty on fertilisers is to prevent the importation of rubbish from the United States, which, if allowed in free of duty, would be of no value whatever to the agriculturists of the country. The very fact that without the aid of these United States fertilisers, so much sought after by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), our produce, per acre, is more than that of the adjoining country, shows that we do not need these fertilisers which are not honestly and properly made in the United States. I understand that a company is now being formed, and will be in operation very soon, which will carry out a suggestion which I had the honor to make in 1883, to the effect that the sulphur product of the Capelton mines in the Eastern Townships, together with the great phosphate deposits of the Ottawa district, should be used for the purpose of making first-class fertilisers in the Dominion of Canada. Sir, this subject of fertilisers is one that cannot be dealt with lightly ; it is one that ought to engage the most serious consideration of this House. To my knowledge, in the county in which I live, fertilisers from Buffalo have been sold to farmers for \$36 per ton, that were not worth \$5 per ton ; and the farmers in that county, at any rate, do not desire to spend hundreds of dollars in experimenting on fertilisers which have not been analysed, or which have been analysed and found to be valueless. A fertiliser is of no value until it has had a proper analysis and its constituent elements are found to be of a proper character. The various States of the Union are extremely careful that no fertiliser is sold to their people that has not been thoroughly analysed, and the value of which has not been made known to the farmers. Therefore,

I do not approve of taking the duty off fertilisers, in order to allow every species of fraudulent stuff which is manufactured in the United States, to be brought into our market, and which, under the law of the State where it is produced, would not be allowed to be put on the market there. Until some other plan is adopted of showing the farmers the value of the fertilisers offered to them, it is right almost to prohibit the importation of this stuff, in the interest of the farmers of this country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have no wish to prolong this debate, particularly after the indication given by the hon. Minister of Finance—although he does not and we cannot expect him to take us into his confidence—that he intends to make some change in the fiscal policy of the Government in the interest of the farmers ; and I hope that the subject of fertilisers will be embraced in any changes which he may see fit to make. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) has urged very strongly the danger of admitting worthless American fertilisers into this country. He tells us that in the United States these fertilisers are not allowed to pass from one State to another until a proper analysis of their constituent elements has been made. Our Government has followed somewhat in the same line, for they do not allow fertilisers to come into this country, and be exposed for sale, until they are analysed by the Government analyst. In regard to that procedure, both the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada have made the tremendous mistake of acting on the supposition that the farmers of both countries are fools. I wish to tell the Government and the hon. member for Welland that both the farmers of the United States and the farmers of Canada have sense enough to find out for themselves, without the intervention of any Government, whether certain fertilisers are suitable to their soils or not. Some time ago I had the honor to read to this House a letter written by Mr. Charles James Fox, of the Township of Delaware, a gentleman who has all his life been a strong Conservative, with regard to his experience in that respect. He says he has bought a fertiliser in New York in preference to anything produced in Canada, because he finds it more efficient for the purpose for which he uses it. So the experience of farmers will soon tell them what fertilisers are most suitable to their soil and most profitable for them to use, without the intervention of the Government at all. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) has objected to this motion, on account of the small amount of duty collected on imported fertilisers. The hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) has effectually disposed of that argument by showing that the tariff is in effect prohibitive. Formerly there was a specific duty of \$6 a ton imposed, and the Government, making what they called a concession, changed the duty to 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, which really amounts to more than \$6 a ton specific duty ; so that the change has been no boon to the farmer, but rather a damage. Again, the hon. member for North Perth asserts that the Government have been doing perfectly right in prohibiting the importation of manures, because their action will tend to develop the phosphate mines of this country, and the enormous salt deposits which we have, especially in the County of Huron. Well, it is refreshing at this

period of the nineteenth century, to see what childlike and bland confidence in his leaders that hon. gentleman exhibits. The Government have laid a prohibitory tax on phosphate and other fertilisers which prevents the farmer from using them, and the hon. gentleman says that is all right. They have laid a prohibitory duty on salt which prevents him from using it as a fertiliser, or makes him pay a ruinous price for it, and the hon. gentleman says this is all right too. It was pointed out, the other night, that the duty on the salt which the Ontario farmer uses as a fertiliser is at least 50 per cent. *ad valorem*, so that the price of that salt to the farmer is increased just one-half. If he uses any other salt, the duty is 42 cents per barrel, and that is added to the cost to those who purchase it. We see how the duty works in this case. It has been stated to-day that a combination has been formed to enhance the price of salt, and it has practically shut out the use of salt altogether as a fertiliser for the farmer. There is not one ton used to-day where there were a hundred tons used formerly; I say that without fear of contradiction. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) referred to the fact that, in her early history, Great Britain encouraged the farmers by throwing tolls off all manure passing along tolled roads. The hon. gentleman ought to have remembered that, in our own enlightened Province of Ontario, we have always done the same thing. While charging tolls on every other sort of traffic, we have made the roads free for the conveyance of manure. The Government have been acting on exactly the opposite principle; instead of encouraging the introduction of manure into the country, as the municipal councils are doing, they have been throwing every obstacle in the way. But I hope the indication given by the hon. Minister of Finance means that they have come to consider the case of the farmer on some just principle, and that we shall have some amelioration at least during the present Session.

Motion negatived on division.

HALL'S HARBOR, N.S.

Mr. BORDEN moved for :

Copies of all reports by engineers who have examined the pier at Hall's Harbor, Nova Scotia, since the year 1882; and for copies of all correspondence relating to said pier.

He said : I wish simply to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the breakwater at this place. In 1884 about 100 feet of this breakwater were carried away, and it has never been rebuilt. I think surveys were made in 1885, again in 1887, and again in 1889. So that, I think, sufficient surveys have been made, and I am sure that the people in the vicinity are likewise satisfied with the surveys; and what they would now like, and what I, on their behalf, desire, is that the Minister, acting on the surveys that have been made, will ask this House to appropriate a sum of money sufficient to rebuild that portion of the breakwater that has been carried away. Owing to this accident, the harbor has become entirely useless. Hall's Harbor is a fishing place, and a good many vessels, both fishing vessels and vessels carrying agricultural products, cordwood, and other things to the United States, have been in the habit of seeking shelter there. Since this

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

accident, the trade of the place has been almost entirely stopped, and I think, if the hon. Minister will look into the matter, he will see the necessity of having this breakwater rebuilt.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to be kind enough to amend his motion, by making it read : "Copies of all reports of the chief engineer of the Department in reference to the examination of the pier."

Mr. BORDEN. I have no objection.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no objection to bringing down the papers, but the hon. gentleman will not expect me to say now whether the work will be done or not.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return of all correspondence, memorials and agreements between the Government and the Temperance Colonisation Company, together with correspondence of settlers, employes and members of the company, relative to the operations of the said company.

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN.

House resumed consideration of proposed motion of Mr. Eisenhauer, declaring the expediency of raising the bounty now allowed fishermen in proportion to the increased bounty allowed the manufacturers of pig iron.

Mr. FLYNN. When the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) moved this resolution, he was immediately followed by the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie), who seemed to fall into an error, or a misconception of the facts, relative to the scope and tenor of this resolution. There is nothing, either in the resolution or the argument used in sustaining it by the hon. member for Lunenburg, to warrant the construction put upon it by the hon. gentleman. My hon. friend from Lunenburg simply showed, in introducing his resolution, that the industry of pig iron, which gave employment in 1888 to 750 men, and the value of whose product was \$337,000, was favored by a bounty of 12 per cent. on the value of the products, while the fishing industry, which gave employment to 61,000 in the year 1888, and the value of whose products was \$17,500,000, was only protected by a bounty paid to the fishermen of about $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. on the value of the products. That was the contention and the view of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer)—the iniquity which existed in the protection afforded to the iron industry, the protection given to pig iron, in proportion to the protection afforded to a much more important industry. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) fell into the same error, and said that there was nothing analogous between the two industries, as stated by the hon. member for Shelburne. I cannot help saying that there is something very singular as between these two hon. gentlemen, who represent constituencies which are largely engaged in fisheries. One hon. gentleman drew the attention of the House to the distinction made by the Government between the great protection which they gave to the pig iron industry, and compared that with the small protection which is given to the fisheries of the country. The inference they would ask us to draw would be that the motion of my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) was of

the same nature; but it is entirely different. Some years ago there was a duty imposed on all fish imported from any country, and there was a duty on Newfoundland fish as well as on other fish. Now Newfoundland fish are free, to the great injury of the Maritime Provinces. If protection is the policy of the Government, the fishing industry is equally entitled to protection with the other industries, and it is more entitled to protection because, while the fiscal policy of the Government affords protection to the manufacturers of this Dominion, the money is taken out of the consumers. It is the consumers who are fleeced to pay for this protection to manufacturers. Even with the bounty which you give to the fishermen, even if you were to increase that bounty, still that will not be taken from the people of these Upper Provinces, because a foreign Government paid \$4,500,000 to this Government for the use of these fisheries, and it is the interest on that amount, and that only, which they claim. Another statement which has been made by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), was when he told the House that the fishermen have been prosperous during the past year in the Province of Nova Scotia. As a proof of that, he quoted the paragraph from the speech of the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia when opening the Legislature. We are accustomed to hear this sort of thing from Governors General and Lieutenant Governors. It is a stereotyped thing. At the opening of a Legislature—whether it be this Parliament or a Local Legislature—we find the statement that the country is prosperous, and that every branch of industry in the country is prosperous. Therefore, I am not surprised that that statement was made by the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia. At the opening of this Legislature about two months ago, His Excellency was pleased to state in the very first paragraph of his speech, that this country was in a prosperous state. But no sooner was this statement made than we found hon. gentlemen stating that for years past there had not existed such deep agricultural depression in the Dominion of Canada as existed now. So much for the coloring given to the condition of affairs by the Speech from the Throne. That statement may have been contained in a speech of the Lieutenant Governor in opening the Legislature of Nova Scotia; but I say that, notwithstanding that statement, he did not speak the truth in reference to the fishermen, and that the condition of the boat fishermen was never worse than it was this fall. But for a very small success in regard to the mackerel fishery, the fishermen would have been in a starving condition, and the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) knows it as well as I do, or even better, because the only place in which assistance was asked for the fishermen was in his own country. He knows very well that the fishermen were on the verge of starvation, unless the relief for which they asked was granted. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman himself was a contributor to that. I state deliberately that the condition of the fishermen has not been worse for several years than it has been for the last two or three years. Some years ago, when the question of granting a bounty was discussed in this House—and the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) referred to that in his speech the other evening—the gentlemen repre-

senting the Maritime Provinces contended that the fishermen alone were entitled to the \$4,500,000 which had been paid to this Government by the American Government; and at that time I had the honor of a seat in this House. Our contention was made on two grounds, at that time. We contended, in the first place, that the privilege granted to the American fishermen who fish within three miles of the shore were territorial rights belonging to the Provinces; and we contended, in the second place, that only one class of people was affected by that provision, namely, the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, and that, therefore, they alone had the right to the interest on this award. But the view which we took on that occasion, of the right of our fishermen to that award, was opposed by the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government and those behind him. My hon. friend, who represented at that time the County of Inverness (Mr. McDonell), moved a resolution asserting that principle, that the Maritime Provinces alone were entitled to that award. He was met by an amendment, which was moved by the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, in which, after a very lengthened speech contending against the principle asserted by the member for Inverness, he insisted that a farmer from Ontario was as much entitled to a share in this award as a fisherman from the Maritime Provinces. When this treaty was negotiated, it was contended by the commissioners representing England and Canada, that the right of Canadian fishermen to fish in American waters, and the admission of fish and fish oil into the American markets, was not equivalent to the rights which the Americans acquired under the Washington Treaty. A Commission was appointed to investigate that question. That Commission sat in 1877 at Halifax, and, as we all know, awarded a sum of five millions and a-half as compensation. At that time the Government of Canada submitted to the arbitrators a large volume of testimony, and the whole, or nearly all, of that testimony went in two directions: in the first place, it went to show conclusively the great and inestimable value of the right to fish within the three marine miles granted to the Americans; and also, the loss sustained by our fishermen by the competition of American fishermen within those limits. It is to be remembered that the award of five millions and a-half was secured as the result of that testimony. Now, if that be the case, who are those citizens of Canada who suffered this damage? Necessarily it was the fishermen, there was no other class in the Dominion who were affected by this concession to the Americans; and therefore they, being the only class affected, I held then, as I hold now, that they were the only class who were justly and honestly entitled to the interest on the whole of that award. A short time afterwards events proved that the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government, wavered in the opinions he entertained in 1878, when the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McDonell) moved a resolution contending that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces alone had the right to the interest of that award. The leader of the Government seemed to have lost faith in the arguments that he put forward then to sustain his views; for we find that in 1882, the Government abandoned the position they had previously taken on this question. We find that

early in the Session of that year the Finance Minister, Sir Leonard Tilley, gave notice of a resolution which he intended to submit to the House, and which read as follows:—

“That it is expedient that an annual grant of \$150,000 be made to aid in the development of the sea fisheries.”

In Committee on that resolution he said:

“It was considered that the interest on the four and a-half millions awarded by the Fishery Commission should be distributed among the fishermen who, under the operation of the treaty, had been compelled to give up to American fishermen the free access to our inshore fisheries.”

During the discussion in Committee he further said:

“The proposition is to reimburse the fishermen of that portion of the Dominion who have had taken from them by the treaty, exclusive privileges which they formerly enjoyed. It is to compensate them for the competition which they are now meeting with from American fishermen.”

Now, this was the contention of myself and my friends who surrounded me at the time when we spoke on this subject. These were the views we put forward. We said to the right hon. gentleman and to his Government: You may, by a strictly technical, or, perhaps, legal construction, if you will, say that this fishery award belongs of right to every portion of the Dominion as well as it does to the Lower Provinces; but we contend that the fishermen of the Lower Provinces are entitled in equity to the interest of that sum. Well, a few short years afterwards we find the right hon. gentleman abandoning the position he held; we find his Finance Minister coming down here and, by the extracts from his speeches which I have read, admitting that the fishermen had suffered by the privileges conceded to the American fishermen, and they alone were entitled to the benefit of this award. The Government acquiesced in those views, and acknowledge the justice of our contention. Now, that being the case, there is no difference of opinion between the right hon. gentleman and those on this side of the House, as regards that matter. He admits that the fishermen were entitled to the interest of that award; but what I complain of, and what the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) complains of, is, that the fishermen never got what they were entitled to. The right hon. gentleman has admitted that they alone were entitled to that benefit; and I say, if that is the case, why not give it to them? They got \$150,000, but the interest on 4½ millions at 4 per cent. would be \$180,000; and in addition, nearly four years had elapsed before this sum was paid to them, so that there was accumulated interest on this sum that hon. gentleman has never recognised, and that he has refused to pay to them. I say they have a right to the accumulated interest during those years; there can be no question of that. The hon. gentleman has admitted that the fishermen have suffered by this concession; his Finance Minister had admitted it by introducing the resolution which I have read; he has admitted that they alone were entitled to the benefit of the award. If those hon. gentlemen admit it, why not pay it to them in full? Surely if they have a right to any part of it, they have a right to the whole of it, and that is the position of the case to which I wish to draw the attention of the right hon. gentleman. He has admitted that this \$150,000 paid as a bounty to the fishermen, is the interest on this award that they were entitled

Mr. FLYNN.

to; why not, then, pay them the full interest from year to year, as a bounty, and not only do that, but pay them the arrears during the nearly four years that had elapsed before he recognised the rights of the fishermen to that bounty? Now, what is the position of these fishermen who are entitled to this bounty? I forget the exact number of boats engaged in the fishery in the Maritime Provinces, but it is a great number. A large portion of the fishermen gain their living exclusively from this industry. The amount they are getting as bounty is a miserable pittance, only three or four dollars a year, while under the fiscal policy of this Government, under the system of protection, they pay ten times that amount. But there is another point to which I wish to call the attention of the Government—and I regret the absence of the Minister of Marine at this moment—that is, the manner in which that bounty is paid. By a regulation of the Department it is necessary that every person engaged in the fishery should fill up a certificate on the 31st December, showing the amount of fish he had caught, in order to enable him to draw the bounty. Now, although that is returned to the Department early in January, by the various officers of the Department throughout the country, it very often happens that the fishermen do not receive this little pittance before the month of June. I cannot see why there should be this great delay in the payment of this bounty; I cannot see why it should not be paid as soon as the returns are all in. That would be the season when the fishermen most require the money, it would be in the winter when they require it most; and I wish to draw this point to the attention of the Finance Minister, who, I am sorry to say, is absent, in order that he may devise some means by which this bounty should be paid to the fishermen at an earlier period of the year. I hope the views and arguments I have put forth in regard to the interest on the award, will receive attention from the Government, and that they will admit that if the fishermen of the Lower Provinces are entitled to any portion of the interest, they are entitled to the whole of it; as I do not think it can be denied that they are entitled to the full interest of the 4½ millions every year, and they are also entitled to the accumulated interest for the three or four years in arrears.

Mr. KENNY. I was not in my place when this debate was renewed, and I presume I may resume my remarks at the point where I was interrupted on Wednesday last. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat referred to the statements which I made in reference to the condition of the fishermen of my native Province during the past year, and he took exception to the manner in which I brought to the notice of the House the reference which had been made to the condition of our fisheries in the Speech of the Lieutenant Governor in opening the Nova Scotia Legislature. The hon. gentleman said that such a paragraph may have appeared in the Speech of the Lieutenant Governor. Perhaps the House will permit me to read, for the information of hon. members, and especially the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), the statement of the Lieutenant Governor to which I referred. It is as follows:—

“I rejoice that I am able to congratulate you on the large measure of prosperity that our Province has enjoyed

during the past year. Our fishermen in some localities did not share in that prosperity as fully as other classes, but good prices in some degree compensated for short catch."

The hon. gentleman for Richmond, if he compares that statement with the remark I made, will, I think, realise that I did not at all exaggerate the statement made by the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia. But if he is not satisfied with that—

Mr. FLYNN. I did not say you exaggerated.

Mr. KENNY. Permit me to refer the hon. member to the speech which was delivered in the Local Legislature by Mr. Roche, the representative of the city of Halifax in that Assembly, when he proposed the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Roche then said :

"We can congratulate ourselves that, notwithstanding some drawbacks, the Province has enjoyed a condition of prosperity."

In another part of his speech he said :

"The labors of the fishermen, as the result of enhanced prices and extraordinary catches in some parts of the country, have been on the whole advantageous and profitable. Regret has to be expressed that there was not an equal distribution of this success in all localities, and it is also to be regretted that some districts, which are largely, if not wholly dependent on the fisheries, have felt the pressure of wants owing to the scarcity of fish, but on the whole the result is successful."

I think my hon. friend, who is, perhaps, even more familiar than I am with the fishing industry of Nova Scotia, will recognise that Mr. Roche's speech represents very fairly and fully the condition of the fisheries in our native Province, and certainly coincides exactly with what has come to my knowledge of the condition of the fishermen. So much for that point.

Mr. FLYNN. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is it not a fact that the fishermen in the hon. gentleman's own county are in distress, and is it not a fact they have applied for relief?

Mr. KENNY. That was certainly within the knowledge of Mr. Roche, as well as within my knowledge and within the knowledge of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), and Mr. Roche specially refers to it; and I was certainly cognisant of its existence, and in my own remarks I stated there were exceptions to that general condition of prosperity, and a notable one was my own county. But to resume. I submitted some figures to the House at the close of my remarks on Wednesday evening which, I think, show from the statistics which are now in the blue books, that a fair measure of prosperity prevails among our fishermen. I remember that an hon. gentleman opposite, I think the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk), called attention to the fact that the number of fishing vessels had decreased from 1879 to 1888; that in 1879 there were 749 vessels engaged in the fisheries in Nova Scotia, and in 1888 only 690 vessels; and the hon. gentleman went on to argue that the bounty had been a failure, inasmuch as it had not resulted in increasing the number of vessels engaged in that industry in our Province. But if the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to look at the tonnage of those vessels, he would have found that in 1879 the tonnage was 28,916 tons, while in 1888 it was 29,125 tons. So that, while it is true there is a decrease in the number of vessels engaged, there is an increase in the tonnage of the vessels. He would

also have found that in 1879 there were 27,616 men employed on vessels and boats, and the number in 1888 had increased to 28,107. He would have also found that the boat fishery, which I quite agree with the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) has very largely been a failure during the last year, has proportionately increased. In 1879 there were 10,706 boats; in 1888, 13,415 boats employed. But what is still more notable is the comparison which I instituted on Wednesday last between the value of the product of the fisheries of Nova Scotia in 1879 and 1888. In 1879 the total value of the fisheries of Nova Scotia was \$5,700,000, and in 1888 it had increased to \$7,800,000, or an average of 30 per cent. That statement, I think, must be gratifying to every gentleman from our Province and to all who take an interest in the fisheries. I do not for a moment contend that this increase in our fisheries is due entirely to the bounty, but I do say that it has contributed to secure the development of our fisheries. Referring again to the resolution of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), I say, notwithstanding the opinion to the contrary which has been expressed by my hon. friend for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), that, inferentially at least, it may be construed into a desire to place the fishing bounty in the same position as the bounty on pig iron. The bounty on pig iron is, as we all know, transient and will expire in 1892, and I am sure the hon. member for Lunenburg would be very sorry to see the bounty given to the fishermen expire in 1892; and I do not think it is wise for us, in view of possible future legislation, to endeavor to establish an analogy between the two bounties. It is not in the interests of the fishermen that any attempt should be made to place them on the same plane. I may here remark in regard to the bounty on pig iron, that I voted for it. I thought it would have the same effect in developing the great iron industry of this country as the bounty on fish exercised in developing the fishing industry. I thought that, under a system of bounties, the minerals concealed in the bowels of the earth would be extracted and add to our national wealth, and we would thus be able to draw our mineral wealth from the bowels of the earth as our fishermen, under the bounty, drew their wealth from the depths of the sea. I voted for it, also, because I believed it would add to the number of men employed in Canada in that industry, and to the number employed in our coal mines, and, to that extent, would increase the home market for our fishermen, which is always the best market, by increasing the demand for fresh fish. It is true, as the resolution recites, and it is a pity it is true, that when our fish goes to the United States it is met by a high rate of duty. But my hon. friend who has just taken his seat proclaimed in this House some years ago that the duty was paid alone by the Americans. And not only that, but the hon. member (Mr. Eisenhauer) and the party who sit around, also voted against the Washington Treaty, which gave our fish free admission into the United States; so I must leave it to my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) to reconcile the very inconsistent positions taken by those with whom he is politically associated. I am quite aware that all the opposite party did not vote against the Washington Treaty, but a large number did, and there are some of the gen-

tllemen who did so, here now to explain their position in that matter. The same gentlemen who voted against that Washington Treaty, by which our fish was to be admitted into the United States free of duty, are now attempting to persuade our fishermen that they cannot live without the American market. The resolution of the hon. gentleman also refers to the tariff to which our fish is subjected to in the West Indies. The hon. gentleman must know that our fish in the West Indies, pays exactly the same duty as fish from the United States or elsewhere. I think I am correct in stating that. Our competitors in these markets are the Americans and hon. gentlemen are aware that for some time past, a commission of the Senate of the United States has been taking evidence as to the trade relations between Canada and the United States; and during the course of its investigations meetings were held in Boston, before which several Gloucester fishermen gave their evidence. The complaint of these American fishermen was, that they could not compete with the lighter taxed Canadian fishermen. My hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Flynn) complains of the heavy taxes to which our fishermen are subjected. I recognise that they have to pay their full share of the taxes, as other classes of the population have, but I do say that they are not as heavily taxed as are their American competitors; and if my hon. friend wants further proof on that, I refer him to the evidence which was submitted by the Gloucester fishermen before the United States Senate Commission. These American fishermen complained then that they could not compete with the lighter taxed Canadian fishermen, whose vessels were more cheaply built and more economically equipped. My hon. friend knows too, as regards the tariff to which my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) referred, that in the United States the duty on fish-hooks is something like 45 per cent., and the duty on nets, lines, and twines from 25 to 30 per cent., whereas in Canada these articles are free of duty. I am not going to refer at any length to the advantages which steam communication with the West Indies offers for transporting our Canadian exports, because that matter was fully threshed out on the memorable night of Friday last. In 1887, the first Session I was here, I brought the matter of subsidising steamers to the West Indies Islands to the attention of the House. I did so, in 1888 again, and finally, in 1889, I succeeded in getting some recognition for a steam service with the West Indies, so as to place our exporters on the same footing as the American exporters. I wonder why my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) did not bring the fishery bounty earlier to the attention of the House. He might have brought it up in 1888 or 1889. Why did he wait till 1890? I warn my hon. friend that it is quite possible that some uncharitable people may imagine that this motion has made its appearance in 1890, because we are on the eve of a local election in the Province of Nova Scotia. The scheme which I proposed to help the fishermen, by establishing steamers between Canada and the West Indies, was a feasible and practical one, whereas my hon. friend brings forward, at this comparatively late date, a scheme which, I believe, neither the House nor the Government will consider desirable. Again, Sir, I find that last year

Mr. KENNY.

or the year before, my hon. friend from Shelburne (General Laurie) called the attention of the House to the Customs regulations in reference to fish imported from the Island of St. Pierre, and which received a bounty of 10 francs a quintal. The hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) complained then that the importation of this French fish affected injuriously the fishermen of Nova Scotia. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) gave that measure of the hon. member for Shelburne a half-hearted support, and my hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Jones) opposed it. It is true I must admit that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) stood alone in that contention, but even my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) did not seem to be very earnest in his desire to have any change in that respect made by the Minister of Customs. In my opinion these Customs regulations were very unjust to our fishermen, and great thanks are due by the fishermen to my hon. and gallant friend from Shelburne (General Laurie) for having them rectified. I mention these facts to show that, as regards the fishermen of Nova Scotia, the members of this House cannot have the slightest misgiving in following the recommendation laid down by my hon. friend from Lunenburg, who stated that he was not going to press this matter, but simply to leave it in the hands of the Government to be dealt with. I say we need not have any misgivings in that respect, for the Government of my hon. friend the First Minister has always recognised the importance of this fishing industry and has always shown a desire to ameliorate the condition of our fishermen. The very fact that the Government has granted this steamship subsidy to the West Indies, the fact that they changed the Customs regulations with reference to French fish from the Island of St. Pierre, and more recently, the fact of their sending a Commission to England, Scotland and Holland, to investigate into the matter of catching and curing herring, an industry in which our people are much interested, shows the desire of the Government to do everything in its power to develop our fishing industry. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) in his opening remarks, referred to the so-called National Policy and the tariff of 1878. He contended that the National Policy bore unevenly on the fishermen, and, by way of illustration, he instituted a comparison between the tariff of 1878 and the present tariff—

Mr. EISENHAUER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not say that it bore unequally on the fishermen. I said it bore on the fishermen equally with all the other classes of the community.

Mr. KENNY—and, therefore, to some extent they suffered from the change; that was the inference, I think, fairly to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's remarks. If the hon. gentleman had told us that the fishermen were paying any more for their tea than they paid in 1878, or any more for any article of food or clothing which they consume, or that they are not as well housed as they were in 1878, or that their children are not as well educated and provided for, or that they do not share in the general prosperity of Canada in common with all others, then I might think there was something in his contention. The National Policy

has, at all events, succeeded in keeping in Canada a number of people, who, but for it would be working in the United States, and who, instead of being customers for our fishermen, would be customers for the Gloucester fishermen. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) shakes his head, but I can assure him that there are a number of people in our Province employed in cotton mills, woollen mills and sugar refineries, who, in 1878 were not so employed, and consequently did not want any fish from the Nova Scotia fishermen. But I cannot understand why my hon. friend should have instituted this comparison between the two tariffs, or why he should have brought the National Policy into the discussion of a resolution of this kind. I think my hon. friend is running a very great risk of introducing Dominion issues into the approaching local elections. Of course, I recognise that my hon. friend is actuated by the most praiseworthy motives in calling the attention of the Government to this matter. But I dare say that hon. gentlemen may find in this resolution a text on which may be preached political sermons throughout the fishing counties of Nova Scotia during the coming local election. He must remember that the repeal cry is dead and buried. The vote of 1887 disposed of that, and some new cry will have to be raised, and it is possible this resolution may be made to do work, which the hon. member for Lunenburg did not intend it to do, in the Province of Nova Scotia during the coming elections, and my hon. friend, perhaps, may be accused, as Sir Leonard Tilley was, when he introduced the bounty resolutions of flying an election kite. Since this question was discussed here on Wednesday last, I have received a newspaper from Nova Scotia, pointing out the fact that a member of the Local Legislature, who is in the political camp of my hon. friends opposite, moved that these elections should not take place for six months, in order that the fishermen might have time to return from the banks and vote. I express no opinion on the action taken by that member of the Local Legislature. To do so is not my mission here. He had a perfect right to do so, if he thought it was in the interests of Nova Scotia, or of those he represented; but the action taken in the Local Legislature of that Province is singularly confirmatory of the statement I made on Wednesday to the House, that it was the intention, if possible, to postpone these elections until the fishermen got back. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) referred to some of the debates which had taken place in past years in this House in reference to the fishery awards, and the bounty resolutions subsequently introduced by Sir Leonard Tilley. I am very much afraid that if the party opposite had remained in power, there would have been no discussion to-day about fishing bounties, because it seems to me the doctrine was pretty well laid down by those hon. gentlemen, that the money received from the Halifax award was not to be used for any territorial or exceptional purpose. The bounty money, it is quite true, did not go into the Treasury of Canada until after the general elections of 1878, when hon. gentlemen opposite were defeated; but if hon. gentlemen opposite had been very zealous in the interests of the fishermen, they would have made some provision before they left office, or have given some indication of their desire to use some portion

of that money for the benefit of the fishermen. On the contrary, so far as I can find, their intention, as recorded, was to the effect, that this money was to go into the Treasury of the Dominion, to meet national obligations, so that the fishermen would never have heard of this bounty had they remained in power. With many of the remarks which fell from hon. gentlemen opposite, I cordially agree. I believe that the system of purse-seining, as it is conducted now, is most injurious to our fisheries, and if persevered in would almost destroy them. On a previous occasion, I mentioned that that was a matter which Canada cannot control, but that it was worthy of consideration, and should be made the subject of international agreement. As long as the American fishermen continue to fish in that manner, our fishermen, in self-defence, must do the same. I think it would be eminently in the interests of Canada if, when the fishery questions are under consideration between the two countries, some efforts were made to stop purse-seining. As regards the lobster fisheries, I know that on the south shore of Nova Scotia at least the men who are engaged in it are most anxious for a short extension of the time. Owing to the hardships they experience, they are unable to fish, on an average, more than three days a week, and as they have to cast their hand-traps from 15 to 20 feet from the ledges of the rocks, against the heavy breakers, from which there is absolutely no protection, thus effectually preventing the use of boats, the loss of time is thus very great; and I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is honestly desirous to do all that he can to ameliorate the condition of the fishermen, and develop the fishing industry generally, will take into consideration the advisability of extending the time for the prosecution of the lobster fishery on the south shore. My hon. friend from Lunenburg, in introducing his resolution, referred to the effect of the duty to which our fish is subjected and to the fact that Newfoundland fish come in free. I quite recognise that, whilst there may be some countervailing national advantages, so far as our fishermen are concerned, they labor in that respect under a disadvantage, and they also labor under other disadvantages in connection with the regulations of Newfoundland, to which it may be well now publicly, as no other opportunity may readily offer, to call the attention of the House. I refer to the manner in which the herring fishery is conducted on the French coast of Newfoundland. There are about one hundred Canadian fishing vessels engaged in that fishery; and I find that when they go there to prosecute that industry, the Newfoundland Customs officials demand from them a duty of 20 per cent. a ton on all the salt on their vessels, and of 45 per cent. on oil casks and 20 per cent. on empty barrels, although none of those articles are landed in Newfoundland except to be repacked and taken away in those casks or barrels. Our Canadian fishermen are charged a duty on the casks or barrels, although these are immediately carried back to Canada. The average tax upon a Canadian fishing schooner is about \$40, and yet the Newfoundland people, who exact this tax, compete on the Canadian coast with our own fishermen without paying any duty at all. Last year, a fleet of fully one hundred Newfoundland vessels were on the Canadian coast, competing on exactly the same terms as

our Canadian fishermen. This should be represented to the Government of Newfoundland, and some effort made to relieve our fishermen from the Customs taxation to which they are subjected on the French coast of Newfoundland. I suppose that the Newfoundland Government has some authority to collect these duties, but I was really under the impression until these facts were brought to my notice, that the French coast was free to all Canadian fishermen. My hon. friend from Lunenburg has intimated that it is not his desire to press this matter to a division, and that he is satisfied to leave it in the hands of Government, having made the statement and brought to the notice of the Government his views of this question and the condition of our fishermen generally. I agree with the hon. member for Lunenburg that, inasmuch as these fishing regulations were made many years ago, and changes have occurred in the fishing industry as in other industries, it may be advisable to revise them, and I also agree with him that we may, judging from the manner in which the Government has always dealt with the fishery industry, and from its desire to promote the welfare of the fishermen, leave the matter in their hands.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The motion of my hon. friend from Lunenburg has provoked a long discussion and a very lengthy speech from my hon. colleague (Mr. Kenny), but I was careful to observe that, while he travelled over a large extent of ground, he took very good care not to commit himself one way or the other. He has a very happy faculty, sometimes, of delivering a speech which may be interpreted according to the circumstances, and according to where it is delivered and where it is to be read. That is one of those happy faculties politicians can sometimes acquire, and I must do my hon. friend the credit that he has acquired it in very short time. The proposal of the hon. member for Lunenburg simply asks that the bounty be increased, inasmuch as, owing to the increased burdens of the fishermen, they are not in as good a position now as they were in 1878. The hon. gentleman would have no difficulty in establishing that fact before any body of business men. We know that the duties are largely increased. The duty on cordage alone has been increased 25 per cent. The duties on iron and everything else have been increased. We do not require to be told that the cost of living is much greater now than it was in 1878, but my hon. friend was kind enough to say that the fishermen have not been laboring under any disadvantage in this respect. I could not give a better illustration of the strength of his whole argument than by referring to one statement of the hon. gentleman. He said the Americans were our only competitors in the West Indies in fish shipments. When I inform the House that Americans do not ship fish to the West Indies, that they are not our competitors, directly or indirectly, and that they seldom shipped any fish there at any time, the House will be able to estimate the full value of the argument which the hon. gentleman has been forcing on Parliament so eloquently to-day. The hon. gentleman laid great stress on the action of myself and others with reference to the Washington Treaty. He was not in the House at the time and cannot be aware of the discussion on which the whole transaction was

Mr. KENNY.

based. He cannot be aware that his present leader, during the discussion of the treaty at Washington, refused offers from the American Government which were of the highest possible importance. He refused coal and lumber, at one time, which was offered free admission by the American Government in addition to our fisheries, because he could not get grain and the products of the west; and the Americans then withdrew their offer. That was the ground he took with reference to that treaty. If my hon. friend had been aware of that circumstance, with his great regard to the coal interest of Nova Scotia, perhaps he would not have been so ready to condemn those who voted against the treaty then. I never regretted my vote on that occasion. The people of Halifax and the people of Nova Scotia generally approved of it, because I was dealing with the whole question—with our interests in coal and lumber as well as fish. The hon. gentleman then took exception to the fact that we did not grant this bounty when we were in power. How could we have granted a bounty during the Session of 1878, when the award was not made until August or September following?

Mr. KENNY. The award was made in 1877.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But the payment was not. Therefore, the Government could not deal with the matter. Again, the hon. gentleman the other day endeavored to create the impression that on this side we were opposed to the bounty. He says:

"Let us see how Sir Leonard Tilley was met when he introduced that measure in 1882. I do not know that my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) has taken the trouble to read that debate. If he has, he must have found that it was insinuated by hon. gentlemen opposite, first of all, that the money never would be paid to our fishermen; secondly, that possibly it might be paid for one year and then the payment would cease."

Then he says:

"Now, Sir, it is a fact that the proposal has never been assailed by hon. gentlemen on this side, but I regret that it did not meet with such fair play from hon. gentlemen opposite, as a reference to the debates to which I have referred will show."

What were the facts? Sir Leonard Tilley brought down the proposal for this in the ordinary Estimates, simply as a trial. He was not aware whether it would work well or not, and he brought it down as an experiment. What was the result? My hon. friend who led the Opposition at that time, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), said that, if this vote was to be of any benefit to the fishermen, it should be made permanent by the introduction of a Bill; and afterwards it was made permanent in that way, at the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, and not at the suggestion of the Government. The hon. gentleman should be familiar with that fact, when he seeks to place on hon. gentlemen on this side of the House the responsibility for any desire to prevent this bounty being paid. The hon. gentleman says that our fishermen are all prosperous. I do not think it is worth while for any one to assert either that they are very prosperous or that they are very badly off. In some parts of the Province, I am sorry to say, they are not well off. In Lunenburg, where they have adopted new modes of fishing, they are fairly well off, but in the County of Halifax, where they have largely abandoned shore fishing for lobster fishing, they have altogether fallen back. Formerly

we had large receipts from Cape Breton, and now our receipts are comparatively nothing, and, therefore, with the exception of Lunenburg, the rest of Nova Scotia is not prosperous. Certainly Halifax County is not, nor are the counties of Guysborough, Cape Breton, Queen's, Shelburne and Yarmouth. I mention this simply to show that this industry requires all the support which we can give it. The hon. gentleman has already referred to the lobster fishery. I do not desire to make any political capital out of that question. Last year, I made a visit to the eastern part of my county and held several public meetings. At one of these a very prominent Liberal took the chair, and, in introducing me, said he introduced a gentleman who he hoped before very long, would form part of a Liberal Administration, and would do away with the obnoxious laws relating to the lobster fisheries. Although that gentleman was a friend of mine, I stated that I did not desire, there or elsewhere, to make any capital out of the agitation in regard to these lobster laws; that I believed that the present, as well as the previous Government were influenced only by one desire, to protect the lobster fisheries and not to see them exterminated; that I believed there was very little information in regard to that, and that all that had been done and was being done, was of a tentative character, and that, therefore, I was not disposed to make any political capital out of it one way or the other. Some of my friends were rather disappointed that I would not make a political point out of that question; but where a man has a public reputation to sustain, and where he may have to deal with these questions himself at another time, I was not going to put myself in such a position that I would not be able to deal with them in the public interest subsequently, as I have recommended the Government to do now. I have made recommendations to the hon. Minister of Marine, and I have no doubt that he is actuated by the desire by which I am actuated, to protect the lobsters, though there is a strong feeling along the shore in regard to that matter, and perhaps experience might show that a longer time might be given for taking lobsters than is now given. I know the people are suffering great inconvenience now, and that, when the time terminates on the 1st July, they are not prepared for the coast fishery, and are practically idle for the rest of the year. Perhaps a month in the latter part of the year might be granted as a trial. I would not at all recommend the Government to do that as a permanent thing, because, if they found that the lobsters were being exterminated, it would be simply killing the goose that lays the golden egg, and the fishermen would be worse off than they are now. The hon. gentleman, in referring to the prosperity of our fishermen, forgot one thing which would not show that they are so prosperous as they might be. What takes so many of our fishermen away to the United States? All along our coast, from Yarmouth down to Cape Breton, a very great number of our fishermen go to the United States every year, and the reason is that they are able to fish under altogether different circumstances, and they have a market for their fish. The hon. gentleman says the Americans complain of not being able to compete with our fish, but that was in the case of there being no duty on our fish in their own market, and was not

in regard to a foreign market. The hon. gentleman laid great stress on this, that, because of their more costly equipment, they could not compete with our fishermen, but that is entirely in regard to their own market. The consumption of fish in the United States is always very large, and, without having access to their market, we cannot possibly have the same success in competing with them. We have only certain markets to supply, and the West Indies do not give us the same opportunities as the United States. Sometimes, when we have a smaller catch than usual, we get a larger price, but, with the United States for our market, we would reap the great harvest which Providence has provided for us at our doors. They are practically our sole customers for the greatest amount of our catch. Last year Providence sent to our starving people in Nova Scotia a catch of mackerel amounting to nearly 10,000 barrels. Every one of those were shipped to the United States, and they were sold for \$16 a barrel, and all that took place within a fortnight or three weeks. But for the American market, I do not know what we should have done with those mackerel. They were too fat for the West India market, and they do not use them in England or in Canada, and therefore the United States is the only market. Hence arises the great advantage of our having the opportunity of reaching that market. The hon. gentleman made a comparison of the increased value of our exports one year over another. While on the whole it was a fair enough way of making a comparison, I think the House will see, on reflection, that it is not altogether a criterion of the success of the fishermen, which largely depends on the value of the article, and not on the quantity. It often happens, as my hon. friend on my right knows, that they have a very large catch of fish when there is a large catch in Newfoundland, and a large catch in Norway at the same time. When that happens, the value of fish with us goes down very low—a difference of \$2 in the value of a quintal of fish, is no uncommon thing. I have known fish to be as low as \$2, and I have known them to be as high as \$4.50. Therefore, hon. gentlemen will see that the value of the exports is not always an indication of the quantity taken. When we have, as very often happens in the early part of the year, very good reports from our fisheries, our people look naturally to see what is the report from Newfoundland, and in Newfoundland they look to see what is the report from Norway. If the report comes of a short catch from Norway, up will go the price of the fish in Newfoundland, and if the price goes up in Newfoundland, up will go the price in Halifax correspondingly; so the price is caused by the quantity taken; when there is a large quantity the price is low. I listened to the arguments which were used, and I did not gain much information, and I thought part of them was not applicable to the question before the House, and I merely refer to some of those points which were not touched by members who preceded me. The proposal of the hon. member for Lunenburg is a plain one; he has asked the Government to increase the bounty to the fishermen. That proposal, I think, the Government should consider and adopt, inasmuch as they have granted larger protection to other industries, and they have not placed the fishermen in as favorable a position. The hon. gentleman says

this is an electioneering dodge. He seems to be very anxious about electioneering dodges. My hon. friend and his party are always suspecting others of harboring what they have in their own minds. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows that electioneering dodges are sometimes resorted to on his side of the House; I suppose he is aware that this bounty was proposed on the eve of a general election in 1882, and I suppose my hon. friend would never, for one moment, say to his friends on that side, that this was an electioneering dodge; and why we should suspect my modest and worthy friend, who is engaged so largely in the fishing industry in Lunenburg, and who naturally feels an interest in building up that industry in his county—why we should suspect him of having electioneering dodges in view, I can hardly imagine. However, the question is not whether this is an electioneering dodge, but whether the principle is sound, whether the hon. gentleman approves or disapproves of it. He has not told us whether he disapproves of it, and I am curious to know in what direction his mind runs, and whether he will use his great influence with the Government to benefit the fishermen in his own county, and in his whole Province at large. I think the proposal is not an unreasonable one, under the circumstances, and I think my hon. friend laid it before the House in a very fair and moderate manner, such as would commend it to the favorable consideration of business men. Our fishing interest is a very large one, and one on which the prosperity of Nova Scotia largely depends. It is the largest interest we have, and if anything tends to cripple it, the resources of the whole Province will be crippled to a large extent.

Mr. COLBY. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat says that this distribution of bounty to the fishermen was made on the eve of a general election in 1882. That, I believe, is a historical fact; but the hon. gentleman must be aware that unless the distribution had been a just and liberal one, one that was likely to be acceptable to the fishermen who were to be benefited by it, the eve of a general election was the last time in the world when it would have been introduced, and the very fact that it was introduced on the eve of a general election, goes, at least, a long way, to show that it was believed, at that time, to be a measure which was not only just and equitable, but one which would be acceptable to the people who were more particularly affected. This question has been so generally and so fairly discussed by members from the Maritime Provinces, that I do not deem it necessary for myself—representing, imperfectly, as I do, the Minister of Marine in his absence—to protract the debate at any length. The hon. member who introduced this resolution asks us to revise and enlarge the fishery bounty in consequence of action which has been taken with regard to the bounty upon pig iron. Now, like the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), I see no analogy whatever between those two cases—no analogy except the use of the word “bounty” common to both, and the use of the word “bounty” in one instance, if not in the other, is a misnomer. It should be termed, perhaps, an allowance given to the manufacturers of iron, and should be considered in the light of a bonus rather than a bounty.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.)

There is nothing of benevolence about it, it is a purely business transaction, resting upon a special ground—whether that ground be right or wrong, the policy is to be discussed independently and by itself. We have in this country, as every one knows, unlimited resources of iron and of coal, and of the fluxes lying in convenient proximity, notwithstanding which, it is a well-known fact, that up to the present time capitalists have not found it to their interest, or have not been induced to any considerable extent, to invest their money in the development of those resources. It was found in the United States, where like immense resources existed, that until a stringent measure of protection was adopted, or a bonus, or encouragement of some kind was given, these immense natural resources of coal and iron were likely to lie there unused forever, and the United States met that condition of affairs by the imposition of a high, almost a prohibitory duty, the consequence of which has been the marvellous development of the iron industry in the United States, since that course was taken. The Parliament of Canada, while pursuing the same general policy which had produced these admirable results in the United States, did not judge it expedient to follow exactly in their footsteps, and instead of putting on the very high duty which was imposed by the American Congress, the Dominion Parliament imposed a duty which was afterwards supplemented, for an unlimited period, by a special bonus, or bounty, the object of which was to accomplish the same result. That policy, whether it be wise or unwise, whether it be right or wrong, is a matter to be discussed at the proper time, and to be considered with those other questions which are kindred to it. But this question is in no way analogous to it. You may withdraw the one bounty, or modify the one bounty, without in any way being called upon to withdraw, or to modify, or to increase, the other bounty. It seems to me, although I do not think the hon. member intended it, that this resolution is calculated to have the same effect which was produced by the resolutions introduced by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) and afterwards withdrawn by him, and which served no good purpose whatever—the effect of causing disaffection among one class of people in this country. I do not think these unnecessary contrasts, the effect of which is to make one class of the people feel they are not as well treated as another class—unless there is some absolute and necessary connection between them—are for the public good. I do not think they are in the interests of the country, and I do not think that these attempts to create disaffection for the sake of creating it, and with no other ultimate object to be gained, can have any beneficial effect. I say, then, there is no analogy between the cases referred to, and there is no necessity for contrasting the bounty as it is termed given to the iron producers with the bounty given to the fishermen. The bounty given to the fishermen was granted for special reasons, which were well considered by Parliament. This is not a new question here. It was urged by certain members representing the Maritime Provinces that, in the distribution of the Halifax award, the principle should be recognised that the moneys which came to us by that award were the property of the Lower Provinces, that, as a matter of territorial right, the moneys belonged to them

and not to the Dominion at large. This matter was fully considered in Parliament. The principle was laid down by a resolution, which was affirmed on a division by 126 against 30 votes, and the principle enunciated was this :

"That the responsibility and duty of regulating and protecting such fisheries were, from 1st July, 1867, undertaken by the Federal Government and Legislature. That grant was thereby cast upon and defrayed from the Dominion Treasury. That such responsibility cannot constitutionally be surrendered or transferred to any of the Provinces, and if it were possible to do so the transfer would be injurious to the best interests of the Provinces more immediately concerned in the development of the fisheries, and they would be legally and pecuniarily unable to bear the burthen and afford the necessary protection. That the duty of fostering and protecting the fisheries is certain to entail great expense on the Dominion in the future. That such expenditure and the public advantage to be derived from are correlative, and that the portion of the fishery award paid over to Canada constitutionally and of right, belongs to the Dominion of Canada."

That was the conclusion at which Parliament arrived, which it affirmed by a very large majority, a majority not confined to one side of the House, but about equally made up of leading members representing both sides of the House, as being the legal and proper principle on which this matter should be settled. At the same time it was recognised that, in consequence of the concession of certain privileges to American fishermen on our shores, an injury to a certain extent had been done to the fishing interests of the Lower Provinces, and in dealing with this subject in Parliament a partial compensation was intended to be granted. But it was not upon the principle that this sum of \$4,500,000 belonged to the Lower Provinces as a matter of right, for it was never so recognised ; and the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) was entirely in error when he claimed that any leading member of the Government or any leading member of the House affirmed the principle that this capital sum, or the interest on it, belonged as a matter of right to the Maritime Provinces and not to the Dominion as a whole. During those discussions no principle was affirmed by the majority of the House which would give the Lower Provinces, or any Province, the right to claim either principal or interest, on the strict ground of right. But in the apportionment that was made of this money, the reasons given are set forth in the Act of 1882. The grant of \$150,000 a year was granted, not as being the interest on the sum obtained from the United States Government, but :

"As an aid in the development of the sea fisheries of Canada, and the encouragement of the building and fitting out of improved fishing vessels, and the improvement of the condition of the fishermen."

That was the authority for the grant, as has been explained. I would inform hon. members of the House, who may not be aware of it, that there are large charges in connection with this sum of \$150,000, namely, those which are incident to the distribution of it, for the cost of distribution is not included in it. The cost of distribution is a considerable item of itself, and in addition to that one or two other statutory votes had been taken, so that the total expenditure for the seven years has been \$1,144,120, or an excess of expenditure, including the cost of distribution, of \$94,120. So that the Government has been quite as generous as Parliament itself was in fixing the grant at \$150,000 a year. I think every hon. member of this House, not only the members from the Maritime Pro-

vinces, quite appreciate the hardships of the fishermen. Every man in this House appreciates the risks to which the fisherman is exposed and the hazardous nature of his calling, and there is every disposition on the part of members from all the Provinces, as well as members of the Maritime Provinces, to do everything that can properly be done to relieve the situation and assist that most meritorious class of men. And speaking of the tariff of which hon. members have thought fit to complain, it will be found, on examining it, that exceptions have been made in favor of that class of the community, and perhaps they form the only class of men who as a class are exempted from some of the burdens. For example, salt is admitted free for the use of the fishermen, although salt is not free for any other uses ; fish hooks, seines, nets, lines and twines ; iron masts for ships, or parts of the same, oakum, pitch and tar, wire-rope and rigging for ships and vessels are all on the free list. All of these articles are on the free list, and they are exceptional ; they are intended to relieve this most worthy and meritorious class of our people, engaged in a hazardous and not infrequently unremunerative vocation, because they are so dependent for success upon causes entirely beyond their own control. These circumstances have been considered by Parliament, and the fishermen have been relieved from financial burdens as no other class in our community has been relieved. While the most liberal intentions exist on the part of all members of this House towards the fishermen, irrespective of party, as was evident in the discussion which took place on this question some years ago, I doubt whether it would be wise and in the interests of the hon. gentleman, or of those whom he so ably represents, to reopen this question, because there is no doubt whatever, that the principle which was laid down by Parliament was, that as a matter of right the moneys coming from the Halifax award were the property of the Dominion of Canada, which has to defend and protect the fisheries, and which has to bear large expenses in connection with the fisheries. Now, this sum given in bounties is practically the amount of the interest on the \$4,500,000 at 3½ per cent. The amount in bounty comes to that, although it is not paid as such. Now, I doubt myself—the hon. gentleman who proposes this resolution can, perhaps, best judge—whether the temper of this House, if he were to try it, would be in favor of increasing or diminishing the allowance which has been made to the fishermen.

REPORT.

Report of the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police, for year 1889.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

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

After Recess.

THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright, with respect to the conduct of John Charles Rykert, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Lincoln and Niagara, declaring it to be discreditable, corrupt and scandalous.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. In speaking of this question, to which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has called the attention of the House, and in which he has asked this House to declare "that the conduct of the said John Charles Rykert is, and has been discreditable, corrupt and scandalous," I think, Sir, the hon. gentleman has asked us to take a very important matter into consideration; a matter of importance not only to the hon. member for Lincoln, but to all the members of this House, and to Parliament itself; because, if this motion is adopted, it seems to me, that the necessary corollary of it is, that the said member for Lincoln be expelled from this House. Hon. members cannot, with credit to themselves, sit in this House if we have among our members one whose conduct is so criticised, and if the criticism is found to be correct. It behoves us, therefore, to proceed with some caution in the matter. It is our duty to maintain the dignity and purity of this House, and if any member is proven to be unworthy of a seat in it, or to be guilty of any crime or any fraud, it is the duty of this House to remove him. The sentence is severe, and even death itself will not end the disgrace which attaches to it, for that disgrace shall remain as a stigma on the name of the member, so long as the records of this House endure. Sir, when we come to consider a matter of this kind, we ought to feel the great solemnity which rests upon us in reference to it. It is important that all hon. members of this House should know that all their conduct in relation to public matters must bear the strictest scrutiny in the brightest light, and that all aspirants for seats in this House must remember that, as it were, we are living in that bright light which beats upon the Throne, and blackens every blot. It must be remembered that what may be condoned even in private or social life cannot be condoned here, and that, if any offence is proven, the most severe sentence must be passed upon the offender. The sentence which attaches to offences of the kind alleged is severe, but I do not complain of that. Severe diseases require severe remedies, and we must make it known to every Canadian that members of the House of Commons of Canada are determined to uphold the honor and purity of this House, and that every member who comes here, must be fit to associate with gentlemen,—gentlemen in the purest and truest sense of the term. But, Sir, if such a severe sentence is to be passed; one that is to consign to disgrace a person who has been sitting with us here for many years, surely we ought to consider calmly and carefully all the facts connected with the charge made against him. I wish, Sir, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), in introducing this motion, had done it in a judicial and judicious speech; but he was, I think, induced to wander off into the more familiar fields of political controversy and to make a political harangue full of party rancour and malice, and all uncharitable. I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman in that course; nor, in the few remarks I have to make, do I wish to say one word in palliation of the sentence which he asks this House to pronounce, nor to condone the offence which it is alleged the hon. member for Lincoln has committed. If the member for Lincoln has committed that offence, the sentence

Mr. COLBY.

must be passed, no matter how painful it may be to his colleagues in this House. I ask both sides of the House to consider this matter, not as political partisans. I ask hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches to approach this matter, not as though they were pursuing a political enemy; and I ask hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to approach it, not as though they were defending a political or a personal friend. We must allow all political and personal feeling in this matter to disappear, and we must endeavor to approach the question in a spirit becoming the highest court in the realm. I have a very great regard for the dignity and purity of this House, but I trust that we will not create, now or at any time, a precedent which will be unworthy of us. We must remember that Parliament has in the past been guilty of some excesses—not our Parliament but the Parliament of Great Britain. History records instances of parliamentary tyranny in which partisan majorities have used the power of expulsion to diminish the ranks of their opponents. Let us be careful that we do not put upon our records any precedent which would give this power to a majority in time to come. I am thankful to say, that the records of this Parliament of Canada have been heretofore free from any motion in precisely the same terms as this. We have had occasion to consider the question of the seats of hon. members and to decide that certain hon. members have forfeited their seats. Such a question does not arise in this case. As I understand this motion, it does not at all imply that the hon. member for Lincoln has violated the Act to secure the Independence of Parliament, but it does charge him with having been guilty of conduct which is disreputable, corrupt and scandalous; and, as I said before, that motion, if passed, is equivalent to a motion for expulsion, because if the hon. member did not resign his seat upon the passage of that motion, it would be the duty of those who control this House, in my opinion to move that he be expelled, for after the passage of such a motion, no hon. member could sit with him. Sir, before such a severe sentence is passed by this House, is it not our duty to enquire carefully into the facts? The hon. member for South Oxford moves:

"That whereas it appears from certain documents and letters published in the Votes and Proceedings of this House, that John Charles Rykert, Member for the County of Lincoln, did, in or about the beginning of the month of April, A.D. 1882,—"

do certain things. Then it winds up:

"That whereas it is apparent from the said documents and correspondence that the said Rykert did make use of his position and influence as a member of this House, in the matter of the said limits, for his own pecuniary advantage; and that he did afterwards make a statement, from his place in this House, with regard to his connection with and the obtaining the said limits, entirely at variance with the facts, and calculated to mislead the House and the country; and that he made further statements in his correspondence with the said Adams to the effect that he was obliged to resort to corrupt practices with members of the Cabinet, and members of Parliament, and other Government officials, in order to perfect the title to the said grant of such limits (which statements have been challenged as false by members of the Cabinet from their places in this House, and admitted by the said Rykert in his place in the House, so far as members of the Cabinet are concerned, to be untrue).

"That the conduct of the said John C. Rykert in the premises is, and has been, discreditable, corrupt and scandalous."

Now, Sir, what are these letters? We find that

they are set forth in the Votes and Proceedings of the 14th of February :

"Sir Richard Cartwright moved, That whereas certain letters and documents reading as follows: * * * were published in the *Globe* newspaper under date of 8th February instant, containing divers statements affecting certain members of this House, and it is expedient that the House should have an opportunity of examining the same, it be Ordered, that the said letters above recited be printed in the Votes and Proceedings for the use of members."

Now, Sir, this simply means that certain letters which are published in a newspaper are ordered to be printed in the Votes and Proceedings. Next, we find that on the 18th of February :

"Mr. Bowell moved: That, whereas certain letters and documents, reading as follows:—"

And then come the personal explanations of Mr. Rykert, in which he states :

"In the *Globe* of last Saturday there appeared a large number of letters purporting to be written by myself." Subsequently, on the 10th of March, there is printed some correspondence from Mr. Hugh Macdonald and Mr. Stuart Tupper, of Winnipeg. I have read all this correspondence, and I do not find anywhere a direct admission that the hon. member for Lincoln wrote those letters.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No, there is no direct confession of the fact that those letters were written by him, and I conceive that the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, in order to make the proceedings of this House regular, should contain the statement that those letters were admitted by the hon. member for Lincoln. Sir, the great power of expulsion which this House possesses can only be exercised under certain conditions. We must have placed on the Table of this House, the conviction of the member whose conduct is in question, duly certified by some competent court; or, we must have a confession by the member; or, we must have a report of a committee. That seems, from all the cases that I can discover, to be the rule of Parliament. Lord Palmerston lays it down in the Sadlier case, when the House of Commons was asked to expel James Sadlier because an indictment had been found against him charging him with fraud, and it was alleged that he could not be found and, therefore, no papers could be served upon him. He had been ordered to attend in his place, and did not attend, and a motion of expulsion was moved. Lord Palmerston said :

"They were now called upon to preserve the purity of the House. That was, no doubt, a most important application; but one of the chief elements of purity was a strict regard of the principles of justice, and an avoidance of precedents which might hereafter be converted to purposes of injustice. Assuming that there was a full conviction in the mind of every hon. member of the guilt of James Sadlier, still he held that they ought not to take a proceeding in the nature of expulsion without being able to find it upon some formal indisputable ground such as conviction, or confession, or the report, after due examination, by a committee."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will find on page 176 the admission which he says is not to be found.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I do not find any confession of the offence of which he is charged. He states distinctly that these letters purport to be written by him. In his statement to the House what does he ask for? In the course of that

statement, the hon. member for Lincoln says, on page 1813 of *Hansard* :

"I can show a Committee of the House, and I can show the country, that the indictment framed by the hon. gentleman is a tissue of falsehoods and misstatements, and I claim that this House has no right to pass judgment on me on a one-sided statement."

Then, on page 1814, he says :

"I have letters and evidence of importance to place before the House, and in order that I may justify myself, I ask the House to appoint a Committee for the purpose of considering this whole matter."

Again, on the same page :

"I ask hon. members to give me that opportunity of defending myself before a Committee, which I cannot have under the present circumstances and under the practice of this House."

Now, Sir, we find the hon. member pleading for an investigation, without making any direct admission. It is true, it may be contended that there is a tacit confession that those are his letters, but there is at the same time, and in the same breath, a statement that he can explain them and offer further evidence that will justify his conduct; and if he can do so, I ask hon. members on both sides to treat this member who is accused, in the same manner as they would wish to be treated themselves; I ask them for the same measure of justice that they would give to the meanest criminal in the land if he were accused of any crime, that is, a fair trial. He cannot have that at the bar of the House. We have appointed a Committee with power to send for papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath; I submit that justice will be delayed but a few days if such a proceeding be adopted. I think that would be a fair and honorable way for us to act, and one in accordance with the proceedings of Parliament; it is a practice which hon. gentlemen followed in the case of a prominent member of their own party, who was charged with having violated the Independence of Parliament Act. They asked, when the evidence was laid upon the Table, over the signature of the hon. member accused, that the matter should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; and when letters, purporting to have been written by the hon. member for Lincoln, are laid before the House, he asks, in his statement, that the same measure of justice be dealt over to him. I think, that if hon. members on both sides will approach this question with fairness, they will acknowledge that it is but right and proper that his request should be granted. I referred, a few moments ago, to the fact that Parliament has been guilty of excess—of acts of tyranny—in past years. Parliament has a great power. We have the power of branding this member's character with disgrace; we have the power of expelling him. But let us remember that, if we have a giant's power, it is tyrannous to use it like a giant. Let us be careful not to create a precedent which may be used as a means of injustice hereafter. Let us, to use the words which I find in Bourinot: "in all matters affecting the seat or characters of hon. members, proceed with due caution and deliberation." I ask, simply, that this House do now proceed with due caution and deliberation, and grant to the hon. member who is accused of this serious offence, and who is liable to the most severe punishment that can be inflicted—a punishment which will last beyond life itself, which will exclude him

from this House, which will exclude him from social intercourse with his old friends and associates, which will be a lasting disgrace to his name,—what he asks, a fair and full enquiry. I refrain from commenting for one moment on the facts of the case. I am on the Committee of Privileges and Elections; and if it is to be sent there, I do not desire, by any word I may utter, to prejudice it. But I say this, that if it is sent there, I am sure the hon. gentleman will receive from members on this side, as well as from members on the other side, a fair trial; and if his conduct is what it has been charged to be, if he cannot explain away or disprove the charge, there can be no objection to the sentence, severe though it be, that will be passed upon him; and I am sure that the leaders of this House will assist the members of that committee in coming to a speedy conclusion, that no obstacle will be placed in the way of the Committee, and that this House and the country will learn, within a very short time, what defence, if any, that hon. gentleman has to make; and when the sentence of the House is passed no one will be able to rise in this House or out of it, and say that we proceeded with undue haste or without due deliberation, or that we did any act of injustice, but treated the hon. gentleman in the same way as the meanest criminal in the land would be treated. With this view, I move:

That all the words after the word "That" be struck out and the following words inserted instead thereof:—"The attention of this House having been called to certain documents, letters and statements, published during the present session in the Votes and Proceedings of this House, under the dates of the 14th February, the 18th February, and the 10th March, relating to the connection of John Charles Rykert, Esquire, member for the County of Lincoln and Niagara, with a grant of certain timber limits in the North-West Territories, all the questions involved in the said papers be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections; and that they be directed to enquire into all the facts and merits of the case, and into the conduct of the said John Charles Rykert in relation thereto, and to report the result of their enquiries at the earliest practicable moment, and that the said Committee have power to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation where affirmation is allowed by law."

The motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, to which this is an amendment, acknowledges that the charges in these letters go further than the hon. member for Lincoln. It acknowledges that the letters charge certain members of the Government, and certain members of this House, with corrupt practices:

"That whereas it is apparent from the said documents and correspondence, that the said Rykert did make use of his position and influence as a member of this House, in the matter of the said limits for his own pecuniary advantage; and that he did afterwards make a statement, from his place in this House, with regard to his connection with and the obtaining the said limits, entirely at variance with the facts, and calculated to mislead the House and the country; and that he made further statements in his correspondence with the said Adams to the effect that he was obliged to resort to corrupt practices with members of the Cabinet, and members of Parliament, and other Government officials, in order to perfect the title to the said grant of such limits (which statements have been challenged as false by members of the Cabinet, from their places in this House, and admitted by the said Rykert, in his place in the House, so far as members of the Cabinet are concerned, to be untrue.)"

There is the deliberate statement made that other members of this House have been guilty of corrupt practices. Is it right that such a statement should go to the country, that the hon. member accused is not the only one implicated, but that other

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

members are open to the charge of corruption? I say that such a statement should not be allowed to go to the country, accompanied by the simple statement that the members of the Government have asserted their innocence. There should be some examination under oath of those statements. There should be some evidence given to exculpate or inculpate the members of the Government, and to let the country know that these wholesale charges are utterly without foundation or to what extent, if any, they are true. The whole of the facts ought to be enquired into in order to exonerate the members of the Government and the other members of this House, whom this motion seems to implicate in the matter. The motion seems to me to be so framed as to expressly eliminate a denial with regard to other members of this House, and to have the charge go abroad that other persons are implicated, but that only the conduct of one should be censured. I think that this should be enquired into by the Committee as well, and I therefore ask that this Committee be instructed to enquire into the facts and merits of the case, and that all the questions involved in the said papers be referred to it, and I ask, further, that the Committee be instructed to report the result of their enquiries at the earliest practicable moment.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has rightly stated that I would second the motion; but, while doing so, I deprecate the manner in which the hon. gentleman has brought the matter before the House and he has endeavored to make some political capital in regard to the manner in which the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) presented the original motion. He said he did it with a great deal of violence and warmth. I listened to the earnest speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, and I felt that that hon. gentleman was simply doing his duty, not only to the House and the country, but to his fellow-members, and I think his speech was characterised by a great deal of calmness, though with a great deal of force, but with nothing that could be called an excess of feeling. I beg to differ with my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in regard to that, and I think he has weakened his case by his reference to the character of the resolution and the manner of the hon. member for South Oxford. As to the motion now before the House, I believe we are living in a free country where Lynch law does not prevail, and if we saw a man struck down on the street, the result being his death, would we hang the assailant on the next tree, or would we arrest him and allow him to state the reason for his adopting the violent means he did? That is almost the position before us now. I condemn the course of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) as much as the hon. member for South Oxford does. He stands self-accused, he is caught red-handed, he is caught in the act, if we are to judge him by his own letters and correspondence; but, I think it is right, to give him an opportunity to go before the tribunal which the law, and the practice, and the rules of the House have provided for the purpose of judging between him and the person who brings the charges against him. If I were to be the judge of the conduct of the hon. member for Lincoln, the conduct which he is accused of, the ungentlemanly and dishonor-

able conduct of which he is accused by the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford, and were to judge by what the hon. member for Lincoln himself has said, I would say he was guilty. My hon. friend says that he did not admit that he had written those letters. Did he deny having written them? They are written over his own name, and he stands up to make his defence and does not deny that he wrote them. That does not prove that he did not write them. The member for Lincoln, is charged with these very grave offences. I agree with my hon. friend that it is a question whether Mr. Rykert has violated the Independence of Parliament Act. I do not think the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) did wrong in applying for that timber limit—not at all. Dozens of men have done the same thing. If he does that in a fair and open way, that is another matter; but he has placed himself in this position, that he has used his high position as a member of Parliament and has attempted to influence Ministers, has openly stated that he did influence Ministers, and, further, that he wanted money from his partner because he had to use it in that way. That is where the gravamen of the offence lies. He says, if I had the opportunity to go before a committee, I could give such an explanation as would acquit me of any dishonorable action. He has made a statement in regard to one of the Ministers, and I may say that I did not and I do not believe his statement in regard to any Minister having been influenced in that way. However, the hon. member has asked this House to give him an opportunity to appear before a committee and to show a justification of, or to give some information as to whether these statements were true or not. Are we to refuse to allow that opportunity to a member of Parliament, who, if he be found guilty of these improper acts, will be stamped for life, and perhaps his posterity after him, because he may be expelled from the highest assembly of the land for acts unworthy of a representative of the people and of a gentleman? The member for Lincoln asks for an opportunity to go before a tribunal in order to show the justification he has and the defence he possesses in regard to the charge which has been made against him. The rules of this House have properly provided such a tribunal. They have selected forty-five members—some of the most influential men in the House—as the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and it is their right to enquire into the case of any hon. gentleman who is so accused, as to whether he should continue in his seat in this House. I think that is the tribunal to which this matter should be referred, and, in common justice, which would be meted out to the meanest criminal in one of our courts, when in this, the highest court of the realm, the member appeals for justice to himself and to the people whom he represents, he should have the opportunity of going before that tribunal in order to vindicate his conduct if he can. I feel that there is another reason why the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), should be superseded by this motion of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and I appeal to the member for South Oxford not to divide the House upon the question. Curses, like chickens, may come to roost, and we may have to pass under the ordeal of a majority of the

House, and may be expelled from our seats without having the opportunity of making a defence, if we establish this precedent. It is possible that Mr. Rykert may be able to bring evidence before that Committee, if what his friends say is true. If he has those witnesses to bring forward which may possibly give some vindication, or at least some palliation, of his conduct, then, I say, it is due to him, as it is due to every British subject, that he should have an opportunity to vindicate himself. Under these circumstances, I again appeal to the hon. member for South Oxford whether, if the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, who controls this House, who controls the Committee of Privileges and Elections, will give a pledge to this House that no delay shall be thrown in the way, and that that Committee shall proceed duly to consider this question, and give the member for Lincoln an opportunity to state his case, to make his defence—whether the hon. member for South Oxford should not consent to it, and not divide this House. Sir, I can imagine how I would feel if I stood in the place of the member for Lincoln, were I arraigned upon a matter of fact which looked black for myself—and I will say that a blacker case cannot exist against anybody than appears at the present moment to exist against the member for Lincoln, and I do say that the darker a case looks, the greater the necessity for giving the man every opportunity to defend himself, to remove those charges which are made against him, and the stains which will inevitably follow an adverse decision. The member for Frontenac has clearly pointed out the consequences of this act. He says: If the charges which are made against the member for Lincoln cannot be removed by evidence, but one result can follow—expulsion. Every hon. gentleman must agree that if this House, if the Committee on Privileges and Elections, decide that the member for Lincoln wrote these letters, unless he can give some explanations—which it seems almost impossible for him to give—nothing ought to save him from expulsion from this House. But suppose we expel him now, without a trial, without an opportunity of bringing forward the explanations and reasons which, he says, he can bring forward, what will the country say about us? Our action would create sympathy for the member for Lincoln, it would place this House in a false position before the country; it would enable him and his friends to say that the House would not give the man who was charged with such a grave offence, an opportunity of producing the witnesses which, he says, he can produce, and of giving the explanations which, he says, he can give. I say it would place this House in a false position before the country, did we not give the member for Lincoln an opportunity of defending himself, which is the right and due of every Englishman. Sir, I regret that I shall have to take a stand different from that of the hon. gentleman from South Oxford whom I admire so much, both for his great ability, and for the manner in which he conducts public business here. I must again take this opportunity of saying to my hon. friend from Frontenac, that he is only injuring his case when he attempts to impute to the member for South Oxford, vindictive motives in bringing forward this resolution. My hon. friend has simply done his duty, he has done what was the duty of every man in this House, but which very few

men like to undertake the responsibility of doing, that is, in order to protect the honor of Parliament, to assail the reputation and character of a fellow-member. In doing this the hon. member for South Oxford has only done a duty which should devolve upon an hon. member like himself, who is a leader of public opinion in this House and in this country. In seconding the motion of the hon. member for Frontenac, let me say that I hope the members of this House will hesitate before they divide the House upon a question of this kind. I think they will best serve the interests of justice, they will best maintain the purity which this House should possess, and I think they will best command the confidence of the country, and create a feeling that we have extended to the member for Lincoln that fair play which every man has a right to, if we accept the motion of the member for Frontenac and allow the member for Lincoln an opportunity of extricating himself, if possible, from a position which is very discreditable to himself. The country will say that we have given him a fair opportunity of defending himself, by sending the matter to that tribunal which Parliament has provided for just such cases as this.

Mr. LAURIER. So this is the result of the long deliberation of the Government upon this matter. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has, I imagine, just given voice to the resolution adopted by the caucus which sat on Friday last. Can it be that the members on the other side, and even my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), are unable to form an opinion on this question unless they are instructed and coached by the Committee on Privileges and Elections? Can it be that the sense of right and wrong, of honor and of shame, is so dull on the other side of the House, that the members are not able to see whether the act charged against the member for Lincoln is censurable, or, forsooth, is not, perhaps, commendable? If the hon. member for Lincoln were accused of having violated a statutory law, I could understand that the Committee on Privileges and Elections might sit upon the case, in order to determine whether his action came within the restrictions provided by law. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman is not charged with having violated any law enacted by man, or any law which is to be found in the statutes; the hon. gentleman is charged with having violated a higher law, which, though unwritten, though undefined, is well known, and is to be found in the heart and conscience of every man. This law was well known to the member for Lincoln himself, since, only a few years ago, when questioned upon this very act, he denied that he had had any connection with it. The hon. gentleman violated no law, no positive statute, but had he not felt in his heart that he had sinned against his better nature, that he had committed an infamous act, why, in the name of common sense, should he have denied any connection with it? His denial of the act was a confession of guilt; out of his own mouth he stands convicted of having committed an act which he had not the courage to confess when called upon to answer for it. And yet we are told that the Committee on Privileges and Elections must sit and enquire whether the hon. gentleman did anything degrading

Mr. MITCHELL.

to the honor and dignity of this House. Sir, it is in the name of justice or fair play that we are asked this matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I would be the last man to do an injustice to any fellow-man; I would be the very last man to do an injustice to the member for Lincoln, but I am sure that, as far as my judgment goes, we are not proposing to do any injustice to the member for Lincoln. The hon. member for Frontenac appeals for justice, and the reasons which he gives—he must pardon me for so saying—appear to me of the most flimsy character. Why, Sir, he tells us that the committee must sit upon this case, that we cannot sit upon it, that the House cannot pronounce judgment upon it, because, forsooth, we have not evidence that the letters upon which the member for Lincoln is arraigned were written by him. Well, Sir, could anything of a more flimsy character be uttered in any deliberative assembly? The hon. gentleman reminded me of the juror who had to sit upon the case of a man who was tried for stealing a pair of breeches. He would not convict the prisoner because there was no witness who had seen him take the breeches, although the prisoner acknowledged that he had the breeches on his legs at that very moment. The hon. gentleman does not want to pronounce judgment upon this case yet, because no one saw the member for Lincoln writing these letters. But let me refresh the memory of my hon. friend. In the explanations which the hon. member for Lincoln gave upon the floor of this House he used the following expression:—

“I maintain that no man can truthfully say that in any of those letters I endeavored to act corruptly towards the Government.”

Well, Sir, in the face of such a statement as this, is it not mere child's play to say that this House of Commons is not ready to sit and pronounce judgment on this case, because, forsooth, it has not evidence that these letters were written by the hon. member for Lincoln. I dismiss that contention altogether as unworthy the hon. gentleman who has brought it forward. I pass now to the contention raised by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). My hon. friend also pleaded for fair play, and he said that delay should be granted because the hon. member for Lincoln had stated that he had letters and documents to offer to the House. Again, I repeat that I would not do an injustice to the hon. member for Lincoln, but this appeal is also, in my opinion, one of a most flimsy character. Why? The matter is not new; this is not the first time it has been brought before this House, it is in fact one of long standing. It was brought before this House as far back as 1883. The hon. member for Lincoln was questioned at that time as to whether or not he had been connected with this transaction. Then he denied any connection with it, then he boldly asserted that he had not the slightest connection with it. The matter was again brought forward in 1887, at the time of the general election. Then the hon. member had to change his utterance; he could not any longer say that he had not anything to do with it, because all the evidence of these letters was before the electors. But he changed his plea. He could not deny it, but he threw himself on the sympathy of his electors, and asked them to forgive him and not be hard on him, because, he said, he had made

provision for his old age. The matter was afterwards brought up in the press. The hon. member for Lincoln was not then able to exculpate himself. He did not deny the charge, he did not appeal for pity as he had done before his election, but his plea was that he had done nothing that was wrong or derogatory to the honor of this House. And when challenged before this House he again came forward and stated that he could bring forward evidence to prove that he was blameless, and this is the language he made use of :

"I propose to-day to supply to the House and the country some letters which have not been published, which will go a long way to explain the reason why some of the correspondence was written by myself, and also give several explanations regarding that correspondence without which it might appear somewhat strange."

And, at a later date, when the matter was again brought forward, the hon. gentleman promised to give additional correspondence to the House. Now, will any man in his senses believe that, when the hon. gentleman was presenting his case to the House he was keeping back correspondence which might have acquitted him, which might have given another color to his case; that, during all that time, he had letters in his possession which he might have brought forward, but which he kept back. Is there any man in this House who will believe that assertion? There is no man who does not know that the hon. member for Lincoln has been anxious to bring forward all the evidence in his power and place it before the House. It is very true that only a few days ago, when the motion was moved, the hon. gentleman spoke as follows:—

"I have letters and evidence to place before the House."

Well, if he had evidence and letters to place before the House, why did he not place them before the House? That was the time he should have done so. I do not think I am doing an injustice to the hon. member for Lincoln, but I cannot fail to believe that, if the hon. gentleman had had letters and evidence which might have given another color to the case, he would then have brought them forward, and if he had not done so he would have done great injustice to himself. At all events, if he was not in a position to place them before the House then he could have stated so, he could have said that he had letters to bring forth, which he had not on that day, and he might have given an outline of the nature of those letters, or have stated the nature of the evidence that he was prepared to offer to the House or to a Committee of the House. But we had simply the bare bold statement by the hon. gentleman that he has letters to offer and evidence to produce. Under such circumstances I say this, that for my part I cannot accept that statement, that it is repugnant to common sense. I maintain that the gentleman has had every opportunity to file any letters he possessed. I say, moreover, that if the hon. gentleman has letters to file which he has not filed, let him bring them now before the House—it is not yet too late. Unless he does so, I must come to the conclusion that the action suggested is only a plea for delay and nothing more, and that such a motion as that offered by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is simply trifling with the common sense of the House. It has been stated also that the committee would be able to enquire as to whether the hon. gentleman had

violated the Independence of Parliament Act. No one has charged the hon. member for Lincoln with having violated that Act. It is stated also that as the hon. gentleman has acted within the letter of a statute, a committee may enquire whether he has done anything wrong. There can be no question but that the hon. gentleman has acted within the letter of a statute; no one denies it. The law permits the Government to issue licenses for the cutting of timber in the North-West Territories. If the Government are empowered to issue licenses, it follows that persons may make application for them. There is nothing to say as to the action of Mr. John Adams in applying for a license to cut timber in the North-West Territories. The hon. member for Lincoln acted also perfectly rightly when he favored the application of Mr. Adams for that license. But an act may be perfectly legitimate in itself and become criminal from the motives which inspire it and from the circumstances which accompany it. It must be remembered in connection with this law that it was in itself an exceptional law; it was not one intended to remain forever in the Statute-book, because it was one intended to apply to a state of things temporary in its nature. The Government thought it was desirable, in order to favor cheap fuel for settlers, to issue licenses for timber limits, provided the grantees built mills and gave other facilities to the settlers. The hon. member for Lincoln favored the application of his friend Adams who made application for such a grant. So far there is nothing wrong, and no blame attaches to the hon. member for Lincoln. But blame attaches to the hon. member for Lincoln when he takes advantage of that law to trade upon his position as a member of Parliament, as the hon. member for Lincoln traded upon his influence to coin money out of such position. This is the gist of the offence charged against the hon. member. Look at the case presented by the correspondence? There were several applications made for that limit, which was a much coveted piece of property, it appears. Already an application had been made by Mr. Laidlaw, which had been backed by the powerful influence of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Still his application had not been granted, and so far as we know from the correspondence it had been denied. Then an application was made by Mr. Adams which was backed by what turned out to be the still greater influence of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). And the application which had been denied Mr. Laidlaw was granted Mr. Adams. I do not say this at the present moment as telling against the Government, or to say that they were unduly influenced; but I presume they were influenced by the strong pressure which a partisan, who had supported them through thick and thin, can always bring on the Government. So far there is no reproach to make against the Government. But the reproach is this, and it is one which I am not applying to the Government at this moment, but applying to the hon. member for Lincoln, that out of that transaction the hon. gentleman coined money and lined his pockets to the extent of several thousands of dollars. The application was made, and it was finally granted on 10th April, 1882. The hon. gentleman had taken the precaution on 3rd April, a few days before the application was granted, to make a contract with his client, Mr. Adams, whereby he be

came joint proprietor of the license to the property which was thus conveyed by Order in Council, and out of which he reaped the substantial benefit of \$72,000. This is the charge which is made against the hon. gentleman and this is the charge which, in my judgment, nothing which has been done so far has disproved, and nothing which can take place before the Committee on Privileges and Elections can disprove either. But, Sir, it turned out that this speculation, so much coveted, was near coming to naught. It appeared after a while that the limits were within the railway belt of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that every alternate section belonged to the company. That was something that had not been foreseen by the hon. gentleman, and upon that he bethought to himself what he should do to remove the difficulty, and at once it occurred to him that bribery among the members of the House of Commons, would be the thing which would remove all the difficulties. It was Philip of Macedon who once said, that there was no impregnable fortress when you could have it entered by a donkey load of gold. The hon. member for Lincoln must have evidently read that reference to Philip of Macedon, and so he bethought himself of bribery, and writing to his friend Adams, on the 28th January, 1883, referring to the fact that the limit was on the railway belt, he said :

"If this is so, we are in a bad fix, as Mr. Sands will claim that he has been defrauded, of course. You sold in good faith and relied upon the Government renewing the license. I have to go to Ottawa to-morrow night to fight the matter out, which I do not like. I mean to have all the hardest part of it to do. I have Powell working for me. And if we succeed in beating the railway, we will have to pay the amount we agreed to pay, as you recollect, when we two were at the Queen's Hotel. I have not slept any for a week on account of this."

So, Sir, the moment the hon. gentleman found himself in the difficulty, he thought the only way to remove it would be to lavish money, and so he laid out his plan to Mr. Adams, and told him to be prepared for a large expenditure. With this idea he went to work; what his work was we do not know, except what we have in his correspondence, and on the 8th March, 1883, he reported as follows to his friend :—

"I find difficulties surrounding us in every way in reference to the limit, and I find that the Canadian Pacific Railway have certain Ministers working for them. I am afraid it will cost us each six or seven thousand dollars to get this made all right. I have five or six at work for me, and have agreed to pay them well if they succeed. Muckle was here and told me the limit was all within the belt."

"I am afraid they will do their very utmost to defeat me. I want to be satisfied that you are sure I am doing what is right, and also that you will back me out in all that I do in the way of payment. Of course if you do not want me to fight the thing through let me know, and I will drop it right away. Even if we lost the amount I have mentioned, we had better do so than lose all, as we surely will, if we let these rascals have their own way."

Now, Sir, the matter was settled in a very simple way after all, simple, because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company sold their lands at the usual price of \$2.25 per acre. It was a very simple settlement, but how was this settlement obtained? Was it obtained as charged in these letters, by bribery and corruption, or through money spent among Ministers and members of the House of Commons? Is that true, or is that not true? Ministers have disclaimed the accusation with indignation, and everybody is prepared to assume their word for it, no one would suppose them

Mr. LAURIER.

guilty of anything of that kind, but so far as members are concerned is it true, or not true, as charged in these letters, that there are, and there were at one time in Parliament, a dozen members who were bribed by the member for Lincoln in order to take up his defence, and to fight his case before the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway? Sir, the charge is true, or not true. If it is not true, should not members of the House of Commons be prepared to vote against such an accusation as this? Sir, I believe it is not true. I do not believe that the member for Lincoln could bribe a dozen members of Parliament as he pretends to have done. I believe that he slandered his fellow-members, and he slandered them in a fashion which ought to be resented by every man sitting on the opposite side of the House. I cannot understand how hon. members, sitting behind the Ministers, who have repudiated such a charge with indignation, can sit there unmoved and without being prepared to say that a member of the House, who thus committed a slander upon the dignity of the House to which he belonged, is not, to-day, guilty of the charge laid down by my hon. friend from South Oxford. Such conduct as this, of the hon. member for Lincoln, does not, it seems to me, require any more investigation. Such conduct carries its own condemnation with it, and as far as I am concerned, I am ready to give my vote on that question. As I said a moment ago, I would not do the member for Lincoln the slightest injury; I have no resentment against him, but it seems to me that if the House were to delay one minute to condemn such language as has been written by the member for Lincoln, the House would give to parliamentary government the gravest stab it has yet received.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat seems to have a great deal of solicitude for the honor of hon. members upon this side of the House. He says that the hon. member for Lincoln has slandered us by making statements, which, by implication, might lead to the inference that members of Parliament, as well as members of the Government, had been bribed in reference to this matter. Well, Sir, my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) criticised the speech of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), in which he alluded to a statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford, who moved the resolution, as one not calculated to secure the approval of members of this Parliament, in regard to the motion he submitted to the Chair. I leave it to you, Sir, and I leave it to hon. members of this House to say, as to whether the hon. member for South Oxford, in the speech he delivered in making this motion to the House, did not slander members on this side of the House more than the member for Lincoln could possibly have done. What did the hon. member for South Oxford say in introducing this resolution to the House? He said :

"Sir, I think that the facts disclosed in the case of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) show that it is a very bad case. But I am not at all disposed to say that the hon. member for Lincoln is, by any means, the only sinner in this matter; I am not at all disposed to say that that hon. member is the only man who has transgressed all those wholesome maxims and principles on which the vitality and usefulness of parliamentary government depend. More than that: I have said elsewhere, and I repeat here, that I hold a considerable section of the people of Canada, a considerable number of the constituencies

of Canada, are far from blameless in this matter. I have always believed that, to a very great extent, members of Parliament were likely to be as honest as their constituents required them to be; and there was one fact, perhaps one only, which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) stated in his defence, recorded on the Journals of the House, with which I am disposed to agree; that is, the statement which he made in which he implied, at any rate, that he came here with the full knowledge and consent of his constituents, who were acquainted with, at all events, all the material facts hereto stated, before they sent him here. "And he implied, and I think he implied correctly, that if he was wrong, his disgrace was their disgrace. If he had committed a crime, his constituents were accomplices in it. I am not disposed to dispute that statement."

And again, he says :

"This transaction, after all, is only a sort of peak, below which lies, perhaps, a mountain range of still undiscovered, but yet undeveloped rascality."

So, Sir, all through the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, there were implications of corruption on the part of members upon this side of the House, and so I say, that whilst we are prepared upon this side of the House to defend our honor, and to defend ourselves against the attacks which these hon. gentlemen may make, yet we do not propose to do it by condemning a man without giving him a chance to be heard before his peers in Parliament. I am not a little astonished that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House should take the course they have taken in regard to this matter. It is quite true that the hon. member for Lincoln has not had his seat attacked on the ground that he has violated the Independence of Parliament Act, and in that respect, perhaps, his case is not entirely analogous to another to which I propose to refer presently. But, Sir, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. member for Lincoln is not accused of having violated the Independence of Parliament Act, my hon. friend from Frontenac has pointed out what would be the inevitable result of the passage of the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. Could the members of this Parliament, after having declared the conduct of the hon. member for Lincoln to be corrupt, discreditable and scandalous, sit in the same Parliament with him? Would it not be the inevitable result of the passage of a resolution of that kind, that the hon. member must be expelled from the precincts of this Parliament? Now, Sir, what did these hon. gentlemen do on a memorable occasion which I think must have suggested itself to the minds of the older members of this House. You will remember, Sir, although you were not then in Parliament, the discussion that took place on the motion offered by the present hon. Minister of Customs, who was then the member for North Hastings, with regard to the violation of the Independence of Parliament Act by a prominent member of the Liberal party in 1877. You will remember that the hon. member for North Hastings moved that he had vacated his seat in consequence of certain transactions which he had with the Government. What did our hon. friends on the other side of the House say on that occasion? The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, who was then the leader of the Government, made this statement :

"The hon. gentleman was endeavoring, in fact, by moving, upon going into Committee of Supply, a motion which the rules of the House forbade that it should be amended in any way, in order that he might by a side-wind have the House declare the seat vacant, and thereby require the issue of a new writ. Whether that were the case or not, it was tolerably clear from the speech of the

hon. gentleman, from the previous records of Parliament, that when anything of this kind"—

That is, anything affecting the seat of a member of this House—

—"was intended, that it should at least be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, in order that that Committee might make due enquiry into the allegations, arguments and statements advanced, examine into precedents and make a report to the House, on which report the House at a future time could act."

Mr. Blake made this statement :

"When there was such deliberation in the action, although it took the Opposition two years to discover that it was a direct breach of the Independence of Parliament Act, they would not allow one day for that judgment, that investigation, that enquiry which according to precedent, should take place. Did they want to avoid investigation? Did they desire that there should be no report of a Select Committee on the subject as had been the practice in cases on these records? Did they want that the whole facts should not be brought out? The true course would have been if hon. members assumed to say that there had been a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act to make a motion to refer the question to a Committee on Privileges and Elections. When there was to be no reference to a Committee, and when after two years' delay they were to be asked to put the judgment into execution without a moment's delay, he believed the majority of the House would condemn the course pursued, and vote down the resolution."

Mr. Huntington, the then Postmaster General, said :

"The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution knew the fair thing was to refer these matters to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. There should be an opportunity for discussion: the accused should have the opportunity of defending himself, and, upon the report of the Committee the House should act."

Mr. Mills said :

"As the First Minister was not permitted to make the statement he desired to make, he now rose on behalf of the Government, to say that they were quite ready to agree to the reference of the matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections where in fairness to the Speaker it ought to go."

Now, Sir, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that before this discussion had taken place, and before my hon. friend from North Hastings had moved his resolution, the Committee on Public Accounts had made a report to the House in the following terms :

"That it appears from the vouchers now before them, large sums of money have, from time to time, been paid to J. W. Anglin, a member of the House of Commons, for printing and stationery while a member of that House. Your Committee beg leave to report copies of said vouchers and papers to your honorable House."

That report was made on the 15th of March, and was on the Table of this House from that time to the 7th of April, when the hon. member for North Hastings made his motion attacking the seat of the then Speaker, the Hon. Mr. Anglin; but, Sir, in the face of the fact that these documents were before Parliament for 23 days, the hon. members who are now opposing the reference of this matter refused to deal with the question, and contended that it should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It is alleged by these hon. gentlemen that the evidence before the House is sufficient to convict the hon. member for Lincoln, and that they are prepared upon that evidence to convict him of the discreditable, corrupt and scandalous conduct of which he is charged. But all matters of that kind, affecting the seat of a member of this Parliament, I contend, ought to be relegated to the committee which has been appointed by this Parliament for the purpose of

trying all such cases. The hon. member for Lincoln says, in the defence he has made before the House, that if his case is allowed to go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections he will there be able to prove certain things which will extenuate his conduct, if not wholly exonerate him from the charges made against him. Let me say to our hon. friends that even supposing that the evidence which the hon. member may adduce before that committee may not be sufficient to exonerate him from the charges, he will have the benefit of having presented that evidence upon oath, and it will go before the country, so that the country will be able to judge whether there are any extenuating circumstances in connection with the matter or not. For my own part, looking at the question from an entirely non-partisan point of view—for we ought all to look at it from a non-partisan point of view—I do not propose to say one single word in extenuation of the conduct of the hon. member for Lincoln. If he is found guilty by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the proper punishment for having committed the grave crimes and errors with which he is charged would be the vacating of his seat in this House. But, Sir, with this very intention pressing upon us, I believe the proper course for this House to take in dealing with the question is to refer it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The hon. member for West Elgin says "hear, hear." Why, Sir, he is the gentleman who in 1877 moved that the very case to which I alluded a few moments ago, should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; and I venture to express the hope, that if the motion of the hon. member from Frontenac prevails, and this question is relegated to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, we shall not see a repetition of the scandal which took place in connection with the matter to which I have just referred. The Conservatives in this House, when in a minority, condemned the action of the majority in withholding the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections on the Anglin case until the last dying hours of the session of 1877; and let me say to our hon. friends on the other side of the House, that the Conservative majority now in this House will neither attempt to perpetuate nor will they condone any such offence as that which was perpetrated by our hon. friends in 1877. I say again, viewing this case as one in which, even though there may not be any doubt on the minds of many hon. members of this House as to the guilt of the hon. member for Lincoln, it is their bounden duty, in all fairness, when he claims a trial at the hands of his peers, at the hands of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, where he will have an opportunity of presenting sworn testimony in regard to all matters connected with the accusations made against him, to give him that opportunity, and to give it with a full sense of the responsibility that devolves on the hon. member, and with a full sense also of the consequences that will fall upon him if the report of the Committee should be adverse to him. I feel it would be unfair to the hon. member for Lincoln to prevent his having the opportunity of defending himself before that Committee, and, therefore, I intend to vote for the

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

resolution of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick).

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend who has just sat down has made allusions to a case which came before this House and between which and the one under discussion he chose to draw a parallel. His allusions to that case render it necessary for me to reply to some extent to his remarks. The hon. gentleman stated correctly that there was a difference of opinion in those days as to the propriety of sending that case to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I wish to call attention to the difference that exists between the opinion of the Conservative members then and that of the Conservative members now. True it is that some of those who took the view I am about to point out at that time are the same individuals as those who take a different view to-day, and the inconsistency will be for them to explain. In the first place let me point out the difference between the two cases. The attack upon Mr. Anglin, as Speaker of the House, was an attack directly upon his seat on the ground that he had violated the Independence of Parliament Act, and was no longer a member of the House—that he had, as a matter of fact, vacated his seat when he received money from the Government under contract. The motion of the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) was:

"That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient and improper for the Government to enter into any agreement or contract whereby public money is paid to members of Parliament—such as the Postmaster General's Report of 1875 and 1876, and the vouchers laid on the table of this House on the 15th of March ult., show to have been paid to Timothy Warren Anglin, a member of this House for the county of Gloucester; namely, \$8,126.31 for the year ended 30th June, 1875, and \$10,263.24 for the year ended 30th June, 1876, and \$2,709.55 being for the quarter ended 30th September, 1876, in payment for printing and stationery done for and furnished by him to the Post Office Department of Canada 'per agreement;' as shown by the return laid before Parliament by the Postmaster General on the 1st March last, and the vouchers reported to the House by the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts on the 15th March, 1877—as such payments are in contravention of an Act passed in the 31st year of Her Majesty's reign intitled: 'An Act further to secure the independence of Parliament,' which provides that: 'No person, whatsoever, holding, enjoying, undertaking or executing, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, any contract or agreement with Her Majesty, or with any public officer or Department, with respect to the public service of Canada, or under which any public money of Canada is paid for any service or work, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, nor shall he sit or vote in the same;' and are calculated to detract from the independence of the members of this House."

If this motion meant anything, it meant that Mr. Anglin had been guilty of a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act by taking money from the Government, and had forfeited his seat. That view was insisted upon by the mover of the resolution and by the right hon. the First Minister, who pretended that Mr. Anglin had no more right to sit in the Speaker's chair than any stranger who might come in here and take possession of it of his own motion. Did the hon. member for North Hastings, now the Minister of Customs, propose to refer that matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections? By no means. It was urged by several hon. gentlemen on this side that the resolution condemning Mr. Anglin included questions of facts and of law. First, as to whether a contract did exist between the Government and

Mr. Anglin, and then as to what was the effect of such a contract on his seat as a member of this House. There were parliamentary precedents tending to justify the action of the Government and of Mr. Anglin, and there were other precedents that could be taken in the other sense. But the whole question was one which required the hearing of evidence before a committee, and a search for precedents, and a deliberate legal argument, such as only could take place before a committee composed of men of legal training, whose decision should be had before this House could deal fairly with the matter. But when an amendment to that affect was proposed to the House, my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. White, Renfrew), my hon. friend who has moved the reference this evening (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and the right hon. the First Minister, and the Minister of Inland Revenue, and others on that side, spoke and voted against Mr. Anglin being given any hearing before the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Look at that motion and you will see there was no division on it.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to finish, I am about to deal with that point. These hon. gentleman, I repeat, voted that he should be condemned without having a hearing before the Committee, and I will explain how they did so. The motion condemning Mr. Anglin was not one subject to amendment. It was one made by the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply; so that it could not be amended. In this it differed from the motion of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in this case, because his is a substantive motion, which can be amended, and which, therefore, gives the House an opportunity of fully expressing its views on the subject. I afterwards moved, in Mr. Anglin's case, a reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but I could not do so as an amendment to the motion of the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell), for the reason I have pointed out. I, however, gave notice during my remarks on that hon. gentleman's motion, that I intended doing so. It was well understood during the debate that it was the intention of the then Government to make that reference, and hon. gentlemen opposite, in voting as they did on the motion of the hon. member for North Hastings to condemn Mr. Anglin at once—a motion which could not be amended—and refusing to accept the expressed intention of this side, to bring the matter before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, practically voted against any such reference. Later on, when I made my motion to refer the matter to the Committee, these hon. gentlemen, seeing that it was sure to be carried, did not call for a division, but let it pass without opposition; but they had previously voted to condemn Mr. Anglin unheard, as against the alternative proposed, of referring his case to the committee. I am, therefore, perfectly correct in stating that they voted to condemn Mr. Anglin, and were opposed to giving him the opportunity of defending himself before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I find that the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) on that occasion quoted several precedents from English parliamentary practice,

to show that such a case as that of Mr. Anglin's could not go before that Committee. He quoted the case of Mr. Bish which had been before the British House of Commons. He had been a contractor, his case was brought before the full House, and his seat was declared vacant by the full House without reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. He quoted some similar cases, in which he said the House of Commons, without reference to the Privileges and Elections Committee, had declared the seat vacant. I am not sure whether his quotations were correct, but he made them. That was the conduct of gentlemen opposite in regard to Mr. Anglin's case which involved points of law and fact, which involved the infringement of the Independence of Parliament Act, and which involved the hon. gentleman's seat. How different is this case. There is no allegation that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has violated the Independence of Parliament Act, but the allegation is that his conduct as a man has been scandalous and discreditable and corrupt, and we are asked to make that statement on the faith of documents which have been written by the hon. member himself. There is no apparent ground for his asking to put in further evidence. What sort of evidence can be put in? Evidence that he did not write those letters? If there were any question of that kind he would have denied their authenticity instead of implicitly admitting that he did write them. The writing is admitted by the hon. member for Lincoln. He says he has other evidence. What other evidence can he bring? Evidence that the statements he made in the letters were true? If he can prove that, then his conduct certainly was discreditable and corrupt, and such as this House is warranted in pronouncing the heaviest censure upon. Would he bring statements to show that what he said was untrue? Then certainly, if he wrote lies, and presented those lies to this House as a justification, his conduct is more discreditable and more corrupt than it would be under other circumstances. I do not see where the use is of getting any further evidence, as nothing further can be proved which can exonerate the hon. gentleman from the scandal of having written these letters. In any case, the scandal upon him and the scandal upon the House remains the same. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) says we should not pronounce this censure upon the member for Lincoln because it would involve the loss of his seat. But thirteen years ago that hon. gentleman not only proposed to pass a censure upon a member of this House and upon the Government, though that question involved the interpretation of the Act, but he voted against the reference of that question to the Privileges and Elections Committee, and yet he now has the confidence—I might say the cheek—to say that we should not pronounce this censure upon a member of the House because it would involve his expulsion from his seat. If it did involve that expulsion, can the hon. gentleman say that is a reason for the House refusing to express an opinion? The hon. gentleman did express his opinion in 1877 in the case of Mr. Anglin. He expressed his opinion by voice and by vote that the House should pronounce a censure upon Mr. Anglin and the Government of that day, and should refuse to allow the matter to go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; and yet, now with the gros-

sest inconsistency he says that this case ought not to be pronounced upon by the House but ought to go to the committee. The member for Lincoln is not charged with anything of which that committee can properly take cognisance. The committee has nothing to do with the conduct of a member of Parliament except in connection with the provisions of the Independence of Parliament Act. Was the case of Louis Riel, who had been elected a member of this House, referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections? No. You will remember that that member of this House was twice expelled.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. There was a conviction there.

Mr. CASEY. He was expelled once before the conviction.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No, he was outlawed.

Mr. CASEY. He was expelled before the outlawry. That is my recollection of it. After the outlawry, his seat was declared vacant, as it was *ipso facto* vacant on account of outlawry. At all events, there was no reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. My hon. friend who moved for the vacation of the seat of Mr. Anglin moved to expel Mr. Riel from the House without any reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but now, in the case of a friend of his own, he wants the dilatory method adopted of a reference to the committee. I do not suppose that all those who vote for that motion have made up their minds that the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) should not be censured in the way specified in the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have no doubt that under other circumstances, many of them would vote for that motion, but I cannot understand why they should have any doubts, and, therefore, why they should refer this question to a committee. The only questions can be whether these letters were written by the hon. member, and, if they were written, whether they were true. The writing has been admitted, and, whether these letters are true or not in their statements, cannot affect the conduct of the hon. member. I am, therefore, without further enquiry, prepared to vote that the hon. member's conduct, as it appears on the face of the documents written by himself, is deserving of the censure contained in the motion of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). In conclusion, let me point out those of the hon. gentlemen in this House who have been so inconsistent, so unjust, so unkind as to wish to condemn a man without trial in 1877, and who now ask us to go through the farce of trying a man who is already convicted by his own admission. Let me read the names from the records, of those who are now here who voted against the proposition to refer Mr. Anglin's case to a committee. I find these: Messrs. Bowell, Caron, Colby, Costigan, Daoust, Desjardins, Dewdney, Ferguson, Haggart, Kirkpatrick, Langevin, Macdonald (Kingston), McCarthy, Mitchell—my hon. friend the third party, who is a little more charitably disposed now, than he was then—Oumet, White (Renfrew), and Wright (Ottawa). Then they voted to condemn a man without a trial, and now those same members have failed to give a reason for refusing to condemn a man without his being allowed to give, as they contend, further explanation.

Mr. CASEY.

tions. The explanation is required still more, because, as I pointed out, the nature of the two cases is so very different. In the Anglin case, there was every ground for a judicial enquiry, while in this, there does not seem to be room for any judicial enquiry into the merits of the case whatever. This is a case of confession rather than a case of enquiry. For that reason, although I moved the reference alluded to by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), in 1877, I feel quite consistent in voting against the same reference now, and I shall do so.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The question before the House, is whether a certain matter shall be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I have carefully read the correspondence, I have carefully read the previous debates, I have listened to what has been said in the House this evening, and the difficulty with me, in coming to a conclusion that will enable me to support the motion of the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is this, that I cannot see what there is to submit to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. There is nothing. There is no question, either of fact or of law; it is simply a matter of opinion which can be gathered only from the documents now before us. Therefore, there being nothing to submit to that committee, it seems to me entirely illogical to move a reference of this kind; and holding that view, and also, feeling that this is a case entirely of opinion, of sentiment, if you will, and that this House is the guardian of its own honor, I intend to vote to-night, as I voted on the motion of the Minister of Justice, against the reference to the committee, and in favor of the direct motion of condemnation. Now, it has been said that the action of this House in dealing with this matter without reference to a committee, would be analogous to that of a mob who, finding a red-handed murderer, should hang him up to the nearest lamp post. I think it is not at all complimentary to this House to make such a comparison. This House is a deliberative body, in a certain sense it is a judicial body, and to say that in a question of this kind, this House is not competent by all the rules of justice, by every principle of fair play, to deal with a question of this kind, seems to me as inconsistent as the former proposition to which I have referred. If there were questions of fact to be tested, if there were questions of law upon which we might have doubts, then the proposition now before us would be a correct one; but if there were reams of correspondence added to what has already been produced, it could not alter the bare fact which appears on the record that the member has been guilty of conduct which is in violation, if not of the letter, at least of the spirit and of the principle of the independence of Parliament. I, for one should be glad to see that principle carried further than it has been carried in our Independence of Parliament Act; I should like to see an addition to the resolution to which that now under consideration has been moved in amendment, declaring that no member of this House should be allowed to act as a paid solicitor, either before a committee of this House, or in the promotion of any Bill before this House, or before any of the Departments of which this Government is composed. Now, it may be said that this would be a very harsh measure; but when we consider how largely we have to deal

with all the various Departments of Government, it seems to me that the members of this House should debar themselves from that privilege, if privilege it is, and be willing to forego any source of emolument that might arise from it. Will any man pretend to tell me that a member, acting as solicitor, can divest himself of his influence as a member of Parliament? Why are members of this House employed as solicitors before committees? Why are they asked to act as the member for Lincoln did? Is it because they are eminent at the bar? Is it because they have any special talent for conducting cases of this kind? No, Sir, it is because it is expected, and hoped, and believed that behind their power as solicitor, behind any particular ability which they have in that respect, their influence as a member of Parliament is to be brought into play to secure the object in which otherwise they would not be successful. Therefore, I say, I would be glad to see this House enact some such measure as would make it impossible for a scandal such as that now before us, to occur—make it impossible for any solicitor who is a member of this House to endeavor to combine in his own person the dual capacity of member and of solicitor. I say that as long as we allow this practice to exist, considering the numerous ways in which, under our present constitution, we have to deal with the various departments of the Government, it would be exceedingly desirable that a law like this should be passed. No analogous case can be found in the history of the Imperial Parliament, mainly for the reason that there is no such intercourse in England between members and the various departments; there are no public lands to be asked for; there are no favors, either legitimate or illegitimate, to be obtained from the Imperial Government, as there are from the Government of Canada. The only way this House can purge itself from the suspicion of corruption on the part of its members, or of being influenced by improper motives, is the enactment of a law of that character, or by adherence to the principle of abstaining entirely from acts combining the dual capacity of solicitor and member. Until we do that we shall always be liable to have imputations thrown upon members of this House, precisely as they are thrown upon the member for Lincoln in the present case. My main reason, however, for voting against the reference, irrespective altogether of the degree of guilt which may attach to this particular case, is that I see nothing to submit to this committee, and it is merely going through a form to pass the resolution under consideration.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not intend to go into the merits of the case, but I want to explain how and why I am going to vote. I shall consider this question as a legal one, entirely aside from its political character. I think it would have been easier for us to vote on the present motion, if the member for Lincoln had stated what kind of defence he wants to make, and what kind of evidence he wants to bring. I believe, also, that the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has committed a great mistake when he seriously proposed to this House to deny that the letters printed in our Proceedings were not signed by the member for Lincoln.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I never denied that.

Mr. AMYOT. He said they were not admitted.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I stated there had been no confession of the charges; there was no admission that these letters were signed by him. He said these letters purported to be written by him. I stated there should be either a conviction or a confession of the charge, or a report by the committee.

Mr. AMYOT. I think there is a confession that they were written by him, in one of his declarations before this honorable House. It is not a good defence to deny what has been admitted, or to say that there has been no confession. Here we have a member of this House, one of our colleagues, who has a mandate from a county, charged with the most serious offence, an offence which, for a man of honor, for a member of Parliament, is as great as would be, perhaps, an accusation of murder against an ordinary man. He says, grant me a committee; I say from my seat, upon my honor, which I still have—because he is presumed innocent until he is condemned—I can bring further evidence, either letters or witnesses, that will explain these published letters. I will prove that I am not guilty as stated in the accusation. Well, Mr. Speaker, as a lawyer, as a man in the habit of hearing trials, I say that I cannot, for my part, refuse the reference of this case to a committee. When the member for Lincoln says he has new facts to bring up, we must give him the opportunity of bringing them. It is all very fine for the hon. member who spoke before me (Mr. O'Brien) to say this is a question of law. But the member for Lincoln says there are other facts, new facts, which he desires to bring before the committee. If he does not bring them before the committee, so much the worse for him. If the case remains as it is now, none of his friends will be ready to stand up and assume his defence; and if he has made a false declaration, if he has stated wrongly and falsely that he will bring forward new facts and evidence, his case will then be worse than it is now and none of his friends will take up his defence. Under these circumstances I feel bound to vote for the amendment. I have confidence in the Committee of Privileges and Elections, and I think in view of the facts spread over the country, no Government would take upon itself to delay, by unfair means, the proceedings of the committee. I think the committee will do justice and act fairly towards the country, and also act fairly towards the accused party. Reference has been made to confessions. We may, without making a comparison, refer to cases of murder. If the accused party pleads guilty the court does not generally accept the plea, but wants the trial to proceed and the accusation to be proved. In this case the accusation is eminently grave against the accused party, and as he has asked to be heard before a committee, I think the request should be granted. As to the suggestion made by the hon. member who preceded me, that no member of this House should act as paid attorney or solicitor in supporting measures before committees of this House, I think he is perfectly right. If hon. members of the different Parliaments in Canada, either Federal or Local, were better paid and were not called upon to lose so much of their time in the public service, they would not be so much exposed to these temptations.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has made an astonishing proposition: that when a man pleads guilty to a charge of murder, his plea is not taken by a court of law. That may be the law in Quebec, but it is not the law of the Dominion. While a prisoner is warned as to the consequence of his plea, yet, if the plea is persisted in, it is accepted, and sentence is pronounced. It appears to me that the duties of the Committee of Privileges and Elections have been misunderstood and misinterpreted as applying to this case. That committee has been referred to as if it were an appellate tribunal for this House. That committee is simply a subordinate body charged with the duty of ascertaining facts, hearing evidence and reporting on the evidence to the House, and then the House decides the case. In that respect it resembles the position of a referee or master to whom has been referred a case for the purpose of ascertaining the facts, and the facts having been ascertained the court decides the case. But I do not think that in a court of law, where the facts are admitted, that a judge on any plea would refer it to an inferior court to ascertain the facts. The business of the Committee on Privileges and Elections being simply to ascertain the facts, as I have pointed out, the argument put forth by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is unanswerable, that there are no facts on which the committee would have to report, but the case would merely come back to this House for adjudication on the facts already contained on the face of our Journal, for not only in *Hansard*, but in the Votes and Proceedings are these letters and statements of the hon. member for Lincoln to be found. Whatever course is pursued, this House is eventually the tribunal to decide the case. The member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) put forward the plea that the Committee of Privileges and Elections would decide as to whether the hon. member for Lincoln was guilty of the charge laid against him, and they would give a decision, and that decision would be reported to the House. The committee's powers are simply to ascertain the facts, they may draw conclusions if they choose, but they may simply report the facts, and at all events eventually this House must decide the case. Several cases have been referred to in this discussion. The case of Mr. Speaker Anglin has been referred to, and the motion then moved by the hon. the Minister of Customs has been quoted. In that case, it was said the Committee on Public Accounts had reported certain facts. But the Speaker of the House had not been heard before that committee, and as presiding officer he was unable to make a statement in this House; but if he had risen in his place and stated that the facts recited were true, the House would have dealt with the case. But the question was one respecting an alleged violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, and the reference to the committee was made to enable him to make his defence, and then the committee was called upon to decide whether the case was within the statute or not. But there is another law besides the Independence of Parliament Act; it is an unwritten law dealing with the honor of this Parliament and of which this Parliament has charge, and regarding which, when the facts are clearly submitted and exposed, it should act without referring the case to a committee. What pro-

Mr. Amyot.

position is put forward in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)? He has put forth certain documents, which state certain facts from which one conclusion only can be drawn as to the position of the hon. member for Lincoln with respect to the timber limit, the benefit he was to derive from it, and the statement he made as to the way in which he had obtained that benefit. Then the member for South Oxford proceeds, and states that the hon. member for Lincoln, when this question was brought up in Parliament, utterly denied the statement that he had any interest, beyond solicitor's fees, in that transaction, and that he then gave an emphatic, clear and categorical denial to the statement made on that occasion by the hon. member for North Norfolk on the floor of this House. The resolution next states the fact that members of the Government who had been charged in those letters with having been influenced improperly and corruptly, denied those charges in this House, and their denials were assented to by the hon. member for Lincoln. Those facts can be accepted and also the letters in question, for the hon. member for Lincoln has not denied them. He has indeed admitted them in clear and emphatic language, and the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is too astute a lawyer not to know that the terms in which he admitted them were such as in law were conclusive. The hon. member for Lincoln said he regretted he had made any charges against Ministers of the Crown—that he made no charges against them. In a letter published by the hon. gentleman in the *Citizen* he stated that those letters were written by him and they were not untrue. We have also the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln as to what took place in this Parliament in 1887, when the charge was brought by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Thus we have all the facts stated, and the evidence and letters printed in the Votes and Proceedings, together with the statements of the hon. Minister of Customs and the hon. member for North Simcoe repudiating the inferences or charges made in those letters. The hon. member for Frontenac referring to the language of Lord Palmerston, in the case of John Sadlier said that he had put in the cases of only conviction and confession. Now, Sadlier was accused of fraud, and before the judgment of a court of justice was passed upon him, he had committed suicide, and, therefore, there was no judgment of conviction in the case. When it was attempted to declare the seat vacant, it was judged that the facts should be ascertained, because there was neither conviction nor confession. In the case of Lord Cochrane, we all recollect that he was indicted with other parties, before the Court of Queen's Bench, for a conspiracy in regard to the funds. He was found guilty by the court, and judgment recorded against him. That conviction went before the House, and although Lord Cochrane stated from his place, that he would prove that the judgment was unjustly obtained against him, and that it was not a true judgment, the House declared his seat vacant. It is true that years afterwards, Lord Cochrane did justify the statement he made in the House. If I recollect the case of O'Donovan Rossa aright, he was similarly expelled from the House. We come now to the case of Louis Riel. He was elected a member of this House, and there was laid before the House a judgment of outlawry

against him, and a witness at the bar of the House identified Louis Riel, the outlaw, as the member elected for Provencher. He was expelled and his case was not referred to the Committee of Elections. These cases are analogous to the one we are now discussing. What, I ask, have we to lay before the Committee on Privileges and Elections in this case? We have all these facts admitted, and if the report of the committee comes back, simply stating these facts, we have to deal with the matter just as it is. It is argued that the hon. member for Lincoln states he has other evidence to offer. We must bear in mind that when my hon. friend from South Oxford first asked that these letters be placed in the Votes and Proceedings, the request of the hon. member for Lincoln was granted, that other letters which he had in his possession should be published contemporaneously with the letters published in the *Toronto Globe*. Again we find, a few days afterwards, that the defence of the member for Lincoln as published in the newspapers was also entered on the Proceedings, and afterwards when the Minister of Customs read a letter from Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, the member for Lincoln was, by this House, unanimously allowed to place other letters upon record. The member for Lincoln is an astute lawyer. He knew the position he was in, and we all know that so far as a court of law is concerned, it is impossible by a verbal statement, to do away with the effect of a written statement, so far as regards the party who made the writing. Of course, hon. gentlemen who are charged in these written statements, have a right to offer a defence, and to show that the statements therein made are untrue. As the matter stands now, we have these letters containing statements which are untrue, and which, if untrue, no man of honor should have stated them at all. If, on the other hand, these statements are true, they are most serious charges against members of the Government, and against other individuals, because it is clear on the face of that letter quoted by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, that some corruption of some kind was openly stated to be used towards some persons. I think the House has a right to deal with this question at once, not only for the honor of this Parliament, but for the honor of responsible Ministers of the Crown. Where statements of this kind are made, and denied by Ministers of the Crown, the House should not hesitate for a moment to condemn him who made them. Suppose my hon. friend the Minister of Customs had passed away from amongst us and was no longer able to defend himself here, look at the position he would be placed in by these statements. I do not wish to see my hon. friend taken so suddenly away from this House. I wish him many long years, but if he were not now a member of this House, a stain would be on his memory which he would be unable to efface. I say that letters of this kind affect the honor and the integrity, not only of the Government, but of the entire Parliament. We have these facts before us, and it seems to me that it is simply a farce to ask us to go to a committee, to ascertain facts which are admitted, and which have not been attempted to be gainsaid. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) admits that the hon. member for Lincoln has brought no statements in his defence. I have no doubt that if he wished to make any further statement to this

House, we would not hesitate to afford him that opportunity. After looking into this matter carefully, as I have done, I have no hesitation in saying that such a demand as that now made by the member for Lincoln would be denied by any judicial tribunal as an attempt to delay. Nothing in the statement made by the hon. member for Lincoln has given us the slightest indication that he can attempt to deny these letters, and I think no judge in a court of law, however anxious he might be to give fair play, would hesitate to say that the member for Lincoln had ample opportunity to defend himself, if he could. The member for Lincoln has not, in any statement he made to this House, endeavored to contradict the authenticity of these letters, although he may have endeavored to qualify the statements therein. It is for us, sitting here as representatives of the Canadian people, to say whether, under all these circumstances, this is such conduct as a member of this House should commit, and if he has committed it, whether or not he deserves the censure of the House.

Mr. GIROUARD. The question before the House is not whether the hon. member for Lincoln is guilty of the serious charge made against him; it is whether in dealing with his case we are following the ordinary practice of Parliament. I have heard some hon. gentlemen say that no man in his senses could assert that the hon. member for Lincoln could exonerate himself or satisfy any member of this House that he did not write the letters which he is alleged to have written. That is not the question at all; the question is whether in dealing with the case we are following the rules of Parliament. If we look at the practice followed by this Parliament for twelve years past, we find that when an accused member has asked that his case be referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, it has been invariably referred to that court. It is said that no one can have any doubt as to the guilt of the hon. member. Let us suppose for instance, that a crime has been committed in the presence of the ordinary judges of the land, and that the accused is brought before them. They have no doubt that he has committed a crime; are they going to pass sentence upon him immediately? No; the law of the land indicates a certain mode of procedure. The accused has a right to ask that he shall have a trial according to that procedure, and he cannot be convicted unless it is followed. It has been stated that the hon. member for Lincoln has made a confession of his guilt. Suppose he has, where is the authority on criminal law that will say that when a man is arrested for a crime and makes a certain confession, but asks to be tried according to the laws of the land, he is not entitled to have a trial according to the laws of the land? Now, Mr. Speaker, the practice of Parliament has been always to grant a reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections to a member who is accused, and who asks for that reference. The hon. member who has just sat down says that Mr. Anglin could not leave the Chair he was occupying as Speaker of this House. I ask where is the rule which prevented Mr. Anglin from asking permission to leave the Chair and make a statement before the House if he wanted to? I would like to know where there has ever been a case more clear than that of

Mr. Anglin. It was so clear that the party in power kept it before the Committee on Privileges and Elections to the last hour of the Session, and after the Session Mr. Anglin resigned. The case of Louis Riel has also been mentioned, but is it a parallel case? He never took a seat in this House and was not introduced. True, he took the oath in the Clerk's office, but he never really became a member of the House. Look at all the cases brought before this Parliament during the last twelve years. Every case, when the accused asked for it, has been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I hope the hon. members of this House, in dealing with this case, will not establish a dangerous precedent, will not be carried away by their first impression that this member is guilty of the gross charge made against him. Even if he has been so guilty, the evidence taken by the Committee on Privileges and Elections will go before the country, and will show that this member has been dealt with like all other members who have been accused. I will certainly vote in favor of the amendment of the hon. member for Frontenac.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to say only a few words on this subject. We have before us the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, which the hon. member for Frontenac proposes to amend. I should be very glad, indeed, to vote for the amendment if I thought there were to be brought to light any new facts or anything that would tend to exculpate the member charged. But I agree with the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who says that he does not see what new facts or new evidence can be adduced. I think we are seized of all the facts in the case, and, that being so, it seems to me that we ought to be prepared to give our judgment now. I think I am conscious of not being actuated by the slightest feeling of either personal or political hostility to the member who is charged. I have met with him on different platforms, as I have met with other members of this House, and we have fought our battles; but I think that gentleman himself will say that no personal enmity has been engendered between us. It is a painful thing—and I can realise that it is especially painful to those on the other side of the House who have been more intimately associated with him—to pass judgment on a fellow-member; and I think I can say truthfully that I share in that feeling. But is there no duty that we owe to this Parliament or to this country? Let us look at some of the facts in connection with this case. Is it something that was brought up and forced on the attention of Parliament by the hon. member for South Oxford? Is it not a fact that in the press of the country letters have been published, signed by the name of the member who is charged—letters that have been placed upon the Journals of this House; that the people of the whole country have read those letters; and that the verdict given by the people who have read them and the journals which have commented upon them, is that the person who had written those letters had, by doing so, and by the receipts he had given for the money he had taken, convicted himself of discreditable, corrupt and scandalous transactions? That being the case, is there not a duty for the House to act? Could the House ignore the matter altogether? It did seem to me that

Mr. GIROUARD.

it was the duty of the Government, who were charged, as the hon. Minister of Customs himself admitted, with influences having been brought to bear upon them to corrupt them, to bring this matter before Parliament; but when they did not do so, can any one accuse the hon. member for South Oxford of doing something that is discreditable, as the hon. member for Lincoln charged him, when he, in vindication of the honor of the House, and in order that this Parliament might stand right in the eyes of the people of this country, discharged the painful duty of bringing this matter before the House; and now that it is before us and we are asked to deal with it, the hon. member for Frontenac interposes and says that he is not prepared to declare that the transactions of the hon. member are discreditable and scandalous. He says in the first place that the letters alluded to in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford have not been admitted by the hon. member for Lincoln to have been written by him. Is that really the case? Let us see what the hon. member for Lincoln does say in reference to these letters. Many places might be cited, but look at this statement on page 1803 of *Hansard*:

"Does he not know that it was discussed in 1887 before the electors of the County of Lincoln, whom I have represented in Parliament for the last thirty years? But now, with his party driven to the last ditch, he thinks he can throw some obliquy on myself by dragging it before the public again. There is nothing more contemptible in an individual than to make public a man's private correspondence, and when we find that this whole arraignment against myself is based on some private and confidential correspondence which was stolen from myself, it is not worthy of this Parliament to discuss it for one single moment."

Is that not evidence most conclusive of the genuineness of the letters? On page 1807 what did he say:

"I stated that this correspondence was of a private and confidential character, and it was either stolen or was obtained by the grossest fraud. This correspondence was in the hands of only five persons."

And then he goes on to enumerate who they were. On page 1814 we find him saying:

"I maintain that no man can truthfully say that in any one of these letters I endeavored to act corruptly towards the Government."

If that is not a direct admission that he wrote these letters, I do not know what is. It is not only an admission that he wrote them, but he takes the stand that they were proper letters to write, and he defies any one to say they were not. I need not multiply evidence, because I do not think that the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) would have ventured on a defence of that kind. But we have another plea put forward, and that is, that we are not possessed of all the facts. Well, if we are not, I do not think any hon. gentleman opposite—not even the hon. member for Frontenac—will say that it is owing to any fault on the part of the mover of the original resolution, or of hon. gentlemen on this side. Every opportunity was given to put in all the correspondence. It was given not only on one occasion, but on two occasions—even on three occasions—and the hon. the leader of the Opposition has said to-night that the hon. member for Lincoln will be given liberty to put in anything he may have. Let me call to your notice what transpired in the House in reference to this matter. On page 182 of the Votes and Proceedings, I find that the hon. member for South Oxford

(Sir Richard Cartwright) said, when moving in this matter :

"The House is now in possession of the hon. member for Lincoln's explanations. I desire that the House should have the other documents which piece out the documents the hon. gentleman has referred to ; and when the House is fully seized of them, we will be in a position to deal with this matter. I should be very glad, therefore, if the House will permit me, to include in that motion :

"And any other papers or correspondence that the hon. member for Lincoln desires to have included.

"My wish being that the House should be seized of everything.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have asked the hon. gentleman, as it is a matter which affects him so considerably, if he requires a notice, and he only brings the condition, which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is willing to grant, that besides the papers that hon. gentleman has moved for, the hon. member for Lincoln will be at liberty to put in the Votes and Proceedings any other papers in connection with the matter.

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose all the hon. gentleman's papers are dated ?

"Mr. RYKERT. They are all in regular order. I have never put anything irregular before the House.

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would make it more convenient for the use of hon. gentlemen if the letters the hon. gentleman wishes to interpolate were placed in order, as some of them are letters in reply to those contained in the document I have handed in.

"Mr. RYKERT. I have a hundred more if the hon. gentleman would like to have them.

"Mr. SPEAKER. As this motion must go into the Votes and Proceedings, what papers are required should be described.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Lincoln will put in within twenty-four hours all the papers, and we will have the whole story.

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection in the world to that.

"Mr. SPEAKER. The correspondence should be defined, so that we may know what papers are to be printed in Votes and Proceedings.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would suggest that, in order that the hon. member for Lincoln may put in all his papers, the hon. member will postpone his motion until to-morrow, and all the papers can be put in to-morrow.

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection to that. It is perfectly fair that the hon. member for Lincoln should put his side of the question as fully as he pleases."

Now, that was what transpired with reference to this matter. I would invite the attention of the House to the fact that when such ample opportunity was given to the hon. gentleman to put in all his papers, the inevitable conclusion that forces itself upon my mind is that all the papers that the hon. gentleman has in his possession and that would mitigate his offence in the slightest degree or explain it, were put in by him. It was a full month ago since the matter came up, and every opportunity has been given for the production of papers. I call the attention of the House to what the First Minister said, on page 1859 of *Hansard*, when it seems the First Minister did not contemplate the necessity of sending this matter to the Committee at all. Sir Richard Cartwright asked :

"Is the right hon. the First Minister prepared to say when this question will be resumed ?"

To which the First Minister replied—and this was after the vote had been taken on the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Justice :

"The hon. the Minister of Justice explained his reasons for moving the adjournment. They were, that upon considering the serious nature of the charge and the serious consequences to the hon. gentleman originally concerned, and the importance of considering what

the precedent would be, sufficient opportunity should be given to the members of this House, after having heard the statement of the hon. gentleman who moved the motion and the statement of the hon. gentleman accused, to read the statements and to form their judgment as to what their vote would be. The Minister of Justice took occasion to say that he would not even say how he would vote. He would not in any way commit himself to the defence of the hon. gentleman accused, but he said, as a matter of justice and reason, that opportunity should be given to every member of the House to read the debate in the *Hansard*, so that he could make his mind fully acquainted with all the circumstances. We will say Monday for the closing of the debate."

The right hon. the First Minister evidently took the view that, the papers being on record, the charge having been made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the accused having had a full opportunity to explain, that all that was required would be before the House on which to form its judgment, but he did think that the proposal of the Minister of Justice was reasonable and that members should have an opportunity to read over the evidence and debate and be in a position to give their vote. That opportunity has been given, the question is before us now, and the House is in a position, according to the right hon. gentleman's own reason, to give an intelligent judgment upon this subject. With reference to what is stated in these letters, which the hon. member for Lincoln seems to think are justifiable, let me remind the House and the Minister of Customs that, the other night, when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) read, from some returns brought down, that the late Mr. Thomas White had applied for a timber limit, that hon. gentleman warmly rebuked the hon. member for North Norfolk for having dared to repeat what had been said in this House before, that the Hon. Thomas White had applied for a timber limit ; and he was careful to explain that when Mr. White applied for that limit he had no interest or profit or benefit in making the application, but simply made it for a constituent, and it was unworthy in the hon. member for North Norfolk to refer to the matter at all. What does that imply ? I would ask the Minister of Customs if the action of the hon. member for Lincoln was justifiable and proper, what kind of an offence it could be to any other member of the House to be told that he had applied for a timber limit ? His sensibility on that point showed it was absolutely necessary for one who had made application that it should be peradventure and beyond doubt that he had not derived one cent's worth of profit from the transaction and was entirely disinterested. The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) desired that parliamentary practice and privilege might be extended so that he might find stronger words in which to denounce the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who had applied for a timber limit at that time, though he declared that he had applied for another person and not for himself. Does not this show that these gentlemen realise that, if a member of Parliament participates, as the member for Lincoln acknowledges that he participated, to the extent of thousands of dollars, in any of these grants, they know that their action would be scandalous and discreditable ? Otherwise, why should they rise to declare that they have had no connection at all with the matter ? They have declared that, if it could even be

suspected that they were interested in these things, it would lower them in the eyes of their peers, and would be discreditable and scandalous to them. While they say that, at the same time, though there is the receipt signed by this gentleman himself, they say there is nothing proved which is scandalous or discreditable to him, but that they must have the whole question referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections to tell them whether it is discreditable or whether it is scandalous. They say that they require time to make up their minds on this subject. There is one point as far as I remember, and only one point in the whole of this correspondence which is denied by the hon. member for Lincoln, and on which there is any difference between him and some other gentlemen who have been mentioned in this connection. I think the charge was as clearly made as it could be, and as the Minister of Customs has already stated, that he was tampering with Ministers. He has stated that he was glad to exonerate these Ministers, and that he did not intend to make that statement and it was not correct. He made another statement that he brought two young gentlemen from Winnipeg—young Tupper and young Macdonald, I think he called them—that he had brought them here in order that they might use their influence with their fathers. These young gentlemen deny that statement, and it is upon record among other things—for I think we are fully seized of all the documents in this matter—that they deny this to be the case. In regard to that, I understand that the member for Lincoln says that was true and not false. But, admitting that to be true, and that the statements of these young gentlemen are untrue, what does that accomplish for the member for Lincoln? It would acquit that gentleman of telling a falsehood in that one instance, but the result would only be to convict him of having used corrupt influences in order to secure his end, to bring those gentlemen here to do what? Not to lay the case before the Government, but to induce their fathers to act promptly in this matter. Their fathers? Why could he not say at once the Ministers of the Crown? The evidence is there, and that is the only case, as far as I remember, that the hon. gentleman disputes; and, if he maintains his veracity in that case, he does it at the expense of showing that he was using corrupt means to accomplish what was not otherwise justifiable. In his letters he says these gentlemen were to come here to induce their fathers to act properly. The member for Lincoln states that the "properly" should be "promptly." If he did not write those letters, how did he know that the word was wrongly used? I do not wish to prolong this debate or to increase the feeling against the conduct of the hon. member. I have no personal hostility and no political hostility to him, but I think we have a duty to discharge. When letters like these were sent abroad for the people to read, naturally the people look to us to see if this Parliament will put down what is discreditable and scandalous, whether this Parliament pronounce upon those documents upon the testimony we have before us, and whether we, sitting in this House, consider that these transactions are discreditable, scandalous and corrupt, or not. If I thought there was anything which could be brought out, anything which would do away with and wipe out the statements in these letters, I would be willing that the matter should

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

go to a committee; but I cannot see how any evidence can be produced to change the present appearance of the case. I am asked by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), after these facts have been recited upon the journals of the House, whether I consider the conduct of this hon. member to be discreditable, corrupt and scandalous; and I feel that I am bound to say that I do think so, that my mind is now made up on the subject, and, if the question is to be determined by the House, I will be compelled so to declare by my vote.

Mr. COLBY. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is not very happy in his definition of what it is proposed to submit to the committee. He says that the proposition is to submit the question as to whether the charges made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), if they are proved, are scandalous and disreputable. I do not think there is any question here, or that there can be any question in the committee, as to whether these charges, if they are fully substantiated, are scandalous and disreputable. I do not think that is the point at issue, and I do not see why the hon. gentleman should suppose it to be the point at issue. Has he heard any gentleman in this House, on one side or the other, attempt to justify or palliate the offences which are charged against the hon. member for Lincoln? That is not the question at all, and, therefore, I say the hon. gentleman was very unhappy in his definition of what was to be submitted to the committee. There is but one sentiment, as there could be only one sentiment, on the part of any hon. member on either side of the House in regard to this matter, and I was, therefore, surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say, that gentlemen on his side of the House had no fault if this matter were not properly decided by the House. It is no question of this or that side of the House. It is not a party question at all. It is a question which concerns the dignity and the honor of the whole House, and, irrespective of any party feeling at all, the judgment—whether rendered by the House or any committee of the House—will be rendered on the merits and without any partisanship modifying its judgment. I am sure that I speak the sentiments of this side of the House when I say that no feeling of partyism, that nothing which is unfair, that nothing which any accused man could say is unfair or improper or any one in the country could say was unfair or improper, should be allowed to interfere in this case. The hon. member for South Oxford was quite within his right in making this charge. It was his duty to do it, if he believed in the allegations contained in his indictment. And what is the proposition? The proposition is simply to submit this question to the consideration of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. An hon. member of this House, a gentleman of high authority in this House, a man who has given, perhaps, as much attention to this class of subjects as any member of this House, has just told us that if we should follow the whole line of precedents, it is our duty to refer this case to the committee. But it is not necessary to go that length in order to make out a case. It is not inconsistent with the precedents hitherto established to make this reference. Then,

if there is no impropriety, if there is nothing inconsistent with the former practices of this House, I can see very good and sufficient reasons, to my mind, for referring the case to that committee. Does any hon. gentleman question the competency of that committee to take evidence, and consider this matter? Is not that committee composed of the picked men of the whole House? Does it not contain men of the largest parliamentary experience, of the most profound legal knowledge, of the highest weight in Parliament, and in the country—men specially familiar with this class of subjects? Can it be said that that committee has a political complexion different from that of this House? Can it be said that by transferring this case from the House to the committee, you are putting it into the hands of a partisan body? That committee reflects the political sentiments of this House, so that if there were a political bias in the committee, it would also operate in this House. The committee are as competent to deal with this case as the House are competent to deal with it. Indeed, they are more competent than the average members of the House, because they are selected for their peculiar fitness to deal with this class of questions. Then why this reluctance to refer it to the very highest and best tribunal that exists? Questions of facts are to come up. There is no question of law. I was surprised at a remark that fell from the leader of the Opposition on this matter. In speaking, not, I hope, as leader of the Opposition, but in his individual capacity, he said: Certainly if there was a violation of a statute, if there was a violation of a written law, I should say by all means refer it to the committee. I think I understood the hon. gentleman to say so; I understood him to draw that distinction, and I think his recorded speech will show it—that if there was an offence against the statute, he could see a propriety in referring it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. But he says the alleged offence is one against an unwritten law, against a law even higher than would be a mere statutory law. But where is the difference? The consequences are the same, whether it be an offence against the statutory or against the unwritten law, the result is obviously the same. If he has offended either against the statutory law or against the unwritten law, as the hon. member has charged, the result is precisely the same; he must walk out of the House, he must be expelled. Now, what determines me in this matter is the plea of the accused member to be allowed to defend himself. I speak as we all ought to speak, not as members of the Government or of the ministerial side, not as members of the Opposition I speak as an independent member of this House, and I hope every man's vote will be recorded from that standpoint. This man who is charged says: I have letters and evidence of importance to place before the House, and in order that I may justify myself, I ask this House to appoint a committee for the purpose of considering the whole matter. This is his language:

“I simply ask the House for justice; I ask hon. members to give that opportunity of defending myself.”

That is a request, Mr. Speaker, that I believe we ought not refuse. It may be, as was suggested by a certain hon. member, the worse for the man who asked it. But that is his business. I do not know

why he asks it, I am not in his confidence. He may be asking what he had better not ask for; because I know that if he goes before that committee this matter will be investigated in a thorough manner. It is sufficient for me to know that the man who is charged here with a most grave offence asks to be allowed to put in evidence in his defence. Can we refuse him that privilege? He is charged here with an offence which, if proved, can never be blotted out from the record of his political career, or from the records of his family, an offence from the consequence of which, if he is proved guilty, he can never recover. He says he wants to put before this committee evidence and letters which have not yet appeared. Now, I, as a member of this House, am not going to deny him that. I do not know what the result may be. It may be that he will be able to mitigate his offence; it may be that while he may not be able to exculpate himself, he may explain certain passages in his letters which seem now to be of a damnable character. I do not know that he can make the slightest defence, but I know he asks it, he claims that he has a right to it, he implores it, and I do not think we ought to withhold it. If he brings forward no evidence to mitigate the charge, the verdict of that committee will be then precisely what the verdict of this House would be if we were to decide now on the evidence before us. But if there is new evidence, then let us hear it, and it is better that we should hear it in committee. If there are witnesses to be examined and facts to be considered, it is evident that a jury of 215 men is too large to make that investigation. There is no question of law in this case; it is merely a question of fact. If a long hearing is to take place the time of the committee is less valuable than the time of the House, and it is better to let the committee make that investigation. There is no concealment, in the committee everything is open to the light of day, the press is there, the members on both sides are there, and the House will know all that the committee will know. Why this insistence that the case shall not go before that committee? Surely it cannot be that any man fears that if the case goes before the committee something will come out that will exculpate the member for Lincoln? I cannot understand why there is any objection to allow the accused member the benefit of making a defence before the committee. I cannot understand why hon. gentlemen insist that we should decide the case summarily in this House. Certainly if he had not asked it, I should not have thought of proposing it. Certainly with the evidence before the House, if he had said he was prepared to accept a verdict on the evidence given, there would have been no occasion for an enquiry; but it is because he asks it that it should be granted. There should not be two sides of the House on this question, and if I were a member politically opposed to this hon. gentleman, whose judgment in this case might be liable to be questioned, I would not want that hon. gentleman or any of his friends to be able to say: You voted to deny me a fair trial, you voted to suppress evidence which I told you I could lay before you, and which, if you had heard, would have modified your judgment. It is equally in the interest of members of all parties in this House and of members of all political opinions not to have a member of Parliament, who has

been a member for many years, and who has enjoyed the confidence of an intelligent constituency for many long years, turned out of this House saying: I appealed to my colleagues for an opportunity of stating my case and putting in further proof, and I was denied. I certainly will not be one of those to deny him that request. Moreover, in granting that request we will not be flying in the face of any precedent, or acting contrary to the records of Parliament, but we will simply be adopting the ordinary course. And when a member asks, and insists and claims it as his right, and implores us to allow him to take that course and submit further proofs, I think we would be hard-hearted, and acting in a wrong manner if we refused. In my view we would be taking an erroneous step if we adopted that action, and we would be saying in effect: We do not want to hear you further, you have had your day, you are out of court, for you might have put in evidence before, and you failed to do so, as might be said by a captious lawyer. We do not wish to treat a fellow-member in such a technical manner, and with such illiberal consideration. He tells us, it may be true or not, that he has more evidence to put in, and he asks us to hear that evidence. He says: If you give me that opportunity, I can either exculpate myself, or greatly modify the feeling that now exists in regard to this matter. If we believe that he will not succeed, what harm is done? If we believe that he might exculpate himself or modify his position, we ought to help him. If by any possibility he can bring any evidence that will exculpate him and cleanse the honor of this House, the better it will be for the credit of all our public men, because there are depths and depths of turpitude, and the lighter this offence, if offence it be, the better it is for the country, the better it is for the credit of our public men, the better it is for the credit of this House. We should send this case to the committee. We should do so if we believe there is the slightest chance of the hon. gentleman explaining or extenuating his action, and he tells us he can do it; and, having adopted that course, we shall then be in a position to say: You have had a double opportunity of stating your case before this House and before a committee, and now your mouth is closed, and you cannot reflect on our conduct in pronouncing the verdict which we find ourselves compelled to pronounce on the evidence before us.

Mr. BLAKE. With much that the hon. President of the Council has said, I quite agree. I agree with him as to the spirit in which this House should approach the consideration of this question. I agree with him that least of all questions which can be brought before this House, ought this one to assume in any sense a party complexion. I suppose all must have been struck by the observation made by the hon. member for Lincoln, when he gave his explanation at the opening of this debate, that expression of regret which, he said, he entertained at his unfortunate position, in that after having made his speech he was to leave the House and was disabled from participating in the debate which would follow. If that debate were to take the tone which the hon. member for Lincoln obviously conceived, if it were to proceed on the lines he obviously indicated, the regret of the hon. gentleman would

Mr. COLBY.

have been justified, and the rule to which he gave deference by his retirement would have been proved to be an unreasonable rule. But, Sir, the regret was unfounded and the rule is an entirely reasonable rule; because that vacant chair speaks more strongly than the most eloquent language we could hear in favor of the member who is absent from it. It speaks in solemn tones, and appeals to us in terms more forcible than any tongue could use as to the line which we should take, the tone we should adopt, the spirit which should animate us in disposing of this case. Why is that chair vacant? It is vacant because our colleague is, according to the principles of reason, disabled and disqualified from being the judge in his own cause. But, then, it is a cause in which we are his judges; and it is, therefore, in a judicial capacity, strictly in a judicial capacity, that we have to deal with the matter, thus I agree wholly with the observations of the hon. the President of the Council, and also in the phrase dropped by the Minister of Justice at an earlier stage of the debate, that we are acting here as judges of the cause. Sir, under these circumstances we have no warrant, whatever may be the latitude, the regrettable latitude, which we permit to ourselves under other circumstances, when we are present face to face and are able, if attacked, to reply to the attack—we have no warrant here and now, to mingle invective with reason, to heighten the complexion of the transaction by any rhetorical devices, to blink the facts, to take any other course than, in a spirit of candor, fair play and impartiality, to endeavor to ascertain the right and the truth. I agree with the observation of the hon. the President of the Council that the honor of the whole House is concerned in the matter. It is concerned in all such matters. The honor of the House is in a sense in the hands of every member of the House. No course of conduct discreditable in the general sense of the community can be pursued by any single member without, to some extent, at all events, lowering the character of the assembly of which he forms a part, and in this view it is our common interest, as members of Parliament, that the transaction, whatever it may be, should not be depicted darker than its true color, and that every reasonable protection should be accorded to the man who is accused. On the other hand, Sir, it is even more clearly the duty of the House to watch jealously that honor of which it is the guardian, and to take care that it does not become, by any unworthy connivance in a discreditable transaction, an accomplice after the fact, and so degrade itself to some extent to the level of those who may be concerned in such transactions. The situation is, under these circumstances, painful. I agree with the hon. gentleman in the view that it ought not to be made in any sense a party question for those reasons which I have given, and for other reasons too; for reasons which, taking a somewhat lower ground, are particularly applicable to those who may happen for the time to be on the side of the minority, because if there be any section of the House that has a deeper interest than another in the observance of these principles, it is those who happen to be in the minority. Their only chance for the affirmation of charges justly made against a member of the majority, consists in the observance of the principle of justice. Their only chance for the avoidance of a condemnation of a charge unjustly made against

a member of the minority, consists in the adherence to this principle of justice; and to introduce a political complexion into matters of this kind, would at one blow render it impossible for a minority to obtain justice against an adversary, and render it impossible for a minority to obtain justice for themselves. Therefore, those who happen to sit on the side of the House on which I sit are especially charged with the duty of holding up that standard of justice to which the hon. gentleman has appealed. Then, Sir, it is on those principles of justice that we ought to act, and I ask myself, applying myself to this case as it is now presented, whether the application of the principle of justice renders premature, at this moment, a final judgment on the main motion. The member for Lincoln, as the hon. President of the Council has said, has asked for a committee. I cannot say that in my judgment the best, the convenient, the fittest course to deal with this case, is to refer it to a committee. My own opinion is that the best, the proper and the convenient course is that it should be disposed of here, for reasons that I will state to you in a moment. When we shall come to dispose of it, either here or elsewhere, I hold myself free, nay, I hold myself bound—as I suppose every hon. member will—upon such evidence and arguments as shall at that time be before us to examine carefully into every recital of the motion that is presented to us, and to ascertain whether those recitals are fair and full; to examine whether the *résumé* is accurate and true; and to examine whether the conclusion which is drawn from those recitals and from that *résumé* is just and fitting; and either to negative, or to amend, or to affirm, as the result of that examination indicates is right. But that, Sir, is not the immediate question. The immediate question is, not what judgment should be pronounced upon the main motion, but whether we should refer the case to a committee, and I ask myself: why we should refer, and what we should refer? I believe that each case of this description should be dealt with according to its circumstances, and that if there be a question complicated and difficult, involving the examination of witnesses, or a subject complicated and difficult, involving a long search into precedents, it is fitting and convenient that the sifting of evidence by the examination of witnesses, or the long search into a series of precedents, not heretofore collected, should be accomplished by the Select Standing Committee that we erect for such purposes. But, I believe that in every case we are called on to consider, whether the case in hand is one that calls for the interposition of that machinery, and the intervention of that committee. Cases have been referred to in the past. It has been said by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) that there was a rule for and a right to a reference to a committee. I do not know where the hon. gentleman found the statement that there is such a rule, or that there is such a right. I dispute the existence of the rule and of the right. I know that leading gentlemen on his side of the House, have from time to time, in days that are past, proposed a much more summary disposition—the most summary disposition possible—of matters brought before the House, and, according to my recollection of the objections taken to that summary disposition when proposed, they were based upon the special considerations to which I have referred. Particular reference has

been made to the motion with regard to one of your predecessors, Mr. Speaker, in the chair. In what form was that motion made, and supported by the whole body of the Conservative party in Parliament? It was made, Sir, directly against the Speaker of this House, with that Speaker in the chair, upon a motion to go into Committee of Supply, as an amendment, in which form it was not amendable, in which an instant decision was instantly sought, and when the party whose conduct was impugned, and whose seat—if not in absolute terms, yet by a necessary implication was fatally assailed—was prevented from saying one word in his own defence. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) indicated that there was some right on the part of the Speaker of the House to ask the indulgence of the House to leave the chair, in order that he might make a statement on the floor. I am not familiar with the precedents upon which the hon. gentleman justified that statement, but I say that if there be such, and I am quite ignorant of them, they are precedents which ought not to have been invoked. My own opinion of the conduct of those members of the House who in that case made that proposal was that, altogether regardless of another consideration to which I shall briefly refer, they took, not merely an unreasonable, but I will say a hard, a rigorous, and an offensive course, in making the motion in the form in which it was made. My opinion was, that a due regard for the principle of justice would have caused the motion to be made in such a form as that those who moved it would have secured to the man whose character and whose seat was assailed, an opportunity of defending himself. Sitting as he did in the Speaker's chair, they ought to have known that the only mode by which that result could be obtained, would be by a motion to refer the matter to a committee, before which he could appear. Beyond all that, there were important questions to be disposed of. There were questions to be disposed of, questions of fact, and also questions of law, based on former precedents, which appeared to justify the view that the seat was not vacated, and, therefore, there was a reason in the search for precedents and in the taking of evidence for a reference of that case. There were many meetings of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. As happened in other controversies which occurred when the Liberals were in a majority in this House, the effort was to do that justice which the hon. the President of the Council appealed to us to-night to endeavor to attain. The case of the Speaker was a case in which a prominent member of the majority was attacked. There was also a case in which a member of the minority was attacked. And in each of these cases I rejoice to think, that the majority entered into the investigation, sought for the truth, ascertained the truth, and framed a unanimous report, upon which the House afterwards acted. But some hon. gentlemen have said that there was a trick played in connection with the presentation of the report. Sir, no trick was played. The Committee on Privileges and Elections met, they agreed upon the report, and it was unanimously agreed by that committee, in the presence and with the assent of the hon. First Minister, who was a member of the committee and the leader of the Opposition, that the Chairman should be requested to defer the presentation of the report

to the latest hour compatible with its presentation during the Session. It was thought to be a convenient course, a proper and manly course, not to create the disturbance and difficulty that would result from the vacation of the Speaker's seat a few days before the close of the Session. The suggestion was made on these grounds, I believe by myself, it was unanimously agreed to, and it was so done. The result was that the report was not presented until the last day of the Session, it being understood that it would be, as it was, acted upon immediately after the close of the Session; and I think it was a course worthy of the hon. First Minister in his position, worthy of the members of the Opposition and conformable to the dignity and the amenities of the House; and a course which a faithful though sometimes recalcitrant follower of the hon. First Minister ought not now to condemn him for having assented to. Now, I wish to know what we should refer, and why we should refer, and in order to decide this, we must brush aside some questions which in the course of this debate have been raised as being more or less in issue. I say that no case is made or pretended of breach of the Independence of Parliament Act; and that if there were, the penalties which are provided by that Act have been exhausted and apply no longer. Now, I do not state this because I conceive there is the slightest difference in principle, upon the question of a reference to the committee, whether the point arises upon the statute or whether it arises upon the unwritten law, any more than my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) did or could have supposed such a possibility. My hon. friend only pointed out that there might be a question as to what the effect of a statute was. The question is whether there is fit matter to be referred to a committee; and, whether that matter arises by virtue of alleged breach of a statute, or by virtue of an alleged breach of a rule, or by virtue of an alleged violation of those obligations, or those unwritten laws which guard the honor of Parliament, the same principle applies to all. But I say there is here no charge that the Independence of Parliament Act has been broken. Again, there is no case here made of a breach of any laws regulating the disposition of timber limits. Again, and this is not an unimportant point, in regard to some of the observations made by the hon. member for Lincoln, there is no case made here, and no charge of any fraud having been committed upon Mr. Sands, the purchaser of these limits, and, therefore, that is not a matter suggested as enquirable into here. Sands may have been defrauded, and he may not; he may have been defrauded by the hon. member for Lincoln, or by Mr. Adams, or by both, or by neither of them; it is a matter with which we have nothing to do on the issues before us. And, lastly, and most important for our consideration, there is no case whatever made of wrong of any kind, save whatever wrong is alleged to be apparent in the hon. member's own letters printed in the Votes, and in his own statements made in this House. Whatever is alleged against him, and whatever proof is suggested as sustaining the allegations, are based upon his own written and oral statements both before us. There is the whole of it. Now, to the benefit of these limitations the hon. member for Lincoln is fully entitled; but by these limitations and their consequences the hon. member is also bound. Now, as well as I can gather, the hon. member in his expla-

Mr. BLAKE.

nation has alleged that the recitals of the extracts from these letters in the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford are unfair and misleading. Though he did not point out the details in respect of which he made that allegation, still he made it in the general. He has also alleged that there are other papers which he can produce; though so far as I am able to judge, these relate wholly or mostly to the irrelevant question of Sands. But these other papers, whatever their nature or effect, he has not further particularised, nor has he produced them. Now, no man can deny that the hon. member for Lincoln has had the amplest opportunity of presenting his defence, both in proof and in argument. He has on two occasions at least produced such materials as he thought proper; he has on two or three occasions made statements here; and I am not saying that it might be held to be unjust to assume that no further valid evidence or defence was available, or even to decide that no further opportunity should be given. But though I contest the strict justice of that view, for my own part I do not choose to act on it. I agree, once again, in much that the hon. President of the Council has said in that regard. I think it extremely important, in the interest of justice and fair play, in the interest of this House at large, that the judgment which is finally to be awarded in this matter, whatever it may be, should be a judgment which cannot be impugned upon any pretence or suggestion that there was any fair opportunity refused to the hon. member to make a complete defence, or even to offer such mitigating and exculpatory evidence as the hon. President of the Council referred to. The ground which I take is this: I think that the hon. member having, though quite mistakenly in my view, regretfully in my view, when he made his statement in this House, reserved in part his defence, ought to have even now the opportunity of completing that statement and defence. I think the House is entitled and ought to say to him this: "While we do not see, upon the material now before us, including your own statements, any ground for referring the case to a committee, we are prepared to receive your further statement, your further argument, your further papers, if any you have, and to deal with this case as may then seem just." I think, then, that the hon. member ought to have the opportunity of saying, in his place here, what more he chooses, and of laying on the Table here what further papers he deems proper. And, I think that the adoption of this course would enable us to dispose in a proper way of the amendment now in your hands, and at the same time to do the fullest justice to the hon. member for Lincoln. It is the course which I venture to submit for the consideration of the House. The hon. the President of the Council has not himself been able to point out what there can be to refer to the committee. He was not called upon to do so. He is no doubt not possessed of such information as the hon. member for Lincoln may be able to submit for our judgment.

Mr. COLBY. I stated that I really did not know.

Mr. BLAKE. I say so. I have not the least doubt of that. None of us are aware of it. We gather its character from the statement of the hon. member himself, and his statement was that there were other papers which he could produce which

would give, as he said, a different complexion to those published. I am not going to weigh or analyse the papers published, with the view of saying whether that allegation is impossible or not of execution. I desire that the hon. member for Lincoln should have the opportunity of laying these papers on the Table, with all the comments and explanations he can give upon them. I desire, under the circumstances, that as he chose in part to reserve his defence—to give us some, but not as he says, all—he should not be placed in a worse position now than that if he had on that occasion given us all; but I do not perceive in that condition of affairs a cause for a reference to a committee. I perceive rather a reason for taking such a course as shall give the hon. gentleman the opportunity of presenting the remainder of his case on the floor of Parliament, and as shall thus leave us to dispose of this matter, with his case complete, according as the dignity and honor of this House and liberal justice to the hon. member for Lincoln require. The House will observe that I have studiously avoided expressing or implying one single opinion with reference to the merits of the transaction. It is impossible, of course, to avoid forming in one's own mind impressions upon papers such as we have before us, but I believe it to be our duty to hold our minds open up to the latest possible moment. I believe it to be our duty to enquire whether there be, as the hon. the President of the Council suggested, any explanation, any door of escape, anything which may alter the complexion which, to some minds, these letters and papers bear, and in that view, keeping, as well as I might, an open mind, I have scrupulously abstained from making any argument or expressing any opinion here as to the conclusions which are to be drawn from the papers in our hands. I repeat, and I close by the suggestion, that we ought to make arrangements for this case being completed in the manner in which it was begun, by the hon. member on the floor, and that we should then proceed to give our judgment in the matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No one can have listened to the address which has just been made without congratulating the House on the adjournment of this debate. For the sake of the dignity of this House as well as the justice of its proceedings, it is satisfactory to know that the discussion has entered a calmer channel than that in which it ran on the night when the hon. member for South Oxford presented his resolution. For having adjourned the debate in order to afford hon. members an opportunity to calmly and fully consider this question, the House is amply rewarded by the consideration of this matter being entirely removed, as it has been by the speech we have just listened to, from political bias and party passion. I am bound to admit that I differ from the hon. gentleman in the conclusion he finally stated, but in almost every word he uttered to this House, as regards precedents and as regards the statement of the particular case before us, I agree to the fullest extent. I do not hesitate to say that if we were bound in this matter by precedents, we would have found that the course which this investigation has taken, from the first to the last, has been a departure from the rules laid down in former years. The custom has

been, whether the charge has been preferred against an hon. member by another hon. member in his seat or by a committee of the House or by one of the tribunals of his country, that the member has been heard from his place in the House, and that the judgment of the House has proceeded on the statement so made by the member accused. Undoubtedly the course of procedure has been in numerous cases in the Imperial Parliament, that if the member accused has made no defence, he has been forthwith expelled. In other cases, not so numerous, when issues of fact were raised by the member accused or when he challenged the authority of Parliament to deal with his case, the result has been a reference to a committee. But we cannot fail to remember, whenever a question of this kind comes up affecting the seat or the character of a member of this House, that the course of precedents in former years has run in channels which we are not disposed to follow too strictly in the present day. We cannot forget that many precedents which can be cited from the annals of Parliamentary procedure are precedents in which the power of Parliament was exercised far beyond the right of Parliament, and that in numerous cases men were deprived of their seats in the British House of Commons, constituencies were deprived of their members, sometimes disfranchised and sometimes ordered to be represented by men whom they had not elected to Parliament, by virtue of the high authority Parliament chose to exercise, under the strained notion of privilege which prevailed in the House of Commons two centuries ago. We have reached an age and live in a country when it is not deemed necessary that we should be bound by these arbitrary precedents. We enjoy constitutional freedom—we enjoy constitutional government in a wider sense than the British people did, when these precedents were established two hundred years ago; and in a free Parliament, with wider notions of the rights of the people who sent us here, to say nothing of the wider and more liberal notions of the rights of the men who sit here, I humbly submit it is the duty of this House to depart, if necessary even, from precedents—not for the purpose of violating a right, not for the purpose of denying justice to any one, but for the purpose of taking greater caution in our decision and seeing that the last chance be given to the accused. We have had a great deal of discussion to-night, not only from the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), but from the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) with reference to the precedent in the celebrated Anglin case, and both these gentlemen, in taunting the Conservative party with its vote on that occasion, forgot that the precedent which binds this House to-day is not the vote either party gave on that occasion, right or wrong, but the precedent which was established by the majority of the House; and if the House of those days, led by the hon. member whose voice has just been heard and the hon. gentleman who sits next to him, was in favor of a full investigation by a committee, if the early course of precedent in the cases in which the accused made no defence was not followed in that instance, it matters not who voted against that action, the precedent is established that the House should give a committee, and that is the precedent which ought to prevail, if precedents are to prevail at all. I do not hesitate to say that the case under discussion is one in which the

honor of Parliament is most deeply involved. I do not agree with the contention which has been made that the authenticity of the letters has not been established. I regard the authenticity of those letters as having been substantially established; I regard this correspondence as a most shocking correspondence, and one which appeals to the House as strongly as any case could appeal to its consideration for justice, as strongly as it can appeal to the mercy of this House. But, while I think that correspondence is without a parallel in the history of any Parliament, I think further that we should not be swayed from the judicial consideration which has been suggested by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and, while that correspondence is of a very shocking character, is of such a character that the member who wrote those letters is liable to the severest censure of the House; still it behooves us to proceed with great calmness in regard to a matter of such importance. An English statesman has said, very properly, that the purity of Parliament would be best preserved by the most scrupulous regard being shown to the rules of justice, and to the deliberation with which the ends of justice should be pursued. I must admit that the member for Lincoln, having had two or three occasions to state his defence, according to the practice of Parliament, has failed to state a defence in this House. I say this with a view to the deliberations that may take place hereafter, and I say that, in the statements he has made, he has failed to exonerate himself, and failed to relieve himself of the censure which the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford makes him subject to. Unless he can make a better defence than that which he has made up to the present moment, that is my view. I listened with the greatest attention to the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln, and I thought he was unwise not to make his full defence here. I find that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) agrees with me in that matter, but I heard the member for Lincoln state that, having taken advice on the subject, he reserved his defence and begged for a committee to be granted to him in order to give him the opportunity of making that defence. According to the precedents in the English Parliament, and in this Parliament for twenty years past, he is not entitled to that committee as a matter of right. But, as a matter of caution and of prudence, I think we must arrive at the conclusion, in regard to such a solemn question, a question which is so grave that, as stated by the hon. member for West Durham, it will be the end of the political life of any man against whom such a censure is levelled, a charge so grave that it is almost equivalent as another member has said, to a sentence of death against the man who is charged, that we should give him the last opportunity, and then we shall know that we have given him the last chance which he can desire, to be heard. We shall not only have given him the opportunity to be heard from his place, according to precedent, but we shall have given him the second opportunity to be heard from his place, and to add to the record on our table, and, finally, before passing such a censure as would exclude him from public life and would degrade his name and character possibly in the eyes of future generations, but we shall have given him the additional

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

opportunity of a hearing before a committee. It is true that we have given him two trials, and now he asks for the third. When the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) asked what we are going to refer to the committee, he himself gave the best answer. The hon. member agrees with me that the member for Lincoln, having failed to make his defence in the House, having, under advice, kept his defence for the committee, and has still a last word to be heard before sentence is given. There is still something to be heard from the member for Lincoln, as he states. I say, then, let us refer this to the committee, with the right and the power to hear that last word which the member for Lincoln has to speak. It may be ineffectual. If so, we shall have given him the last opportunity which any man can ask, and we can come to the free exercise of our duties in this matter. It may be that the conduct of the hon. member may be relieved or palliated, at any rate to some extent. I need not speculate upon that, because, when we are endeavoring to see whether a man should have another trial or not, it is vain to enquire whether he can make a good defence or not. That is a question of the accused—never for the accuser or for the judges. Therefore, when the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) asks what the reference to the committee would be for, I think he has effectually answered his own question, by saying that we shall have the evidence brought forward by the member for Lincoln, which, if necessary, will be given under the solemnity of an oath. I desire to say a word as to a feeling which may naturally affect some members of this House in regard to the policy of the Government. I did feel that there was a sentiment abroad in the House the other night that, perhaps, the Government was inclined to what the hon. member for West Durham calls an "unworthy connivance." Such a desire never entered the mind of any member of the Government. If a reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections is now granted, I pledge myself, and I pledge my colleagues, that every influence the Government can bring to bear will be brought to bear in order to have this matter speedily brought to an issue, so that the result may be recorded before the prorogation of this Session. In that case, I may ask what is the reason for more haste, what is the reason for any informal hearing of the member for Lincoln or for the carrying of the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford to-night? Surely we are not in such a hurry to vindicate our virtue that a matter of a week or two stands between us and the giving of the most liberal trial which a man can possibly ask. I will make this further statement, to the member for Lincoln, and those who feel interested in his defence, whether inside this House or out of it, if they receive the concession of a committee, they must be prepared forthwith to enter upon the investigation with the knowledge that it must be terminated speedily in order to give the committee time to report before the close of this Session, and to allow the House ample time for consideration. And I make the further statement, that on the deliberations of that committee the Government will ask the House to come to a consideration of the whole case, as the member for West Durham came to the consideration of it to-

night, free from political bias, and that every man may record his decision upon this case as one sitting on a jury under the solemn obligation of an oath. Under these circumstances, and in view of the observations which have been made to this House by the hon. member for West Durham, I feel that we are not unduly violating precedents, and that we are conserving the dignity of Parliament, and at the same time guarding against any possibility of rashness, by adopting the resolution of the hon. member for Frontenac, and allowing the committee to hear the defence of the member for Lincoln, although it might have been better that he should have made it to the House at an earlier period.

Mr. LAURIER. With the permission of the House I desire to make one remark. I stated my views at an earlier stage of the debate this evening, and while I have not changed my mind in regard to this matter, I desire to say, that after the strong declarations which have been made by the Minister of Justice, I am somewhat inclined to modify the conclusion at which I had arrived; and I will on this occasion, as an act of grace suggested by the Minister of Justice, say that perhaps it is better, though my mind is made up as far as I am concerned, that every opportunity should be given to the member for Lincoln of presenting the defence which he desires to make. Under these circumstances I would ask my hon. friends around me to agree to the motion.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to repeat the appeal which I made to the Premier when I spoke upon this question, that he should see, as having charge of the business of the House, that every opportunity should be given in order that this matter may be fully investigated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is necessary for me to say that, after the statement made on behalf of the Government by the Minister of Justice. The Government, so far as they can, will take every step in their power to expedite the proceedings of the committee, and will allow no adjournments that will not be assented to by the minority of the committee; and will press the matter in such a way as will ensure a report early in the remainder of the Session, so as to give this House every opportunity to consider the report, and either to accept it or reject it.

Amendment agreed to, and motion, as amended, agreed to.

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 18th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the H. H. Vivian Company (Limited).—(Mr. Dawson.)

EMPLOYMENT OF A SHORTHAND WRITER.

Mr. GIROUARD moved that leave be granted to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to employ a shorthand writer, to take down such evidence as the committee deem necessary.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, as I do not see the Minister of Finance in his place, perhaps the Prime Minister, or some other member of the Government, can give the desired information. Last week I enquired of the Finance Minister when he would introduce the Banking Bill, and he informed us that he expected to lay it on the Table to-day. Is it about to be laid on the Table, may I enquire?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Finance Minister would have introduced the Bill to-day, but, upon consulting the authorities, it was found to be a matter of doubt, whether it ought not to be introduced by resolution, as the last Bill was introduced. The Minister of Finance has given notice of a general resolution for to-morrow, which will be moved, and the Bill brought in immediately after.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I also enquired of the hon. gentleman whether he was likely to produce the Budget this week, and he replied that it was not impossible that he might introduce it on Friday. I presume that he has by this time ascertained whether it is possible or impossible, and probably he has acquainted the First Minister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I will have to leave that answer for the Finance Minister when he comes in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would request that the First Minister should inform me before the House rises to-night.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He will remember that a week's notice was promised, but that sort of notice is very indefinite.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is so.

THE COPYRIGHT ACT.

Mr. CARLING moved that the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 19) to amend the Copyright Act, be read the second time and concurred in.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The amendment makes no change except a verbal one. The section of the original Bill provided that criminal courts should have jurisdiction to deal with matters relating to the Copyright Act, on information of the Attorney General of Canada. The Senate has simply provided that the Exchequer Court shall be a competent court. The object was to make it clear that it was merely a court of concurrent jurisdiction.

Motion agreed to.

THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that Bill (No. 116) respecting the Department of the Geological Survey, be read the second time. He said: Hon. gentlemen will remember that, heretofore, the Geological Survey has been a branch of the Department of the Interior. The working of the branch was found to be rather inconvenient in that connection, and it is proposed to make a Department by itself, with a deputy head. Another provision is to increase the educational standard of the officers of the Department, whereby technical officers can be appointed under the Civil Service Act, which will enable any gentleman of ability and experience to be appointed to either class in the Department, at a salary fixed for that class. It will not in anyway interfere with the working of the Department so far as expense is concerned. There is another clause, which prevents officers of the Department from reporting on the private properties of individuals. Those are the principal objects of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

ADULTERATION ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the order for the further consideration of the Bill (No. 9) further to amend the Adulteration Act, chapter 107 of the Revised Statutes, be discharged, and the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration. He said: It was understood that this Bill should be referred back to the Committee for further consideration, as it was thought desirable to further amend it. I propose to amend it in Committee, by striking out of section 9 the following words: "but the evidence of such person shall be admitted in his own behalf only when corroborated by the evidence of the analyst or inspector, or some other disinterested person." It is proposed to leave it to the court to say what weight should be attached to the evidence given. It is inaccurate to say that the evidence shall be admissible only if corroborated, because it must be admitted before it can be corroborated. Moreover, difficulties will arise as to the nature of the details for which corroboration will be necessary. It might be sufficient that the evidence should be corroborated on some point quite immaterial in a scientific sense, such as the date of inspection.

Motion agreed to; Bill re-considered in Committee, reported and read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—APPOINTMENT OF QUEEN'S COUNSEL.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. AMYOT. A question of importance now agitates the public, especially the legal portion of it, and is of a nature to cause trouble. There seems to be a conflict of jurisdiction in regard to the appointment of Queen's Counsel, between the Federal and Local Governments. The object of my motion is to elucidate that prerogative, which also includes other questions vital to the Confederation at large. It is an important one, not only as far as the etiquette in the courts is concerned, but it may involve serious consequences. The criminal

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

law provides that the Crown Prosecutor shall have the right to reply, in addressing the jury, when he is a Crown Counsel. The wrong application of this rule may occasion new trials, writs of error, cause heavy expenses, undue delays in the administration of justice. We all know what were the Queen's Counsel in England. "Custom," says Blackstone (Vol. III, page 354) "has, of late years, prevailed of granting letters patent of precedence to such barristers as the Crown thinks proper to honor with that mark of distinction; whereby they are entitled to such rank and preaudience as are assigned in their respective patents." These counsel, in England, are appointed by the executive power. It is one of the prerogatives of the Crown. The same practice obtained here, and, up to Confederation, those appointments could not give rise to any difficulty. Even after the Confederation, no difficulty arose until the Supreme Court delivered its judgment, in 1874, in the case of Lenoir vs. Ritchie. Up to that time, nobody denied the right of the Local Legislatures to appoint Queen's Counsel for their courts. The Supreme Court of Canada, in the case cited, decided that the Local Legislatures had no such power. Their judgment rests on the following syllogism: First, the appointment of a Queen's Counsel is a royal prerogative, and can only be made in the Queen's name; Second, the Queen does not form part of the Local Legislatures, but only of the Federal Parliament; Third, hence to the Ottawa Government alone belongs the appointment of the Queen's Counsel. No appeal to Her Majesty's Privy Council was taken from that decision, which has perplexed the mind of the legal community ever since, and embarrassed the divers Governments of the Dominion. That judgment was concurred in by only three of the honorable judges of the Supreme Court; the Chief Justice was not present; one of the sitting judges pronounced that the Provinces had the right to appoint Queen's Counsel, and another would not give any opinion, because the question did not arise. The only question in dispute was whether an appointment of Queen's Counsel made by a statute of Nova Scotia in 1876, had a retroactive effect, and gave to the new title-holders precedence over the counsel appointed by the Ottawa Ministry since 1867. That was the only point discussed at the argument by Mr. Haliburton, representing the Government of Nova Scotia, and he declared that the constitutional question had not been raised before the inferior court, that he did not expect it would be raised, that he did not intend to discuss it, and that he was not prepared to do so. None of the Provinces had received notice, or knew that such an important question would be raised, and none was represented. This question was not the one dependent upon the issue, although this *ex parte* judgment, on a collateral issue not in point, given by a divided tribunal, without hearing the interested parties, has sufficed to reverse all precedents; to annul, virtually, all the local statutes passed; to supersede all the deliberate opinions, formally expressed, by the law officers of England, as well as by those of the Dominion. I might here quote the correspondence exchanged between the right honorable leader of this House and Lord Kimberley. After having quoted section 92, paragraph 14, of the British North America Act, omitting therefrom the word "exclusively," he says:

"Under this power, the undersigned is of opinion that the Legislature of a Province, being charged with the administration of justice and the organisation of the courts, may, by statute, provide for the general conduct of business before those courts; and may make such provision with respect to the bar, the management of criminal prosecutions by counsel, the selection of those counsel, and the right of precedence as it sees fit. Such enactment must, however, in the opinion of the undersigned, be subject to the exercise of the royal prerogative, which is paramount, and in no way diminished by the terms of the Act of Confederation."

Lord Kimberley answered, on the 1st February, 1872, very politely confirming or accepting the views taken and submitted to him by the right hon. the Premier :

"I am advised, he says, that the Governor General has now power, as Her Majesty's representative, to appoint Queen's Counsel; but that a Lieutenant Governor, appointed since the Union came into effect, has no such power of appointment. I am further advised that the Legislature of a Province can confer by statute on its Lieutenant Governor the power of appointing Queen's Counsel; and with respect to precedence or pre-eminence in the courts of the Province, the Legislature of the Province has power to decide as between Queen's Counsel appointed by the Governor General and the Lieutenant Governor, as above explained."

I must protest against those *ex parte* cases submitted to the Home Government. In all such instances, the interested parties, the Provinces, should be invited to join and submit their own views in a joint case. I will not discuss the question as to whether a statute is necessary or not, to authorise the exercise of the royal prerogative in appointing the Queen's Counsel. Before the Union, even before Confederation, I know of no Quebec statute providing for those appointments, which, however, were freely made by the representative of the Crown, advised by his counsel, as exercising a royal prerogative. The authorities in Canada appointed them by virtue of the public law of England, which became for us the common public law of the land by the cession of this country to England. The more important point which I want to elucidate is this one: Does the Queen form part of the Local Governments? If she does not, the appointments of magistrates, coroners, justices of the peace, sheriffs, gaolers, constables, and hundreds of others are null, because every one of these appointments is equally of royal prerogative, the Queen being the source, the fountain of all honors and powers. More than that, all our local statutes would be void, because they are all enacted by "Her Majesty, with the advice, &c." In the beginning of the Confederation, the dual mandate existed. I see here hon. members who were present when the first of those statutes was enacted for the Province of Quebec, it might even have been at their suggestion that the first statutes were so phrased. None of those statutes have ever been disallowed for such phraseology. Have all the public and leading men of Canada, all the judges, all the Bar of the Dominion been so long in error on such a point? Some of our statutes have been discussed before the Privy Council. Never has it occurred to the mind of any one that they were wrongly enacted. But let us examine the law more closely. By the 31st Geo. III (1791), chapter 31, section 2, it is provided :

"That there shall be within each Province of Upper and Lower Canada a Legislative Council and an Assembly to make laws, &c., and that such laws will be assented to by His Majesty or in His Majesty's name, by such person as His Majesty shall, from time to time, appoint to be the Governor or Lieutenant Governor of such Province."

By section 30, the Governor or Lieutenant Governor is

"Ordered to assent to the Bills in His Majesty's name." The same Act provides for the establishment of the courts by the Canadian Legislature. The 3rd and 4th Vic. (1840), chapter 35, section 3, again prescribes :

"That the laws of the United Canadas shall be assented to in Her Majesty's name by the Governor. Section 40 provides that the Lieutenant Governor may receive the same powers as the Governor General."

The same Act declares that all the existing laws shall remain in force, specially as to the administration of affairs by the Executive Council. It gives power to create courts, &c. Section 61 is very explicit. It reads as follows :—

"And be it enacted, that in this Act, unless otherwise expressed therein, the words 'Act of the Legislature of the Province of Canada' are to be understood to mean 'Act of Her Majesty, her heirs or successors, enacted by Her Majesty, or by the Governor on behalf of Her Majesty, with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council and Assembly of the Province of Canada'; and the words 'Governor of the Province of Canada' are to be understood as comprehending the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, or person authorised to execute the office or the functions of Governor of the said Province."

Such was the law when the Confederation Act was passed. Not only was the Governor or Lieutenant Governor allowed, but he was bound to act in the name of the English Sovereign. Nothing has been changed by the British North America Act in that respect. Section 129 says :

"Except as otherwise provided by this Act, all laws in force in Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick at the union, and all courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and all legal commissions, powers and authorities, and all affairs, judicial, administrative and ministerial, existing therein at the union, shall continue in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, respectively, as if the union had not been made."

So the duty of the Governors or Lieutenant Governors, the obligation by them to assent to the Bills, to act in the name of the Queen, remained in force, for such was then the law of the land. Now, let us see for the executive or administrative power. Section 69 :

"All powers, authorities and functions which, under any Act of the Parliament of Great Britain, or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of the Legislature of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, or Canada, were, or are, before or at the union vested in or exercisable by the respective Governors or Lieutenant Governors of those Provinces, with the advice or with the advice and consent of the respective Executive Councils thereof, or by those Governors or Lieutenant Governors individually, shall, as far as the same are capable of being exercised after the union in relation to the Government of Ontario and Quebec, respectively, be vested in and shall or may be exercised by the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario and Quebec, respectively, with the advice or with the advice and consent of, or in conjunction with the respective Executive Councils or any members thereof, or by the Lieutenant Governor individually, as the case requires." * * *

Section 88 applies virtually the same principles to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Section 12 applies the same rule to the Governor General. So it is clear, obvious, undeniable that the right and obligation of the Governor and Lieutenant Governors to act in the name of the Sovereign remained, by the British North America Act, the same as they were before. Let us now see more closely the mechanism of government introduced by the Confederation Act. Each Province had, at the dawn of Confederation, its rights of self-government confirmed by the British Parliament. Each Province kept some parts of those rights, and

consented to some other parts being delegated and transferred to a general Parliament and an executive responsible to the people of the new Dominion. A Parliament and Executive for the whole Dominion were created; the two Canadas were separated *de novo*, forming each a separate Province, and each Province of the Dominion was provided with a Parliament and Executive of its own. So as to avoid confusion, different names were given to each. By section 17, the legislative body for the Dominion is called the Parliament, and it consists of the Queen, the Senate and the House of Commons. This differs from the appellation of the Government of the United Kingdom, wherein the corresponding branches of the Parliament are called: "The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and the Commons." For the Executive body the words chosen (sec. 11) were "Queen's Privy Council for Canada." Section 9 provides that the executive government and authority of and over Canada shall continue to be vested in the Queen, but section 10 provides that the chief of the Executive shall administer "in the name of the Queen." *De facto* it is the Governor or his representative who administers. We substitute the word "Queen." It is a mere fiction of the law. The Queen never signed any of our laws, our proclamations, our official documents. Any other word than "Queen" might have been chosen to designate the chief of the Executive. The result would not have been changed; the laws and acts of the Executive would have been equally valid, in virtue of the powers conferred upon us by the British Parliament. That the chief of the "Queen's Privy Council for Canada" only acts in the name of the Queen is made again very clear by section 55, which says:

"Where a Bill passed by the House of Parliament is presented to the Governor General for the Queen's assent, he shall declare either that he assents thereto in the Queen's name, or that he withholds the Queen's assent, or that he reserves the Bill for the signification of the Queen's pleasure."

For the Provinces, other words were chosen to designate the divers powers. So the legislative body, instead of being called Parliament, was termed "Legislature"; the expression "Lieutenant Governor" was substituted for "the Queen"; the expression "Legislative Council" was substituted for the "Senate" (the Upper House), and the expression "Legislative Assembly" was substituted for "Commons" (the Lower House) (sections 69 and 71). As to the administrative power, the words "Executive Council" were adopted instead of "Queen's Privy Council" (section 63). The Queen, acting with the advice of her own council, might have kept the right of appointing herself the Lieutenant Governors. She delegated that power to the Governor appointed by her, acting in her name. When once appointed, by virtue of that authority, a Lieutenant Governor, within the limit of his attributions, represents the Queen as fully as the Governor General also acting within the limits of his attributions. He derives his powers directly from the Queen, through the Governor her mandatory. It is of common and universal law that the acts of the mandatory bind his principal. Both the Governor and Lieutenant Governors have the same powers, under different names, in different fields of action, with jurisdiction

on different subjects and matters. They all take the same oath (section 61). The members of the Privy Council are sworn as such (section 11). The members of the Executive Councils are sworn as they were before the Union (sections 64 and 135). By comparing sections 12 and 65, it is easy to ascertain the identity of powers of the Privy Council and of the Executives, each within the limits of the attributions conferred by the British North America Act. By these quotations, it is easy to see that the Queen forms part of the local Executives and Legislatures as well as of the Privy Council and Parliament of Canada. The names and appellations are changed, but the effect remains the same. The principle that the Queen forms part, virtually, by fiction of the law, of every Parliament of her colonies, has been broadly laid down as far back as 1774, in a case of *Hall vs. Campbell*, in which Lord Mansfield, delivering the unanimous judgment of the Court of King's Bench, decided that the King had no power, by letters patent, to impose duties on the Island of Grenada. He said:

"We therefore think that, by the two proclamations and the commission to Governor Belleville, the King had immediately and irrevocably granted to all who were and should become inhabitants, or who had or should acquire property in the Island of Grenada, or, more generally, to all whom it might concern, that the subordinate legislation over the island should be exercised by an assembly with the consent of the Governor and council, in like manner, as the other islands belonging to the King."

And, further on, he says:

"To use the words of Sir Philip Yorke, Sir Clement Wearge, it can only now be done by the assembly of the island, or by an Act of the Parliament of Great Britain."—(1 Cowper's Reports, page 213.)

The Supreme Court of Canada, in deciding that the Queen did not form part of the Local Legislatures, doubtless overlooked the then recent decision of Her Majesty's Privy Council, in the case of *Théberge vs. Landry*, decided in 1876, in which Lord Cairns, delivering the unanimous judgment of the court, and speaking of the Quebec Controverted Elections Act, called it "an Act which is assented to on the part of the Crown, and to which, therefore, the Crown is a party." (Council of Law Reports, Appeal Cases, 2, 1876-77, page 108.) In the case of the *Queen vs. Coate*, the Privy Council had decided, in 1873, that the Quebec law appointing fire marshals with power to investigate, swear witnesses and commit to gaol, was within the competency of the Province (1st Cartwright, page 97). In fact, there is no possible law, in any dependency of England, as well as in England itself, without the Queen being a party to it; the same principle applies to the Executive powers. Authorities on that point are innumerable:

"The constituent parts of Parliament are, the King, the House of Lords and the House of Commons."—(Stephens: *The Rise and Progress of the English Constitution*, page 531.)

"The first prerogative of the King, in his capacity of supreme magistrate, has, for its object, the administration of justice. 1st. He is the source of all judicial power in the state; he is the chief of all the courts of law, and the judges are only his substitutes; everything is transacted in his name; the judgments must be with his seal, and are executed by his officers. 2nd. By a fiction of the law, he is looked upon as the proprietor of the Kingdom. 3rd. The second prerogative of the King is, to be the fountain of honor."—(Stephens: *The Rise and Progress of the English Constitution*, page 566.)

"A Bill does not become an Act of Parliament until it has received the Royal assent."—(Cox: *Institutions of the English Government*, page 48.)

"In other cases, Parliament has expressly delegated to the Colonies a power of making laws for their own internal economy."—(Cox: Institutions of the English Government, page 10.)

"That the several enactments of Parliament should receive the Royal assent, will appear very clearly, if we consider the nature of the Coronation oath."—Cox: Institutions of the English Government, page 51.)

"No doubt the assent of the Governor is needed, in order to turn Colonial Bills into laws; and further investigation would show our enquirer that, for the validity of any colonial Act there is required, in addition to the assent of the Governor, the sanction, either expressed or implied, of the Crown."—(Dicey: Lectures on the Constitution, page 96.)

"The King is a constituent part of the supreme legislative power." (1 Blackstone, page 256.)

"The making of statutes is by the King with the assent of Parliament." (Bacon's Abr. tit. Prerogative, 487.)

"The King has the prerogative of giving his assent, as it is called, to such bills as his subjects, legally convened, may present to him, that is, of giving them the force and sanction of a law."—(Bacon's Abr. tit. Prerogative, 489.)

"No Acts of Colonial Legislatures have force until they have received either the assent of the Governor in the Queen's name, or the Royal assent when reserved and transmitted for consideration."—(Cox's British Commonwealth, 525.)

What is true of the legislative power is equally true of the executive and judicial powers. The Queen is the fountain of all power.

"All jurisdiction exercised in these kingdoms, that are in obedience to our King, is derived from the Crown; and the laws, whether of a temporal, ecclesiastical, or military nature are called his laws; and it is his prerogative to take care of the due execution of them. Hence, all the judges must derive their authority from the Crown, by some commission warranted by law, and must exercise it in a lawful manner, and without any the least deviation from the known and stated forms.

"So although the King is the fountain of justice and entrusted with the whole of the executive power of the law, yet he hath no power to change or to alter the laws which have been received and established in these Kingdoms; for it is by those very laws that he is to govern; and as they prescribe the extent and bounds of his prerogative, in like manner do they declare and ascertain the rights and liberties of the people." * * *—(VI. Bacon's abridgement, page 428.)

"Privy Counsellors are made by the King's nomination."—(Cox, page 298.)

"The King is said to be the fountain of justice, *fons justitie*, and in that capacity has the right of erecting courts of judicature, though the right is subjected to many restrictions by Acts of Parliament. All jurisdictions of courts of justice are either mediately or immediately derived from the Crown; their proceedings were generally in the name of the Sovereign, and are executed by ministerial officers of the Crown."—(Cox, page 300.)

"Another capacity, in which the Sovereign is considered in domestic affairs, is as the fountain of justice and general conservator of the peace of the Kingdom. By the fountain of justice the law does not mean the author or origin, but only the distributor. Justice is not derived from the Sovereign, as from his free gift; but he is the steward of the public, to dispense it to whom it is due. The original power of judicature, by the fundamental principles of society, is lodged in the society at large; but as it would be impracticable to render complete justice to every individual, by the people in their collective capacity, therefore every nation has committed that power to certain select magistrates, who with more ease and expedition can hear and determine complaints; and in England this authority has immemorially been exercised by the Sovereign or his substitutes. He, therefore, has alone the right of erecting courts of judicature: for, though the Constitution of the Kingdom has entrusted him with the whole executive power of the laws, it is impossible, as well as improper, that he should personally carry into execution this great and extensive trust; it is consequently necessary that courts should be erected, to assist him in executing this power; and equally necessary that, if erected, they should be erected by his authority. And hence it is, that all jurisdictions of courts are either mediately or immediately derived from the Crown, their proceedings run generally in the Sovereign's name, they pass under his seal, and are executed by his officers."

"But at present, by the long and uniform usage of many ages, our Sovereigns have delegated their whole

judicial power to the judges of their several courts." * * *—(1 Blackstone, page 261.)

I need not multiply the authorities on such elementary principles of English constitutional law. The power of erecting tribunals and appointing judges and officers has been delegated fully, without restriction, to our central Government on certain matters, and to our Local Legislatures on others. Let me now refer to the "Colonial Laws Act of 1865," which is an Act to remove doubts as to the validity of Colonial laws:

"Section 5. Every Colonial Legislature shall have, and be deemed at all times to have had, full power within its jurisdiction to establish courts of jurisdiction, and to abolish and reconstitute the same, and to alter the constitution thereof, and to make provision for the administration of justice therein; and every representative Legislature shall, in respect to the colony under its jurisdiction, have, and be deemed at all times to have had, full power to make laws respecting the constitution, powers and procedure of such Legislature; provided that such laws shall have been passed in such manner and form as may from time to time be required by any Act of Parliament, letters patent, Order in Council, or Colonial law for the time being in force in the said colony."

I will apply, further on, the British North America Act to that statute so clear and conclusive. The Supreme Court of Canada seems to have overlooked, not only the precedents and authorities I quoted, but even that statute specially made and provided for the colonies; and surely nobody will deny that every Province of the Dominion is a colony. The Supreme Court has, by that decision in *Lenoir vs. Ritchie*, reversed numerous precedents and decisions of our Canadian courts, which I will not quote, the Supreme Court being a higher tribunal, sitting in appeal of the Provincial Courts. Since the decision aforesaid, of the Supreme Court, Her Majesty's Privy Council has again decided, as to the plenitude of powers conferred upon the Provinces within the limits of their attributions. In the case of *Hodge vs. the Queen* (Law Reports, 9 Appeal Cases, page 132, in 1883) the Honorable Lords of the Privy Council said:

"It appears to their Lordships, however, that the objection raised by the appellants, is founded on an entire misconception of the true character and position of the Provincial Legislatures. They are in no sense delegates of, or acting under any mandate from the Imperial Parliament. When the British North America Act enacted that there should be a Legislature for Ontario, and that its Legislative Assembly should have exclusive authority to make laws for the Province and for Provincial purposes in relation to the matters enumerated in section 92, it conferred powers, not in any sense to be exercised by delegation from or as agents of the Imperial Parliament, but authority asplenary and as ample within the limits prescribed by section 92 as the Imperial Parliament, in the plenitude of its power, possessed and could bestow. Within these limits of subjects and area of the Local Legislature is supreme, and has the same authority as the Imperial Parliament, or the Parliament of the Dominion, would have had under like circumstances, to confide to a municipal institution, or body of its own creation authority to make by-laws or resolutions as to subjects specified in the enactment, and with the object of carrying the enactment into operation and effect."

It seems to me that this last decision of the Privy Council virtually reverses the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Lenoir vs. Ritchie*, which, besides, never amounted to *res judicata*. In spite of that last judgment, our Canadian courts have unanimously continued to consider as valid our laws assented to by the Queen. But I will only refer to the Privy Council, and quote, by analogy, the following decisions. In 1883, in the celebrated case of *Ontario Government and Mercer*, it was held:

"That lands in Canada escheated to the Crown for defect of heirs, belong to the Province in which they are situated and not to the Dominion."—(Law Reports, 8 Appeal Cases, 1883, page 767.)

I presume it is useless to remark how much that decision has a direct bearing on the question I discuss, and how it fully recognises the fictive presence of the Queen in the local powers. In the case of the Exchange Bank of Canada *vs.* The Queen, it was held, in 1885 :

"That the Crown is bound by the two Codes of Lower Canada."—(11 Appeal Cases, 1883, page 197.)

In the case of the Bank of Toronto *vs.* Lambe, and three other similar cases, it was held, in 1887 :

"That the Public Act, 45 Victoria, chapter 22, which imposes certain direct taxes on certain commercial corporations carrying on business in the Province, is *inter alia* *intra* the Provincial Legislatures."—(12 Appeal Cases, 1883, page 575.)

This Act had also been assented to in the name of the Queen. In the case of the Attorney General of British Columbia *vs.* the Attorney General of Canada, it was held, in April, 1889 :

"That a conveyance by the Province of British Columbia to the Dominion, of 'public lands,' * * * does not imply any transfer of its interest in revenues arising from the prerogative rights of the Crown."—(14 Appeal Cases, 1883, page 295.)

I do not pretend to exhaust the list of cases involving the same principle and affirming the same. I merely chose some of them, so as to satisfy this House as to the constant and clear opinion of Her Majesty's Privy Council. Having thus established that the Queen forms part of the Local Legislatures ; that the appointment of Queen's Counsel is part of the royal prerogative equally with the appointment of all judicial officers ; that the British Parliament has delegated to the Colony of Canada all the powers and prerogatives necessary to the organising and working of the courts of justice ; that all these powers and prerogatives have to be exercised in the name of the Queen, by any colony entrusted with them, there remains to be seen to what extent those powers and prerogatives were delegated to the divers Provinces of the Confederation, in so far as the courts, their officers, management and organisation are concerned. That part of the question does not seem to be of a great difficulty. I freely admit that the Federal Government have the right of appointing Queen's Counsel for their own courts, for the tribunals they have the right to create in virtue of section 101 of the British North America Act, such as the Supreme Court and the Exchequer Court. But sub-section 4 of section 92 of the same Act gives exclusively to the Provinces the right over the establishment and tenure of Provincial offices and the appointment and payment of Provincial officers ; sub-section 13 gives them an exclusive right over property and civil rights in the Province ; sub-section 14 gives them the exclusive right over "the administration of justice, including the constitution, maintenance and organisation of Provincial courts, both of civil and criminal jurisdiction," and sub-section 16 gives them the exclusive right over all matters of a merely local or private nature in the Province. The appointment of a Queen's Counsel amounts, in our days, to the giving of a rank of precedence and preaudience. It concerns the internal economy and management of the courts. Surely this is a local matter and civil right. It is essentially provincial. A Quebec

Mr. AMYOT.

lawyer could not plead before an Ontario court. He would have to be admitted to the Ontario bar before pleading there, and *vice versa*. Section 94 provides that the laws of Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick may be assimilated. No such disposition exists for the Province of Quebec. Our courts, bar, laws, have been, and will remain, separated, distinct, local and private, to the Province. The power of constituting, maintaining and organising a court, implies, and carries with it, all the necessary powers to regulate the internal economy of the same, the rules of practice, the admission to the bar, the appointment of the officers of the court, the keeping of records, and everything concerning the same, save the appointment of the judges of the superior, district and county courts, reserved to the Privy Council by section 96. The first law officer of the Crown is the Attorney General. He is appointed by the Lieutenant Governor, and nobody ever contested the validity of the appointment. Indictments are signed in his name, and have been upheld by all the courts. He is the first of the Queen's Counsel, according to Blackstone. The Solicitor General comes after him. Both appointments by the Lieutenant Governor are provided for by section 63 of the Confederation Act. Would it not be most extraordinary that the Lieutenant Governor should have the right of appointing the first Queen's Counsel, the head of the hierarchy, and should not have the power to appoint those who only rank after ? Where is the clause of the British North America Act that takes away that prerogative from the Crown ? When the British Crown delegated all her powers to the Provinces, in so far as the courts are concerned, she delegated the whole of her powers and prerogatives to carry that disposition of the statute into effect. It would have required a special provision to except any of those powers and prerogatives. Not only are the provincial statutes assented to invariably in the name of the Queen, but all the officers of the departments, all offices of trust, as officers of the courts, sheriffs, registrars, coroners, gaolers, justices of the peace, police magistrates, constables, legislative councillors, &c., are appointed in the name of the Queen. All the writs in the courts, *viz.*, of summons, *habeas corpus*, *quo warranto*, *scire facias*, prohibition, *ferri facias*, *renditioni*, *exponas*, writs of possession, all the letters patent for lands, mines, timber, for incorporating companies, all the proclamations, licenses, — in a word, all the important acts of the Executive are made and issued in the name of the Crown, as required in the exercise of any royal prerogative. If the Queen did not form part of the Local Governments and Legislatures, all those appointments and documents would be void, and the Local Governments would have no power at all, and the Confederation would be a sham. It never came into the mind of any one to deny the validity of all those Acts of the Local Governments. But why should there be an exception in regard to the Queen's Counsel ? What part of the Confederation Act would justify that pretension or exclusion ? If our laws were not assented to in the name of the Queen, they would have to be assented to either in the name of the Governor or Lieutenant Governor. No part of the British North America Act gives them any such power. The Governor General received the power of disallowance as to the Bills, but never

was he substituted for the Queen as the fountain of powers and honors. No disposition makes him a constituent part of a Provincial Legislature. He carries on the Government of the Dominion in the name of the Queen, and wherever he is mentioned, it means the representative of the Queen, acting in her name, using her great seal, the emblem of sovereignty. But the Local Governments have also their great seals, the affixing of which means the consent, approbation, action of the sovereign. It amounts to an official signing of a document by the Queen. A special clause of the British North America Act (sec. 136) even provides for the design of those great seals for each Province. If the Queen did not form part of the Local Legislatures, the Provinces would no more be under the monarchical system; they would be mere republics, with a president elected by the Privy Council of Ottawa. The confederate power alone would constitute a monarchy. Will any sensible man sustain such an anomaly? I have spoken of the Attorney and Solicitor General. Let me refer you to sections 134 and 135 of the Confederation Act. They give to those officers all the powers they had before the Confederation. Section 134 adds that the Lieutenant Governors "may also appoint other and additional officers to hold office during pleasure, and may from time to time prescribe the duties of these officers, and of the several departments over which they shall preside or to which they shall belong, and of the officers and clerks thereof." Surely the administration of justice entrusted to the Provinces is included in those powers; and the appointment of Queen's Counsel forms an essential, though small part of the same, affecting the internal economy of the courts of justice. The Attorney General is supposed to conduct every criminal trial. Was he in court, he would be *de facto* the first Queen's Counsel. He appoints substitutes who sign and speak for him. Section 134 undoubtedly gives him the right of delegating to them part of his powers and privileges; more than all that, our Federal statutes are full of dispositions, formally recognising that the Queen forms part of the Local Legislatures. The jurors appointed by the local officers are called the jurors of Our Sovereign Lady the Queen. The indictments are drawn charging a defendant to have acted against the peace of Her Sovereign Lady the Queen, her Crown and dignity. The jurors are to be challenged or ordered to stand aside in the name of the Crown. Chapter 174 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, section 179, says:

"Provided always, that the right of reply shall be always allowed to the Attorney or Solicitor General, as to any Queen's Counsel, acting on behalf of the Crown."

Can there be a more explicit recognition of the principle I sustain? Now, how extraordinary it would be that the Attorney General would have the obligation, by statute as well as by the common law, to attend to the administration of the criminal law, would have, in virtue of the same authorities, the authority of delegating his powers, but that he could not choose whom he would please, and that he would have to wait upon the good-will of an alien Government to appoint his representatives Queen's Counsel, so as to give them the right of reply in the public interest? There remain the questions of convenience or expediency and of sanction by enforcement of the appointments. It will be clear in the eyes of every

one that the local powers are in a better position than the central power to judge the requirements of the Province, the qualifications of the lawyers. It would not be fair that the majority of the vast Dominion should oppose its will, in that respect, to the majority of a Province. As to the sanction of the appointment, if there was a conflict between the Federal and Local Governments, how could the federal authority have its appointments recognised? Suppose the judges appointed by Ottawa should desire to recognise and enforce them in spite of the local authority, he would be surrounded by sheriffs, prothonotaries, clerks, bailiffs, gaolers, all appointed by the Province, receiving instructions from the same, being paid by the same. He might have to leave the bench, act as sheriff, take a man by the throat, conduct him to gaol where the gaoler would tell him: "I have instructions not to receive that prisoner!" He might have to sign and execute himself, his own warrant of distress. That suffices to exemplify the impossibility of this Government having any such appointment by them recognised and sanctioned by due execution. Though the possibility of execution has always been looked upon as a criterion of jurisdiction. In the case of *Lenoir vs. Ritchie*, Hon. Judge Fournier said:

"It is a general principle that a court has no jurisdiction in cases wherein the judgment it would give would not be susceptible of execution."

Broom: "Commentaries on the Common Law," page 54: "The word 'law,' indeed, *ex vi termini*, implies a sanction." I think I have demonstrated:— 1st. That the Queen forms part of the Local Governments, as well as of the Federal Government. 2nd. That every one of them are supreme within the limits of their attributions, deriving their authority directly from the Queen. 3rd. That the administration of justice entrusted to the Local Governments carries with it all the prerogatives of the Queen, necessary to the good working and management of the courts, and that the appointment of Queen's Counsel forms an ingredient and inseparable part of the same. 4th. That the decision to the contrary by the Supreme Court of Canada, in the case of *Lenoir vs. Ritchie*, is an isolated one, rendered on a point not in issue nor argued contradictorily, without the interested parties being called to answer, by a divided and incomplete bench, is contradictory to all precedents as well to the precise terms and true intent and meaning of all the laws in force; that the principles upon which it rests have frequently since been denied and reversed by the highest tribunals of the Empire, and that the adoption of those principles would render impossible the working of the Confederation as well as the administration of justice. Since these notes have been prepared, I, fortunately, have procured a copy of a most able memorandum sent to this Government by the Ontario Government. As this honorable House is not yet in possession of that very valuable document, but it would take some time to read it all through, with the permission of the House, I will hand over the same to the *Hansard* as read.

Mr. LAURIER. I would remind my hon. friend that we have invariably refused to consent to anything being published in the *Hansard* which was not spoken or read on the floor of the House. If we were to depart from this rule, it would lead to very objectionable consequences, I am sure.

Mr. AMYOT. I was not aware of that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume the hon. gentleman's only object is to get the document on record. I am under the impression it has been printed among our Sessional Papers, but if not, I am sure there is no objection to bring it down in such a form that it will save the hon. member the necessity of reading it.

Mr. AMYOT. I know it is not in our official papers. The leader of the Opposition would gain nothing by insisting on my reading the document, as it would only fatigue the House.

Mr. IAURIER. I think my hon. friend had better follow the rule which we have invariably adhered to. If we commence by departing from this rule and allow members to send in matter to be printed that was not spoken in the House, we will have whole speeches sent in by-and-bye.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The document is a long one, and the hon. member's only object, I understand, in reading it, would be to have it on record. I am inclined to think that it is already printed among the Sessional Papers; but if not, we will take care that it shall be printed, in order to relieve the hon. member from the necessity of reading it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand the Minister of Justice will bring it down and lay it on the Table, formally, and have it referred to the Printing Committee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, I will do so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman wants this document to stand as part of his speech, he had better read it.

Mr. AMYOT. I will not undertake to read it; it is too long. As we have the assurance that it will be laid officially before the House, that will meet the object I have in view. By an official letter, dated 27th September, 1886, the Government have refused to comply with the desire expressed by the Ontario Government of having the question of Queen's Counsel and the jurisdiction as to their appointment submitted to the Privy Council upon a joint case. And they say:

"His Excellency is advised that so long as the judgment in *Lenoir vs. Ritchie* is not revised, it is the duty of Governments and individuals in Canada to respect and conform to that judgment."

Such is the policy adopted by the Government on that question. They take advantage of an *ex parte* judgment denying the Provinces an important right, namely, the right of using the great seal in the name of the Queen, and refuse the Provinces the opportunity of being heard before the competent tribunals. In spite of that, the commissions of Queen's Counsel, issued by this Government, prove that some doubts still exist in the mind of the hon. Minister of Justice. After having stated after whom the new Queen's Counsel will rank, to wit, after Queen's Counsel created by the Provinces before Confederation, and after Queen's Counsel created by Ottawa since the Confederation, these commissioners add: After "those members of such bar (if any) who may lawfully be entitled to rank and precedence over you the said." * * * Who are those? The document professes not to know it! Let the title bearer find it out for himself! The Department is impotent in that regard. I am surprised that a Government

Mr. LAURIER.

allows such documents to officially issue from the Department of Justice, where the laws are presumed to be entirely known, understood, and put into practice. The same letter affirms that no inconvenience has been occasioned by the judgment. I think I have proved that the very reverse of that pretension is actually the case. It is greatly time that this question be finally and clearly settled. Therefore, I beg to submit the following proposition to this honorable House, without making of the same a question of non-confidence:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is the exclusive right of the Local Legislature and the Executive of each Province to appoint Queen's Counsel for all courts established, maintained and managed by such Province, and to settle the rules and rights of precedence or pre-eminence of the bar in proceedings in such court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subject which the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has brought to the notice of the House this afternoon, of course the House will regard as one of very great importance, not only for the rights which are immediately connected with the appointment of Queen's Counsel for the various courts in this country, but because, as he has indicated very clearly, the subject branches out into constitutional questions lying at the basis of much larger rights than those of Her Majesty's Queen's Counsel in the courts. I cannot too strongly express my appreciation of one observation which the hon. gentleman made towards the close of his address, when it was suggested that he should proceed with the reading of a document which came to this Government from the Government of Ontario. The hon. gentleman hesitated to do so, on the ground that the reading of documents of that character, touching upon legal and constitutional questions, gave the House very little information and instruction, and required, in order to be appreciated, to be more carefully read than can be done in the progress of a debate. I feel I must, with great respect to the hon. gentleman, apply that observation to the whole of the argument on this question he has submitted. I feel somewhat at a disadvantage in coming to the discussion of an abstruse constitutional question, without the slightest notice, considering it touches a subject not only of constitutional importance, but also involving legal technicalities which I have not looked at for a good many months, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman will not consider me, I am sure, wanting in courtesy to him, if I find myself, this afternoon, unable to contribute anything to the discussion of this question which will very much interest the House or throw very great additional light on the subject. I, however, have had some acquaintance with it. I am in a position to assure the hon. gentleman that one of the propositions which he states at the conclusion of his paper, as having been completely established, namely, that the decision in the case of *Lenoir vs. Ritchie* was upon a point not before the court, not raised on the appeal, not considered in the judgment below, that that proposition, so far from being established, would not be considered well founded by any one who was acquainted, as I have had to be, with the case of *Lenoir vs. Ritchie* from its inception to its close. So far from its being correct, as the hon. gentleman supposes it to be, from the statement by Mr. Haliburton, in the course of his argument before the Supreme Court on appeal, that the constitutional question had not been raised in the court below, I am in a position, as one of the coun-

sel who argued the case, to say that that was the gist of the argument in the court below; and not only so, but if the hon. gentleman will turn to the decision in the court below, the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, he will find the judgment of one of the judges giving judgment in favor of Mr. Ritchie proceeded only on the constitutional ground and disregarded all others; and that constitutional ground was more or less discussed likewise in the decisions given by the other judges.

Mr. AMYOT. I took my information from the reports of the Supreme Court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would refer the hon. gentleman, for further information, to the decision in the court below, not only given in the Supreme Court reports of Nova Scotia, but embodied in the Cartwright edition of constitutional cases, where it immediately follows the decision in the Supreme Court of Canada. The hon. gentleman intimated to the House that the decision in the case of *Lenoir vs. Ritchie* was an erroneous one, and he arrived at that conclusion by a course of reasoning, in which he sought to affirm the proposition that Her Majesty is part of the Provincial Legislatures, and he came to the conclusion that that proposition had been denied by the Supreme Court of Canada in the judgment in *Lenoir vs. Ritchie*. I venture to say that the judgment in the case does not proceed on that ground, and I venture to differ from the hon. gentleman that he has established that the Crown is an integral part of the Legislatures of the Provinces. Let me first refer to the course of reasoning by which the hon. gentleman sought to establish that position. He sought to establish it by showing a course of legislation existing long prior to the confederation of the Provinces, to the Imperial legislation confirming certain rights and powers as to the use of Her Majesty's name by the functionaries who, from time to time, governed the different Provinces in British North America. The hon. gentleman referred to the practice which prevailed in some of the Provinces, of using Her Majesty's name in the enacting part of the Provincial statutes. Let me submit for the hon. gentleman's consideration, in the first place, that Imperial legislation prior to Confederation has really no bearing upon the subject, and that the provision in the Colonial Statutes Act of 1865, passed in the Imperial Parliament, and designating the powers which Colonial Legislatures possessing representative institutions can wield, has really no bearing on the subject, for the very obvious reason that, in 1867, by the British North America Act, there was a completely new distribution of the powers by the Imperial Parliament. In reference to all the Provinces of Canada, I think I am speaking within the lines of the decisions, which have all run one way, proceeding from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, all the legislative powers and constitutional functions which existed down to that time in the various Provinces in British North America were, for the instant, taken back by the Imperial Government and redistributed under the terms of the British North America Act. Whether I am strictly correct in stating that they were taken back or not, certain it is that from that time forward the distribution of powers in those various Provinces must depend upon the provisions of that Act, and on that Act alone. Nowhere is it provided in that Act that Her

Majesty shall be considered an integral part of the Provincial Legislatures. So much for the early Imperial legislation on the subject. I will come by-and-bye to the hon. gentleman's argument, that Her Majesty's prerogatives are necessarily involved in the administration of public affairs in each Province. That I do not dispute. I am confining my argument for the present to the contention that Her Majesty is an integral part of the Legislatures of the Provinces, as was held, and properly held, in the case of *Lenoir vs. Ritchie*. As to the practice which the hon. gentleman has cited, of Provincial Legislatures using Her Majesty's name in the enacting part of the statutes of the Provinces at various times, I beg likewise to differ from him, both as to the conclusions which he would draw from that circumstance, and as to the extent of the practice itself. In the Province of Canada, the practice did exist before Confederation, of enacting these statutes in the name of the Queen, and that practice, without authority, I think, without anything more to be said for it than a mere desire to continue the form which prevailed before Confederation, was carried forward and continued, and to this day, not only in Ontario, but in the Province of Quebec, the statutes continue to be enacted in the name of the Queen. Now, it does not by any means follow that Her Majesty is the enacting power, and as to the correctness of that practice, I do not feel myself sufficiently informed to criticise the soundness of it, as applied to the Province of Canada before Confederation. It may have been proper to use it there, on account of the circumstance that in that Province Her Majesty's rule was administered by her direct representative, the Governor General. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that that practice did not exist in the other Province of Canada, and that from the time representative institutions were given, down to the present moment—outside, I mean, of the old limits of Canada—the statutes were, from the earliest periods, and are to-day, enacted in the name of the Governor, Council and Assembly, without any pretence whatever that Her Majesty was part of the legislative body. I conceive, Sir—and in this respect I again differ from what the hon. gentleman has said—that that is of no material consequence whatever; and I am unable to agree with the hon. gentleman, that if Her Majesty is not a part of the Legislature of the Province, it follows that the statutes purporting to be passed by Her Majesty are invalid, or inoperative, or should have been disallowed. On the contrary, the validity of a statute arises from the fact of its having been enacted, by the powers which have a right to pass it, within the British North America Act. If a statute is passed by the Lieutenant Governor of a Province, with the advice of his Assembly, and his Legislative Council if he have one, that statute is valid, as the statute of the Province, and as I submit, valid, altogether irrespective of any style by which it purports to have proceeded from Her Majesty. If the Act was actually passed by the Legislature of the Province, it is immaterial that it purports to have been enacted by Her Majesty. Now, having said that much with regard to the hon. gentleman's contention, which he understood that his argument had established, that Her Majesty is an integral part of the Legislature of the Province, let me refer the hon. gentleman

to the mistake which, I think, he made, in attributing that as the foundation of the decision in the case of *Lenoir vs. Ritchie*. It seems to me, and it has always seemed to me, that the Executive Government, not only of Canada itself, but of every one of her Provinces, is vested in Her Majesty. It seems to me, that it is perfectly within the competence of a Provincial Legislature to make enactments binding Her Majesty's prerogative, and binding that prerogative to the fullest extent, but only in regard to matters which are entrusted to the Provincial Legislatures under the British North America Act; and this, for the very obvious reason, that, inasmuch as these powers are given to Provincial Legislatures, the Provincial Legislatures cannot fully legislate upon them without binding all the rights which Her Majesty has in regard to them, as well as the rights which Her Majesty's subjects have in regard to them. When we find the power to regulate the civil procedure of the courts entrusted to the Provincial Legislatures, it is surely competent for the Provincial Legislatures to control that Provincial procedure, even though it affects to some extent the use of Her Majesty's name, as, for instance, in the issue of writs, which the hon. gentleman has referred to as running in Her Majesty's name. It seems to me perfectly within Provincial powers to control and to regulate that procedure, notwithstanding the mere fact that justice is supposed to be administered in Her Majesty's name, and that all who come within her courts are supposed to come at Her Majesty's summons. But the difference between the proposition which the hon. gentleman has laid down, with regard to Her Majesty being an integral portion of the Provincial Legislatures, and the principle which is laid down, rightly or wrongly, in the case of *Lenoir vs. Ritchie*, seems to me to be this: that the respect in which Her Majesty was said not to form a part of the Provincial Legislature by the Supreme Court of Canada, in the case of *Lenoir vs. Ritchie*, was this respect, that Her Majesty could not be said to be bound in her prerogative rights by a Provincial statute, unless the power of a Legislature upon that subject was expressly conferred by the British North America Act. It had been contended there by counsel for the appellant that even though the subject dealt with should be the distribution of honors and of titles—which constitutionally proceed from Her Majesty as the fountain of honor—yet the Provincial Legislatures might properly pass a statute binding Her Majesty in respect to the exercise of that prerogative, even though the power was not conferred upon them by the British North America Act, on the ground that the Provincial statute being once passed, Her Majesty had yielded her prerogative in giving assent to that Act. That involved the proposition that Her Majesty was a portion of the Legislature of the Province, and it was in that respect that the Supreme Court of Canada, as I understand the decision in the case of *Lenoir vs. Ritchie*, held that Her Majesty was not bound by a Provincial statute, and that she did not form part of the Provincial Legislature. The logical result of that conclusion was, not at all as the hon. gentleman seems to suppose, that Her Majesty could not be bound in any of her rights by a Provincial statute, but simply that Her Majesty was not bound by a Provincial statute, unless that Provincial statute was passed

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

in pursuance of powers conferred on the Legislature by the British North America Act. In the case of a statute passed by this Parliament, or passed by the Imperial Parliament, the result would be different. Her Majesty would be bound, and Her prerogative would be yielded by the fact of her giving assent to the Act, irrespective altogether of the powers which the Parliament itself possessed. Now, to show that I am right in supposing that that was the view taken by the Supreme Court of Canada, and that, therefore, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Amyot) was hardly right in impugning that decision as being erroneous in that respect, I will call his attention to a passage from the judgment of Mr. Justice Henry, in which he says:

"The Local Legislatures are now simply the creatures of a statute, and under it alone have they any legislative powers. The Imperial Parliament, by the Union Act, prescribed and limited their jurisdiction; and, in doing so, has impliedly and virtually and effectually prohibited them from legislating on any other than the subjects comprised in the powers given by that Act. The right of the Imperial Parliament, when conferring legislative power on the Local Legislatures, to limit the exercise of them, cannot be questioned; and any local Act passed beyond the prescribed limit, being contrary to the terms of the Imperial Act, must necessarily be *ultra vires*."

A little further on, and toward the conclusion of his judgment, Mr. Justice Henry deals directly with that question of Her Majesty being a portion of the Legislature, in these terms:

"If the Imperial statute has not given the necessary legislative power to the Local Legislatures, an Act of theirs would be of no higher value than a city ordinance, such as I have stated. The argument of this question, however, is unavailable, for the Queen has not signified her assent to the local Act in question. By the provisions of section 90 of the Imperial Act, the Governor General, and not the Queen, assents to local Acts made in his name, as provided. The Lieutenant Governors are appointed, not by the Queen, but by the Governor General in Council. It cannot, therefore, be successfully contended that the Queen has assented to the local Act in question; nor can it be with greater success contended that by assenting to it the Governor General had any power, in doing so, to interfere with the Royal prerogative."

One other extract from the decision of Mr. Justice Taschereau indicates the same conclusion:

"But, said the appellants, Her Majesty has assented to this Act of the Nova Scotia Legislature. This, in my opinion, is a grievous error. Her Majesty does not form a constituent part of the Provincial Legislatures, and the Lieutenant Governors do not sanction their Bills in Her Majesty's name."

Then he goes on to show that Provincial Acts are not sanctioned by Her Majesty at all. The hon. gentleman, therefore, I think, will see that the heresy which the Supreme Court of Canada was aiming at in the decision of *Lenoir vs. Ritchie* was not at all, in fact, the proposition that the statutes of a Province cannot bind the Crown; but that the Crown is bound by the provisions of a Provincial statute by the fact of its being allowed to go into operation, and the court merely held that the Act, for its validity and effect on the Crown, must depend on the single consideration whether it is within the powers conferred on the Provinces by the British North America Act. Then the court proceeded at the next step to consider whether this was within the range of the subjects entrusted to the Provincial Legislatures, and came to the conclusion that the appointment of Queen's Counsel was simply the conferring of a title of honor carrying rank and precedence, and, therefore, was not within the powers given to the Local Legislatures. Now, the hon. gentleman read to the House a summary of several

decisions of Her Majesty's Privy Council, in which the position was laid down, that the Provincial Legislatures have, as the hon. gentleman asserted, plenary powers. I do not for a moment question the force of the decisions referred to. They by no means take the view that the Provincial Legislatures have any powers, plenary or otherwise, beyond those given to them by the British North America Act. The single effect of all that line of decisions is, that within the powers conferred upon them by the British North America Act, the Provincial Legislatures are supreme in their legislation; but the fundamental question which lies at the base of this whole controversy with regard to the appointment of Queen's Counsel is, whether it is within Provincial powers or not. If it is within Provincial powers, I admit that those powers are as plenary as any which are conferred on the Central Government. The hon. gentleman has made reference to the form of the commissions which are now issued, and which the hon. gentleman thinks are ludicrous in their character. I do not profess to be wiser in my generation than all the Attorney Generals who have preceded me, and all those who administered affairs of this kind in the various Provinces of Canada, and I think it will be found that the commission which we have issued is in substantially the same form as that established ever since the appointment of Queen's Counsel has been made by the Federal Government, and is substantially in the same tenor as the commissions issued by the Provincial Governments before Confederation. I think, further, it will be found, on a close comparison of that commission with the commissions that used to be issued by Her Majesty's Government conferring the rank of Queen's Counsel on practitioners in British North America, that the forms of the two are substantially the same. The commission simply confers the title *quantum valeat*, and does not profess that the precedence conferred upon the recipient shall justify him in asserting rank or precedence over any class or over any particular person. It assumes that the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada, when they are announced, are the law of the land, and that being so, the precedence is to be regulated by the court to whom the patent is presented, and, in the ordinary course, confers on the recipient the right to rank next to the person who last received the appointment from the Federal authority. The hon. gentleman impugned the force and effect of the decision in the case of Lenoir *vs.* Ritchie, not only on the ground I have already referred to, that it proceeded on a point which really was not involved in the appeal, but likewise on the ground that the parties interested had not been heard. I am not able to agree with the hon. gentleman in that view of the case. It might have been more satisfactory if all the Provincial Governments had been invited to take part in that argument, or it might not. The question was raised in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia between a barrister holding a patent from the Governor General and a barrister holding a patent from the Lieutenant Governor of the Province. Those two parties were all whose rights were immediately concerned in the subject under controversy. Although, in the litigation of those rights, doctrines of law were laid down which were exceedingly interesting to many persons outside of the immediate litigants, that is precisely the case with every important decision pronounced; and if

we impugn the decision of Lenoir *vs.* Ritchie on the ground that every person who took an interest in the subject was not heard, we must take the ground that every decision of the courts of this country and of the mother country is inconclusive in establishing the law, because the hon. member for Bellechasse or myself may have had, or intended some day to bring, a suit just like it, and ought to have been heard. Now, in replying to the observations of the hon. gentleman somewhat fully, as I felt bound to do in courtesy to him, considering the care he had bestowed on this subject, and the care and ability with which he brought it before the House, although I have followed him at some length, I do not propose to ask the House, and I hope he will not think of pressing it, for a decision of the legal question by a vote proposed in amendment to going into Supply. I do not propose this afternoon to state, and, I think, I am not called on to state to the House, what my opinion is as to the powers of the Provincial Legislatures or Governments with regard to the appointment of Queen's Counsel. That has been within certain lines decided by the Supreme Court of Canada. All I have ever said, in answering despatches which have come from any of the Provinces in reference to my report, is, that while the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in Lenoir *vs.* Ritchie exists and remains undisturbed, we must recognise it to be the law of the land within the limits within which it proceeds, and that, if any person, whether a Provincial or Federal appointee to this office or any other, is of opinion that the case of Lenoir *vs.* Ritchie does not deny or establish the authority of the power which appointed him, it rests with the courts of the country to administer between him and those who contest his rights the same measure of justice that was meted out between Mr. Lenoir on the one hand and Mr. Ritchie on the other. I think myself that it would be more convenient to allow these constitutional questions to be settled in that way, unless the actual rights of property or revenue of the two Governments are so interfered with by the action of one of them as to make it inconvenient that such action should be allowed to continue. The questions in dispute can be left to the decision of the tribunals which may be appealed to by those parties. I think it is more simple that they should be left to the tribunals than that we should interfere. For these reasons I do not feel called upon, this afternoon, to assert with any confidence or dogmatism what is my own individual opinion on this point. The hon. gentleman has not been able successfully to question the decision in the case of Lenoir *vs.* Ritchie. While that decision remains unreversed it ought to be recognised by this Parliament as the law of the land. But the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has made an argument to the House in which he claims to have reached the conclusion that the decision of the highest tribunal in this country was wrong in point of law, and he asks the House this afternoon, on amendment to go into Supply, to reverse that decision by its vote. Without, therefore, saying what foundation there may be for the ingenious and able argument the hon. member has advanced, without saying that I am able to concur in any of the points which I may have omitted to answer, from forgetfulness of the hon. gentleman's argument as it fell on my ear, or from

the difficulty I sometimes experience in hearing him—without going further into the matter, I simply ask the House to decline giving an opinion on this question, seeing that it has been decided by the highest court in the country within certain lines and limits, and that, outside those lines and limits, we may leave that question to be pressed to a solution by those directly interested. I would urge on hon. members that we should pause before undertaking to declare our opinion to-night on a difficult question of law, upon which the courts have differed, counsel have differed, and Provincial Governments have differed, and in respect of which, when this question comes finally to be conclusively decided, we might have the mortification of seeing that we had expressed and recorded on our Journals a fallacious opinion as to what the law of the country is.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not understand the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) proposes to do more by his motion than to invite discussion in the House upon an important question, upon which we had administrative action, and therefore a proper question to discuss, whatever may have been the judgment of the Supreme Court. But it does appear to me that the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the case of the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company against the Queen, does, in effect, overrule the decision of the Supreme Court in the case to which the hon. the Minister has referred. I will just read an extract from that judgment to the House. It is stated in that judgment that :

“By an Imperial statute, passed in the year 1840, the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, then known as Upper and Lower Canada, were united under the name of the Province of Canada, and it was, *inter alia*, enacted that in consideration of certain annual payments which Her Majesty had agreed to accept by way of civil list, the produce of all territorial and other revenues at the disposal of the Crown arising in either of the united Provinces should be paid into the consolidated fund of the new Province. There was no transfer to the Province of any legal estate in the Crown lands, which continued to be vested in the Sovereign; but all moneys realised by sales or in any other manner became the property of the Province. In other words, all beneficial interest in such lands within the Provincial boundaries belonging to the Queen, and either producing or capable of producing revenue, passed to the Province, the title still remaining in the Crown.”

According to that decision, the title to all the Crown lands in the various Provinces, or the lands so designated, is still in Her Majesty, and yet those lands are under the control of the Provincial Legislature. There is not simply a beneficial interest recognised, but there is absolute control; and if the opinion expressed by the Minister of Justice to-day, and by the Supreme Court, in the case to which he has referred, be good law, it is quite impossible that a Local Legislature can, by any Act of its own, divest the Crown of that title and vest that title in some other party. If the Lieutenant Governor in a Province does not represent the Crown, I would like the Minister of Justice to explain how he can legally, in the name of the Sovereign, pass a patent which will convey the title to the property therein described to any individual.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He can do so under the terms of the British North America Act, which gives the Provincial Legislatures power to legislate on that subject. The same power might have been

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

conferred on a municipality; and if conferred upon a town council, that town council could alienate the lands of Her Majesty, not by virtue of Her Majesty being a member of the town council, but by virtue of the powers conferred on the town council itself.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is no such power in the British North America Act as that to which the hon. gentleman refers, unless it arises from the fact that the Lieutenant Governor is a representative of Her Majesty. The Province, as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council say in this case, has simply a beneficial interest, and the title is and always has been in Her Majesty. Under the provisions of the British North America Act, a beneficial interest is in the Province, but the legal title is wholly beyond the control of the Province, unless it be with the Lieutenant Governor as a member of the Government of the Province. Let me say, further, that I respectfully dissent from the view expressed by the Minister of Justice, that there was ever an instant of time in which the Provinces which constituted the British North America federation were divested of the powers they possessed when the British North America Act was passed. It is true there are certain words and expressions in the Act which, if read carelessly, would bear the construction sometimes put upon them, and seem to favor, from a cursory examination, that view, but it must be remembered that one of the objects aimed at when the Canadian federation was formed was to divide the Province of Canada into two Provinces, as well as to federate the various Provinces which were to be united. The preamble to the Act declares that the union is to be a federal union, and there was never an instant of time when it was anything else. It is true that section 5 of the Act says :

“Canada shall be divided into four Provinces, named Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.”

That provision was made, because, if the country had been federally united without the division of the Province of Canada into Ontario and Quebec, there would have been three Provinces, and the emphatic word in that section is the word “four,” because it was intended to prevent there being but three Provinces, and to make these four Provinces constitute the federation. Now, Her Majesty was a part of the Provincial Governments—at all events, in Ontario and Quebec—at the time the federation took place, and it seems to me to be a wholly erroneous view to suppose that the Provinces, which remained as they were before, were divested of any of those powers which are declared by the British North America Act to be exclusively vested in them. Nova Scotia, for example, stood, as far as these powers were concerned, in the same position as she was before. She had control over property and civil rights before Confederation, and she continued to have that control afterwards. The only change in her constitution was that there were certain powers which she possessed before the Act was passed of which she was divested; but her form of Government, her constitution, the formation of her Legislature, the duration of that Legislature—except so far as it was changed by this Act—the responsibility of the Ministers of the Crown, etc., remained just the same as they were before. There is not a word said in this Act, from beginning to end, about the

constitution of the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, because they were already provided for and it was not intended to alter them. But, as to Ontario and Quebec, we find different provisions, for the reason that the old Province of Canada was divided, and it was necessary, not only to provide a constitution for the union, but also to provide a constitution for each of the Provinces carved out of the old Province of Canada. As to Quebec, the Act says:

"The Legislative Council of Quebec shall be composed of twenty-four members, to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor, in the Queen's name, by instrument under the Great Seal of Quebec."

Why in the Queen's name? What meaning has that expression? If Her Majesty is a part of the Government erected in the Province of Quebec we can understand it. In that case, the Lieutenant Governor acts as Her Majesty's representative, calls these people to the Legislative Council in Her Majesty's name, and that is done because the Lieutenant Governor is a representative of Her Majesty, so far as the executive powers with which he is vested are concerned. Then, in section 82 we find:

"The Lieutenant Governor of Ontario and of Quebec shall, from time to time in the Queen's name, by instrument under the Great Seal of the Province, summon and call together the Legislative Assembly of the Province."

Why in the Queen's name? Because the Lieutenant Governors are the Queen's representatives, acting on behalf of Her Majesty. They call these Legislatures together in Her Majesty's name. There is not a word said there about the Legislature of New Brunswick or the Legislature of Nova Scotia. Why is this? It is because the Legislatures of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were existing institutions. The Government and the constitution in those Provinces existed before Confederation. The Legislature in New Brunswick, which existed when the federation was formed, continued to exist afterwards. If there had been an instant of time when there was no power in that Province, when all that power which it possessed had been resumed by the Imperial Parliament, there would be an instant of time when the political life of the Provincial establishment would have been wiped out of existence, and it could not have been revived. But the fact is that, so far as those Governments are concerned, they continued to exist. They had the same form of Government and the same constitution which existed before Confederation existing after it. There was the same responsibility of the Executive Council to the Legislature afterwards as there was before. In fact, everything remained afterwards as it was before, except that the Legislature which existed before Confederation existed afterwards with a more limited legislative dominion than it had prior to the passing of the British North America Act. Therefore, in order to learn what is the constitution of these two Provinces, we have to look outside of the British North America Act to find out what it was when that law was passed. I have always felt a very great deal of difficulty in understanding the position of those who deny that the Lieutenant Governors in the different Provinces, under our federative constitution, represent Her Majesty. In the first place, there is an Attorney General in each Province. Whose Attorney General is he? Is he the Attorney General of

the Lieutenant Governor, or the Attorney General of Her Majesty? Is he the law officer of the Crown, or is he the law officer of the Lieutenant Governor? If he is not the law officer of the Crown his title is a misnomer. What right has he to prosecute in the Queen's name and to conduct the Queen's business? This power is recognised, in part, at all events, as belonging to the Attorney General, on the assumption that he is Her Majesty's representative. If we look at the ancient institutions of England, I think we will see why it is that under our Federal system the Lieutenant Governors are recognised as exercising the powers of the Sovereign. Look at the ancient Counties of Chester and Durham, where the Lord Palatine exercised a prescriptive right; and if you look at the ancient County of Lancaster, where it was a matter of grant from the Crown, and it was held that they had the same royal rights in their respective limits as the Sovereign possessed elsewhere, prosecutions in those counties were made in the name of the Lord Palatine. The Attorney General was not the Queen's Attorney General, but the Attorney General of the Lord Palatine, because these powers were held to be exercised as a grant, and not as a trust. How is it in regard to the exercise of powers in the various Provinces of Canada? Is there a grant of executive power so as to divest the Crown of that power? If there is a grant divesting the Crown of any powers which it previously possessed that grant is sufficient to divest the Governor General of the rights held by the Crown, except as an act of prerogative, and all those powers held by the Governor General under statute of this Parliament would be separate and distinct from those powers which appertain to Her Majesty. When we look at the provisions of the British North America Act we find that the words used in regard to public lands seem to be broad enough to have vested the title in the Province. Section 109 says:

"All lands, mines, minerals and royalties belonging to the several Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, at the union, and all sums then due or payable for such lands, mines, minerals or royalties, shall belong to the several Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, in which the same are situate or arise, subject to any trusts existing in respect thereof, and to any interest other than that of the Province in the same."

Now, if the Crown is not a part of the Government of the Province that would have been a conveyance, that would have divested the Crown of the title which it previously possessed, and would have vested that title in the Government and Legislature of the Province. But the Privy Council, in the St. Catharines Milling Company case, declares that the provisions of this Act never divested the Crown, that they were in the Crown after 1840, when the control of these lands was transferred to the various Governments of the Provinces. Why was not the Crown divested then? Because the Crown continued to be the Government of the colony at the time; and so, when you find here this provision declaring that all the lands, mines and minerals situated within the limits of the various Provinces shall belong to the Provinces, and when you find the Privy Council in that case holding that the Crown was never divested of the legal title which was in it, it is perfectly clear that the Privy Council assumed that the Crown was a part and parcel of the Government of the different Provinces. And in the case of British Columbia against the

Dominion, the Judicial Committee held the prerogatives of the Crown, so far as they related to lands, mines and minerals, were in the Province. It does seem to me, that that being the case, the decision in the St. Catharines Milling Company case in this particular over-rides the decision of the Supreme Court in the case to which the hon. gentleman has referred; and if that be so, undoubtedly the power of the Crown, as represented by the Governor General, to appoint Queen's Counsel, would be a power to appoint Queen's Counsel for the courts of the Dominion, and not for the courts of the various Provinces. Now, when you look at the provisions of the law in this particular, when you look at its history, you find that the Crown originally, when it appointed a prosecutor to conduct the Crown business on circuit, recognised that prosecutor as a Queen's Counsel extraordinary; he was the Queen's Counsel for that purpose; he had not a permanent appointment, but he had a temporary and a provisional appointment. If you have in the various Provinces a party appointed to prosecute offenders in the Queen's name, the party who appoints the persons so to prosecute is a party who appoints a Queen's Counsel, the appointment being an appointment of Queen's Counsel extraordinary. In the Palatinate Governments the party appointed to prosecute was the counsel of the Lord Palatine, because the Lord Palatine, having royal rights, was entitled to have parties who offended against his law prosecuted in his name, and that being so, the prosecutions were so conducted. But the appointment of a Queen's Counsel is the appointment of a party to act on the Queen's behalf permanently, and, in its character and spirit, it is not at all different from the appointment of a person to conduct the Crown business upon circuit. The first appointment of Queen's Counsel that ever took place was that of Sir Francis North, for prosecuting Denzil Hollis, in the place of the Attorney General, before the House of Lords. That was the first case of a permanent appointment, and before that all the parties who prosecuted on behalf of the Crown were simply persons appointed to prosecute on circuit, or before any court in which the Crown had a right to have a party appear on its behalf. So, if you deny to the Provincial Legislature, or the Lieutenant Governor, under a Provincial statute, the right to appoint Queen's Counsel, you deny his right to appoint a person to conduct the Crown business on circuit in the various Provinces. Now, I say that has never been contended, that has never been argued, and if that be so, I think it is clear that the appointment of Queen's Counsel in Provincial courts is an appointment by the Crown upon the advice of the Attorney General of the Province. The Minister of Justice is not the head of the bar of each Province, as the Attorney General is the head of the bar in England. The Minister of Justice may not be a member of the bar at all, in many of the Provinces; and how can he advise the Crown in regard to the appointment of persons to prosecute on the Crown's behalf, in a Provincial court, when he is himself, perhaps, not a member of the bar in that particular Province? The Attorney General, as the head of that bar, advises appointments from that bar on behalf of Her Majesty, but otherwise he has not that power, unless, indeed, it is specially conferred upon him by the British North America Act, and I do not think the hon. gentleman can argue seriously, that

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

that is the case. I agree with the Minister of Justice that this is not a proper place to undertake to argue this question. I had not looked into the subject for many years, but I dissented from the views which the Minister of Justice had expressed to the House, and I thought it was only proper, before this matter was disposed of, that I should give my reasons for so dissenting.

Amendment withdrawn, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Superintendence of Insurance..... \$9,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are the sums paid by the various insurance companies sufficient to cover this amount?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; they meet the whole expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what purpose is the additional \$500 required?

Mr. FOSTER. The Superintendent reports that an extra clerk is required in the Department.

Geological Survey..... \$60,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been usual for the Minister in charge of this Department to give the Committee a general summary of the manner in which it is proposed to expend the vote during the coming year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I presume the hon. gentleman means a statement in regard to the different parties in the field, the principal expenditure being incurred under the surveys. Last year the parties were divided as follows: Dr. G. M. Dawson and Mr. Bowman were engaged in British Columbia, the latter not being a permanent officer of the Department, but engaged in the mineral work last year. Dr. Dawson made a flying visit to the Kootenay district, which is being rapidly developed, and he made a short report, which is now printed, and will be distributed tomorrow, I hope. Mr. McConnell spent last season in the Athabasca district, where large oil districts are being surveyed. Mr. Tyrrell was in Manitoba, along the western shore of Lake Winnipeg and Lake Winnipegosis. Dr. Lawson was engaged on the north-west portion of the shore of Lake Superior. Mr. Ingall was engaged in the phosphate district. Dr. Bell was employed in the Sudbury district. Mr. Low was in the Eastern Townships. Mr. Ells was occupied in the southwest section of the Eastern Townships. Mr. Adams was also in the Eastern Townships. Professor Bailey was engaged in the northern portion of New Brunswick, near the boundary between New Brunswick and Quebec. Mr. McInnes was employed near River du Loup. Mr. Chalmers was engaged in New Brunswick, Mr. Fletcher in Nova Scotia. I may say, generally, that the work for the coming year will be an extension of these surveys, unless any point of special interest should need the services of members of the staff immediately. The disposition of the staff during the present year will be as follows:—

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY—PROPOSED EXPLORATIONS FOR SEASON 1890.

British Columbia; Dawson, Dr. G. M.; Mr. McEvoy, assistant; Bowman, A.

North-West Territory: McConnell, R., assistant; Petroleum District to Athabasca Lake, &c.

Manitoba: Tyrrell, J. B.; Mr. Dowling, assistant; Duck and Riding Mountains, &c.

Ontario: Bell, Dr. Robert; Mr. A. Barlow, assistant; Sudbury District. Mr. Cochrane, correction and additions to topography, Ontario map series. Lawson, Dr. A.; Mr. Smith, assistant; Port Arthur and Pigeon River.

Quebec: Ellis, Dr. R.; Mr. Giroux, assistant; South-western sheet, E. T. Map. Low, A. P., assistant; N. W. sheet E. T. Map and line of Lake St. John Railway. Laflamme, Rev. Prof.; Ingall, E. D.; Phosphate Region. Mr. White, assistant, field surveying and mining statistic work. Mr. Brumell, statistical work.

New Brunswick: Bailey, Professor, 3 months; Mr. McLunes, assistant; boundary of Quebec and New Brunswick. Chalmers, R., assistant; superficial geology, soils, timber, &c.

Nova Scotia: Fletcher, Mr. H.; Faribault, E. R., assistant; Gold District.

(General LAURIE. In what counties in Nova Scotia will the work be continued?)

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Fletcher, I think, was last year in the Pictou district, and it is proposed to continue the work there. There has been an application from some gentlemen in Nova Scotia that he should report on some gold deposits, I forget exactly the locality, but I think in Pictou County; and although an examination had already been made there, it was found necessary to make further inspection, and Mr. Fletcher was asked to do it. An application has also been made for the survey of another gold section, and it is hoped that Mr. Fletcher's assistant, Mr. Faribault, will be able to attend to it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In addition to this sum of \$60,000 we spend \$47,000 in payment of salaries, making \$107,000. Having reference to the enormous extent of our Dominion, I cannot say that the amount is a large one; but I am aware that a considerable number of persons, whose opinions are entitled to respect, are of the opinion that we get very little for the money we spend on the survey, and that, in view of the fact that in eight or ten years a million of dollars are expended, but small economic results are arrived at. I made a suggestion, I think last year, to the Minister, which I had made without success on other occasions to the hon. gentleman's predecessors, and which I think, looking at the fact that we own enormous quantities of land in the North-West, might be worthy of consideration, even although I make it, and that was this: It would be well that a certain portion of the money should be expended in making borings through certain sections of the country; as probably the Minister of the Interior knows, very great improvements in the way of constructing machines for boring have been made within the last few years, and there are many inventions by Americans and others, connected with that, which enables boring to be done very cheaply. I cannot help thinking that it would be very greatly to our advantage, as being practically the landlords of an enormous tract of territory in the North-West, if we caused to be made, at proper distances, a number of trial borings in different sections of the country. I believe we would learn more in that way of the real nature of the country we have possession of than we would by a very considerable number of these superficial surveys.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I quite agree with a great deal of what has been said by the hon. gentleman, and I assure him that I did not forget the suggestion which he made last year. I dare say he has

heard that an artesian well has been commenced at Deloraine, in Manitoba. The settlers themselves subscribed the money, and the municipality taxed themselves for the purpose of making this well to the full extent they could under their by-law. They sank the well to the depth of some 1,300 feet, when they got stuck for money, and they appealed to this Government to help them. I felt so much inclined to assist them that I made a recommendation to my colleagues, and a sum of money will appear in the Supplementary Estimates to enable these people to sink the well to the depth at which they believe, and which is believed by the Director of our Survey, they will strike water. This summer, Dr. Selwyn visited the artesian wells which are south of Deloraine, in Northern Dakota, in order to get some information in regard to them, and he refers to them in his report this year. Mr. Tyrrell also visited the wells that are being sunk at Deloraine, for the purpose of getting some information, and he states that the parties who had charge of the boring made a note of the strata at every five feet, and had kept specimens for the information of the Government. We had given \$500 at this time, out of our Geological vote, to assist them; and subsequently the Government granted \$2,000. They are still at work, and every day I expect to get some information as to their progress. I mention this because I do hope we shall be able to demonstrate that we have a large area with an artesian basin in the North-West, which will prove of the very greatest benefit to the country. While we are getting information with regard to the strata we shall also, I hope, be able to supply a portion of the country where they have no water, and where the settlers are suffering for want of it. There is a notice on the paper in reference to irrigation in the Territories, and in consequence of that, I was aware that this would come up. Although I cannot agree with some gentlemen's views with regard to irrigation in the North-West Territories, to the extent to which some of them would go, I believe a great deal of good can be done by sinking artesian wells, and I intend to propose to recommend to carry out the ideas, not only of hon. gentlemen in this respect, but also the views and the hopes of a great number of settlers in the Territories, so as to enable them to obtain a plentiful supply of water where now they have great difficulty in securing it.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has expressed the views of a great many hon. gentlemen in this House, and of a great number of the people of the country, when he hints that the people and their representatives here do not feel they are getting value for the money expended on this Geological service. The hon. Minister and myself are quite old enough to remember the condition of our Geological Survey under the late Sir William Logan. We all know that at that time, with a very much smaller staff of assistants, and at a vastly less expenditure than we have to pay out now, that gentleman made the Geological Survey of Canada the admiration of the scientific world. It was, I may say, the pioneer Geological Survey upon this continent. Since that time our neighbors across the line, moved to admiration by the scientific achievements of that splendid Survey, and espe-

cially of its practical usefulness, have gone into the business themselves. Many of the States of the Union have established Geological Surveys, and there is also, I believe, a Federal Geological Survey which takes a general oversight of the geological explorations of the whole of the United States. These surveys are doing most valuable work, in mapping out the country and giving a general scientific report of the strata found in different parts of the Laurentian and other formations—I will not go into technicalities which I do not understand very well. Besides, these surveys are adding greatly to the wealth of the country by their practical discoveries. The surveyors in the United States have been, as our surveyors under Sir William Logan were, discoverers of great deposits of economic minerals in different parts of the country. They have also traced valuable deposits already known to a considerable distance from the place they were first discovered, and in thus pointing out to capitalists where there was an opportunity of investment they have added greatly to the wealth of the country. It cannot be claimed that our Geological Survey, for several years past, has been doing anything of this kind. I take some little interest in the matter. I look at the Geological Report from year to year, and I am unaware that for a good many years past our Survey has materially extended our knowledge of the mineral resources of Canada. I say "materially," because no doubt it has extended our knowledge to some extent, mostly in regard to previously known deposits. But, Sir, nothing has been done with our present large staff, and our present large expenditure, that could compare for a moment with the achievements of the small staff, and the small expenditure, under Sir William Logan. I do not know whether the fault rests with the Department, in their general management of the Survey, or with the Survey itself, on account of its management of the details of the operations. We had a few years ago, a committee to enquire into this matter, whose report was laid before the House, and which report did not attract at that time, nor since, the attention which it ought to have received. I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to that report, as it was before his time in this House, and he may have remained unaware that this important question was discussed before the Committee and an opinion pronounced thereon.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have read the report.

Mr. CASEY. Having read that report, I am astonished that the hon. Minister has not something more definite to propose to us in the way of reforming—I will not say the "abuses"—because I do not mean to use such a strong word, but of reforming the general state of inefficiency into which the Survey appeared at that time to have fallen, and in which it still appears to remain. There are, I must say, some marked exceptions in the way of explorations by some members of the Survey, but little appears to have been done in the way of explorations of a geological type. A great deal has been ascertained in a general way about the fertility of the North-West, about its flora and fauna, by special explorers, and who have been sent out to report on the general features of the country and its fitness for settlement, rather than upon its geological features. Without being invidious, I might refer to the explorations of Professor

Mr. CASEY.

Macoun and Professor Bell; these two gentlemen, among others, have added largely to our knowledge of the country. If all the revenues of the Survey had been spent to as good purpose as those spent in promoting their explorations, I should not have these complaints to make. But I find that a very large portion of the funds voted by this House are spent in exploring, for example, coal mines in Cape Breton and other parts of Nova Scotia, already very well known to capitalists, and not in any sense the property of this Dominion. They were originally the property of the Province, and they have since, to a very great extent, passed into the hands of private individuals; and the effect of the survey of those lands amounted to mapping out the coal deposits of that part of the country for their benefit. The elaboration of the details has not been to add to the wealth of the Dominion, but rather to add to the wealth of the individuals who have already acquired those lands. I do not think it is the business of this Dominion to survey the lands of private parties for them.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CASEY. When you left the Chair at six o'clock I was referring to the explorations conducted during the last few years by the Geological Survey, and I pointed out that a very large proportion of the work done under that Survey consisted in the development of private property, referring, for example, to the coal mines of Nova Scotia. It was no doubt desirable that a good general map of that region should be had, but I contend that it is none of our business to provide perfect detailed maps of coal deposits which have passed into the hands of private parties. The capitalists who invested their money in them were and are quite able and ready to make the fullest explorations of the lands which they hold in fee simple from the Province of Nova Scotia, and their own work might have been left to themselves. It was not only not our duty to vote money for the purpose of developing these private properties, but it was distinctly our duty to abstain from doing anything of the kind. The true scope of the Dominion Geological Survey is to develop, by exploration, analysis, and all other possible means, the lands that belong to the Dominion, and to explore and develop other lands belonging to the Crown, but held in the name of any of the Provinces. I contend that only Crown lands as yet ungranted should be developed and advertised at the expense of the people of the country. Of course it will be necessary, once in a while, in carrying on a survey of this kind, to take note of property belonging to private individuals, where something noteworthy occurs that requires to be investigated, in order to assist in the investigation of cognate matters. For instance, a vein of ore may start on private property, and continue some distance outside of it, and the whole vein must be mapped out to give any idea of its extent and value. But the primary reason for the existence of a Geological Survey is to make known to the country and

to investors who may be ready to invest their money in them the extent of our mineral resources. So far from accomplishing this object at the present time, it is the fact that a gentleman, of whose business I have some little knowledge by hearsay, applied to the Geological Survey, some years ago, for information in regard to certain mineral deposits within the Dominion; I need not specify the exact locality. He applied as the agent of a large syndicate of capitalists in Great Britain who wished to invest a large sum of money—I was told it was half a million pounds sterling—in some good paying mineral region. My friend simply asked the Geological Survey for a little practical information in regard to the region that had been recommended. He informed the head of the Survey that he did not expect him to guarantee any particular results from the mines, but he wished to get such practical information as would enable capitalists to decide whether it was worth their while to make further explorations of the neighborhood. The answer I received from the head of the Department was that it was none of the business of the Geological Survey to give such information to investors. If that be not part of its business, I should like to know what is. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior expressed the intention of the Government to include a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of boring for water in certain parts of the North-West Territories, with the subsidiary intention of ascertaining the distribution of the tiers of strata at the same time. My contention is not that the Government should not make these experiments in artesian wells, but that they should be able to make them out of the grant the House has been already asked to vote; and they could do this by the very simple process of curtailing expenses in other directions, as, for instance, the advertising of private property. But, if it should be found, after the practice of such economy as I have suggested in one direction, that it would be desirable to go a little further than the Minister promised to go in the other direction, namely, that of testing the value of our own land, I, for one, would not be inclined to oppose a considerable vote for that purpose. We should find out the value of our own territory and make it known to the investing world at large. The sooner we make it possible, by adopting a financial policy which I shall not discuss at present, for foreign investors to put their money profitably into Canadian mines, the sooner we shall become a rich and flourishing nation. We hear every day, near the north shore of Lake Superior, in the district around Sudbury, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, north of Lake Nipissing, from various quarters of British Columbia, even from the prairies of the North-West, where, some ten or fifteen years ago, nobody thought of looking for minerals, of discoveries being made of deposits of the greatest value, whether of metal or of coal, and yet we do not find that the operations of the Government Survey, which may be looked upon merely as an agency for ascertaining our corporate wealth as a nation, have been directed intelligently towards developing these deposits of which we hear. No doubt a cursory survey has been had of the mining district north of Lake Superior; no doubt a report of some sort has been had of the Sudbury district;

no doubt a year ago Mr. Dawson made as good an exploration as could be made in the time at his disposal, of the Kootenay district, and regions in British Columbia; but there has been no systematic and thorough survey of those particular parts of the Dominion where the greatest mineral wealth has been developed in the past few years. That is what we ought to get for our money and that is what we have not got. I find, in looking over my notes, that I have omitted to mention one particular exploration which took place within the last few years, and which has been of general value, though coming more under the head of an exploratory expedition than of a geological survey. I refer to Dr. Dawson's expedition to the neighborhood of the boundary between British Columbia and Alaska, which resulted in furnishing us with much valuable information, though necessarily of a somewhat superficial nature, owing to the limited time at the Doctor's disposal and the vast extent of country he had to visit. But I say such an exploration as that was rather connected with the Crown Lands branch of the service. In fact, I hardly know what Department to mention as the proper one to conduct that exploration. It was an exploration to find out the general nature of the country near the boundary between us and the United States territory, in that direction. It was not, in the strict sense of the word, a geological exploration, and it could not be, under the circumstances. I wish to give credit to the Department for what it has done, and, therefore, mention this now, in connection with these general explorations and cursory surveys which have resulted in information of great material use to the country. This information itself has been unconscionably delayed. We have in the blue book laid on the Table for 1889 the report of Dr. Dawson, to which I have just referred, and a sprinkling of others, ranging from the beginning of the season of 1887 down to the season of 1888. Now, if the information collected by the Geological Survey is not to be laid before the public until more than two years after it has been obtained, that fact alone is a most convincing proof of the inefficiency either of the Survey itself, as a Department, or of the greater Department of the Interior, which controls its general line of policy, and under whose instructions it must act. Of course, the members of the Survey are not responsible for the delay in the publication of their reports, unless they have been behindhand in sending them in, and I do not believe such has been the case. I believe they have been sent in as soon as could be expected after the explorations were made, but the Department, for reasons best known to itself, has been so careless as to delay many of these reports over two years from the time the information was acquired. I may be asked what I would suggest that the Survey should do. I would suggest, in the first place, that a thorough survey, not a mere rough exploration, should be made as early as possible of all the regions possessing railway facilities, in which Crown lands are situated and in which the existence of minerals is ascertained or suspected. There is no use in exploring places where we have no hope of finding minerals, but all the places where the existence of valuable minerals has already been ascertained, or is suspected by experts, and which

are near the great transcontinental railway or any of its branches, should be examined as early as possible, and examined, not in a superficial way, but so thoroughly that the survey would afford capitalists some fair idea as to whether it would pay them to invest in one locality or another. In the second place, the regions already known to contain valuable deposits should be again surveyed, and I may mention Sudbury, the Lake Superior mining district and the gold mining district of British Columbia as practical instances. Further, it should be the duty of the Survey to furnish to any enquirer such information as they have in their possession. It has been asserted—I do not know how truly—that an agent of that Survey has taken it upon himself, in one case in the Province of Ontario, to furnish information in regard to something which might be found under the surface of the earth, not to the general public, or to the first enquiring investor, but to political friends, in advance of the publication of his report. It has even been alleged that he has given that information in advance of the publication of his report to a member of the Government, and that, in consequence of such information being given before the report was made public, a company was formed which now includes the said member of the Government, and of which the said agent of the Geological Survey is now the manager and at the same time a shareholder.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Name.

Mr. CASEY. I will give the names of the parties. I have said that this is alleged. I do not know whether it is true or not, but I state the facts as given to me in order to elicit information on the subject.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). You cannot state facts unless you know them.

Mr. CASEY. The agent of the Department to whom I referred is Mr. Coste, who, I understand, was sent to look for natural gas in the County of Essex, and the member of the Government to whom he is alleged to have given information is the hon. the Postmaster General. It is stated that a company was formed before Mr. Coste's report was made public, and that the Postmaster General is a member of that company and Mr. Coste is the manager. I shall be glad to be assured that this is not so, but I should like to hear from the Minister of the Interior whether Mr. Coste is now in the employment of the Government, or whether he is the manager of a company to develop natural gas in the County of Essex; and, if that is so, whether he became connected with that company before or after his report to the Government was made public and available to investors at large, and that is only within a few months. I think I have made sufficiently clear my views as to what should be the general purposes and operation of this Survey. I wish now to call attention to one or two details of the local administration of the Department which do not concern the Survey, but which do concern the Minister who is at the head of that Department. I find, for instance, that, during the year for which we have the Auditor General's account very considerable sums were paid to different parties for lithographing and printing maps connected with that Survey. I find that the British American Bank Note Co., the Burland Lithographic Co., George E. Desbarats & Co., and Mortimer & Co., received

Mr. CASEY.

payments on this account, and the sums paid were very considerable, especially in the case of the Burland Lithographic Co., who received over \$2,600. I should like to know whether this was let by contract, or in what way it was given. Then I find that very considerable sums have been paid for other kinds of printing, which I suppose means ordinary letter-press work, to two newspapers which are certainly not inimical to the Government of the day. I refer to the items of balance for printing of 1888 to the *La Minerve*, Montreal, \$1,513, and a payment of \$5,606 to the *Gazette* Printing Company of Montreal "on account of \$7,500 for printing." I suppose this means that this \$5,600 is part of a contract to do \$7,500 worth of printing, on which only this amount has been paid. Year after year the Department has been asked why they had this printing done in Montreal instead of by the Government printers here in Ottawa. For some years the excuse was that the headquarters of the Geological Survey were in Montreal. My recollection goes back to that somewhat distant time. But for many years the Geological Survey has been located in Ottawa, and the system of having this work done by the journalistic friends of the Government has been continued, and it has been done by the Montreal *Gazette* instead of by the Government printers. But no excuse has been given to the House for that course, and now, when we have a Government Printing Bureau, I must ask the Minister to state whether he intends in future to give out this extensive amount of printing to the *Gazette* and to *La Minerve* of Montreal or to have it done in that magnificent structure which has been, at great expense, erected in this city to do all the Government printing? It was stated that great economy would result from the establishment of the bureau of printing, and no doubt great economy might result from it if the original intentions were carried out; but, if these large slices of Government printing are to be given in the future, as in the past, to outsiders, as a bit of fat is thrown to the terrier that follows at one's heels, the result will not be attained. I desire the Minister to give his attention to these points. In the first place, was the lithographing let by contract or by private arrangement? In the second place, is it the intention of the Government to continue letting their printing to newspaper offices, or to other parties outside of the Government Bureau itself? Surely, on these two points the hon. gentleman can give us definite information, and I would like to hear a more explicit statement as to the intentions of the Government as to the general operation of the Survey for the next year.

Mr. MARA. I am glad to hear that the Government intend in the North-West to bore for water and prospect for minerals. The Government must not forget that they are also landlords in British Columbia and own a vast territory there, over 500 miles in length by 40 in width. They must also recollect that they are now deriving a large revenue from that section of the country, and they owe it to the Province of British Columbia to assist in the development of that country. Croppings of coal have been discovered at Golden, Kamloops and Ashcroft. If the Dominion Government, by boring, can demonstrate that coal exists in those

districts, they will be able to sell large areas of land at \$10 an acre that to-day are worthless. Then, again, in the valley of the Thompson there are thousands of acres of rich land now lying waste and valueless for want of water. If, by a system of boring, the Government can demonstrate that these lands can be successfully irrigated, the lands can be sold at \$10 per acre. The Province is about to inaugurate a system of boring, and I would suggest to the Government that they should work along with the Province; it would be cheaper for both. If the Dominion Government would place a small sum in the Estimates this year, say \$2,500, they could commence work with the Provincial Government, and if the enterprise proved successful, the grant could be increased next year. I would strongly urge upon the Minister of Interior the necessity of attempting something of the kind this year. If successful, this Government will receive the lion's share, because they would reap a direct benefit from the sale of the lands, besides indirect advantages derived from increased population, and an increase in the customs and excise.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In answer to the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), I must say that I perfectly agree with him that our officers should not be employed to report on private property. I did not understand from him what private property he had heard that our geologists had reported upon. I think he referred to the coal districts in Nova Scotia.

Mr. CASEY. I mentioned those as a typical example of what is going on.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Since I have had the honor of being connected with the Department, the Director has informed me that he has always been averse to reporting directly on private properties or on properties of companies. A short time after I took charge of the Department several applications were made to me by private individuals to allow our engineers or geological surveyors to report on private properties. I refused; and on the Department being still further pressed, I submitted the matter to my colleagues in Council, who decided to instruct me to issue a regulation forbidding any of our engineers to report upon the private property of individuals. If the hon. gentlemen had read the Bill which has been introduced into this House he would find there a clause forbidding our surveyors to do that, which will relieve the Director and myself from the annoyance to which we have been subjected in that respect. The hon. gentleman has referred to the survey made in olden times, under the supervision of Sir William Logan, and the work which is now being carried on. I admit that the amount of money voted in those days was not as large as at present, but I cannot agree with him that the work now being carried on is not of equal importance; indeed, it is certainly equal, if not superior, to the work which was carried on in those days. If the hon. gentleman will examine the reports published in those years, and compare them with the reports published to-day, I think he will come to the conclusion that I am right in this statement. I know there is a feeling amongst a great number of people in this country that the Geological Department is not doing justice to the country; but I am glad to say that we have, from other portions of the

world, especially from the United States, very complimentary letters from geological experts in that country, not only congratulating us upon the work which we are doing, but also giving great credit to the officers in our Department. I must say, from what I know of the officers connected with the Department, that I believe there is no Geological Department in America, or in the world, which has men of greater talent than are to be found to-day in the employment of our Department.

Mr. CASEY. I am not disputing that in the slightest.

Mr. DEWDNEY. With regard to the conduct of the Survey, that must necessarily be left, in a great measure, to the Director of the Department. If he is not fit to do that, certainly he is not fit to be at the head of the Department. The hon. gentleman must know that Dr. Selwyn had been engaged in this work for years before he came into this country. He has now been engaged in that work in this country twenty-five years, I think, under successive Governments. I consider that he is a gentleman of great abilities, great experience, and a man unequalled in capacity for the position he holds. Every man has his failings, and probably the Director has his. Although I have had no difficulty with him, I know that he is a gentleman who has opinions of his own, and a gentleman who likes to stick to his opinions; at the same time, I believe he is conscientious in his work, and I think he has well earned the salary which has been paid to him since he entered our service. He has been now for twenty years or more in our service, and his salary is just the same now as it was at the beginning. I think we have received from him good service for the salary he has received. The hon. gentleman in one breath says that our Departments should be able to show to capitalists, or to people who wish to invest, where they can profitably invest their money.

Mr. CASEY. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman stated that our service should be able to show the people who wish to invest their money where they can do so.

Mr. CASEY. No; I did not. What I said was, that we ought to be able to furnish to investors such general information as they, in their position, required, regarding different regions where minerals exist, and which might form the basis for investment by those capitalists. At all events, that is what I meant to say.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the next breath the hon. gentleman complains, as I understood him, that in some instances our officers were doing so.

Mr. CASEY. Yes.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He referred to a gentleman who, I may tell him, has left our Department for a year or more, and he said this gentleman had made use of his information for the benefit of private individuals when he was in the service of the Department.

Mr. CASEY. Exactly; I said I was told so.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The gentleman named may have taken credit to himself for making the valuable discovery to which the hon. gentleman referred; but I think, if the hon. gentleman will

read the reports previous to that, he will find that the Director of the Survey had indicated a locality in the peninsula in western Ontario where, if borings were made, gas would be discovered.

Mr. CASEY. In his report he indicated this ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Director of the Survey indicated this several years before, and he discovered where gas could be found. The hon. gentleman stated that Mr. Coste had taken upon himself to furnish to political friends the information which he had received while in the service of the Department. I do not know exactly whether Mr. Coste had been sent specially to survey there or not. I think not.

Mr. CASEY. He did make a special survey, and I have his report.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Director had himself reported. Mr. Coste may have done so; at all events, he has left the Department and has not been in the service for a year. I think the hon. gentleman does not understand what the object of our Geological Survey should be. I quite agree that it certainly should not be to report for the profit of private individuals. I also agree that the surveyors should be most careful in their reports, as otherwise they are liable to lead capitalists into trouble. With regard to all our men, from the Director down, I can say this: I have read the reports for years back, even before I expected to come to this House, and when they were reporting specially on British Columbia I was struck with the very careful manner in which they reported on mineral districts which I knew were most valuable and important. I give credit to the staff for those reports, and it is the duty of the geologist, especially any young man, to exercise the utmost care in making his report. In an article published in the *American Geologist* in March this year, by John C. Brenner, a noted geologist in the United States, on "The Training of a Geologist," he says:

"The necessity of caution on the part of the young geologist, in publishing conclusions that one feels to be open to criticism, or when he sees that important facts may be over looked, cannot be too strongly emphasised. The publication of facts is generally useful, but deductions can afford to wait until they are properly matured. A most valuable piece of advice was once given to me, to the effect that young people would better not begin pumping out of their intellectual reservoir before something has been pumped into them."

In another paragraph, referring to another matter, the writer says:

"I may say briefly that a professional geologist, especially if he is in a public place, such as State Geologist, in any way connected with the State or National Survey, has no moral right to have a personal interest in any mining property, or in any other property, a knowledge of the value of which might come to him through his knowledge of geology. Abstaining from such interests is a duty the geologist in the public employ owes to himself as well as to the public, and the public has the right both to expect and to demand that its employes shall not walk off with the profits of its investments, just as the manufacturer has the right to demand that his employes shall not appropriate the articles they make."

I perfectly agree with those sentiments, and it is in accordance with those sentiments that I introduce the Bill this year. In regard to other question put by the hon. gentleman, as to the publication of reports and maps and why the contracts were not let for the lithographing of the maps, the hon. gentleman must know that these are works requiring very great care, and it is being performed

Mr. DEWDNEY.

by the Burland Lithographic Company, and we have had no occasion to change that arrangement with the firm. With regard to the publication of the report, it is the intention of the Government to utilise the new Printing Bureau for printing our reports, so far as it is capable of doing so. This year the French translation has been printed in the Government Bureau. The English edition, as has been the custom, was published in the *Gazette* office, for, I am sorry to say, the Printing Bureau was unable to do it on account of pressure of work; but I hope this is the last time it will be published outside of the Bureau. With respect to the remarks made by the hon. member from British Columbia (Mr. Mara), if the Government will agree to adopt my suggestion and commence boring in different parts of the territory I shall be glad to see the system extended to British Columbia. With respect to boring and sinking of artesian wells or other works, I am not at all satisfied that it would be advisable for the Government to take the matter into its own hands and do the work as heretofore with its own machinery and gang of men. I hold this opinion because the machinery is very heavy; it has to be transported at great cost, not only the machinery, but also the lumber in connection with the power to be used, and when breaks occur, the men drawing Government pay will not hurry about remedying the repairs. I, therefore, propose to recommend, if we do anything in this direction, that we should let the work by contract at so much per foot, which will be the cheapest and most satisfactory way. There are firms in Ontario and the United States perfectly willing to undertake contracts of this kind.

Mr. CASEY. It will be given by tender, of course ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. By tender.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has stated that the reason why the lithographing has been left in the same hands without asking for tender was that the work had been done by those parties for many years, and satisfactorily. That may be quite true, but a great many years have elapsed since the Burland Lithographic Company united to form a company to execute fine work. Since that time a number of other companies have sprang into existence to execute fine work. It is the duty of the Government to remember that the country has not failed to advance, although the Department may have done so. Although the Department may follow old-fashioned methods, it is their duty to ascertain whether the Government cannot obtain the same class of work at lower rates than those that are now paid. It appears that the letter-press work which was formerly done by the *Gazette* and *La Minerve* was done last year by W. Foster Brown & Co., of Montreal, as I find from the imprint on the book. I do not know whether or not the *Gazette* has fallen from favor with the hon. Minister, but, at all events, W. Foster Brown & Co. seem to have done the work, and they did not get it by tender, nor could they have obtained it on the ground that they had performed it for years satisfactorily. The hon. Minister may be able to explain this.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). What about the price ?

Mr. CASEY. The price is given in a lump sum for the year before. We cannot yet tell what it cost last year, unless the hon. Minister is able to inform us. In regard to my pretension that the Department ought to supply information to investors, the Minister said that I complained because Mr. Coste had furnished such information. What I urged was that the Department itself, and not the officers of the Department, should furnish information to investors; but I never said that even the Department should furnish that information before it had been made public by presentation to this House. Everyone knows it would be a very great scandal if even the Department gave information to intending investors, without letting it be known to the public at large. But if an investor wants to know about a particular region the Department should send him the information they have in their blue books about that region. That is one of the purposes for which the Department was established, but the Coste matter is very different. I am sorry the Minister has not been able to deny the allegations about Mr. Coste's action which have been made to me, and, through me, conveyed to the House. These allegations are that Mr. Coste, not only before the presentation of his report, but before it was sent to the Department, had given private information to other parties that, he knew gas to exist in a certain locality, and that on the basis of that information, a company, of which he became manager, was formed to utilise that gas. The charge is, that he used the information he acquired while an officer of this Geological Survey for the purpose of putting money in his own pocket, and in the pockets of the members of the company with which he is now associated. Now, as to whether an hon. Minister, who had been mentioned here, had any connection with this matter or not, I cannot say, or as to whether he had any knowledge of the improper manner in which Mr. Coste had acted I will not attempt to judge. That will be for himself to make clear, as soon as he thinks it is his duty to do so. It is a matter that ought to be explained, and I hope he will explain it, since the hon. Minister at the head of the Department does not seem to know anything about it. I accept the hon. Minister's statement that the Department has issued instructions to their explorers not to explore private properties for the personal information of the owners thereof. I did not charge that they had gone to examine "John Jones' mines" or "Tom Smith's mines" for the purpose of furnishing information to them personally, but what I complained of was that the public money had been spent in making detailed maps, and explorations, and borings of property, which was in the hands of private individuals, and which were good for nothing else but to advertise that private property. Let me give you an example of how this advertising of private property is done. From the Geological Report of the year 1889 we find in the "list of plates and maps" accompanying this volume the following: Plans I to IX, plans of mines: Silver Islet, Pie and McKellar's Islands, Spar Island, Jarvis Island, Shuniah Mines, Minerals 3A Mine, Porcupine and Rabbit Mountain Mines, Beaver Mines and Silver Mountain and Crown Point Mines, and views of Rabbit Mountain Mines. One of these is a picture and the other are plans and maps of the mines. We find from the report of 1889 that a number

of these plans and maps and lithographing are done for the benefit of the owners of these mines and at very great expense to the public. This should be put an end to. It only remains for me to remark that I am sorry to find that our wonderful Printing Bureau has not yet been able to undertake all the work that has come before it, and that, according to the Minister's statement, there is yet a prospect of the Government being able to give some work to their political friends of the newspapers which support them. This defect in the Printing Bureau must be owing to a mistaken idea as to what it would be able to accomplish when it was first started, or to the mismanagement of the Bureau after it has been established. Whichever is the true reason, I hope this state of things will not be continued any longer. I trust we will find that the country, after having been put to enormous expense for erecting that Printing Bureau to do the public work, shall not be put to the further expense of having a large slice of the Government printing done outside this Government Bureau.

Mr. MARA. The Provincial Government in British Columbia has already taken means to carry on "borings" in certain parts of the Province, and have purchased the necessary plant to commence operations in the early spring. While it is to the interest of both the Dominion and the Provincial Governments that these experiments should be carried on near the line of railway, yet, if water is discovered there, the Dominion Government will have the greater part of the benefit, because they have lands to sell, while the Provincial Government has none. I, therefore, think that a special sum should be voted by this Parliament to assist the British Columbia Government in boring for water as well as for minerals in lands within the railway belt. I think there should be money set apart, outside of the general vote for this special purpose, as the Minister has explained that it is his intention to call for tenders and to carry on these borings by contract. I think in this case there ought to be a special vote to assist the British Columbia Government in carrying on the borings which they contemplate carrying on this year.

Mr. TROW. I do not rise to make any objections to the grant to the Geological Survey. I think the resources of this country of ours are worthy of considerable expense in their exploration. We are possessed of rich minerals in almost every Province of the Dominion. I dissent from the remarks made by the hon. member for West Elgin, and also by the Minister, in regard to private enterprises. I think private parties should be able to get the services of any of the officers of the Department, when they are not otherwise employed, to examine and report upon private enterprises in the interest of the country at large, so long as they pay all the expenses. As an illustration, I may say that a gas well for natural gas has been started in the city of Ottawa, and I understand that some \$4,000 has already been expended upon it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Nearly \$10,000.

Mr. TROW. By examining a geographical map in the Department, drawn by Prof. Dawson, any one must come to the conclusion that people might bore there to eternity without getting any gas, because

it is out of the region of natural gas. But there is a region extending from St. Catharines to Essex Centre where natural gas flows in many places on the surface, and it takes no exploration to find it. I look upon Mr. Coste as a creature of circumstances in many instances. He has fallen upon a region which has been explored and reported upon by others before his day, and by following in their wake he has been successful where almost any explorer could have succeeded as well as he. I hope the Minister will take into consideration the propriety of aiding the settlers in the North-West by sinking artesian wells in settlements where the land is arid and where there is a deficiency of wholesome water. By very little expenditure you may succeed in accommodating a hundred settlers even with one artesian well. I think a few thousand dollars expended in the North-West in that way would have a very beneficial effect on the future settlement of that great country. On the other side of the line, south of Lake Superior, 500 per cent. has been expended by the State of Michigan in explorations more than we expend altogether, and anyone passing up one side of the lake and down the other can see the spirit of enterprise displayed on the other side, while those who are acquainted with the geology of the country say that our mineral wealth far surpasses theirs. If the proprietors of the project I have spoken of in the city here under our eyes had got the opinion of one of the professors of the Geological Survey, who make such matters a life study, it would have satisfied them that it was utterly useless to make any effort in this locality and the \$10,000 would have been saved.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Let me state to the hon. member that the parties who sunk the well in Ottawa did it in the face of an adverse report made by Dr. Selwyn, who advised them not to sink the well, and told them that if they did they would find no gas.

Mr. CASEY. I must differ in one respect only from my hon. friend the member for South Perth (Mr. Trow). I do not think the officers of the country engaged on this Survey should be allowed practically to hire themselves out for the benefit of private parties. Their whole service is needed by the Department to which they belong, and if a private party wants explorations made on his own property he should hire his own expert. At the same time, he is entitled to all that the Department knows from previous explorations with regard to it, and should be able to obtain it without expense.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I should not have said one word except for the last expression of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. He said that the opinion of none of the Government officers should be employed to enhance the value of important discoveries made by private individuals. On that point I decidedly disagree with him. During the last few years the range of Laurentian Mountains have been supposed to contain immense resources of minerals, and a vast amount of time and labor has been expended in exploration. Many people have supposed that they have made valuable discoveries, and many have been mistaken; and if the authorities of the Geological Survey can endorse the discoveries of those private individuals and give them a fixed commercial value it would be

Mr. Trow.

important, not only to the discoverers, but to Canada. If the private individuals, by submitting samples of minerals or oil, or by taking parties over the ground to test for deposits of gas, could get an opinion from the Geological Survey, it would be of great advantage to the country and would enhance the value of the discoveries of private individuals.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do you mean through the reports of the Department?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I say that when a private individual makes a discovery, and submits it to the Department, and asks them to report upon it, they do not do their duty to this country or to that individual if they do not faithfully report upon it, and afterwards embody it in their report.

Mr. TROW. So long as the private parties bear the expense.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I do not care who bears the expense, so long as the country gets the benefit. With regard to natural gas company referred to, I am not thoroughly conversant with it; but I am in possession of this information: that long previous to the formation of the company referred to by the hon. member for West Elgin the indication of gas was signified by the Geological Survey of this country, and before the report of Mr. Coste was made I believe that company was formed. With regard to the Government or any individual friend taking advantage of this report, such is not the case. Now, it is notorious to every man in this country who has paid any attention to what has been done in the North-West, or on the north shore of Lake Superior, that even the most astute geological explorers have passed over regions redolent with wealth without being able to discover anything, and yet private explorers have afterwards made discoveries there and brought them into notice. These discoveries should not afterwards be emphasised and the credit taken for them by the Geological Survey after they have been brought to their notice. They are simply talking nonsense, and we are paying a staff for a service which they do not do.

Mr. DAWSON. It is very satisfactory to hear the hon. Minister express himself so highly with regard to the staff. It always encourages officers to know that their superiors are ready to defend them, though I do not think they have been seriously attacked to-night. I believe there are many good and rising men among the present staff of the Survey, but they will have to work well and to exert themselves greatly before they can hope to attain the eminence which has characterised their predecessors. Sir Wm. Logan had a world-wide reputation as a geologist, and so had some of his associates—Mr. Billings as a palæontologist attained great eminence, and is quoted all the world over, and a man still living, Dr. Sterry Hunt, gave his great ability and time to the service of the country for a great many years. His abilities were better appreciated in another country. He considered he was not placed in his proper position here, as I believe he was not, and he went over to the United States where he attained a high position. These were men any country might be proud of. We have now on the staff, no doubt, many rising and capable men, but I do not think they have attained

to the eminence which their predecessors reached. However, although the Survey is open to criticism, it has accomplished a great deal of good. It has extended its explorations all over the Dominion, and the discoveries, though not always of practical value, are of great interest. It is to be regretted, however, that the Director, when a discovery is made and he goes to investigate it, is very apt to throw cold water on it, and to frighten away foreign capital. He has evidently a nervous dread of our American neighbors losing their money in Canadian mines. Sudbury came very nearly being crushed out in that way. There were copper and nickel there, he said, but really so overwhelmed with iron pyrites as to be of little practical value. In the same way the silver mines at Port Arthur came very near being crushed out some years ago. The distinguished Director of the Survey came up there, and could not see much good in them. All he could see was a little silver in certain positions; but he changed his mind afterwards, and I must say that once he became thoroughly convinced of the great richness of the district—and he was not convinced through his own work—he was not slow in proclaiming the fact. Upon the whole, this grant to the Geological Survey is one that is well expended, and there is no doubt that when the new Act is introduced and discussed, the organisation of the Department will be very much improved. I am very glad to see that our friends opposite do not very seriously criticise this grant, but only offer some suggestions.

General LAURIE. I regretted to hear the hon. member from West Elgin state that he considered enough had been done in surveying the Maritime Provinces, and that the whole resources and energy of the Geological staff should now be occupied in developing the North-West. We are not at all prepared to accept such a recommendation. On the contrary, we claim that a great deal still remains to be done in the Maritime Provinces, and especially in the Province of Nova Scotia. The central part of the western portion of the Province of Nova Scotia, the back part of Shelburne, and Queen's and Digby counties are generally believed to be very full of minerals. Large discoveries of gold have been lately made in the interior of Queen's County, and we believe that if examinations were made in the counties of Shelburne and Digby gold would also be discovered there in quantities which would add largely to the material wealth of the country; and we believe that not only gold, but other minerals of great economical value will also be found in those districts. I urged the matter on the Department two years ago, but was informed that it is desirable a continuous survey should be kept up from the east to the west. The wise men came from the east, but if we are to wait until the wise surveyors come from the east to enlighten us it will be a long time before the resources of the western portion of the Province will be ascertained. By employing an additional staff these resources could, without interfering with the work in other parts, be enquired into, and if possible developed, and I hope our Geological staff will devote some energy in surveying the western portion of the Province and not expend it altogether in other sections.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is Mr. Coste still in the service?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; he resigned.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Was he superannuated?
Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When did he resign?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Last year, during the Session.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Had he been conducting a survey?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The year previously he had.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Had he made a report to the Department?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are we to understand that the report for this year is to be printed outside the Government Bureau?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; the report of this year will be, and I hope that will be the last.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not think there can be any excuse for this.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Well, every one was pressing to have this report published, and I found it impossible to have it printed in the Government Bureau.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It seems absurd to think that a work of that kind cannot be done in the Bureau, where they have ample room and every convenience, and the finest building of the kind on the continent. They have printing presses to do all the work that is required to be done there, and an unlimited supply of material. Well, why cannot the work be done? The only possible excuse might be that they have not a sufficient number of hands. They have room enough for all the printers required to do all the Government work. They have presses and they have type sufficient to do all the work that can possibly be set up for the Government. The only possible lack may be in the number of hands, and there can be no difficulty in obtaining a sufficient number of hands. The Minister knows that there was a great deal of difficulty in connection with the printing of the voters' lists, but he engaged a number of extra hands, promising them three months' work, and discharged them before the expiration of that time. It is evident, therefore, that there is no difficulty in obtaining the requisite number of hands, so that the only reason for giving this work out must have been that it was desired to give it to some friend of the Government. I think, if the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) were to investigate this matter he would discover that, though the imprint on this report for some years was not that of the *Montreal Gazette*, the work was done there, because, though for years the work was done in that office, the imprint was that of the Dawsons. When we have a Printing Bureau of our own the work should be done there, and there can be no excuse at all for giving any work out at all. The building is large enough, and everything in the way of plant is good enough to prevent any excuse for giving any work outside. I do not think the Minister has offered any sufficient excuse for giving the work out.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I told the hon. gentleman the reason why I thought it was advisable to give out the printing of the English copy of the report this year. The French copy was printed in the Printing Bureau. I took an opportunity of testing

the prices which it cost to print the French copy in Montreal last year and at the Printing Bureau this year, and I found that the cost per page in Montreal was \$2.28, and that it was \$3.50 at the Printing Bureau.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That carries out exactly what gentlemen on this side of the House urged when the Printing Bureau was established. The Bureau never should have been established, because it is well known that printing can be done more cheaply in an ordinary printing office than it can be in a Government establishment. The Government will find in this Printing Bureau that they have an elephant on their hands, and that has already been discovered by the Minister of the Interior, who has found that it is going to cost a dollar a page more to print the Geological Survey Reports there than to print them outside, and he must remember that the printing of these Geological Reports has cost the Government for many years past double what it would if it had been done by the contractors in Ottawa, so that the contrast is still greater than he represents. That, I believe, will be the experience of every Minister of the Crown, that this Printing Bureau, instead of being a gain to the country, will prove to be a losing concern.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If I save \$2,000 by printing the report outside, I hope the hon. gentleman will give me credit for it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I will give the hon. gentleman credit for printing it at a fair price, but the *Gazette* has been getting much more than the contract price in Ottawa, and I do not think the hon. gentleman deserves much credit now, when there is a Printing Bureau, because he has there more facilities than the contractors had.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We cannot give credit to the Government, of which the hon. gentleman is a member, though we may give him credit in his Department, because the Government established this Printing Bureau to save money, and it must be remembered that, besides the difference of one dollar a page in favor of private printing, there is the immense amount of capital invested, and the wear and tear, so that one dollar a page does not by any means represent the whole difference between the printing in a private establishment and the printing in the Printing Bureau. Some years ago it was found necessary to do this printing in Montreal, for the reason that the Geological Department was there, and the proof sheets of the report had to be read by an expert. It was necessary that a geologist should read over the proofs in order to prevent inaccuracies, as the report is, in many of its pages, of a highly technical character. But it was supposed, when that branch of the Department was removed to Ottawa, that there would no longer be any necessity for having the printing done elsewhere. The Department is here, and for years the printing of the Geological Report ought to have been done by the public printers in Ottawa, because the parties who are to read the proofs reside in this city. While the hon. Minister of the Interior may have made out a case in favor of the economy shown in his Department, he has made out a very strong case in regard to the un wisdom of establishing a Printing Bureau at all.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Do I understand the hon. Minister to state that Mr. Coste had made his

Mr. DEWDNEY.

exploration a year ago last summer? If he made these surveys a year ago last summer, I would desire to know from the hon. Minister if he was employed during the whole season in making the exploration for gas in the County of Essex?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I believe that, during the summer the hon. gentleman refers to, Mr. Coste was engaged in the Eastern Townships. He was not making any exploration in that oil district that year. I do not know that he ever made any exploration of those oil districts for the Government. I cannot speak with any certainty, but that is my impression.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Did he make any examination of that gas district in Essex?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Not to my knowledge. I do not think he did.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Where was Mr. Coste occupied during the summer before last—the summer previous to his resignation?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I believe he was in the Eastern Townships during that year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Do I understand from the Minister that Mr. Coste was not engaged in Essex making any exploration during that or the previous summer?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot say definitely as to that; but I understand that the year previous to my coming here, he was engaged in the Eastern Townships collecting mining statistics.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Then the Minister does not know whether Mr. Coste ever made any examination of the Essex section or not?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; I do not.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I find by the Auditor General's Report that, in 1888, Mr. Coste did a good deal of travelling around, and was allowed a considerable amount for travelling expenses. The Auditor General has called attention to the fact that, in some cases, as high as \$5 a day were allowed for expenses, whereas the regulation allowance is only \$3 per day, and if they are on the regular staff they are allowed only actual expenses. On page 78—E the Auditor General says:

"Mr. E. Coste and his assistant, H. B. Brumell, were allowed a per diem allowance of \$3.50 in place of actual expenses, when travelling on Geological Survey business, during last season."

Where were they travelling? Where did these expenses occur? Then he goes on to explain that they were only allowed actual expenses, and further on he says:

"I may remark that from one of the vouchers rendered by Mr. Coste it appears that when in the city of Sherbrooke he was paying only \$2 a day for board, while charging \$3.50 for living allowance—an overcharge of \$1.50 a day. Mr. Coste drew an allowance of \$3.50 a day for sixty-seven days, and \$5 for four days while travelling in the United States, or \$254.50 in all. Mr. Brumell drew \$3.50 a day for seventy days, or \$245 in all."

On page 79—E the Auditor General calls attention to the fact that there were other charges not pertaining to the Department proper:

"Please explain the charges for tobacco which appear in the following surveyors' accounts:—W. McInnes, \$3.90; T. C. Weston, \$1.70."

Will the Minister please explain how these items occur? Why should they be charged to the Department? We ought to have some information given as to where Mr. Coste was engaged prior to

his resignation, and why it was that he resigned. We ought to have some information as to how he came into possession of the facts in reference to gas up in Essex. We ought to know how and why it is, that he formed a company for the purpose of boring for gas; we ought to know whether any members of this House, or members in other places, have any interest or share in the explorations made there; we ought to know whether the Government has in their employ, officials who may possess certain information which they use to their advantage, and to the advantage of some of their personal friends, contrary to the general interests of the country. We ought to know whether any of those reports are true, and the Minister ought to give us full explanations so that we may be in possession of all the facts. I think it is his duty. I think my hon. friend from West Elgin was right in calling attention to these facts. We want to know if there was anything wrong in the transactions of Mr. Coste before he resigned his position as a servant of the Government.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I must say that I am not in a position to answer all the questions which have been asked by the hon. gentleman, and I do not think he can expect it. I am not in the confidence of Mr. Coste, therefore I cannot tell him why Mr. Coste resigned. I can only suppose that Mr. Coste, who was getting a salary of some \$2,200 or \$2,300, found that he could better himself, and he gave up his position in the Department and went into an occupation which pays him better. I think I explained to the hon. gentleman that I was not aware that Mr. Coste made any special report, or was employed by the Government to make any special report, with regard to this gas field in which he appears to have taken an interest. I did tell him that that portion of the country was indicated by the Director of the Geological Survey some years before, as being one in which, if parties undertook to bore, they might probably strike gas. This I believe they did. With regard to the travelling allowance the hon. gentleman spoke about, I may say, that shortly after I came into the Department I found there was a misunderstanding between the Auditor General and the Director in reference to travelling allowance, and it was that which brought about the explanations I see here. Subsequently to this, I issued regulations regarding the travelling allowances of that Department, which were very similar to the regulations which we had in the land branch of that Department, that is, that when surveyors are travelling independently by themselves through the country, they get \$3.50, whilst they are in our country; and when they are out in the field with other parties, they have a subsistence allowance sufficient to cover their actual expenses. I recollect that when I was going into this matter of the travelling expenses, Mr. Coste was in the Eastern Townships during that year, and he had also visited the United States to get some information with regard to his work, during which time he was allowed a travelling allowance of \$5 a day.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the Minister will freshen his memory a little if he will read his report. He certainly would not sign his name to that report and allow it to go out without examining it carefully, and he must have known whether Mr. Coste did make a report in reference

to Essex. If he will look at the last Geological Report, he will have an opportunity to refresh his memory, and he will find that Mr. Coste did make a report, and subsequently resigned and went into a company which was formed, and, perhaps, my hon. friend the Minister, if he has not all the information in reference to that company, might call upon some members of the House who sit not far from him, and who might give him some information in reference to the formation of the company, and the gas well in Essex. Now, if you will look carefully into the expenses of this Department, you will find extravagance in almost every detail, as appears in the Auditor General's Report. We find that these individuals under the charge of the Minister, from the chief manager, Dr. Selwyn, down to his subordinates, although they may travel upon a first-class car, think it is not good enough for them, because you will see that these individuals charge for Pullman cars, and, of course, the Minister allows this extravagance to go on. No one will find any fault for the expenditure on this Survey if it is economically administered; but I think we have just cause to complain of the lack of attention given to this Department by the Minister. If the Minister allows this report to go broadcast through the country without knowing what is in it, I say that some one else should take charge of that branch of the Department. He would then be able to say whether his officers are receiving salaries and allowances and gratuities and other consideration to which they are not entitled. I have no hesitation in saying that we are paying more money for this service than is necessary.

Mr. HAGGART. I should like to offer a few remarks in answer to the hon. gentleman. I know the hon. gentleman intends his remarks for me. He has insinuated that the Minister of the Interior might know something about the stockholders in the gas well in Essex, and if he was not able to do so an hon. gentleman near would probably know. I am one of the stockholders in the gas well in Essex County. I do not know what business it is of the hon. gentleman as to whether I am a stockholder or not. I did not take my stock or get my information in any improper way. I never knew Mr. Coste was in Essex; it was not at his instance that I took the stock. And after that statement from me, until the hon. gentleman knows better, I hope he will stop his insinuations and be better informed before he makes an attack on any hon. member.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It appears, then, that if I did not strike gas I struck oil. It appears that the hon. gentleman thinks I have no business to obtain information respecting a public officer.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. gentleman says it is none of my business whether he is a stockholder or not. I do not pretend to say it is. I was asking for information in regard to what Mr. Coste was doing. I knew he had been in the service of the hon. gentleman; I knew he had been employed by the Government here, and was receiving a salary at the hands of the Dominion of Canada; and I knew further, that the hon. gentleman who said it was none of my business was a member of the Government who was responsible

for Mr. Coste doing his work. It is strange how the hon. gentleman should have ascertained so readily, if he knew nothing of Mr. Coste, that there was gas there, and it would be a good investment. It is surprising indeed. The hon. gentleman appears to have displayed a simplicity for which I would not have given him credit. How did he obtain his information? Through what source? It is right that he should have taken stock and become a member of that company, but the question is this: Did Mr. Coste, an employé of the Government, by any means allow my hon. friend to have an opportunity to know there was a good investment there, and that in all probability it would yield an ample and full return on the money invested? The hon. gentleman said it was none of my business that I, in my place as a representative of the people, should try and find out what Mr. Coste had been doing.

Mr. HAGGART. I never said anything of the kind either here or elsewhere.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Will the hon. gentleman repeat what he did say?

Mr. HAGGART. It is not necessary. If the hon. gentleman will not put words into my mouth, I will reply to him afterwards.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Will the hon. gentleman state what he did say?

Mr. HAGGART. That would not make any difference to the hon. gentleman; he would go on and repeat again and again something which I did not say. I spoke in plain language, which he could not misunderstand. I told him I never got the information from Mr. Coste, that it was from another party, that it was the hon. member for Essex, Mr. Patterson, who asked me to take stock in the company. I told the hon. gentleman I did not see Mr. Coste, that I was not aware he was there; and I said it was none of the hon. gentleman's business whether I was a member of the company or not. Perhaps the hon. gentleman understands me now.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Now we have got at the bottom of the whole matter. It appears that an individual by the name of Mr. Patterson—I wonder if it is the hon. member for Essex.

Mr. HAGGART. It is.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). So here we have a Minister of the Crown and one of the leading supporters of the day, and further we have an employé of the Government, who is under the pay of the Government, and holding a position under the Government, and this individual possesses information which is essential to the Minister of the Crown and a supporter of the Government obtaining the opportunity to form themselves into a stock company to develop a gas well in Essex. And yet I am told, forsooth, that it is none of my business, nor is it the business of any other representative of the people to ask how they got the information. I think we have a right to know, and I am very glad we have extracted from the Postmaster General the declaration that he is a member of the gas company there, and that another member of this House is also one of the stockholders.

Mr. HAGGART. You could have found that in the *Gazette*, if you had looked for it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Further, I would like to know from the Minister whether Mr. Coste had any vacation that year? If so, how long did it last; did he receive any salary during his vacation; was his vacation for three weeks or six months? I think the Minister will be able to answer this question.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I was not in charge of the Department at that time, so I am not able to give the hon. gentleman the information.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Then, may I expect he will search the records, ascertain the information, and bring it down on a future occasion?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Certainly. I should like to make one remark. It is very difficult to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) stated that our officers should be able to make such reports as would enable financial men to invest their money. When one of our officers—if he was one at that time—makes a report, which the hon. gentleman thinks he did, such a report as induced capitalists to invest money, then, says the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), he had no business to make a report.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If the Minister will take the trouble to examine the accounts of the Department, he will come to the conclusion that an unnecessarily large expenditure is made. If he will examine the Auditor General's Report, from page 72 to 76 inclusive, he will find the expenditure could be reduced. So far as regards the remark made by the Postmaster General, that this matter is one respecting which it is not the business of any hon. member of this House to ascertain the facts, I pay no attention to his statement. Whatever statement is made in the heat of anger by an individual, not responsible for his sayings, I say that so long as an individual is not responsible for his sayings in this House, I treat him with that contempt to which he is entitled. I say that any hon. member of this House who will make such a remark across the floor, when a member is trying to obtain information of that nature, should be treated in the same manner as his remark was intended.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Before the Committee passes away from this item, I trust that the hon. Minister who is leading the House to-night, will take some notice of the very serious charge preferred by the Minister of the Interior, against his colleague the Secretary of State. It is a very serious matter, and one which should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. If I understood the Minister of the Interior aright, he officially declares that the business of the Printing Bureau is managed so unsatisfactorily, so expensively, and with such an absence of that economy, which should be directed to the management of all such institutions; that the public documents cannot be printed there. In other words he states, that in order to publish a report of his Department with any reasonable regard to economy at all, he has to go away to the city of Montreal, and get it printed there at a private establishment. The hon. gentleman who is leading the House will on the present occasion, I am sure, be actuated by that keen sense of chivalry which leads him to come to the rescue of the Secretary of State, whenever he is attacked in his absence. I trust he will ask the Secretary of State to inform us whether there is

ground for this serious statement. If it is true, some steps will have to be taken to abolish that bureau. If the Minister of the Interior is correct in stating, that even in the extravagant Department over which he presides, they cannot go to the Bureau to have a report printed because of the Bureau's extravagance, then the same must apply to the other branches of the service. If I understood the hon. Minister aright, he said it would cost a dollar a page more to print the Geological Report in the Printing Bureau than he could get it done by private contractors in Montreal. The private contractors have their own profit out of this work, and here we have a great many hundreds and thousands of dollars sunk in the purchase of material and plant for that Bureau, but notwithstanding that they cannot do the work at such a rate, as would justify a Government official in sending the work to be done there. That is a very serious charge and requires explanation.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think the hon. gentleman understood me correctly. I did not say that I could get the report printed a dollar a page cheaper in Montreal, than in the Government Bureau here. I did say, that I had a return sent me to-day, which showed me that our French report, which was printed in Montreal, last year, cost a dollar a page or so cheaper, than the report which is being printed this year in the Printing Bureau, and I said, when the hon. gentleman was complaining of the report, which I had to print in English this year, that if I had saved a dollar a page or two dollars a page, the hon. gentleman might give me credit for it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As I understand, the Minister admits that the work costs a dollar a page more here than in Montreal. The member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) must remember in addition to this fact that this work done in Montreal was not done at contract price, but at the price they choose to ask for it. If it had been done at the contract price by the contractors who did the Government work here before, it would be done for half the price that was paid for it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Yes. Fifty cents was charged in Montreal for the composition, while the Government contractors here were bound to do it for twenty-five cents, and we pay the same in proportion for presswork.

Mr. LISTER. Why was not this work done in the Printing Bureau here, instead of being sent to Montreal?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I understand it was not done here, because they were unable to do it.

Mr. LISTER. That is no answer at all. The hon. gentleman must remember that when the Secretary of State, introduced the measure to establish this Bureau, he promised the House and the country that all the departmental and other printing required for the public service, would be done in the Printing Bureau; and he promised, moreover, that the system of contracting, as it had existed before, between the Government and the different printing establishments throughout the country would cease, and that all the public printing would be done in the city of Ottawa, at the lowest price. Either the Secretary of State did not know what he was promising, when he made

this statement, or else the Government has given printing to outside establishments, for the purpose of making patronage. So far as the printing of this particular report is concerned, the Minister of the Interior has stated to the House that it would have cost a dollar a page more, if done in the Printing Bureau in Ottawa, than if done in Montreal.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. LISTER. That is the plain meaning of the hon. gentleman's statement. More than that, he has not stated to the House whether tenders were asked for the performance of this work, or whether it was given to the contractors at their own price.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I explained that in connection with the printing of this English copy, which I was obliged to have printed this year, I had the price referred to the Queen's Printer, who certified that they were most reasonable.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The practice for the last eight years has been to give out this work without tender.

Mr. BOWELL. Carry it back further than eight years.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I only speak of what I know.

Mr. BOWELL. The Geological Report has always been printed without tender.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This debate has elicited several points worthy the consideration of this House. In the first place it has been shown that an officer of the Geological Department, who had been engaged in explorations in the county of Essex communicated the result to private parties. I do not know how many persons were engaged with him in this exploration, but they made apparently an exhaustive survey, and no doubt in due time they reported to the Department the nature and value of the discovery they made. That report, as far as I am aware, was not made public until some time afterwards, and as a result we find this officer of the Department retiring from the service and forming a company to utilise the discovery made by himself. We find not only a member of the House, but a member of the Government as well, joining that company, and we now hear that member of the Government rising in his place and with courtesy more forcible than to be admired, he answers an hon. member on this side of the House "that it is none of his business whether he joined the company or not." That is quite true, if the information obtained were not acquired by the outlay of public money, but if it has been so acquired, it is the duty of every member of this House to ascertain whether that information, which was the basis of the formation of this company, was communicated by an officer of the Department in the public service who obtained his information at the public expense. It may be considered proper on the part of the Postmaster General to act as he did to-night, but the members of this House should consider this matter well, for I think it was a very unfortunate statement for a member of the Government to make in this House, under circumstances which appear, at all events, so very shady as this transaction does. I do not know what amount of money was expended on that survey, but this we do know, that the information was afforded by an officer of the

Government, on which this company was formed, and that a member of the Government, as well as a member of the House, entered that company. Then, the hon. Minister gets up as if his conscience was pricked by it, and as if he thought it came within the purview of the Independence of Parliament Act. At any rate, I think it is the duty of this House to enquire into the circumstances under which that company was formed, and it is unfortunate that a gentleman so situated should get up and make a statement against an hon. member, who is only doing his duty by asking for the reasons and objects for which an expenditure of public money has been made. It is a legitimate and proper question, at all events, and it demands a courteous answer. If the hon. gentlemen forming the Government of this country cannot be courteous to the members of this House, they should give way to those who will be courteous and polite in stating to the House the expenditure of the people's money and the uses to which it is applied. Now, we find that an officer has resigned his position under the Government, and has become manager of this company. The Government say that we have no right to enquire into that matter, but I say we should be neglecting our duty if we did not enquire into it. It is our duty to ascertain whether the knowledge on which that company was formed was procured by this man while he was still an officer of the Government.

Indians, Ontario and Quebec..... \$53,235.25

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Have there been any new Indian schools instituted during the past year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There have been only two new schools established—one at Stoney Point, in the County of Lambton, and one at Red Rock, in Lake Superior.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I find by the Auditor General's Report that the expenditure on the schools up to the 30th of June, 1889, was \$15,000, while the vote taken is \$24,000.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I fancy that after the 30th of June there would be some unpaid accounts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this would be an appropriate occasion on which to make some enquiry of the Minister of the Interior with reference to the aid that has been given to these Indian schools—how far they are still under denominational control, and how far they are aided otherwise than by the Government. The hon. Minister knows that during the past six or eight months a very active agitation has gone on in the country, and that a great many synods and conferences and associations have pronounced against state aid for any religious purpose whatever, and it would be interesting to know to what extent the parties who have taken this position, have notified the Government of their intention to cease accepting Government aid for those schools, and how far they purpose relying on the voluntary efforts of their respective denominations. This is one form of connection between Church and State. Indian schools, when first established throughout the North-West Territories, within the district where the Indian title to the soil had been surrendered, were aided, because they, in most cases, lay beyond the regions

Mr. LANDERKIN.

where settlement was being carried on, and it was very much more convenient to aid the missionary establishment than it would have been to undertake to establish Government schools. But that aid was given, from year to year, with the express understanding that the Government pledged itself to nothing beyond the appropriation for the year. Now, it would be interesting if the Minister would lay before us a statement of the extent of this aid, of how much these institutions have received from other sources, and whether there has been any intimation on the part of those who control these schools, of their intention to depend wholly on voluntary contributions in the future, and decline aid from the public treasury.

Mr. DEWDNEY. As the hon. gentleman very likely knows, nearly all the schools of Ontario are Protestant, while those in Quebec are Roman Catholic, and in the two Provinces we pay \$9,531.68 for salaries for the year. We ask to have the balance of \$9,331 voted to supplement the amount paid out of the school fund. The hon. gentleman I fancy will know better than myself what amount of support we get from the different denominations in Ontario. In Manitoba we have support there from almost all the denominations to a certain extent. We have a number of industrial schools carried on purely by the Government, schools of different denominations—one at Qu'Appelle, one at Battleford, and one at High River, and since last year we have built one in Manitoba, near the St. Peter's Reserve, at St. Andrews, and one at Elk Horn, Manitoba, and have just completed one at Regina. I think those are all the industrial schools we built this year. One is built in the Diocese of Rupert's Land, which the church assists to some extent. With regard to the Roman Catholic institutions which are being erected in the Territories, such as the one at St. Albert, we have to pay \$60 a head for any pupils they take, and they pay the balance. Last year we provided for twenty pupils at the St. Boniface College, and agreed to give \$100 per pupil, the Roman Catholics agreeing to pay the balance. A great number of our day schools, especially those carried on by the Methodists and the Presbyterians, have been assisted to a great extent. Also two industrial schools, one of which has been built and furnished entirely by the Presbyterian Church, and to it we make an allowance of \$60 a head for a certain number of pupils.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My statement was that the Government did not pledge itself to the continuance of its support, but that it was given in the meantime as the most convenient way of aiding Indian education, reserving the right at any time to establish a public school system for the Indian population as well. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to an appropriation which, perhaps, it would be more regular to refer to at a later period; I refer to the appropriation for industrial schools of about \$140,000. If I rightly understand the hon. gentleman's statement, this money is expended in aiding the education of the Indian population in institutions wholly under church control.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman understands that the Indian Act has to guide us to a great extent as to the manner in which we conduct the schools on the reserve. All these schools

are on the reserve, except a few Industrial schools, and although they are carried on under the immediate control of the different religious bodies, the Government has the entire control. With regard to the Indian schools, we find the greatest difficulty on account of that section of the Indian Act which compels us to give a school to a minority of Indians, if they ask us for it, and the Government consider they are prepared to receive them. I should like some arrangement by which only one denomination should be on a reserve.

For payment of Annuities under the
Robinson Treaty..... \$16,806

Mr. DAWSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what steps have been taken, if any, to secure to the Indians the amount of the arrears due them under the Robinson Treaty? These arrears amount to a large sum, I believe to as much as half a million dollars at least. According to the estimate I made some years ago, not less than half a million dollars is due to these poor people. Some of those Indians, especially in the older settled parts of the country about Garden River, are exceedingly poorly off. There is quite a large population of them there, and they are so poor that they cannot afford to send their children to school in winter, because they have not the clothes wherewith to cover them. It is too bad that these poor people, with half a million dollars in the hands of the Government, should be in that position. I believe this arises from the fact that, while it remains with the Government of the Dominion to deal with the Indians, the land on which the annuities were made a lien has fallen to the Government of Ontario. I believe the Government of Ontario refuses to recognise any duty in that regard, and says that it is for the Government of the Dominion to pay the annuity. On the other hand, the Government of the Dominion maintains that the payment of annuities should go with the land on which they are a lien. I believe there has been a decision recently by the Imperial Privy Council, which puts it beyond doubt which Government has to pay. I believe that decision makes the payment to the Indians go with the land, and determines that the Province which has fallen heir to the land must pay the annuities of the Indians. But, why should the Indians be made to suffer from this? Would it not be much better that the two Governments should agree in the meantime to pay these poor people what is due to them, and then have it decided which of the two should be responsible for the payment? These poor people are in need and can hardly exist without their annuity. Let them be paid, and let the question be settled afterwards as to which Government should ultimately pay the money. The Indian Department administers the affairs of the Indians with care, prudence, and economy, and the payment of these amounts would, under its careful management, provide a fund which would relieve their distress for a long time to come, would provide for the education of their children, and might do an infinite amount of good. When there is a dispute between the two Governments, surely an arrangement might be brought about by which the Indians would be paid in the meantime, and the question as to which Government was responsible for the payment might be settled afterwards.

Mr. BARRON. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dawson) refer to these annuities. I have had occasion to notice the great distress which the Indians—especially those under the Robinson Treaty—are suffering. While I am on my feet, I cannot but refer to a matter which was brought up last Session in order to show the way in which this Government treats the Indians. There was brought up last Session a matter referring to the Indians on the north shore of Georgian Bay under Treaty No. 6. The Government disposed of an Indian reserve, or of the timber upon it, to the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Robillard) for the small sum of \$316. The Minister of the Interior then justified his course by saying that, notwithstanding this fact, the Indians would receive about \$20,000 in timber dues. I think the hon. gentleman will remember making that statement. Well, if the Indians were to receive \$20,000 at one dollar a thousand, that means that there must be at least twenty million feet of timber on that reserve which the Government sold to the member for Ottawa for the paltry sum of \$316. I understood at the time that many hon. gentlemen sitting behind the Minister did not seem to appreciate the importance of the case which was made against the Government. The Minister said that the Indians were to receive \$20,000 in dues, but they could not receive these dues if the timber were not there, and that would represent, at \$2 a thousand, \$40,000 of a bonus which the Government should have received instead of the small sum of \$316. Since last Session, matters have come to my knowledge which show that the junior member for Ottawa who got this limit did not state exactly what was correct. He stated then that he did not make one dollar out of that limit. I corrected him flatly at that time, and I wish now to justify my position. I state that the junior member for Ottawa received, for the limit for which he paid \$316, \$15,000 in cash for his half interest shortly after he obtained it. I am in a position to prove that, and, if I had a committee of this House granted me, I could prove that a gentleman went to him, Mr. Riopel, and offered him \$10,000 for his half interest, that he refused that offer, but afterwards sold his half interest in this limit for \$15,000, the other half interest remaining with his partner. Subsequently those to whom the hon. gentleman sold his half interest sold the limit for \$55,000. It will therefore be seen that a timber limit of seventy-nine square miles in extent, which was sold by the Government for \$316, was very shortly afterwards sold for the enormous sum of \$55,000, and the hon. gentleman who sits behind the Minister of the Interior got for his half share the sum of \$15,000. And yet the hon. gentleman who represents Algoma (Mr. Dawson) asks for an additional grant for the Indians. Let the Government recognise the fact that the Indians are their wards, let them sell their property by competition, and then the Indians will get their just dues, and will not have to ask the country for additional annuities. I think the case which was really made out last Session showed a state of things which was a perfect disgrace to the country at large and reflected the greatest possible discredit upon the Government.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I should like to ask if the Minister of Interior has taken into consideration

the question of the annuities paid to Indians of Ontario. I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. PATERSON), who has given a good deal of attention to this subject, will agree with me in saying that the Indians who receive their annuities in semi-annual payments, very often need some assistance during the meantime, and they go to stores and get credit, and, as a consequence, pay a great deal more for their goods than they ought to, because the merchants are not secured. The Indians themselves are very anxious that some system should be devised by which orders should be issued by the agent on the several reserves; those orders of course, would be as good to the merchants as cash, and by that means the Indians would not only be helped in time of need, but would also receive full value for the amount which they desire to draw. I think it would be a great advantage to the Indians, as well as a protection to the merchants.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I may state that the Department have put their face very much against the issuing of orders in any way. Where they have found cases of actual distress, they have reluctantly given permission for a certain amount of the annuity money to be drawn in that way. I believe in days gone by, the agent was allowed to give orders on the different storekeepers in the neighborhood. That led to great abuse, and heavy claims were made against the Department which, in some cases, they had to meet, and it resulted in their issuing stringent instructions against the order system. I think myself the Department were perfectly correct in that regard; and although since I have been here, strong appeals have been made to me to allow the order system in certain cases, I have agreed to it in very few, and the orders were not on the merchants, but the money was sent to the agent and he was allowed to give a small amount of the annuity in cash to the destitute Indians; but he was allowed to do this only when he was sure that the Indians would spend the money for the purpose for which it was given. But we have stopped entirely allowing orders to be given to the Indians upon the merchants.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Would the hon. Minister explain in a few words, the state of the negotiations between the Ontario Government and the Department with reference to those arrears?

Mr. DEWDNEY. These arrears, I am sorry to say, are mixed up, and unfortunately for the Indians, they are mixed up with other claims which the Federal Government had against the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. The treasurers of each Province have met on several occasions, but have not been able to come to a satisfactory decision with regard to those matters. I understand that they have now agreed to submit the matter to arbitration, and my information is that it is in a fair way for settlement. I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), and I also recollect the remarks made by the member for Simcoe last year. It does seem a hardship that the sum of \$543,000, or thereabouts, which are due to the Indians up to the year 1882, should be kept out of the hands of the Department and prevented from going to the benefit of the Indians. By a return which I have in my hand the sum has increased since that time, making, I presume now, over half a million. However, they

Mr. MONTAGUE.

are not losing any money, and I have no doubt eventually the money will be paid, with the interest that has been added to the claim. I hope that in the near future the matter will be settled. They are drawing now, as hon. gentlemen know, from \$18,000 to \$20,000 a year, which is sufficient to supplement the amount which we have at our disposal, some \$4,400, which sum will pay the \$4 per head of annuity which was to be paid at the time of the Robinson Treaty. That has been paid regularly since 1874, I think. As soon as the amount is paid into the fund, the Indians will also receive the actual interest which has accrued. I am in hopes the matter will be settled in the course of a year.

Mr. DAWSON. I am happy to hear such a satisfactory explanation of the matter from the Minister. I really hope he will press the matter, because these poor people are suffering very much, and I am sure they will be much pleased to hear that their claims are so valuable.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to say to the Minister that the Mississauga Indians are exceedingly anxious that the sum of \$52,000, with the accumulated interest of the money which should have been paid to them some years ago, should be distributed among them.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Such an application has been made, but I am not at present able to say what course the Government will take. My attention was drawn to it a day or two ago, and I will make enquiries and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With reference to the trust fund, I see there is a discrepancy between the account as kept by the Auditor General, and the account kept by the Department, of some \$83,000; that discrepancy occurs in the account of the trust fund of the Mississaugas. Does the Minister know how it happens? His Department credits them with the sum of \$83,000 more than they received credit for in the account of the Auditor General. That is probably the money that is referred to.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman is correct. This \$60,000 makes about the difference. The Auditor General refuses to credit us with that amount, although an Order in Council has been passed, as I understand, giving it to the Mississaugas.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But it has not been paid to the Mississaugas, apparently.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, it has not; that is why there is no credit given by the Auditor General.

Removal of the residue of the Lake of Two
Mountain Indians from Oka to Town-
ship of Gibson.....\$4,912.73

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe this is a revote. In what position are the negotiations at present?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the course of the spring, I hope—though I have not as great hopes as I had a few weeks ago—that we shall be able to come to an understanding with the remainder of the Okas, so that they will remove to Algoma. We are in communication with them quietly, and I expect one of the chiefs, one of their leading men, up to see me in a few days. The negotiations so far are very satisfactory, and I hope we shall be able to induce the balance of the Okas to remove in

the course of the spring, as they are anxious to do so.

To provide for the survey of Indian reserves..... \$639.02

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister should explain about these surveys of Indian reserves, how they are conducted, and whether, before a survey is conducted, it is asked for by the bands, and whether, in cases where surveys are made, the funds of the band are used to pay. If I remember rightly, I heard the Minister reply to my hon. friend from Laprairie (Mr. Doyon) that a survey had taken place on the Caughnawaga reserves, and that the amount had been paid out of their funds. In a case of that kind does the Department order a survey without any request from the Indians, and pay the cost out of their funds; or is it paid out of the amount voted by Parliament? I ask this question because in the case now under consideration the amount asked is not nearly sufficient to cover the expenditure of the survey on the reserve.

Mr. DEWDNEY. When the Indians have a fund at their disposal, surveys are only made on the application of the Indians themselves. The vote asked for is for surveys in Ontario and Quebec, where there are no funds at the disposal of the Indians.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Has the Tomogaming reserve been set apart? Application has been made for a reserve, and some dispute arose between the Ontario Government and the Department with respect to its location; and that is the last I have heard of it. Has it yet been set apart?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Department is still in communication with the Ontario Government with regard to that matter, and after several letters had been written, to which, I believe, we received no reply, I had an Order in Council passed a few days ago, asking that a final reply be obtained from the Ontario Government with regard to this matter.

Mr. DOYON. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if I rightly understood the hon. the Minister of the Interior, he said that, in the Province of Quebec, when there is anything to the credit of the band, the Government take out of their funds what is required to have the reserve surveyed. The hon. Minister stated, a few days ago, that he had, out of the funds of the band, paid \$19,000 for the survey of the Caughnawaga reserve, and that a sum of over \$3,000 was still due. I find in the Auditor General's Report, that the balance to the credit of the band only amounts to \$83.95. I should like to know whether the Government will pay the balance due on the cost of that survey. They cannot pay it out of the funds of the band, for there is nothing left to their credit, unless it is entered elsewhere.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The cost of the survey has been taken out of the funds of the band.

Mr. DOYON. Two weeks ago the hon. Minister gave me the same answer, that the money was taken out of the fund of the band. This survey has cost \$22,250, and upon that amount there has been paid \$19,000, so there is a balance due to Mr. Walbank, the surveyor, of over \$3,000. On looking at the Auditor General's Report I find the balance to the credit of the band only amounts to \$83.95. I should like to know from the Govern-

ment if they intend to take this balance to pay that sum.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There does not appear to be, according to the Auditor General's Report, a sufficient sum at the credit of the band to pay the amount required. Have not the Caughnawaga Indians a trust fund in the hands of the Government?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A few years ago their trust fund amounted to over \$20,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This expenditure was taken out of that fund.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. DOYON. Then the whole fund has been expended in order to have the reserve surveyed, and there is a balance of \$3,300 still due to the surveyor, according to the Minister's statement a few days ago. I should like to know from the hon. Minister why the Government had that reserve surveyed? The work was commenced in 1882 and was not completed until 1888, and, if I remember correctly, the surveyor was nominated on his own recommendation. A few days ago in answer to the hon. member for Huron, who asked the cost of surveys in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, the Minister answered that the cost was a little over 4 cents per acre; but the cost of surveying the Caughnawaga reserve has been \$22,250 for 12,327 acres, or a little over \$1.80 per acre. What does the Government intend to do in regard to this matter, for there is no money to complete the sub-division of the reserve?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The survey was made on a petition of the Indians themselves, and it has been carried on, as the hon. gentleman states, for a number of years. Of course a survey of this character must cost a great deal more than the survey of the Dominion lands. The cost per acre of the Dominion lands survey, was calculated on millions of acres which had been surveyed. This survey, as the hon. gentleman knows, was cut up into small fields, resembling much the appearance of this chamber, the desks representing the little holdings of the Indians. The location of every house, and fence had to be surveyed, and a most complete and detailed map, equal to an ordnance map of the old country, I find has been made. Whether there was a necessity for such a detailed survey as that, I am not prepared to say. I know something about that class of work, and I can say that the map has been very well made, showing the topography of the whole of the reserve, as well as the various holdings. The sub-division of the reserve has been commenced although not completed. The reason of the survey was, I have no doubt, as was found to be the case in other reserves, that some of the more advanced Indians took up larger portions of the reserve than others thought they were entitled to, and they believed that the survey would give them more equal portions. I know that this difficulty has presented itself to such an extent in our North-West country, that we have already commenced to sub-divide our reserves there into forty-acre sections, and, as far as we possibly can, we are inducing the Indians to settle on their own sections of land, not compelling them to remain there if they do not like it, but when they get there, we find that they make their improvements, and begin to look upon it as a home. I

have no doubt that this undertaking will have a beneficial effect. This survey does appear to have cost a great deal of money, but the work, as far as it has gone, is very good work, perhaps, indeed, too good for what we really require.

Mr. DOYON. I admit that there was a good deal of work in sub-dividing that reserve, but the hon. Minister must see that there is a great deal of difference between the cost of this survey, and the cost of the survey in the North-West. I should like to know, whether in this survey the estimate of the cost of the improvements made by the Indians has been calculated. Some of them owned larger tracts of land than others, and, if I understand aright the views of the Government, they want to sub-divide the land into equal parts to the members of the band. I heard that the surveyor made an estimate of the improvements on the whole property. I should like to know if that is correct, and I would also ask the hon. Minister when the Government intend to sub-divide the reserve?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I informed the hon. gentleman that the sub-division had commenced, but was not yet completed, and I presume that until it is completed it will be impossible to get the Indians to settle on the permanent locations. I find from the remarks of the hon. gentleman that I was correct that the difficulty on the reserve was, as I thought, that some held more land than others thought they should. If the surveyor were also instructed to make an estimate of the improvements, I presume that will be obtained in the report which is in the Department, and when the time arrives, and the Indians themselves are satisfied to take their different locations, I am sure the Government will give them every assistance.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. In connection with this item for the travelling expenses of Indian agents, I wish to ask the Minister, if he can give us any further information with reference to the travelling expenses of Mr. Dingman, which amounted to \$1,795 last year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The information was asked by the hon. gentleman some days ago, and I now hold in my hand a statement showing the points to which the inspector was sent from July, 1888, to June, 1889. That was the year, I think which covered the amount of expenses referred to. Would the hon. gentleman wish me to read the different items or shall I pass the statement over to him?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I might just say that this expenditure for travelling expenses has been attracting the attention of the newspaper press of the country, not merely the Reform press, but the Conservative press as well, and I have in my hands the *Stratford Times*, one of the strongest supporters of the Government in Western Ontario, in which I find some criticisms in regard to Mr. Dingman's expenses for travelling. I will just quote for the information of the Minister a few sentences from that article.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have read it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think, probably, the House would like to hear it. This is a staunch Tory newspaper which invariably supports the Government, but it appears to have no faith in Mr. Dingman as an Indian inspector. The article says:

Mr. DEWDNEY.

"It is a well known fact that this man, who is called an Inspector of Indian Agencies, is loafing part of his time about Stratford. Time and again the *Times* has called the attention to this barnacle, and it is a satisfaction to know that our efforts in the direction of having a useless 'official' removed, are at last bearing fruit. Time works wonders. In addition to a salary of \$1,700, which Absalom Dingman received last year, he squeezed \$1,700 out of the Government for travelling expenses, less \$5. Just imagine \$3,400 for a useless tool called an 'Indian Agency Inspector.' And what does he do for that extravagant expenditure? As Mr. Casey pointed out, the Hon. Mr. Dewdney, Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, 'did not know whether Absalom Dingman's work was shown in the report of his Department or not. He did not know where Absalom Dingman had gone, what he had done, or how far he had travelled! But he did know that the Government had to pay \$1,700 (for travelling expenses alone). Mr. Casey characterised this 'as rather a loose way of doing business.' We should say it was a decidedly loose way of doing business! Something that calls for a searching enquiry."

"Absalom Dingman had, it is true, paid a visit to the seaside for the purpose of settling some grievances among the Caughtawagas last summer. The Government might just as well have sent a native of Congo or an Esquimaux, as Absalom does not understand their language, nor yet can he speak French. When he is away from his office in Brantford, he frequently conveys the impression that he is out on an inspection tour, but the facts are he is loafing about this city, where his family are quartered. His frequent trips between here and Brantford and Sarnia every few days will explain some of the travelling incidentals. Every time he wants a change of linen he makes a trip to Stratford, travelling by the back streets to his residence in the outskirts of the city. And, then, it is currently reported, that whenever one of his progeny goes on a kissing or fishing excursion to Port Dover or the back townships, his travelling expenses are charged up to the 'Indian contingency fund.' Was there ever a ranker fraud perpetrated upon the people than this man drawing \$3,400 from the Ottawa Government?"

This is rather a serious charge for a Conservative newspaper to bring against the Government, of giving this large sum of money to Mr. Dingman for services which it declares are not rendered, and I think the Minister should give us a full explanation with regard to it.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is an Opposition organ.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I beg pardon; it is a Conservative organ.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is in opposition to Mr. Dingman. I may say it is a newspaper quarrel. Mr. Dingman is a very able officer, and does not deserve the criticism made in that paper, which is opposed to a newspaper owned and carried on, I believe, by some members of Mr. Dingman's family in the same town. But probably it would be well, as the hon. gentleman has raised the question, that I should read to the House a statement of Mr. Dingman's expenses during the year for which this amount is charged, though I understand that the gentleman has been summoned before the Public Accounts Committee, where it would be much more convenient that he should himself give an explanation of his travelling expenses:

STATEMENT of Mr. Inspector Dingman's travelling expenses, &c., for the Year ended 30th June, 1889.

		\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1888.	Balance from 1887-88		150 80
July ...	Moving expenses from Brantford to Montreal, Quebec, Lorette, headquarters and return	56 96	
	Livery at Brantford, visiting Six Nation Reserve	27 50	
	Board and lodgings	60 00	
	Assistance in the Brantford office	22 50	
			166 96

STATEMENT of Mr. Inspector Dingman's travelling expenses, &c., for the Year ended 30th June, 1889—Continued.

		\$	cts.	\$	cts.
1888.					
Aug.	Moving expenses, Ottawa to Lorette and return, and Ottawa to Brantford	42	32		
	Living expenses	36	00		
	Services of an interpreter at Lorette	12	00		
				90	32
Sept.	Moving expenses, Brantford to Warton and return, and visiting Six Nation Reserve	31	78		
	Living expenses	98	00		
				129	78
Oct.	Moving expenses, Brantford to Warton and return, and visits to Six Nation Reserve	38	65		
	Livery at Brantford	19	50		
	Living expenses	77	00		
				135	15
Nov.	Moving expenses, Brantford to Ottawa	13	80		
	Living expenses	7	00		
				20	80
Dec.	Moving expenses, Ottawa, Sarnia, Brantford, London	22	35		
	Living expenses	91	00		
				113	35
1889.					
Jan.	Moving expenses, Sarnia to Ottawa, Ottawa to Brantford, Brantford to Ottawa and return	67	41		
	Living expenses	108	50		
				175	91
Feb.	Moving expenses, Brantford to Onondaga	5	94		
	Living expenses	98	00		
				103	94
Mar.	Moving expenses, Brantford to Hagersville, Onondaga and return, and Brantford to Ottawa and return	59	01		
	Living expenses	98	00		
				157	01
April.	Moving expenses, Brantford to Deseronto and return, and Brantford to Hagersville and return	15	38		
	Living expenses	105	00		
				120	38
May.	Livery hire on Brantford Reserve	12	72		
	Living expenses at Brantford	108	50		
				121	22
June.	Moving expenses, Brantford to Ottawa and return, and living expenses in connection with visits to Six Nation Reserve and Mississaugas of Credit	105	03		
	Living expenses	105	00		
				210	03
	Total			1,695	65

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are these livery expenses at Brantford charged to the Six Nation fund or are they paid out of our money?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are charged to management.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understood that he resided on the reserve while doing work there.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; he was living at Brantford. The Indian office is there.

Mr. AMYOT. If the hon. gentleman employed an officer who knew both English and French he would avoid some expense. They do not understand English at Lorette. Perhaps he could not find any one competent to speak both languages. If not, I am sorry.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That would entail another inspector, and would increase the expense.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I suppose the Department keeps some check on those officers so as to know whether the returns of expenses they make are correct?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I presume the inspector keeps a diary, and his accounts which are sent in every month are audited in the Department before they are paid.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Some difficulty has taken place with regard to the limits of the Lorette Reserve, near Quebec, and a case was taken before the Superior Court to ascertain what the exact boundaries were. After the case had been proceeding in the court for some time, the powers of the attorney, who represented the Indians, were revoked and the Government took an action in disavowal against him. I do not think there was ever a more clear case of political persecution than this action in disavowal against the attorney, Mr. Pelletier. The Superior Court dismissed the action, the judge expressing the opinion that there was not the slightest foundation for it. Despite that, an appeal was taken. There were rumors in Quebec that these actions were due to the fact that the lawyer who represented the Government, the latter tutor to the Indians, had changed his political course, and the friends of the Government declared it was intended to ruin this lawyer by piling up costs against him. I know something of the case, because I argued it in appeal, and I must say I never saw a case conducted in such an extravagant manner. The judgment of the court below was maintained by the unanimous decision of the Court of Appeal, and now it is rumored that the case is to be taken to the Supreme Court. I would like to know at whose expense and in whose interests these proceedings are taken? I have not the slightest doubt of the final result, and in Quebec the friends of the Government say that the case will be taken as far as the Privy Council. It is well known that before the Privy Council you can recover but a very small portion of the costs you are compelled to incur in your defence, and relying on that some friends of the Government are boasting publicly in Quebec that they are going to ruin Pelletier. Is it at the expense of the Indians these costs are being incurred? Or are they to be paid by the Government? They amount to very nearly \$4,000, and perhaps more. They reach nearly \$4,000 at present, and will probably go into the tens of thousands after the case is taken to the Privy Council. Are these costs to be paid by the Indians of Lorette or by the Dominion Government, and in whose interest are they taken?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs is not in a position to give an explanation as to the details of this proceeding. I was spoken to concerning the matter about ten days ago; when the documents connected with it were handed to me by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and I promised to look into the case. I do not understand that there has been any persecution of Mr. Pelletier in the case. There certainly has not been any disposition to persecute him on my part, and I am not aware of any of the proceedings of the

character described by the hon. gentleman having been taken. They may have been commenced before I took charge of the Department. I can assure the hon. gentleman that those who are stating that it is the intention of the Government to appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the mere question of removing the attorney, are speaking without authority. If the proceedings were taken unduly, they will not be continued any further; if they have been taken with due ground, and the law of Quebec is such that it is impossible for us to get rid of an attorney whom we once engaged, we will have to abandon our case, and get it into the hands of a solicitor in whom we have confidence.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). It has been established by the Indian agent of this Government that he had given instructions to the attorney in question, but after some movement was attempted to stop the proceedings, he came up to Ottawa to receive documents to assist Mr. Pelletier in the direction of the case. After an attempt was made to disavow Mr. Pelletier as attorney, Mr. Bastien—not the Indian Chief—was heard as a witness, and stated he had been paid some \$700 or \$800 for his trouble and expenses in giving instructions to that attorney, and it was contended that the attorney had no authority whatsoever. The court was struck so very much by that feature of the case, that when the party who had given Mr. Pelletier instructions in the name of the Government had been paid by the Government subsequently, when they knew every thing.

Mr. AMYOT. I am sure the Minister of Justice never had any ill-feeling against Mr. Pelletier, but I know all the facts and circumstances, and I may tell the hon. gentleman, that there is no more bitter opponent to Mr. Pelletier than the attorney chosen by the Crown, and that gentleman is taking every opportunity to satisfy his hatred. The whole cause of the misunderstanding was as follows:—Mr. Pelletier was duly authorised in the beginning of the proceedings. He took action for the Indians in the name of the Government, according to instructions received directly from Ottawa; at a certain moment politics interfered, and an order was obtained from the Deputy of Indian Affairs to stop the proceedings. A telegram was sent to that effect to Mr. Bastien, sub-chief of the Indians. That telegram was entrusted to Mr. Picard, another Indian, but instead of giving the telegram to Mr. Pelletier, he tore it up and never said a word about it; so the proceedings went on. After that Mr. Bastien came to Ottawa and received further instructions in the case, and the case went on. It is under these circumstances that proceedings are taken against Mr. Pelletier. If the Department believe that Mr. Pelletier was wrong, it is their right to go on, but they have lost in the Superior Court and in the Appeal Court, and on that simple question of fact they are attempting to ruin Mr. Pelletier in costs. He has had to make the disbursements from the commencement, and I think it is unfair for a Department or for the Government to use the public money to persecute an individual under those circumstances. I know the whole circumstances of the case, and I am sure that my calling the attention of the Minister to the matter will prevent its going further.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON

Indians, Prince Edward Island... \$2,000

Mr. CAMPBELL. How are the supplies for the Indians in Prince Edward Island purchased? Is it by tender, and at what season of the year are they purchased?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The supplies are purchased under contract. I see by the report that Mr. Gaffney received \$449, Mr. Arsenaux received \$198 and Mr. Gallant received \$260.

Mr. CAMPBELL. At what season of the year are these contracts made?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the summer season, after the summer supplies are voted.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In what month?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am not aware in what month.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I find by the report that there are only 314 Indians in Prince Edward Island altogether, and according to the Minister's statement, some of them are cultivating the soil and are very industrious. Yet I find that the Government purchased for these Indians 71 barrels of flour, at an average cost of \$6.10 a barrel. That seems a most extraordinary price to pay for flour. The finest grades of flour would not be worth anything like that in Prince Edward Island at that season of the year, and I cannot understand how 314 Indians could use that amount of flour in that time.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can only give the hon. gentleman the information I have here, and I am told that it is not an unreasonable price to pay for flour in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I suppose the best grades of flour are not purchased for the Indians, but in any case this price is too high.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot state as to the flour purchased in Prince Edward Island, but I know that we give a very good grade of flour to the Indians in the North-West. At all events tenders were called for and the contracts given to the lowest tenders.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick I find there was very little flour purchased for the Indians at all.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Very little relief is given to the Indians there. In New Brunswick they are largely engaged in lumbering.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There appears to have been 40 lbs. of flour to each Indian in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I should like to ask why there is an increase in the expenditure for medical attendance and medicine of \$300 in Nova Scotia and \$188 in New Brunswick?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The amount voted for New Brunswick has never been sufficient. The amount expended in 1884-85 was \$1,145; in 1885-86, \$951; in 1886-87, \$1,209; in 1887-88, \$1,002; in 1888-89, \$1,443; or an average of \$1,500. The estimate is made on a cost of 75 cents a head. It is considered that no smaller amount than that is sufficient to pay medical expenses in New Brunswick.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is not extravagant, considering that the Mounted Police cost \$8 a head.

Indians, British Columbia..... \$66,910

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is an increase of \$2,630, which is caused principally by the fact that the Department were obliged to fit out a steam launch, which has just been completed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that the vast bulk of this sum of \$66,910 goes rather to pay the officials of the Government than for relief or assistance afforded the Indians. It looks to me as if these men absorb something like six or seven-tenths of the entire grant that we are making for the benefit of the British Columbia Indians.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can explain that satisfactorily. British Columbia is a very large Province, and has a very large number of Indians in it. There are nine agents, scattered from one end of the Province to the other, whose time is entirely occupied with the Indians. But the state of those Indians is very different from that of Indians in other parts of the Dominion. A large majority of them are self-sustaining. The country is still full of game and fish, and nine-tenths of them live almost entirely on fish. In fact they are a great deal better off than some of our settlers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I would like to ask the Minister in regard to the surveys of the reserves. I supposed, when this plan of laying out Indian reserves in British Columbia was agreed upon, that long before this the work would have been completed. Can the Minister tell us how near the work of the commission is to an end?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman, I think, asked me the same question last year, and I then told him that in the immediate vicinity of the settled portion of British Columbia, the reserves have nearly all been settled. But the country is growing, and settlement is expanding, and the reserve commission, I think, will be employed for several years longer. When we send this commission among the Indians where there is no settlement, it will be a great benefit to them, by defining their reserves, and preventing many of those unpleasantnesses which we have had, and really brought about the commission.

Mr. CASEY. In looking at the very first of the items under the head of general expenditure, British Columbia, I think the remarks of my hon. friend from South Oxford are pretty well borne out. Under the head of salaries, we find that I. W. Powell, superintendent, receives \$3,000 salary for one year, a pretty big salary. If the hon. gentleman will look at page 81—E of the Auditor General's Report, he will find some information which will probably be as new as interesting to him in connection with this matter. \$3,000 salary for the Indian Superintendent, is about the pay of a permanent head of a Department in Ottawa. It strikes me as very high pay for British Columbia. When we find that Mr. Powell received in addition \$284 and some cents for travelling expenses, we find that he is paid quite as well as a head of a Department in this city, who has to live in a very different style from that expected of an Indian Superintendent in British Columbia. Then we find that Mr. Wootton, stipendiary magistrate, received a salary of \$2,599.92 for one year, 8 cents less than \$2,600. Why they deducted the 8 cents, I do not know. But he also travelled a great deal, and was pretty

well paid for it. He received \$855 for travelling expenses, making about \$3,855. Why, Sir, there are many county judges in the wealthy and populous Province of Ontario, receiving smaller salaries than that.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The service of that gentleman has been dispensed with. He was appointed under an understanding that we had with the Provincial Government, appointed for a stated time, which is now up.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Was that a salary as stipendiary magistrate, or was this in addition?

Mr. DEWDNEY. As stipendiary magistrate.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to see that this very expensive official has been dispensed with. What is paid to his successor?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He has no successor.

Mr. CASEY. There is no stipendiary magistrate at all?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. CASEY. So it appears that for some time back we have been paying about \$3,855 per year for an officer who was not needed at all.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Oh, yes, he was.

Mr. CASEY. Then, why has not a successor been appointed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He was appointed at a time when there was considerable trouble on that north-west coast, and it was necessary to have there a magistrate with superior powers, and he was sent there at the request of, and with an understanding with, the Local Government of British Columbia. That state of affairs has passed away, and there is no longer a necessity for a magistrate. The Indian agent has sufficient authority to deal with the questions which arise there.

Mr. CASEY. This trouble, I suppose, arose out of the Metlakhatla business?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. A question which the Government could have regulated before it came to a head, through their ordinary agents, and by doing justice to the Indians at that point. However, we have to pay for these little mistakes. Then, after these large items for salaries, I find, under the head of supplies, a charge of 75 cents for bacon. I think the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was justified in saying that salaries rather than supplies make the larger portion of the cost in British Columbia, probably no less than nine-tenths of the amount. At pages 82 and 83 (E) appear very large charges for medical attendance and medicine; \$454 to one doctor, \$217 to another, \$111 to another, and so on. I do not know whether there was any epidemic at that time or not; it is not so stated, because we had a special charge for attending small-pox patients. Are those doctors permanently appointed or are they called in as needed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are called in as required, and there is, I believe, an understanding with the Department with respect to their charges. They are not regularly appointed; there is a tariff fixed.

Mr. MARA. If the hon. gentleman will look at the number of Indians in British Columbia, 30,000, as compared with 20,000 in the North-West Terri-

tories, he will see that the cost of administering justice and regulating the Department of Indians is very much lower in proportion, about one-fourth of that in the North-West. With respect to the Indians, I may state that the doctors are paid a very low rate, often \$1, when in ordinary cases they would be entitled to \$5; and I know in many cases a doctor spends the greater part of the night on an Indian reserve and receives only \$2 or \$3, whereas in an ordinary case, according to the fees in British Columbia, he would receive \$20.

Mr. CASEY. I am sure the Minister will be glad to have this matter explained to him by his colleague (Mr. Mara), especially as to the fixed payment to doctors. We have yet, however, not been told whether a fixed rate or fixed fee is paid, or whether the rate is only one lower than the ordinary fee. I find also among the items, rent of office \$585. The agents' salaries average \$1,200 throughout and a very large allowance for travelling expenses; and in fact a very much larger proportion of the expenditure is paid for administration than for the support of the Indians. Taking out medical attendance and certain supplies and the cost of administration, and what is there left?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We have not had a satisfactory statement as to a fixed rate being paid to the medical men. Apparently there is no agreement between the Government and the physicians in British Columbia.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the doctors are instructed they will be paid the smallest charges made to the poorest class of individuals.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). There is no such rate among doctors. Doctors have a regular tariff; and if they feel disposed to charge a poor man 25 cents instead of \$1, it is not a charge made but it is taking a pittance. There is no such thing as the smallest charge. There must be some agreement between the Government and officials in attendance. We would like to know whether there is an agreement or not, and if there is, what are the terms?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The doctors verify in their account that such is the case, that they only charge the Indians what they would charge the very poorest portion of the population; and the hon. gentleman, who I understand is a medical man, will understand that. No doubt he does not charge all his patients alike.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That is not an agreement between the Government and physicians. We want to know whether there is, or there is not, such an agreement, what it is, how much is paid per visit and per mile for travelling expenses?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We do not have any special rates. The accounts are sent in through our agent, who knows what is a fair account; they are audited before they come to the Department, and if they are thought to be excessive they are sent back. The same custom prevails in British Columbia as in the Maritime Provinces. In the North-West Territories a fixed rate is paid.

Mr. CASEY. In Ontario, the doctors at the agencies, are paid a fixed sum, no matter how much attendance they have to give. That is the proper course to be adopted, for then the doctor is not tempted to multiply calls when not needed. As

Mr. MARA.

regards British Columbia there is no limit to the number of calls a doctor may make at an Indian reserve, and there is no specific sum paid for his fees. The Minister will have an opportunity of distinguishing himself by engaging doctors with fixed salaries for each Indian reserve. I am glad the Minister has ascertained, what he evidently did not know at the commencement of this discussion, the absence of agreement with medical men in British Columbia and he will have an opportunity to make a reform in that respect, of which, no doubt, he will avail himself. Are the supplies for the Indians of British Columbia contracted for on the basis of tenders, or are they also obtained from the most convenient sources when needed?

Mr. DEWDNEY. All our Indian supplies are contracted for.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it is highly desirable that some arrangements should be made with the doctors, for I believe they are imposing upon the Indian Department. When we look over this list here and see the enormous amounts expended for medicines and medical attendance, I believe it is in the interest of the Government that they should have a special arrangement with the doctors, because I do not think they are to be trusted very far.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My hon. friend from Kent is a living witness that the millers were charging too much for flour in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MARA. I quite agree that a fixed salary should be paid to the doctors. I have repeatedly urged that upon the Minister of the Interior, but he has declined to do so, on the score of economy. My impression is, and it is based on observation, that the Indians do not receive that medical attendance which they require, and that the Indian agent does very often haggle with doctors, and doctors do not care about attending the reserves, because the fee they receive is very low. According to the scale in British Columbia, a doctor is entitled to \$5 a visit, on an ordinary patient, and he will not care about going on the reserve in the middle of the night when he will receive only \$1 or \$2. I hope the hon. Minister will accept the suggestion made by hon. members opposite, that the doctors should be paid a stated salary for certain reserves.

Mr. MACDOWALL. In the North-West Territories doctors are paid certain sums, and I agree, that if the Indians are to be properly attended to, the doctors must be paid such sums as will secure first-class professional men. I think every man belonging to the medical profession will say that good doctors are entitled to be paid their fees, and that they should not be paid in such a way as might cause them not to devote all their care and attention to the Indian patients. I regret very much to see that this item is reduced, because I believe that the doctors might be paid a little more with great advantage to the Indians.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I cannot see why the doctors should be made the subject of a special attack to-night. The hon. member (Mr. Mara) has said that they only get \$1 or \$2 for attending the Indians in British Columbia, whereas they get \$5 for attending the white man. In that case it cannot be charged that they are

paid too much for attending the Indians. It is so well known throughout the country that the members of the medical profession are so high-minded, so dignified, and so honorable, that no such accusations should have been made on the floor of the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In some of the reserves in Ontario, the system has been adopted of paying the doctors a stated fee, and it has not been found to work well. The Indians of the Mississagua band desire to return to the system of paying the doctor for just the services he renders, and they are now agitating for a change in that direction.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I believe it would be in the interests of the Department, if the doctors on certain reserves were paid so much a year for their services. We find physicians very frequently attending the Oddfellows, and such other societies, at the rate of a dollar a year for each member. Could not the Government enter into some such arrangements with the doctors for attending the members of an Indian band? The worse charge that has been made against the Government tonight has been made by one of their own supporters, who coolly rises to his feet, and states that the medical wants of the Indians are neglected because of the parsimony of the Government, and that these poor half-civilised people are allowed to die without proper medical attendance. I say that the Government is censurable for this conduct. I find that a very large amount is expended for medical purposes, and as the physicians only get a small amount, some one else must get the money. We find some very large sums here for medicines, and there must be something wrong, or it is very evident that the doctors are not called in when the Indians are sick. I would advise the Minister who has charge of those Indians as his wards, to see that proper medical care is taken of them and that they are not allowed to die out for want of medical aid. In British Columbia, we find that \$6,000 or \$7,000 have been expended for medicines. How many Indians are treated there, and who are the physicians treating them? Who furnishes this medicine? How is it used, and who is responsible for its use? These are questions which should be looked into by the Minister.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman talks about something that he knows nothing about. The medicines which he sees charged there are medicines which are sent to the outlying districts of British Columbia, where there are no doctors. The missionaries every month of the year were begging us to send medicines, and the amounts expended in that regard are very small compared with the demands made upon us.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). You ought to make them larger, then.

Mr. CASEY. It is very unfortunate for the reputation of British Columbia as a healthy country to look at the items in this report. I think the hon. Minister should not taunt my hon. friend from East Elgin with speaking of matters that he does not know anything about. I am afraid the hon. Minister would have to profess that he does not know very much about this subject himself. He is perhaps not aware that the expenditure for medical attendance and medicines amounts to at least \$10,000, if not more. I do not think he

knows, either, why these items are charged in such a peculiar and haphazard way. We find on page E—82 a lot of charges for medical attendance and medicines under the head of general expenses; again, under the head of each agency we find charges for medical attendance and medicine for that agency; and then, at the end of the whole, we find this lump sum which my hon. friend has alluded to. In the Fraser agency, \$1,085 was paid for medicine and medical attendance, and it appears to have been very useless after all, for in spite of it the doctors allowed an epidemic of small-pox to break out among the Indians, which cost us \$3,555 in addition. Then, in the Kamloops agency \$1,439 was spent for medicines and medical attendance, of which about \$500 was paid for the attendance of two doctors. I hope my hon. friend will be able in the future to make a better showing for the salubrity of the climate of the Province which he came from than he has been able to do hitherto.

Indians, Manitoba and the North
West Territories.....\$910,089

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad in one sense to see that there is a very considerable reduction proposed in this item, but I should be glad to hear from the Minister on two matters—first, whether the population on the reserves is rapidly diminishing, and in what particular quarter it is diminishing, and also to what extent the Indians are becoming self-sustaining.

Mr. DEWDNEY. In some portion of the Territories within the last year or two there has been a considerable decrease in population. It has occurred specially in Treaty No. 7, that is, the western district, amongst the Blackfeet and the Piegans. Amongst them the deaths exceed the births. I have a return here showing the birth-rate and death-rate on every reserve, and I am glad to say that on eleven of our reserves in the Territories there has been an increase. The Indians in the Blackfeet country have a large number of old people, which partially accounts for the large number of deaths among them, and they have also suffered from a bad attack of whooping-cough, which has carried off a great number of children. I am glad to say, however, that the Indians of the North-West Territories and Manitoba are making very marked progress. If I had time to read the return which I have in reference to their progress and the increase in their wealth, I think the hon. gentleman would be astonished. He will see that we are asking a decreased amount for supplies to destitute Indians by \$24,000. They are raising a great deal of their own food now. For instance, at Fort Pelly, there are 673 Indians, and we only ration 338; at Birtle there are 557 Indians and we only ration 112; at Moose Mountains there are 303 Indians and we ration 283; at Crooked Lakes there are 809 Indians and we ration \$500; and so on. In the Blackfeet country we have to ration almost every man, woman and child, for they are the most helpless and unprogressive of all the Indians. The ration varies from 8½ ounces in the Touchwood Hills to 23½ ounces in the Blackfeet country.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Before this item passes I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the case of the Prairie Lake Indians, who have not been paid their annual allowance since the rebel-

lion. They were supposed to have been disloyal, but I hope that now the Minister has received such evidence as will induce him to take their case into consideration. I believe myself that they were loyal.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I may say that I think this year every Indian in the Territories will be paid his regular annuity. We have been increasing those who we think deserve it from year to year.

Mr. WATSON. There is a great fear experienced by the Indians and their agents that the fishing allowed in Lakes Manitoba and Winnipeg are depleting these lakes of fish.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That matter has been brought to my attention by the officers of the Department, and also by the Lieutenant Governor, who has taken great trouble to enquire into the matter, and has written me several reports which I laid before the Department of Fisheries. They propose to send Mr. Moffatt, who is in charge of the fisheries, at an early date to make special enquiries into the matter. From what I hear, I believe the southern portion, especially, of the lakes has been depleted to a great extent, and I understand what a serious signification that has, because if we allow our lakes in Manitoba to be fished out, we shall have to feed all the Indians, of whom there are 8,000 or 10,000, the same as we do those in the North-West. The fishermen are making a big fight, contending that there is no depletion in the catch and that the Indians are perfectly satisfied, but I know that our inspector invariably on his trips receives complaints from the Indians, and, therefore, I am taking specially means to get at the truth.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understood the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) to say that the Indians were really loyal, and yet have been deprived of their funds since the rebellion up to the present. If they were loyal they are entitled to be paid those funds.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Although we have not paid these Indians their annuities, we have seen that they have not suffered, and have assisted them to a large extent in other ways. My opinion is different from that of the hon. member for Saskatchewan, and I acted upon the information I had. The Indians will be perfectly satisfied when they get their annuities paid.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I do not believe the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) has helped the Indians. My information is perfectly sound, and I hope the hon. Minister will consider it.

Mr. WATSON. The Government derive no revenue at all from the fishermen on the waters of Lakes Manitoba and Winnipeg. All the fish caught there are taken by the company, who are Americans, down to the United States, so that our people have more difficulty in getting fresh fish now than before that company was started. Mr. McColl in his report says :

"In many of those favored districts the supply of game, fur-bearing animals and fish is becoming gradually exhausted in consequence of the more effective instruments of destruction now used by hunters and fishermen in prosecuting their business regardless of consequences to the Indians who are naturally apprehensive of starvation unless their valuable fisheries are preserved. Their alarm is great at the probable failure of their fisheries, especially in Lake Manitoba and in the southern half of Lake Winnipeg, because American fishermen have commenced operating extensively there with several steam-

Mr. MACDOWALL.

boats and a fleet of fishing smacks, fully equipped with men and provided with the requisite number of nets for catching nearly all the choicest fish in a very few years. At every council meeting I attended in those districts the question was prominently brought before me, with eloquent and pathetic appeals for assistance to prevent the destruction of their fisheries before they would be irremediably ruined.

"In consequence of the extensive fisheries established on Lake Winnipeg, especially in the Little Saskatchewan Bay, a large number of Indians belonging to this agency abandon their reserves during the fishing season and resort, with their families, to that locality for employment. They are supplied by the companies engaged in the business with boats and nets for fishing, and receive two dollars in trade or about one in cash for every hundred whitefish caught; these fish are afterwards disposed of for upwards of fifty times the amount paid for them. Instead of the Indians being benefited by the fisheries, I find the very opposite to be invariably the case, for not only is the supply of fish, upon which they principally depend for subsistence becoming rapidly exhausted, but also the general condition of the Indians within this agency is getting apparently worse every year. Since the commencement of those fisheries their reserves are not properly cultivated, their gardens are frequently neglected and their houses often deserted. At the approach of winter, when the fishing season is over, they return to their homes empty-handed and heavy-hearted, to wander about in search of food to keep themselves and families from starving."

He makes the same report on the fisheries of Lake Manitoba and the Indian reserves. These Indians are paid for their catch the paltry sum of one cent apiece for whitefish, and I believe it would be in the interest, not only of the Indians, but of the white settlers as well, that this fishing industry on the part of the Americans should be stopped. The Indians would then receive a fair price for their fish, instead of one cent apiece, and the people would be better supplied with fish than they are now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How are the Indians taking care of the cattle placed in their charge?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are taking very good care of them. Within the last year or two, we have given them on a few reserves small herds of heifers where we thought that they would look after them, and the result has been very satisfactory. In regard to their own cattle, which they are now purchasing largely, as well as agricultural tools, they are taking as good a care of them as the whites do.

Day and Boarding Schools.....\$68,905

Mr. WATSON. I would like to enquire of the Minister what is being done in regard to the boarding school at Birtle, and also in regard to the boarding school at Portage la Prairie.

Mr. DEWDNEY. As to the proposed purchase of the school at Birtle, I may say that the matter was brought before me last year and, during my trip west last summer, I went to inspect that school. I subsequently had an expert to examine the school, and one of our inspectors to go there also, and to find what additions were necessary in order to make it what we would consider a proper school, similar to those which we have in operation in other parts of the country. I confess that I was a little disappointed in the building, and the school inspector in connection with the expert reported that it would take \$5,000 to make the additions to the school which were necessary. However, there is an amount which I have put in the Supplementary Estimates for that purpose, but it has not been placed before my colleagues yet, and conse-

quently no decision has been come to. There is one difficulty, and that is that there is no ground about it and I am not aware that we could get any land to serve as an Indian farm, which is almost a necessity in connection with such a school. Before we come to any decision I shall have further information to present to my colleagues. In regard to the school at Portage la Prairie, I may say that, on my visit last summer, I found out that I had sufficient money granted to give that school \$300 for the balance of the year. I have placed \$1,000 in the Estimates this year for that school, and I have received a letter from the secretary of the Presbyterian Synod in Winnipeg thanking me for the liberal consideration we are giving that school for the coming year.

Mr. WATSON. I hope the Minister will be able to induce his colleagues to vote the sum required to complete the purchase and the additions which are required in connection with the Birtle school. It has been occupied as a boarding school by the Government for some time, it is in a very nice situation, and I would not suppose that it would be necessary to have a great quantity of land around it, as it is close to the reserve; but I have no doubt that a small quantity of land could be secured. The municipality is anxious to dispose of it, and I hope the Minister will be able to induce his colleagues to take it over.

Mr. BARRON. We would like to know—and if the Minister cannot give us the information now, he may do so on concurrence—what is the number of the denominational schools among the Indians, the respective denominations which are assisted, and the amount of Government aid which is given to each denominational school?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can give you that at once. We were paying towards the support of 21 Church of England schools in 1889, and are adding six for 1890, making 27. We pay towards the support of 11 Presbyterian schools, 10 Methodist schools, and 24 Roman Catholic schools, making a total of 72 of all denominations. The amounts paid are, to the Church of England schools last year, \$30,957.60, to which we add \$1,700 for this year; to the Presbyterian, \$16,807.85; to the Methodist Church, \$2,737, and we are adding to that \$300 for a new school this year; to the Roman Catholic schools we paid last year \$60,970.89, and for 1890, there is an addition of \$1,400.

Mr. BARRON. I should like the hon. gentleman to explain why he is granting \$61,000 for 24 Roman Catholic schools, and only \$30,000 for 27 Church of England schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A great deal of that amount for the Roman Catholic schools is for the support of the two large industrial schools which were established before any others were founded. To the Fort Qu'Appelle Industrial school there is an amount of \$39,675 voted for that year, and the High River Industrial school takes \$12,354.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose the hon. gentleman will give the attendance at those schools later?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; I have a return somewhere.

Mr. BARRON. I see the 24 Roman Catholic schools are given a larger sum than all the Pro-

testant schools put together. Is this large increase to be accounted for simply by the industrial schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; that takes \$42,000 for industrial schools out of the \$60,000.

Mr. WATSON. It seems to me that a very extravagant price is paid for fuel at these industrial schools. At Battleford there were 100 tons of coal used at \$12, and 260 cords of wood. At the High River school, 62 tons of coal, at \$16 a ton, and 30 cords of wood, at \$7.75 a cord. I do not know much about the High River school, but I think that is an extravagant price for wood. At Qu'Appelle there were 99 tons of coal used, at \$16.50, and 167 cords of wood, at \$2.12. Now that appears to me to be a very excessive price to pay for coal at Qu'Appelle. Certainly, if coal cannot be got cheaper than that, it would be much better to burn wood altogether, when wood is comparatively so cheap.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The coal used at Qu'Appelle and at High River is hard coal from Winnipeg, and I think now they are using our own hard coal at Calgary, where it has only lately been delivered. They were not able to supply the demand at Calgary until this winter. That contract was let 18 months ago, and the coal has to be hauled twenty-four miles. The wood at the High River School has to be brought a long distance. The wood in the neighborhood of the river has been used up, and it now has to come, I fancy, from the base of the mountains. At Qu'Appelle the wood is supplied by the Indians, who gather the dead wood on their reserves, principally at File Hills. This they are very anxious to do, to get a little money. I think they have to haul it about twelve miles.

Mr. WATSON. It would be better to encourage the Indians in hauling wood at \$2.12, than to bring in American coal at \$16.50 a ton. There is evidently bad management here. If wood can be got for that price, and it certainly can, the Indians ought to be encouraged in that industry. It seems strange that the Government, after giving large assistance for the purpose of developing our coal mines in the North-West, and giving large subsidies to build railways, should find it necessary to bring in American coal for their own schools in the North-West, now that western coal is shipped east as far as Winnipeg and is used there exclusively by some people for heating purposes. If it is good enough for the people of Winnipeg, it is good enough for this industrial school.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I do not think the price of wood or coal is a bit too high. In the first place, hard coal will burn all night; wood will not, and these fires have to be continually replenished. The price of wood at Battleford is not a bit too high; in fact so much is that the case that the people of Battleford only last year petitioned the Government not to take their wood and supplies from the Indians, because it was cutting off the market from the white settlers. The white settlers themselves find that the market is being taken up by the Indians. There is so much competition that the hon. gentleman may be perfectly certain that the price is not too high.

Mr. WATSON. Surely the hon. gentleman, as representative of the people, is not going to suggest that we should keep on feeding those Indians at the public expense, when they are able, and will-

ing, and anxious to work to supply wood, and when actually the white settlers are petitioning the Government as, against giving these Indians any work to do. That is the most illogical argument that I ever heard a representative of the people make use of in this House. He is actually in favor of preventing the Indians from working, and that we should feed them and not allow them to earn their own living when they are able to do so. Have we not got industrial schools and instructors on purpose to educate the Indians up to the point where they will be able to provide for themselves? But the hon. gentleman advocates that the Indians should not be allowed even to cut wood and sell it in competition with the white settlers.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I think the hon. gentleman is quibbling. I never advocated anything of the kind, I simply made a statement of facts.

Mr. WATSON. What is your opinion, as a representative of the people?

Mr. MACDOWALL. I do not know that you have any right to ask me my opinion.

Mr. WATSON. I think when a statement of that kind is made, and the hon. gentleman, as their representative, says what the people wish up there, he ought certainly to express his own opinion on it. I should suppose he was leading this House to believe that the Government should not allow these Indians to sell wood to the industrial school in Battleford. He says the people ask for that, and he, as a representative of those people, certainly intended to convey that impression to the House; I have no doubt he was doing so, because the Indians in that section of the country have not got a vote.

Mr. MACDOWALL. As the hon. gentleman insists on having my opinion—he has already stated that the Government and the country have spent large sums in developing the North-West—I may tell him that when isolated settlements find their markets so restricted, more must be spent if the improvement of the North-West is to be gone on with, and large sums must be spent, and the country be developed more rapidly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like some information with regard to the denominational schools further than the Minister has given us. I observe that for the industrial schools, \$139,214 are asked. The Minister has given us sums that amount to about \$110,000. Now, are there any secular schools supported wholly by the Government, and under the control of the Government? Then, with regard to the day boarding schools, I observe there are \$68,905 for these. How much of this sum that the Minister has given us, applies to the day boarding schools, and how much to the industrial schools? I would also like the Minister to say how it is that there is \$7,800 of a reduction in the amount voted for industrial schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is regulated by the amount of building we are doing, because the amount has been asked for that purpose as well. With regard to the other question, I may say that these amounts which I gave to the hon. gentleman is the money that we gave up towards the day schools and industrial schools in the North-West and Manitoba.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The sum he has given us is a good deal less than the appropriation.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That refers only to the North-West Territories alone. Manitoba, I think, is \$15,000.

Mr. WATSON. Are supplies of medicines and drugs usually kept in schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; there is always a certain quantity of medicine on hand. Regular visits are made to the school by a doctor who is paid a regular salary; that applies to Qu'Appelle and another large institution.

Mr. WATSON. In the school accounts there is an extraordinary item: whiskey, 2 quarts, \$6.00.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot give the hon. gentleman any explanation in regard to that item, but the whiskey must have been used for medicinal purposes.

Mr. WATSON. Where are the grist and saw mills to be erected this year, for which \$3,100 is asked?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This amount is to provide for the completion of a mill belonging to the Department, which was completed at Carlton last year. It is completed, and has been opened, and I have here a sample of flour made by the Indians from Indian wheat. It is a very wholesome flour, although if supplied by the Department, it would be considered to be rather dark in color. Another building will be erected at Onion Lake. We are making use of the machinery which was left on the ground after the troubles. We paid the loss and took over the machinery, and we hope this summer to complete the mill. Then we propose to erect a flour mill at Crooked Lake, south of Broadview. When His Excellency visited the North-West last year, the Indians in that locality waited upon him, and one of their requests was that he would ask the Government to place a grist mill on the Indian reserve.

Mr. WATSON. How is the mill operated at Crooked Lake? Does the Government employ a miller there?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; we have had a mechanic to erect the machinery, but the farm instructor will run the mill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman explain how the item of \$18,032 would be expended?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The buildings which it is proposed to erect and to complete with this sum of \$18,032 are as follows:—Fort Pelly, to complete warehouse, office and stables, \$800; Moose Mountain, to erect new agency buildings on White Bear's Reserve, \$2,500; Crooked Lakes, to erect wagon and harness house, \$200; cellar for gunpowder, \$30; repairs, \$62; Muscowpetung's Reserve, general repairs to agency buildings, \$100; new farm house on Pasquash's Reserve, \$600; Piapot's Reserve, for farm house, \$650; well, pump, &c., \$300—total, \$1,650; File Hills, to erect new farm house on Pee-pee-kee-sis' Reserve, \$600; improvements and repairs to agency building, \$350; repairs to houses of clerk and interpreter, \$125; well at agency, \$100—total, \$1,175; Touchwood, to complete granary and implement sheds, repairs to agency buildings, new implement and wagon

sheds, repairs to farm buildings, \$780; Duck Lake, repairs to agency buildings, for roofing and gables of new barn, \$400; Carlton, repairs to agency buildings, \$100; Battleford, new farm house on Moosomin's Reserve, \$600; Onion Lake, additions and repairs, \$180; Saddle Lake, new office building, additions to agent's house, repairs of farm buildings, &c., \$815; Edmonton, repairs to building, \$435; Peace Hills, repairs, \$100; Sarcee Reserve, repairs, &c., \$545; Blood Agency, new stable, &c., \$800; Piegan Reserve, new agency house, \$1,500. Regina, warehouse, \$1,500; minor items, \$430. I propose this year to adopt the suggestion made a year or two ago with respect to the purchasing of supplies on which I feel sure I will be able to make a considerable saving; that is, to call for tenders for articles, such as groceries, tools, and all our supplies (except the very heavy machinery which it is proposed to deliver on the reserves), and will distribute throughout the North-West Territories. When I first went to the Territories, the transport was so poor that it was found to be almost impossible to conduct that from Winnipeg, but now, as the transport is cheap and the roads better, I believe it will put a great deal of money into the hands of our people who do the trading. I gave my attention to this matter two or three years ago, when it was brought up before the House, and at that time I made an estimate, and I calculated that we should save, perhaps, \$25,000 a year.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I would suggest to the Minister that in purchasing supplies he will give the traders in the northern portion of the Territories an opportunity of tendering for such articles as they can supply.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. I am glad to hear that the Minister has seen fit to adopt this system which I have advocated for the last five or six years in this House—that is, to allow the settlers in the different districts to do the freighting. It is not only fair to the people of the local districts, but it is fairer to the contractors of the east that this should be done; because, as I before explained to this House, a contractor, say, in Ottawa, would want to supply some articles for some particular agency and he could not figure on these supplies being delivered at these agencies, because he had to arrange for the freight. When these supplies are delivered at some place on the line of railway any contractor, whether for a large or a small quantity, can put in his tender, and can know what it will cost him to deliver the article at any point on the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think that by the adoption of this system local merchants will have a better opportunity than before to tender for supplies. This system will certainly, as the Minister has stated, distribute quite a few dollars into the hands of local freighters which otherwise would go into the hands of the large carriage companies who undertake to carry these supplies to different points.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.15 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 19th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CURRAN moved:

That Rules 49 and 51 of this House be suspended so far as they apply to the petition of the Grand Trunk Railway for an Act to grant them certain powers, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Before this motion is adopted, I wish to call the attention of the House, and especially the attention of the Minister of Railways, to its terms, because, although the Bill, with respect to which this motion is submitted to the House, may be properly described, in regard to the greater portion of it, as dealing with matters with which the outside public have no special concern, and in regard to which the rules might properly be suspended, yet, there is in that Bill one clause of a very great and sweeping character, which, I think, should not be allowed to pass without the notice of those interested in railway legislation in this House being called to it. General powers are asked to lease, or purchase, or otherwise deal with existing lines in terms that are very vague and very general, and, it seems to me, that a clause of that kind cannot properly be tacked on a Bill, which, *prima facie*, appears to be simply to do things which very properly come within the control of the board and shareholders. I do not propose to pursue the matter any further; but I call the attention of the House, and of members of the Railway Committee, to this Bill, and I ask them to consider whether or not such a clause should be passed, without the ordinary notice having been given to the public and to all concerned with regard to it. I may be wrong in my view, but I think such a clause should not be passed, without, at all events, the attention of the House and the public being called to it.

Mr. BERGERON. If I may be allowed, in a few words, to defend the position taken by the Standing Orders Committee, I would say that the Grand Trunk Railway Company are asking by their petition, briefly, the following powers: To aid, financially, the St. Clair Tunnel Company, with which they are connected; the Midland Railway, for the purchase of rolling stock; the Detroit, Grand Haven and Milwaukee Railway, to enable it to make improvements; to double the track between Hamilton and Toronto; and also general powers to lease and acquire any other railways authorised to be leased to the company by Act of Parliament. It is true that no notice was given. The question that came before the Committee was: whether any private interest would be injuriously affected by the granting of such petition without notice having been given. The members of the Standing Orders Committee generally regulated their action by precedent, and we have nothing better before us than the work on parliamentary procedure by Bourinot, from which I desire to read an extract before I proceed to defend the report of the Committee before the House. Bourinot says:

"The committee will always be guided, in coming to a conclusion, by the circumstances of the case under their consideration. It may not infrequently happen that they will dispense with the notice altogether or declare themselves satisfied with a partial and defective notice, when they are assured that no private interests will be affected injuriously by the irregularity.

"The committee have also dispensed with a notice with the following circumstances:

"When no interests except those of the petitioners are likely to be affected by the proposed legislation. When no exclusive privileges are asked for in the Bill. When the omission has arisen from some accident, and not from any negligence on the part of the petitioner, and the absence of notice would not be prejudicial to any private interests. When it has been shown that the circumstances rendering legislation necessary were so recent that it was impossible to give the requisite notice.

"When the committee have had abundant evidence that all parties likely to be affected were fully informed of the application, and that there was no opposition to the project."

We had before the Committee the Assistant Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, who satisfied all the members of the Committee, except the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, that there were special reasons why such petition was not presented in time. I may here merely mention that before prorogation an application will be made by the Standing Orders Committee to have a change made in certain of our rules. At present ten days are given within which to present petitions for private Bills, but no Session has occurred when that time has not been extended to thirty, forty or even fifty-one days. We were perfectly convinced that no private interest would suffer from the request of the Grand Trunk Company being granted. Last week or the previous week, a similar application was made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in which the request was also made to grant the company the privilege of leasing railways in the same way as is asked in this petition submitted by the Grand Trunk. The request was granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company without opposition, the petition went through this House, and their Bill was received. I believe this to be wise legislation. Even during this Session the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been obliged to come here three times to obtain permission to lease three railways: South Ontario Pacific, Regina and Long Lake, and Qu'Appelle, Manitoba and Western Railways. By the legislation which they ask they would be authorised to enter into these agreements with other companies without being obliged to come here specially and ask each time for the same privilege. I may say, for the satisfaction of members who are not conversant with our rules, that there is no danger in this action. We have, moreover, recommended that a provision similar to that inserted the other day in the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill shall be inserted in the Grand Trunk Bill, namely, that nothing can be done unless with the sanction and approval of two-thirds of the shareholders of the company. Whenever either the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway, by this legislation, may wish to lease or acquire a road, such agreement cannot be made unless the companies which want to lease or enter into an amalgamation with either the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railway come and ask special legislation to that effect, and unless such agreement is sanctioned also by two-thirds of their shareholders. It is true we have special rules adopted by the Standing Orders Com-

Mr. BERGERON.

mittee, but it is inexpedient to always put them in force. If the Committee are satisfied that no interest will suffer by the rules of the Committee being waived in certain cases, then it should be done, for these rules were not framed for the purpose of preventing legislation, but for assisting it. Much is left to the discretion of members of the Committee, and until now not only have we followed the precedents of our predecessors, but we have followed them very closely. We have only in three cases asked a suspension of the rules, and, I do not think, we have any precedent for the suspension of Rule 51, and the cases in question are: The Dominion Mineral Company, asking for an increase of capital; H. H. Vivian & Co., for confirmation of charter; George Smith, extension of letters patent; and in all these cases we thought no private right could possibly be injured. In the case of the Montreal Coal Company we could not ask to suspend Rule 51, because we were not satisfied that parties who might be injured had been notified. For all these reasons, I hope that the House will adopt the report which we made, and will carry the motion which is now before the House, granting to the Grand Trunk Railway Company the very same legislation as was given last week to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I do not propose to make any very lengthened remarks on this subject, and I would not have said anything, but for the casual statement of the chairman of our Committee, that the Committee were practically unanimous, with the exception of the hon. member from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). I have no wish, as an individual member of the Committee, to require that its rules and forms should be absolute and without any relaxation whatever, but I confess, that while I have no disposition to place the least obstacle in the way of the Grand Trunk Railway obtaining any legislation that may be necessary for the development of its resources, and the advancement of the undertakings on its hands, I am at a loss to understand, similarly with the hon. member for Muskoka, how it was that time for only one notice in the *Canada Gazette* could be found, for the various important matters applied for to the Committee on Standing Orders this morning. The doubling of the track of the railway from Toronto to Hamilton, or the aiding of the St. Clair tunnel, or the acquiring of power to amalgamate with railways that are authorised to amalgamate with the Grand Trunk Railway, were, to my mind, in no sense enterprises that could have been only decided upon by the Grand Trunk Railway Company last week. I cannot conceive any circumstances under which the efficient management, as we know it to be, of a large and powerful institution, such as the Grand Trunk Railway, could have been found to be so cornered in their administration as to come down to the Standing Orders Committee and to ask us, inside of four days, to pass legislation of that sweeping character. I confess that I share the feeling of the hon. member for Muskoka, that we are becoming altogether too lax in suspending the rules of the Standing Orders Committee at the request of powerful corporations; whether they be the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific

Railway, I care not. I remember, Sir, that on two occasions last Session, in consequence of representations made to the Committee that there were no private interests involved, and that the legislation affected none outside of the economy of the railway companies that were making application, we allowed these Bills to be presented. These members of the Standing Orders Committee, who were also members of the Select Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, had to receive a rather pointed rebuke, very properly administered by the chairman of the latter Committee, to the effect that they had not discharged their duty of properly seeing that the interests of other parties were preserved in these applications; and both of the measures were thrown out in consequence of our failing to discharge our duty as we ought to have done. Personally, I do not propose to offer any objection to the Bill that is before the House, but I do think that it is only fair to the Committee, and fair to the hon. member from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that I should make this statement, after what I saw in the Committee this morning.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not see that there should be any objection to the report of the Committee. The chairman has explained that the Committee has looked into the case, to see whether there was really any right which would suffer, and that, as far as they could learn, no outside interest would be affected. They thought that, under the circumstances, the Bill should be allowed to be introduced. The chairman has, of course, added, that they have recommended a special clause to be inserted in the Bill, to the effect that it must be submitted to the acceptance of two-thirds of the shareholders. I have no doubt that the Railway Committee will look carefully into the measure when it comes before them, in order to protect any special interest that might be endangered, and I believe the motion should be adopted.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that, after what has been done in other instances, as the hon. gentleman has stated, we should adopt this motion, but I cannot forbear to say that I view with some apprehension the proposal of the hon. gentleman to move the House to extend the time for action by the Standing Orders Committee. I must say, Sir, that during some years I took a very earnest part in endeavoring to enforce, as far as was practicable, consistently with real emergencies, those rules of the House which require the presentation in due time of private Bill legislation. I think that we have now fallen into laxer practices than have prevailed in former years. From my observance of the system in past Sessions, I think it is one which is open to very great possibilities of evil, and when we find private Bill legislation dropping into this House at an advanced period of the Session, it is almost certain that something will slip through for want of being attended to, which, if properly attended to, would be prevented. So far from relaxing these rules, I had rather that we should pass an ordinance which would make them more binding, and that the regulations of the Standing Orders Committee should be more rigorously observed in the future than in the past. I think our attention should be directed to some plan by which we should further enforce upon those who require private Bill legislation, the duty—unless in a case of emergency, and of course our laws are flexible

and adequate to meet all real emergencies—of giving the full notice required, and sending in their petitions and presenting their Bills early in the Session. I think a very large improvement would be obtained if we made some arrangement whereby these petitions should be so dealt with that the Bills, by perhaps some alternate process or otherwise, should take their initiation in the other branch of the Legislature. We know that after Parliament meets, of necessity but a very small portion of legislative duty can be discharged by the Senate in the early part of the Session, until we supply it with work. I think a function of the highest public consequence would be performed by that Chamber, if a much larger part of the private Bill legislation, than has ever been initiated there, were, by a course of practice, which the two Houses have it in their power to arrange, begun in that branch of the Legislature. We know that in England a certain class of private Bill legislation is very largely moulded and managed by the House of Lords. I have some reason to believe, not from personal experience, but from what I have heard, that those Bills which are dealt with by the Senate are very carefully criticised, and I do think that it would be of great consequence, if we could devise some methods, not for further relaxation, but for more rigid observance of the general rules; and also for providing that a large portion of the private Bill legislation should take its initiatory stages in the other branch of the Legislature, in order that it may have that more perfect consideration which we cannot give it here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad to hear my hon. friend calling the attention of the House to the very great expediency of following, to a considerable extent, the practice in England, with respect to private Bill legislation. From the fact, that a great portion of the measures before Parliament involve the expenditure of public money, they must originate in this House, and, therefore, as regards these measures the Upper House is simply a court for reconsideration. But there is here, as in England, a means by which a portion of the work of this now overburdened House can be thrown upon the Upper House; at all events, as regards the initiation of such measures. I am under the impression, though I do not know for certain, that in England private Bill legislation, as a general rule, is initiated in the Upper House. If such a practice prevailed here, we could much more readily apply ourselves to measures which must of necessity originate in this House, at the same time having confidence that the measures originating there would receive a degree of attention which we cannot well give them. I think it would greatly expedite the work of Parliament, greatly shorten the Sessions, and assure a more careful consideration of private Bill legislation than we can give it at present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have made a suggestion here before—which, unless my memory deceives me, was received with some favor on the Government benches—with respect to private legislation, and I will take this opportunity to repeat it. During the time I had a seat on the Private Bills Committee, some years ago, I came to the conclusion that it would be very greatly to the interest of the public if no private Bill were permitted to pass until it had been care-

fully revised by a competent legal official employed by the House. In old times, some sort of an attempt was made by the Solicitor General, if my memory serves me, to discharge that function; but he could not do it with anything like the efficiency with which it would be done by some such officer as I suggest. I have considerable doubt whether, even now, no matter what other precautions we take, it would not be in the interest of the public that every Bill should be reviewed by some legal person set apart for that special duty.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the criticisms on the action taken by the worthy president of the Standing Orders Committee, and I must say that I agree with the suggestions in relation to it made by all the gentlemen who have preceded me. I think, in place of relaxing the rules, we really ought to make them more stringent than they are now. The suggestion made by the hon. member for South Oxford, I think, is worthy of consideration. It will be in the recollection of this House, that on a recent occasion, while the Grand Trunk Railway Company had a Bill before this House, several alterations were made in it, and it was withdrawn and amended from time to time. Had that Bill been required to go through the hands of such an officer as the hon. member for South Oxford suggests, the difficulties that then arose would never have occurred. I am not going to rake up old scores with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. They have done a great deal better since I took them in hand. I see the Premier smiling. He knows the pressure which on that occasion was brought to bear upon him to condone a very serious offence against this House, and he did it; but I am proud to say that my action has compelled the Grand Trunk Railway Company to double-track the line between Montreal and Toronto; and if that is being done to-day, it is because the power was not left to the discretion of the board in London, but was made compulsory before the bonds could be used, and it is due to my persistent efforts in forcing them to agree to do it at the risk of losing their Bill. With regard to this particular Bill, the Grand Trunk Railway Company are a very important corporation. They are competing against a younger and more active corporation, and it is our duty to show them fair play. Only last week we passed a Bill giving the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the same power which the Grand Trunk Company are asking by this Bill, of endorsing the bonds of the roads which they wish to acquire; and it is only right that we should give the Grand Trunk Company the same power. Another portion of the Bill, I understand, is to enable the company to raise money for the purpose of adding to the equipment, and for the purpose of building a tunnel which is to be of great service to the line. Under such circumstances, as no private interest can be affected by the short notice, I do not think we should stand on technicalities. Another feature of the Bill provides for the raising of money to double-track the road between Toronto and Hamilton. I am glad to find that the company have awaked to the necessity of making further improvements in their system, in order to compete with the younger and greater corporation, and although I am not in sympathy with them, I will do what I can in the public interest to help them to get their Bill

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

through; but I will say to them: "Do not do it again; do not come late next time."

Mr. LANDERKIN. As a member of the Committee, I may be permitted to say, that this morning, after we had heard the reasons advanced, we felt that we should hardly be justified in not asking for the suspension of the rule, so that the Bill could be presented to Parliament this Session. We did not feel like taking upon ourselves the responsibility of obstructing the Bill, which is of so much importance to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and to the country, and I hope there will be no opposition to our proposition. I have been a member of that Committee for a number of Sessions, and I think that we have asked for the suspension of the rule on fewer occasions this Session than in former Sessions. In that respect, we can meet the views of the hon. member for Northumberland, as we are doing better than we used to do, and, in now asking for an extension of time, we are endeavoring to do what is in the public interest.

Mr. O'BRIEN. My remarks only applied to that portion of the Bill which cannot be considered urgent, and with regard to which I thought public notice could be given.

Mr. BERGERON. I am afraid that the hon. member for West Durham did not understand what I meant. We are entirely in the hands of the House, like all the other Committees. I only spoke of the feeling that we might suggest to the House before the end of the Session—the desirability of enlarging the time for presenting petitions at the commencement of the Session. We should not be obliged to ask for the suspension of any rule, if the time were made a little longer. At present it is only ten days, and there has not been a Session since Confederation, in which it has not been decided, at the first meeting of the Committee, to ask Parliament to extend the time. If the regular time were made a month or six weeks, we should not need to come to the House and ask for the suspension of Rule 49. The hon. gentleman has referred to England. There, the Standing Orders Committee formerly consisted of from seventy to 100 members. It was reduced afterwards to forty members, and divided into five sub-Committees. But to-day, it is only a small Committee of eleven members, of whom five form a quorum, and they sit for a month or six weeks. We do not want to change the rules, but we want to make suggestions for the best. I may state that the Canadian Pacific Railway came to Parliament and asked for legislation which was accepted immediately in our Committee and in the House without any opposition, and very sensibly, as the hon. member for Northumberland has said. The Grand Trunk Railway, naturally, seeing that Parliament was disposed to grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway such a privilege, come here and ask for the same. It is true they are eight days later, but there are no private interests which will suffer, and, consequently, the Committee thought they were justified in asking the House to suspend the rule in this case as in the other.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CURRAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 125) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Mr. GIROUARD moved :

That the letters, books and papers relating to the charges made against John Charles Rykert, Esquire member for Lincoln, in connection with the granting of certain timber limits in the North-West Territories, as referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, may be reprinted in pamphlet form for the use of the members of the Committee, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

I make this motion in consequence of a resolution passed by the Committee this morning.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me this is incurring a great deal of expense, as we have the papers in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. GIROUARD. I understand that the type is up, and that it will not be necessary to reprint them. They are found in the Votes and Proceedings of three different dates, and it will involve very little expense to have them in this convenient form.

Motion agreed to.

MR. ARTHUR PRIEUR.

Mr. NEVEU (Translation) asked, is Mr. Arthur Prieur, advocate, of Three Rivers, in the employment of this House and what are his duties? Or is he in receipt of any emolument, in any form whatsoever? What amount has he received since he has been so employed as a translator, or otherwise?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I would suggest to the hon. member that his question be put in the form of a motion and to put it now, if he desires it. When the motion would be adopted, the answer would be laid on the Table by the clerk, as this is not an answer to be given by the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) The answer will not be given during this Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

An hon. MEMBER. In English.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have just said in French that as this is a matter relating to the House, and which cannot be answered by the Ministers, I would suggest that the question be put in the form of a motion, and that the answer would be laid on the Table in a couple of days.

Mr. NEVEU moved :

That the clerk do lay on the Table a return showing salary and remuneration paid to Mr. Arthur Prieur, employé of this House, as translator or otherwise, and the total amount received by him since his employment in any capacity.

Motion agreed to.

BUOYS IN RIVER ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. GUAY asked, Whether the Government have given a contract for placing the buoys in the River St. Lawrence, between Quebec and Montreal? If so, to whom? Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a licensed pilot to superintend the placing of the said buoys? If not, under whose supervision are the buoys to be placed?

Mr. COLBY. The contract for placing the buoys in the St. Lawrence, between Quebec and Montreal, has been awarded to the Sincennes-McNaughton Company, of Montreal, and no decision has yet been made as to the appointment of persons to superintend the placing of these buoys.

PICTON HARBOR.

Mr. PLATT asked, Has the engineer sent by Public Works Department to examine the harbor at Picton and to enquire as to the necessity of dredging and improving the same, presented his report? If so, 1st. Does such report indicate that necessity exists for improving such harbor? 2nd. What is the estimate cost of making necessary and permanent improvements? 3rd. Is it the intention of the Government to place a sun in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of making such improvements or any part thereof?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The harbor, which is 1,800 feet in length with an average depth of 400 feet, has been gradually shallowed by the deposit of mud brought down by a small creek emptying into its head. Large quantities of grain and lumber are distributed at Picton, and it is a port of call for steamers and vessels plying on the Bay of Quinté. Owing to the shoaling of the harbor (the average depth being 8 feet) these are necessarily of light draught, and it is to accommodate a larger class of vessels that dredging has been asked for, the cost of which, to give 11 feet of water, is placed at \$9,000. I am not in a position to give an affirmative or a negative answer to the third question.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. From one cause or another we have had no meeting of the Public Accounts Committee for a fortnight, and I would suggest the desirability of calling one early.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will mention this to the Minister of Finance when he comes in.

SULTANA ISLAND.

Mr. BARRON. I would draw attention to the insufficiency of the return brought down relative to Sultana Island. I asked for the original location of the island, with a map of the reserve. The only map brought down is one bearing quite a recent date, with the reserve colored on it. It appeared to me to be an ordinary map, with just the reserve painted on it. I would like to get a copy of the original map showing the reserve as originally surveyed. There was a map published by the Interior Department as far back as 1877, which shows the reserve is considerably east of where it recently has been placed. There is no correspondence brought down between this Government and the Ontario Government, although that was asked to be embodied in the return. Let us have any other maps showing the original location of the reserve, and also all correspondence between the two Governments.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I may mention that, since the hon. gentleman asked for the return to be brought down, we have had reports of some trespasses having been committed on Sultana Island. That was the cause of my making further search for papers in connection with this matter which I thought should be on record in the Department. I mean that, if parties were cutting timber on that island, there should have been on record either a surrender of the island by the Indians or a surrender of the timber. On communicating with the Department of Indian Affairs, I found that there was no record there. I then

directed that search should be made in the Department of the Interior. Some papers were found there, and I think it is likely that the map referred to by the hon. gentleman will be found on that file. If so, I shall be glad to bring it down as well as any other papers, but I do not think there is any correspondence between the Ontario Government and either of the two Departments, except that which has been brought down from the Indian Department. However, I will bring down what may be found.

Mr. BARRON. There was a letter dated the 16th July, 1888, from Mr. Vankoughnet. There was another letter, of which I have not the date here. I know there has been some correspondence between the Ontario Government and Mr. Vankoughnet.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I could only trace two letters in the Indian Department and those are on the file and have been brought down.

MISS MAYBEE.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for :

Correspondence between the Post Office Inspector and other parties at Quebec, and the Post Office Department at Ottawa (and other Departments or officials at Ottawa, if any), respecting the discharge of Miss Maybee, a shorthand writer and type-writer in the Post Office at Quebec.

He said : This motion asks for information in regard to the dismissal of Miss Maybee from the position she held in the post office in Quebec. I know very little about the matter excepting from the rumors that have been made public through the newspapers, and it is in order to verify these rumors or to show that they are unfounded, that I ask for this correspondence. It is charged, as I understand, that Miss Maybee, who is a thoroughly excellent officer as a stenographer and type-writer, and who bears an excellent character, was appointed to a position in the Quebec post office, and that representations were made in reference to her appointment by people from Quebec, and that the fact that she was not a native woman was brought up, and she was dismissed because she was not a native of the Province of Quebec. It is in order to verify or disprove these charges that I call for this correspondence. If these reports are true, the action of the Government is not creditable to them, and if they are not true, it should be shown that they are not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In consequence of some discussion which has taken place on this subject in the newspapers, no objection will be made to carrying this motion. At the same time, I would again, as I have on several occasions before, call the attention of the House to the inexpediency of the administration of affairs being interfered with because of a mere rumor published in the newspapers. No matter what Government may be entrusted with the administration of affairs, this kind of interference should not be permitted. It is never done in England. There it is considered that the House of Commons is a legislative, and not an administrative body. If there be a proved wrong, or if there be *prima facie* evidence of a wrong, then it would be well enough for Parliament to interfere, but this interference on mere newspaper rumors is altogether a different thing. Still, as this case has been made a matter of

Mr. DEWDNEY.

public discussion, I think it is well that all the papers should be brought down.

Mr. LAURIER. I am glad to hear the statement of the First Minister. I think the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) is quite right. I do not know what took place in the Post Office Department in regard to this lady ; I do not know whether she was dismissed or not ; but this matter has not only had all the honors of publicity in the newspapers, but it has had publicity in a great debate which took place in this House, and I, therefore, think the action of my hon. friend in making this motion is quite right and proper.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not like to hear the reflection which the Premier has made on the newspapers. He speaks of this having been brought up on a mere newspaper rumor. It is from the newspaper that we get most of the information as to what is going on. I hope the right hon. gentleman will speak more respectfully of the newspapers in the future. They, or at least some of them, point out the way that he should follow, and if he adopted their suggestions a little more than he does, it would be better for him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt, as my hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) suggests, we get all the facts from the newspapers, but unfortunately we get a great deal more than the facts. We not only get information as to facts, but we get further information which arouses our imaginations.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, that is very beneficial. Motion agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE MONTREAL COURT HOUSE.

Mr. CURRAN moved for :

Return showing : 1. The actual cost of first construction of the Montreal Court House, 1851-57. 2. The amount spent for repairs since, each year down to Confederation. 3. The total number, nature and amount of bonds issued in connection with the Court House, showing also when said bonds were redeemed. 4. The total amount received or collected each year down to Confederation, in sale of stamps or otherwise, from the levying of the tax in the District of Montreal generally known as the Court towards paying the cost of such Court House.

He said : I am informed that the two first items of this return can be obtained, but that the others are not in the possession of the Government. The returns will show some light upon rather an important subject. The lawyers and litigants in the district of Montreal have been victimised for a great number of years. They think it is very proper that they should pay their share towards the revenue of the Province of Quebec, but they feel that they have paid for the Court house many times over. They desire to know exactly where they stand. Therefore, in order to supplement the other information which may be obtained elsewhere, I beg leave to move in respect to the first two items of this motion, as I have been informed by the Government that information respecting the other two is not in their possession.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

TIMBER LIMITS.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for :

List of timber limits granted by the Dominion Government since 1st March, 1885 ; the names of the parties to whom granted, with date of grant ; the area of each

limit granted; whether granted to highest bidder at public competition, and the amount of bonus, if any, in each case received.

He said: I do not know whether any return has been brought down since February, 1885. The object of the motion is to secure returns from the date mentioned. I only wish to have the record complete by getting a return for what has not been brought down.

Mr. DAWSON. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has made this motion. He said, the other day, that a limit had been granted to me. I beg to say that I was not aware of a limit having been granted to me, and I have made enquiry since in the Department of the Interior and I find that no such thing occurred. I do not know how the idea got into the hon. gentleman's head.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think my statement, the other night, was, that the hon. member for Algoma had made application for a limit, and that the limit had been granted upon his application. I have a little ledger here in which I find this information in regard to timber limits, taken from the returns made in 1885:—

"Application by S. J. Dawson, M.P., May 3, 1884. Page of return, 9809. Order in Council issued to T. McRae, Port Arthur, fifty miles on Rainy Lake, May 17, 1884. Applications made by S. J. Dawson, M.P., not granted: For Thomas Marks, March 18, 1882; for Walter Ross, April 29, 1884."

My statement was that an order had been issued upon the application of the hon. member, and the record I have shows that such was the case. Two applications were made by the hon. member, which were not granted.

Mr. DAWSON. In my district there are a great many lumbermen, and they often send applications through their member, and I suppose I sent forward a good many of their applications, but I sent not one for myself. If the hon. gentleman had expressed himself in that way the other evening, I should have had no fault to find, but I understood the hon. gentleman to say that I had got a limit, which is not the case. I am in the habit of sending applications in regard to various matters every day to the Departments for which they are intended. My constituents on the occasion referred to, asked me to send forward applications, and I did it, but none for myself; and I take this opportunity of saying that since I became a member of this House I have never purchased so much as a single acre of Dominion land, nor acquired so much as a single square mile of limits for myself.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the statement I made was that he had made application for a party who had received a limit upon his application, and if I made a statement that he had secured a limit for himself, then I stand corrected.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that now, but he made a speech the other day in which he quoted a long list of members, from which he carefully excluded any member from his own side, and he made a charge of impropriety of conduct on the part of those members. He said it was a scandal that members of Parliament were making application for timber limits. He does this with a purpose. It would be unparliamentary in me to impugn the motives of the hon. gentleman; the motives may have been most praiseworthy, but the object

was obvious, it was for the purpose of trying to cast a slur upon hon. members. That was the necessary inference from the hon. gentleman's language, otherwise his speech was of no value; it was for the purpose of conveying the impression that the members whose names he had quoted, had been making application for timber limits and using their position as members of Parliament in order that their applications might be successful. That was the plain object of the hon. gentleman. He quoted the name of Mr. Thomas White as one of them, and he requested it, although in a previous debate when he brought that matter up, he had heard that hon. gentleman, now in his grave, state that he received an application, as a member, and that he sent it into the Department; and yet, the hon. gentleman brought it up again, as it were, to cast a stain upon the memory of that hon. gentleman. That was the fact, and it met with the just indignation of the House, which, if necessary, would have been loudly expressed from both sides of the House. In the same way, the hon. gentleman, in 1886, I think, brought up the name of my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy); he left it out this time because he and the hon. member for North Simcoe are both Equal Rights men. How are we to put down that kind of thing? The only way I can see is to ask my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) to sit upon the gentleman as he did before.

Mr. CHARLTON. As the hon. gentleman has made a personal charge against myself, I suppose I may be permitted to say a few words. I deny the assertion that I suppressed the names of any of my friends on this side of the House; I did suppress one name, and that was the name of the right hon. gentleman himself. He made application for his friend Onderdonk for a small limit, but I thought it was a matter not worth troubling the House about. But, so far as my conduct in this matter is concerned, I may express regret now, that I mentioned the name of the late Hon. Thomas White. I found his name among those who had made application for limits, and for the moment it had escaped my memory, that the hon. gentleman had made the explanation he did make, and to which the First Minister referred. But I may tell the First Minister, that the feeling he evinces with respect to this matter shows very clearly, in my opinion, that he feels the pinch of the shoe in connection with the timber limits scandal. The proof was made that limits were granted to his friends, and they were granted in considerable numbers; and when I show the House that this was the case, the fact elicits an exhibition of feeling on the other side, which clearly proves that the hon. gentleman is conscious that he cannot justify the course that he and his Government have taken on this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I can.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, you cannot. The hon. gentleman made use of the public domain to reward his friends, and he granted, as I showed the other night, over 850 square miles of timber limits to members of this House; he granted nearly 4,000 square miles to his friends in the country, on application of members of this House; and the whole thing was a gigantic scandal from beginning to end. And yet the hon. gentleman stands up here to-day, and because I made an explanation to the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) with regard

to what I said last night, that hon. gentleman having misunderstood me, and I stating exactly what I did say, the First Minister rises and refuses to accept that explanation, but charges me with having maliciously and intentionally made a gross charge against the hon. member for Algoma, when I made no such charge as that to which the hon. gentleman alludes. The hon. gentleman had better say as little as may be about that episode in his political history connected with the granting of 25,000 square miles of timber limits to his friends without inviting competition, and granting the greater part to his own political friends in a most corrupt manner. It is a scandal in our history, and the Government have since admitted that the policy was wrong by abandoning it and resorting to competition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must say a word or two in reply to the hon. gentleman. I pointed out to the House that the hon. gentleman had acted disingenuously in his speech the other day. I have not the slightest objection to a discussion taking place on the policy of the Government with regard to the administration of affairs in Manitoba and the North-West. I would be glad to have that discussion, and I would prove, not to use an unparliamentary expression, that the hon. gentleman is as much in error as it is possible for a man to be. I am ready and able to justify to this House and to the country, everything that was done connected with the administration of public lands in Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

Mr. BLAKE. The only observation, I think, I need offer in answer to the hon. gentleman's appeal is, that I am delighted to hear so many verifications from all quarters of the House of the views which we on this side of the House for some years ineffectually expressed. The view, in the first place, which we endeavored to enforce in the form of a resolution as long ago as March, 1882, that the cession of timber limits to private individuals without competition was liable to gross abuse, and apt to result in the cession of the public domain for inadequate consideration to favored individuals, and which we repeated in 1886; and, in the second place, I am delighted to observe the disposition on the part of hon. gentlemen who are charged, or with respect to whom it is supposed, that they have touched what I may, I suppose, now call that unclean thing, a timber limit, to purge themselves from what the First Minister calls, a stain on their reputation; I am delighted to observe the desire evinced by those who did not touch, but are the protectors of those who did touch, to wash out any such possible stain. I am glad that we are undergoing this process of purgation and lustration.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think what hon. members have a right to complain of in regard to the action of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), is this, that both in 1886 and the other night again he read a list of gentlemen who had made application for timber limits, impliedly for their own benefit, and in making that statement the hon. gentleman the other night referred to those hon. members as having participated in what he very elegantly expressed as the public swag. The implication was made on hon. gentlemen whose action was within the law—and I am not going to express an opinion in regard to the law, because I have already expressed my opinion on the matter—

Mr. CHARLTON.

and who had, on behalf of their constituents, legitimately made application to the Department for an apportionment of the public land under the law as it existed. The objection which hon. members on this side of the House entertain to the course of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), is, that he implied that those hon. members participated in the profits arising from the apportionment of the public lands.

Mr. WARD. I desire to say a few words with regard to the matter brought before the House by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Unfortunately I was out of the House when he brought forward the list of the names of members who had from time to time made application for portions of the public lands. I read from the hon. gentleman's speech in *Hansard* that he stated:

"That H. A. Ward, M.P., had received one limit."

And further:

"H. A. Ward M.P., made three applications and secured three limits."

The hon. gentleman must have had the returns before him at the time he made that declaration in this House, and he must have known, if he had read the returns and dates on which these applications were made, that these limits in question were applied for two years before I became a member of this House. That, however, is the style of the allegation put forward by the hon. gentleman. I simply wish to say that at that time, two years before I became a member, I was interested with some American and Canadian gentlemen who desired to enter into transactions in timber in the North-West. They applied through me, and I had one limit granted to myself, and afterwards about \$3,000 was expended in examining and surveying the limits. My friends, however, came to the conclusion that they could not by any possibility be made to pay. Nothing more was done in regard to them, and the applications were cancelled. The hon. gentleman's mind must be relieved by the circumstance that the public domain has not in any way been squandered on gentlemen associated with me, but he cannot be relieved of the imputation of having attempted on false premises to assail the reputation of a member of this House.

Motion agreed to.

PICTON HARBOR.

Mr. PLATT moved for:

Correspondence, petitions, memorials, reports of engineers and others relative to the necessity and expediency of dredging and otherwise improving the harbor at Pictou, Bay of Quinté, since 1st January, 1883; and also containing all correspondence, petitions, memorials and reports concerning the desirability or expediency of constructing public buildings at the said town of Pictou for the accommodation of Post Office, Customs and Inland Revenue offices in that town, since 1st January, 1886.

He said: Although a portion of the information asked in this motion has been given by the Minister of Public Works in answer to a question, yet there is a portion not covered by that answer which is of more than local importance. I will not enlarge on the question at issue between myself and my constituents on the one side and the Minister of Public Works on the other, in regard to the necessity of improving the harbor of Pictou at the present time. The latter part of the motion is of still greater local interest, and my reason for seeking the information which I desire to be submitted to

the House, is that rumor has been busy in stating that certain parties, interested in renting buildings for public offices in Picton, have been instrumental in neutralising or paralysing the efforts of those who were interesting themselves in securing the construction of public buildings at the public expense. I have only to say that, so far as Picton is concerned, the people of that town will be delighted by the discussion which took place in this House the other day, and by the remarks which were made by the First Minister, and by the motion which was unanimously adopted by this House, which gave us to understand that, in future, political favoritism was not to influence the distribution of public moneys; and, further, that the revenues received from the Customs and post offices in the various towns were to be considered in the construction of public buildings. I will make no reference, therefore, except to facts which are within the knowledge of the people of my immediate locality. I wish simply to compare the towns of Napanee and Picton, which are closely situated to each other. The town of Napanee is on the main line of railway and so situated that it has always received large benefits from the expenditure of public money in the construction of railways. The town of Picton, on the other hand, not being on the main line of railway, has never, I may say, received any direct benefit from the expenditure of public money, and the same may be said of the entire county which I have the honor to represent. We find from the returns, that the net Customs revenue from the town of Picton last year, was \$10,216.74, and the net revenue from the post office of that town, \$5,506.60, making a total of \$15,723. In Napanee, the Customs revenue last year was \$4,361, and the post office revenue \$6,536, making a total of \$10,897. The town of Napanee has had an expenditure on public buildings, in the last year or two, of some \$37,000, while the town of Picton has as yet received no favors of that kind. I simply draw attention to the fact, that if political favoritism is not to influence, in future, the distribution of public works, and if the revenue of the various towns is to be considered; then, in order to regulate that very great discrepancy which seems to exist with regard to the different treatment extended to those two towns, it will be necessary to do something for the town of Picton.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I leave to the hon. gentleman the interpretation which he put upon the motion passed by the House the other night. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman, instead of putting the words "of engineers and others," should insert the words "report of the Chief Engineer of the Department," which is the ordinary phraseology to put in a motion of this kind. I have no objection to the motion if that change is made.

Mr. PLATT. I understand that the engineers sent to examine these works report to the chief engineer, and the chief engineer reports to the Department. I know that, on a former occasion, some such change was made in a resolution I had the honor to move, and the report did not come down, simply because the engineer who made the examination did not report to the chief engineer. If the report to which the hon. Minister made

reference to-day is brought down, that is all I require.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is what I suggest to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PLATT. I adopt the suggestion.

Mr. BURDETT. If an engineer or other officer is to be sent to survey the harbor of Picton, with a view to making permanent improvements to which they are justly entitled, he should be instructed to take some means to report on the advisability of deepening the Bay of Quinté, at Telegraph Island, above Deseronto. I am informed, by competent authority, that some slight improvement in the way of dredging and buoying out the course will make the waters of the Bay of Quinté at that point deep enough, as they are at other points, for the larger lake vessels which will pass through the Murray Canal to Montreal. I respectfully suggest that if an engineer is sent to Picton, or to any other port on the Bay of Quinté, or, indeed, whether one is sent there or not, it is advisable that the waters of the Bay of Quinté, from Belleville to Deseronto, should be surveyed and the depth ascertained, with a view to accommodating the large class of vessels which will pass through when these canals are constructed. With reference to the question of public buildings, I should think, that if Picton and Napanee are to be considered, the town of Deseronto should not be passed by. It lies between the two former towns, and is the most thriving town in that district. It is progressing very rapidly and gives a larger revenue from the post office and Custom house than many other towns which have public buildings. If the claims of important towns are to be considered in this matter, Deseronto should have a new post office and Custom house. It is an important centre, from which a large quantity of lumber and other goods are shipped. It has large manufactures in different classes of articles, and the people are enterprising and industrious. Neither should the Government forget the towns of Madoc and Tweed, the one in my riding and the other in North Hastings. These two towns are entitled to public buildings, as many other places have obtained them which give less revenue to the country, and in which the population is not so large or progressive. I call the attention of the House to this matter, as it seems, from the resolution adopted the other night, that the Government were disposed to carry on an equitable distribution of public money. If that be the case, all I have to do is to point out how they can do their duty, and if they do not do it I may call their attention, on a subsequent occasion, to their neglect.

Motion agreed to.

ALIEN CONTRACT LABOR.

Order for resuming adjourned debate on proposed motion of Mr. Taylor, for second reading of Bill (No. 8) to prohibit the importation and migration of Foreigners and Aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor in Canada, read.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall the Bill be now read the second time?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. SPEAKER. Second reading of the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did I understand you to say "carried," Mr. Speaker? By no manner of means.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, unless a division is called for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I call for a division on that Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was declared carried.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a Bill which was most strongly objected to, and which ought not to be passed without division in this House. It is taking quite an unfair and unusual advantage. I had thought that the thing had been withdrawn by mutual consent.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman does not refer to me when he speaks of an unfair advantage having been taken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, certainly not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I waited the usual time, and supposing that the House was in favor of the second reading, I declared it carried.

Mr. MITCHELL. There were some faint "yeas," but the "noes" were really predominant. The right hon. First Minister speaks for a great many, I admit, but there is no doubt that the feeling of this House, when this matter was discussed the other day, was against the spirit of the Bill. I think it is a most pernicious Bill, and it ought not to be allowed to pass.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If I remember aright, the hon. gentleman agreed with me in everything I said on this Bill. I said that it was of very great importance, that full information should be got upon a measure of this kind; that it should not be summarily thrown out by the House; that it was of great importance that the people of Canada, especially the working classes, should know that we consider that very harsh treatment has been dealt out to them by the American law, and by the way in which it had been administered; and I suggested that the Bill should be read a second time *pro forma* and referred to a special Committee, from which we should get a report upon the Bill. I stated, and the hon. gentleman agreed with me, that I did not believe that the case of Canada had been at all in contemplation of the American Congress when dealing with the subject, but that their object was to keep out the overflow from Europe and Asia. I stated that it was of great importance that a sub-Committee should be struck, and that that Committee should make a calm, deliberate statement of the facts of the case; and that it would be greatly for the promotion of good feeling between the two peoples lying to the north and south of our great inland waters, that there should be liberal treatment on both sides. My hon. friend also pressed that very strongly; he said he agreed with me in every respect, and thought the Bill ought not to be summarily treated by being thrown out. I have no desire in the world to spring a mine upon the hon. gentleman. The motion was put in the ordinary way, the usual time was given, nobody said a word in objection, and the Speaker, in the performance of his duty, declared it carried. Now, I am still in favor of the proposition that I made. I think it would be well for this House, and I would ask hon. gentlemen on both sides, to accede to my

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

proposition. It will satisfy the working classes in Canada that we are not summarily telling them: "You have no grievances, and you can go to the States if you want to get employment there." I think the feeling should not be allowed to spread throughout the country that we have not considered their case at all. I did not hesitate for a moment to say that I would not give my assent to the Bill in principle, and I gave my reason—that the United States were full to overflowing, in the opinion of Congress, and wanted no increase to their population beyond the natural increase, while we had a very large country without a population, and wanted an increase. But I put it to the House very strongly, and I put it now to the House, that it is desirable to satisfy our own people that we do give due consideration to their feelings of irritation and annoyance at the harshness with which they have been treated along our borders. Let the Bill go to a Committee, from which we shall get a calm and full statement of our case; and then we can hold ourselves perfectly free, as Parliament has frequently done, to vote as we like on the report, and on the question of the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. In justice to myself I feel it necessary to make a short reply to the right hon. gentleman. He is right in saying that, when the matter was before the House on a former occasion, I endorsed his view as I do now—that was, that the Bill should not be passed. That was the principle on which we both agreed. But I thought the hon. gentleman was going quietly to let the Bill remain on the paper, in order to see whether the United States Congress would make any alteration in the legislation, or place any different interpretation upon it. I believe that the application given to that law by the subordinate officers of the United States Government was never intended by Congress, and I do not believe it now. That was the principle on which I agreed with the hon. gentleman; but I did not agree, and do not agree now with the essential principle of the Bill. But if my right hon. friend wishes to place upon record something that will enable him, in the course of the negotiations, to utilise any act of this Legislature for the purpose of strengthening the position of our own people, he will find no one more ready to join him than I am. His duty, when this motion was made, was to have stated to the House that the second reading of this Bill would not be considered as any recognition of its principle by this House. Had he stated that he intended to refer it to a Committee, in order that the Committee might make a full and elaborate enquiry into the matter, and submit an exhaustive resolution to the House, I do not suppose that any one would have objected to the reference, but I do not feel disposed to allow the right hon. gentleman to place me in a false position with regard to this matter. As the hon. gentleman has now stated what he should have stated at the outset, that our agreeing to a second reading should not be recognised as binding the House to the principle of the Bill, I would have had no objection that this motion should pass, and the Bill be referred to a special Committee. I desire that our workmen should be protected as far as we can protect them; but I desire that we should take action in a way which will be effective, and it certainly will not be effective if we attempt to retaliate in the way

proposed by this Bill. Any attempt at acts of retaliation, either in this or anything else, against the country to the south of us, will only be a waste of time, and do harm instead of good. The rights of our people can be best respected and maintained by moderate and judicious correspondence and diplomatic action, and not by our resorting to threats or to force.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I stated that I asked the second reading merely for the purpose of sending the Bill to a special Committee, where the whole subject might be considered. I stated that explicitly, and I will read what my hon. friend said in reply :

"We are called upon, with the view of advancing the interests of this country and its peace and prosperity, to cultivate the most friendly relations between the United States and Canada; and, while I agree with the right hon. gentleman that it might be of service that this Bill should be read a second time and referred to a special Committee, I think that special Committee, which should be composed of the best men in this House, should place upon the records of Parliament our desire to maintain friendly relations with our neighbors, should show that the application which has been made of their legislation as against Canada is unfair, and should call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that that application has been unfriendly to his country. I believe that that would do great good, and I, therefore, support the motion of the right hon. gentleman as to the appointment of a special Committee. I am opposed to the passage of this Bill, and I only support the second reading for the reasons which have been given by the Premier."

I consider that the hon. gentleman supported me in every respect on that occasion.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did, so far as that is concerned, but what I hold is this: That it is the duty of the right hon. gentleman to state to the House that he intended to send this Bill to a special Committee for the purpose of getting an elaborate report on the subject. I do not want to be considered as pledged to the principle of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I stated that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I objected to mainly was what I supposed to be an attempt to rush this through, without regard being had to its great gravity and importance. I cannot at all assent to the principle of the Bill, because it commits us, as far as it goes, to a direct policy of hostility and retaliation towards the United States. I hold, with the right hon. the First Minister, that this American measure was not intended to apply to Canada, but to apply to a totally different class of persons from those passing to and fro between Canada and the United States. I hold this is a matter which most undoubtedly ought to be brought to the attention of the people of the United States, and to the United States Government, and I can only say that this is one of the incidents which are constantly occurring, and which go to show the wisdom of the proposal made a good many years ago by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and reiterated afterwards by myself and others, that the time has come when it is in the highest degree in the interest of Canada that we should have a recognised agent of our own, in some form or other, at Washington; and this, in my opinion, is a great deal more important to us than to maintain an expensive and useless High Commissioner in London. As regards what the right hon. gentleman has further stated, I do not see any objection to referring the Bill to a special

Committee. I do see a grave objection to affirming the principle of it by giving it a second reading, and I really think, if we are to depart from precedent and custom at all, it would be better to send this to a Committee such as the hon. gentleman describes, without going through the formality of a second reading, which formality is technically supposed to pledge us to the principle. I do not at all desire to be understood as imputing any unfairness, Mr. Speaker, to you. We can call it, *pro forma*, carried on division, and then it will go to the committee the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not suppose, Sir, that any one could imagine your conduct to have been otherwise than proper and correct, and the misunderstanding was due to the fact that attention was not called to the arrangement on which the proceeding to be taken was intended to be based. The second reading of the Bill, even under the circumstances under which the First Minister proposes it shall be read, may be used in the neighboring Republic as an evidence that we have assented to its principle. I think that it would be an unworthy act for us to pass it through a second reading with any such object, since the First Minister, who leads the great majority in this House, has announced that he does not agree to its principle. He has stated that the second reading has entirely another object. We have, therefore, no idea of using this as an indication of any intention to pass hostile legislation. Whatever the intention may be in our breasts, that is not the intention with which we are asked to go through a second reading. If it were, I should regard it as a very regrettable intention to act on, unless we were fully decided that the principle is a sound one, which the First Minister says he does not affirm. On the contrary, he asks us to agree, in words contrary to the formal effect of the second reading, that we do not affirm that principle. He has stated that his desire is that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, in order that there should be a careful and full report made of the conditions and circumstances of our grievance and difficulty with the neighboring Republic—not the grievance and difficulty which this Bill professes is designed to remove, namely, that too many people are coming in from the other side, but the grievance and difficulty we labor under by the restriction of the passage from our side to the other of the citizens of our own country. I hold that is not the function of a Select Committee on the Bill. I think, Sir, you will find that all the Select Committee on the Bill can do, if you strike one, is to report the Bill either in its present shape, or with such amendments as they may think should be submitted to the House; and, therefore, the object the right hon. gentleman has in view will not be attained by the appointment of the Select Committee he proposes. If the purpose be to examine this question carefully, to consider its whole bearings—the bearings, namely, of the operation of the law of the United States upon us, and the bearings of the operation of such a law as is proposed by this Bill upon us, and the best remedies for the difficulties—the better plan would be, that the hon. mover of the Bill should propose, or that the hon. First Minister should propose, a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to consider the whole subject and report upon it. Such a Committee could consider it and give us a full and

general report, which a Select Committee on the Bill will not, under its appointment, have power to give, as such Committee will be able to deal only with this Bill, which presents but one side of the case, and its powers will be limited to simply remodelling the clauses according as the Committee think they should be remodelled. I wish to refer briefly to another matter, in respect of which I have been anticipated by my hon. friend the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I do think that the passage, in its present form, of the legislation on the other side, and the effect which has been suffered to be given to that legislation, without any attempt made to modify it, are very cogent proofs of the importance of a diplomatic agent of Canada being present at Washington. I stated that view as long ago as the year 1880, and I think all that has happened since that time has indicated the importance of our doing what I then said we ought to do, that is, to send there the very best man this country can afford, to bend his mind to the consideration of those matters in which the interests of the one country are affected by the action of the other, in which Canadian interests are affected by what is being done and what is being said in Washington. I thought then, and I think now, that it is important that there should be always a free and responsible Canadian medium for the interchange of opinion with the Washington authorities in regard to Canadian interests. I believe that, if that plan were adopted in regard to a country which, to adopt the language of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), is so much governed by newspaper misunderstandings would not occur, difficulties would be explained, the path would be made easier in many ways in regard to our various relations with the States. This House is now sitting, and it may perhaps have a function to discharge in regard to this matter. My opinion is that the function would be best discharged by the appointment of a Select Committee; but, if you are going to accept the suggestion of the First Minister in regard to this Bill, it will either be necessary to interfere with the precedents and practice of Select Committees on Bills, or, in some extraordinary way, by giving some special authority or instruction to the Committee, to enable them to make a finding in this regard, otherwise you will find, when the report comes back, that it will not be what you expect.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that the proposition of the Prime Minister is a sort of dilatory proposition. It proposes to suspend the action of the House on this Bill indefinitely, or, at all events, for the present time. I agree with the view which has been expressed by the First Minister and by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), as to the object of this legislation. I have no doubt that the construction put upon that measure is very much wider in its effect than the intention of the promoters of the Bill. I do not see, however, that the reference of the Bill to a Committee is going to remove the difficulty of which we complain. I think the Government ought to enter into negotiations with the American Government—through the existing machinery, I suppose, until a better machinery is provided—with reference to this subject. This is an executive matter. If we are going to assume that the

Mr. BLAKE.

American legislation is to remain unchanged, then our course might be altogether different, but we still hope that some action may be taken by Congress to alter the legislation which is now on the American Statute-book. It seems to me that the views of members on this side of the House, as well as the supporters of the Government, would be best met if the American legislation on this subject were modified, if the clause of the American Alien Contract Act were repealed as far as Canada is concerned. The hon. gentleman has not informed the House—and I do not think it would interfere with anything the Government is doing at Washington if he gave that information—whether any action has been taken in this matter or not. If the Government have taken any action, it seems to me that, pending a decision, it would be very improper to pass any legislation on that subject, and to either affirm or disaffirm the principle of the Bill which is before us. Why should this House refer the Bill to a Committee to report upon it, when the House is still in the dark in regard to the action of the Government in reference to the whole subject? Let the Government assume the responsibility of determining what course shall be taken in the first instance. It is not a Committee of this House to whom the administrative policy of this country is entrusted, but it is to the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. It is not the view of a Committee, but the view of the Prime Minister and those who are associated with him in the government of this country that we have to consider. What action have you taken? What line have you pursued? The hon. gentleman has told us that he does not approve of the principle of this Bill. Whether he means that he does not approve of it under present circumstances, or whether he goes further, I do not know. Whether that is a general proposition on his part, or one which is looking hopefully to a change in the condition of things in the United States, I do not know. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman could very well take the House into his confidence without interfering with any negotiations that may be proceeding, and might let us know whether the Government have initiated any negotiations in Washington or not, and whether any conclusion has been reached. If the negotiations have taken place, and the American Government have absolutely refused to entertain any proposition for action in this matter, we should know it, and then this House would not be taking a leap in the dark. We would know what was the state of affairs in the United States, we would know whether it was permanent or not, and then we could deal with the hon. gentleman's Bill much more intelligently than we can under the present circumstances. The responsibility to decide this does not rest on this House, but on the Government. The responsibility which rests upon this House is to decide whether the Government has done what is right or not, but it is not for us to point out the road which the Government should travel. That is a matter which they should decide for themselves, and subsequently we may decide whether they have acted wisely or unwisely.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may remind the hon. gentleman that this measure was not introduced by the Government, but was introduced by an hon. member because it happened that his

constituents suffered special hardship from the American law, and from the extreme harshness with which it was administered. The hon. gentleman, to use an Americanism, "voiced" the opinions of the workingmen of the Dominion, and, if I were desirous of getting any political advantage in this matter, I would be glad to see every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House vote against this Bill, because I know that it would be considered as an unfriendly act upon their part. But I have already explained candidly and truly to the House that I thought it was of great importance, that the people of the United States and the Congress of the United States should know what was the opinion of the people here. At Washington, even among the statesmen, there is a wonderful amount of ignorance as to the working of our political machinery, and I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the executive in this country, like the executive in England, have certain responsibilities. We do not ignore those responsibilities, but in the United States the executive forms a portion of the Legislature; and what I desire to get was a calm, friendly statement from the Legislature of Canada as to the injustice and the hardship that was dealt out to us by the Legislature of the United States. Our Legislature would calmly say: Your Legislature have acted in an unfriendly manner, unintentionally we believe, but we desire to tell you that it is so. It is with that object only that I took that course, and I am of the opinion still that we should set aside the technicality that the principle of the Bill is acknowledged on the second reading. In my parliamentary experience, and no doubt in that of hon. gentlemen opposite also, I have known many instances in which, by universal consent of the House, a Bill was read the second time with the understanding that we were perfectly free, after the subsequent report of a Committee, to act on the third reading. I think it is of very considerable importance, in the interest of the working classes, and of all people who are liable to have their business interrupted by interference of communication with the United States, that we should have this report of our Legislature taken up calmly, because we think the Legislature of the United States has made a mistake. There is some basis for the statement of my hon. friend from West Durham, as to the limited powers of the Committee. That Committee will take the evidence; it is quite within the scope of their power and of their reference to take evidence on the matter, and they can point out quite relevantly with regard to their duties, what the cause of this Bill was, and in what respect it might be amended so as, in some degree, to ameliorate the consequences of the legislative action of the United States. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stated that the Government had not taken the House into their confidence. Well, their confidence was not asked in the matter, but I have no hesitation in telling the hon. gentleman that immediately after this Act was passed, the Government received remonstrances from our people who had suffered hardship, and those remonstrances were transmitted to Washington, and certain proceedings took place with regard to those remonstrances. This question, like several other questions that have arisen between the two countries, is now under discussion at Washington. The

House must not suppose that in this case we have been in any way indifferent to this matter, or to the consequences to our people, especially in some sections in the immediate vicinity of the United States. Now, I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to forego any objection to have the Committee struck at once, that we may have a report upon it.

Mr. LAURIER. Before we do this, it would be well to understand exactly where we stand. The position is this: When the Bill was called, the hon. Prime Minister said "carried," and you, Sir, as usual under such circumstances, called "carried," dealing with this Bill as with an ordinary Bill. I do not question your ruling, but the House cannot forget that this is not an ordinary Bill. It is one of great importance, and on this side of the House, on repeated occasions, from different hon. members on the front benches, strong objection was taken to it. I do not, for my part, abate one jot of the objection I made on a previous occasion, but I have no objection that the Bill should be carried on division.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a misunderstanding, I think, on the part of those gentlemen who raise an objection to the Bill being carried. The Bill was spoken against as strongly from this side of the House as from that, when it came up for discussion in the ordinary way, on motion for reading it the second time a week or two ago. We called "carried" this afternoon, merely in consequence of the explanations which the First Minister had made, seeing that his desire was to have it read a second time without the principle being considered to have been adopted by the House, and with a view to have a reference to a special Committee. There is one other observation I wish to make in addition to what I said the other evening, that is, by way of correcting an impression which seems to exist on the part of some hon. gentlemen, that the enforcement of this statute by the United States in the oppressive way mentioned by the gentleman who has charge of the Bill, had been wholly a matter of inadvertence, that it was never the intention of the American Government to enforce this Act against the Canadian people, and that all that was necessary to correct the cases of hardship which were illustrated by the cases mentioned by the hon. member, was for the Government of Canada to call the attention of the United States authorities to the fact that the Act was being enforced against Canadians. Now, I beg to say that while I still adhere to the opinion I expressed the other evening, that the Act was not by any means passed with a hostile purpose towards Canada, yet it was passed for the protection of American laborers against all the peoples of the earth, including Canada, and Canada was in the mind of the Congress of the United States when that statute was adopted. To show that such was the case, I will read from the report of a Committee of the House of Representatives, on which report the Act was passed to restrict the importation of alien labor. There is a passage headed "Immigration along the Canadian border," and this is the language used:

"Along the border between Canada and the United States no inspection whatever is made of immigrants, and alien paupers, insane persons, &c., may land at Quebec and at once proceed to this country without any let or hindrance. The number of persons not lawfully entitled

to land in the United States who thus arrive in this country by way of Canadian frontier, is rapidly assuming large proportions, and has become a matter of serious contemplation. The testimony shows that in many instances, immigrants, coming by steamer to Quebec, have, within forty-eight hours after their arrival there, been applicants for shelter in the alms-houses in the State of New York. At many points along the border, no account whatever is kept of the number of immigrants arriving, so that it would be a difficult matter to state, with exactness, the number arriving in the United States, whose landing on this continent was first effected in Canada; but, from information submitted to them, the Committee believe that for the six months ending the 30th June, 1888, there were about 50,000 such immigrants who arrived here by way of Canada, many of whom, by reason of being paupers, idiots and insane persons, were not lawfully entitled to land. The charitable institutions in the county of Wayne, Michigan, of which Detroit is the principal port, are filled to overflowing, and the county has now in process of erection, an alms-house at a large expense.

"Sigmond Simon, President of the Board of County Poor Commissioners, testified before the Committee that this state of affairs was owing entirely to the alien immigrants coming from Canada, whom the county is forced to take care of, and that, were it not for the alien paupers who are supported by the county, no increased facilities would be demanded."

If the measure rested simply upon that statement of fact, as regards the grievance on the Canadian side, I admit that representations as to the incorrectness of those statements, and a promise to guard against Canada being made a passage for immigrants of that kind, would probably be sufficient to correct the operation of this Act, and to induce Congress to reconsider the policy of enforcing it against Canada, in part at least, so that the class of laborers mentioned by the hon. member for Gananoque (Mr. Taylor) might be relieved, as far as possible, from the hardships to which they are now subjected. The report goes on to say:

"Along the frontier bordering upon Canada it is the practice of aliens to perform labor in the United States, coming over in the morning and returning to Canada in the evening. At Detroit, in the State of Michigan, it was ascertained that a great many aliens are so employed, notably in the building trades. The testimony shows that about 800 carpenters and joiners, subjects of Great Britain, perform labor in that city, and that about the same number of American citizens of that occupation are lying idle because they cannot obtain employment."

I mention this for the purpose of showing that this application of the Act to Canada was not overlooked, and that it was brought to the notice of Congress, when that Act was before Congress, that one of the evils that it was desirable to remedy by this Act was the passage of Canadian laborers from our country into the United States.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that by common consent the Bill has been read the second time, and that we are now discussing a proposition to refer the Bill to a Committee of the Whole or to otherwise deal with it. From the discussion that has taken place it is manifest that the country is face to face with a very serious problem, a problem that is going to grow in increasing importance, a problem that, in the interests of Canada, must be solved, if possible, one way or the other, a problem that we cannot solve by the mere passage of a Bill introduced by a private member this Session, but a problem to which the Parliament of Canada must without delay, I consider, give its best attention. Whether, therefore, the proposition now suggested, to refer this question to a special Committee, will enable this House to obtain such information as may ultimately solve it, I cannot venture to say, notwithstanding the fact that I can conceive that such a reference may

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

be productive of great good. I think it would be most unfortunate if there had been a division in this House on a question such as this. In order that our action may have any influence towards bringing about more friendly relations, it is manifest that we should be of one mind in regard to defending Canadian interests. It would be unfortunate if, whenever we discuss any legislation of a foreign country that seems to operate harshly against ourselves, we should at once proceed to adopt retaliatory measures, instead of first adopting that course which is now invariably followed by civilized countries, namely, to resort to methods of diplomacy. It may be that our means of communication with the United States are not sufficient whereby we may, in the most convenient and ready way, put these methods of peaceful negotiation into immediate and active operation; nevertheless, I think that the discussions and resolutions of this House can in various ways be communicated to the authorities in the United States, and may be the medium of bringing about a solution which would render retaliatory measures as this wholly unnecessary. If, after investigation, and if after diplomacy has failed to bring about any amelioration of the conditions, then, and then only, it will be necessary, or the time will be opportune for us to consider the desirability of dealing with the question in a radical manner as is proposed here. But, at this stage, while I am not prepared to express an opinion as to what legislation circumstances might justify, I think we are bound, as a friendly people living alongside of a friendly people, to first endeavor, in the manner that has been suggested, to see if this difficulty can be settled in a satisfactory way. We cannot ignore the fact that there are points of contact from ocean to ocean between Canada and the United States, and these points of contact are going to increase in number, and the occasions of difficulty between the two countries will enormously increase as years roll by; and if every time there is any friction we are immediately to rush to retaliatory measures, it will be impossible to have any communication of a satisfactory character with our neighbors. I think, in view of the discussion, whatever difficulties there might be in the way of such a reference being satisfactory, no doubt the Committee would feel it had enlarged powers under the circumstances and might make its enquiry more extensive than the matter involved in this particular Bill would technically justify. I have no doubt the argument of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) is technically correct, and that the proper method would have been for the order for the second reading to have been discharged, and the Government, on its own responsibility, to make some proposition involving a resolution carrying with it a reference to a Committee. But as the Government have taken the responsibility of saying that a reference even under this motion will meet the case, I think the Committee will feel justified in extending its enquiry beyond the matter in issue, and in that light I favor that mode of dealing with the matter.

Mr. TAYLOR moved:

That the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee composed of Messrs. Brien, Colby, Daly, Davin, Earle, Ferguson (Welland), Gillmor, Girouard, Lépine, Lister, McDougald (Pictou), McKay, Mills (Annapolis), Mulock, Taylor, Weldon (Albert), Welsh and Wilson (Elgin), with

power to send for persons and papers, and that Rule 78 be suspended in relation thereto.

In regard to the remarks of the Minister of Justice in relation to the discussion which took place on the Bill when before Congress, I wish to say that I have received a letter from Buffalo, N. Y., dated March 13, in which a few passages occur that I will read for the benefit of the House and for the Special Committee. The writer says :

"I have been raised along the border, and, for the last six years, have lived on the Yankee side of it, and I know how much the United States would be likely to discriminate in favor of Canada. I lived in Windsor for a time, and worked in Detroit, and I heard the vile epithets hurled at us every morning by street loafers and passers-by, as we came from the dock. There were meetings held with a view of stopping us, though, at the same time, there were sixty-five more, by actual count, coming from Detroit to Canada, than went the other way. The Canada Southern Railway are almost all Yankees, though the road lies altogether in Canada, simply because the starting points are Detroit and Buffalo. A Canadian cannot run the train a few rods in the States, but a Yankee can run it two hundred and thirty miles or more if needs be, in Canada. This is, indeed, a pretty state of affairs. Now, could you not get a short Bill through, which would make it necessary for persons working in Canada to live there; let them come in under contract if they wish, providing they intend to become residents, then it would not prevent immigration, it would promote it. It would also give the people along the border a more independent feeling, and put them on an equal footing with residents of the States."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not wish my name to appear on the Committee, as I am opposed to the reference. I hold that it is a matter for executive action, and that the Government should assume the responsibility of dealing with an international matter; and, further, that the Committee will not have before it the necessary information to enable it to act properly. I, therefore, decline to serve on the Committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has taken the words I was about to utter out of my mouth. I decline to serve on the Committee for the reasons which have been so clearly stated by my hon. friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. The House can appoint you on the Committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask the House not to make such an appointment, when I state I am opposed to the principle of the Bill, and think it is the duty of the Government to initiate a policy and take the responsibility of it.

Mr. CASEY. The Government have, in a certain sense, by authorising this reference to a Committee, made themselves responsible for this Bill, to the extent at least of desiring further discussion on it. But I do not think that they have yet placed themselves in the position which the Government ought to maintain in reference to a Bill of this nature. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that this is a question that should not be dealt with at the instance of a private member. It involves very delicate international questions, which may possibly get us into difficulty with our neighbors, and which, at all events, must be treated with diplomacy and with a degree of lengthened and mature consideration which cannot be expected from a private and irresponsible member of this House, but which should be expected from those who control the legislation here. A matter of this kind should eminently be a Government measure, and should not be passed at all, unless, after being introduced by a private

member, it be adopted by the Government, who take the whole responsibility of passing the measure, as well as the consequences of its passing. As the Government have not done that, I think they have not done their duty. With regard to the Bill itself, I think, as I said before, that the principle of it, which appears to have been adopted by the House, is a correct one, namely, that native labor is as much entitled to protection as native manufactures; and that the operative in a manufactory who has to pay high taxes on all that he uses should not be subjected to the importation of foreign labor under contract, whenever he wishes to ask for higher wages. I believe that the laborer has as good a right to protection as the employer, and, therefore, I support the principle of protecting native labor against competition from labor imported under contract. I do not believe that our neighbors in the United States should take offence at our asserting that principle, although they might take offence at some details of the measure, and at the high-handed conduct adopted by the hon. gentleman who proposes it. I do believe that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who has declared war against the United States, and enforced a blockade of their ports, is likely to be regarded with disfavor by the Government and people of the United States. He has made himself, by that action, an international question, and he is in fact a difficult national problem in himself. He is now a person of such importance that his name is known in the United States as having taken that action, and leading articles have been written on him in the New York papers. Therefore, everyone in the United States will know what the Taylor Bill means, and they will think accordingly.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is a copy of their own Bill.

Mr. CASEY. Under all these circumstances, I am satisfied that the Government should take this Bill into their own hands, and mould it so as to suit themselves, or to substitute another Bill for it, or otherwise to choke it off right here. Of these three alternatives, I think the proper one should be that they should substitute a Bill of their own. But to put my opinion in this respect more clearly on record, I beg to move:

That all the words after "That" in the motion be left out, and the following substituted: "this Bill be not now referred to a Committee, but that it be resolved, that the delicate international questions involved in this Bill should not be dealt with by this House, at the instance of a private member, but by legislation introduced by the Government, and that it is the duty of the latter to secure fair and adequate protection for native labor."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I regret very much that my hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will not consent to sit on the Committee. It is quite understood that the principle of the Bill is not in question, and that that will come up on the third reading. I think it would be a great deal better if the hon. gentleman would consent to give his experience, his wide information, and his general acquaintance with the country, to the service of the Committee. I have no doubt that he would be a valuable addition to the Committee, and that his absence will be a loss to it. I was rather surprised that my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) should make such a motion—that is to say, that he should deny the perfect equality of the members of this Parliament; for, whether it be an Act affecting the administration of affairs or the

foreign relations of the Government, no matter what the question may be, every member of this House has the same rights. I should be very sorry indeed to see a resolution put upon the Journals, stating that any question, no matter what it should be, ought only be introduced by the Ministry of the day. That would be a surrender of the power of the representatives of the people, which I was glad to see found no response anywhere in the House. If my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is obstinate in his refusal to sit on the Committee, I would suggest that the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Brien), who has not yet expressed an opinion on the subject, and who lives on the frontier and must understand the subject well, would be a valuable member of the Committee. With the consent of the House, I would ask that the hon. member's name be placed upon the Committee. I am sorry, also, that the leader of the third party will not sit on the Committee. After the strong opinion he has given to the House on the question, I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would give us the name of some member of his party who would take his place. But, in all seriousness, I would like the hon. gentleman to sit on the Committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am sorry to say that I do not take the same liberty with the names of my followers as the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House do with theirs. As I have not consulted the other members of my party, I am not in a position to oblige the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. Besides which, the hon. gentleman's party always follow his lead, and if he refuses to sit on the Committee, they will surely follow his example.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. In common, I have no doubt, with many hon. members of the House, I have received numerous representations from my constituents in favor of this Bill, and I think, whether we approve of the principle of the Bill or not, it is only courteous to the member who introduced it, that it should be submitted to the Committee, to consider the whole question and to pronounce upon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Allow me to make just one other suggestion. I wish to have a committee that really understands the subject. It has been suggested to me—I did not think of it before—that Mr. Lister and Mr. Brien be put on the Committee, as they both live on the frontier, and they will both act, I have no doubt.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and documents whatsoever respecting the placing of a floating light on the St. Lawrence, opposite the Church of Ste. Croix, in the County of Lotbinière, in place of the buoy now located there.—(Mr. Rinfret.)

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill (No. 91) to grant certain powers to the Chamby Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Bill (No. 89) to amend the Act to incorporate the River Detroit Winter Railway Bridge Company, and to change the name of the company to the River Detroit Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 121) to amend the Act to incorporate the Dominion Mineral Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved second reading of Bill (No. 12) for further securing the Independence of Parliament. He said: I ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments, while I explain the object I have in view in bringing this Bill forward. I believe that the Independence of Parliament may be further secured. I believe I am justified in saying, that corrupt practices in elections have not disappeared, despite the very severe laws against them on our statutes, and I am endeavoring to find some means by which the law, both in letter and spirit, may be enforced. During my experience in Parliament, and I have been here a good many years, I have seen members occupying their seats in this House who were not entitled to occupy them. I have seen men who sat here, while their cases were being fought out before the courts of law or the Committees of Parliament, and who were declared in the end not to have been properly returned. I remember one instance in which a member of this House was disqualified for seven years and his seat declared vacant. Since many years, and more particularly since the last election law was passed, I venture to say that money is still spent at elections, so that the law is not operative as it should be. Every effort is made not to be discovered, and when the election fraud is discovered, the accused resorts to all the quibbles of the law to avoid the penalty. Are there, then, any other means than those provided in the statutes, available by which we can control to a certain extent the conduct of candidates at elections? I believe in the sanction of the oath, and that such oath would be a proper control to be exercised upon candidates at elections; and I propose by this measure that a member should, before taking his seat, and after he has taken the oath of allegiance, make a declaration under oath that he is eligible as a member according to law, and not only that he is eligible, but that he has a right to sit in the House under the statute; that is to say, that he has not been guilty of any act of corruption which would void or tend to void his election. As regards the oath, no doubt some hon. members will consider this a drastic measure, but while, perhaps, it may be too severe for some candidates, I believe on the whole it would have a good effect. I believe, if a member knew that before taking his seat he would be obliged to swear that he was really entitled to it, and that he did not make use of any corrupt means, he would take care not to break the law. I do not think such an oath would be easily violated. I have a better opinion of men than that; and supposing even that in some cases it would be violated, that would be no reason for not applying it in all cases. The member who took the oath would be answer-

able, first, to God, and, secondly, to the torture of his own conscience, if he perjured himself, besides subjecting himself to be brought before the criminal tribunals of the country. The main feature of the Bill is that no member should occupy a seat who is not lawfully entitled to it. Another feature is the imposing of the oath of office to members. As to that part of the Bill, the members are restrained by the law to the different enactments which I propose; that is to say, that a member should not have, directly or indirectly, any contract with the Government. The law is stringent upon that point. It is very clear that no member of this House should have any contract with the Government while he is acting as member. Also, that he will not willingly sell any wares, goods or merchandise to the Government; also, that he will not, directly or indirectly, receive or accept any emolument or value in money or in kind, or any pledge or promise of any kind, to promote or impede any measure or proceedings pending in the Parliament of Canada. This is nothing but carrying into effect the statute passed to secure the free action of members, in order that they may not be induced to accept any bribe or promise to support any measure before Parliament. I hold that the duties of members of Parliament are duties of trust. Not only are the Ministers the trustees of the people, but the whole Parliament are, and each member of Parliament is one of these trustees, and as such cannot receive, directly or indirectly, any emolument or profit or advantage whatever from the Ministers or the Government as a whole. This is the law, and I do not see why members of Parliament should not be bound, like other trustees, to observe this trust to the fullest extent. When we see that Parliament is called every year to vote very large sums of money, which are sometimes voted with too much laxity, I think that the application of the oath will have a salutary effect upon the administration of public affairs. I believe that, in cases where members are called upon to act in this House in their judicial capacity as representatives of the people, as they have been lately, the obligation of fulfilling their duties according to the laws of the land and the justice of the case, would be felt to a greater extent if an oath were imposed upon them. The principle of this Bill, I believe, ought to be accepted by the House as a good principle—the further securing of the independence of Parliament. If the members who compose this Parliament act well and irreproachably in their seats, the community will benefit by that, and we will not see members sitting here who are returned by undue means, or who continue to have contracts with the Government, or who remain under any of the disabilities which the law forbids. In one of its features, this Bill presents an aspect which it may be difficult for some members to accept, but, if that is so, it is simply because it is too good a measure in the first part. As to the second part, I do not hesitate to say that the Government ought to adopt that and oblige members to take an oath of office. The highest function varies in the State, even the judges, whose character and dignity and personal reputation are above suspicion, are constrained to take an oath of office as well as the small justices of the peace. Even the Queen of England, the sovereign of the realm, takes the

Coronation Oath, and she is bound to follow the laws of Parliament and the laws of the land. Under these circumstances, and seeing that corporations and municipal bodies and private individuals, who are corporators in charge of public funds, are constrained to take an oath of office, I think this Bill should pass. The members of a corporation—the city of Montreal, for instance—are obliged to take the oath of allegiance, and also to take another oath to this effect:

“I swear that I will faithfully fulfil the duties of the said office according to the best of my judgment and ability.”

Further, the oath is to the effect, that the incumbent of the office has not fraudulently or by collusion obtained the same by making a false statement in regard to the amount of real estate necessary to qualify him. If these municipal officers are constrained to take an oath of office, I do not see why a member of Parliament, whose trust is much more extensive, and who has much more weight in the conduct of the affairs of this country, should not have to take a similar oath. I, therefore, move the second reading of this Bill.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have followed attentively the argument of the hon. mover of this Bill, and certainly he seems to have given a good deal of attention to his measure. In fact, he appears to be full of his subject. Of course, this Bill would make a large amendment to the present law. According to the present law of Parliament, we have one oath to take when we become members of Parliament, and that is the oath of allegiance to Her Majesty, and then we take our seats. By this Bill, the hon. gentleman wishes us to take another oath, by which the member declares:

“That he is not, to his knowledge and with his consent, guilty of any unlawful and corrupt practices which avoid his election and return; that he is not, directly or indirectly, alone or with some other person, or company or partnership, or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding, enjoying or undertaking any contract, expressed or implied, with or for the Government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the said Government, for which public money of Canada is to be paid, or has been paid in full before the final execution of such pending contract; that he will not knowingly, so long as he remains such member, sell any goods, wares or merchandise to the Government of Canada, or to any of the officers thereof, for which public money is paid or to be paid, whether such sale or transaction is single or continuous, and whether the said money is paid by the interposition of a third party or in any other indirect manner whatsoever; that he will not, so long as he continues such member, directly or indirectly receive or accept any emolument, or value in money or in kind, or any pledge or promise of any kind, to promote or impede any measure or proceeding pending in the Parliament of Canada; and that he will do his duty faithfully and truly as such member, without fear, favor or partiality.”

There is, no doubt, a great deal in this proposition of the hon. member. I do not say that everything contained in it, or that the whole of the language which is used in it might absolutely be accepted, but certainly everything which is there deserves great consideration. I would only throw out this, *en passant*, that perhaps sub-section (d) of that clause might be extended. It provides that a member:

“Will not, so long as he continues a member of the said House of Commons, accept any office or commission, work or employment in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, or at the nomination of the officers of the Government of Canada, to which any fee, salary, wages, allowance, emolument or profit of any kind is attached, whether in money or otherwise.”

I am surprised that the hon. gentleman did not extend that to the Governments of the different Provinces, so as to make members perfectly independent. It is all very well to make them independent of the Government of Canada and of its officers; but he should extend that principle so that no member of the House, as long as he continues to be a member—

“shall accept any office, or commission, work, or employment in the service of the Government of any Province at the nomination of the Crown, or at the nomination of the officers of the Government of such Province, to which any fee, salary, wages, allowance, emolument, or profit of any kind is attached, whether in money or otherwise.”

He would certainly make his Bill more stringent, and secure better the independence of the members of this House. Of course I throw that out in the meantime, so that it may be considered later on. The other clauses of the Bill are less important. The hon. gentleman will understand that I do not object to the second reading of the Bill, and I would suggest that it be then referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. I think the hon. member is a member of that Committee, and, as he knows, it is composed of the leading members of the legal profession in this House, who will certainly give to this Bill all the consideration that it deserves.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would just remark, concerning the observations made by the Minister of Public Works, that to secure the independence of Parliament is to secure the independence of Parliament from the Crown as represented by the Government of a Province, or in Australia, or in England. It is legislation in this House, and not for legislation in any other House, that we are here specially concerned with. We are not specially interested in maintaining what we call the independence of Parliament against the influence of a Provincial Administration, nor is the Provincial Administration specially interested as against us. We have no power of voting in the Provincial Legislature, because we are not members of that Legislature. But I am rather surprised at the declaration of the Minister, because it seems to me, from a hasty reading of this Bill, that the hon. gentleman ties himself to the principle of abolishing Cabinet Government; for if that Bill is carried, a member of the Government cannot remain in the House. I looked at the Bill hastily while the mover was discussing it, and I did not notice any provision excepting members of the Cabinet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend did not say that he approved of the whole Bill, but he said there was enough good in it to warrant him in agreeing to the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He supported the principle of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The principle of the Bill is to perfect the independence of Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). By excluding the members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is one of the clauses, but I dare say the Committee on Privileges and Elections will somewhat modify it, for the purpose of preserving Cabinets more valuable to the country than the present one. My

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

hon. friend wishes Parliament to be independent in a certain sense; he wants that there should be a limited liability, that we should be independent after a fashion, but that our independence should not be complete. However, that will be all considered by the Committee.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If the hon. member for Bothwell had read the Bill more carefully, he would have understood it better. The object of the Bill is to secure the independence of the members of this House from the control of the Ministers of the Crown—that is, to prevent them from asking any favors or receiving any favors from the Government, in order that they may be free to act, and not only be free to act, but bound to act to the best of their ability, without fear, favor or affection.

Mr. AMYOT. I will suggest to the mover that he make his Bill apply to relations, to sisters, cousins and aunts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. CHARLTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 38) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chapter eight of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I may remark that the election law of Canada, so far as it refers to the acts of a candidate with reference to individuals, is as stringent as could be desired. The candidate is debarred from the use of any corrupting influence with the individual voter. He can neither promise him employment, or pay him money, or influence him in any way, even by treating, and the provisions of the law in this regard do not require revision or amendment. The individual acts for which a member may be unseated, or some of them, are very insignificant in their character. For instance, I believe there is an hon. member of this House who was unseated on one occasion because an indiscreet friend of his, who was really not an agent, paid a man in liquor one dollar to get rid of his importunities, after the election had passed. The Government candidate, however, may, and often does, make use of influences that may have much more effect upon the results of an election than very many of those individual acts that are declared now under the law to be corrupt practices. The Government candidate is able to make promises to the voters of his riding in the shape of Government appropriations, that may, and often do, influence very largely a portion of the electorate in the riding which he seeks to represent. And this class of offences, I believe, are corrupt practices that require the attention of this House, as having a more corrupting influence on the electors of this country than very many of the practices that are now prohibited by the Election law. The Government of the country, too, can, if I may be permitted to use the expression, resort to practices which are little short of bribery *en bloc* with respect to ridings all over this Dominion; and we are all quite well acquainted with the Government methods for the purpose of influencing elections. For instance, the Government may, if there is a redistribution of seats, if a Province is to be accorded one, two, three or four additional represen-

tatives, it may, as it has done heretofore, re-arrange ridings in such a way as to secure a very corrupt advantage at the elections. The Government may, in its distribution of patronage, in fact, it does in its distribution of patronage, seek to influence the elections, and it succeeds in doing so to a very great degree. In its appropriations, presumably for the public good, appropriations which should be made impartially, without reference to the effect they may have on the elections, the Government are charged with, and I believe the Government are guilty of the offence of making those appropriations in such a way as to redound to their own political advantage in the elections in every portion of the Dominion. The Government have made use, as we are all well aware, of its ability to reward favorites, by granting timber limits, by granting pasture leases, and by granting bonuses to railways, and a very serious abuse has gradually grown up, which has cost this country many millions of dollars, purely for the purpose of strengthening the Government, purely for the purpose of influencing the ridings, purely for the purpose, in short, of buying support, by the expenditure of public money in vast sums. The methods adopted are perfectly well understood; and supporters of the Government, it is well known, can obtain favors from the Government, which no member sitting on the Opposition side would think for a moment of asking, or have the remotest chance of getting if he did ask it. The public interest is not taken into account in these matters. It is not a question the Government asks as to whether this appropriation will be in the general public interest. That question has no bearing whatever with the Government; but these appropriations, if we scrutinise their character closely, in the great majority of cases, are made, purely and simply, for the purpose of strengthening the Government and make more certain a renewal of its lease of power at the next general elections. The annual increase of our debt, which has been very rapid, which has been in fact alarming, has been largely due to this method of appropriation and the granting of bonuses made by the Government purely for political purposes. In this plan of appropriation, if we had time to go into the details, we would find very striking abuses. I will mention one or two. For instance, take the case of the hon. member who represents the County of Haldimand. The Government have made appropriations which are presumably, which I assert are beyond doubt, made simply for the purpose of strengthening that hon. gentleman in his riding. We have for the little insignificant village of Cayuga, comprising 600 souls, an appropriation made for the purpose of erecting a costly post office, while Woodstock, one of the most prosperous cities in the Dominion, has no public post office, simply, I presume, for the reason that the riding has been, from time immemorial, represented by an opponent of the Government. The little village of Hagarville, in Haldimand county, has been made a port of entry. There was no necessity for it. There are scores of places in Ontario more entitled to the privilege which the Government has accorded it of being made a port of entry than the insignificant village of Hagarville. I might instance cases almost without number of this character, where appropriations have been made clearly for the purpose of influencing elections and where no other reason

existed for making such appropriation. Our friends from the Maritime Provinces, in the course of the debate raised on the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) a day or two ago, laid before the country the character of the appropriations made by the Government for the purpose of constructing piers, lighthouses, harbors and other public works. In regard to the appropriations made for railways, I might instance the case of the South Norfolk Railway, where the present Conservative representative secured a bonus for a railway some 17 miles in length. I venture to say that the gentleman who previously represented the riding (Mr. Jackson), who was not a supporter of the Government, would never have dreamed of asking for such an appropriation, and he would not have had the remotest chance of securing it if he had asked it. Now, unquestionably, the members who support the Government, are well satisfied with this condition of things. It is natural they should be so. There is a passage in the Scriptures which says: "Doeth the wild ass bray when at grass, or loweth the ox over his fodder." This is pasture and fodder for these gentlemen. The Government furnishes money for public works to secure them in their seats, and they are amply satisfied with the system; but it is a corrupting system, and one which should be ended in this country. The penalties under the Act at present are stringent and severe, but these penalties are not sufficient. I claim there are classes of corrupt influence used by the Government and by the friends of the Government, which should be dealt with by the election laws of this country. The first section of the Bill which I move tonight is as follows:—

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

The candidate who offers to a voter a dollar to stay at home, or a dollar to vote for him, who calls a voter up and gives him a cigar, who hires a team to transport a few voters to the polling booths on election day, will be unseated for that act; but he may make promises of the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars in his riding, he may induce numbers of people, as being a supporter of the Government and as having influence to secure appropriations, to vote for him, and he may by that promise, secure hundreds of votes. The promise may be one that will give to hundreds of voters promise of employment. If he promised, in his individual capacity, employment for one day to a voter, he would be unseated, but he may promise employment to hundreds of men by an expenditure of public money, and by that means influence the election and secure his seat, and he may do this under the present law without being guilty of a corrupt practice, or with having used a corrupt influence at elections.

The second section of the Bill is as follows:—

"Any grant of money, unless for necessary repairs or demanded by urgent public necessity, made by the Government of Canada for any railway, or public work or building within any constituency where an election is to be held within ten months from the date of the making of such grant, and calculated to influence the result of such

election in the interest of the candidate favorable to the Government, is a corrupt practice within the meaning of the said Act."

If that clause were a part of the election law it would debar the Government from making the large appropriations which are made on the eve of every election for the express purpose of influencing the result in their favor. It would be the means of saving the country millions of dollars, it would be the means of securing a purer election and of debarring the Government from engaging in a wholesale system of bribery, and of expending the public money for the purpose of influencing elections; and certainly no amendment of the election law that could be proposed could be a more reasonable one, and one better calculated to obtain greater purity in elections than is this clause of the Bill.

The third sub-section provides as follows:—

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

Now, Sir, the agent of a candidate may go into a riding, and he may promise the smallest advantage to an individual voter, and that promise on the part of the agent of the candidate is a corrupt act and voids the election. But a Cabinet Minister may go into the riding and make promises of lavish expenditure, calculated to influence that election; any officer in the employ of the Government may do the same thing, and may exercise a thousandfold the influence of the agent on the individual voter, yet he escapes scot free. Surely, the act of an officer of the Government in attempting to influence hundreds of voters in a riding, by the promise of the expenditure of public money, is tenfold more corrupt than the influencing by an agent of an individual voter.

The fourth clause of the Bill provides:

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

Very many of these inferential promises held out to constituencies, by the sending of engineers to survey works that it is alleged the Government intend to undertake, are the barest swindle, for they are done very often without any intention on the part of the Government to proceed with this work, and for the express purpose of influencing the election that is pending. The sending of engineers to survey public works, and thereby conveying the impression to the voters of the riding that if the Government be sustained in power, they are likely to proceed with the construction of these works to the great advantage of the constituency in a pecuniary sense, is, in the highest degree, reprehensible. If any corrupt practice is to be declared illegal by the election law, surely this one should be so declared. We have in this country a political conscience and a private conscience, and there is a great deal of

Mr. CHARLTON.

difference between the ethics that pertain to private transactions and the ethics that pertain to political transactions. The treating of a voter, or the hiring of a team, are acts which the voter sees are made illegal; but the voter sees the Government rewarding its followers by the granting of timber limits, as they did some years ago. He sees the policy of the Government with regard to the superannuation of men in the prime of life, for the purpose of making vacancies to be filled by the favorites of the Government, as a reward, perhaps, for political services. He sees millions of money squandered in bonuses for railway enterprises which are totally unnecessary in the general interest of the country, but which are made for the purpose of influencing the result of the elections in Provinces, or in ridings. He sees such transactions as the Onderdonk contract, passing unchallenged, as well as the wholesale granting of money to the Canadian Pacific Railway; and he contrasts these with the stringent conditions of the law with regard to his individual action. He loses faith in the Government, he loses faith in the institutions of the country, and he draws the inference that there is neither justice nor truth in the administration of public affairs. The voter arrives at the conclusion that the Government may do, with impunity, acts a thousandfold more reprehensible than the acts for which, if he performs them, he is liable to severe punishment. The progress of the political demoralisation of this country, since the Pacific scandal, has been of the most alarming character. Perhaps it is a fortunate thing, if we look at it in the right light, that the policy of the Government has made this country miserably poor; for if we were in a state of affluence, we might, like Jeshurun, with all the corrupting influences at work, "wax fat and kick." If we had gone on in luxury I do not know what disaster might fall on the country. We are too poor to be corrupt as we might be, but so far as the Government can corrupt, by its policy, the electors of the country, and so far as they can introduce false opinions as to the line of policy to be pursued, the Government has done that as best they could. I say, with regard to the Government, in a collective sense, and with regard to the offences committed in a general sense, that the Government is the great briber, the great demoraliser, and the great debaucher of the public conscience of this country, by the policy it has pursued. I do not say that in an offensive sense as regards individuals, but I speak of the policy of the Government. It has produced most deplorable results, and it is time that such a policy should be changed. I propose by this measure to ask the Government to consent to the curtailment of its own power for evil. I propose that the Government shall be willing to place on the Statute-book a law that will enable it to be more virtuous, and will compel it to be more virtuous if it does not feel inclined to be so. I move the second reading of this Bill, in order that it may render the Government more amenable to the principles of morality.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that this Bill be read a second time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it will be the pleasure of the House to adopt this Bill. It is simply a wanton

insult to any Government, and to every Government in this country. The hon. gentleman in his Bill assumes in the first place that every Government will be corrupt, and that, therefore, being corrupt, they must be deprived of all the powers which have been hitherto thought requisite for the public interest, either in England or in any of the colonies. The phraseology of the Bill is singular; we will take the first clause:

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

What does the hon. gentleman mean by "in the interest of the Government?" All a person has to do is to say, that he is not going in the interests of the Government. The hon. gentleman does not seem to know the difference between the Government and the Ministry. The Government is a permanent institution in which the representative of the Sovereign is one of the main elements, and the Ministry is quite a different thing. If a man says he is a supporter of the Ministry of the day, he cannot tell his constituents that he will work for them; he cannot say that he will try to get something done for his county; he cannot say that he will be active; but if he says he is opposed to the Ministry of the day, he can make all these promises. I will give you an instance. The hon. gentleman, in his speech just now, spoke of a post office having been built at Cayuga, a small place, when there was no post office built in Woodstock, which is a large town. Well, let us suppose that there are two candidates running for the county. The hon. gentleman opposite, who now so ably represents South Oxford, could denounce the Government for not having made a grant for a post office. He could say: "Let us turn out this do-nothing Government, this corrupt Government, which has helped other places but has not helped Woodstock, and when our party comes in, we will see that justice shall be done to Woodstock." He could make that speech; but if the candidate opposing him should say: "Woodstock has been too long neglected, and if I am elected, I will wake up this sleepy Government and try to get them to give us a vote for a post office," according to this Bill, the hon. gentleman who now sits for South Oxford would be quite right to make that speech, but the candidate opposing him would commit a corrupt act which would, if he were elected, turn him out of the House and disqualify him for eight years, for doing what the hon. gentleman on the other side has done, and I have no doubt will again do with his accustomed ability and energy. So with all the rest of the Act. It says:

"Any grant of money, unless for necessary repairs or demanded by urgent public necessity, made by the Government of Canada for any railway or public work or building within any constituency where an election is to be held within ten months from the date of the making of such grant."

I do not know that the present Minister of Public Works is gifted with the Scotch gift of second sight, by which he can know when the seat is going to be vacant, or can guess when the incumb-

ent is going to die, or resign, or be appointed to office; yet if it happens by any chance that any necessary expenditure is made in any constituency within ten months of an election in consequence of the member being carried off by *la grippe* or anything else, a corrupt act has been done. The whole Bill is a parcel of nonsense, and is quite unworthy of the hon. gentleman who has introduced it. I move that this Bill be read a second time this day six months.

Mr. LAURIER. No one expected that the hon. gentleman would accept this measure. My hon. friend drew it in full anticipation of the opposition which it meets from the other side of the House; but no one expected that the hon. gentleman would characterise it as a wanton insult to the Government. My hon. friend in his remarks did not say or imply that all governments were corrupt; but he not only implied, but he distinctly said, that this Government was corrupt. Now, this is an opinion which it is the privilege of every subject of Her Majesty to entertain with regard to the present Government, and that privilege carries with it the further privilege of expressing that opinion in so many words; and it is because my hon. friend has not full confidence in the honesty of the present Government, that he says he wants to prevent them doing wrong, if it is possible to do so, by law. This is the nature of this measure. I think my hon. friend may possibly agree with me that his measure is not as happily worded as my right friend opposite would have worded it if he had framed it himself; but, Sir, is this Bill, which I believe to be a good Bill, the only thing in the world which is not an unmixed good? Are we to adopt the doctrine that because a thing is not perfect we are not to attempt to perfect it, but should throw it aside altogether? This is the objection of the hon. gentleman. He says the Bill is unhappily worded and is a piece of nonsense; but if it is based on a true principle, that is a reason why we should do what we have done but a few minutes ago with regard to another Bill, namely, to pass it through its second reading, and then refer it to a committee which would put it in better language. In my judgment the principle of this Bill is unimpeachable. What have the people to do in a general election? They have to pass on the policy of the Government. The Government boast of their policy, and yet I never knew an instance of their going to the people on the merits of that policy alone since they came into power in 1878. In 1882 their National Policy was in full bloom, but did they go to the country on the simple merits of that policy? Why, Sir, it is on record that they loaded the dice as far as they could. They did not go to the electors and ask them to try them on the merits of the National Policy, but they adopted the Gerrymander Act in order to obtain an undue advantage over their opponents. So in 1887, when they again went to the country. They did not appeal to the electors simply on the merits of their policy, but they were careful to obtain for themselves an undue advantage by the Franchise Act. On every occasion when there has been an election, whether a general election or a bye-election, these promises of public works, which are objected to in this Bill, have been a constituent of the elections. We had

a motion the other day, moved from this side of the House, and accepted by the hon. gentleman, that the construction of public works should be determined simply by the public interest. The hon. gentleman assented to that doctrine in words, but he has never assented to it in practice. What is the language used in every election by every ministerial candidate? It is simply this: "If you elect a supporter of the Government, you will have public works." We have heard that in this election and that election, in this Province and that Province, everywhere; and the electors are further told: "If you do not elect a supporter of the Government, a candidate of the Opposition will not be able to obtain any favor from the Government. So these public works, which the hon. gentleman said a few days ago should be determined only by the public interest, are always used in election times as an inducement to the electors to support the Ministerial candidates. This is what my hon. friend is opposed to. The right hon. gentleman says that we may make promises from this side of the House. Let him then amend the Bill and agree that those promises shall be carried out, whether made by a Ministerial or any other candidate, and then the objection will be obviated. He referred to the case of Woodstock. Well, if the hon. gentleman were to agree to the doctrine which we laid down a few days ago, there would be no occasion for any candidate in Woodstock or elsewhere to refer to public works, because then they would be built according to public standard. It may be that the Bill is not as aptly framed as it might be. It may be that it might be improved in its wording; but it must strike any man that if we are to have anything like purity in our elections, if we are to have the action of the Government pronounced upon fairly, we must prevent the Government exercising the corruption my hon. friend desires to guard against, and this Bill, if adopted, will certainly be a step in that direction.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is highly desirable that some change should take place in the law, for as it now exists it is quite clear that the Government exercise an undue influence in every constituency in this Dominion whenever there is an election. No one who has observed the course of the Government since Confederation down to the present time, can fail to observe that every provision of her constitution which could possibly be violated has been violated, and every law which could be turned into account to secure to the party now in power the perpetuation of their lease of office, has been so used. The hon. gentleman who introduced this measure referred to the Superannuation Act. That Act, which was intended to secure a small sum to those who were worn out in the service of the country, in order to enable them to be independent for the balance of their days, has been grossly abused. We see to-day men superannuated under that Act who are as healthy as any man in this House, and who were superannuated solely because their places were wanted for some others who had claims on the Government. In that way we are forced to pay \$225,000 a year for the superannuation of civil servants, \$100,000 of which has been incurred within the last ten years. This superannuation tax has increased from year to year, until to-day we are paying at the rate of

Mr. LAURIER.

\$225,000 a year. Take the question of railways, and what are the facts? It was well understood at the time of Confederation that the Provinces should manage matters connected with their local lines; but in order to take out of the hands of the Local Governments the handling of local lines of railways, a Bill was introduced, under that provision in the Confederation Act by which all lines declared for the general advantage of Canada should be looked upon and treated as Dominion lines, and passed, and the result was that every line of railway, whether it was a small local line or not, as soon as it was connected with any main line, was declared to be for the general advantage of the country, and brought under the intention of the Government, and then began the general wholesale subsidising of roads in all directions when it was thought any good could be accomplished for the Tory party. Constituencies came here and asked for charters and applied for bonuses, and we had the ridiculous farce on several occasions of constituencies asking bonuses for five miles of a railway declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, because it connected with the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, and because it was located in a riding where it was thought the granting of a bonus would be an advantage to the party running in the interest of the Government. Take the small bonus granted to the line of road running in connection with the Toronto, Grey and Bruce to Wingham. That road was subsidised by hon. gentlemen opposite to keep out of the House the man who now sits here. There are hundreds of cases like that. Take the erection of the post office in Goderich. The First Minister went round on his election tour before the last general election. There was no post office in Goderich then, and whether he made a promise or not is not known, but there is no doubt the hon. gentleman has had erected a post office at Goderich. Why?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because it is a small village.

Mr. McMULLEN. Because the hon. gentleman who sat on this side for that constituency was defeated, and, as a mark of appreciation of the defeat of a man who was a thorn in the side of the hon. gentleman, he erected a post office at Goderich. It was erected there simply because he was grateful to that constituency for turning out of the House one of the best men that ever sat in it—a man who fearlessly exposed the transactions of hon. gentlemen opposite, a man who never lost an opportunity of showing to this country the nature of the transactions the Government was guilty of. It was thought desirable by any and every means to get rid of him, and the result is that a monument in memory of his defeat is erected in Goderich. They should print over the door of that post office: "Erected in memory of the defeat of M. C. Cameron." My hon. friend has stated something with regard to Cayuga. It is a known fact that the post office was erected there solely because the people had elected at one time the hon. gentleman who now represents that constituency. We had in this House the other night the fact brought out of several buildings having been erected in the Province of Quebec, which no doubt were erected for the same purpose. I drew attention to one or two myself, and stated that I believed the Minister

of Public Works was using the construction of public buildings to manipulate the elections, and secure the returns of members to support the Tory party. I say that the looseness with which public money has been squandered from one end of the Dominion to the other has been the means of increasing our debt and the responsibilities of the people. We are now laboring under an annual expenditure of \$40,000,000 a year to 5,000,000 people. That is largely owing to the improvidence of hon. gentlemen opposite. We know well that when Sir Charles Tupper came across last time from Great Britain with the object of trying to secure a solid following in the Province of Nova Scotia, it was stated plainly and openly through the press that it would cost from \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000 to implement the promises made on that occasion by the Government. We have built the Oxford and New Glasgow line, which cost an enormous amount of public money, to duplicate our present line, and in place of bettering the condition of that road which the people constructed, and for which they do not receive a cent in return, it injures it. And this was done in order to secure the election in the Counties of Cumberland and Gloucester of supporters of the Dominion Government; and to secure in the County of Pictou the return of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That county was subsidised by the construction of the Pictou branch at an expense of \$550,000. In all directions money has been recklessly squandered in order to secure the return of Government supporters. My hon. friend deserves credit for bringing in this Bill. I did not expect the Government would accept it. I knew well they would not, because the First Minister has told us he feels very comfortable in the position he has held for a number of years, by means of the exercise of enormous influence through subsidies to railways, erecting public buildings, the superannuation system, timber limits and the many other human devices in which he is past master. But it has been a serious thing for this country, because the hon. gentleman has been adding a million a month to the debt of the country for every month during which he has held office. If you examine the national debt, you will find that my statement is correct, and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman is willing to continue to add a million a month to the debt in order to hold office. I believe he has made up his mind that, as long as he is allowed to breathe breath—no matter what the results to the people may be, no matter what the increased drain on the resources of the people may be—any means which may be used to keep him in office he will exercise. We are aware that, to the discredit of the party which the hon. gentleman has led so long, we had the discreditable Gerry-mander Act passed, which was intended to beat men out of their rights and to sustain that party in power. The hon. gentleman says that if the town of Woodstock has not a public building, the hon. member who represents that constituency can easily make a strong appeal to the electors against the Government because they refused to build a post office there, and so can assure his return to the House at the next election. The hon. gentleman knows very well that nine-tenths of the electors in that county are Grits, because he knows that he hived them all together. He knows that they do not take any stock in the hon. gentle-

man, and that they would not elect a supporter of his in any case, and that is the reason why there is no post office in Woodstock. If it would be the means of electing a supporter of his, there would be a post office there very quickly, and there would be a pavement in front of it which might cost double the amount which the pavement cost in front of the building at Napanee, which was \$2,000, and the hon. gentleman would spend \$10,000 for a pavement in front of a building in Woodstock, if he thought it would result in attaining his object. I say that this Bill should become law, and that the party opposite would do themselves credit by frankly acknowledging, even at this late date, that the law of the country should be changed in this regard. It would be a great relief to the hon. gentleman himself, for he would no longer have deputations coming to him every day, urging and praying and begging for bonuses for railways and bridges and for other advantages. I suppose, however, that he is accustomed to that now, and that it is pleasant to him, and that he likes to see these people buzzing around him. If this measure were passed, he would not be bothered with them as he is now. I say that measure should become law, and I say it is unfair to the party in opposition—I care not what political complexion they may have—that the Government should be able to use the great power which they have in their hands in this way. Until we have a purer system, we will have a continuation of the present mode of managing affairs. Our debt will roll up every year and the people will become financially enslaved; we will have to resort to repudiation, or the population will be practically enslaved by the Government.

Mr. PORTER. It was not my intention to trouble the House with any remarks, if the hon. gentleman had not attacked my action in the election in 1887. I did not desire to be dragged into this debate, even by the remarks of the hon. gentleman, because, as the Spanish author has told us, "There is never anything to be made by breaking a lance on a windmill." As to the post office in Goderich, which the hon. gentleman accuses the Government of having promised in order to aid my election, I tell him here from my place that he is saying what is not true. I tell him that, during my whole canvass, not in any meeting which I held, was a word spoken or a promise made by me that any public work would be undertaken in that riding. I defy the hon. gentleman, or any one in this House, or outside of this House, to say that I, in any public meeting, or in my private canvass, represented to the people of West Huron that one dollar would be expended on any public works. I say further, that the building of a post office in Goderich was a work of necessity. If the hon. gentleman has ever visited that town, he must know that the public building which was used there was altogether inadequate, and was almost a disgrace to the town. He must know that it is a poor, miserable building; and he must also know that the Customs revenue at that port is of considerable magnitude, while the revenue of the post office alone is between \$5,000 and \$6,000 per annum. I think that any attack upon the Government, or upon the member who represents that riding for using his influence with the Government in this matter, is wholly unjustified, and could

only come from a man whose mind is as small as his utterances are mean.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is to be regretted that the First Minister, before calling upon his supporters to vote down this measure, did not venture to offer any argument in support of his position. I think he did not on this occasion rise to the gravity of the situation, and did not deal with it in the manner which it deserves to be dealt with. We are face to face with a very grave condition of affairs. For many years the law has declared that bribery is illegal, and should be punishable in certain severe ways, but, while the principle of the law has been affirmed by statute, which was always the law in theory, we now find the law to be defective. There is no necessity to cite cases to support this fact. We all know that the practice has been resorted to, and it may be because the First Minister appreciates the results of that practice that he calls upon his supporters to vote down this measure. He ridicules some of the features of this Bill, and endeavors to kill it by ridicule. That is a favorite way of treating a matter of this kind when those who oppose it are unable to treat it on its merits.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has no merits.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sorry that the First Minister does not think it is meritorious to affirm that it is just as improper to buy elections by wholesale, when the law says they shall not be bought by retail. I say, that this matter lies at the foundation of the liberties of the people. The First Minister and his colleagues are now affirming that it is meritorious to use the people's money to buy the people's liberties, in order to sustain a certain Administration in power. Why, Sir, admit such a principle as that, and what becomes of our boasted representative institutions? They pass away. The people become in that way corrupted, they place themselves in a position to be bought with their own money, and then, they cease to be a free people, Parliament ceases to be a representative institution, and the Minister, by his argument, says that that is the proper condition of a free people, that it is not meritorious to ask to free them from those who should be their servants, but who have now become their masters, and that we shall now throw out of Parliament a measure, right in principle, endorsed in principle, always recognised in principle and endorsed by legislation as right and proper. Sir, we are face to face with a threatened danger, a danger not merely threatening one Government or one party, but a danger that strikes at the foundation of the institutions we are supposed to guard here. Are we here to allow the Government, because they are entrusted with the public money, quietly to take the people by their throats and, by abusing their position, to solidify themselves in office, make themselves the masters of those to whom they should be the servants? I regret that the First Minister has not risen to the occasion, at all events that he does not treat seriously and with argument a question of the importance of that involved in this Bill. If there is something in it that does not commend itself to him, there is something in it that does. I do not choose to follow the isolated illustration of Woodstock, or, for that matter, of Goderich. I know nothing about whether the hon. gentleman who has posed

Mr. PORTER.

as Don Quixote, is right or wrong in his presentation of the case; it is not necessary to dispose of this proposition by an isolated case. We find, by reference to the statute, by the debates extending over years, what abuse the Government has made of their power. We have it in the very case referred to by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), how that New Glasgow road was constructed for nothing but corrupt purposes; we have had the experience before us last year, and again this year, of the acts of the Administration in trying to implement the promise made to the Maritime Provinces, to build a short line railway from Harvey to Salisbury. Why was that promise made? Why was it endeavored to be carried out? There never was a good argument presented on the floor of this House in defence of the proposition to expend several million dollars to construct a short line railway from Harvey to Salisbury. The Government dared not give the true reason to the House. The argument could only be made in secret. Certain reasons were assigned by the Government, but they were so unsound that their own supporters in the Senate, a body not amenable to public opinion, in a sense, refused to listen to the arguments that were advanced. But we have to look to our financial statements to find out the consequences of this state of affairs. As the member for North Wellington says: Look at our public debt if you want to see whether there is any need of this amendment to the law; look at our Estimates for this year. The hon. gentleman says that the Minister of Public Works is not gifted with foresight, but I think every member in this House who is possessed of the slightest degree of sagacity—and I assume we are all possessed of some—may safely make up their minds when the Dominion elections are imminent, the public records of this House will show that we are going to be saddled with an enormous advance to our debt for the purpose of carrying these hon. gentlemen safely through the next general election. Look at the measures of the Government introduced at the dying moments of every Parliament since the First Minister has been in office, and what do they show? Whenever he is about to go through a general election you will find large sums of money voted for this or that enterprise. Why is it that these good things are all reserved until the eve of a general election? How comes it that there is only one house-cleaning during the whole life of a Parliament, and that that takes place about the time they are laying down the reins of office, and going back to their constituents to ask for a renewal of confidence? How comes it, if these things are all so pure, that they are all reserved to this particular period? I again express my deep regret that the First Minister has, on this occasion, appeared in the roll of a backslider. A couple of days ago, he was repudiating any such thing as a corrupt act, and I began to have a great deal of confidence in him, and said to myself: "The old man is not so bad as they have been telling us." I began to have hopes for him when I saw him repudiating the conduct of an hon. member, and declaring that these actions should be thoroughly ventilated, under oath, before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, holding up his hands—they seemed to be all right—and I began to think that the First Minister was in his latter days going to reverse his record and go

back to reform principles. Even now, late as it is in the debate, can he not take a turn round again? He has taken many a sharp curve before, and can he not go back on his utterances of a few moments ago, see the error of his way, and repent before this Bill is disposed of, and declare himself in favor of further adding to the securities of the people and the good government of the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) stated a few moments ago that the leader of this Government has added a million a month for every month he has held office since Confederation. I think that statement should be taken with a grain of salt, indeed I think it would take a whole barrel. When Confederation was formed this Dominion assumed the debts of the different Provinces, amounting to some 130 millions.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. During the five years of the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite they increased the national debt by about 40 millions, and adding that to the debt assumed at Confederation we find that the total debt amounted to 170 millions. The total debt to-day is 240 millions. Deduct from that 170 millions, and we have only 70 million dollars for which this Government are responsible; still the hon. member says that this Government has spent a million a month for every month they have held office. Well, they have held office about 18 years, or 216 months, which, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, would make, 216 millions. The fact is the present Government has increased the debt by only 70 millions, making 146 millions of a misstatement by the hon. gentleman opposite. That is on a par with all the statements that hon. gentleman makes, when he attacks the leader of the Government and the members supporting him.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to make a correction. In the first place the statement of the hon. member is not correct when he says the debt at Confederation was 130 millions. It was only 75 millions. I stated that since Confederation—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; you have already spoken.

Mr. SCRIVER. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman in the statement he has made. He has tried to lead this House astray: he has made a statement that is not correct, not in accordance with the facts, and I simply wish the privilege of showing wherein he is incorrect. He stated that the net debt at the time of Confederation was \$130,000,000. That is not correct; it was \$75,800,000. He stated again that the Reform Government during the time they were in office, from 1874 to 1878, increased the debt of the country \$34,000,000. That is not correct, because the debt was created by their predecessors before they took office, and they had to find the money to pay it.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much did they increase it?

Mr. McMULLEN. They had to find money to pay expenditures to which their predecessors had committed the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House how much they did increase it?

Mr. McMULLEN. From 1878 to 1889, a period of eleven years, the public records show that this Government has added \$132,000,000 to the debt. I say the statement I made is correct to the letter; the present Government have added the amount I have stated, and the records will prove it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried, carried.

Mr. LAURIER. I think we had better dispose of this question now.

Mr. SCRIVER. With the permission of the House, I withdraw my motion for the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried, carried.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope the Government are not disposed to shirk this question, and do not propose to avail themselves of the motion made for the purpose of allowing the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to make an explanation, to shirk the issue and avoid a vote upon the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. The majority can have their way. If the debate is to be adjourned, we are willing, and we will spend another evening on it.

Motion to adjourn debate withdrawn.

House divided on amendment of Sir John A. Macdonald (six months' hoist):

YEAS:
Messieurs

Amyot,	Labrosse,
Audet,	Landry,
Bain (Soulanges),	Languevin (Sir Hector),
Barnard,	La Rivière,
Bell,	Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),
Bergeron,	Lovitt,
Bergin,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Boisvert,	Macdowall,
Bowell,	McCulla,
Boyle,	McDonald (Victoria),
Brown,	McDougal (Pictou),
Bryson,	McGreevy,
Cameron,	McKay,
Cargill,	McKeen,
Carling,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Carpenter,	McNeill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Madill,
Cimon,	Mara,
Cochrane,	Mason,
Cockburn,	Moffat,
Colby,	Moncrieff,
Corby,	Montplaisir,
Coughlin,	Patterson (Essex),
Coulombe,	Pope,
Curran,	Porter,
Daly,	Prior,
Davis,	Purcell,
Dawson,	Putnam,
Denison,	Riopel,
Desaulniers,	Robillard,
Desjardins,	Roome,
Dewdney,	Ross,
Dickey,	Rykert,
Dickinson,	Shanly,
Dupont,	Small,
Earle,	Smith (Ontario),
Ferguson (Leeds and Gren.),	Stevenson,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Taylor,
Ferguson (Welland),	Temple,
Foster,	Tisdale,
Freeman,	Tyrwhitt,
Gigault,	Vanasse,
Gordon,	Wallace,
Grandbois,	Ward,
Guillet,	Weldon (Albert),
Haggart,	White (Cardwell),
Hale,	Wilmot,

Hesson,
Hickey,
Jamieson,
Jones (Digby),
Kenny,

Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wilson (Lennox),
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland).—103.

NAYS:
Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),
Barron,
Béchar, d,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brien,
Burdett,
Campbell,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Casgrain,
Charlton,
Davies,
De St. Georges,
Doyon,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,
Fise,
Fisher,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Guay,
Innes,
Kirk,
Lang,
Langelier (Montmorency),

Langelier (Quebec),
Laurier,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
McIntyre,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,
Meigs,
Mitchell,
Mulock,
Neveu,
Perry,
Platt,
Préfontaine,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Rowand,
Ste. Marie,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Trow,
Turcot,
Watson,
Weldon (St. John),
Welsh,
Wilson (Elgin),
Yeo.—60.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I beg to call your attention to the fact that, through inattention at the moment the vote was being taken, I voted in a way that I did not intend to vote. The vote which I intended to give was against the amendment, and I ask that my name be entered as voting against the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. It might perhaps be advisable at this moment to call the attention of hon. members, more especially of those who have had long experience, to the fact that I do not think the vote given by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) should be altered, according to the authorities. Both May and Bourinot cite the English practice. We have no precedent in our parliamentary history. It might, perhaps, be well for the House to discuss this matter, for, if we are going to create a precedent, the subject should be well considered and discussed before such precedent is created.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. In the nineteen sessions during which I have sat in this House I remember several instances, although I now cannot call attention to the particular cases, where a member has voted, through inattention, on the side on which he did not intend to vote, and he has invariably been allowed to correct his vote on stating his intention to the House. I am quite willing that a different precedent should be established in the future if such is the will of the House; but as such has been the practice hitherto, and as such has been done during the present session in the case of an hon. member, I hold that I should be allowed to correct my vote. During the present session the hon. member for East Assiniboia was allowed this privilege on explaining that a mistake had occurred, and his vote was entered as he wished it to be entered.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I beg your pardon. It never occurred.

Mr. CASEY. I claim what is sauce for the Mr. LAURIER.

goose should be sauce for the gander. The hon. member for West Assiniboia is the hon. gentleman to whom I should have referred. I am asked who was the goose? You pay your money and you take your choice. It was foolish on my part to make the mistake, but a strict rule should not be enforced now, when it has not been enforced hitherto; and I should be allowed to record my vote as I wish it to be recorded on this occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the House must yield to the impassioned appeal of the hon. member, and allow him to change his vote. We will give him some of the sauce. At the same time, I would say that the point is worthy of consideration, as to whether, when a vote is once registered, it should not remain; and for one reason, there might be a tie, and then, at the last moment, for party purposes, an hon. member might change his vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. You are not so far gone as that yet.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not quite sure, with all deference to you, Mr. Speaker, that the rule is exactly as you have put it down. If a name was erroneously entered on the roll, it would be quite an anomaly that it should remain there, and surely under such circumstances the list must be corrected.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In response to your request, Mr. Speaker, to ascertain what was the recollection of the older members of the House, I may say that my recollection distinctly is, that, under former Speakers, this thing has occurred more than once, and on several occasions what the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has asked to be done was done. Whether it was correctly done or not is another matter, and I am not prepared to offer an opinion on that; but, as a matter of fact, it has been done on former occasions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been done. Main motion, as amended, agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that notice of motion has been given by the Government to take Wednesday. If the House should adjourn now, it will be impossible to reach certain pressing private business this Session.

Mr. LAURIER. The next order is a Bill of my hon. friend from Laprairie (Mr. Doyon). A promise was given by the Government that the House would have an opportunity to consider it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That pledge will be carried out.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend from Gleggarry (Mr. Purcell) has a Bill on the paper of great importance to the laborers of the country, and I trust that he will have an opportunity to bring his Bill before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we will give him a chance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask if the hon. gentleman means to go into Supply to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I wish to give notice that certain matters have been put

into my hands affecting a company called "The Direct Meat Company" to which I will call the attention of the House when going into Committee of Supply. I may state that I do not intend to make a motion, but I will use the privilege of calling his attention to certain matters and asking for an explanation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Very well.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 20th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SMELT FISHING IN MIRAMICHI RIVER.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to so alter the fishing regulations, as to permit the taking of smelts during the fishing season in the Miramichi River above Middle Island?

Mr. COLBY. It is not the intention to change the regulation referred to at present. The object of the regulations was the protection of the bass fishing at that place during the limited period of three years.

NATIVE TOBACCO.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to continue in force the enactment which forbids the cultivators to manufacture into cut tobacco or cigars the tobacco which they raise for their own use and consumption?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is the intention of the Government to continue in force the enactment referred to.

ANNAPOLIS POST OFFICE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, (1) What area of land was purchased for the site of the public buildings in Annapolis? (2) From whom purchased, and at what price? (3) Was a lot adjoining the one selected offered for sale to the Government? (4) If so, at what price was it offered? (5) Who is the person in charge as inspector of said buildings? (6) What was his occupation prior to this appointment? (7) When appointed? (8) Is he engaged until the buildings are completed? (9) What salary does he receive?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In reply to the first part of the question, the answer is: The area purchased is 3,116 $\frac{3}{4}$ feet. (2) From Pickels & Mills, 50 feet by 48 $\frac{3}{4}$ feet, price \$3,300; and from John Buckley, 15 feet by 47 $\frac{1}{4}$ feet, at \$700; total, \$4,000. They were corner lots. (3) Another lot, two lots distant from the one selected, was offered by S. A. Corbitt for \$2,500. It was not a corner lot. (5) Charles Jacques. (6) House builder, bridge contractor and farmer. (7) 19th July, 1889. (8) Yes, so long as he satisfactorily discharges his duties. (9) \$75 per month, the usual amount paid to clerks of works. I may say that the vendors

also transferred whatever rights they may have to a strip of land lying in front of property sold, up to old line of street, an area of 1,386 feet.

PATENT BALLOT BOXES.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved:

That a Select Committee composed of Messrs. Edgar, Girouard, White (Cardwell), Kenny, Madill, Choquette, Ward, Perley, Brown, and the mover, be appointed to examine and report upon newly-invented ballot papers and ballot boxes to be used in parliamentary elections.

Mr. LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Several well-intentioned persons in the Dominion have thought, since the last time we deposited in one of the rooms of this House a ballot box furnishing a means of securing a better system of voting, that they could invent a system for registering votes which does not present the disadvantages and the defects of that at present in use. We all know that, under the present system, a number of votes are lost because the cross which is to be made in a certain part of the ballot paper may be formed in such a manner as to be interpreted by the returning officer as not being according to the provisions of the statute. The marking of ballot papers with ink, as any one of experience in elections well knows, often leads to the loss of votes on account of the ballot paper being maculated by the ink. Caveats have been taken out in the Patent Department recently for ballot boxes which secure full secrecy in the giving of the vote, and at the same time prevent any mistake in marking the paper, or the necessity of an illiterate voter having to mark his paper in the presence of the agents of the candidates. These boxes have been perfected, and have been sent to the Government for examination. At the same time, other persons have thought of keeping up the ballot paper system, but have suggested a kind of ballot paper made, printed and arranged in such a manner as to prevent in a large measure the mistakes in voting I have alluded to. No action has been taken by the Government, as they considered that the question of registering votes at elections was one which essentially belonged to Parliament. It is for that purpose that we decided to ask the appointment of a Committee to report to the House on these ballot paper boxes. The Committee will have an opportunity of inspecting those papers and boxes, and they can report to the House whether any one of these contrivances might be used more effectually in elections than the present system.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will these ballot boxes support the Government?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It depends on the material of which they are manufactured. If they are made of good stuff, they will, no doubt, support the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. I look with a good deal of suspicion on any proposition of this kind coming from the other side of the House. Ever since the present election law was passed, which I opposed in almost every particular, except the principle of the Bill, which fixes the power of regulating the franchise in the Parliament of Canada, I have felt, and experience has confirmed it, that the Bill is a dangerous one, and I shall look with a great deal of distrust on any proposition to purify

elections, and to ensure more correct and honest voting, coming from members on that side of the House, who proposed, carried out, and brought into existence, such a Franchise Bill as is now in existence in this country.

Mr. LAURIER. I think our present system has worked fairly well, though there have been some frauds and some errors in connection with it. What we want in any system of ballot is, as far as possible, to ensure fair play between the voters, and prevent any possibility of fraud. I have nothing to say, at this moment, as to the suggestion the hon. Minister offers, but it seems to me that the remark made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is not altogether out of place—that we must look with suspicion at what comes from the other side of the House in this respect. We should especially do that in this case when we look at the composition of the Committee, in which the hon. gentleman has not been at all fair to the Opposition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman object to the first name?

Mr. LAURIER. I do not object to the first name, but I object because there are not enough names of the same persuasion. Mr. Edgar and Mr. Choquette are the only two members of the Opposition on the Committee of ten which is proposed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection at all to ask that one or two Opposition members should be added.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest three more from the Opposition side, which would then make the Committee consist of five Opposition and eight ministerial members. If the hon. gentleman will agree to that, I would suggest Messrs. Sutherland, Watson and Langelier.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is really not at all a question of party. What we want to have is the best mode of taking the vote, without the suspicion of any outside influence being able to tamper with the voter when he goes up to vote. I must say that I think the present system is fairly satisfactory, and I should be quite satisfied to leave things as they are. But there are a great many schemes proposed, some, which I have seen, exceedingly ingenious, for promoting absolute secrecy. We are all interested in the same thing, namely, in having absolute secrecy in the polling of the vote, and in seeing that after it is polled there is no interference with it and no disputing it except on the suggestion of fraud; and if any of these schemes are likely to promote this object more effectively than the present system, I think they are worthy of being considered by a Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. I confess I entirely shared the view of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier), when I saw the composition of this Committee as proposed. It is all very well to say that we are all equally interested, and all want to see fair play; but one thing one always has to consider about a machine is the character of the man who works it; and when you find that the Government of the country has taken into its hands the appointment of the returning officers, who in turn appoint the deputy returning officers, the poll clerks, and all the other officers who are to have the control and the

Mr. MITCHELL.

handling of an election, then it is extremely important that the machinery placed in their hands should not be so pliable, or so excessively complicated, that it may give facilities for fraud still greater than those which pertain to the present system. I do not now recollect all the defects that were pointed out to me after the holding of the first election under the present system, but one I remember was, that the ballot papers were of such a thin and flimsy texture that it was impossible to mark them with the implements provided for that purpose without rendering it possible in the great majority of cases—and we know that in the great majority of cases a tolerably heavy hand is used—to perceive from the outside of the ballot paper, after it had been folded, the way in which the vote was marked. I agree with the view that, so long as you maintain the ballot system, it is of the last consequence, not merely that you should have security for secrecy, but that the mass of the voters should be persuaded that the ballot used is secret; because nothing is more common than to inform the voter that his vote can be found out, and that he must vote thus, and so, at the peril of his vote becoming known, notwithstanding the ballot. So I am informed. Therefore I agree that an arrangement under which, first of all, actual secrecy should be secured, and, secondly, under which that secrecy should be guaranteed, understandably by the mass of the voters and recognised and appreciated by them, would be very important. But, as I have said, we must take very great care that this machinery is not of such a pliable character as to be in danger of being put to the uses to which I have referred. The hon. gentleman is probably aware that, a few days ago, an investigation was held in the State of New York with reference to the election of a senator by a machine method which was supposed to work well, but which lent itself to most atrocious and widespread frauds. Therefore, it occurred to me that the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman, that this was a matter peculiar to the House itself, in which the Government did not wish to interfere—a suggestion which he sought to enforce by a committee composed of eight ministerial members and two Opposition members, with reference to machinery which was to be operated entirely by the hon. gentleman's friends—was a little “too thin.” There was not a great deal of secrecy about that, whatever there might be in the new ballot. I am glad to know, therefore, that the hon. gentleman and his leader feel that the Committee cannot assume quite that complexion, and that a larger representation is due to this side of the House, considering that the character of the operators gives us of the Opposition the greatest interest in the character of the machinery to be adopted.

Mr. HESSON. I congratulate the hon. gentleman in the remarks he has made as to the desirability of secrecy in the ballot system. It is that for which we in Ontario have been struggling for some time past, and it is that, I believe, for which the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature are struggling to-day; and I do hope that the remarks made by the ex-leader of the great Reform party of Canada, will have their influence in securing for the electors of Ontario the secrecy of the ballot which they so much desire. I am sure we cannot but feel that the hon. gentleman has struck a chord which will

vibrate in many a breast, and I hope that the Hon. Mr. Mowat and those opposing the principle of a secret ballot in the proper sense, will take notice of what the hon. gentleman has said, and will be influenced thereby.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I must repudiate any of the intentions which have been indirectly attributed to me in the composition of this Committee. I must say that I thought that the two gentlemen of the Opposition whom I put on that Committee would be faithful watchers and were sufficiently acquainted with the ways of elections not to be deluded by any devices of their opponents, but, Sir, it is not only the members of that Committee who will take an interest in its doings. I am sure that members on both sides of the House will examine those mechanical inventions, and they will be given every opportunity to do so before the Committee. So far is it from my desire to prevent the other side of the House from having a voice in the Committee, that I will add to my motion the names of any two or three other members from that side. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has stated that there were doubts as to the absolute secrecy of the votes given under the present system. I have no doubt that if people wish to know how others have voted, they can find out, in a great many cases, especially with regard to those who have not sufficient education to mark their papers and give their votes themselves. If there be connivance between the voter and the election agent, the voter may, by making his cross in a certain way, show the agent that he has voted according to his promise. I found in my experience that an agent of a candidate could tell by looking at their ballots whether certain voters had carried out their promises. My hon. friend has stated that in New York, despite the ingenious machinery used there, the boxes have been stuffed. Well, we need not go to New York to find instances of that practice. I had the misfortune at one time of being obliged to ask for the conviction of two or three of my fellow-countrymen, in a case in which I was acting as counsel, for having stuffed a ballot box, and by this means changed the result of the election. I need not mention names, but the case is well known to the members on the other side. What the Committee will be asked to examine is both the new ballot papers and ballot boxes. For my part, I would say that if some of the ballot boxes would work as their inventors pretend they will, they are by far preferable to the present system, because they provide the greatest secrecy to the voter. This invention does not, as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said, come from this side of the House. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) has told me that the inventor of the best of those ballot boxes is one of his electors. The inventions are those of well-meaning people who have no political object to serve. I don't know whether the change proposed will be found preferable to the present system, but I must say that the present system does not give absolute security of secrecy to the voter. In adding those names which my hon. friend will suggest, I would ask, with the consent of the other side, to add to the motion, for the instruction of the Committee:

And also on the best means of securing the secrecy of voting.

Mr. CASEY. I have no doubt at all that the desire of the vast majority of this House is to have an absolutely secret ballot, but I was rather astonished to find my right hon. friend the First Minister posing as one of the supporters of that kind of ballot, because, if my memory does not greatly deceive me, at the time the present Ballot Act was passed, the right hon. gentleman objected to the absolute secrecy which the promoters of that Bill claimed it secured, and preferred a system by which the voter would afterwards be identified on a judicial investigation—a system something similar in effect, though not in detail, to that now in force in Ontario. He wanted then to have the power of identifying a voter, of course in a judicial manner and before a judicial tribunal, at a future time; and was not then an advocate, but an opponent, of absolute secrecy in connection with the ballot. He appears to have changed his opinion, and I think he is right. At the same time it is very questionable whether any mechanical method of casting votes is superior to that of voting by ballot. Every machine for that purpose must involve certain technicalities in its management. The part to be performed by the voter may be very simple—the mere pulling of a handle or the turning of a crank; but still the manipulation of the machine to prepare it for the voter's use, and after a vote is given, for the use of the next voter, will require an expert's knowledge of its working; and as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has said, when the operation of the machine requires the handling of an expert, and the experts are all of one party, there is certainly room for grave suspicion as to the result. I claim further, that there is an advantage in voting by ballot, in that it preserves a record of the actual number of votes cast. I do not see how that can be done by a mechanical ballot box. These boxes all profess to record the votes at the time, but do not preserve a record of the votes cast.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Some do.

Mr. CASEY. I would urge as a *sine qua non* that some permanent record should be secured of the actual number of votes cast. It is quite possible, either from accident or fraud, that the parties who counted the votes might make a mistake, and there should be some means of recounting the votes at some future day, if the number be called in question. The vast experience evidently possessed by the Secretary of State, and of which he has given an example to-day in regard to the possibility of marking the ballots so that the agent can find out who marked them, shows that some reform is necessary. The hon. gentleman has given the benefit of his large experience in this respect to the Committee, and no doubt if we stick to the ballot, some improvement may be obtained. I do not believe that the Government, for their own purposes, can make any improvement on the old invention. In one county of New Brunswick, instead of having a machine to count the votes, they found the shortest way to secure what they desired, was to have a returning officer who would return the Government candidate in any case.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

BANKS AND BANKING.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the House do forthwith resolve itself into Committee on the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to extend the charter of the several banks in Canada, and to amend the laws relating to banking.

He said: As this is simply the formal motion which precedes the introduction of the Bill, and, I believe, necessarily precedes it, I shall take occasion at this time, inasmuch as the resolution itself gives very little insight into the nature of the Bill which may be founded upon it, to give a brief *résumé* of the Bill which will be introduced if the Committee adopt the resolution. It will be seen by those who make even the slightest review of the banking legislation since Confederation, that it has proceeded upon very conservative and very careful lines. What I mean by that is that it has never been attempted to carry out ambitious or revolutionary theories. I think I may say that our banking system is a growth which has developed out of the existing circumstances, the business interests, and the trade development of the country, and has kept very good pace with them. In 1867, the first enactment was passed, which did little else than continue for three years the charters of the incorporated banks then in existence, and to apply the system of a tax upon the bank circulation to the banks in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. In 1868, another idea seems to have prevailed, and legislation was had in that year which contemplated the taking over by the Government of the note circulation of the country, under arrangements which should be made with the different banks, upon the principle, I think, of paying the different banks a certain rate per annum, for the average circulation which they at that time possessed, and which should be continued until their charters expired. It appears, however, that this plan was not adopted by any of the banks, with the exception of one, which, I think, was the Bank of Montreal, and, in 1870, the legislation was repealed. In that year, the first extended legislation was had in reference to the banks. The charters were then continued for ten years and it was made obligatory that banks which were newly started should have a *bonâ fide* paid-up capital of \$200,000, that the circulation should never exceed the paid-up capital, that they should have no power to circulate notes below the value of \$4, and also that a certain amount of the cash reserves should be in Dominion notes—the minimum being 33 per cent., and the maximum to range somewhere in the vicinity of 50 per cent. A double liability of the shareholders was also provided for in that year, and arrangements were made to have lists of shareholders and stated returns published for the information of the shareholders and the general public. In 1871, legislation was again had in which the chief features of the Act of the preceding year were embodied. Some change was made in reference to the amount of capital, and it was then fixed as it remains to-day, that the subscribed capital must be \$500,000, with \$100,000 paid up, when a new bank was established, and \$100,000 more to be paid up within two years from the time of its commencing business. The next legislation took place in 1880, when the principal features added were that the Dominion notes to be held as reserves should be not less than 40 per cent., that the issue of four dollar notes be taken from the banks, and that the privilege of issuing fives and multiples of fives be continued, and that notes have a preferential lien in order to give greater security. These are the principal features of bank legislation as it

Mr. FOSTER.

exists to-day. In looking over that legislation, it seems to have been the purpose of Parliament not to interfere violently with what we may call the natural growth of the banking system in this country. Parliament, from time to time, at these different periods of revision, affirmed the principle that it possessed authority to control the circulation, and the power of circulation was continued to a greater or less degree to the banks as a privilege, the Government, in the meantime, taking over a certain proportion, from period to period, of the smaller note circulation of the country. It also appeared to be the desire of Parliament to hedge around the banking system, which then prevailed, by severer conditions of charter, by regulations which should be restrictive upon the dealings of the banks, especially with their own stock and with the stock of other banks, to foster the laying by of reserve capital, and by a judicious requirement of returns to perfect the system and render it as safe as possible without interfering voluntarily with the general principles upon which the banks had been operated from the earlier time. Concurrently with the legislation affecting the banks, there was legislation, from period to period, affecting the circulation of the country. Before 1867 there had been, by the united Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, legislation which had the effect of calling into possible existence the circulation of Provincial notes to the extent of \$5,000,000, with a limit above that of \$3,000,000 contingent upon the banks giving up their power of issue, to be assumed by the Government. In 1868, I think, or in 1867, the Parliament of the Dominion legislated in the same direction and authorised an issue of that amount of notes, and made it obligatory that a specie reserve of 20 or 25 per cent. should be held therefor. Various changes were made as to the limit of this note circulation and as to the reserve until in 1880, the limit was fixed at \$20,000,000 and the reserve at 25 per cent., not less than 15 per cent. of which must be in gold. I find that the Government circulation has increased from Confederation up to the present time, until last year the average was some \$15,000,000. The circulation of the banks has risen from about 10 millions in 1867, to a maximum of 35 millions and a least circulation of 30 millions last year. In coming to consider what legislation should be had as the time for revision drew nigh, and as the time draws nearer when the bank charters are to expire, there were, amongst others, four or five plans which presented themselves for consideration. One was, that the Government should take over *in toto* the circulation of the country. That, of course, would have involved several very weighty considerations. In the first place, the Government would have to take the responsibility of providing a sufficient circulation, and of providing sufficient gold reserve to hold against the circulation; it would have had to undertake that very difficult and delicate task of providing the mechanism for a perfect circulation, and of deciding the varying amounts which, from time to time, should be kept in circulation, or should be put into circulation, in the country. It would also have had to face the great problem of the redemption, possibly in part at any time, possibly in the whole at times of great disaster, and would always have been skirting that sea of possible inflation and an inconvertible currency wherein has been the rock of shipwreck of many

a governmental financial system. Another plan which presented itself for consideration was, that of the Government guaranteeing a circulation, under which the banks, for instance, were to place in the hands of the Government a certain percentage of their circulation in debentures or in proper securities, and that the Government should thereupon guarantee the circulation to the country. This would have brought about, as its advocates hold, what is so desirable in this country, a circulation of one kind and passing at par from one end of the country to the other; but it would also have brought the Government face to face with a very heavy contingent liability, one which, under the present limits, might have arisen to \$60,000,000, and which, in the actual circulation last year at its highest, would have arisen to \$35,000,000. On this contingent liability, of course, it would be stated by the advocates of that system that the Government should have then the lien which is now held, but if the Government had taken the contingent liability and taken the lien as well, it would also have brought the Government face to face with the difficult problem of realising assets, personal and otherwise, and it only needs a little reflection to perceive how difficult such a task as that might be. Another plan which presented itself was that akin to the plan adopted in the United States, by which the bank deposits security, Government debentures or bonds, to the total amount, or 10 per cent. more than the total amount, of its circulation. The adoption of this plan would imply the transfer of a large amount of capital from what you may call a usable condition, to that of a permanent investment; and, in the present state of the country, very strong objections would be made to that system as causing a stringency, and curtailing the amount of usable capital, which is now none too much, for the development and progress of this country. Another plan was that of taking the general features of the present system and continuing them, at the same time making certain improvements which should better safeguard them than they are at present, and which should obviate some of the objections and defects which are generally acknowledged to exist in the present system. Now, it will be seen in a moment that the advocates of all these systems had one idea uppermost, and that was the security of the note circulation. No one of these systems did primarily, or even secondarily, to any degree, look at any larger and stronger security for the voluntary creditors; all of them aimed at making as absolutely perfect as could be the security for the note circulation. Well, Sir, it is a question, I think, which might well be considered by the Government, and which might well be considered by Parliament, whether there is not, under the present system, a sufficiently reasonable security for the realisation of the note circulation, if it becomes necessary. If there is a sufficiently reasonable circulation, it would not be prudent to adopt measures which, although having good features in some respects in themselves, would certainly have the effect of unsettling the present system of banking, and the present system of trade which is so intimately connected with it. Now, with reference to this we might ask the question, How has our banking system worked so far? I am sure that all of us, in looking over the working of the banking system since 1870, when the first principal legislation was had in this

Parliament, must come to the conclusion that, take it all in all, looking at the circumstances of this country, and at the development of business over its broad extent of territory, at the peculiar service which the banks here have to fulfil in taking hold of business ventures, to a certain extent, and of helping to develop them, I am sure, taking all these things into consideration, along with the history of the banks, we must come to the conclusion that the system in Canada has worked quite as well as, and probably in a superior manner, to the banking system of any other country, at a similar stage of its development and its history. With reference to the security of the bank notes, I quite admit that it is not a sufficient argument to say that because a system has worked well in the past it must necessarily, under different conditions, work well, but certainly it is a fair argument to say, that if it has worked reasonably well in the past, it has claims for a fair and full consideration, at least, before it is violently interfered with. Then, as to the matter of security for the note circulation, let us see what it is to-day. In February, 1890, by the latest bank returns that we have, the assets of the banks amounted to \$246,289,764. We have a double liability available of \$64,560,395, making a total of \$310,850,156, as a security upon which the present note circulation of \$30,627,074 has a preferential claim; that is, for every note of the banks at present in circulation, there are about \$10 in assets, and double liability available for their security and for their ultimate redemption. It would seem that that is a very large and a very satisfactory security for the notes in circulation. The system, as I have stated, is one of growth, of natural development. It has worked, in the main, well; it keeps in touch with the business and trade of the country. We have under it large banks, which are fitted to hold up large operations; we have under it small banks, which are peculiarly fitted to be useful to the rural sections of the country. We have no great monopoly built up under the banking system. But there were certain defects which have been complained of in the country, and which have been complained of in this House, and it is proposed by the present Bill, which I shall have the honor to introduce, to remove those defects. One of them was this: That the notes of solvent banks, banks of which there was no suspicion, banks the notes of which no person fears would not be redeemed if they were presented at the office or agency of the bank which issued them, that the notes of these banks, when presented outside of the section of country in which the banks had its offices, were subject to discount; and citizens of the same country were under the disagreeable feeling that when they had a note, even of a solvent bank, but happened to be outside of the region or district for the redemption of that note, they were to be subject to a discount upon it, at the railway station, at the hotel counter, at the place of business. And there was a well-founded desire that such an anomaly should cease, and that notes of chartered banks, so long as they were perfectly solvent, should pass at par from one end of the country to the other. There was a means by which no person need have lost. We have in this country now in circulation, in the small circulation of Government notes, between five and six millions of dollars, and it

would not have been a difficult thing, it is not to-day a difficult thing, for any person who wishes to travel outside of the district of a small bank with which he may be doing business, to gather those notes and take them with him. In taking payment from any bank a customer has to-day a right to ask for \$60 of the payment to be made in the small notes of the Dominion circulation. But even that was felt not to be sufficient, and one of the clauses of this Bill deals with that question, and will, I believe, bring it about that the notes of all solvent banks in any part of Canada, wherever they may be presented, will be paid at par; and in that respect there will be no difference between that and what may be called a national circulation with but one imprint upon it. Another defect consists in this: There has not been, in the history of banking in Canada since 1870, with one exception, I think, and that was the exception of the Mechanics Bank, if I remember rightly, any case in which the notes which were secured by the banks have failed to be redeemed at their face ultimately. But the original holders of the bills, who live often in remote parts of the country, are the persons who suffer when a bank suspends payment, because they have to submit, many of them by the force of circumstances, and others by the general feeling of panic which is aroused when a bank suspends payment, to lose upon the notes they hold, although ultimately the notes are redeemed at their face. It was felt by the Government, by the country, and by the bankers themselves, that the time had come when that anomaly ought to cease, and when some means should be devised by which the notes of a bank, from the time of its suspension to the time of its liquidation, should be so held that the investor, the original possessor, the trader, the broker and the banker would be able and willing to keep them, so as not to fall below par, so that not only would they be ultimately redeemed at par, but there would be no loss to the holder between the time of the suspension of the bank and the ultimate redemption of its notes. The plan which is proposed to bring that about is this: That a certain percentage of the average circulation of the bank shall be paid into a fund, to be called the banks' circulation redemption fund. The provisions of the clause are these: That on 1st July, 1891, when this Act comes into force, two and a-half per centum of that payment shall be lodged in this fund, and one year thereafter another two and a-half per centum, and that thereon and thereafter five per centum of the average circulation of each bank shall be held in this fund as the payment of each one of the banks. Upon that fund of five per centum of the average circulation the Government proposes to pay interest to the banks at the rate of three per centum per annum, which I think the House will not quarrel with as an exorbitant rate of interest, and which at the same time will prevent that amount of money contributed from the banks lying dead. It is at least a fair investment for them on the amount held in the fund. This amount is always to be held in the fund. Upon the suspension of a bank, and between the time of suspension and redemption, whether it be long or short, comparatively speaking, the notes will be kept at par partly from the knowledge that there is a fund of that amount to redeem them, and partly because it is proposed that from the time

Mr. FOSTER.

of the suspension of the bank until the day notice is given of the liquidation of the notes, these notes shall bear interest at the rate of six per centum per annum. That will prevent the notes falling below par, and it will enable the original holder, if he pleases, to keep them, feeling that he gets a fair investment for his money, and it will enable investors to hold them; and more than all and better than all, it will cause the banks to take those notes immediately from one end of the country to the other, and, consequently, when presented by the holder at any bank, they will be taken the same as any other bank note. If, however, at the end of two months the notes have not been liquidated in whole or in part, then the fund becomes available for the redemption of what may remain unredeemed, and the interest which may have accrued is taken from the fund, and is to be recouped to the fund out of the assets of the suspending bank. That is, in brief, and as clearly as I can put it, the arrangement which is proposed in the clauses which deal with that matter. It is a sort of co-operation. It will, I believe, have the effect which it was designed to have, to prevent loss to the original holder upon the note of a suspended bank between the time of redemption and time of ultimate liquidation. These two amendments, then, will take away the two defects which have been mainly complained of, namely, the discount upon current notes of a solvent bank, and the discount or loss to individual holders upon the suspension of a bank from the time of its suspension to its ultimate liquidation. It is felt also that greater care should be taken in the formation of new banks, and that, with the number of banks which we have at present in Canada, no other banks ought to come into existence and do business without giving *bond fide* warrant that they are prepared to do business, and do a safe business; and it is proposed, although the capital stock to be subscribed, is not increased, which is a lesser matter, that before any bank undertakes business in Canada, \$250,000 shall be *bond fide* paid in and deposited in the hands of the Finance Minister and Receiver General. That will prevent any bank, I think, going into operation in Canada without giving a fairly good guarantee that it is prepared to do business on a solid foundation. It is proposed to extend the bank charters for the usual period, the period of ten years. It is also proposed to introduce an audit system, an audit system not of the Government, but yet compulsory, an audit of shareholders. The machinery for that is something like this: that the shareholders shall, at their annual meeting, elect two or more auditors; that those auditors shall, during the course of the year, have the opportunities which are necessary for the auditing of all accounts and of all statements, that they shall present this report, and their audit of the directors' report, at the yearly meeting, and that a copy of this report shall be lodged with the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General. These are, in brief (and I have striven to give them in brief), the chief features of the Act. There are other emendations which will be better discussed clause by clause, as we take them up in the Committee on the Bill. With this introduction, I beg leave to move the House into Committee on the resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that it would have been more convenient that

the hon. gentleman should have placed this Bill in our hands, which I presume he could easily have done, at a sufficiently early date, to have allowed us to follow his description of the merits of the Bill. It is not easy, no matter how familiar hon. members may be with subjects of this kind, to offer any opinion as to their merits or demerits, without the text of the proposal of the Finance Minister in our hands. In matters of this kind, it is of extreme importance to us to see how the details are intended to be worked out, and, therefore, I do not propose at present to make any but the very briefest observations, on the remarks which we have now heard. I may say further, that I agree with the hon. gentleman in this: that I think, take it altogether, the banking system of Canada has worked very well; that it has grown up naturally among us, and is well suited to our wants, and I do not believe, for my part, that it is at all desirable to make any hasty alteration in it. One point I might call the attention of the hon. gentleman to, is this. I observe that he spoke of the security which we had for our notes, as if the whole aggregate assets of the banks were pledged for the whole aggregate circulation. Now, that is not quite correct. The assets of each bank are pledged, no doubt, for the circulation of such bank, but the assets of one bank are not pledged—except by such clause as the hon. gentleman may hereafter introduce—for the notes of another bank. It is not a very safe way of viewing the subject to say, because the collective assets of banks, plus the double liability, amount to something like \$350,000,000 (as, I think, I heard the hon. gentleman state), and our circulation is only \$35,000,000, that, therefore, we can say we have \$10 for \$1, as regards our circulation; because some banks have a very small circulation in proportion to their assets, and some have a very large circulation. It would be indiscreet at present to go into details, but I can recall that one of the very best banks we possess, has a circulation very much smaller than many banks of not one-third or one-fourth of its capital; and certainly not one-half of its stability. If I caught the hon. gentleman's meaning aright, I think he was, therefore, a little in error in giving the House to understand, that because we had aggregate assets held by banks to the amount I have stated, that we, therefore, had that applicable to protect the general circulation. There are, no doubt, several points which it is very desirable that we should endeavor to secure with respect to our banking system. One important matter is the security of the notes. I will say a word or two as to what I have understood the hon. the Minister of Finance to propose. This question of security, as regards the public at large, is a matter of first interest, and too great pains cannot be taken to see that when we create these institutions, and when we make them to a large extent the vehicle for supplying the needed circulation of this country, we should take all possible means to protect the involuntary creditors, more especially as these are largely composed of the poorer class of the community. We should also, in my opinion, be careful to guard against undue monopoly by banks, and that is a matter to which, no doubt, a good deal of attention will have to be directed in considering the hon. gentleman's proposal. One of the very most important functions

in maintaining commerce, is to secure the due elasticity of the circulation, and I concur with the hon. gentleman in thinking, that he has been well advised on this occasion in not attempting to take that excessively delicate and difficult duty into the hands of the Government. There is another matter on which the hon. gentleman said nothing, but which may, perhaps, not unprofitably engage the attention of the House, that is, the desirability of maintaining a good specie gold reserve in Canada; a thing which has been considerably trenched upon by a number of these regulations to which the hon. gentleman alluded. As a matter of fact, in the case of a good many of our banks it may be said, that they practically hold no gold at all. They hold a certain amount of Dominion notes, for which the Government is compelled to keep a specie reserve of 15 per cent., if my memory serves, but they themselves hold no gold at all. That has not as yet proved a source of more than, perhaps, temporary inconvenience, but there is a risk there, and a risk which cannot altogether be overlooked. Then there is another matter which possibly comes more within the purview of the hon. Minister of Justice, than the hon. Minister of Finance, but to which the attention of the House has sometimes been directed, and which is germane of this subject; that is, the way in which the law can best be framed to deal with men in the position of directors or cashiers of banks, who have abused the trust reposed in them by their shareholders and the public. That is a point about which, also, something may be said. As I understand the proposition of the hon. Finance Minister, he states that arrangements are going to be made—but he did not state, or at least I did not catch it if he did—whether these arrangements were to be made by the banks themselves, or by the Government—whereby the notes of solvent banks are to be paid at par all over the Dominion. I take it for granted he means that is to be done by some arrangement among the bankers themselves, and perhaps enforced by law. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then there arises the other and important question to which I alluded just now, namely, how the public are to be secured, and how the note circulation is to be redeemed? I understand that the hon. gentleman proposes to provide that to a certain extent the banks are to be each other's insurers, and that if I also follow him correctly, he proposes that what we may call the insurance fund or the reserve fund, is to amount to 5 per cent. on the circulation, which would be an insurance reserve fund of about \$1,500,000, on the present circulation of \$30,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that is right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, that might or might not be a sufficient reserve. I suppose that that, if it were trenched upon by the failure of one or two banks, could be immediately made up in some form or way to the \$1,500,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It is to be kept at that percentage.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So I supposed, but I did not hear the hon. gentleman say so. That is a matter of detail which will bear

some discussion. There is no doubt that, as regards the great mass of the small banks, that would be sufficient; but should such a calamity occur—and such calamities have occurred—as one of the large banks with a large circulation failing, or two or three banks with a considerable circulation failing at the same time—and the hon. gentleman will note that some of our smaller banks have a very large circulation, out of all proportion to the amount which is in circulation from larger banks—it is possible that this provision may not afford, by any means, such perfect security as it is desirable to have. To these points I simply call the attention of the hon. gentleman and the House briefly. I think discussion had better be had at a later period, when we shall have all the details before us; I hardly think it can be carried on very profitably now. As I understand, the hon. gentleman proposes to make no change as to the amount of subscribed capital required by new banks, but he proposes that instead of \$200,000 being paid up—\$100,000 paid down and \$100,000 in two years—they shall be required to pay \$250,000. So that the minimum of cash paid up will be raised from \$200,000 to \$250,000, and the hon. gentleman will insist on it all being paid at once.

Mr. FOSTER. With the exception that the payment is to be a *bonâ fide* payment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was to have been a *bonâ fide* payment before, although there have been cases, and not a few, in which that wholesome provision has been evaded.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been done by discount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That has been done, and it is the duty of the Finance Minister, I suppose, if possible, in this Bill to see that there is no chance of that being done. As to his proposed audit system by the shareholders, we can say nothing until we see what he proposes. Although the provisions he intends to introduce may be valuable, my own impression is that the public should be cautioned against putting too much reliance on any audit system or system of inspection that can be devised, for this reason, that I can conceive of no possible mode by which any auditor or inspector can ascertain the real intrinsic value of the notes which a bank discounts, which form by far the greatest portion of its assets, and whose value depends entirely on the solvency and standing of the men who make them. I have never, myself, been able to see how that difficulty was to be overcome; and I think that the Government, in making any of these provisions, should take special care to see that bank shareholders and the public are not lulled into a false security by the idea that the proposed audit system, or any other that can be devised, will secure good management and care on the part of the banks. I shall not trouble the House with any further observations at present, because I deem it almost essential to have before us the text of the measure before we can properly discuss it.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that it would be convenient if he would provide us with a table, in plain and simple form, showing the details of the calculations of which he gave—what was very satisfactory in one way—the general result, but the details of which he

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

did not give. I refer to the relation of the gross assets to the gross liabilities of the banks. It is quite clear that that teaches us nothing. You might as well say that you could decide as to the solvency of an individual by putting down on one side the assets and on the other the liabilities of all the members of his community, and striking a general balance. You would find that, although there might in the whole be a considerable margin of assets over liabilities, yet if you looked into the details there would be deficits in the case of some and large amounts to the credit of others. For my own part, I am much more disposed to place reliance on that to which the hon. gentleman alluded in this regard, as the actual experience of banks which have gone under, and which, speaking generally, I think, quite justified his observations. I do not propose to say a word with reference to the details of the plan for the redemption of the notes, for the hon. gentleman has not entered into details, and there are some questions of detail which are rather important, but which, in the absence of details, it would be entirely premature to discuss. Nor do I intend to enter into the question of the working of the guarantee system, because that also requires very careful consideration as to details, and as to the exact liability which it would impose on the mass of the banks and as to the arrangement in case of a call. As to the audit system, I must say that I concur in every word the hon. member for South Oxford has uttered. I agree that if our present system of auditing is in any respect defective in theory, if it does not provide an adequate legislative recognition of the duty of the shareholders or the authorities to secure a proper audit, we ought to make such a legislative recognition. But with reference to most institutions which are engaged in enormous transactions in the lending of money, especially to those lending money on personal security, I hold that it is absolutely impossible for any auditor to make an audit which will indicate the real position of the bank. We know in our own experience that it is quite impossible. We in this House have had the most signal instances brought before us of banks which displayed the most flourishing statements, duly audited, before their shareholders, and in a very few weeks, or even days, it was found—without imputation of fraud on anyone—that those accounts were really nominal, and that enormous sums which were returned as good, turned out in the end to be of the most doubtful character. It is really of the greatest consequence, therefore, that we should not hold out to the public that we are giving them a security which we cannot give. I feel the importance of a proper audit, and I think that, if by any means we could, we should establish to some extent the independence of the auditor; and I will even go so far as to say that it would be worthy of the consideration of the House whether we could not provide some peculiar mark of our sense of the responsibility which any man assumes who undertakes the duty of auditing, as to the thoroughness and accuracy of the audit, by attaching to him a certain responsibility, which would of course involve a satisfactory remuneration. But, so long as the board of directors have the confidence of the shareholders, although the shareholders may, in name, appoint the auditor, after all we know that it is the board of directors who really name him, and, so long as that is the case, the

auditors are very much exposed to the danger of doing their work perfunctorily, and of being guided, in matters which at all savor of questions of opinion, by the views of the manager of the institution and those who surround him. I was disappointed, I confess, to hear the hon. gentleman's statement with reference to the change he proposed to make as to the creation of smaller banks. As to the amount of capital to be paid in, if he is only going to ascertain, by the actual payment of cash that cash has been provided for the moment or for a brief space, to the amount of \$250,000 instead of \$200,000, that does not amount to very much, nor is it in the matter of the actuality of the payment extremely satisfactory. You cannot provide that without imposing a barrier, which, I do not suppose, you intend to impose. You cannot provide it by retaining for any long time the \$250,000, because that is what the bank is built upon, and you must hand it back. It is evident, from our experience, that the system which has gone on will not, by any such arrangement as that, be stopped, though to some extent its operations may be restrained—the system, namely, of a bank, almost immediately after its formation, discounting the paper of its shareholders for an amount approximating to the amount of their subscriptions, and thus making the transaction a nominal one. Apart from this difficulty, which, I think, the hon. gentleman's proposition may to some limited extent prevent, I must say for myself that the experience of Ontario, so far as I can gather, with reference to the smaller banks, has not been favorable. I say so the more openly because I very well remember the discussion we had, a good many years ago, when the late Sir Francis Hincks was Finance Minister, when we had before us that whole question, and when a considerable effort was made to keep up the minimum capital for the establishment of banks. I was amongst those—in those days I was much younger than I am now—who moved by the unquestionable difficulties which the smaller centres of population then labored under, strenuously insisted upon a lower minimum. Those difficulties were due to a condition of things which has, to a considerable extent, disappeared. That condition was this: The number of the banks was much smaller, and the capital of the banks was also very much smaller than in these later days, and the indisposition of the banks to provide branches in the country was very much greater than it has since become; and it was a fact that very great difficulty was experienced, arising, in many instances, from the impossibility of obtaining local banking facilities in a good many thriving communities. It was thought necessary to give those facilities; but I must say that the experience of our Province has been that the smaller banks have not been on the whole a success. They have been, speaking generally, though with some exceptions, rather an element of danger than otherwise, and it has been proved that the present plethora of banking capital, and the widespread banking facilities, make it exceedingly difficult to conduct a profitable banking business with a bank, weak in the sense of its capital being small. Therefore, we ought to consider carefully, though not at all unfairly—I do not suggest any interference with any existing institutions—in the light of the experience of the past few years and of the

existing condition of things as to the amount of banking capital which is available—the question whether it may not really be in the interest of the country, to discourage the establishment of banks with a minimum of capital so low as that which at present obtains. In expressing that change of opinion, I think it proper to assume the penitential stool, in view of my former attitude and of the position I now take on this question.

Mr. COCKBURN. I cannot but think that both the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) have unconsciously in their minds confounded two things which are in reality very different. They seem to me to have mixed up the idea of audit and the idea of inspection. Now, I think that for the Government to attempt to make an inspection of the banks, under our Canadian system, would be to attempt an utter impossibility. As the hon. member for West Durham has said, it would be an utter impossibility for any inspector to take hold of customers' paper of a bank and value it, as that is a process which severely taxes the ingenuity both of the manager and of the directors. What I understood the Finance Minister to say was that he intended to improve the system of audit; and as long as that system is confined to mere auditing, it may to some extent be improved. I do not think myself it can be of much benefit, but at the same time I do think it is advisable, in dealing with this question, that we should not in any way confound the inspection with the audit. You can easily understand, Sir, the difficulties even of simply auditing under our Canadian system. In the United States, where they have but the one bank with no branches, under one national banking system to deal with, it is not so difficult for an auditor, appointed by the Government, to enter into a bank and form some idea, even though an imperfect one, of its assets. But we have seen even in the United States glowing reports given by Government auditors of banks whose doors were closed in a few days. Under our system it would be utterly and physically impossible for the Government or anybody else to value all the assets of, say the Bank of Montreal, or Commerce, or the Merchants Bank, or any other, or even to trace the cash or count the cash. We can easily conceive an inspector walking into the Bank of Montreal here and counting the cash, and finding it amounted to, say, \$50,000, and then starting for Kingston, and on arriving there find in the Bank of Montreal, in that city, the same \$50,000. He might go on his rounds and keep on counting the same cash over and over again. We could only have a thorough system of inspection, even with reference to the cash, by having on the same day and at the same moment a whole host of inspectors actively inspecting every branch as well as the head branch. I do not think it is in the sphere of the Government to undertake any such duty. I think, if any attempt were made to establish a Government inspection, the result would be to create a false impression altogether in the minds of those who are shareholders and of the general public, and I question very much if, in the event of failure, a moral responsibility would not rest on the Government to make good the assets of the bank.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no intention to propose a Government audit.

Mr. COCKBURN. I understood there was.

Mr. BLAKE. No ; but to impose an obligation on the shareholders to provide an audit.

Mr. COCKBURN. I do not know that that would amount to anything very different. I think that is a matter which might be left very fairly to the shareholders interested to determine for themselves.

Mr. BOWELL. So it is.

Mr. COCKBURN. I do not see the necessity of the Government interfering in a matter of that kind, because such an audit will be made by those appointed by the board having the confidence of the shareholders, so that you can safely leave it, as a private matter to be settled between the shareholders' and directors, and presidents of the banks, for them to say how they will manage their own affairs. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), regarding the guarantee fund, amounting to ten dollars of assets to every dollar of circulation liabilities, taking the banks as a whole, the position taken by the Minister of Finance is a sound one, because we must take the weaker banks into the calculation. We must not forget that the Finance Minister told us that the weak and the strong banks under this system will be welded, for the time, into one conglomerate whole, so that they will be bound to give each other mutual support.

Mr. BLAKE. To the extent of 5 per cent.

Mr. COCKBURN. The 5 per cent. will amount altogether to \$1,500,000, and if the Government had at any time that much insurance fund in hand, it would be able to meet any one difficulty that might arise. There is no use of our contemplating the sudden disruption of all the banking system of the country, in making a provision of this kind. At the present moment, as I have not had the pleasure of seeing the provisions of the Bill, I shall reserve any further remarks for a future occasion, when the Bill is under discussion in Committee of the House.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Is it proposed in the Bill to provide that a fixed percentage of their liabilities shall be held at all times by the banks in specie and legal tenders ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Of course I do not propose to criticise the observations of the hon. gentleman. There is just one point to which I would venture to draw his attention. It has been thought by some that there is a difference between the note holders, who are involuntary creditors, and the depositors, who select their own bank in which to deposit their money. A man is very often induced to deposit his money in a bank on account of getting some interest on his money, while the holders of the notes are involuntary creditors ; and the question naturally arises, whether the double liability of the shareholders should extend to both or only to the note holders. That is a question which is worthy of the hon. gentleman's consideration.

Mr. COCKBURN.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I rise to say a few words upon the resolution which has been brought forward by the Minister of Finance, and I do it under the very great disadvantage of not having heard what fell from the hon. gentleman in regard to it ; but I understand that the principal change which it is proposed to make in the Act as it now stands is that a guarantee of 5 per cent. is to be provided by the banks as a whole. I must say that I feel disappointment that something more radical has not been attempted at this time. I had hoped, and I think the country is also fully prepared for this, that the Government would have secured a guarantee for every dollar that is circulated throughout the Dominion. I think the time has come when we might well take a leaf out of what has been done by our neighbors on the other side of the line, and, in doing so, I trust the proposition would be approved of by a great majority of the members of this House, and I feel satisfied, at all events, that it would meet with the approval of the country as a whole. I do not mean that the change should be made in a moment, but that it should be carried out gradually. At all events, might we not go some way towards the establishment of such a guarantee ? If we were not to have it pure and simple as in the United States, where we know it has been very successful, might we not insist that each bank should deposit with the Government, say, to the extent of one-third of its circulation—33½ per cent. or 40 per cent. ? This, with the double liability and with the first lien, would give an assurance to the country, and would also guarantee the Government from loss. I do not think the same objection could be taken to this as might be taken to insisting upon a full guarantee, that is, adopting the plan in existence in the United States, by which each bank gives dollar for dollar, or, at any rate, 90 per cent. of its circulation. This would not interfere with the circulation or the commerce of the country to the same extent as that, while I believe it would give a thorough guarantee to the Government. With the double liability and the Government having the first lien on everything appertaining to the bank, there could be no danger to the public interests or to the Dominion treasury. Would it not be wise for us to pause before passing into law such a half measure as that which has now been presented ? Would it be at all fair, for instance, that the larger banks, the solvent banks, about which there is no doubt, should be compelled to make sound the smaller banks ? Is it reasonable that those institutions which have acted prudently for ten, twenty or fifty years, and have built up a business that for its character, for prudent and efficient management, causes them to be trusted throughout the country, and relied upon, not only in ordinary times, but in times of crisis, should be called upon to contribute so largely in order to make strong banks which, to say the least, may be very doubtful as to their solvency ?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is the offer which came from the banks.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I do not think it is an offer which has been concurred in by all the banks ; there must be at least two banks which do not approve of and have not concurred in that offer.

Mr. COCKBURN. Which banks?

Sir DONALD SMITH. At least two of the banks do not approve of that offer, and there need be no hesitation in naming them. I think this provision is most unjust. I do not see why we should call upon a bank, the solvency of which is beyond a doubt, to establish the *bonâ fides* of other banks any more than we should call upon you, Mr. Speaker, or any one else whose credit might be beyond question, to put people whose credit is very doubtful in the same position as yourself before the public. I think, also, that the hon. gentleman might very well have taken into consideration the putting of some further limit upon the circulation. Ought not the circulation to be in proportion, not alone to the capital of a bank, but also to its rest, because, if a bank has a large rest, surely it ought to have the benefit of that beyond one that has nothing but its capital. With regard to the audit, I hold very much with the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), that it would practically be of little use to have any other audit than that which we have under the board of direction of the bank. At the same time, it ought in every case to be insisted upon that the audit should be thorough. It is not, I understand, intended that the audit should be made by a Government auditor, but that it should be more immediately under the control of the shareholders than it has been heretofore. While I think that a well-managed bank will have sufficient confidence in the directors to make anything of this kind unnecessary, and while it may not be strongly objected to by the directors of a bank, I feel that it is very little indeed to give, in order to improve the Banking Act as it at present exists. However, I wish to make only these few observations in the meantime, and when the Banking Act comes up, of course we shall be prepared to deal with it.

Mr. IVES. I would like to ask what provision, if any, the new Act will contain as to the amount of capital required in the case of new banks?

Mr. FOSTER. I mentioned that a capital of \$500,000 must be paid up.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that the member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) does not fully appreciate the advantages to the public of the suggestion made by the Finance Minister. This arrangement, as I understand it, is a species of coercive endorsement on the part of the stronger banks, on behalf of the weak ones; and the hon. gentleman must see that the public will have a great deal more confidence in the circulation of weak banks where such a provision is made by law.

Sir DONALD SMITH. That, I am afraid, does not speak for its justice.

Motion agreed to, and resolution considered in Committee, and reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) respecting Banks and Banking.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that, for the remainder of the Session, Government measures

shall have precedence on Wednesdays, commencing with Wednesday, the 26th instant, after questions put by members.

Mr. LAURIER. I would remind the right hon. gentleman, that there are several public Bills of importance which have not yet been called for the second reading. If the hon. gentleman carries this motion, he will see that these Bills cannot be called during the present Session. Does he propose to make any provision as to that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If Wednesday is given to Government measures, then Monday will be the only day left for business in the hands of private members; therefore, I see no objection, that the same rule should be adopted as was last Session, and that every Wednesday the routine should be the same as if it were Monday; that would give precedence to the public Bills and Orders.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

TRANSATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. KENNY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire, with the permission of the House, to call the attention of the Government to the manner in which the subsidised transatlantic mail service is performed; and by way of illustration, I beg to read a telegram which I received this morning, dated Halifax, March 19:

"Persons leaving Liverpool, March 5th, in the *City of Paris*, reached here Sunday evening, the 16th, after spending one day in New York, and one day in Boston. The Canadian subsidised mail steamer *Peruvian*, sailing March 6th, is not yet here."

On looking at the files of the New York *Herald*, in the reading-room, I find it is reported there that the steamer *City of Paris* arrived off the bar at New York at 6.15 p.m., on Wednesday, March 12th. That would make, without allowing for any difference of time, a passage of about $7\frac{1}{4}$ days. Now, if that steamer had been coming to Halifax she would have arrived there on Tuesday at mid-day, that is, Tuesday of last week. Allowing that the voyage from Halifax to Liverpool at this season is 2,400 miles, six days steaming at 17 knots would make 2,448 miles, or an average of 408 miles a day. The telegram which I have read states that the Canadian mail steamer *Peruvian*, which sailed from Liverpool on March 6th, had not completed her voyage yesterday; I do not know, as a matter of fact, whether she has yet completed that voyage. But, assuming that she will arrive in Halifax to-day, this subsidised Canadian mail steamer will have occupied fourteen days on the voyage, or an average, say, of $171\frac{1}{2}$ miles as against 408 miles by the steamer which was bound for New York. Sir, I might mention other instances; I dare say there are many others within the knowledge of other hon. members in this House. I know of one case which came under my personal observation, of a gentleman, a friend of mine, who lives in the adjoining Province of New Brunswick. He arrived in Halifax in the first days of Christmas week. He told me that ten or twelve days before that date that he was in Liverpool, England, and that he was anxious to get to his home in New Brunswick, and to arrive there in time for Christmas. He came down to Liverpool, and he found that the Canadian mail

steamer was sailing on a certain day, and on the same day there was sailing another steamer for New York. The risk was that, if he came by the Canadian steamer, he would not be home in time to spend Christmas with his family. Halifax was his objective point, to some extent, because he had business to transact there, and he was very much inclined to take the Canadian mail steamer bound to Halifax. What happened? He took the New York steamer. He went to New York by that route; he passed by the port of Halifax, and was almost within sight of it; he steamed 500 miles further, to New York; he took the train there and went to Boston, from Boston to St. John, N. B., from St. John to Moncton, from Moncton to his home on the north shore of New Brunswick; he spent a day, or a day and a-half, with his family, he came down to Halifax, transacted his business, and proceeded to his home in New Brunswick, and arrived there before the Canadian mail steamer, which had sailed from Liverpool on the same day as the steamer by which he had gone to New York, had arrived at Halifax. I quite recognise that it will not be in order to enter into any discussion of this question at present. My object is to bring it formally to the notice of the Government, in the hope that when the steamship mail subsidies come under consideration, the hon. Postmaster General will be able to explain to us, in some way which will be satisfactory to the House, the manner in which the service is conducted; and I call especial attention to these particular cases.

Mr. HAGGART. I regret to say there is a good deal of truth in the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), but we are getting the best service we possibly can obtain for the money. We are only paying \$125,000 for the service under our arrangement with Messrs. Allan, and there is a sum of nearly \$90,000 accruing to the Government out of that sum, so that the net cost of the service is about \$35,000 per annum. We have taken a vote, as the hon. gentleman must be aware, in the Estimates with a view of obtaining a much faster service than at present, and the Government are trying to make an arrangement, and are using every effort, by which we shall have a line of steamers to Halifax which will be as fast as any coming to the city of New York, and I hope at some future time to hear the hon. gentleman state in his place in this House that he has received a letter from some gentleman who had arrived at Chicago *via* Halifax by our new line of steamers while those steamers he has been talking about had not arrived at Sandy Hook or New York.

Mr. LOVITT. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), account has, probably, not been taken of the delay due to the presence of ice. That fact probably accounts for the long passage.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Might it not be due to fog outside Halifax harbor?

Mr. KENNY. There is one fact which it is a satisfaction to know—that when vessels come to the harbor of Halifax there is always plenty of water for them.

Mr. HESSON. I desire to ask the Finance Minister when the return in regard to banks that have failed and charters that lapsed will be brought

Mr. KENNY.

down? It will be useless to bring down the return after the discussion has taken place on this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I enquired yesterday in the Department in regard to this return, and it was stated that it was very nearly ready, and I hope to be able to bring it down to-morrow.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to bring to the notice of the House a matter affecting the honor of this House. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), on Tuesday last, stated as follows:—

“So here we have a Minister of the Crown and one of the leading supporters of the day, and further, we have an employé of the Government, who is under the pay of the Government, and holding a position under the Government, and this individual possesses information which is essential to the Minister of the Crown, and a supporter of the Government, obtaining the opportunity to form themselves into a stock company to develop a gas well in Essex.”

Further on, we have the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) stating:

“It has been shown that an officer of the Geological Department, who had been engaged in explorations in the County of Essex, communicated the result to private parties. I do not know how many persons were engaged with him in this exploration, but they made apparently an exhaustive survey, and, no doubt, in due time they reported to the Department the nature and value of the discovery they made. That report, as far as I am aware, was not made public until some time afterwards, and, as a result, we find an officer of the Department retiring from the service, and a company formed to utilise the discovery made by that officer of the Department. We find not only a member of the House, but a member of the Government as well, joining that company.”

The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) stated in connection with this subject:

“It has been asserted—I do not know how truly—that an agent of that Survey has taken it upon himself, in one case in the Province of Ontario, to furnish information in regard to something which might be found under the surface of the earth, not to the general public, or to the first enquiring investor, but to political friends, in advance of the publication of his report. It has even been alleged that he has given that information in advance of the publication of his report, to a member of the Government, and that, in consequence of such information being given before the report was made public, a company was formed which now includes the said member of the Government, and of which the said agent of the Geological Survey is now the manager and at the same time a shareholder.”

It has been within my knowledge for several years that there was natural gas to be found in the County of Essex. Four years ago, a number of gentlemen formed themselves into a company to bore for natural gas in the north riding of Essex, in the township of Rochester, a year before the report which is referred to here was ever entertained or ever suggested. In the Session of 1888, or some time prior to that year, some gentlemen had suggested to me that we should form a company and experiment in regard to finding gas. They suggested, among others, the name of General Alger, of Detroit, as one of the investors, and a number of other gentlemen in Detroit and in the County of Essex. Towards the end of that Session, I said to my friend, with whom I had been on terms of intimacy for many years, the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), not then a Minister of the Crown: Suppose you join me in this matter. I said it more in a jocular than in a

serious spirit, because I had very little faith in the pecuniary success of the enterprise. I do not say this as an apology, nor do I say it as an apology that he was not then a member of the Government, because I consider that what a man should not do as a private gentleman is the guide we should take, and not whether he is a member of Parliament or a member of the Government. Mr. Haggart joined that enterprise subsequently on my suggestion solely, wholly, and alone. If there is any blame to be attached to any person owing to his having joined that enterprise, I am the person, and I alone, to whom that blame is to be attached. Now, Sir, Mr. Coste never furnished me with any information—that is Eugene Coste, a young gentleman who was a member of the Geological Survey, and whose character is impugned in this matter. So far as I know, Mr. Coste is entirely blameless. I have no knowledge of his having furnished prior information to any one. I have no personal knowledge of his ever having obtained one dollar owing to the enterprise having been gone into. I know, as a matter of fact, he is not, and never has been, manager of the company. So far as stock is concerned, he does not appear as a shareholder, although I am not aware but that he may have an interest through his father, who is a wealthy gentleman in Essex, and who is one of the largest shareholders in the company. Mr. Haggart and I agreed that we would each take two shares, but when I went home and looked into the matter, I thought that two shares, costing \$1,000 each, would be too great a risk, for I did not consider, and I do not consider now, that any pecuniary profits will arise from the enterprise. I went into it solely because I was member for a portion of the county, and as a matter of public spirit; and when I took my friend into that enterprise, I made up my mind that, if there was a loss involved, I would not allow him to bear that loss. Now, as far as knowledge of this matter is concerned it was derived from the fact that I have been consulted by, and have advised with gentlemen who were actually, four years ago, engaged in this enterprise. These gentlemen had applied to the County Council of Essex for a franchise to exclusively use the county roads for piping purposes. Dr. King of Kingsville, who was also an intimate friend of mine, had opposed that application in the County Council, because he said that there was natural gas in other portions of the county, and in consequence of this the council refused the privilege to the company who were boring at Rochester, in the north riding of Essex. Some gentlemen from Ohio, who were visiting at Kingsville, advised Dr. King, the Reeve of that village, to go into the enterprise. Professor Selwyn, in his report of 1887, drew the attention of the public of Canada to the question of natural gas, and he directed special attention to the similarity between the specimens of natural gas in Canada, and the natural gas in Ohio, which lies south of the County of Essex. Professor Orton, of whom you have all heard, and who was employed as geologist in Ohio, published a map in *Science* showing the natural gas region of Ohio, and any person of common sense acquainted with those regions in Ohio, could see that the belt extends across the County of Essex. In 1888, Dr. Selwyn again referred to the subject of natural gas in southwestern Ontario. As for Mr. Coste's report, I

never heard of it until I read the *Hansard Debates* on this matter. I went around to the Geological Department this morning, and I there obtained the report for 1888 in which Mr. Coste made the following statement:—

"At intervals during the summer, Mr. Coste or Mr. Brumell visited a number of localities in Ontario and Quebec with a view to investigate the occurrence of natural gas and petroleum in those Provinces, especially in the formations that underlie the Devonian. In reference to natural gas Mr. Coste states as follows:—'A number of localities where natural gas has been reported were examined and where possible the gas flow was measured and the logs of the borings and specimens of the drillings were obtained. Respecting wells bored several years ago, it was impossible to obtain any reliable information, and the loss of all such data is very much to be regretted. The result of our investigation is that none of the wells yet bored in Ontario and Quebec produce more than 50,000 cubic feet of gas per diem, and very few even this much. The production of these wells, though small as compared with those of the United States gas region, are nevertheless of some value when in or near towns or villages.

"There seems no reason why further trials, especially in that part of Ontario between Lake St. Clair on the south-west, and Lake Simcoe on the north-east, should not prove more successful, and yield as abundant a supply of gas or petroleum as do some of the Ohio wells.

"In reference to petroleum, Mr. Coste states that no new oil wells of value have been bored, and that the entire production, 594,273 barrels in 1887, is confined to the County of Lambton, and produced from about 2,700 wells, very few of which yield more than one barrel per diem. The average depth of the oil rock in Lambton is 400 to 500 feet from the surface.

"Several wells have been bored in Essex County. One at Comber, 1,300 feet deep, is said to yield about one barrel of oil per diem. This oil is probably from the same formation as that of Findlay in Ohio."

I never saw Mr. Coste's report until to-day, and that is the only report I know of that Mr. Coste ever made. Based upon the statements in Parliament which I have read in the *Hansard*, the *Toronto Globe*, of Wednesday, 19th March, has the following statement:—

"In Committee of Supply a new scandal was uncovered and an old one resurrected. Mr. Eugene Coste was a surveyor connected with the Geological Survey. He was sent into Essex County to prospect for natural gas. He struck a rich flow, and with prompt and beautiful acceptance of the teachings of this Government he proceeded to organise a company and to make provision for profit out of the discovery. When he organised his company he resigned from the service of the Government and became its manager. The list of stockholders, according to the statements made to the House to-night, contains the names of J. C. Patterson, Conservative member for North Essex, and the Hon. John Haggart, Postmaster General. It seems that not only did a public official, engaged on public business, make use of his position to promote his personal interest, but he was joined in his speculation in public property by a member of Parliament and a Minister of the Crown."

Now, I hope that the enterprising correspondent who telegraphed that information, if he is present here as I suppose he is, will do me the justice to give as wide publicity to my statement as he did to those unfounded remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite. If the shade or a shadow of blame rests on me in the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I use that term "hon. gentlemen" in its restricted and non-parliamentary sense—if the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), or the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), or the hon. leader of the Opposition, or my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), or my hon. friend from the west riding of Durham (Mr. Blake), if I may take the liberty of calling him so, or any other gentleman in the House, in the restricted and non-parliamentary sense of that term, gets up and blames me for what I have done—

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is making invidious distinctions between certain members of Parliament and certain other members of Parliament. I do not think he means it, but it is quite improper.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). If the hon. gentleman considers that a shade or a shadow of blame attaches to me, I will resign my seat on an hour's notice. If some other hon. gentlemen had made enquiry from me before they attacked me, I would have given them all the information they desired. I do not want to hold my seat for ten minutes in this House, if I am considered to be unworthy the confidence my constituents have so generously bestowed on me. I do not want to hold my seat longer than men on the opposite side of the House, whose honor and high position I respect, and I consider I am entitled to hold it with self-respect. I will again state that the hon. the Postmaster General had the sole and only information on this subject from me, and from no other human being, and that we joined that enterprise in the spirit of pioneering exploration and experiment, not having struck any rich flow of oil as was stated in the *Globe*. We went into it as a preliminary company, and we paid up our money. We have sunk several wells unsuccessfully, but one well has been struck which is stated to have been a successful one, but, under circumstances that I need not refer to, it is yet untried. Mr. Haggart and I have paid our \$500 each, the price of a share, and a little more too. We have not the control of the company, nor can we dictate to it. Others have that power. I went into that enterprise because I lived in the locality, and because I believed that it would develop our trade and prosperity there. As far as Mr. Eugene Coste is concerned, I am not here to defend him. If he has done wrong, let him defend himself, but if he has done wrong, he has done it without my knowledge. I feel bound to say in justice to that young man, that personally, I have no knowledge of anything that would reflect on his character as an official or as a private gentleman. If he has done any wrong in this matter it was entirely without my knowledge, and there was nothing in the formation of this company to justify the attacks made in this House and in the public press. There was no political preference or anything of that kind; it was purely a matter of business. As a matter of fact, Mr. William McGregor, the ex-member for the county, who is a Liberal in politics, and whom I defeated in 1878, is a member of the company, and has just as much say in it as I have. If there are any other questions I can answer to hon. gentlemen opposite, I shall be only too happy to do so. I do not know if I have fully answered the statements that have been made, but I am only too anxious to do so, for I have nothing either to conceal or to evade.

Mr. CASEY. As my name has been mentioned in connection with this charge, I may say that I never mentioned the name of, or alluded to, the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) in connection with the matter. I stated that my information was that Mr. Coste had given hints as to the existence of natural gas at this point to the Postmaster General, before making his report to the Department, and in consequence thereof that hon. gentleman had joined the company. It was the hon.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex).

Postmaster General himself who was the first to bring the name of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) into the controversy. The hon. Postmaster General was the first to bring the name of the hon. member for North Essex into the controversy, by giving him as the only source of his information with regard to the natural gas. I think my hon. friend from North Essex has done perfectly right in making a full statement in regard to the matter. I think it is highly probable that he, as an enterprising member for that county, knew all that it was possible to know with regard to the natural gas industry there; but I think it was hardly within his power to state positively that the hon. Postmaster General got information from nobody but himself. He knows what he told him, but he does not know what information he got from other sources. I hope the Postmaster General will make an equally full and frank statement.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman will remember that I made the statement the other evening that the person who gave me the information, and who induced me to go into the enterprise, was the hon. member for North Essex, and he alone.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). As my name has been mentioned in connection with the allusion to the hon. member for North Essex, it may be proper for me to state that I would have treated with indifference the remark made by the hon. member had he not made the insinuation that some members of this House were guilty of making attacks in the House which other members would not make. Now, Sir, I made the remarks I did in the interest of the public, after ascertaining from the Minister in charge of the matter, as far as I could, whether I could or could not obtain the information I desired with regard to the time Mr. Coste made the survey in Essex. I then suggested to him that if he had not the information, perhaps it would be possible for him to obtain it from members sitting close to him. After I had taken my seat the hon. Postmaster General rose and stated that he was no doubt the individual I referred to. It was he, and he alone who mentioned the name of the hon. member for North Essex; it was not mentioned until then. The hon. Postmaster General stated that he had obtained all his information from the hon. member from North Essex, and that that hon. member was a member of the company engaged in the enterprise. We had no report and no definite statement from any other source, and, therefore, we were unable to say whether Mr. Coste did or did not give the information referred to by the hon. member for West Elgin. Further than this I have only to say that I am very glad indeed to hear the statement made by the hon. member for North Essex. But Mr. Coste was a servant of the Government; his father lived in Essex in the neighborhood of the exploration; Mr. Coste possessed the information which it was necessary to give to his father, and his father is one of the leading spirits of that company in which the son is perhaps the manager. And it is a very easy matter to ascertain how this information may have gone from the son to the father, and from the father to those interested in the enterprise. So I think no hon. member of this House should be charged with insinuating anything dis-

honorable or disrespectful towards another hon. member. I do not desire to injure the feelings of any one; I desire merely to ascertain, so far as I can, all the facts in connection with this matter, and as it has been referred to, it will of course naturally occur to any one that a further enquiry into the facts ought to be made.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I thank my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) for the courteous way in which he has treated me in reply to my remarks. As to the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), all I have to say is that if he had, in a neighborly manner, desired any information from me, he would have got it as frankly and fully as I could have given it to him. So far as Mr. Coste is concerned, I am not responsible for the relationship between him and his father. Mr. Coste knew nothing more about what was going on in the County of Essex, or about what was contained in the bowels of the earth there, than any other well-informed geologist; and the newspapers are entirely in error in supposing that anything was discovered there. The ground on which gas was struck was selected by Dr. King, of Kingsville. Mr. Coste was not connected with it; Mr. Coste has never succeeded in getting gas in the County of Essex; and what makes me think that he cannot have had any interest in the company in which I am interested is, that he has, in a hostile spirit to that company, induced other speculators to come into the county and bore for gas. Therefore, it is not likely that he is very anxious for the success of this particular company. I am sorry to obtrude this matter on the House. It is a matter not only personal to me, but it concerns the honor of the House, because anything that reflects upon the honor of any member, however humble, reflects also on the honor of the House, and I trust that I have satisfied the House that I have not done anything that a private gentleman might not do.

Mr. LANDERKIN. As I took part in the discussion the other evening, I wish to state that the information I received on that occasion, as to Mr. Coste having been engaged in explorations in the County of Essex, I received from the Minister of the Interior. Other members who took part in the discussion drew out the fact, that Mr. Coste had formed a company, and that the information which enabled him to do so had been obtained by him during the time he was a paid servant of the Government; and if so the natural reference was, that the act was a very questionable one indeed.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I might shorten the remarks of the hon. gentleman, if he would allow me to say that he entirely misunderstood me. I stated, that Mr. Coste never made any report in reference to that part of the country, and in going over, to-day, the notes of my remarks in *Hansard*, I find that that is exactly what I said.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There was a discussion on that point, and we had the fact that Mr. Coste had made the exploration while he was a paid servant of the country. I have no feeling in the matter, and no desire to do a wrong to any hon. member of the House. I only spoke on that subject from the information I received, and the conclusions which I drew from that information are those which any hon. gentleman in this House would naturally draw from them.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I wish to recall again to the hon. gentleman that Mr. Coste, of whom he speaks, is not the manager of any company that I know of in Essex. He never, as far as I know, formed a company, and never succeeded in getting as much as one dollar.

Mr. LAURIER. The whole discussion is out of order. No one would interfere with the hon. gentleman as long as he confines himself to any question regarding a point of honor, but he is out of order in attempting to defend Coste.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I am not defending Mr. Coste. The hon. gentleman reiterated a charge which I denied, and I am not disposed to submit. There are other methods of bringing this before the House, if I should be declared out of order, and the hon. gentleman need not think that he is going to cut me short in my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the whole discussion on this incident has been allowed to go too far. When an hon. gentleman arises to reply to something, to some statement in which he finds his honor attacked, it is my duty to give him full opportunity to defend himself; but where I should have stopped hon. gentlemen is when they continued the discussion which we had the other night. If the hon. gentleman to whom the hon. member for Essex made allusion had only risen to say "yes" or "no," as to whether he intended to impute anything against the honor of the hon. gentleman, he would have been quite in order, but I cannot allow any attempt being made to renew the discussion of the other night.

LEATHER INSPECTION.

Mr. WALDIE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to enquire if it is the intention of the Government to proceed with Bill 117, for the inspection of leather. The tanners in my constituency are very anxious to know whether it is the intention of the Government to withdraw this measure, as they are now negotiating for an order from England for a portion of the leather they manufacture, and they think they would obtain this order if this Act is not amended. In connection with this they have forwarded me to-day a memorial from the Council of the Board of Trade of Toronto, asking that the law may be permitted to stand as it is.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order. He must confine himself to merely asking the question.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Several representations have been made to me with regard to the Bill referred to, and these are under consideration of the Government.

HURRELL AND VALIQUETTE PENSIONS.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to a return which he promised to lay before the House some time ago, and with which promise he thinks, no doubt, he has fully complied. I refer to the return in the case of Staff-Sergeant Hurrell. Only a portion of the papers asked for have been laid on the Table. I have received a communication from Sergeant Hurrell, saying that he has seen those papers, and they do not include all those in the Department

on the question; and he asked me if I would suggest that the return should be made complete. He writes me further, as follows:—

“I went to the Militia Department yesterday to look at the papers *re* my hospital sergeant services in the North-West Force, in February, 1886. I was refused access to them by order of the Minister of Militia.”

No doubt that is a mistake. If it happens that there are further papers in the Department bearing on this question which ought to be laid on the Table, the hon. gentleman will, perhaps, be good enough to have them brought down, and, perhaps, would allow this volunteer to attend at the Department and point out such as he says should be produced.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am under the impression, from the information given me by the officers of my Department, that all the documents connected with the case of Private Hurrell have been brought down. But I will enquire again, and shall be glad to bring down any others, if there are any. I am not at all prepared, however, to allow Private Hurrell or anybody else to come into the Department, and take possession of official documents which can only be obtained by a member on an order from the House for their production. When those papers are brought down the hon. gentleman who takes such a deep interest in this case will, no doubt, be able to give communication of them to Private Hurrell, but the officers of the Department are really kept too busy to attend to the private matters of every man who considers himself aggrieved and would like to run through the official documents for the purpose of obtaining that information which he considers he may be entitled to.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not propose that the hon. gentleman should place the papers of the Department in the hands of any person outside of his own employés, but what I suggested was that in order to remove any possible complaint which this volunteer might make, he might be permitted to point out in the Department such papers as he said have not been produced, and which should be produced. While he may be but a private or an ex-private in the volunteers, I presume the hon. gentleman will not deny him his rights. In fact, his very weakness ought to be an argument in his favor.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to the other return, regarding Valiquette, which the hon. gentleman brought down, I wish to call his attention to a letter which, it seems to me, indicates that the return ought to be supplemented. The following letter appears in the return from Antoine Valiquette to M. le Colonel Lamontagne:

“After having waited a long time, I see the necessity of having recourse to you with reference to a pension which was granted me by the Government on the decease of my son, Sergeant Prima Valiquette, who died in the North-West in the service of his country, on the 4th July, 1885. In the month of May that pension was granted to me, and a few days later I received a departmental letter from the office in Montreal, asking me to go there and draw the sum of \$612.54. The same day Colonel Hughes came at my place, saying that he had been working in order to procure a pension for each child, and asked me for a power of attorney (which I gave him), authorising him to act in my name. Under this power of attorney he drew my money, and remitted to me one-half of the sum, that is \$306, and some months afterwards, \$130, and nothing more afterwards. I do not know when the next payment will come. Will you be good enough to conclude this affair, and tell me when the next payment will come.”

Mr. MULOCK.

and the balance of the first payment. In doing so you would oblige a poor, sick old man whose seeks protection.” That letter, put upon the Table of the House, leaves Colonel Hughes in a very painful position which has been altogether unexplained, and there is a later letter in a similar strain. I suppose there has been an enquiry.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have ordered an enquiry.

Mr. BLAKE. It appears, so far, that Colonel Hughes had a power of attorney, that he received this amount and remitted the half of it, and held the remainder for some time, how long we know not. Will the hon. gentleman bring down a statement showing the regulations as to officers of the Government being allowed to act as attorneys. My impression is that there is a general regulation forbidding gentlemen in the public service to act as attorneys for public creditors. It is a wise regulation, as this case proves, if the statements made are correct.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In reading over the papers, I noticed the letter which the hon. gentleman has just read, and I called upon the deputy of the Department to get all the information which could be collected in reference to the action which appears to have been taken by Colonel Hughes. The deputy has written for that information, and I expect that by this time he has received the information. In regard to the conduct of Colonel Hughes, I may state that he was really the colonel in command, or one of the officers in command of the regiment to which young Valiquette belonged, and it may be that, after helping the father of his late companion in arms, he may have done more for him than for an ordinary volunteer. However, I shall bring down all the explanations that can be obtained.

REPORT.

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the year ended 31st December, 1889.—(Mr. Carling.) It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SUPPLY—CANADIAN DIRECT MEAT COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In compliance with the notice which I gave last night, I desire to call the attention of the House to certain facts connected with a company called the Canadian Direct Meat Company. I desire to call attention to the fact that, on or about the 27th November last, a company appears to have been floated in London, under the above title, with an authorised capital of close upon two million dollars—£350,000 sterling. The greater part of the shares of this company, as I understand, have been issued. At any rate, about £300,000 appears to have been taken up in one form or another. Now, I have lately received a copy of the prospectus of the company, and I desire to read to you certain statements which are contained in that prospectus, and to call your attention to certain other statements which have been publicly made in the city of London by gentlemen of standing

there who are connected with this company. The first sentence of this prospectus reads as follows:—

"The objects of the company are to acquire a concession by the Corporation of Three Rivers city, Canada, of one hundred acres of freehold land within the city's limits, subject to the erection thereupon of abattoirs and other buildings at a minimum cost of £20,000, and which land, with all buildings thereon erected or to be erected, is to be free of all taxation for a period of 99 years, so long as the works are in operation, to purchase live stock and to kill and dress same, for shipment or otherwise, on the company's premises, which are adjacent to the seaboard, and where the hides, horns, offal and other remains can be advantageously utilised."

Thereupon, there follow a considerable number of paragraphs referring to the estimated value of the cattle in England and other matters of that sort with which I do not intend to trouble the House, but I desire to call the attention of the House to this further statement:

"The vendor has fixed the price of the concession, with all its advantages, at the sum of £150,000, from which he will pay all expenses of the formation of the company up to allotment."

"The said £150,000 to be payable as follows, viz.: £60,000 in cash, and £89,500 in cash or fully paid ordinary shares, at the option of the directors, and the balance of such purchase money in 100 fully paid founders' shares of £5 each."

There is another paragraph which likewise requires attention. It reads as follows:—

"From the Canadian Statistical Abstract and Record in 1888, published at Ottawa, it appears that 54,248 head of cattle and 30,421 sheep were shipped alive from Canada to Great Britain, while 40,047 head of cattle and 353,999 sheep were sent to the United States. It is believed that the 40,047 head of cattle is very much understated."

Here is a paragraph which conveyed a great amount of novel information to me, and, I think, will convey a great amount of novel information to many members of this House, and not the least to those who come from the neighborhood of Three Rivers. It states:

"From the district east of Quebec large quantities are sent to Chicago, a distance of 900 miles, where they are slaughtered, and the produce sent back another 900 miles for export to Europe *via* New York. This company will have the advantages of dealing with cattle at Three Rivers, thus saving the cost of carrying it 1,800 miles, its consequent loss of weight, and the cost of feeding in transit."

Now, when I first saw this prospectus, and when I first saw the comments that were made upon it in the press, I thought it necessary, before venturing to bring it forward in this House, to make certain enquiries touching the statements herein contained, and especially with regard to the value of the concession, and the price which is paid for that concession; and also the statement relative to the sending of these cattle 900 miles to Chicago, and thence to Europe *via* New York. So far as I am informed—of course, I am open to correction—the market value of this concession for which £150,000 sterling is stated to be arranged to be paid, part in cash, and part in paid-up stock, appears, so far as the evidence that has been laid before me goes to show, to have been simply *nil*; that is to say, that the city of Three Rivers, as I am informed, was perfectly willing to hand this property over to anybody who would undertake, as the prospectus states, to spend £20,000 sterling at least in erecting buildings thereon for the purpose of promoting this trade. I am informed—again I say, under correction—that this most valuable concession, for which £150,000 sterling, three-quarters of a million, in round numbers, was arranged to be paid, was offered to several parties in Canada,

without any of them being induced to accept it, as a free gift. Now, I made further enquiry with respect to the cattle which were sent to Chicago, and here again I speak under correction. My informants, who are parties who ought to have known something about the matter, were of opinion, some of them, that no cattle whatever were sent from the district east of Three Rivers to Chicago to be slaughtered, and thence exported to Europe, *via* New York, or otherwise; and others stated that if any such trade did exist, it must be in exceedingly minute proportions. Now, although the transaction, to my mind, is one which ought never to have been put on the English market, and though it is very much to be regretted that any Canadians of any sort should have been engaged in it, the transaction, so far, is not one as to which this House would be called upon to deal; but on the 20th February last, about four weeks ago, I find that a meeting of the Canadian Meat Company was held in London, with Sir William Marriott, chairman, in the chair, and I find there that a series of statements are made which do appear to me to require explanations at the hands of the Minister of Public Works; I find that in the prospectus, occupying an entire side of the London *Financial News*, a paper of very wide circulation, the board of management in Canada is headed by Sir Hector L. Langevin, K.M.G., C.B., &c., Minister of Public Works of Canada, and I find that Sir William Marriott, M.P., states in this report, on the 20th February last, that their position was as follows:—

"Amount subscribed was £151,355, and the amount paid to Mr. Bender was £44,500; therefore out of the £151,000 they had in hand about £110,000. The directors thought if their duty on hearing of the reports to stop all expenditure, because at any rate, if the worst came to the worst, they felt the shareholders would have two-thirds of the money. They thought it then their duty to make enquiries, and sent telegrams over to Three Rivers at once. The first one was to Sir Charles Tupper, and was as follows:—'Inform Directors Canadian (Direct) Meat Company, Three Rivers.'—

I presume the Canadian directors.—

—"passed resolution, mailed to-day, protesting newspaper attacks, confirming Bender's statement prospectus." Then he goes on to say:

"He has always believed that the company would be a great success. Sir Charles Tupper, the responsible agent for the Canadian Government here, believed in it. Sir Hector Langevin, a responsible Minister in Canada, approved of it, and agreed with all the statements made in the prospectus, and those statements were also borne out by the mayor of Three Rivers, who, they were told, was a highly respected man. Those were names he knew they could rely on as being trustworthy."

He further proceeds to say in reference to these gentlemen:

"These people were not irresponsible people, and if the worst came to the worst, when they found they had been deceived, he did not think the company would be without their remedy to get back the whole or the greater portion of their £44,000. If they had been deceived by the promoters, he thought they would be liable, and could be made liable, but he did not know of any prospectus brought out that had better people, people in a higher position, to state that what was in it was correct. In conclusion he assured the meeting that the directors were anxious, &c."

I found further, that it was stated that Mr. Bender appeared to have got this for nothing, and proceeding to deal with one of the questions raised, the chairman went on to say:

"Proceeding to deal with questions raised, the chairman said, Sir Hector Langevin and Mr. Normand were

managers in Canada for the company. Canadian people were not, as a rule, investors in enterprises, because they had not the money to subscribe."

And certainly, in an enterprise of this kind, I think, it is not very much to be wondered at. Now, I desire to call the attention of Ministers to these statements. I think it would be well, under the circumstances, that the Minister of Public Works, whose name appears at the head of the Canadian board of management, should state to the House, first of all, what interest he has in this enterprise: whether he has received, directly or indirectly, or been promised, any portion of the £44,000 sterling, or any other advantages in connection with this; I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman is in a position to contradict the statements which have been made to me as to the value of this concession, as to whether it is or is not true that this concession was offered to anybody in Canada who chose to expend the money required, and whether, in point of fact, the £150,000 sterling, partly in cash, partly in paid-up shares and founders' shares, which has been paid to the promoters of this enterprise—whether, in point of fact, at any rate so far as the money part of it goes, that sum has not been extracted from the pockets of English capitalists, wholly and solely for a concession which could have been obtained for the asking from the corporation of Three Rivers; and, what is much more to the purpose, whether it was not paid, as Sir William Marriott states in the speech which I have read, which he made in London on 20th February last, on the ground of the confidence which English shareholders reposed in a prospectus issued apparently under the sanction of our High Commissioner in London (Sir Charles Tupper), and bearing the name of the hon. the Minister of Public Works; and besides, what information or particulars the hon. gentleman is able to give us as to the statement that a large quantity of cattle are sent from the district east of Quebec to Chicago, a distance of 900 miles, where they are slaughtered, and the carcasses sent back another 900 miles for export to Europe *via* New York. These questions I think it is desirable the hon. gentleman should answer to this House. I am not going to proceed, as I stated, to make any motion with respect to the advisability or inadvisability of hon. members, while Ministers of the Crown, interfering in any commercial enterprises in this country. That is a question which may well be discussed, but I will not discuss it on the present occasion. What I do say is this: *prima facie*, if the information given to me is true, it would appear that a great fraud has been perpetrated on the English public, who had been induced, under the circumstances I have described, to take stock in this enterprise; and that it is likely to be in the very highest degree injurious to the interests of the people of Canada, and to all persons who are desirous to obtain money on the English stock exchange market, if no better explanation than I have heard can be offered with respect to the issue of this prospectus and the statements therein contained. I venture to say that the repetition of transactions like that would inflict many millions of pounds sterling injury upon the people of Canada, and I sincerely trust that the hon. gentleman, for the sake of Canada, will be able to give to us a satisfactory explanation of the circumstances to which I have now called the attention of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, thought it his duty to bring this matter before the House, and I do not complain of the manner in which he has done so. The hon. gentleman put certain questions to which he wants answers. I have prepared a short statement of the facts, which I will now read to the House, in order to answer his question, and I may offer a few remarks after reading this statement. The statement is as follows:—Mr. Bender, before leaving for England last summer, told me he was going for the purpose of forming a company to be called *La Compagnie des Abattoirs des Trois-Rivières*; that the city corporation of Three Rivers were disposed to give free for that purpose one hundred acres of land and other concessions in order to have the seat of the company in Three Rivers, considering that it would be to the advantage of the city and also that of the company, labor being cheap in Three Rivers, and ships being able to load and unload easily at their wharves. I said I believed the city was right and I hoped the project would succeed. Some eight or ten weeks after that I received from Mr. Bender a cablegram from London telling me that the company was formed and that Sir Henry Isaacs, Admiral Inglefield, Sir William Marriott and others, directors of the company, would wish me and the Mayor of Three Rivers to become directors with them. I consulted Sir John A. Macdonald, and he thought that inasmuch as this company was to have its seat in Canada in my constituency, and that it would thus benefit largely the city of Three Rivers, I should give an affirmative answer. I, therefore, cabled "Yes." Since that period I have had no notice from the company. They have never communicated to me their prospectus. They never notified me to attend any meeting. I have never been called upon to subscribe or sign the stock-book, and therefore have not considered myself a director. When Mr. Bender came back to Canada, he met me with the Mayor of Three Rivers, and I told them that I did not consider myself a director, having had no notification from the company and not having qualified, and therefore I did not intend taking any part in the management or direction, and up to now I have had none. I may add that either directly or indirectly I have received no money, fee, stock or other advantage from the company or any person connected with it, or in any other way whatever. Moreover, I expect none. This is my statement. I may add that from it the hon. gentleman and the House must see, that leading men in London, including Sir Henry Isaacs, Admiral Inglefield, Sir William Marriott and others form the company, that they obtained their information either from Mr. Bender or someone else, and not from me, and that the only communication I had with those hon. gentlemen was the cablegram sent by Mr. Bender, asking, on behalf of those gentlemen, that I, as well as the Mayor of Three Rivers, would become a director with them. That is my position. The only other communication I had with any of those gentlemen was with Sir Henry Isaacs, who shortly afterwards telegraphed, asking me whether I would go to London to be present at his inauguration as Lord Mayor of the city and to attend the banquet, which invitation I declined, not being able to cross the ocean at that time, and it not being my habit, of course, to

go that distance to be present at a banquet. In regard to the other questions asked by the hon. gentleman opposite in regard to land at Three Rivers, in regard to cattle and other matters, I know nothing about them.

Mr. AMYOT. I cannot allow this matter to pass without stating what I know in regard to the whole subject. Mr. Bender, with whom I am well acquainted, although I am perhaps not on very friendly terms with him, is a most honorable and enterprising man. He considered that a large trade could be done in live stock between Canada and England, and he thought that by forming a company and slaughtering the animals here they could be sent in a frozen state to the English and European markets, and very large profits obtained. He went to England for the purpose, and he succeeded in forming a company. Everything went on very well until Chicago merchants interested in the same trade raised very strong opposition, and they filled the newspapers with attacks on the details of the prospectus, and so on. They succeeded in throwing doubts into the minds of the directors of the company in England, and to-day I am sorry to say that we in Canada are giving our assistance to the Chicago opposition. I think that the trade of shipping dead meat to England would be much more profitable than that of sending the living animals. We would save the cost of feeding the animals on the voyage, we would save the danger of disease among the animals, we would retain here the skins and other portions of the animals; and moreover, labor is cheaper here, and the cost of transportation is cheaper for dead meat than for living animals. Moreover, a company would be able to erect buildings at Three Rivers on ground that could be obtained much cheaper than elsewhere, and being exempt from taxation, the company would be sure to be a paying one. But by joining hands with the Chicago opposition, we run the risk of preventing the company from succeeding, and it will be so much money lost to the country. As to the live stock being shipped east of Quebec or Three Rivers to Chicago, those who deny it have never seen the Grand Trunk cars, as I have seen them very often, filled with live stock, going to Chicago from these places. There is a considerable amount of live stock at the disposal of the market in that section of the country, but the abattoir company would not be limited to that district for that supply. Of course, if we proceed with this opposition, the capitalists, when they see such influential men as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) opposed to the company, may be inclined to think that the opposition from Chicago is well founded in fact. I hope that the company will succeed, because it will encourage the farmers in raising stock, it will improve the condition of the labor in the country, and it will create a new commerce which will be to the benefit of the Dominion at large. I think it is the duty of any public man, when he sees an undertaking of this kind having a chance of success, to lend his name to the project, and to encourage the enterprising men who wish to devote themselves for the benefit of the country, and for their own benefit as well. I see no impropriety in that, and I think that the people of the city of Three Rivers, instead of approving the course of the hon. member for South Oxford, will think it most strange that the

opposition to the scheme should come from one of our fellow-countrymen. I do not say that as a party man, but I state it from a national point of view. I know the hon. gentleman is moved by honest motives, but I believe he does not know much about the part of the country to which he refers, and that if he did know he would change his opinions entirely.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite sure that it is not necessary for me to corroborate the statement of my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, but I wish to emphasise the fact, for fear there should be a doubt about it, that these gentlemen in England, Sir Henry Isaacs, and the other gentlemen who have been named, were not in any way induced to enter into this company, from the fact of its being encouraged or initiated in any way by my hon. friend, Sir Hector Langevin. Sir Hector came to me with a telegram from Mr. Bender, which ran to this effect:

"Sir Henry Isaacs, Lord Mayor of London, Sir William Marriott, and others, have formed a company for the purpose of establishing this abattoir, and they want you and the Mayor of Three Rivers to join."

Sir Hector asked me if, under the circumstances, I thought he ought to give his name. I told him that if these respectable names were in the company, and as it was a company that was likely to be of great advantage to his constituency, I did not see how he could well refuse, and the Minister of Public Works acted on my suggestion.

Mr. LAURIER. Every member of the House will, I am sure, accept as perfectly satisfactory, and will be glad to hear, the explanation given by the hon. Minister of Public Works. But what has taken place in this matter shows, in my judgment, the great precaution public men in Canada should take before they allow their names to be used in such a way as this. I do not say that the object of this company is not a laudable one. I think it is a laudable one in many respects, for I believe that a meat trade could be organised anywhere on the St. Lawrence, whether at Montreal, Three Rivers or Quebec, but it is manifest to me that the statements which have been made in this prospectus cannot be borne out by facts. In the first place, it is not true that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is one of the directors in Canada; and, in the next place, I cannot conceive where my friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has ever seen that there is a cattle trade between the district below Quebec and Chicago. My hon. friend says he has seen some cars loaded with cattle, and I believe it; but we have only to look at the blue books to see that there is no export trade of live cattle between Quebec and Chicago or between any part of Canada and the United States. As to the concession of a hundred acres of land made in the city of Three Rivers, for which is agreed to be paid £150,000 sterling, a part cash, with the additional condition that there should be an expenditure on it of £20,000, this seems to me the most monstrous proposition I have ever heard. This certainly could not be the price of one hundred acres of land on the outskirts of the city of Three Rivers, which is not built on, and which is merely farming land. If it were to bring \$100 an acre, it would be the most it would be valued at, and some of it would be worth that price, because it is most valuable farming land, but when there is such a preposterous price as this stipulated, we do not know

how to criticise the prospectus, and I had better abstain from any comment upon it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this matter, I desire to say two or three words. After what the hon. Minister of Public Works has said, I do not think that I am at present disposed to condemn him for more than great imprudence. If he does not know, I know right well, how this transaction is going to be commented on in England. Already actions have been taken at law by the shareholders of this company, to recover part of these £44,000 sterling, which has been paid for an utterly worthless concession. I have to say to my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), and to others, that such transactions as this are infamous, and will make the name of Canada stink in the nostrils of every English investor.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has referred to the people in this country who, he says, are aiding the people of Chicago to deter a legitimate enterprise which comes into rivalry with their trade. As one interested in newspaper enterprise in Canada, and as one connected with one of the first newspapers to take this matter up and deal with it, I wish to tell my hon. friend from Bellechasse, that it was no spirit of aiding the people of Chicago which induced that newspaper to take that matter up. When I read that prospectus, and knew to my own knowledge that it was founded on misstatements, I felt it to be my duty, as a person controlling a leading journal in Montreal, to deal with the question. I have listened to the explanation of the hon. Minister of Public Works, and I am glad to find that that gentleman can so well clear his skirts of this transaction. I did not believe, when I heard it, that he had anything to do with promoting a scheme of that kind, further than to allow his name to be used to promote the prosperity of the district he represents. Sir, we know what this country has suffered in the British market from enterprises which have been deleterious and injurious in their effects. We know that the false representations which were made for years in connection with the original prospectus of the Grand Trunk Railway, threw this country back nearly half a century in the money market of London, and it has scarcely yet recovered from the effects of that affair. Sir, this is a wilder scheme, such as was never contemplated at the time the Grand Trunk scheme was promulgated, whose promoters promised to pay 11½ per cent. on the outlay. Sir, any one knowing anything about the business of the country and taking up the prospectus and reading it, knows what an absurdity it is. I am amazed at the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) saying that there is a great trade in cattle in that district, and that he has seen carloads of cattle shipped at Montreal for Chicago. The hon. gentleman must have deceived himself, because such a thing does not exist. I have taken the pains to ascertain the facts in the matter, and I cannot find that a single carload of cattle has been shipped there for Chicago. Some breeding cattle may have been sent to the west, but I do not think any of them came from the district of Three Rivers. They have been almost entirely imported cattle, on their way to Ontario and Manitoba for breeding purposes; but I venture to say, that the hon. gentleman did not

Mr. LATRIER.

see one carload of feeding cattle shipped at Montreal for the west. My objection to this scheme is on public grounds. I feel that anything launched on the British market that will have the effect of deceiving the people there is deleterious and detrimental to the business interest of Canada. I feel that we, as public men, ought to put our foot on such schemes; but we ought, at the same time, to let the British public know that if they are misled into making foolish investments in things of this kind, the fault rests with themselves for accepting representations without verifying them. This Parliament ought not to sit silent when such a monstrous scheme is propounded. It was only a week or two ago that I met a couple of gentlemen who were sent out here to verify the statements made in the prospectus of this company, and, from what I could learn, they were not very well satisfied. I do not know what actions are threatened in connection with this matter; but if actions are commenced in London, and the subject is ventilated, as it will be, I am sure it cannot have otherwise than a very injurious effect on the credit of Canada and on those Canadian enterprises which are worthy of the investment of British capital. We know that there are at the present time gentlemen in England floating our phosphate mines, asbestos mines and copper mines, and they are meeting with some degree of success; but if they are met in the market with charges such as that formulated to-night, of parties having been induced to put money into enterprises founded on false representations, they cannot have anything but a disastrous effect. My hon. friend speaks of the butter business in Three Rivers being a success. Well, I know something about the business of the country, and I venture to say that if that scheme goes on in the expectation of getting cattle from Three Rivers to make the business a profitable one and to return anything at all to the investors, it will only end in disappointment and disaster to the British capitalists who put their money into it. Therefore, I am glad that the hon. Minister of Public Works has so well explained that he has had no complicity in this affair, and I am proud of the hon. gentleman who has had the courage to bring the subject before Parliament, so that, whatever happens, the Parliament of Canada cannot be said to have remained silent with regard to such a transaction as this, even though it prevents British money from coming into the country.

Mr. MULOCK. There is one feature in connection with this matter which I think ought not to be lost sight of. The newspaper from which the hon. member for South Oxford has quoted, the *Financial News* of London, England, in giving the speech of Sir William Marriott, reports him as having stated that the scheme had the endorsement of the High Commissioner, the words being that Sir Charles Tupper believes in this scheme. I would ask the House whether it is proper for the representative of Canada in England to take part at all in endorsing schemes of this kind or in promoting private enterprises of any kind. I am not assuming in this case that Sir Charles Tupper has given authority for the statement assigned to him. He may not have so expressed himself to Sir William Marriott, although it would seem most extraordinary that that gentleman should make the statement if it was not founded in fact. If it

is a fact that the High Commissioner of Canada lends his countenance to the promotion of private enterprises, however pure his motives, in his desire to promote the best interests of Canada, still I think he commits a grave mistake. I do not think he is paid for any such purposes. He is in England to represent the Dominion of Canada, and the Dominion of Canada only, and he should be limited to dealing with such matters as are assigned to him by the Dominion Government, and the Dominion Government only. I think the Government should take steps to see that this statement is contradicted if untrue; and if it is true, steps should be taken to caution our Agent General not to do so again.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it at all necessary to defend Sir Charles Tupper from a casual remark in a newspaper, which I have heard now for the first time. I think Sir Charles Tupper understands very well that he is to keep himself clear of any connection with private enterprises of any kind so long as he is High Commissioner for Canada. He cannot well hold his tongue about such things, however. I will give an instance. Suppose the Bank of Montreal were to double its capital and go to the English market for a million more of stock, and somebody should go to Sir Charles Tupper and ask him, "Do you think that is a safe investment?" Do you think he would say, "No, I cannot give you an opinion of it?" If the hon. gentleman himself were High Commissioner in such a case, and the question were put to him, "What do you think of this company—do you think it is a respectable company?" I think he ought to express his opinion if he has any opinion; but he ought not to be connected with promoting, or projecting, or holding stock in it, or in any way whatever implicating himself in, or annexing himself to any private enterprise however meritorious. I agree with my hon. friend; but, if there happens to be a worthy enterprise coming from Canada, and he happens to be asked if it is respectable and worthy of consideration, I think he would be very wrong in refusing to give his candid opinion, because the fact of his declining to express an opinion would cast such a doubt upon it as would most likely kill the most worthy enterprise in the world.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not make my observations with any view to refer to him particularly, further than to say that he should not promote companies. I am giving him credit for honesty of purpose, but I say that he should not use his position to promote private companies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am with you altogether in that.

Mr. MULOCK. That was the tenor of my remarks, and the more closely he adheres to that policy the less danger he will run. He ought if possible to avoid giving opinions, though under certain circumstances his withholding an opinion might do more harm than good. That is a matter which he must judge for himself and run the risk.

Mr. AMYOT. My statement has been challenged as to the number of cattle that go to the United States from the Province of Quebec. Taking the tables of Trade and Navigation of last year of our general freight with the United States, I find that, of horned cattle we shipped \$488,266 worth, and of sheep \$918,374, making a total of \$1,406,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. To Chicago?

Mr. AMYOT. To the States.

Mr. MITCHELL. He said Chicago.

Mr. AMYOT. If we can keep the greatest part of that and ship it from here with profit, I think that will be a very good thing.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sault Ste. Marie Canal..... \$1,641,000

Mr. DAWSON. I have some very interesting information about the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, which I may be permitted to give to the House. It is very important for us to consider the trade which has arisen in that western country, and I have a statement here showing the amount of freight that passed through the canal during the past summer. The traffic has very largely increased on the American side, and it was only by working night and day, and by the very best management, and by taking advantage of every hour of time, that the enormous fleet of vessels which passed up and down during the summer could be got through. Upon a former occasion I had occasion to draw a comparison between the traffic passing through the Suez Canal, which carries the commerce of Europe and Asia, and that passing between our two great inland seas, Lakes Huron and Superior. While I stated last year that the traffic on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal was hardly up to that on the Suez Canal, I am in a position to say this year that the actual freight traffic passing through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal is in excess of that passing through the Suez Canal. The traffic of the Suez Canal was as follows, in the following years:—

	Vessels.	Gross Tonnage.	Net Tonnage.
1885.....	3,624	8,985,411	6,355,752
1886.....	3,100	8,183,313	5,767,655
1887.....	3,137	8,430,043	5,903,024

The net tonnage, I believe, means the actual freight tonnage, and the gross tonnage means the total room of the ship. Now, that trade does not vary much from year to year, and the value of freight carried is over £58,000,000 sterling yearly. Through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal last year, the quantity of freight which passed, was 7,516,022 tons of actual freight, and the number of vessels was of course greater than in the Suez Canal, but not so large in tonnage. That trade has gone on increasing gradually at the rate of a million tons a year. Last year over seven millions and a half of tons passed through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal of actual freight, the total value of which was \$83,732,000. Of course, the value does not come up to that of the freight that passes through the Suez Canal, but it exceeds it in bulk. A great portion of the freight is from the country round Lake Superior. The quantity east-bound last year was 5,552,000 tons, and the greater part of that east-bound freight consisted of iron and copper ores, and wheat and flour. Eighteen million bushels of wheat and 2,228,707 barrels of flour came by way of Duluth last year through the canal, and with the leave of the House I will give this little statement to the *Hansard* for reference.

STATEMENT of the Commerce through Saint Mary's Falls

Year.	Sailing Vessels.	Steamers.	Unregistered Craft.	Total Passengers.	Total Lockages.	Tonnage.		Passengers.	Coal.	Flour.	Wheat.
						Registered.	Actual Freight.				
						Tons.	Barrels.				
1855						106,296		4,270	1,414	10,289	
1856						101,458		4,674	3,968	17,686	
1857						180,820		6,650	5,278	16,560	
1858						219,819		9,230	4,118	13,782	
1859						352,642			8,884	39,459	
1860						403,657				50,250	
1861						276,639		8,816	11,507	22,743	
1862						359,612		8,468	11,346	17,291	
1863						507,434		18,281	7,805	31,975	
1864	1,045	366		1,411		571,438		16,985	11,282	83,937	
1865	602	395		997		409,062		19,777		34,985	
1866	555	453		1,009		458,530		14,067	19,915	33,603	
1867	839	466		1,305		556,899		15,120	22,927	28,345	
1868	817	338		1,155		432,563		10,590	25,814	27,372	
1869	939	339		1,338		524,885		17,657	27,850	32,007	
1870	1,397	431		1,828		690,826		17,153	15,952	33,548	49,700
1871	1,064	573		1,637		752,101		15,859	46,798	26,000	1,376,705
1872	1,212	792		2,004		914,735		25,830	80,815	136,411	507,134
1873	1,549	968		2,517		1,204,446		36,966	96,780	172,692	2,119,397
1874	833	901		1,734		1,070,857		22,958	61,123	179,855	1,120,015
1875	569	1,464		2,033		1,259,534		19,685	101,260	309,991	1,213,788
1876	884	1,735		2,417		1,541,676		39,286	124,734	315,224	1,671,549
1877	1,401	1,050		2,451		1,439,216		21,800	91,575	355,117	1,349,738
1878	1,091	1,476		2,567		1,667,136		26,394	91,856	344,599	1,872,940
1879	1,403	1,618	100	3,121		1,667,071		18,979	110,704	451,000	2,603,666
1880	1,718	1,735	50	3,503		1,734,890		25,766	170,501	523,860	2,105,920
1881	1,706	2,117	181	4,004	2,120	2,092,757	1,567,741	24,671	295,647	605,453	3,456,965
1882	1,663	2,739	372	4,774	2,572	2,468,088	2,029,521	30,256	480,184	344,044	3,728,856
1883	1,458	2,620	237	4,315	2,351	2,042,259	2,267,105	39,130	714,444	687,031	5,000,473
1884	1,709	3,649	371	5,689	3,074	2,997,837	2,874,557	54,214	706,379	1,248,294	11,985,791
1885	1,689	3,354	337	5,380	2,863	3,085,937	3,256,628	36,147	894,991	1,440,093	15,274,213
1886	2,554	4,584	306	7,424	3,593	4,219,397	4,527,759	27,088	1,009,969	1,759,365	18,991,485
1887	2,562	5,968	825	9,355	4,165	4,697,598	5,494,649	32,668	1,352,987	1,572,735	23,096,520
1888	2,009	5,305	489	7,803	3,845	5,130,659	6,411,423	25,558	2,105,041	2,190,725	18,596,351
1889	2,635	6,501	443	9,579	4,684	7,221,935	7,516,022	25,712	1,629,197	2,228,707	16,231,851

Season.	Actual Freight. (Tons of 2,000 lbs.)		Valuation of Freight Tonnage.
	East-bound.	West-bound.	
1881	965,236	445,111	\$28,965,612 94
1882	1,338,027	601,494	31,238,153 68
1883	1,277,283	989,822	39,730,663 56
1884	1,909,290	965,267	51,905,786 61
1885	2,135,066	1,121,562	53,413,472 13
1886	3,179,943	1,347,816	69,080,071 95
1887	3,749,446	1,745,203	79,031,757 78
1888	3,923,344	2,488,079	82,156,019 97
1889	5,552,641	1,963,381	83,732,527 15

NOTE 5.
The valuation of freight for each year is based on the unit values used in 1885.
The trade is still increasing, and the canal last year was taxed to its utmost capacity. They were scarcely able to pass the number of vessels through, and it was only by adopting the most excellent system and working night and day, that they were got through. Now they are building a new canal on the American side of far greater capacity than the present one, and they are also straightening the channel in order to avoid the difficulties which exist at present. The cost of improving the Sault Ste. Marie channel by way of Hay Lake will be \$3,000,000. Besides that, the new lock which is being built will cost \$4,000,000. In view of these facts, the necessity for a canal on our side must be very evident. I would call the attention of the Government to this fact. The fleets of vessels on the lakes are increasing so immensely every year that it is absolutely necessary that additional lights should be provided. This is a matter which can be no longer neglected. The Government should adopt a more liberal policy in regard to the placing of lights on these coasts so that the waters in that region may be safely navigated at all times. The navigation on the Canadian side of Lake Superior, is far better than that on the American side, and the natural harbors are very much superior to those on the other side. It only needs a proper system of lighting to have the whole American fleet passing on the north shore of Lake Superior

NOTE 1.
The west-bound freight since 9th June, 1881 (the date on which the U. S. Government assumed control), is 33 per cent. of the total, or very nearly one-half as much as the east-bound freight.

NOTE 2.
Total cost of carrying freight. Cost of carrying per mile, ton.
1887..... \$10,075,153 2.3 mills.
1888..... 7,883,077 1.5 mills.

NOTE 3.
Value of American craft. Value of Canadian craft. Total value.
1887.... \$17,684,550 \$2,089,400 \$19,773,950
1888.... 20,381,100 1,514,300 21,895,400

NOTE 4.
Proportion of freight tonnage carried by Canadian vessels: 1887, 7 per cent.; 1888, 6 per cent.
Mr. DAWSON.

Canal for each Calendar Year from its Opening in 1855.

Grain—other than Wheat.	Manufactured and Pig Iron.	Salt.	Copper.	Iron Ore.	Lumber, B.M.	Silver Ore and Bullion.	Building Stone.	Unclassified Freight.	Date of Opening.	Date of Closing.	
Bushels.	Tons.	Barrels.	Tons.	Tons.	Feet.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.			
.....	1,040	587	3,196	1,447	126,000	June	18	Nov. 23
33,908	781	464	5,727	11,597	385,000	May	6	Nov. 28
22,300	1,325	1,500	5,790	26,184	572,000	May	9	Nov. 30
10,500	2,597	950	6,744	31,035	185,000	April	18	Nov. 20
71,738	5,504	2,737	7,247	65,769	May	11	Nov. 28
133,437	9,000	120,000	May	11	Nov. 26
76,830	4,194	3,014	7,645	44,836	394,000	May	3	Nov. 14
59,062	6,438	2,477	6,881	113,014	196,000	April	27	Nov. 27
78,480	6,681	1,507	1,044	181,567	1,411,000	May	28	Nov. 24
143,560	7,643	1,776	5,331	213,753	2,001,000	May	2	Dec. 4
.....	7,346	3,175	9,935	147,459	822,000	May	4	Dec. 3
229,926	13,235	4,454	9,550	152,102	144,000	May	5	Dec. 8
249,031	20,602	5,316	10,585	222,961	390,000	May	4	Dec. 9
285,123	22,785	4,624	12,222	191,939	1,119,000	May	2	Dec. 3
323,501	23,851	5,910	18,662	239,368	1,260,000	May	4	Nov. 29
304,077	42,959	11,089	11,301	409,850	722,000	92	2,917	April	29	Dec. 1
398,823	54,984	36,199	14,562	327,461	1,072,000	464	5,228	May	8	Nov. 29
445,774	86,194	42,690	14,591	383,105	1,742,000	306	5,213	May	11	Nov. 26
309,645	44,920	29,335	15,927	504,121	1,162,000	580	2,218	May	5	Nov. 18
149,999	31,741	42,231	15,346	427,658	638,000	443	401	May	12	Dec. 2
250,080	54,381	43,989	18,396	493,408	5,391,000	847	2,978	May	12	Dec. 2
407,772	64,091	46,666	25,765	609,752	17,761,000	985	2,102	May	8	Nov. 26
343,542	39,971	63,188	16,767	568,082	4,143,000	987	2,506	May	8	Nov. 30
264,674	14,882	63,520	22,529	550,750	24,119,000	650	2,754	May	8	Dec. 3
951,496	39,218	92,245	22,309	540,075	35,598,000	324	2,226	May	8	Dec. 3
2,547,106	46,791	77,916	21,753	677,073	44,539,000	66	2,283	April	28	Nov. 15
367,838	87,830	65,897	29,488	748,131	58,877,000	1,400	129,031	May	7	Dec. 5
473,129	92,870	176,612	25,409	987,060	82,783,000	22	5,428	172,167	April	21	Dec. 3
776,552	109,910	70,898	31,024	791,732	87,131,000	814	2,405	191,571	May	2	Dec. 11
517,103	72,428	144,804	36,062	1,136,071	122,389,000	9,731	6,047	207,173	April	23	Dec. 10
422,981	60,842	136,355	31,927	1,235,122	127,984,000	3,669	8,189	184,963	May	6	Dec. 2
715,373	115,208	158,677	38,627	2,087,809	138,688,000	2,009	9,449	230,926	May	25	Dec. 4
775,166	74,919	204,908	34,886	2,497,713	165,226,000	350	13,401	344,586	May	1	Dec. 2
2,022,308	63,703	210,433	28,960	2,570,517	240,372,000	3,385	33,541	345,854	May	1	Dec. 4
2,133,245	3,1	168,250	33,456	4,095,855	315,554,000	5,947	33,538	312,410	April	15	Dec. 4

Average date of opening up to close of season of 1889—May 2.

Average date of closing up to close of season of 1889—Nov. 30.

because of the greater safety which they find there, and, when we remember the immense quantities of agricultural products which will be sent down from our own North-West, which are increasing every year and which must come to Lake Superior and pass through these waters, it is evident that we need not only this additional canal, but improved navigation and additional lights and increased accommodation for the vessels which pass through those inland seas.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would desire the Minister to inform the House if he is at present prepared to state the probable total cost of this work, as well as the time when he expects it to be completed. I think it would be convenient, at this period, if the hon. gentleman would explain to the House the general policy of the Government in regard to the canals and the probable cost which they think will be necessary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps we had better confine ourselves to the question of each of the canals as they come up. I can give more specific answers to the hon. gentleman in that way. The cost of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal is estimated as approximating to \$3,000,000. Most of the amount of \$1,641,000 which is now asked for is a revote. This is estimated to be the amount which is required during the year 1890-91. The expenditure hitherto has been very small—\$42,164. That has been used in sinking the great lock which will be required on that canal. A portion of the lock-

pit has been sunk to the full depth, and there has been dredging on the upper entrance to the canal. I need not say much more about the value of the canal after the very clear statement, and the very satisfactory statement, which has been made by my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) in regard to the great value and the great necessity for this canal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has not stated at what date he expects to complete this canal?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In about two years and a half.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is about the end of 1892?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the hon. gentleman thinks that \$3,000,000 will suffice to complete that work?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My information from the chief engineer of canals is that it will approximate to that amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose that is for a depth of 16 or 18 feet?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is for a depth of 18 feet below the lowest possible water.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. 18 feet clear

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Lachine Canal.....\$71,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman choose to state now what he expects will be the total cost of the contemplated works on the St. Lawrence canals?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I do not think I have a statement of that prepared, though, perhaps, I ought to have had one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it would have been better.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will have that prepared for the hon. gentleman. As to this vote of \$71,000, it is for the purchase of lands necessary to deepen the canal to fourteen feet, and to form a drain from the town of Lachine to the St. Lawrence, and also to give natural drainage to the town of Lachine. There has been a great deal of complaint from the people of Lachine as to the canal intercepting their connection with the St. Lawrence. It has been stated that this has rendered their town unhealthy, and that it is absolutely necessary that some means of drainage should be afforded to the town of Lachine. This is the principal object of the vote this year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I see that a large amount is taken because of a judgment of the Supreme Court for \$4,992 to the representatives of R. A. Hebert.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That sum the hon. gentleman speaks of, was to pay the claim of Mr. Hebert for damage done to his land by the overflow of the canal. He brought an action and got a verdict. The Government may be obliged to buy his land, because there is no means of preventing the inundation at some seasons of the year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What were the costs of the suit?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot sever them, but I suppose the whole amount is included in that sum.

Cornwall Canal..... \$1,000,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are you going to do here?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The revised estimate of the probable cost of enlarging the Cornwall Canal for a draft of fourteen feet throughout, is \$3,710,000; the total expenditure chargeable to enlargement up to 30th July, 1888, was \$824,854.15; expenditure for 1888-89, \$163,993.85; from 1st July to 31st December, \$205,889; total expenditure up to 31st December, \$1,194,708. The estimated expenditure from 1st January to 30th June of this year, is \$14,111, making an expenditure as estimated, up to the 30th June, of \$1,208,820. Required to complete to 1st July next, \$2,501,180. That gives 14 feet for navigation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A question of interest has been raised with respect to this which it is probably my duty to mention. Statements have been made by some shippers cognisant with the river, although, of course, I am not at all prepared to say that these statements are all correct. It is an engineering question wholly, and I simply repeat what these men have said; but I have been informed by some shippers, friends of the hon. gentleman, that, in their opinion, there

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

was considerable risk lest, in the process of deepening the channel, the water in the upper regions would be sensibly lowered. Now, I cannot say whether there is any foundation for that, but such a thing is at least abstractly possible, and if there should be any foundation—and these gentlemen have had long experience and acquaintance with the St. Lawrence—we would find ourselves in a very pretty position, if, as fast as we deepened the stream in one part, we found that we made it shallower in another.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman, or some other hon. member, brought this up last year, and I took occasion to make some enquiries about it. My information is that there is not the slightest apprehension that the deepening in the manner the hon. gentleman mentions, or even the deepening by removing boulders and obstructions so as to make a depth of 14 feet, will in any way accelerate the draught of the water to such an extent as to lower it above.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not at all mean that it would affect a reservoir like Lake Ontario; but the St. Lawrence, as the hon. gentleman knows, is contracted in some places, and I dare say, Mr. Chairman, you know pretty well that the width must be something like half a mile or three-quarters of a mile close to Brockville. It is conceivable, if you are constructing a channel of that depth for four or five miles, that the effect might be to lower the water above.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Quite conceivable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not pretend to say that is the case; still, if the First Minister has caused enquiry to be made and is satisfied that there is no apprehension on that score, there is no more to be said.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The chief engineer told me that there was not the slightest apprehension that it could in any way affect the river.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice by the Auditor General's Report, page D—138, that as high as \$80 an acre was paid for some land in connection with this canal; \$1,920 for twenty-five acres in one place, and \$2,000 for ten acres in another place. How has the value of this land been placed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have always been appraised by the Government appraiser. In most cases the parties object at first, but they are told that if they do not like it they can go to the Court of Exchequer, and rather than go to the Court of Exchequer, they take the price.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me a very high price to pay for ordinary township land.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Land is valuable along the St. Lawrence, and depend upon it, there is no more paid than a fair value. We are obliged to pay the appraised value. The hon. gentleman must remember that, besides the value of the land, there is the consideration that the parties are cut off from direct access to the St. Lawrence, which greatly diminishes the value of the property.

Murray Canal \$150,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of the Murray Canal to date ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The total expenditure on the Murray Canal is \$1,042,646 up to the end of the fiscal year. I have a memorandum which says that up to the 31st December, 1889, the whole expenditure has been \$1,106,513, and this vote of \$150,000 is required to complete the canal. It will have a depth of 12 feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What depth is there in the Bay of Quinté, below that ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is 12 feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disposed to censure making it 12 feet, because, after all, it gives admission to only a moderate class of vessels. As the matter stands, only comparatively small craft can take advantage of the internal navigation of the Bay of Quinté.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The depth of the main channel is considerable. The depth of water at Belleville and Picton, and of the latter I speak particularly, is eight or nine feet. Dredging operations have been steadily continued until a depth has been obtained of about 12 feet. There are some shoals which interfere with navigation, but they are of small extent, and can easily be removed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has there been any serious trouble on this canal from the falling in of the banks or from quicksands ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No ; nothing of that kind. The canal is not faced with stone ; there is a little wash, but no falling in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it open to travel to the full extent ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be open in May to the full extent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it used at all at present ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been used, but it has not been regularly opened.

Welland Canal..... \$184,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice under this head an item of \$92,000, deepening Welland Canal to 14 feet throughout. The Welland Canal cannot be deepened for that outlay. What has been spent upon it up to the present time ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This amount of \$92,000 is for the purpose of winding-up certain contracts. The work connected with the deepening to 14 feet has been completed. There is also an item included of \$12,000 for land damages on Grand River.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see, on page D—141, Auditor General's Report, a payment of \$9,228 for sodding on the canal. This is a heavy charge for the work, as natural grass sown would have saved the expense.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am informed that grass will not grow on newly thrown-up earth, but that such has to be sodded.

Trent River Navigation..... \$76,000

Mr. BARRON. I think I should thank the Premier, or whoever is responsible, for taking my

advice last Session and completing some of the work necessary for the navigation at Fenelon Falls. I have to recognise that they did what was right in removing obstructions so far as the rocks at the entrance to Fenelon Falls River are concerned. But I still have my complaint to make, which I made no less than four Sessions ago, that the money expended on this lock has been, and is now, entirely wasted by reason of not having the bridge across the river at Fenelon Falls removed. I am not alone in my complaint, for I find that an official of the Government refers to it. Speaking of the work done at the lake he says :

“ The corner was broken off one of the valves of the lock-gates. This was repaired. The passage through to Cameron's Lake is stopped by the fixed bridge of the Grand Trunk Railway across the river at the head of the canal. This bridge should be provided with a swing before the opening of navigation next season.”

Next season is rather late in the day, although, of course, better late than never. Hon. gentlemen opposite should listen to, and take the advice of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who are really anxious to do what is right in behalf of their constituents, and the Government should have adopted the advice I offered during the first Session I was in Parliament. I then pointed out that this bridge was in the way of navigation, and, not only so, but the money expended up to the present time on the lock at Fenelon Falls has been actually wasted, and the money recently expended on removing obstructions to the entrance of the river has also been wasted, unless the obstruction of the bridge is also removed. What is the use of expending money year after year if we are going to allow an obstruction, such as this bridge is, to remain ? What is the use of making two bites of a cherry ? What is the use of prolonging this work, except to prolong it to the next general election ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh.

Mr. BARRON. The Premier says “ oh.” It is the truth, nevertheless ; and I may tell him that the prolongation of the work is not satisfactory to the people in my part of the country. There is on record not only the correspondence with myself, but also a petition from the different municipalities interested in the navigation of these waters, setting forth the needs of the country in regard to navigation, and also that private individuals have up to the present time suffered severe pecuniary loss by not being able to fulfil contracts, as they were unable to forward cord-wood through Fenelon Falls on account of the obstructions in the river. We all know that, prior to every election, the Premier and Sir Charles Tupper, when he occupied a position in the Government went through that part of the country and made election promises connecting the waters of the Georgian Bay with Lake Ontario. I applaud the Government for the work they have done in making internal navigation, but I am sorry to say they have not done that which they promised the people would be done ; that is, to make this canal right through to Lake Ontario. On one occasion, when the Premier himself went to Peterborough, he told the people that he had made arrangements to retain control of these internal waters, which the late Government had handed over, he said, to the Ontario Government, so that they would have communication from Georgian Bay right down to

Lake Ontario, by means of this Trent Valley Canal. That was just prior to an election, but just so soon as the election was over, the Premier said "no" to that project. I think I produced last Session the remarks then made by the right hon. gentleman, as published in his own organ.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Read them again.

Mr. BARRON. Not only that, but I produced a statement from a Peterborough paper, an organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, showing that the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) after the last election stated that he had received an intimation from the Minister of Public Works, that the work between Lakefield and Peterborough should go on in the following summer. That statement was made the night of the election, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman must have heard it from the Minister of Railways and Canals prior to the elections, and no doubt, perhaps, he made use of it for the purpose of gaining his election. The Premier himself has recognised the importance of this canal, when he says in his report for 1889:

"In view of the interest taken in the scheme for connecting the waters of the Bay of Quinté, Lake Ontario, with those of Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, it was thought advisable that the matter should receive investigation at the present time."

The Government thought wise to appoint a commission on the 8th October, 1887, to find out the needs of the country, so far as the Trent Valley Canal was concerned, but which needs they professed to be familiar with when they made the election statement I have alluded to. From the date of the appointment of the commission, in October, 1888, to the present time we have not yet had their report. The Premier will recollect that at the beginning of this Session I asked if he expected to have the report of the commission soon laid on the Table, and he said "yes;" but I see by the papers of yesterday, or the day before, that the commissioners visited Orillia with the object of getting some evidence there. If I am not mistaken, the time occupied by these commissioners for the whole purpose of getting evidence, and making up their minds as to what report they should present, has been altogether forty days since their appointment in 1887. May I ask why is it, that the commissioners are allowed to take this very long time to make up their minds in regard to their report, if the reason is not that the Government is willing that they should prolong their deliberations until just prior to the next general election? In view of the great interest which the Premier himself says is taken by the people of that locality in this work, I say that the Government are much to blame for allowing the commissioners to so long delay their report. I am voicing the feeling in my part of the country when I say that much dissatisfaction is felt, not only at this commission being appointed, but particularly on account of the way in which they have been allowed to delay their report, and also on account of the way in which the work has been done at Fenelon Falls, by reason of which navigation has been interfered with for such a length of time, and the interest of the money wasted ever since 1885, when the lock was first begun. I do hope that some reasonable promptitude will be shown now by the Government in completing the work at Fenelon Falls, so as to make the

Mr. BARRON.

upper waters navigable with those below. While I say that, I am quite willing to give the Government credit for doing the work as well as they have done it, although it was long-delayed justice. Here let me say that Mr. Kennedy, of Bobcaygeon, the contractor, did his work well in removing the obstructions at Fenelon Falls River. But, if the obstruction of the bridge, which Mr. Rogers refers to in his report, is not removed the entire communication will be stopped, and the large amount of money already expended will be wasted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is, I think, getting election on the brain. He says everything is postponed until election time, and yet he lauds the Government for having done what they have done. He also says, that when I was in that part of the country, I urged this matter for election purposes; but the hon. gentleman applauds me for using it, whether for election purposes or not, if it happened to be for the benefit of his constituents. The hon. gentleman says that he objects to the delays which have taken place, and he thinks we are holding the matter over until the election. Well, we are approaching election time now, and if we expended too much money up there, the hon. gentleman would probably say as to that what he said as to the previous expenditure, that it was for election purposes. Don't you think it would be safer for us to postpone all further expenditure until after the general election? Would that suit my hon. friend?

Mr. BARRON. I am quite willing to sacrifice my chances in the interests of my constituents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we cannot be charged with any want of energy or neglect of the Trent River navigation, I shall read to my hon. friend the amounts which have been expended for this purpose: In 1883, \$40,767; in 1884, \$161,161; in 1885, \$282,000; in 1886, \$357,000; in 1887, \$537,000.

Mr. BARRON. That was the year of the election.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, in 1888, the year after the election, we expended \$652,000. In 1889, for the fiscal year, \$699,000; and up to the 31st December last, \$703,000. I do not think we can be charged with any want of energy in this matter, and it is rather fortunate for the good fame of the Government, that we have spent considerably more money since the elections than before. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says with respect to that bridge at Fenelon Falls, but there is a contention between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company as to who should pay for the building. At all events, this vote for \$75,000 is required to pay the work now under contract, to settle with some contractors yet unpaid, and for cleaning out the channel at several points between Lakefield and Balsam Lake. With regard to the commission, Mr. Kennedy, one of them, whose report we want specially to get, was absent from ill-health and had to go to Europe, and there was no particular hurry in urging them to make the report. We want to get a full report in order to ascertain what the real cost is to be. No one knows better than the hon. gentleman that various opinions have been given as to that. Some persons are of opinion that it is going to cost

millions to connect the Trent navigation and to carry it down to the Bay of Quinté. There was no hurry at all, however, because these other works are going on vigorously in the meantime, and they are especially valuable for inland navigation in that part of the country. So that nothing has been lost, and this \$76,000 will remove the obstruction which the hon. gentleman complains of. The railway bridge will be built, and the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company will have to fight out the question as to who is to pay for it.

Mr. BARRON. Last Session I was told that the grant then voted was for the purpose of removing not only the obstruction which has been removed, but that created by the bridge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The money did not hold out, that is all.

Mr. BARRON. Then you should have removed the obstruction and asked Parliament to sanction the expenditure afterwards.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I should have the hon. member for North Wellington attacking me for asking for a special warrant. We are not going to do that.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. Premier says that there is a dispute as to who is liable. Has it taken three years to decide that? I do not think any lawyer acquainted with the facts will deny that the liability rests with the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Do not give our case away.

Mr. BARRON. At any rate, are the people going to suffer because the Premier and his Government cannot decide as to who is liable, when the work has to be done at some time or other? I do not complain of the expenditure. What I do complain of is the dilly-dallying policy of the hon. gentleman in proceeding with this work. He does it by piecemeal, and the result is that although the lock is there, we have been unable to use it for three or four years by reason of these obstructions to which the attention of the Government has been called time and again. They have now only woke up to the necessity of removing them. The people have confidence in the commission, but they believe that the Government are delaying the report for some reason. While the connection of the waters is, of course, an admirable thing, the people will not be satisfied unless the work on this canal goes on, especially in view of the money already expended upon it. The right hon. Premier says that it may cost a large sum of money. Suppose it does, the work is necessary; and when we find the Government wasting money in building certain railways in the Lower Provinces, our people think—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You want to have a share of the swag, eh?

Mr. BARRON—if the money is to be wasted in this way, we want some of it also; and I tell the Premier that, in view of the election promises he made, the people are dissatisfied with the way he is proceeding.

Mr. BLAKE. I really think it is about time that this question of the canal should be settled. Certainly, as long ago as before the election of 1882, the hon. First Minister did make a promise in the town of Peterborough that the canal should be built.

Certainly, for years after that time the Minister of Railways and Canals reiterated that promise, and time after time it was indicated that reports were being obtained as to what the cost would be; and, if I remember aright, Mr. Rubidge was named as the officer from whom those reports were expected. Ultimately, an intimation was given, in the Railway Committee room, or somewhere else, to some large deputation which called on the Government to redeem its pledges—which had been very extensively used in a large number of the ridings bordering on the route of the projected canal—that the cost of the work was roughly estimated, I think, at the sum of \$9,000,000. Another election came on, when I have no doubt further pressure was put upon the Government, and after the election of 1887, it seems that for the first time the Government took the step of appointing a commission. Their doing so at that time was, of course, an indication that they had neglected their duty up to that time. If they were going to make the building of the canal contingent on the commission giving a satisfactory statement of its cost, there should have been no such pledge as was given in 1882, and kept dangling before the eyes of the people for years afterwards. This commission has, I think, for nearly three years, had the matter in hand, and the hon. gentleman does not yet give an intimation when their report is expected. He says that somebody was ill and went to Europe, but that there is no hurry, because the work is going on all the time. But how do we know that it is work on the canal? To do work of this kind piecemeal, if it is to be part of the great communication between the upper and the lower lakes, may be to do it in an extremely wasteful way. It may be that the work being done is adequate for the purpose of local communication, and yet it may be inadequate for the purpose of the large work if it ever comes to be accomplished. What I do say is that what was in a sense formally initiated as a pledged Government undertaking, as early as before the elections of 1882, ought not to be in the condition it is in to-day, nearly eight years later, namely, that for five or six years a step which the Government then declared to be essential, the formation of a commission, is delayed, and then the report of that commission is postponed for three or four years, and we do not know when it is to be obtained. I think the hon. gentleman ought to see this thing expedited; the report should be obtained early and a decision reached; and the people who are interested in this project, and who have been waiting for it and hanging on the hon. gentleman's words so many years, should be relieved in one way or another, by a determination either to proceed with the work or to abandon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has hardly been fair. He says we have gone on without the necessary information, but if he will look back he will remember that this is an old scheme and that it was reported on by engineers fully competent to judge on such matters. It has always been understood that this was a work sooner or later to be undertaken. The probable expenditure delayed it for years after the first project was mooted, and after these reports were made. Then the hon. gentleman says that these works, although in the general line of the proposed improvement of the Trent navigation, may be unfit for that navigation when completed. I can

assure the hon. gentleman that all the works were of great use for the local purposes for which they were used, and were constructed with a view of being a portion of the completed canal down to the Trent. There is a certain indication which is known to all engineers, as to what it would cost owing to the shallowness of the stream and of the impossibility of getting more than a certain depth, but the canal so far has been built with the object of being a portion of this great line of inland navigation. I am not in a position to say when the report will be made, but will let the hon. gentleman know in a day or two.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before closing this discussion we ought to have some understanding as to when the report of this particular commission will be received.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It does not in any way affect this work, only the extension of the work.

Mr. McMULLEN. The country has already expended a good deal in connection with this work, and before proceeding further we should have a distinct estimate of the cost, and a plan of the location of this canal. This commission has been established to ascertain whether it is in the interest of the country that the work should be completed or whether we should abandon it altogether.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object of the commission is to ascertain whether the statements of experienced engineers are true or not. They vary very much from the earlier estimates of the engineers, who were considered quite competent in their day, and we wish to ascertain exactly what the extension could be built for. The hon. gentleman must understand that, even supposing the extension of the canal should be abandoned, which I do not at all contemplate, every farthing of this money has been well expended, because it has connected a chain of lakes and has given very valuable means of transportation in a portion of the country which greatly requires it, and I think my hon. friend who represents that part of the country, and who sits near the hon. gentleman, will say that the portion of the canal which is intended to be finished by means of this vote will be very valuable and should under any circumstances be undertaken.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have not had the slightest information as to the total cost.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must wait for the report of the commission for that purpose.

Mr. McMULLEN. And we should wait for that report before voting this item. The right hon. gentleman says this is a very old scheme. It is, and it has a very peculiar history. It is quite clear that from year to year the First Minister has moved in the direction of constructing this particular work just as political necessities demanded; and when perhaps those political necessities were got over, there was a lull in the prosecution of this work, which was undertaken as a political job.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. It was undertaken for the purpose of exercising considerable political influence in that section, and has been kept alive from year to year with that object. It will stand,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

like many other works, a monument of folly for the purpose of using political influence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend who sits behind the hon. gentleman will tell him whether it is a piece of folly or not.

Mr. McMULLEN. Some portions may possibly be worth some money. If the country's means are to be invested in a manner that will give a general beneficial result, and procure a proper return for the investment, they would never have been invested in a work of that kind. Before we are asked to vote any money to begin another movement in the direction of the completion of this canal, we should have the report of that commission to guide us, because, I presume, the hon. gentleman intends to be guided by that report. In the meantime, before voting this money, we should know what that commission is going to report. I notice by the Auditor General's Report that those commissioners are drawing \$20 a day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Only when they are working.

Mr. McMULLEN. How is the hon. gentleman going to decide whether they are working or not? One of the commissioners is away in England on leave of absence, and when he comes back he may say that he has been at work all the time getting certain information. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman will be able to tell how much work the commissioners did—whether they worked Monday and adjourned Tuesday, and so on. We have had a great many commissions and we know how expensive they are. We had two or three men appointed as commissioners to settle the North-West Rebellion claims, and they sat twelve or fourteen months, and drew \$30,000 altogether. This commission has been appointed longer than the one I have just referred to, and I would like to know what it is going to cost?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These commissioners happen to be gentleman of high standing and are certainly not going to rob the country, and certainly stand above that suspicion. That would be an injurious suspicion. One of them is Mr. Frank Turner, of Toronto, who, perhaps the hon. gentleman knows, is an engineer of standing, and all he has charged so far is for thirty days of service. The \$76,000 asked for has no connection with the extension of the canal, but is required to complete the work now under contract between Rockfield and Balsam Lake, and to pay some unsettled balances due to the contractors for the old works, and to construct the railway bridge which the hon. gentleman complains is an obstruction. It has nothing to do with the extension of the railway down to the Bay of Quinté.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think there is a great deal in the contention of my hon. friend in front of me that the Government is bound to proceed more rapidly with this work. If the work was promised in 1882 by the First Minister, he must have had some idea as to the extent of the work. When he was holding forth to the electors and promising that he would use his influence to have this completed, he must have had some idea of the cost. Eight years have elapsed since the pledge was made by the Government, and I think my hon. friend has good reason for saying that, if such a time has elapsed and the Government has

not gone on with the work with the vigor they have shown in other works, they are not serious in regard to this. In 1887, there is no doubt that they made further promises, that they stated it was a very important enterprise, that it was required by the people and that the people would be benefited if it were completed. They have expended a large sum of money, but the question is, what are we to realise for the work which has been performed? Have we any adequate return for the amount of money which has been expended?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If the hon. gentleman would take a pleasure trip up that canal, he would see how far he could get, even on an ordinary light boat. If he went there to see the country, he would hardly get half way up before he would be stuck in the mud, and yet he tells me that the money has been well expended in the interest of the people in that part of the country. No doubt the money was well expended, in order that the hon. gentleman might obtain the vote of the people in that part of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They elected my hon. friend opposite.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. gentleman did everything in his power in order to defeat my hon. friend, and it was only the inherent worth and the moral superiority of my hon. friend which caused his election, and not the expenditure of this money. If the First Minister desires to see the result of the large expenditure of money on this work, I suggest that he should go up there himself next summer.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope it will be a wet summer.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Yes; or he should take sufficient quantity of drink with him or he would be thirsty before he got through.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I might do it in a cab.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Now we find there is a commission appointed. Is that intended to blind the eyes of the people in that section when the hon. gentleman states that he will go on with the work when the commissioners make their report? They are delaying that report, and the hon. gentleman does not desire to have that report. That would spoil the whole game. He would either have to say that the work is impracticable or he would have to go on with it. No doubt there will be a great deal of talk about this canal at the time of the next general election. Although the commissioners do not report, although they are kicking up their heels in Europe or in some other place and are having a nice time, we find by the Auditor's Report that they have not neglected to make their mark on the pay-roll. They do not believe in working without getting their pay. We find that some individuals are pretty well paid there. There is a certain engineer named J. A. Aylmer, who worked seven months and received \$875. He had living expenses there for 214 days for which he received \$321. It would not do for one man to perform that work, and so he had his assistant, a Mr. A. J. Belcher. I do not know whether the names are purposely reversed or not, but I see that one is J. A. and the other is A. J. Mr. Belcher was employed for 183 days for which he received \$915, and he also received a consider-

able amount for horse hire and cab hire and other things of that kind, bringing his salary up to between \$1,100 and \$1,200. Not only that. Though they were paid full wages for the services they rendered, and were allowed living expenses so as to stop the work, so as not to proceed with it, so as to keep the matter before the electorate up there, what was done? These men had to be set aside, and they could not be set aside without some consideration, and the First Minister, in the generosity of his soul, advised perhaps by his subordinate, decided that they should have a gratuity, so Mr. Aylmer received a gratuity of \$338.50, making his total pay \$1,605.50. The other individual, Mr. Belcher, was also set aside and he received a gratuity of \$255, or, in all, he received a sum of \$1,212 for the 183 days' work which he performed. Now is it any wonder that my hon. friend in front of me should feel discouraged, and should feel inclined to the opinion that the First Minister did not intend to have this work gone on with? Because, here we find a large sum of money paid to commissioners and to engineers, and large gratuities paid to men who have been removed from the work. And, yet, we are told: Oh, it is a very important work; the benefits arising from the expenditure of the money are ample; and we are having a just return for that expenditure. We find, also, in the First Minister's report, the sums paid to certain individuals. There was one sum of \$2,000, paid to a man named Stevens, for one-half of a lot containing a mill property. Perhaps the First Minister will be able to explain why this money was paid. Is it necessary to buy out all the mill properties in that section, so that they may be able to float a canoe or a flat boat down the stream? Have they to go round all the neighborhood and purchase all the little mill streams? If that be the case, more injury than benefit will be done to that section of the country. Have these amounts been expended for the purpose of building a canal? No; for no such purpose at all. It is for the purpose of keeping these people up there quiet, with the idea that they are going to have a very large amount of money expended among them, so that they may vote right at election time. That is the evident object, from the manner in which this work is being proceeded with. Now, the First Minister says that we are getting ample returns for the amount expended. What are the ample returns? Let us take his own report, and I suppose it is correct in every particular; let us see what is the amount of tonnage upon this blessed Trent Canal. The whole volume of business amounts to 16,153 tons, all told. You will be surprised when I tell you the enormous amount of revenue that the country receives from this work. It is beneficial, I have been told, for excursion parties who attempt to go up the canal for pleasure trips, for fishing, but it seems that after they have got a short way up they get stuck on some uncompleted portion of the work, and have to turn round and return home. We find the whole revenue from this canal is \$259.72. These are the ample returns for the expenditure of that money. If the hon. gentleman would go on manfully with this work, as he promised the people he would do, he would have larger returns; but he has spent just enough money to leave the work perfectly useless. He is allowing it to remain in that condition, and allowing his commissioners to kick up their heels all over

the country, and only return to their work when they want to draw their fees. I say it is time the Government should decide what they are going to do in this matter. If they think this work is important and useful, it is their bounden duty to proceed and finish it at once. On the other hand, if they think the work is not useful or is not feasible, let them tell the people so, and let the people know that they are not going to receive any more money at election time.

Mr. BARRON. It is not often that I have to disagree with any hon. gentleman on this side of the House. Notwithstanding the kind reference made by my hon. friend behind me, towards myself, I must say, that his appreciation of the state of things on that canal, in my opinion, is entirely wrong. However, much, politically speaking, I would like to see the Premier stuck in the mud, at the same time, I do not think, if he attempted to go up the Trent Valley Canal he would have any such difficulty as has been pointed out by my hon. friend. I dare say my hon. friend's figures are correct, regarding the amount of tonnage and the revenue, but, they are easily explained by the facts which I pointed out a few minutes ago, that is, by reason of the imperfect state in which these works have been left for so many years, by not completing the entire system of navigation, and the result has been that the country has received very little return for the expenditure. If the work had been gone on with properly, completing it as far as it went, the amount of tonnage would have been very much greater. I can state that large contracts to carry wood from one part of the country to another, down these waters, were entered into, and it was discovered that these contracts would have to be cancelled by reason of the obstructions to be found in the channel, which ought to have been removed when the work was proceeding, so far as the locks themselves are concerned, I entirely deny the statement that the work, so far as the internal waters are concerned, is useless. On the contrary, it has been a great boon to that part of the country, and the only annoyance the people have suffered arises from the fact that the Premier and others on that side of the House have, from time to time, been making pledges which they have not carried out. Let us see what the Premier himself said in the House on the 11th July, 1885, speaking of this system of waters:

"The system is a very old one. It has been reported on by many able engineers, and at last the Government adopted the idea of making it a permanent work by connecting the two great waterways."

That is, the Georgian Bay and Lake Ontario.—

"It may be it cannot compete in all respects with other and deeper waters and with a railway system, but it will be substantially a Dominion work, connecting the two waters, and at the same time of great advantage to the fine district and country through which it passes."

There was a distinct pledge, in the year 1885, that the work, as a canal from one great waterway to the other, would be gone on with and completed, and yet in 1889 he tells us that he appointed a commission to find out the necessity of doing that which, in the year 1885, he said would be done by his Government. Therefore, I say, the people have reason to complain bitterly of the treatment they have received in reference to this Trent Valley Canal.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

Tay Canal..... \$11,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This, I understand, is a really useful work; it drains the County of Perth.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It drains the public treasury pretty well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the annual receipts?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not opened yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand it is not completed yet?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This amount is to settle with the contractors and finish the work.

Lachine Canal..... \$55,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the amount of \$45,000 for constructing a bridge over the canal at Wellington street, Montreal, should properly appear under capital account, as it will be a permanent improvement.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is a new work, and should be carried to capital account, for it is necessary to relieve the overburdened traffic.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The remark I have from the chief engineer is this: Wellington street bridge does not afford sufficient accommodation for the traffic. When there are many vessels entering or leaving the canal, long lines of vehicles are frequently delayed on both sides. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that the city should secure other means of crossing. A bridge and the means of access will cost between \$50,000 and \$60,000.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I do not consider that the amount of \$8,400 will be sufficient to pay for the drainage of land and leakage of banks from Lachine to Côte St. Paul.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The extension of the pier to the head of the Lachine Canal has interfered with the natural drainage of the town of Lachine and the low lands adjacent. Between Lachine and Côte St. Paul the drainage of the low lands is likely to be interfered with. Consequently it is necessary to adopt some plan to deal with it. Mr. Parent, the engineer, is now engaged in preparing plans and reports as to the best means of dealing with this subject. This is only a temporary vote, as the Government has not yet received the engineer's report as to what works will be necessary.

Chambly Canal..... \$43,256

Mr. McMULLEN. Has there been any break in this canal to cause such a large expenditure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. It is, however, an old canal built many years ago.

Post Office Service..... \$3,083,140

Mr. McMULLEN. I see there is a very large increase of \$19,000 for the mail service; that will require some explanation.

Mr. HAGGART. That is caused principally by the increased amount given to the Canadian Pacific Railway of from 8 to 12 cents per mile, and to the increased mileage on the railways. The increase of from 8 to 12 cents between Montreal and Toronto

comes to \$81,300, less amount of one quarter, which was paid in 1888-89, \$61,000, and the additional mail service on 164½ miles of railway, making the total that would be paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$336,153.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the service between the Maritime Provinces and Ottawa. It is disgraceful to a country like this that the mails to the Capital should be detained for seven hours in the city of Montreal. The mails from the Maritime Provinces, east of St. John and as far as the boundary, are daily delayed, and they go no faster now than they did over the Intercolonial Railway. Nothing is gained whatever by that service over the Canadian Pacific Railway. I trust that the Postmaster General will do something for this service, and make it at least creditable to the country.

Mr. HAGGART. It is only a question of expense. The hon. gentleman will understand that to get the mails direct it would require the payment of another train from Montreal to Ottawa.

Mr. FISHER. I think there must be some difficulty also, either in the Montreal post office or the Ottawa post office, because I find, frequently, that letters which must arrive in Montreal the forenoon of one day, are not delivered here until the following morning. The mail trains from my part of the country arrive in Montreal about ten o'clock in the forenoon, and these letters ought to come up here by what is known as the "Soo" train, or, at the latest, by the afternoon trains. They certainly ought to be delivered in the afternoon or evening, as they frequently are, but more frequently they are not delivered until the following morning.

Mr. HAGGART. They do not arrive here until eight o'clock in the evening, so that they are not delivered until the next morning.

Mr. FISHER. I think they ought to be delivered here in the evening. They sometimes are, but not always. I do not understand either why the "Soo" train leaving Montreal at ten o'clock does not carry the eastern mails which arrive there before that hour.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When the time was shortened over the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, one of the advantages we were to derive was that we were going to have more rapid mail communication; but if our mails are to be delayed for seven hours at Montreal, we shall lose all we were to gain by rapid transit. It seems to me that some arrangement might be made by which the mails would be shifted as readily as passengers at Montreal Junction, during the sitting of Parliament at least, as it is very inconvenient that the correspondence of members should be delayed so long.

General LAURIE. The Intercolonial Railway is a Government line, and the trains on it might be so arranged as to accommodate the mail trains on other lines.

Mr. ELLIS. It seems to me that the expenditure necessary to bring these mails from Montreal to Ottawa during the Session would be very small, compared with the sums expended for purposes that seem to be utterly useless. It is not creditable to the country that the mails coming from the Maritime Provinces should be delayed for seven

hours between Montreal and Ottawa. The Postmaster General might dispense with the mails by the earlier train and bring them all by the "Soo" train.

Mr. HAGGART. There are three mail trains a day between here and Montreal, and those trains are arranged to meet the trains which have the greatest amount of correspondence on them. If more trains are wanted, it is only a question of expense. I will look into the matter, and see whether the expenditure will be justified.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand that the increase in the estimate is caused by increased mileage only, or by an increased payment per mile?

Mr. HAGGART. An increased payment per mile from 8 cents to 12 cents over the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is owing to an arrangement made with my predecessor, by which we get half a car instead of one-quarter of a car.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that the same as is paid to other railways?

Mr. HAGGART. I think the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial Railway get a larger sum per mile.

Mr. BARRON. I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to a complaint which has been made to me in connection with the post offices of Bushkong and Carnarvon. The mails are taken out on Saturday, and they leave on Saturday morning, so that a whole week elapses before an answer can be got. I am told that petitions have been sent to the Department from these localities asking for two mails a week instead of one, and the people say that no response has been received from those petitions, and no attention whatever has been paid to them. If that is true, the hon. Minister ought to look into the matter.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think it can possibly be true, because I take particular care to see that every petition is answered and referred to an inspector, and that a report is made upon it. I am not aware of the complaints made, but I have taken a note of them, and I will furnish the hon. gentleman with the information.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I should like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if the various mail routes are let by public contract?

Mr. HAGGART. All over \$200 are required by the statute to be let by public contract.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But any for \$200 and under can be by a private arrangement.

Mr. HAGGART. I very seldom make a private arrangement. The routes are almost always granted by tender.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman tell me under what circumstances the mail contract for the post office of Upper Musquodoboit was taken from George Hamilton, who had it for nine years at a sum of \$104 a year, and given to Alexander Burnet, in October, 1888, for \$200 a year? It was for carrying the mails three times a week. Hamilton tendered again at the same rate of \$104, but his tender was passed over in favor of Burnet.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think it at all possible that any such thing as that ever happened. I know that it did not happen under my régime,

because the law directs that the lowest tender, for any amount, whether \$200, over or under \$200, if a tender is called for, shall receive the contract; but I have the option of making private contracts for amounts under \$200.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My memorandum does not say that tenders were invited, so I suppose the Government exercised the power which they possess of giving \$200 for work which had previously been done for \$104. I have this information from the contractor himself, who I do not think would make any misrepresentation, and I would ask the Postmaster General to look into the matter.

Mr. HAGGART. I have taken a note of it and will give an answer later.

Mr. GUAY. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to a fact which is a cause of great complaint among the merchants and manufacturers and others of Etchemin. As the case now stands, we have in Etchemin, which is about six miles from Lévis, two mail deliveries a day—one about 10 o'clock in the morning, and the other about 5 o'clock in the afternoon. The lumber merchants, manufacturers and others, who do a great deal of business with the west, are obliged, if they wish their answers to leave the evening of the day their letters are received, to send them by carter to Lévis, where they must be posted by 8.30 in the evening. If the Department could arrange with the Grand Trunk Railway Company to stop their 8.30 a.m. train at Etchemin on the way west, our business men could post their letters at Etchemin, and thus be saved the inconvenience and loss of time and expense of sending their letters a distance of six miles to Lévis, in order to be posted there, and this arrangement would entail very little expense on the Department, and be a great benefit to our people. Some years ago there were great complaints, owing to the fact that the mail from the west, which passes Etchemin in the morning at 6 o'clock, did not stop there, but went straight to Lévis, from which place they were sent back to Etchemin only at 11 o'clock the same day by the regular mail, and the consequence was that our merchants had not time to read and answer those letters and mail their answers in time to go to Lévis by the regular mail which leaves Etchemin at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, in order to be posted from Lévis to the west that same evening. Thus, by losing this regular train, as in most cases they were bound to do, their letters were held over in Lévis the whole of the next day, and not sent until the afternoon of the second day, thus entailing a loss of two days which was a matter of considerable importance to our lumber merchants, manufacturers and others, who do an extensive business which demands much greater promptitude in answering their correspondence. This, however, was remedied to some extent lately, because the down train from the west that passes Etchemin at six in the morning stopped at Hadlow, and delivered a supplementary bag there especially for Etchemin, and this bag was then sent by a mail carrier to Etchemin. Another cause of complaint lies in the fact that the mail train which leaves Lévis in the evening at 8.30 does not stop at Etchemin on its way west, and thus letters which come from the west by the Canadian Pacific Railway and

Mr. HAGGART.

arrive at Etchemin at 5 or 6 in the afternoon cannot be answered and sent to the west by that train, in consequence of the train not stopping at Etchemin. Therefore, if by any possibility the answers cannot be sent to Lévis by carters in time for the 8.30 train, they have to stay over at Lévis the whole of the next day, and only leave by the 8.30 train of that day. If, however, the 8.30 train from Lévis were to stop at Etchemin just long enough to receive the letters for the west, this would be a great boon for our business men, and I hope the hon. gentleman will take steps to see that the Grand Trunk Railway Company will give us this facility, which they could do with very little inconvenience and cost.

Mr. HAGGART. I have often asked railway companies to stop at stations for the purpose of accommodating the postal service there, but unless these places are of sufficient importance for other reasons than mail purposes, we can never induce them to stop.

Mr. GUAY. I would however impress on the hon. gentleman that Etchemin is an important place and the centre of a large business. In the fall and spring of the year especially nearly two hundred or three hundred people leave there to work in the States and these people are obliged to drive to Point Lévis and pay \$1.50 to get there, in order to catch the train. If the train would stop at Etchemin they would be saved this expense. I have been told frequently by our lumber merchants and other business men that the objection made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company to stopping at Etchemin was that the grade was too steep. This cannot be accepted as a good reason, since we know that the Intercolonial Railway stops there, both coming and going, every day.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that in the municipality of Bayham, near Stratfordville, the mails could be carried twice a week at the expense of \$24 a year. The amount is a small one, and if the hon. gentleman would send his inspector to that locality to enquire into the necessities of the case, he would find that the revenue would pay the expense.

Mr. HAGGART. The deputy has taken a note of it, and will make the necessary enquiry.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would call attention to the fact, that a certain post office in the County of Kent, called Oldfield, was closed a year or two ago, on account of the postmaster having moved away, and no other competent person, being found to assume his duties. But last year a petition was sent to the Department, praying that a certain Mr. Gordon, a very competent person would assume the duties of postmaster, and asking that the mails would stop at that particular place. The mail carrier carries the mail past that post office to the next one, and it would cost the Government very little to have this office re-opened and the mail delivered there. I do not know that any action was taken on this petition, but I hope the Minister will take action on it, and see if these people can be accommodated. I would also draw his attention to Pig Point and Dover South, in the county of Kent. They only get their mails now twice a week, and I want the Department to arrange that the mails should be carried there at

least three times a week. The expense will be very trifling.

Mr. BARRON. I understood the Minister to say that in all cases where the amount was over \$200, the contract had to be let by tender, but that where it was under that amount, he could give the contract without any tender. That seems to be a very dangerous principle. A tender might be called for, and one might be a small amount over \$200. It might be made known—though I am sure the Minister would not do anything of the kind—and another man might be induced to put in a tender for something just under \$200, who might get the contract. That is quite possible, and it is even probable under certain circumstances.

Mr. HAGGART. I have never known such a case. In regard to Oldfield, that is simply a temporary matter. The reason why Oldfield post office was closed was that we could not get any postmaster.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know that was the reason.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Has the hon. gentleman received any report on the question which was brought forward by my colleague and myself in relation to Herring's Bay in Halifax County? He stated that he would look into that matter.

Mr. HAGGART. Whenever a petition is brought in, it goes to the inspector for his report.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I would like to know if anything has been done in regard to the carriage of the mails between Chambord, on the line of the Lake St. John Railway, and Roberval? The railway has been opened between these two places for more than a year and a-half. And yet the mails have been carried under the old system, by a mail courier with a horse. Petitions have been sent to the Department in regard to this matter, and I think interviews have taken place also with the Minister, or with his officials and with the contractors of the railway, in regard to that service. There was a rumor that the Government had acquiesced in the demand to have the mails carried by railway instead of by a team, but the last time I was in Quebec I was unable to discover that anything had been done. I should like to know whether anything has been done in this matter, because I cannot understand why the Government retains the old system of carrying mails for a distance of 18 miles by means of a horse.

Mr. HAGGART. An offer was made that the mail should be carried from Chambord to Roberval at 4 cents per mile. I did not receive any acceptance of this offer, and it is only yesterday or the day before that the railway accepted it, and now the business will be properly carried out.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I should like to know what the Government has done in regard to the carriage of mails between Grand Falls and Edmundston. As a matter of fact, the mails get to their destination twenty-two hours after the passengers.

Mr. HAGGART. I have been waiting for an arrangement to be come to between that company and the company which runs from Rivière du Loup to Temiscouata. The reason why no arrangement was made was that the Government was awaiting the arrangements that might be made between the railway companies. I have been waiting for a con-

nection which I understood was to be made, and in the meantime I find that the mail is being carried by couriers at a cheaper rate than it would be carried by the railway.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I have before called the attention of the Minister to some occurrences in connection with the Quebec post office, especially in regard to the position of the Inspector, Mr. Bolduc, and the deputy inspector, Mr. Fréchette. I have since had some information in regard to the superannuation of Mr. Fréchette, which I did not have when I referred to it before. I have been informed by the gentleman himself that his superannuation was dated on 1st January, or that he received notice on the 1st January, that he was to be superannuated. He did not receive the formal notification, but, when he was making his New Year's calls, one of his friend told him he had heard some news about him. He said: "What news?" I said, "The news of your superannuation." He said: "I never heard of such news." "Well," I said, "there is a rumor in the post office to that effect, a letter has just been received, stating that you had been superannuated, and that your superannuation is to commence from yesterday or the day before." He was making New Year's calls. He was so surprised that he nearly fainted, as he told me himself, and he actually had to take a cab to go home with. He sent to the post office and the news was confirmed. I can but repeat what I stated upon that occasion, that Mr. Fréchette is not an old man at all. He may be about 60 years of age, but before he was superannuated, he did not look more than 50. He is in perfect good health, and he told me that he had never failed on any occasion to go to his office. He was a model officer as deputy inspector for the district. If the Postmaster General will take the trouble to inform himself he will find that there never was a better officer. The Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Militia know Mr. Fréchette very well. There is no more respectable man in Quebec, and no better officer. He told me himself that he had never been in better health in his life than he was when he was superannuated. He had been 20 years in the office, and he considered himself just as able to discharge the duties of deputy inspector as he had been at any time during the last 20 years. Why was he superannuated? We do not know. By whom is he replaced? I do not know that either. It is in the recollection of the House that the Postmaster General was not able to give any information at that time. He said that he had no more details than the Order in Council deciding upon the superannuation. I would like to know now upon what grounds Mr. Fréchette has been superannuated? It is a great hardship to Mr. Fréchette, but the public interest is also concerned, because every one knows it is a terrible waste of money to superannuate a man and replace him by another man who is no more able to discharge the duties of the office. To all appearances Mr. Fréchette was able to discharge the duties of that office for 20 years more. He is now receiving a superannuation allowance of, I think, \$650, and he told me that he could not live upon that allowance, and that he had been too long in the service to go into any other occupation now. The public of Quebec are very much interested in having some explanation of that superannuation.

Mr. HAGGART. I brought a return down to the House giving the reasons for the retirement of these two gentlemen, Mr. Fréchette and Mr. Bolduc. It was found necessary to reorganise the Quebec Post Office, which was getting into a very bad state. The assistant postmaster was in his sixty-second year, had been a long time in the office, and the inspector told me that he was incapable of managing the office. As it is well known Mr. Bolduc was owing \$5,000 to the Government and had only repaid it a year or two ago. The inspector reported that he was unfit for the management of the office. The appointment of an assistant postmaster has not yet been made, but it will be when we can get a party who is perfectly fit for the position. We are trying the gentleman who is there now. In reference to the statement the hon. gentleman made that notices were not sent to these two parties, you will see by the copy of the return that after the order was decided on by the Department, a notice was sent to these gentlemen informing them of their superannuation. Mr. Bolduc was appointed on the 21st November, 1854, and had been in receipt of a salary of \$1,400 a year from the 1st of July, 1875. He is in the sixty-second year of his age, and on the report of the inspector he was superannuated. The superannuation allowance is the usual amount to which he should be entitled.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I am more and more surprised at the reasons given. I know that Mr. Bolduc has never been sick in his life, and he never was in a better state of health than he was at the time of his superannuation. Now, as to the other reason for his retirement which was not mentioned then, the defalcation, I think it shows a queer system of managing public affairs to superannuate an officer who had been a defaulter. If there was really a defalcation, he should have been dismissed at once, and not given a pension at the public expense. But I think there is some other explanation than that pretended defalcation. As to bad management in the post office, that is news to me. I think I know as much of the public of Quebec as the deputy inspector does, who has been there only one or two years. He was a stranger to Quebec, although I admit that he is a very intelligent and able officer. I say that I never heard any complaints about the management of the deputy postmaster's office; on the contrary I have always heard his management highly praised in Quebec. Mr. Bolduc has shown himself to be a model officer. There were some complaints about the general management of the Post Office Department, but none against the management of the deputy postmaster's office. If there ever was an efficient officer in that department, it was Mr. Bolduc, who, I hear now, for the first time, has been reported by the inspector to be unfit to occupy the position any longer. I am sure that whoever the Government may appoint in his place, he will not be as efficient for some years to come as Mr. Bolduc was.

Mr. LAURIER. Did I understand the Postmaster General to say that Mr. Bolduc was a defaulter?

Mr. HAGGART. I understand so. He was a defaulter for a great many years.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

Mr. LAURIER. And yet this man, who was a defaulter, was superannuated, and is paid a pension out of the treasury of the country. If ever an outrage was committed against the people this is the case; and if this is the way in which our affairs are to be administered, where are we to end? He is a defaulter, and admitted to be so. I do not know whether the charge is true or not, it surprises me, for I never heard of it; but if we are to believe the head of the Department, here is a defaulter who has been paid a pension. If he was a defaulter, he should have been brought before a criminal court; but instead of that being done, he is superannuated and given a pension. I do not see how this transaction can be defended.

Mr. HAGGART. Why did you not try him? He was a defaulter when you were in power.

Mr. LAURIER. That is more than I know. If he was a defaulter in our time—

Mr. HAGGART. The whole time.

Mr. LAURIER. That may be so or not. I do not know. I take the statement made by the Minister, that he was a defaulter. If he was a defaulter in our time, surely he was not superannuated and given a pension in our time.

Mr. HAGGART. He was a defaulter for a great many years, and during the whole time hon. gentlemen opposite were in Government. Since then he has paid up his defalcation, the last amount about two years ago.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will not be allowed to shirk the question in that manner. He says he was a defaulter at that time. How did I know that? I cannot be expected to know such matters, and I did not pretend to know it. But the hon. gentleman has acted on that fact or not. If he considers he was a defaulter, surely that was not a motive for superannuating him. If he did not consider him such, he had no right to bring in the name of the officer, and it is unfair to the officer to so act, if he is not treated as a defaulter.

Mr. HAGGART. It is thought inadvisable to state to the House all the reasons given by the inspectors for superannuating officers. I did not know he was a defaulter until his name came before me for superannuation. He had been for 12 or 15 years a defaulter, but he had paid the amount of his defalcation, and his superannuation was deducted from his salary; and in the last two or three years he has paid up the amount of his default. Surely we could not then dismiss him after taking the superannuation, when he had made reparation to the full extent, and dismiss him without superannuation.

Mr. LAURIER. That is perfectly right. If Mr. Bolduc was a defaulter, and if his offence was condoned by the Department and he paid up the amount of his defalcation, the hon. Minister has no right to bring the matter before the House. It is unfair to the officer, when the whole matter has been condoned by the Department. I look now to the motive of the superannuation. It cannot be the deficit. I find, however, a memorandum to the effect that Mr. Bolduc, Assistant Postmaster, now in the sixty-second year of his age, has been placed on the retired list since 1st January, 1890,

with an allowance of \$980. His average salary during the time of service was \$1,400. At sixty-two years he is in the prime of life and able to discharge his duties, and there is no reason why the Government should have dispensed with his services.

Mr. McMULLEN. A new phase of the superannuation system has been developed, namely, that when an inspector reports the inefficiency of a servant he is liable to be immediately superannuated without any communication taking place with him. This superannuation system was intended, however, for the purpose of pensioning civil servants after long and efficient service. In this case the man was quite capable, at all events there is no evidence that he was incapable. Men should not be superannuated simply because the inspector reports them as being inefficient. It is unfair that the inspector of post offices should be allowed to exercise the power of recommending men, who are capable of discharging their duties, for superannuation.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). Did I understand the Postmaster General to state that the other officer was a defaulter?

Mr. HAGGART. There is nothing reported against Mr. Fréchette, except that he was not an officer qualified for that important position.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). I am very much surprised at the statement of the Minister. I do not find in the return before the House any such statement made, and there is nothing to support the statement that the superannuation was made at the request of the inspector.

Mr. HAGGART. It was decided to reorganise the office, and this officer was considered by the inspector not to be capable of managing such an office as Quebec.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). I do not understand that the present inspector is a kind of autocrat who can do what he pleases as to the Quebec Post Office, without reference to the Post Office Department. I do not see in this return anything to the effect mentioned by the Postmaster General.

Mr. HAGGART. The inspector's reports are not brought down; they are treated as confidential documents.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). It is very unsatisfactory not to be placed in possession of the reason which actuated the action of the head of the Department. It is desirable to know what suggestions were made, and what foundation there was for them. I am sure that the inspector would not state under his signature, in any newspaper in Quebec, that either Mr. Bolduc or Mr. Fréchette were inefficient. All who have had business with the post office will be of a different opinion, and know better than the post office inspector. All those who have business at the post office will protest against a statement of that kind. That is the reason why I would like to have the report of the inspector, because if it were published, the public of Quebec would be in a position to contradict it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the Postmaster General what has been done in reference to the post office at Maple Hill? This post office has been established for nearly thirty years,

but this year it appears that the allowance to the postmaster was reduced, and the postmaster refused to keep it longer. I would like to ask the Postmaster General whether or not this post office has been re-opened, as he promised early in the Session?

Mr. HAGGART. Maple Hill post office was re-opened some time ago, and the postmaster has been appointed. In answer to the member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) I will give the exact words which Mr. Bolduc stated in his correspondence, when it was decided to reorganise the Quebec post office. He stated: That he did not regard Mr. Bolduc as a suitable person for the position, and in a semi-official correspondence with the Postmaster General he recommended that Mr. Bolduc should be superannuated, and then it goes on to say who should be recommended in his place.

Mr. LAURIER. Who says that?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Bolduc, the inspector.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). I have been speaking with the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) now, and I am surprised to hear what has been read, because that hon. gentleman received quite a different statement from Mr. Bolduc, the inspector. Mr. Bolduc was reproached with having been the cause of these superannuations, and he denied that he had anything to do with it, or that he had made any report that these gentlemen were inefficient. He spoke as if he had been asked to make a report as to their age, but he never complained of their inefficiency. If he did, the Postmaster General could call on the public press of Quebec, or ask the opinion of any one doing business in that city, who will contradict it. I have been mayor of Quebec for eight years, and I have had more to do with the post office than Mr. Bolduc, the inspector, who is a new man imported into Quebec, only a short time ago, and who is a brother of a senator lately appointed, I know Quebec better than he does, and I never heard any complaint against the efficiency of the two gentlemen who were superannuated.

Mr. HAGGART. The Department here are likely to know better than the hon. gentleman as to the efficiency of the post office at Quebec. It has been reported to the Department again and again that the Quebec Post Office was not in an efficient condition.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is citing from a report which I understand is the basis of the superannuation. How is it we have not that report brought down in answer to a return for all the papers connected with this matter which was moved for and laid on the Table of the House this Session?

Mr. HAGGART. I think the hon. gentleman will remember that in motions of this kind for papers, I always make a statement excepting the inspector's reports, which are confidential and are not brought down.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that these superannuations are made on confidential reports which cannot see the light of day?

Mr. HAGGART. A good many of them are.

Mr. LAURIER. Then, I do not think that is right or proper.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I would remind the Postmaster General that I have during several Sessions presented petitions for better mail accommodation and for post offices in the County of Lunenburg, and nothing has yet been done for that county. The expense that would be incurred by giving these districts additional mail services, and by establishing post offices would be very small. I trust the hon. gentleman will take that matter into consideration and see that something is done.

Mr. HAGGART. Whenever I receive such petitions, I refer them to the inspector for his report, and I am guided by that without any consideration at all, as to the particular locality for which these post offices are asked.

Mr. EISENHAUER. The question is whether the inspector takes any trouble to ascertain.

Mr. HAGGART. I think there is no doubt that he does. If the hon. gentleman will call on the Department, he will get those reports as there would not be anything confidential in them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice that the appropriations for the mail service is very largely increased, while I learn from a great many postmasters in country places that the allowance made to them for keeping the post offices has been decreased. I would like to know how it is that the Postmaster General has made this decrease in the salaries of country postmasters.

Mr. HAGGART. The manner of paying the postmasters has not been altered since I have been in the Department, and I understand from my assistant that it has not been altered for a great number of years.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Can the Postmaster General give us information as to the way this reduction took place?

Mr. HAGGART. Because, I suppose, there is a reduction of collection in the different offices.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does the Postmaster General give us to understand that the business done at these offices has diminished, in keeping with the reduction of the business of the country? Is that the inference we have to draw?

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman looks at the Estimates he will find that the payment of postmasters, as a whole, has increased.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I know that some parties have complained to me that their salaries have been reduced from eight to ten dollars, and it is somewhat singular that they should be reduced in this way. I think the fact must be admitted by the Postmaster General himself, that there is no class in the public service worse remunerated for their services than the country postmasters.

Mr. O'BRIEN. With regard to the diminution in some post offices, I may say that I have a great deal to do with the Post Office Department and I find that in a new country where railways are being opened, as they are being opened in some parts of Ontario, the revenues from some post offices are constantly changing and, consequently, the salaries to some post offices are reduced. A place may be important, but if a railway runs a few miles away from it, it may lose a good deal of that importance and in consequence reductions of the post offices revenue ensue. There is a complete change from year to year in the nature

Mr. LAURIER.

of the population and the methods of doing business, and consequently there is a frequent diminution in the business of some of the post offices, and an increase in the business of others.

Mr. LANDERKIN. A few days ago I brought to the notice of the hon. Postmaster General the subject of the postage of British periodicals mailed in this country, and I was told by the hon. Postmaster General that the organ of books and notions was entirely incorrect and did not understand the question. I have since received a statement from the Executive Committee of the Booksellers' and Stationers' Association of Ontario in reference to this subject, which I will read to the House.

Mr. HAGGART. We have all read it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then you understand the nature of it. I understand that the postal revenue does not come up to the expenditure. If the postal revenue is fixed on the basis indicated by this return, it is no wonder that it does not meet the expenditure of the Department. I think by a re-adjustment of the postal tariff the revenue could be largely increased, and the interest of this country largely promoted, and improvements made that would tend to increase the postal facilities to the public and the trade in the matter of books and periodicals delivered in this country. Now I will read a letter which I have received from a gentleman concerned in the book trade in Toronto:

"TORONTO, 18th March, 1890.

"DR. LANDERKIN, M.P.

"DEAR SIR,—The booksellers of Canada are much indebted to you for bringing up the question of postage on periodicals in Parliament. Letters and petitions from the trade have been sent to the Post Office Department for five years past on this question; deputations interviewed the Postmaster General concerning it as long ago as three years since, and it seems impossible to get them to understand it. They appear to be under this impression, that by reducing the rate to one cent per pound they will at the same time reduce the revenue, and as the post office revenue is less than the expenditure, they cannot afford it. Such an impression is entirely erroneous. The fact is that more money is paid to the post office in New York for mailing English magazines from there to the Canadian trade than our Government is at present getting from the dealers in Canada on periodicals altogether. At present the cheapest way to bring English magazines to Toronto is to ship them across the ocean by freight to New York and bring them by mail from there. I cannot say exactly what quantity is brought to Canada in this way, but it is fully 90 per cent. of all the English magazines used in the Dominion, somewhere between five and ten tons per month. These were formerly brought by freight across the ocean to Halifax and Quebec, and thence by express to Montreal and Toronto. If the Canadian postal rate had been the same as the American, in all probability they would now be mailed at Halifax in winter and Quebec in summer, instead of at New York as at present. But as Postmaster Haggart's rates are so much higher than Postmaster Wannamaker's, the latter gets the business. Taking the quantity of English magazines at the lower estimate, five tons per month, you will find that it would cost \$4,500 per year to mail them from Quebec, while it only costs \$1,200 to mail them from New York. But what we have to complain about is not that our Postal Department will not take this \$1,200 per year at Halifax and Quebec, but will rather let the amount go into the American treasury at New York, and receive the magazines from the American postal authorities at Niagara Falls and distribute them all over the Dominion, from Halifax to Vancouver for nothing. This is not what we are complaining about at all. It makes no difference to us whether we receive them *via* Halifax, New York or *via* Jericho, and if Jericho is the cheapest, you may bet that we will bring them that way every time even if the Turk gets the revenue. But what we have to complain about is simply this, that after receiving them in Toronto, we cannot mail them to subscribers and the retail trade as cheaply as booksellers

living in the United States can, that our market is freer and more open to the American trade than it is to our own, that having to pay one cent for four ounces or fraction thereof postage on English magazines and having to stamp each and every package separately we are compelled to pay six times as much for mailing English magazines from Toronto to subscribers in Canada as a bookseller in Buffalo has to pay. We complain that this is not right—that it is unjust, and I think the Postmaster General will find it less difficult to remedy the matter than to convince us that we are wrong.

"Thanking you for the interest you have taken in the question and trusting that you will not allow it to drop,

"I remain,

Yours sincerely,
"W. T. WILSON."

If the statements made in this letter are correct, and they appear to be well founded, I think it is the duty of the Postmaster General, and if he will not attend to it, I think it is the duty of the House to look after this matter and provide a remedy, and a remedy is very easy and simple and within the reach of the Department, so that we can retain in this country the revenue which is now going into the treasury of the United States.

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman, let me show the amount of treasure that would come into our vaults from his proposition. Periodicals from the old country, which come by mail from the old country to this country are remailed free, and if they come to this country by freight in most cases they are mailed free; but the regular postal rate for 52 British weekly papers sent to any part of Canada is 12 cents a year. The rate which the hon. gentleman proposes we should substitute for ours, in order to fill our vaults, is one-half a cent a year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The question is this: We now send out few of these magazines, and the postage on all that are sent out goes into the treasury of the United States. If the Postmaster General decides to continue this restrictive policy, this export duty on magazines, it will of course drive the whole trade into the United States, and that in effect is what the policy of the Government is doing.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to a defect which exists in the mail service between the town of Picton in the county of Prince Edward and the town of Adolphustown. Adolphustown post office, which is the chief post office in the township of Adolphustown, is only some eight or nine miles from the town of Picton, the county seat in the county of Prince Edward, and that county is separated from the township of Adolphustown and from the county of Lennox simply by the narrow Bay of Quinté. I am not aware of a single mail crossing the Bay of Quinté except that at Belleville so that the whole county of Lennox and the county of Prince Edward, are separated, so far as the mail service is concerned, by an insuperable barrier. Now, take the route across the bay at Glenora or what was formerly called Stone Mills. Adolphustown and Stone Mills are only three miles apart, yet a letter written from Glenora to Adolphustown, or from Picton to Adolphustown, cannot reach the latter place except by some such route as this. It has to travel by stage to Picton.

Mr. HAGGART. There is a subsidy given the Rathbun boat to carry the mails from Deseronto.

Mr. PLATT. That does not touch Adolphustown.

Mr. HAGGART. But you said they all went round.

Mr. PLATT. So it will by Napanee, just as it now goes around by way of Georgetown to Napanee. But the boats are not running now, and a letter written three miles from Adolphustown post office has to travel to Picton by stage, then thirty-three miles by rail to Trenton, then fifty-five to Napanee, and then twenty-five miles east by stage again to reach Adolphustown, taking in all one day and a half to reach Adolphustown. In summer when the mail is carried by the Rathbun boat, the same letter will go to Picton by stage, to Deseronto by boat, to Napanee by rail, and thence twenty-five miles by stage to Adolphustown, taking four days to get a return. If the hon. gentleman would look at the map, he could see that that could be easily remedied. He has a line running now down the North Marysburg shore within sight of Adolphustown post office only two miles distant. By connecting Glenora and Adolphustown, the remedy would be complete, and a very great convenience would be supplied to the people of Adolphustown.

Mr. HAGGART. I will take a note of it.

Mr. DOYON. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, Colonel Brosseau, who was postmaster at Laprairie, resigned his office two years ago and was succeeded by a gentleman named Grondin. The former gentleman received a salary of \$250 a year, and the latter receives but \$210. Both of them are friends of the Government, and Mr. Grondin performs his duties to the general satisfaction as well as Colonel Brosseau did. It appears to me, however, that business has not lessened in the Laprairie post office. On the contrary, it must have increased, if I am to judge by the subsidy which the hon. the Minister of Public Works has just placed at the disposal of Laprairie village for the erection of a post office, and I beg this opportunity of congratulating the hon. Minister on his generosity towards the Laprairie village. It is true some members complained that certain localities, having a larger population, were not so favored; but one must have regard to the fact that the County of Laprairie has never been spoiled by Ministerial favors and that it is very proper that it should have its small share. Everybody knows that there is no patronage whatever in that county; there are even, in any of the Departments, very few public officers coming from the county. If I am not mistaken, there are only two of them, and they were appointed only two years ago and their salaries are very low. I, therefore, consider that the hon. the Minister of Public Works, in acting as he did, has been doing a simple act of justice towards the village and parish of Laprairie. I wish now to enquire from the hon. Postmaster General why he has reduced the salary of a good servant who needs it perhaps more than his predecessor did, and I think it would be a simple act of justice to give him the salary which Colonel Brosseau received.

Mr. HAGGART. If I understood the hon. gentleman rightly he was complaining about the reduction of salary of a postmaster. The salaries of the postmasters are computed every year or eighteen months, and are based on revenue. The percentage is calculated the same way in every case. There may have been a mistake in the calculation, but all the calculations are made up on the same principle for the postmasters in the whole Dominion.

Mr. PERRY. A very bad arrangement has been carried out from time to time during the present winter, between the Postmaster General and the mail carriers, with regard to the mail service from the Island to the main line. We have been as much as nine or ten days without any mail from the Island, and no doubt on the island they were the same length of time without receiving their letters. The steamer *Stanley* happened to make a trip successfully a week or two ago from Georgetown to Pictou, and the consequence was the mails were ordered from Cape Traverse to Georgetown. The result was we were five days without a mail. Any one who knows anything of Northumberland Straits knows well that this is the hardest time for a steamboat to cross there, and the best crossing is between the two capes. Why, then, not leave these mails to be carried by the boats? Is it because a few Liberals are engaged in these boats that the Government wish to deprive them from carrying the mail? If the agents of the Department on the Island do not know when the time is proper for this mail service to be changed from the Cape to Georgetown, or *vice versa*, they are not capable to represent the Postmaster General or his Department on the Island. The people on the Island expect to have their mails once every twenty-four hours, but as it is they are often nine or ten days without their mails. I want also to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that on the 12th February, the House made an order for certain papers to be brought down in connection with the post office at Farmer Road, P.E.I. The hon. gentleman has said that the inspector stated a post office was not wanted there. How then came his deputy to promise a post office there very nearly a year ago? That can be shown in black and white, and I read his letter the other day. But there is somebody else behind the screen and I want to know by these papers upon whose recommendation a post office has not been established there. I do not want these papers garbled, but I want the whole of them. I want the petition, I want a copy of all the letters which have been asked for and promised and ordered by this House, I want all the correspondence between the Government and this gentleman, whoever he may be, and I have an idea who he is. If I cannot get his body, I want his ghost, and this House has a duty to perform, and that is to order the Postmaster General to send these papers down here without further delay. I want them, and I will take no excuse. If the hon. gentleman is not able to bring the four bones of that gentleman here, I will accept his ghost. I hope the papers will be brought down very soon. The hon. gentleman need not think to frighten me by nodding his head. I believe this is a question of privilege, and I may have to move to have the Postmaster General examined at the bar of the House. We are a small number here—only five, or six with myself. It will not do to put the blame on the Inspector in Charlottetown, Mr. Brecken, because I believe that Mr. Brecken recommended the establishment of that post office. I know that his deputy did, and the Postmaster General could not deny that, but I have my doubts as to whether he is correct or not in some of the statements he has made. I would like to know whether there is not some Sir John concerned in this matter. I do

Mr. HAGGART.

not mean Sir John Macdonald, but another Sir John who lives in Summerside.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With reference to the mails from the Island, I think some discretion should be allowed to the postmaster as to the carriage of those mails. I crossed in the *Stanley* a short time ago. She arrived three days after she was due, and left half an hour before the mails were ready for her. The result was that they remained in Georgetown on Sunday and Monday, and were only received in Charlottetown on that day. We received notice that the boat was to leave Georgetown on Monday morning, and I supposed there would be a train leaving Charlottetown on Sunday night; but I found that the postmaster had sent the mails the other way, by the capes, and I had to hire a special train, at a cost of \$40 or \$50 to get to Georgetown to catch the boat. I think discretion should be allowed to the postmaster in this matter. Fortunately, for me, on that occasion there were some twenty other passengers who took advantage of the special train, and to that extent I was relieved of the cost, but the postmaster told me that he had no discretion and had to obey arbitrary orders. I am quite sure that if Mr. Brecken is given a certain amount of discretion, he will act upon it reasonably.

Mr. HAGGART. I thought the postmaster there had that discretion, and also that there was a close connection made by the train with the boat which carried the mail.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thought so too, until I found that the mail had been sent the other way, by the cape.

Mr. HAGGART. I will enquire into the matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. Since we commenced discussing this item I find we have a change of chairman. I understood that we were taking these amounts item by item, but I see the present chairman is disposed to carry the whole *en bloc*.

The CHAIRMAN. I was informed that the whole was to be considered under one head.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the importance of establishing another service to Glenborough. There are three passenger trains running there each week, and there are only two mails. I think the additional service should be given.

Mr. HAGGART. I have considered that matter a good deal. It has been urged very strongly by the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth) and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly). These two gentlemen have been incessant in their efforts to obtain that mail service. I am inclined to give the matter very favorable consideration, but the amount required is very considerable.

Mr. WATSON. What would it cost in addition to the present service?

Mr. HAGGART. I think it would cost something in the neighborhood of \$5,000 or \$6,000. There is a large revenue derived from the post office in that neighborhood; and, as the hon. gentleman says, that service is very much needed. Whenever we can afford it we will put on the additional service.

Mr. ELLIS. Has the Postmaster General come to any decision as to the application of the letter carriers throughout the country for an increase of

pay? Their present pay appears to be very low. I merely confine myself to the question whether the Postmaster General has come to any decision.

Mr. HAGGART. You will see by the estimates that I have made no provision for any increase.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I brought to the attention of the Department last year, the case of John Campbell, a letter carrier, who, while in the discharge of his duty, was killed on the Maine Central Railway; the train ran off the track and he was burned to death, leaving a wife and children. I asked for some compensation to his family, but the hon. gentleman seemed to think that two months' allowance was a sufficient gratuity. There was a man injured on the Canadian Pacific Railway for whom the Government made more allowance than that. Where a man dies in the discharge of his duty it seems to me there is even a stronger case for a gratuity. The man had been a long time in the service, and I think his family are fairly entitled to compensation.

Mr. HAGGART. I followed the usual course. There was no precedent for giving this man's family any more than the usual gratuity.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I understand that two months' allowance is usually given when a man dies, but in this case the man was killed while in the discharge of his duty, and that makes his case even stronger.

Mr. HAGGART. No discretion is left to the Postmaster General. All these matters come before the Treasury Board, and the Minister of Justice looks strictly into them.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Has the Minister of Justice no more bowels of compassion than the Treasury Board?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before we leave this item I would like to bring to the notice of the Postmaster General the need of adding to the mail service on the Georgian Bay and Wellington Railway. It will be known to the Postmaster General, who has, no doubt, studied the condition of the postal service of this country, that this is a very important section, and yields a very large revenue. On the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway, they have two mails a day. That is quite proper, and quite enterprising on the part of the Postal Department. I would like them to extend the same service to the Georgian Bay and Wellington Railway that runs from Palmerston to Wiarton. It passes through a number of towns and villages, and a fine agricultural country, and I think it is the duty of the Minister to see that the people on that line receive the same accommodation as on other lines of railway. I understand that the Wellington, Grey and Bruce Railway have also two mails a day; if they have not, I think they should have. I think the Postmaster General should look into this matter with a view of seeing whether we cannot have an extended accommodation in the way of mail service there, and would the hon. gentleman have the kindness to let me know whether he thinks he will be able to comply with this request?

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot tell, I do not even know that two passenger trains a day are running on that road. I will make enquiries and find out what the receipts are from the towns in that section, and whether the Department would be justified in making the increased expenditure.

Mr. LANDERKIN. After you leave Palmerston you pass through Harrison: that has already two mails a day. Then you pass through Ayton, Neustadt, Hanover, Elmwood, Chesley, Tara, Allanford and on to Wiarton. All these are places of considerable importance, and I think, from the revenue they yield, they are entitled to the service. I think the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill) will bear me out in what I say, that these towns are justly entitled to the fullest consideration from the Post Office Department, and are justly entitled to this service.

Mr. CARGILL. I am very glad that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has brought this to the attention of the Postmaster General. I know that there have been numerous complaints with respect to the mail service north of Palmerston. During the summer season there are two daily trains, but in the fall of the year the Grand Trunk Railway takes off one train, and this reduces the mail service to one per day. Petitions have been sent by the County Council to the Department to increase that service in the winter season to two mails a day, and I should be very glad if the Department could see their way clear to grant that request.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am well aware we have two trains a day in the summer, but, I think, during a short time in the winter season, one train a day is taken off. On three days in the week they have two trains, and during summer two trains a day both ways. I do not ask any favor from the Postmaster General, but I think we are, in justice, entitled to this additional accommodation in view of the large revenue which these places yield.

Government of the North-West Territories \$186,910

Mr. MULOCK. In regard to the appropriation of \$1,000 for the cost of elections in the North-West Territories, I think the time has arrived when we might fairly introduce the ballot. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce the ballot for the approaching elections?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I fancy the Assembly have that matter in their own hands, by the powers given them under the North-West Territories Act.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the item for printing in the North-West Territories ought to stand over, until those who object to printing the dual language are here to attend to their duties. I really think, after a debate extending over several days on printing these ordinances, it would only be right that we should give those gentlemen, who took such a deep interest in this matter, an opportunity to be present to lay their views before the House and before the country. I think the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) took an interest in this matter, and I believe the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) had some views upon it—I do not know to what extent, though I understand he took an interest to-day in financial matters. I would like to know whether he is now in favor of this expenditure for printing in the North-West Territories? I think we should have his views as a follower of the hon. member for North Simcoe.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for having had the courtesy to ask me to give my views. I may say that I have

unlimited confidence in the Government, which I am prepared to follow; and, no doubt, any proposals they bring forward this evening in regard to printing or anything else will commend themselves to the mature judgment of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock).

Mr. MULOCK. It is no doubt satisfactory to the Government to find that the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) is growing as a supporter of the Government. I remember a year ago he had not that unbounded confidence in them; I might say he had it until he went to Toronto. I understand that on a certain occasion his constituents induced him to withdraw for the time being that confidence which he had hitherto reposed in them.

Mr. COCKBURN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I must simply tell him that he is stating what is not consistent with the facts. The hon. member for Centre Toronto gives his vote as he conscientiously believes to be right. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is so much under the direction of newspapers and his constituents, that he is utterly unable to imagine any person having an opinion entirely his own.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the legal adviser?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Scott, Q.C., formerly of Orangeville.

Mr. WATSON. Has any arrangement been made with the Manitoba Government with a view to keeping the insane people in the asylum instead of in the penitentiary.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I never heard the question raised.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think it is a very suitable place to keep people. It would be much better to keep them in the asylum than in the penitentiary?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Up to the time I left all insane people were sent to Selkirk asylum.

Mr. WATSON. What has been done with the four boring machines, and what results have been obtained?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I understand they have been very unsuccessful in the work for which they were intended. They have been used almost entirely in the dry portion of the Assiniboia. They are used entirely for boring for water, and are capable of going down 300 or 400 feet. They are seldom required more than 100 or 150 feet, for water is generally found at 60 feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what is \$500 paid to Judge Richardson?

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is a claim two or three years old. Judge Richardson was engaged, at my request, when I was Lieutenant Governor, to prepare an ordinance, in which work he was engaged during the month of August, 1886. The claim was made during my term of office, but I did not make any recommendation. Since that time the matter has been brought before the Lieutenant Governor, and a memorandum has been submitted to this Government respecting the claim, which was thought to be a reasonable one.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Mr. COCKBURN.

ADJOURNMENT—ANNUNCIATION DAY.

Mr. TROW. On Saturday we have a holiday, and on Tuesday there is a statutory holiday; and as many of the hon. members are going east and west it will be inconvenient for them to leave here to-morrow night, remain at home over the Sabbath, and return on Monday, which is private members' day, and then have a holiday on Tuesday. It is advisable, I think, that the Government should agree to an adjournment from Friday night until Wednesday at three o'clock. I, therefore, move:

That when this House rises on Friday night it stands adjourned until three o'clock p.m. Wednesday.

Mr. LOVITT. If the members want to go home, I do not see why they cannot go home and stay there. It should be remembered that the Maritime Provinces members live so far away that they cannot get home the entire Session.

Mr. McMULLEN. I call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that the Don improvement scheme, and several other important matters, are set down for consideration before the Railway Committee at 11 o'clock on Wednesday morning.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is only a motion to adjourn the House, and not to adjourn the committees.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the House should give some consideration to members who come from a distance. It is understood that the Minister of Finance will introduce his Budget statement on Tuesday, and the probabilities are that there will be a slim House and that this will be postponed. Whether or not, Monday is the only day which remains to private members after the Government takes Wednesday, and they should have an opportunity of bringing these matters before the House. We have been here over two months now, and the probabilities are that we will be here a month longer. I do not think that these hon. gentlemen who want to go home should ask the whole House to be adjourned for their convenience. In a very short time we will have to adjourn for Easter, and, of course, I do not oppose such an adjournment, but it is becoming quite a serious thing for men who have business to attend to, to stay here longer. It is unjust to a number of members that this adjournment should take place, and it is not in the interests of the country.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) that it is unjust to members who come from a distance, that this adjournment should be asked. There are a number of Public Bills and Orders which should be disposed of, and private members should have an opportunity to bring them forward. We have every prospect of being here now until the 1st of May, and probably longer. It is not right that the business of Parliament should be delayed by such an adjournment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government of course are in the hands of the House in this matter, and from all that I can learn, I think that the majority of the House is in favor of the motion made by the hon. member for Perth. After all, it is only one day, and I think that the hon. members from the Maritime Provinces might allow their friends, and their friendly foes, to go home and not break up their chance holiday by coming back on Monday. All the members will be here on Wednes-

day morning and the business will go on at three o'clock. I do not know whether my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will not consent to postpone the Budget until Thursday.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, on Thursday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will point out to the First Minister, that what my hon. friend says is perfectly correct, as to the probable result of postponing the Budget until Thursday. If the financial statement is delivered on Wednesday, there is a fair chance of getting the debate, important as it is, through by Friday night, although I cannot say that that will be the case; but there is a certainty that if the financial statement is made on Thursday, the debate will be carried over until Tuesday and that means that the whole of next week will be devoted to the Budget discussion.

Mr. FISHER. It seems to me that it would be much better to sit on Saturday next, and thus make up for the loss of the following Tuesday. There are many members of the House who feel that they have been already kept too long here, and that the Session should be advanced as rapidly as possible, so that before spring opens they can return to their occupations.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is very unfortunate that the work of the Session should be postponed to a period when members are anxious to return to their homes; and it should be remembered that every interruption of the business now tends to lengthen the Session. Personally, I sympathise with the motion; but, having regard to the convenience of hon. gentlemen from a distance, I think we should proceed with the work of the House as rapidly as possible. I think we are not promoting the public interest by giving up the time that we ought to devote to public business, even for one day, thereby throwing important measures over to the close of the Session, especially when we are going to have a further vacation at Easter.

Mr. TROW. I do not think that adjourning over Monday will prolong the Session. It is a day exclusively for private members, and already on two separate occasions the motions have been read, and the members were not prepared to go on with their business.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not wish to press the question of order, as a large number of the members are opposed to it. The motion cannot be put except by general consent, but if it is put, I think we ought to have a division upon it.

House divided on motion of Mr. Trow :

YEAS :
Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	McDougald (Picton),
Bowell,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bowman,	Masson,
Brien,	Moffat,
Cameron,	Moncrieff,
Cargill,	Montague,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	O'Brien,
Casey,	Platt,
Cockburn,	Pope,
Corby,	Putnam,
Coughlin,	Roome,
Denison,	Rykert,
Desaulniers,	Small,
Dewdney,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Doyon,	Smith (Ontario),
Earle,	Sproule,

73½

Foster,	Stevenson,
Girouard,	Taylor,
Grandbois,	Thérien,
Guillet,	Thompson (Sir John),
Haggart,	Trow,
Hesson,	Tyrwhitt,
Holton,	Vanasse,
Jamieson,	Ward,
Jones (Digby),	White (Cardwell),
Kenny,	Wilmot,
Landerkin,	Wilson (Elgin),
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Brockville),
Macdonald (Sir John),	Wood (Westmoreland).—59.
McCulla,	

NAYS :
Messieurs

Barron,	Lovitt,
Borden,	McDonald (Victoria),
Campbell,	McMillan (Huron),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	McMullen,
Cimon,	Mulock,
Davies,	Paterson (Brant),
Edwards,	Perry,
Eisenhauer,	Robertson,
Ellis,	Rowand,
Fisher,	Wallace,
Lang,	Watson,
Laurie (Lieut.-Gen.),	Weldon (St. John).—24.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 21st March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BERGERON presented the sixteenth report of the Committee on Standing Orders, recommending that the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company should be allowed to introduce a private Bill, for reasons stated in the report, notwithstanding that the time had expired.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thought that yesterday we had the last of these reports from the Standing Orders Committee. I think the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), who so ably performs the functions and duties of president of that Committee, should give some explanation where the urgency exists in this matter. This application does not look like the reform he indicated yesterday.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know that it is the time to give an explanation until after the motion is made.

Mr. MARA moved :

In accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, that the petition of the Columbia and Kootenay Railway Company for an Act to declare their railway to be a work to the general advantage of Canada, and to confer upon the company certain powers, be now read and received.

Mr. BERGERON. Before this motion is adopted, I wish to say one word in answer to my hon. friend for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). Although I presented a report and asked the consideration of the House upon it, I had not the

honor to preside over the Committee this morning. It was presided over by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who is satisfied, with the remainder of the Committee, that the recommendation in this report should be made. If the hon. gentleman wishes some further information, I may say that the delay was caused by the British Columbia House of Assembly. The same measure was before that body, and it was only sanctioned last week, and could not come down here earlier.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 105) to amend chapter 148, Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting the improper use of fire-arms and other weapons.—(Mr. Brown.)

THE MEMBER FOR LINCOLN.

Mr. GIROUARD moved :

That a Message be sent to the Senate requesting their honors to give leave to the Hon. Sir David Lewis Macpherson, K.C.M.G., one of their members, to attend and give evidence before the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections in the enquiry relating to the connection of John Charles Rykert, Esq., member for Lincoln and Niagara, with a grant of certain timber limits in the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GIROUARD moved :

That the evidence taken before the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and also any letters, documents or papers which may be filed with the Chairman of the Committee by Mr. Rykert, be printed from day to day for the use of members of the Committee, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

SERGEANT VALIQUETTE'S CASE.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to refer to a matter which was brought up by the hon. member for West Durham in connection with the Valiquette case. The hon. member, after reading over the papers, drew my attention to a letter among them indicating that Colonel Hughes, who occupies a very high position, as we all know, had been acting under a power of attorney on behalf of Sergeant Valiquette, and that some complaints were brought by Valiquette against him. I think it only due to Colonel Hughes that I should read a telegram which I received from him to-day, supplemented by information which I have been able to obtain from my Department. Colonel Hughes telegraphs :

"I acted as attorney for Valiquette. I paid him every cent I received from your Department for himself and family. I hold receipt from Valiquette for the moneys, and will forward it to you if necessary. I never received any communication from the Department on this subject."

I wish also to state that the cheque which was paid to Valiquette was in the usual way made payable to his order. It was sent to him directly, and any transaction which may have occurred between him and Colonel Hughes was a matter between themselves. I wish also to state that, after the cheque had been received by Valiquette, Colonel Hughes sent in his resignation as a member of the militia force, and was no longer under the control of the Department. I think it proper to make these few remarks, so that the matter, from

Mr. BERGERON.

the standpoint of Colonel Hughes, could be explained immediately. I will bring down, as soon as I receive it, the receipt which Colonel Hughes says he has forwarded to me, and also the papers which have been collected in the Department, explaining the whole Valiquette matter.

Mr. BLAKE. I perfectly understood that the cheque was made payable to Valiquette's order, because that was the reason a power of attorney was required. While it is satisfactory to know that the money was all paid, the complaint of Valiquette was that it was paid in dribblets, and, therefore, I wanted to know when it was paid.

PRIVATE HURRELL'S CASE.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before the Orders are called, I should like to lay on the Table some information which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) required in the case of Private Hurrell. It is a memorandum addressed to me by the Deputy of my Department, Colonel Panet, and it says :

"The undersigned has the honor to report, that the papers now laid before Parliament comprise all the official letters and documents received and sent in the case of the claim of Private Charles T. Hurrell, 90th Battalion, for compensation on account of illness contracted during the North-West campaign of 1885."

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be convenient, if the hon. Minister of Finance would state now definitely, on what day he proposes to take up the Budget.

Mr. FOSTER. My present intention is to deliver the statement on Thursday of next week.

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I wish to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to a suggestion which I took the liberty of making in a debate the other day, and which may, perhaps, be deserving of some further consideration. It was with reference to an improvement in the method of originating Private Bill legislation. At this stage of the Session it is impossible for any private member, except with the consent of the Government, to advance any measure he has in hand. I wish to say, that if I received an intimation that it would be assented to, I would undertake to propose the appointment of a select committee to sit in conference with a committee of the other Chamber, for the purpose of endeavoring to prepare some scheme by which that could be effected.

TRAD ERELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders are called, I would direct the attention of the Government to a very important communication from Washington, which I have seen, in regard to a report made by a committee over which Mr. Hitt presides—I believe the Committee on Foreign Relations—in which, it is stated, they have unanimously agreed to recommend that the President of the United States be authorised to appoint three Commissioners to meet and consult with three to be appointed by Canada, should the Government of

Canada choose to appoint them, with the view of enquiring into, and, if possible, improving the business relations between Canada and the United States. I should like to ask hon. gentlemen if any such information has come to their knowledge, because it is a matter which largely affects the prosperity of the country, and in which the public are deeply interested?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that we have had no intimation of that kind.

Mr. MITCHELL. I regret very much to hear it, because several private telegrams have been received to that effect

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the Finance Minister if it is his intention to have the Banking Bill distributed among the members before the adjournment? If it is intended to carry the Bill this Session, it is very important that members should have it in time to send to the outlying portions of the Dominion, the furthest away from the Capital; and if not distributed until after the adjournment, and after the hon. gentleman makes his financial statement, it will be utterly impossible to those interested in many parts of the Dominion to receive it and return it in time to members here with any comments they may desire to make on it.

Mr. FOSTER. The Bill is being pushed through at the printing office with all possible dispatch. The very first moment that copies are available they will be put in the hands of members, but I am afraid that will not be to-day.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Salaries of Officers and Inspectors of Excise.....\$277,881 25

Mr. COSTIGAN. The first increase is \$650, distributed as follows:—

Powell, J. B., Guelph.....	\$ 45 00
Girdlestone, R. J. M., Winnipeg.....	50 00
Dowling, Thos., Donald.....	135 00
Cahill, T., Peterboro.....	150 00
Hicks, W. H., Toronto.....	20 00
Nichols, J. T., Stratford.....	250 00
	<u>650 00</u>

There were twelve new appointments made during 1889-90, as per schedule B:

Bayard, G. A., London.....	\$ 500 00
Boucher, O. N. E., St. Johns.....	600 00
Codd, H. J., Montreal.....	500 00
Gatien, E., St. Johns.....	500 00
Leighton, W. R., Victoria.....	300 00
Raircot, C. E. G., Montreal.....	500 00
Saucier, F. X., Winnipeg.....	500 00
Sexton, John, Quebec.....	600 00
Verner, F., Montreal.....	500 00
Weir, James, Windsor.....	600 00
Winter, A. W., Toronto.....	500 00
Waller, John, Ottawa.....	500 00
	<u>6,100 00</u>
3 new Excisemen.....	\$1,800 00
1 Messenger, Toronto.....	400 00
	<u>2,200 00</u>
Total.....	\$8,300 00

There were four new appointments proposed, amounting to \$2,200. By putting them under the head of proposed appointments, I mean that the appointments were recommended at the time the

Estimates were prepared, but not completed. Then there are eight additional excisemen to the staff for next year, which represents \$4,800. The special increases in schedule C, amount to \$350, and are as follows:—

Deputy Collector at Donald.....	\$200 00
McNamara, Quebec.....	250 00
Patrick Cullen, Montreal.....	200 00

The first of these items was to bring the salary of Mr. Dowling, deputy collector at Donald, to something near the salary of his predecessor. It is proposed to give Mr. McNamara, of Quebec, \$250, because at the time of the construction of the Department of Inland Revenue that officer had been in the service, and had passed an examination and obtained a first class certificate; but for years his pay has been that of a third class exciseman. His case was brought to my attention and put before the Council and the Treasury Board, and in view of the fact that he had long possessed a certificate of first class exciseman, his legal right to the salary was undisputed. I propose, therefore, that \$250 be paid to give him the maximum of that salary, which he would have reached many years ago. To Patrick Cullen, of Montreal, the \$200 is his salary as caretaker. The regular increases represent \$5,263, being increases provided for under the Act and according to the regulations of the Department. That would make a total increase of salary in the year of \$19,663. With the exception of the eight appointments I have mentioned, specially recommended as an addition to the staff, the appointments in all cases were to replace officers who had died or left the service.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not observe any names that I recognise as belonging to the county I have the honor to represent. How is it that county is left out?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The special increases for the whole Dominion are only \$600.

Mr. MITCHELL. You should not leave out Northumberland altogether.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Northumberland comes in with the rest. The amount of \$5,265 applies to all the Dominion. I may say, that in the Department of Inland Revenue the salaries are regulated strictly under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the County of Northumberland get any of that amount?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It gets the same consideration as any other portion of the Dominion?

Mr. MITCHELL. But under this vote, does any one in that county get anything at all?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; every official will receive an increase of a regular percentage on his salary. The provision is that the chief officer shall report that the officer who is discharging his duty has been intelligent and attentive. In that case he receives the increase. There have been some cases where the increase has not been given, because the chief officer did not report that the employé was entitled to it. The total increases were \$19,663, and from that you have to deduct \$9,383.75, made up as follows:—There was an amount of \$200 which was provided and not paid, and there were four deaths. There is no necessity for me to read all the names.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think you had better do so.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There was G. V. Ellwood, London, \$1,000; there was Mr. Lafontaine, Joliette, \$400; there was Mr. Richard, Montreal, \$950, and there was Mr. A. St. Louis, Montreal, \$1,100, making a total of \$3,450 of a reduction there. Then there were four superannuations. There was Mr. McEachern, of Beauharnois, at \$500. The reason he was superannuated was, in the first place, that he was pretty well advanced in years.

Mr. CHARLTON. How old was he?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He was beyond the age which entitled him to claim superannuation, but, I think, he was not physically unfit for the performance of his duty, but it was found to be more economical to amalgamate that division with the Montreal division and to superannuate that officer, whose salary was \$500 a year. Then there was Mr. Regnier, of Iberville, whose salary was \$650. He was retired. He was considerably past the age when he might claim to be retired. His memory had become defective, and, although he had remained in the service for many years without any increase in his salary, he admitted himself that he was not able to keep up with the changes which have been made in the duties performed by excise officers; so, being considerably over the age, he was retired. Mr. J. D. Kennedy, of London, who received a salary of \$850, was retired. I cannot, from memory, state the reasons in his case. Mr. M. E. Brougham, of Guelph, who had a salary of \$750, was also retired. I presume that these two officers were retired for similar reasons. At any rate, I have no hesitation in stating that none of these officers were retired in order to make room for any one else, or for any purpose inconsistent with the proper carrying out of the public service. There were two resignations, and two dismissals. The resignations were those of Mr. G. W. Carver, of Toronto, who was receiving a salary of \$750, and of Mr. J. J. Heney, of Ottawa, who was also receiving a salary of \$750. There were also two dismissals.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who were dismissed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There was Mr. J. B. E. Ste. Marie, of Montreal, who was connected with excise work at Lachine, and Mr. James Williamson, of Toronto, who, I think, was a messenger.

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe that there have been sixteen superannuations in the hon. gentleman's Department this year. The hon. gentleman has given us the names of some officers who have been superannuated, but there are a number whom he has overlooked. I do not say that, in some cases, there may not have been a good reason for superannuating old officers, but when he states that a man fifty-seven years of age should be superannuated, after seventeen years' service, at an amount of \$248, and the office is filled by a man at \$600, when his predecessor was receiving \$750, I cannot see where the saving comes in. It has been contended that, wherever the Superannuation Act is brought into force, the result is a saving to the Department. In this Department there has been a perpetual addition made to the expenditure of \$5,322 in the way of superannuation. If you were to apply that to all the Departments, you would find a very serious increase. I contend that, unless there is a positive necessity that a man should be retired because of advanced years or ill-health, or unless there are good grounds to believe

Mr. CHARLTON.

that he is totally incapable of performing his duties, there should be no such additions to the superannuation list. We have already an enormous number of men placed on that list, and, in most cases, they are as capable of performing any ordinary duty as they were at any time of their lives. I am not charging that the hon. gentleman has been making superannuations in order to find places for other people, but I think that evidence should be given that a man is utterly incapable of performing the duties of his office before he is placed on the superannuation list. For instance, we have here the case of a man who was retired on the ground of old age at fifty-seven years. I would not call a man sixty years old a very old man. A good many men of that age are able to perform very efficient services.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There are several officers of seventy.

Mr. McMULLEN. Here is one man retired on account of old age who was only sixty, another on account of old age at sixty-seven, another for the same reason was retired at sixty, who had only served seventeen years. He is now drawing \$255 of an allowance, and a man was put in his place at \$600. Now, the original salary paid to him when he was discharging his duty was \$750, so that the outlay in that office is now \$855; there is a jump upwards of \$105 under the operation of the superannuation. Now, if you imagine that this system is going to reduce the annual outlay, you will have to present a different set of figures from the one I hold in my hand, which is a copy of the return laid upon the Table of the House at the commencement of this Session. This shows that you have superannuated sixteen men, and you have added to the perpetual drain on the country's resources \$5,332 a year. Now, I say it is time that some stop should be put to this practice of superannuating men who are, to all appearance, quite able to perform their duties. I find here a man superannuated at the age of fifty, another at fifty-three, another at fifty-four, another at forty-five, another at sixty, one at thirty-four, one at thirty-three, and so on. Now, I say that these are not ages at which men should be superannuated. I am surprised that men should claim a retiring allowance at these comparatively early ages. It is evident that there is a screw loose somewhere, and I would like to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has made that statement, and I am quite ready to give him all the information I can. The hon. gentleman will remember that I was quite candid in giving the names of the officers superannuated. The item that we are discussing, covers the salaries of excisemen; but the hon. gentleman, according to his figures, which are, no doubt, correct, has gone over all the different branches of my Department. We have not yet come to some of those branches from which the hon. gentleman takes his figures. For instance, he includes in the number of officers retired, every officer who is retired as an exciseman, and that is the only class we are discussing under this item. He includes, also, those who have been retired under the Weights and Measures branch, which item we have not yet reached. When we do reach it I will be able to give explanations to the hon.

gentleman, and when these other items come up I will give the other names and all the information regarding them, and the reasons for the retirement under the Superannuation Act of any of the officers. It would be more regular if the hon. gentleman would take the names of all of them, and I will endeavor to give him satisfactory information with respect to any particular individuals he may mention, if he thinks, from the record, that their ages would not justify their retirement. Now, with regard to one of those men, Officer Mulligan, of Toronto. I was in Toronto and consulted with my chief officers there, and Mulligan's case was brought under my notice. Of course, like any other head of a Department, I acted largely upon recommendation of the head officers of division, but in the interest of the service. These officers represented to me that Mulligan, although he had only reached the age mentioned by the hon. gentleman, was completely unable to perform the services for which he was receiving the salary. Under these circumstances, I do not know that it was any loss to the country or any loss to the service, to retire this man and put a younger and a more active man in his place. I do not think the country lost anything by giving the new appointment \$100 more to do the work, instead of continuing the old salary to a man who, according to the doctor's certificate, was unable to perform his duties. With regard to the other cases of superannuation, when the items came up under which they took place, I will be very glad to afford all the information I can. I have one more remark to make, and that is, that there is a very strong feeling on this side of the House as well as on the other, against superannuating officers until a fair claim has been made out for such superannuation. I can tell the hon. member that I am a member of the Treasury Board, and when these cases come before us they are carefully sifted, and a good case has to be made out before the superannuation is granted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to hear the Minister's statement with regard to superannuation, and I earnestly hope that he will act upon that conviction with regard to the superannuation system. I am sorry to say that, by this list, I am not convinced that the Government have been guided by the principle he mentioned, in the superannuations that are taking place in the hon. gentleman's own Department. Take the case of John Lane, belonging to the Cullers' office in Quebec. He was in receipt of a salary of \$1,600. That man had been only five years in the service, and was, consequently, not entitled to superannuation. No man is entitled to superannuation unless he has had ten years in the service. Now, in order to put that man upon the superannuation list the hon. gentlemen have gone to work and added five years to his term of service, and granted him a superannuation allowance of \$350 a year, after he had been drawing a salary of \$1,600. Why was that man not granted a gratuity, if it was thought necessary to retire him? I think \$1,600 a year was a good salary for a man of that stamp, but, notwithstanding, we find the Government stretching a point and adding five years to his term of service in order to put him upon the superannuation list.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That man has gone now to another branch. The hon. gentleman must re-

member that during the last few years repeated effort has been made upon both sides of the House, to reduce the expenditure in connection with the Cullers' office at Quebec. The hon. gentlemen who are now on the Opposition benches, when they were governing the country, felt the necessity of this action, and they made a reduction in the number of cullers and provided for their retirement at \$200 a year, which was a very wise and fair transaction. The square timber trade had fallen off every year, and there was still an annual expenditure of \$48,000, while the receipts only reached \$15,000. It became necessary to further deal with the question, and the House a second time made a reduction. Still complaints came that the expenditure was excessive, and a proposition was made last year by which a further reduction took place, not only among the cullers, but in the staff of the office, and also a reduction in the salaries of the higher classed officials. The House, accordingly, authorised my Department to retire as many of those officers as it was expedient should be retired. A great reduction was made, and if the hon. gentleman will turn back to the records, he will find that after the Estimates had been submitted with an item of \$48,000 for culling square timber, it was reduced, at the desire of the House, to \$28,000, a saving of \$20,000 being thus effected by a stroke of the pen. The whole saving could not, of course, go to the country, for it was our absolute duty to provide for those men who had been appointed permanently in the service. The cullers were retired under the Cullers' Act and a vote of Parliament, while the higher officers took advantage of the Superannuation Act, because they had paid into the fund. Take the case of Mr. Lane. He was not retired on account of old age or incapacity, but because it was in the public interests that he should retire, with many other officers, and I was called upon to perform the very unpleasant duty of discharging twenty or twenty-five men from permanent positions. This, of course, appeared to be harsh treatment; and if ever an officer should be able to take advantage of the Superannuation Act, this was the particular case. This is one of the special cases in which the action of the Government is justified.

Mr. McMULLEN. I thought it my duty to call attention to this matter on account of the number of abuses of the Superannuation Act which have occurred during the last few years. I claim that the Government should exercise the power vested in them under that Act with the greatest caution and care, for I have drawn attention to the fact, that a very large number of allowances under the Superannuation Act have been drawn from the Dominion treasury; and when abuses have taken place so frequently, we are naturally aroused when we notice such a case as this under consideration, and we are liable to come to the conclusion that another abuse has occurred. I can understand that, because an office is abolished, the Government may consider that some allowance should be made, but in no case should the law be administered with unnecessary liberality so as to cause a drain upon the treasury. In this case, owing to the abolition of the office, there may have been a kind of justification for the course followed; at the same time, I would have preferred that the man should have received a gratuity, as he had been

for some years in the receipt of the large salary for a culler of \$1,600 a year.

Mr. COSTIGAN. He was deputy supervisor and second in charge of the office.

Mr. McMULLEN. He was, at all events, receiving a liberal salary, and he might have been paid six months' salary instead of being placed on the superannuation list.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This case brings up the question of the dismissal of all the officials under the Weights and Measures Act. They were dismissed, and no one was superannuated or received an allowance. After holding office six or seven years, they were legislated out of office; and if this gentleman in question has a claim because he was in office five years, his case is not stronger than that of the officers under the Weights and Measures Act. Those officers were nominated by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and they performed their duties for several years. When a change of Government took place an Act was passed depriving them of their offices, and I never heard that any of them were superannuated. If the Government see fit to superannuate a man who had been in office five years, how can they refuse to grant allowances to those inspectors who were in the service a longer period, and who were then legislated out of office?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I was about to express similar views to those presented by my hon. friend, and, I think, the Committee should have an explanation from the hon. Minister.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The two cases are entirely different, to my mind. The case brought forward by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was one which required an explanation. The hon. gentleman called attention, very properly, to the great care that should be exercised in keeping down the expenses in connection with the Superannuation Act; but the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Landerkin) thought the Government should go further, and superannuate all the former officers under the Weights and Measures Act.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why make fish of one and flesh of another.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am only stating the difference between the positions taken by the hon. gentleman. In the one case Parliament dealt with the Cullers' office and ordered a reduction of \$20,000 in one year, and at the same time Parliament agreed that the men retired should receive allowances. In the other case, Parliament did not so decide; the whole law was reconstructed, and there was no saving to the country because the law was still to be carried out, only in different form, and Parliament had not provided for the retirement of those officers. The difference is a very marked one.

Mr. LANDERKIN. At that time the offices were abolished by Parliament for the purpose of effecting a saving, or, at all events, that was the ostensible reason given. I presume the same reason was given regarding the cullers. If the reason given was that it was done for the purpose of economy, such result has not been obtained, because there are more in office than were legislated out of office.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think so. At all events, the expenditure for the Weights and Measures Department is more now than it was then.

Mr. COSTIGAN. A long time has elapsed since those officers were retired. Another reason why Parliament did not think fit to grant them retiring allowances was that the Act was a new Act, and a very small amount of work had been done under it. The Act, like many new Acts, was unpopular at first, and very little work was done. It might be considered that the men who had received their salaries during all that time, and rendering little or no service, were very well paid without being put on the pension list.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They were not paid such salaries as the present inspectors and deputy inspectors.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman complains that we are spending more now than before the change took place. I question whether the vote for that service has ever been as high, since that change of the law, as before. I know it went down from \$70,000 to below \$50,000, and you will find that now the staff is doing three times the amount of work that was done at that time, if we judge by the receipts.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister now manifests a good deal of concern for dealing fairly with public servants who have been in the employ of the Department, and he gives as a reason to the enquiry of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), that he did not like to dismiss these officers without placing them on the superannuation list.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not say quite that. I had no authority for that, because Parliament would not allow me.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman says that Parliament directed him, but it was under the direction of the hon. gentleman's own Government that Parliament so directed, and it was himself, I believe, who asked Parliament to change the law. He wiped out of existence a class of officials against whom no charge of neglect of duty laid. He says that was not his doing, as Parliament did it. But the executive act was the appointing of the officers under the new law that Parliament had passed, and the hon. gentleman made those appointments. Did he exercise then the same anxiety for the welfare of those public servants that he claims to be possessed of now? Did he fill the positions under the new Act, by reappointing the servants who had done their duty faithfully before, and who, from their experience in the service, would be more valuable than new men? Did he appoint any of these to the new positions, or did he appoint them all? It is a fair question which the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has brought up. It is a question of fair dealing on the part of the Department, and in order to ascertain whether this is a rule that is applied generally to all cases, or whether it was not most flagrantly violated in the case of those men who were summarily deposed from their offices without any fault of their own.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) claimed that they had a good right

to be superannuated, if the argument in favor of the cullers is good, and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) says that the officers who had been displaced by the reorganisation of this branch of the service should have been appointed under the new law. That, I think, is a very fair argument, but I do not know how far that policy was carried out, as it was before my time. The hon. gentleman will see that the reorganisation of the Weights and Measures districts must have made a great change in the location of the officers.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That would not affect it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Oh, yes, it would. You could not appoint an inspector, living in one division, to be inspector for another.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That has been done. An hon. gentleman here says that the officers were removed from Halifax to Yarmouth.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There were ninety-five divisions under the old Act, and those were reduced to forty, so that it would be pretty difficult to reappoint all the officers. I can tell the hon. gentleman that, after I took charge of the Department, one of the old inspectors, who had been deprived of his office, was appointed to a vacancy which occurred.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is one out of forty.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It was one out of two or three, to my own recollection. The reorganisation took place, and the appointments were made, before I came into office. I had no doubt they were made for good reasons; but, as I said before, it was impossible to reappoint the inspectors of the ninety divisions and distribute them over the forty divisions.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) has not been answered by the Minister. When the change was made by the present Administration, and these parties appointed by a Liberal Administration were dismissed—because that is the only word to be used in this case—they were not treated in the same way that these officials are now treated by the Government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) wants to know upon what grounds these inspectors, who were appointed by the Liberal Government, are placed in a different position from the others. We know that when that Act came into force under the administration of Mr. Mackenzie, all the appointments were made by his Government, and I have no doubt they were all good appointments; but they were all Liberal appointments, of course,—I say of course because I assume they were. When the present Government came into power, it did not suit them to have Liberals in these positions, and they simply legislated these men out of office and appointed their own political hangers-on instead. I am not arguing now, or at any time, in favor of superannuation. There has been too much of that already, but I desire to see that the same principle which applies to one branch of the service should be applied to all, and that, if the hon. Minister has seen fit to allow these officers to be legislated out of office, and to give them no remuneration in the shape of a pension, he is not acting in the public interest now in proposing to superannuate other officials. The whole Weights

and Measures Act, in my judgment, was a huge mistake, and I did all I could to prevent my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie), the then leader of the Government, from carrying the Act into effect. However, when the change of Government took place, the machinery was provided, the law was passed, and everything was ready to carry the Act into operation. I always thought it was a retrograde measure, and I think so still. The Government in carrying out this Act, have increased the expense attending it, and have used the grossest favoritism in every branch connected with it, and in this, as in everything else, they have shown that they preferred party to efficiency in the public administration.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think that the point raised by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is a very proper one to bring forward. I know that when the old inspectors were dismissed some years ago, there was one case in my town which I thought was a very hard one. There was a gentleman there who had been for many years inspector of weights and measures, and who was admitted by all persons to be one of the most competent men that could possibly be appointed. He was a very careful and painstaking officer, but when the new law was introduced he was dismissed, and when they appointed the new officials, instead of appointing him, they gave the office to a gentleman in Windsor. Now, the man in Windsor has to come to Chatham to inspect the weights and measures in that neighborhood, and it would not be any more difficult for the old officer to go to Windsor than it is for the man in Windsor to come down to Chatham. The old official always performed the duty of the office faithfully and well, and to the entire satisfaction of every person who had anything to do with weights and measures. Still further, when they found it necessary to appoint an assistant inspector, instead of appointing this old and deserving officer, they appointed a new man living at Chatham, who now has to go to Windsor to perform his duties. If you superannuate the cullers who have served only five years, and to whose term you have to add five years in order to entitle them to superannuation, you are doing a very great injustice to these old officers in not treating them in the same way. I am not in favor of superannuation at all; I believe the whole system is a grand fraud, and ought to be abolished. These gentlemen, who have only been serving five years or thereabouts in the public service, have no right to be made a burden on the treasury of this country for the rest of their lives. I know of no class of business men who have such a system of superannuation, and the nearer we come to carrying on the business of this country on business principles, the better it will be for all. I have no sympathy whatever with the system of superannuating officers who are thirty-five or forty years old, men in the prime of life, after they have been drawing large sums of money from the treasury of this country. I say it is all wrong, and the Government ought to take a stand on the question and abolish it altogether.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. Minister has the idea that a great saving was effected by legislating the old officers out of their offices to the number of about eighty, and appointing forty in their places. I notice that the estimate for the salaries of deputy

inspectors of weights and measures in 1877-78 was \$53,500, and in 1878-79, \$54,300, and that to-day it is \$52,800, so that there has not been a very large saving.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman will save time if he will just state the receipts of those different years.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have not got the receipts, but I fancy that the Minister will find that they were treble at that time what they are now. I hope the Minister will give us the receipts from 1874 to 1878, and then compare them with the receipts at present. We shall then find out how much we are paying for this piece of economical party legislation, whereby a number of people are legislated out of office, merely because they belong to a certain political party and another set of people are put in their places. With regard to the gentleman in my district, I was told by the Department that he was a most reliable and capable officer, and yet, although perfectly able and willing to discharge his duties, he was dismissed, and a person was put in his place who is not fit to wipe his shoes, who is in no way equal to him, mentally or otherwise, who has not the standing or the capacity to perform the duties which the other man has. He was, however, a supporter of the Administration, while the other man was not, and that is the only reason that I know of why the change was made.

Mr. KIRK. It appears to me that the reasons given by the Minister for not appointing these men to office who were legislated out of office cannot hold good. It is true he said there were only forty new officers appointed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not say there were only forty officers; I said there were forty divisions.

Mr. KIRK. That was the meaning of what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How many officers are there?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There are sometimes four or five or six in some large divisions like Montreal.

Mr. KIRK. That makes the matter very much worse for the Minister. These gentlemen were not dismissed because there were not places for them. If the officers were required and the old men were not reappointed, then there must have been some reason for appointing new men. Why were the old men not appointed? Was it because they were not fit to fill the positions, or was it because they were Liberals? It is generally believed in my district that the officer there was dismissed because he was appointed by a Liberal Government, and that the new man was appointed because he was a supporter of the present Government. The gentleman appointed was a near neighbor of the old officer, but he had no experience, and knew nothing at all about the business. I have not a word to say against him; I have no doubt he made a good official; but the reason the Minister gave for not reappointing the old officers does not hold good in Guysborough.

Mr. ELLIS. There was the case of the inspector in St. John, a gentleman appointed by the former Administration, who had carried on a mercantile business for a long time, and had the confidence of the commercial community on both sides of

Mr. LANDERKIN.

politics. He was not an extreme party man, but when the reorganisation took place he was not reappointed, but a new man was appointed. The Minister must know that there was never a more glaring injustice committed than there was in the case of Mr. Macfarlane.

Mr. McMULLEN. Under the old system the inspector in my county lived in Guelph, but at the present time the new inspector lives at Cayuga, which is fifty miles to the south, and, I think, outside of the district altogether. The Minister said that the reason some of these men were not reappointed was because they did not live in the district; but that reason does not apply in this case.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The connection between the two cases is this: The Minister says that Parliament changed the law; he had to dispose of some cullers in consequence of that change; and, therefore, he thought justice demanded that they should be placed on the superannuation list. Then the question is asked, if that is the Minister's idea of what is just and right, how is it that when Parliament, at his request, changed another law and wiped out the officials connected with the Weights and Measures Department, these officials were not placed on the superannuation list? We are not saying that that should have been done. But the answer of the hon. gentleman is, that as these officials had been in office some five years, during which time they had not done a very great deal of work, and had received fair salaries, he could not see that they were very unfairly treated. Would not the same argument apply to these cullers, who have been five years in the service and have received good salaries during that time? I find \$1,600 a year was paid.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Use the singular number. Do not apply that to the whole staff. That is only one man.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Here is another at \$1,500, and so on. How does the Minister reconcile the treatments of the two cases? These cullers have been in the employ of the public service. Parliament has changed the law and dispensed with their services, and, therefore, he said, it would be treating them very unjustly not to put them on the superannuation list. But when we find that Parliament, at the request of this Government, passed a law by which eighty or ninety officials in the Weights and Measures Department were wiped out of existence, and none of them placed on the superannuation list, he says: Oh, well, a person need not complain when he has only been five years in the service and drew a good salary during that time. Here is another injustice: That while these men were dismissed through the change of law, that change was made, not with the view of saving the Government money by dispensing with the services of these or similar officials, but with a view of reorganising the Department, and to enable the Department to fill these offices again with other men. When the Department was reorganised these men, who had been dismissed by this change of law, against whom there was no charge, and who had faithfully performed their duties, were not only not put on the superannuation list at the time of their retirement, but were not reappointed to the offices which it was necessary some officials should fill. How

does the hon. gentleman account for that? He shields himself behind the fact that this was done before he took charge of the Department. That may be, but the hon. Minister is responsible for his Department; he must bear the responsibility of what was done by his predecessors in office. If his reason be good, that these men cannot complain of not having been put on the superannuation list, because they only served five years and received fair salaries during their service, how will he justify these cullers, who have served only a like time and received far larger salaries, being put on the superannuation list? That is the point, and that is a fair comparison to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to.

Mr. COSTIGAN. As I have said before, I deem it my duty to give every explanation and information I can with regard to the item under discussion, and I have endeavored so far to do so, in as courteous a manner as possible; but I do complain of the course taken by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. He is known to the older members of this House as a gentleman very well able to state his case in Parliament. He is not a new member, and he ought to rest on the strength of his own case, and not take both sides of the question into his own hands. I have made several statements in regard to this matter, and explanations, which I thought—though I may be wrong—very reasonable. The hon. gentleman does not deal with my statements, but he goes to work and reconstructs my argument, and then tries to demolish it. That is not the way to criticise these matters. The hon. gentleman draws a comparison. He says we have superannuated men who have only served five years in connection with the Cullers' office, and declares that, comparing the treatment received by them with that received by the old officers of the Weights and Measures Department, the latter were treated unjustly. The hon. gentleman seeks to create a bad impression on the public mind by making a statement of that kind. I do not wish to say that he wished to misrepresent the facts, but the statement he has made to this House is misleading. The facts are, that the officers superannuated in connection with the Cullers' office did serve for a maximum of thirty-five years down to five years, and there is only one who served the latter period. Five years has been the shortest service. That is a very different statement from that which the hon. gentleman made, namely, that all the cullers served only five years. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) tried hard to persuade me that I had stated we were going to reduce the weights and measures staff from ninety, under the old Act, to forty, under the new Act. I never said that. I stated that the weights and measures division had been cut down from about ninety-five divisions, into which the Dominion was divided under the original Act, to forty divisions. The whole reduction was not made at the first change, because, since I came into the Department, I recommended further reductions, and will give the reasons why. Of course, the number of officers is very large, because in nearly every division there is an inspector and an assistant inspector, and in some of the larger divisions, such as Hamilton, Toronto and Montreal, there is a staff of from eight to ten men employed in the office, as

each of these divisions covers a large district. Another hon. gentleman complained that I gave as a reason why the old officers could not be appointed, that they could not be sent from one division to another. That was not the whole reason. I mentioned that when we disturbed the old organisations so radically as to reduce it from ninety-five to fifty or sixty divisions, it was very inconvenient to place the same men in the same offices. I stated then, with regard to the two cases, that there was one great difference, and I repeat it. The hon. gentleman went back to a case of which I have a very limited recollection. He said I shielded myself behind the fact that I was not the Minister at the time the change was made. I do not remember shielding myself behind anything. I am quite willing to assume all the responsibility it is my duty to assume. I said, among other reasons, that the reorganisation of the divisions made it difficult to appoint these same men again, but I did not give that as the whole reason. I gave another reason. When the reduction took place, to which the hon. gentleman refers, with regard to the Cullers' office, I showed it was a question which had been repeatedly dealt with by this Parliament, and by both sides. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when in office, dealt with it, the present Government dealt with it twice, and both agreed on the necessity of reduction. There is this difference between the case of the reduction on the Weights and Measures staff and that of the Cullers, that on the reduction of the staff in the Culler's office in Quebec, hon. gentlemen opposite thought it necessary that provision should be made, and thought rightly, because it was exactly what I was prepared to ask, and Parliament decided that they should be retired on a gratuity, in some cases, and with pensions in others. In the other case, not one single man came under the operation of the Superannuation Act. When I was called upon to deal with the Cullers' office and to make this reduction, I tried to do it in such a way as to meet the wishes of the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am rather surprised to hear the hon. gentleman state that none of the men employed in connection with Weights and Measures came within the operation of the Superannuation Act. He must know that any public servant may receive a gratuity, though he does not get a superannuation. If he serves for ten years, he can get a superannuation, but, if not, he may receive a gratuity in proportion to the time he has served. The hon. gentleman says that none of the men employed under the Weights and Measures Act were entitled to superannuation, but there was a man who served only three years and one month to whom he granted a gratuity amounting to \$565. My hon. friend has claimed that these men were unceremoniously dismissed, that they were legislated out of their offices, and that, instead of receiving any gratuity or superannuation, they were not granted anything at all.

Mr. KIRK. The Minister stated that I tried to misrepresent him in the few remarks which I made. I have no desire to misrepresent him.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not put it as strongly as that.

Mr. KIRK. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that, when he legislated these men out of office, there were forty officials appointed where there had

been ninety before, and that that was his reason for not appointing the same number of inspectors of weights and measures that had been appointed by the Liberal Administration. He now explains that he was talking about the divisions and not about the officials, and that in the forty divisions there were more officers employed than were required. Then I pointed out that the reason for not appointing these old officers, and appointing inexperienced officers in their stead, was, that there was no ground for that except that the new men were supporters of the Government. That is perfectly clear, no matter what the Minister may say.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In regard to the revenue derived from the inspection of weights and measures, the hon. gentleman sought to convey to the House the idea that it was much larger in the later than in the previous part of the operation of the Act. I have the Public Accounts before me, and I find that the statement does not justify the observations of the Minister. I find that in 1876-7, the revenue was \$50,423.90. In 1877-8, it was \$30,054.10. In 1878-9, it was \$31,685.97. Last year, 1887-8, it was \$37,810.39, showing a falling off of \$13,000 from 1876-7. For the year 1888-9, it amounted to \$36,040.91, showing a still further falling off. Here we find that, instead of an increase in the revenue by a change in the system under the new legislation which was brought in, there was not a realisation of the hopes expressed by the Government at that time, though they taxed the people almost as much, or even more, than they did in the previous years. There is one blot on this system, and I think it is the duty of the Government to remedy that as soon as possible, and that is the injustice which has been committed against the former inspectors of weights and measures. No matter what light you may regard that in, it does not redound to the credit of the Government, and it would be only just to those officers who discharged their duties with efficiency and ability, that the Minister, who is superannuating various officers in his Department, should remember that these men have claims which should be considered. I looked up the Public Accounts, and I find that these men have not been properly considered.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman would deal more fairly with the House if he were to state that the fees were reduced one-half, and, therefore, the receipts could not be as large.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The fees were reduced before the hon. Minister came into power.

Mr. BOWELL. No, I beg your pardon.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I beg yours. I remember going to the Government of that time to ask that that should be done. Now take it back.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman asked for the receipts during the years which he has mentioned. I asked the Commissioner to get the figures from the returns and send them to me. This he has done, but he has only sent them for two years. I will get them for another year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have got them here.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The figures do not seem to agree. I will read my own figures, if the hon. gentleman will allow me.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will read yours, too,

Mr. KIRK.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I would like a little order. In 1878, the revenue was \$33,404, and the expenditure was \$81,187, leaving an excess of expenditure over receipts of \$47,873. In the year 1889, which the hon. gentleman has also quoted, the receipts were \$50,033, and the expenditure, \$66,353; excess of expenditure over receipts, \$16,321. There is the difference between the two years, in the management of that branch of the Department. I do not claim that every year shows the same results, but I do believe that all through there is more service rendered and at a less cost to the country, than formerly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to this point—I took down his figures, and he stated that the total receipts for 1889 were \$50,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. \$50,033.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, I find in the Public Accounts, Weights and Measures, 1889, the total receipts were \$36,040.91.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They have got two sets of accounts. They keep their books by double entry.

Mr. COSTIGAN. As I stated before, I have taken these figures from the Public Accounts. The Commissioner explains that this is an expenditure for gas and weights and measures, the two services included. Both are administered in the same way at a little cost to the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is rather strange, because in another part we find gas set down—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If you will excuse me until I settle this matter with the Minister.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I began, and I thought I would settle it myself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not the least objection, but I would like to settle this little question first.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I can settle it secondly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt you will settle the other. I was correct, then, in saying that the expenditure was \$66,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know the exact figures. The Commissioner tells me that \$50,033 includes gas; and the expenditure of \$66,000 covers both.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The expenditure, the hon. gentleman says, is \$66,000. Now, here again I find a little difference. I find that, under the statement in the Public Accounts, the expenditure for weights and measures and gas, amounted to \$85,990, as the hon. gentleman will see himself. So that in neither way am I able quite to make the hon. gentleman's figures tally with those here. As I should suspect, the expenditure for weights and measures alone would run to something like \$66,000, and the receipts at \$36,000, leave a deficit of \$30,000. That appears to be the case, but I suppose the hon. gentleman may have explanations.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The only explanation that I have is that the hon. gentleman is quite right. As I stated, I asked my commissioner to get the figures before the discussion; he has got the figures, but, as the Finance Minister suggests, I think he has done it a little hastily.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In this comparative statement of the receipts of the Consolidated Fund, I find there is \$12,242.10 for gas inspection, in addition to the \$36,491 I have referred to. I would like to say, while on my feet, that I do think it is about time for the Government to consider the propriety of abolishing the Weights and Measures branch altogether. I do not believe it is in the interest of the people of this country that the fees should be collected as they are now. This is a special tax upon the merchants and others who use scales, and I think they should be relieved from the payment of the inspection of their scales and of their weights and measures. If it is thought to be in the public interest to continue this system, then I say the public, and not the merchants and those who use scales and weights and measures, should pay for it. I think it is the duty of the Government to consider the desirability of abolishing these petty imposts upon classes, as is done under this system. I think the Act in its conception was not a brilliant thing, and I do not think the operation of it has been a success.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am anxious that a fair treatment should be extended to every one of the civil servants, either inside or outside; I think it is only just and fair that similar treatment should be meted out to them all. I cordially agree with the statements made here that the Minister's treatment of these cutlers, as compared with those he has dismissed wholesale by the repeal of the Act, is unfair and unjust. But that is not the question to which I wish to call the attention of the Minister. He will remember that after the new law came into force, the Government appointed certain officers in the section of the country that I have the honor to represent. They appointed Mr. Egan as inspector of weights and measures—a very efficient man. They appointed in St. Thomas, Mr. Boggs as assistant. He was a faithful servant, and attentive to his duties, as I understood. He remained in that position for a number of years, performing his duties in a very capable manner. He must have occupied that position for four or five years; but for some reason unknown to me—though, perhaps, known to the Government—Mr. Boggs was removed. Was he treated as fairly as these cutlers, one of whom had only been five years in the service? Was there any compensation granted to Mr. Boggs? He had performed his duties under this Act in an efficient manner, and it would only be reasonable to expect that if the Government were going to superannuate any one, they would have superannuated Mr. Boggs. But they dismissed Mr. Boggs, and appointed another man. Why did they dismiss Mr. Boggs? He is an old man, but not too old to perform his duties efficiently, and they dismissed him even without allowing him a gratuity on account of the time he had served the country. I cannot impute to hon. gentlemen opposite the reason alluded to by some hon. gentlemen, because this man was a Tory of the Tories, and his whole family were ready and anxious to render aid to the Conservative party. He was always an active worker against me. I have no particular interest in advocating his case further than this: that the Minister has done an injustice, and a gross one, to that man. The Minister superannuated the cutlers, but he

dismissed this officer in his old age, when he was not fitted to perform other duties, throwing him, if he had not had any means, upon the corporation for support and he did this with perfect indifference. This is a gross wrong, perpetrated on a good citizen of St. Thomas, and it is, moreover, a violation of the pledges of the Government. The Government neither gave this man consideration for his services to the Department, nor for his past services to the Government of the day, which he has always supported in season and out of season. So this is the way they treat a man who, having arrived at advanced years of life, is considered to be of no more use to them politically. They had no longer any use for him, and although he had served them faithfully, yet they sent him adrift and appointed another man who was more energetic and would, perhaps, be able to exercise more influence in favor of the Government. I repeat, that I regard this as a transaction shady in the extreme on the part of the Government, it is a wrong, it is not a moral transaction, it is unjust and cruel, and a hardship on the individual in question.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think it is my duty to thank the hon. member who has just taken his seat. Every hon. member who has listened to his remarks will not fail to find in them a complete answer to the charge made by some hon. gentlemen opposite, that the dismissal was made for political purposes. The hon. gentleman has answered that point very effectually by pointing out that, when changes become necessary, we even discharge a Tory of the Tories, and an assiduous supporter of the Government. No better answer is required than the one given by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. gentleman should understand that I adopted no such reasoning. The present Government dismissed, for political reasons, the official appointed by the previous Government, and Mr. Boggs was appointed by this Government after they had dismissed a Mr. Campbell, appointed by the previous Government. Mr. Campbell had performed the duties efficiently, and was a very useful and capable man, but he was removed for political reasons. Then they appointed Mr. Boggs for political reasons. I heard no complaint that he was not competent, but when it was found that his usefulness to the party was not as great as it promised to be, then the Minister found it necessary to appoint another officer. These actions show that the conduct of the Government is such as it has been described by hon. members on this side of the House. They are still pursuing the same course, and, no doubt, will continue to pursue it; they feel they are justified in doing anything so long as they are able to retain power. They will immediately lop off the head of one of their supporters if he stands in the way of the interests of the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to set myself right in regard to a remark I made in reply to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), a few moments ago, when I said that, comparing the years to which he had called the attention of the House, the later years, the fees had been reduced one-half. That was the statement I made. The hon. gentleman at once rose and said that the reductions were made by the previous Government. He was

correct in the statement. I misunderstood him at the time, and the hon. gentleman having called my attention to it, I desire to set myself right. The comparison to which I desired to call the attention of the House was the calculation made on the previous years to which the hon. gentleman referred and that made on the later years, that of the former being under the higher rate and that of later years under the lower rate.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is possible that the hon. gentleman, having fallen into so many errors to-day, will, perhaps, have a little more confidence in statements made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; and they will understand they are not made in a captious spirit, but in order to ascertain the true facts of the case.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I congratulate the hon. Minister of Customs on the explanation he has given.

Mr. BOWELL. I thank the hon. gentleman for what he has said, and for this reason: I lay it down as a principle that when I make a statement to the House, and find that, even through some misunderstanding, it is inaccurate in any particular, to make the correction immediately, because I do not wish to have anything on record which I may find afterwards not to be strictly correct. I find in a speech made by myself in 1883, when arguing the same question with the then hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), that I pointed out the same facts and spoke in the same sense.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am pleased to hear the statement of the Minister. I may say that we are always so exact and correct in making our calculations that we never make any mis-statements, and so we have nothing to take back.

Mr. BOWELL. I must tell the hon. gentleman, that if he has any regard for veracity he will never repeat that statement.

Mr. FLYNN. I entirely concur with the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) in regard to the charges made by the inspectors of weights and measures on traders. I rise to ask the Minister of that Department the reason why every other officer of the Government is paid a fixed salary for the discharge of the duties imposed upon him, and that an exception is made in the case of these inspectors of weights and measures? I believe that the trader who uses scales is bound to pay the inspector his fees when he goes around to adjust them. Why is this departure made from the general rule? Why is it, if all other officers discharging public duties in different branches of the public service in every part of the Dominion are paid a stated salary, that in this case alone the salary of the inspector is made a tax on those who have weights and measures to inspect? I hold that the principle is unfair and unjust, and unless the Minister can give some good reason for it, the law should be changed in this respect, and the traders of the country relieved of this imposition.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman, as I understand, asked the question: Why these officers are not paid a fixed salary like customs, excise or other officers?

Mr. FLYNN. I did not ask that. I asked rather, why you pay these inspectors out of the
Mr. BOWELL.

pockets of the people who have weights and measures to inspect, and why you impose a tax upon them for this purpose, while all other officers are paid out of the general revenue?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is the same question as the one put by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson), and the question of salary does not arise at all. Parliament has decided years ago that there should be an inspection fee, and has adhered to it, and both sides of the House are responsible for it. It may be wise to change the law in this respect, but, so far as I know, no proposition to change it has ever been made. The staff of the Weights and Measures service are paid out of the general revenues, but, to recoup the country for that expenditure, a certain fee is charged for the inspection of scales, balances and measures. The result has been, that while the trading portion of the community bears about two-thirds the cost of that inspection, the country generally supplements it by the other one-third, and the fees charged are not expected to meet the whole expenditure. To a certain extent, an admission is made in the direction of the argument of the hon. gentleman, because Parliament has always seemed willing to supplement the fees for this service, by a grant to pay the full expenses.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the Minister has not given me any reason for his having removed Mr. Boggs, and appointed some other person as assistant mechanical inspector. There is no doubt that Mr. Boggs has paid a certain amount every year into the superannuation fund, but yet he is removed from office and he is not placed upon the superannuation list. If the Minister will promise me that he will look into the matter, and that he will place Mr. Boggs in a similar position to that in which he has placed these cullers, I will be satisfied. I want to know why Mr. Boggs was removed, and was not allowed a certain amount of superannuation when he left the Department? or, why he was not refunded the money he paid in, and also, why a Mr. Coghlin or a Mr. Thomas was appointed in his place?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I may state to the hon. gentleman that I will look into the matter. If Mr. Boggs has contributed to the superannuation fund, I certainly would, personally, be in favor of refunding any payments he has made, because that principle has been acted upon before, wherever the officers were not superannuated. For instance, I think Parliament made a vote to refund to the inspectors, under the old law, the amount they paid into the fund. This case, I think, would come under the same head, and if Mr. Boggs has a claim of that kind he is entitled to consideration. Mr. Coghlin was not appointed to replace Mr. Boggs, but it was, I think, a Mr. Thomas, from Brantford.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am thankful to the Minister for that promise, and I think he is anxious to act fairly. I want him, when he is refunding the amount, not to forget that this man has been kept out of his money a number of years, and that he ought to have compound interest on the money, as the Government have had the advantage of it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We will look into that too.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not wish to detain the House, but we have had a very interesting dis-

cession with regard to this matter. I think that the law ought to be changed with regard to the system of inspection of weights and measures. The entire public of this Dominion are equally interested in proper and just scales being maintained in every place where trade is carried on. It is desirable that the Government should see that the fee for the inspection of scales is not extracted from the men who use them, but that the burden of expenses should be equally divided among those who are generally interested in trade. I believe it to be unfair that a man who happens to be the owner of a scale, should be victimised to the extent of squeezing out of him a fee of one, two, or three dollars, for the inspection of the scale, and that all those who are interested in doing business with that particular man should go scot free. It does not lie within the reach of any member on this side of the House to introduce a Bill to do away with the system of collecting these fees, because it strikes at the revenue of the country, and a question of that kind should come from the Government themselves. I think it is well that the Opposition should fully make known to the Government their views upon this question. In my opinion, it would be proper and right that the law should be changed at once, and that an efficient inspection of all scales throughout the country should be made at the expense of the country, because the whole public are equally interested. I have known some poor people in my part of the country doing a two-penny-half-penny business, who could not afford to pay two or three dollars for an inspection, and who put their scales out of the way when the inspector went around. Perhaps one scale would be presented to him for inspection and the others put under the counter. There is no doubt that thousands of cases of that kind occur, simply because the party using the scales does not want, or is not able, to pay the fee. Now, it is desirable that in every establishment where business is done, a proper and correct scale should be used, and it is the Government's duty to step in between the buyer and the seller and see that the measures and scales used are kept in a proper and honest condition, and that justice is done between them.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. He spoke for the Opposition.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not think it is at all the duty of a Government to step in and settle all these little matters. I think there should be a standard provided by the Government which could be sought by men who do business; but that the Government should appoint officers, at great cost, to see that justice is done between man and man in all these small transactions of life is perfectly absurd, because if you appoint an inspector to see that justice is done between the buyer and seller, he would not only have to inspect, but would have to stand beside the seller while he weighs out goods to his customers. If all the transactions of life were regulated in that way by the Government, it would make the conditions of life worse than politics does now. It is utterly absurd that the Government should inspect gas. You might as well have inspectors of oils and electric lights, and everything else used in the ordinary concerns of life. In the last five years we have paid out for the inspection of weights, measures and gas, \$429,442, and

have received \$216,504, leaving a balance of \$212,938 to be borne by the country. The way to remedy the difficulty is to abolish the offices entirely. Let the Government provide these standards at particular places, and let the people apply them as they want them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I quite agree with the hon. member for North Wellington, that weights and measures should be inspected. A great many people have to depend altogether on the accuracy of the seller's means of measuring or weighing a particular article, and, I think, it is only right that the Government should protect the buyer, who is unable to verify the accuracy of the instruments used. The Government simply stands as the protector of innocent persons who are unable to protect themselves. Therefore, I think, the principle of letting the country pay a certain proportion, and those who own the instruments, pay another proportion of the cost of inspection, is a correct principle. I was glad to hear the Minister say, that he would look into the case of Mr. Boggs, of St. Thomas, as I believe the hon. member for East Elgin made out a very strong case; and while looking into that case, I hope he will look into the case of Mr. Thomas Nichol, of the town of Chatham, which is even a stronger case. Mr. Nichol was an old and faithful officer, who deserved and received the entire confidence of the people who had dealings with him, and he was dismissed without notice, and Mr. Hayward of Windsor, was appointed in his place. If the Minister looks into this case, I am sure that he will do what is right by Mr. Nichol, and if he can place him on the superannuation list, as he did the cutlers, he will render him such assistance as he deserves.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will enquire into the case.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). A vote of \$4,800 is taken for eight third-class excisemen. Where are they to be stationed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman how they are to be distributed. Some six months before we were called on to prepare our estimates, I had a letter written to the different inspectors throughout the Dominion, asking their particular attention to the organisation of the staff in their districts, because we sometimes get applications for additional excisemen in certain districts. I asked the chief inspector to report the divisions where he thought additional officers were required, and also those which he thought could spare any officers, who could be transferred to where they were needed, without our making new appointments. He has reported only one division where an officer could be spared, but he has reported the absolute necessity of appointing eight additional men for the whole Dominion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose the vote of \$695 to increase the salaries of excise officers in Manitoba, in lieu of board allowance, is not an increase, but is simply a change.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The board allowance is an old question. In the early days of the Province of Manitoba, excise officers and the officers of the Post Office Department were appointed on the scale of salaries prevailing in the older Provinces. But representations were made, and, I think, properly made, that the cost of living there was so far in excess of the cost of living in the old Pro-

vinces, that what would be a fair salary in them, would not be a fair salary in Manitoba. Therefore, a special board allowance was granted to these officers for a number of years. But it was considered by the House and the Government that the condition of things there had changed, and that that system should be abandoned. It was abandoned in my Department two years ago, but continued in the Post Office Department. The officers have not received the board allowance for the past two years, but this sum is to be given to them as an increase in their salaries in lieu of that board allowance and as a final settlement of that claim.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Are they receiving as good salaries as similar officers in other places?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, the same scale exists all over the country, except in British Columbia, where we make a little difference in the salaries. We keep constantly to the scale, but used to make an allowance on account of increased cost of living. We think that in future that will be avoided, although they claim that the cost of living is greater in Winnipeg in many ways than in the older Provinces; but this is a final settlement.

Preventive Service \$15,800

Mr. LOVITT. I notice that the Hon. John Costigan is down for preventive service last year, \$200. Is that the hon. gentleman?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There are not many of that name, and I believe I am the person referred to.

Mr. LOVITT. Is that special pay besides his regular salary?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not ask for any special pay, and I do not think that the hon. gentleman presumes I receive this for services performed in the preventive service. It is charged there as one or two items were charged before, the payment being made through me direct for the secret service. The cheque passed through my hand on my authority on one or two occasions, one or two payments have been authorised through the commissioner, with my knowledge, on his signing the cheque. The information was received which led to seizures and was considered secret in the Department, and the name of the informant was not divulged. I think this is the third payment in nine years of a strictly secret character in that service, and there are reasons why this should be done.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Have there been any seizures during the year of illicit stills?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there a special number of men engaged in the preventive service, and that alone? Or have the seizures been made through the instrumentality of different excise officers? Or are there special men to devote their whole time to this work?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There are twenty-one or twenty-two men who are placed in certain localities and are paid certain small amounts for their work.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do they share in the seizures as the Customs officers do?

Mr. COSTIGAN. They do not share so, generally. The highest class of officers in the Inland
Mr. COSTIGAN.

Revenue have no participation in the seizures at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that Mr. C. Curliss, who receives a salary of \$800, was paid for information, travelling expenses, &c., \$2,550. That was a very large amount.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We have one officer who is the whole year round actively engaged in that service, and his services are utilised in any part of the Dominion where there is hard work to be done. He is a most active officer and has done good work. Without making any reflection upon the other officers, I think he has done more active work in that respect than any of them. The seizures made are very numerous, but the receipts from them are not very great. A great many of them are made with a view of enforcing the regulations of the Department, as, for instance, in the selling of tobacco. With regard to illicit distilleries, where they are seized, I have laid it down as a rule that the Department would allow the law to take its course. In all these cases, prosecutions have taken place, but the returns are very small. In many cases the offenders are imprisoned, but the informer has to be paid whether a penalty is recovered or not. With regard to tobacco and other small cases, we do not prosecute on the first offence, but still we must impress the public with obeying the law. With the second offence we deal more heavily.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman has a very efficient officer evidently in Cape Breton, judging from the number of seizures there compared with other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Some places are better fields for operations than others.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see that the fines vary. Some of them are moderately light. I suppose they are for first offences?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In some cases the penalty is a month in goal. In one case a fine of \$50 was imposed and no term in goal. In two cases there was a release, probably because the seizure was not justified. In another case there was a fine of \$100, and in another a fine of \$100 and five months in goal. The difference was, no doubt, due to the fact of the offence being a first offence in one case, and the second in another, or to other mitigating or aggravating circumstances.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Most of these cases, I dare say, have gone to the court, and perhaps that will explain why the penalties vary. The minimum penalty is, I think, \$100, and the maximum, \$500. As I said before, we seldom settle these cases, except it is for the first offence, but we confiscate the goods, and in some cases \$100 has been imposed. Sometimes we might get part of a still, and it is a question whether that was used legitimately. But you cannot afford to be liberal and let them get off easy, because otherwise there would be great temptation to defraud the revenue.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice on the same page of the Auditor General's Report the name H. A. Costigan, \$998.05, for travelling expenses. Who is he?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He is the Collector of Inland Revenue at Winnipeg. The reason the amount for

travelling expenses was so large last year, is because he was obliged to make repeated visits all through the North-West, in connection with the manufacture of beer in that country, and in connection with some seizures made there. He is my son.

Extra duty, pay of officers at large distilleries and factories..... \$5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is that for?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The same explanation I gave before applies here. The sum paid for extra duty is really in the interest of economy; it is a special vote given to pay these men without raising their salaries as excisemen. These men have to give much longer hours in distilleries than in their ordinary employment. In the cities excisemen only work from 9 to 4, but in the distilleries they have to be on duty from 7 in the morning to 6 or 7 in the evening every day. When they go to discharge that particular duty, we pay them this extra allowance.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is their fixed salary without any allowance?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It may differ. They are all general excisemen. We might want a first-class exciseman, and we would take him out of the Toronto office and put him in a distillery; he would then get a proportionate increase out of this vote. A third-class exciseman might be wanted there also. If he went there and performed these duties, he would get his increase proportionate to his salary.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it would be better that an arrangement was made in some way, that they would be allowed so much an hour while engaged in this service. I dare say that sometimes in these distilleries they are called upon to put in longer hours than in other places. I notice there is a general disposition on the part of public service, outside as well as inside, to charge, from time to time, any little additional sum that they possibly can charge, over what they would be entitled to within a certain limited compensation. I see that tendency is growing. Last year I drew attention to the fact that we have on our list a large number of officers who are drawing good salaries, and they have got the idea that if they do a little overplus work they can get paid extra for it. At the commencement of the Auditor General's Report he states that there are four or five hundred officers who are in the habit of making extra charges, although they are getting good salaries. If the Government encourage this sort of thing, we will have every officer in the country endeavoring to take advantage of this practice which has grown up in the service.

Mr. COSTIGAN. While I do not question the right of the hon. gentleman to make this complaint, his complaint does not apply in the present instance. It is not for one hour over service during a particular day that we pay these men extra. The same book of attendance is kept in the distillery, that is kept in the office here; and when the officer goes to that distillery in the morning, he must sign that book at 7 o'clock, and if he puts in twelve hours a day all the year round, the book is there to show it. There is a guarantee that he has done this additional work, and, consequently, he is entitled to additional pay.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose this is done only at half a dozen places?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not more.

Travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c.; also stamps for imported and Canadian tobacco..... \$70,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that a great many complaints have been made to me, and, I think, to other members of the House, as to the oppressive manner in which retailers are dealt with in this matter of collecting stamps. I am not quite certain that I exactly understand the nature of the complaint, though I have no doubt that the Minister does. But as I understand, under his regulations, a very great particularity is observed, and, as it appears, a rather needless particularity. I have been told, if my memory is correct, that you must open the package of stamps in a particular fashion, at a particular end, and in a great variety of ways something like traps are laid for the retailer, who is often harshly dealt with. No doubt the Minister is conversant with the nature of these complaints, and also with the fact that many members of the retail trade consider they have been very harshly dealt with by some of his officers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is quite right in supposing that I am familiar with the complaints he has alluded to. The complaint is one, of course, which may be natural. It arose through the difficulty of enforcing the law under the preventive service I have just referred to; but while I know it to be difficult to enforce that law, and inconvenient to some extent, on account of other circumstances, I believe it to be absolutely necessary in the interest of the revenue. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be satisfied if I tell him now that this subject will be dealt with during the present Session, in a Bill amending the Inland Revenue Act, which I propose to ask this House to pass. When that comes up we can discuss it very fully. These complaints have been brought to the attention of the Government, and the Government intend to see if something cannot be done by which the operation of the law may be attended with less inconvenience to the trade—without prejudice to the collection of the revenue.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 87) respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the Elbow River Water Power Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 34) to amend the Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Wallace.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 124) respecting H. H. Vivian and Company (Limited).—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 125) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask the Minister to explain the payment of \$150 to A. Fréchette, for translation of circulars, Orders in Council, &c.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This was an amount paid to a gentleman who, it is true, is receiving another salary. It is very difficult to obtain any one familiar with the technical terms of the Department of Inland Revenue to do this work of translation, especially in the Foods and Drugs branch. So we are obliged to ask this gentleman to do the work. He refused to do it unless he was paid, and we could not do otherwise than ask Parliament for a vote of money. I repeat that this officer is peculiarly qualified, having had fifteen years' experience in the Department, and the Government, therefore, asks a vote of \$150, out of which will be paid the amount the work is worth.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the Law Clerk and Translator of the House of Commons receives a salary of \$1,500 a year. No doubt, his time is fully occupied while the House is in session, but during the recess this cannot be the case. I fail to understand the ground on which an extra payment of \$150 is made to this man for doing a little work when he is not otherwise occupied. This is an example of the same principle as that to which I objected this afternoon. We have no less than 616 clerks on the pay-list of the Dominion drawing double salaries, the number having increased from 480 last year. This is a most pernicious system, and I cannot understand the justice of men receiving double salaries. There are many examples of this practice. An excise officer at Winnipeg has drawn, for inspecting weights and measures, \$200 in addition to his ordinary salary. The Collector of Customs at New Westminster has drawn \$150 for receiving \$3,998 of excise duties. The Collector of Customs at Newcastle was paid \$119 for collecting \$2,300 of excise duties, he already receiving a salary of \$1,000. I also see that he received \$72.45 for distributing bounty cheques to fishermen. That is another absurdity. A Government officer is entrusted with a number of cheques to distribute to the fishermen, who will be very glad to receive them, and for doing this work a charge is made of four or five per cent. I also draw attention to the case of I. Johns, Customs Collector at Vancouver, who receives a salary of \$1,200 a year, and who is paid \$250 for collecting excise duties. The Commissioner of Customs receives a salary of \$3,200, and he draws \$800 for being chairman of the Board of Commissioners. F. H. Hesson, Brandon, receives a salary of \$1,200 as Collector of Customs, and he draws a sum for collecting excise duties. I draw the hon. Minister's attention to these payments, not because I consider his Department is worse than the other Departments, but because I entirely object to the whole system. It is wrong that any officer should draw double salary, and it should be distinctly understood when they are engaged that their whole time must be devoted to the service of the country in any capacity in keeping with the position they occupy. If they are re-

Mr. COSTIGAN.

quired to do a little extra work outside their ordinary duties, it must be remembered that their time belongs to the country, and they should not be encouraged in the direction of obtaining double pay for their services.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman to the full extent, in his remarks, that economy might be secured in the public services by following the course suggested. I present this point as being worthy of his consideration. In a town a Customs office is first established. If there is business of the Inland Revenue Department to be done, the question arises, whether the volume promises to be such as will justify the appointment of an officer at a salary upon which he would be able to live. In 1883 this principle was embodied in the Inland Revenue Act, and authority was given, in small towns where it was found to be necessary to appoint excise officers, to utilise the services of the Customs officers by giving them a small percentage on the collection. That was done with a view to effecting economy, and we have followed on that line. With respect to gas inspection: on opening the gas offices at all towns, instead of appointing an inspector at each, the small sum of \$100 is given to one of the officers already in the service in addition to his present salary. Economy is thus secured. The hon. gentleman may not agree with me, but it is to be hoped that his views might be modified to some extent.

Mr. McMULLEN. Take the case of Mr. Hesson, Collector of Customs at Brandon, who receives a salary of \$1,200 a year. I am sure that his time is not occupied more than two hours a day in transacting the work of the office. On what principle of justice or right to this country, do you pay him an extra sum for collecting a certain revenue of the Inland Revenue Department there? Why cannot the Government, when they employ a man, make an arrangement with him, so that if he has not much business to do at his office, he shall be required in addition to perform other duties for the public service until such time as the volume of business of his particular office reaches the extent that it will occupy his whole time? Why should not the Government say to the collectors of Customs at these small places: We expect you to do your duty in the service, and we will not allow anything extra for that duty. That would be a reasonable thing to do. But it appears quite clear that in every case throughout the whole country, these Customs officers, Excise officers, and clerks in Departments, both in the inside and outside service, have got the idea into their heads that they ought to make an extra charge for any little service they render. The system is a bad one. Some of these men may not, perhaps, have an hour's work in the day, and if they are asked to perform some other service in the country's interest they ought to be compelled to do it without extra charge. With respect to this next item for an allowance of \$3,500 to collectors of Customs on duties collected by them, it is exactly in the same position as the last. Will the hon. gentleman say how it is that he asks an extra vote for the purpose of distributing money among collectors of Customs for rendering some little service to the Department?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The only answer I can give is that it is the same item, and that there are the same reasons against it and the same reasons for it. This is the same vote given year after year and for the same reason, that we think it much cheaper to give a percentage to those officers than to appoint officers of our own.

Mr. McMULLEN. That shows that we have established a pernicious system which is encouraged and kept alive by the Government. There is nothing to prevent the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Customs making an arrangement so that this \$3,500 should be saved to the country.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think there is much in what my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says. Of course there is this difficulty: Perhaps the Minister of Customs will not allow the Minister of Inland Revenue to have one of his servants do work for him without getting paid. I believe that many of these collectors engaged at small ports do not occupy their whole time in the service of the country, and if they have spare time, I do not see why they should get extra pay, because they happen to collect inland revenue instead of Customs. No matter how small the revenue from a place may be, you have to give a man a salary adequate for maintenance, and sometimes you have to give more than you think the work is worth. In such a case, he ought to perform the additional work without extra pay. I blame the Government, as a whole, for this system, and not the Minister in particular, and I think they ought to take the matter into consideration and make some reform. I do not think that there is anything in what the Minister says, in reference to appointing a special person for doing special work. The Collector of Customs is a servant of the Government, and he ought to be called upon to do work for the Government, no matter under what Department it may be.

Mr. WALDIE. I understand there is an arrangement by which officers of the Customs Department who receive salaries higher than \$600 a year are not allowed to engage in any other employment. After listening to the discussion to-night, I think that some arrangement might be made between the Customs and Excise Departments, so that in small places where the business is limited, and the salary less than \$1,000, a commission might be allowed; but where the salary is \$1,000 or over and the business is small, I think the collector should do the excise work without any commission. Some such principle as that might be adopted by the Government, and it would result in a saving of the public expenditure.

To enable Department to supply methylated spirits to manufacturers, the cost of which will be recouped by the manufacturers to whom they are supplied.....	\$5,000
--	---------

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to have a pretty full explanation about the working of this system. How do the receipts compare with the expenditure; how is it worked by the Department; what satisfaction has it given? As far as I have been able to ascertain myself, it looks as though this system is being worked at a loss; but the Minister can probably explain.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Speaking from memory only, and from the information I have obtained from my own officers, I can reply to the hon. gentleman, that I am under the impression that it is not administered at a loss. The arrangement made for importing wood alcohol, mixing it and distributing it to manufacturers when required, was that 10 per cent. margin above cost should be charged to cover expenses. If the hon. gentleman's idea should turn out to be correct, I should be surprised, for I am under the impression that the business is about self-sustaining. The change made has placed the production of methylated spirits in the hands of the Department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). On page 20 of the Public Accounts, the receipts of the Excise Department from methylated spirits are stated to be \$28,178, and in the Auditor General's Report the expenditure is stated to be \$58,493. I find by the report of the Minister's Department that the quantity of methylated spirits manufactured during the year was 100,283 gallons, of which 97,472 gallons were sold, leaving 2,811 gallons in the warehouse, so that almost all that was manufactured was sold. There is a discrepancy there which, I think, cannot be actual, but which I am unable to explain.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The discrepancy would not be as large as would appear from the figures given, because there is a portion of the manufactured methylated spirits still on hand, and I am under the impression that a considerable portion of the wood alcohol is on hand also. I may add that the Department took control of the manufacture of methylated spirits because there was good reason to believe that the privileges given had to some extent been abused, and that the revenue had suffered, and the change resulted in an increase in the revenue from \$400,000 to \$600,000, which increase is fairly attributed to that change.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is this \$5,000 wanted for, then, when there is an annual expenditure of about \$58,000? A larger amount than that must be required to purchase the supplies necessary for consumption during the year.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is to purchase the imported wood naphtha.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there not a debit and credit account kept, showing all the transactions during the year? The \$5,000 would not cover all those.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It would not, of course, cover the whole expenditure. The receipts coming in enable the Department to carry on the transactions to a much larger amount.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We do not work our other Departments in that way. The total expenditures and the total receipts, I think, ought to be shown.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is an exceptional item. The work was tried as an experiment a couple of years ago.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The apparent excess of the expenditure over the receipts, however, is still unexplained. I can understand that the discrepancy might be accounted for by the stock on hand. Does the hon. Minister know whether, from the inception of the undertaking, he struck a

scale which fully remunerated the country, or did we work it at a loss for a time?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We struck a scale which we had reason to believe would enable the Department to mix the ingredients and distribute them to the manufacturers without any loss to the country, and the 10 per cent. provided for in the law has been quite sufficient to cover the expenses. I will give the hon. gentleman a full statement further on, to show exactly how the balance stands.

Culling Timber..... \$29,150

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I very much regret to see that, after reducing this vote to \$20,000 last year, nearly \$10,000 are added to it this year. We were certainly given to understand that \$20,000 would be the maximum. That requires an explanation.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am glad to be able to offer the explanation, and I want to do it at the earliest possible moment. During the discussion of the Estimates last year, the statement was very clearly made that the business was expected to be done for \$28,000, which was \$20,000 less than the previous cost. \$28,000 was the sum my estimate was based upon, and it was a mistake which made it appear as \$20,000. Therefore, the difference between last year's estimate and this year's estimate is only about \$1,150.

To pay the salary of W. J. Macdonald,
Assistant Inspector at Pictou, N. S. \$500

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the necessity for an assistant inspector at Pictou?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have stated already that from the creation of the divisions, in most of the divisions there was an inspector and an assistant inspector. Pictou was one of the few divisions where there was no assistant at all, and it was provided to appoint one, as the inspector was quite unable to do the whole work. We enlarged the district last year, and it was absolutely necessary to appoint an assistant.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many districts are there?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The last reduction made was made since I had charge of the Department. We reduced the number by enlarging the districts. Whenever an inspector in one division dies or retires we do not replace him by a new man, but we add that district to the adjoining one. There were forty-one throughout the whole Dominion, and we reduced the number by one or two.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that in the Hamilton district the number employed is very large. There are seven assistant inspectors and two inspectors. If it is necessary to appoint so many assistant inspectors, I fail to see where the saving is made in enlarging the districts.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Suppose we have two districts and two inspectors, at a minimum salary fixed by law of \$1,000, and reaching a maximum of \$1,300, by combining the two in one, we will have only one inspector at a high salary, and the additional men will only get \$500 and a maximum of \$800.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that the receipts of Hamilton are \$10,000, double those of Montreal or any other place.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. COSTIGAN. That can be partly accounted for by the fact that in Hamilton a very large number of scales and balances are manufactured there, and the inspection takes place in the factory.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a large factory in Hamilton.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There are several.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is also one in Toronto and one in Montreal. There must be a very large amount of inspection done in Hamilton compared with Montreal, where the receipts are only \$5,000, and with Toronto, where the receipts are only \$2,500.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman does not complain that we collect too much?

Mr. McMULLEN. No; but I do not understand why such a large amount is collected at Hamilton, and so little at the other points.

Rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postage, stationery, &c., for Weights and Measures..... \$18,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Taking that and the next item together, I would ask whether the weights and measures and the gas inspection could not be in the one building, and thus save extra rent and fuel?

Mr. COSTIGAN. To a large extent, of course, there are public buildings provided in towns which have gas accommodation, but where there are none we have to rent them. If I could make arrangements to rent one building which would accommodate both or all of the departments, as a matter of economy I would adopt that system.

To meet expenses of Adulteration of
Food Act..... \$25,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What are the fees under this item?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no comparison between the receipts and the expenditure. It was never contemplated that this branch could be anything like self-sustaining, although I propose this year, and have done something in that direction, to make the receipts more than they have been.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What has been the amount of expenditure during the last year under this Act? Does he really know whether he requires this \$25,000 or not?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Judging from the expenditure last year, I think this is about the same amount, and will be sufficient to carry on the work of that branch.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see that about \$23,000 were expended last year.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It would be about that.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What was expended in 1889-90?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We are limited by the vote of Parliament in regard to this expenditure. If Parliament voted \$50,000, I have no doubt we could expend it. The expenditure is made in getting samples and analysing them all over the country. The operation of the Act has been very largely extended, and I think, from the notices in the press, this is very favorably viewed by the public. Out of this vote we pay the salaries and expenses

and provide for the analyses of drugs, medicines, food and water. If Parliament went further and voted a larger sum, we could utilise it by extending this system, but we are limited by the vote of Parliament.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. gentleman can easily come down with an additional amount in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will not do anything of the kind.

North-West Mounted Police.....\$709,250

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that there is a considerable decrease in the pay of the force, which was \$332,176, whereas now only \$320,000 is asked. I would like the hon. gentleman to be good enough to state how that reduction has taken place—whether it is by a reduction in the number of men, or by a reduction in the wages.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This arises from the fact that in this year nearly 400 men will become entitled to their discharge. They are now receiving from 60 cents to 75 cents a day, according to their length of service. No doubt a considerable number of them will be re-engaged, but the recruits receive the minimum pay.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you call recruits those who re-enlist?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; those who re-engage have the same salary as they had before.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the idea of the Minister in regard to retaining that force at its present strength? Some time ago we increased its numbers, but now that the Territories are getting settled, it might be that such a large force need not be maintained for all time to come. Can the Minister state that he has any idea of reducing that force?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid that it would be a great mistake to reduce that force. Before the influx of settlers into the North-West, the force as originally organised had simply to look after the Indians, to preserve peace, and to protect the few straggling settlers who were going in there, from Indian outrages. Now there is an influx of people from across the border—people with all kinds of habits, and the raiding, the stealing of cattle, and the smuggling—especially of intoxicants—are continually on the increase. In fact, the force is now more hardly worked than it ever was before. It has to protect the peaceable whites from the raiders, from the people who cross the line and commit all kinds of outrages. If we had not the most friendly relations with the American force on the south of the border, the situation would be almost intolerable. I do not think the strength of the force could be reduced without danger to the peace of the country. It is also expected that there will be a great influx of miners from the south, in view of the mineral resources of the North-West.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see that the hon. gentleman's commissioner reports in regard to the matter of preventing the introduction of liquor into the North-West. I do not know whether the First Minister fully endorses that report, but, at all events, he presents it to Parliament. I will read to

the hon. gentleman what his officer says in this report, and then I will ask him if he endorses it:

"The liquor question is in nearly the same position it was last year. There is still a considerable outcry against the enforcement of the Act in the various towns, but not nearly as much as last year. The facility of obtaining permits for the sale of four per cent. beer, and the great improvement in the quality of the article, has, to a large extent, lessened the demand for stronger beverages, and I think there has been much less drunkenness in the country."

If he had not said that, we might, perhaps, have inferred that the four per cent. beer had, in some mysterious way, become stronger than four per cent., and had done away with the demand for strong liquors. He adds:

"It is generally conceded that permission to brew beer in the Territories under proper restrictions would have a beneficial result, besides in a great measure allaying the considerable discontent that undoubtedly exists. Barley grows well, and in some sheltered places, hops; but at present they are unsaleable. Home breweries would keep a considerable amount of money in the country, and afford a market to farmers for grain which they could with great advantage grow, as it can be sown long after the season for sowing wheat and oats expires. I myself have sown barley on 12th June and reaped a good crop on 10th September."

Then he goes on to speak of contraband liquor:

"A good deal of contraband liquor has been captured and spilled, the largest consignment, valued at \$1,700, being seized and destroyed at Calgary last month. Great inducements are held out to our men to allow liquor to come in without permit, and in one instance \$1,000 was offered to a corporal to go on pass for three weeks. This corporal has been particularly successful in capturing liquor, and is greatly in the way of professional smugglers. Very few instances have come to our notice in which liquor has been given to Indians. Hop beer has frequently, however, been sold to Indians, but the vendors have generally proved that the beer was doctored with tobacco, &c., by the Indians before drinking, and the prosecutions have consequently fallen through."

That is the point upon which I would like the Minister to give us his opinion, as to the desirability of the manufacture of this four per cent. beer up there—as to whether he agrees that it is beneficial or otherwise.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. From all I can hear I think it is very beneficial. Personally, I quite agree with Colonel Herchmer, though I do not wish to get up a discussion on teetotalism on this report. The matter is to be left to the Local Legislature, and they will decide it for themselves. Moreover, that discussion will come up on the North-West Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is coming down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is coming down; it has been introduced in the Upper House. I would say to my hon. friend, speaking about the service of the force, they patrol steadily from the foot of the Rocky Mountains to Emerson. They watch the frontiers; they seize horses and cattle that have been stolen from the United States; the officers of the United States follow, and the animals are surrendered. In the same way, when cattle and horses have been stolen from Canada, the American force, which is a very large one along our frontier, help to recover the animals stolen, and to hand over the offenders. I believe that the use of this very mild alcoholic beverage, this four per cent. beer, has actually rooted out the horrible stuff that was smuggled across the line. It is sufficiently stimulating, too, as a substitute, except for very hard drinkers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman speak from personal knowledge of the four per cent mixture?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I never tasted it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We would like to have a sample. Or, can the Finance Minister supply the requisite information?

Mr. FOSTER. It is against my principles to supply it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose it is very much like lager beer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it, when analysed, of about the same percentage of alcohol as lager beer? Where is the Minister of Agriculture? He ought to be able to give us some useful information?

Mr. CARLING. I never tasted it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am told by the Comptroller that this four per cent. beer is like weak lager.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I would suggest that the hon. member for South Oxford should go up to the North-West and reside there; then, perhaps, he will find that anything like weak lager is not very tempting.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you speak from experience?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). No doubt the hon. member who has just spoken is a very fair judge of the quality of four per cent. beer; no doubt experience has taught him whether it is good or not, whether it will stimulate or not. Now, I wish to call the attention of the First Minister to some points in this report, which is a very interesting report, and shows that the Commissioner has devoted a great deal of thought and attention to the subject, and I think it may, to a certain extent, be relied upon. But I cannot understand why one of the First Minister's strongest supporters, an hon. gentleman who would put himself out of the way every time to support the hon. gentleman, attacks his Commissioner most unmercifully, on the floor of the House, and in every other place, and in his subsidised paper in the North-West. I cannot understand that. It would appear to me that either the Commissioner must be wrong, or else the representative must be wrong.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps they are both wrong.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am glad to hear the Minister say that, perhaps, they are both wrong, because I think I can find some recommendations in this report which he would hardly agree with; I am inclined to think that some of the recommendations are not in the interest of the North-West, as I hope to be able to show. I think the course pursued in reference to our Mounted Police in the North-West, is an extravagant course and, to a certain extent, a reckless one. When we take up the list, what do we find? The Commissioner recommends that all the salaries ought to be increased. He says the men are getting too small an amount, and he recommends that those receiving \$1,000 should get \$1,300, those receiving \$1,400 should get \$1,800, and those receiving \$1,600 should get \$2,000 or \$2,400, according to the length of service. He recommends an increase

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

of salary all along the line. He presents a glowing report of the manner in which the force is conducted, the economy, as he would call it, that is exercised by the Commissioner and the officer in charge. But my object is more particularly to draw the attention of the Government to the manner in which the medical staff in the North-West is being managed. I think the system pursued there is not a judicious system. I think we have 900 men employed there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 1,000 men, besides officers.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Well, I may say, in the neighborhood of 1,000 men. Quite a number of them have escaped. Senior Surgeon Jukes receives \$1,400; Assistant Surgeon Aylmer, \$1,000; Dr. Dodd, \$1,000; Dr. Fair, \$1,000; Dr. Fraser, \$1,000; and three others at salaries, respectively, of \$800, \$720, \$720, or, in all, an expenditure of \$7,640 for salaries of attending physicians. Add to that the amount of incidentals that must occur, or take the contract physicians, who are employed by the month, and you add another \$1,000, or, in all, \$8,640. This is not all the expense in this connection. Each of the medical men who is employed at an average salary of \$1,000 requires a horse. The cost may be placed at \$100. The cost of the physician's maintenance may be placed at \$175; coal will average \$100, light \$25, and other sundry necessities \$100, or in all \$1,500 is the lowest estimate that can possibly be placed as the cost of the physician's service in the North-West. If you consider the duties these physicians have to perform, the sum appears to be a very large one indeed. Taking the force at 1,000 men there will be an average of about 100 to each physician, during the year, each physician costing, as I have said, \$1,500. These physicians make their visits at certain specified hours; and I venture to say, that not more than one hour per day is devoted by each physician to attendance on the force. For one hour a day during the year he obtains \$1,500, and that hour is generally in the morning, unless special circumstances should arise. Further, in reading over the Commissioner's report, I find that he represents that this force consists principally of young men about twenty-five years of age, who are hardy, strong, and among whom very little sickness prevails. I remember last year, when this matter was under discussion, the First Minister said the Mounted Police had to perform very laborious work, to travel from one end of the North-West to the other, exposed to all the hardships of out-door life in the North-West. I do not read so in the Commissioner's report. There they are represented as hale, hearty, strong men, very few of whom are sick. For his attendance on the very limited number, perhaps five men each year out of the 100, each physician obtains \$1,500. I suggest that it would be a much better system to employ contract physicians. We have employed them at Lethbridge, Calgary and one or two other points. They attend the force in that vicinity for a payment of \$60 per month each. Whenever a member of the force is sick a physician attends him, and under this system a great saving is effected, from the fact that the incidentals equal to \$500 a year are saved, and very likely the force is more efficiently attended to than under the regular staff as

now provided. I also desire to call attention to the manner in which the Government provides the stock of drugs in each locality. The system is a bad one. In fact, you cannot call it a system at all. The various staff surgeons at the different stations send in their requisitions in November to Regina. Senior Surgeon Jukes gives the order to Montreal for the drugs required, and they are sent in the spring. It might be imagined that a large amount might be saved by purchasing drugs in quantities from Montreal, but such does not seem to be the fact, because the various surgeons at the different posts, when sending in requisitions are very likely to ask for a larger supply than is needed, lest the supply should run out, and thus they keep a much larger stock on hand than is necessary. Not only that, but the attending physicians are frequently changed and removed from one post to another. We know that a physician takes a fancy to certain drugs and uses them more frequently than other physicians do, and so when a new physician arrives at a post he finds the stock of drugs is not such as he desires, and he, therefore, sends to the head of the Department for a different assortment. Thus it comes about that at each post there is an extensive Government drug store. That system might have been a prudent one a few years ago, but the time is past for such a system to prevail. When it was established, there were few drug stores, but you can now find drug stores at almost every post in the North-West. The First Minister shakes his head. Let the hon. gentleman go to Calgary, and he will find a large drug store; also at Battleford, Regina, and at Prince Albert there is a contract physician, and an extensive private drug store. I think you can hardly find a single point there, where you would not be able to get all the drugs required for the force. If you adopted a system of this kind you could always get all the drugs you want, because the contract surgeon, or the regular attending surgeon, could at once send to the drug store and get the necessary medicines for the treatment of the patients. What is the necessity of the Government keeping up these drug stores at Calgary and other posts? Are they going into the drug business there? If you look at the enormous amount of money expended in the North-West, it will astonish you as to how in the world a thousand men with ten or twelve physicians in attendance could possibly do away with that enormous amount of drugs in a year. This money is squandered, and I say that the system could be changed with economy and with benefit to the force. It is time that the First Minister should consider whether it is not in the interest of the service, and in the interests of economy, that some other system should be adopted. Before there were drug stores in that country, the Government had no other course than to adopt the present system, but there is a different state of affairs in the North-West now to what there was then. In many places the physicians could use the private drug stores established there, and if it were necessary to have a surgeon in some of the outside posts where there is no civilisation yet, one could be sent there. I would advise the Government to consider this matter between this and next Session, and see whether they cannot adopt some other system by which they can exercise more economy than is being displayed in the North-West. I call the First Minis-

ter's attention to the fact, that if the Commissioner is all that he says he is, a good judge of four per cent. beer, and an efficient officer, the right hon. gentleman should call off his supporters, and not allow them to pursue Colonel Herchmer in the future as they have done in the past.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I listened with the greatest respect, of course, to the recommendation of my hon. friend, who, as a professional man, understands this subject. The hon. gentleman truly says that, when the force was first organised in the North-West, the country was comparatively a wilderness, and there were no drug stores or shops there at all. Now they are beginning up there to establish themselves as respectable and trustworthy dealers. The hon. gentleman knows that there are all kinds of drug stores and all descriptions of drugs, and it is of the first importance, more than the price of the article, to have these medicines of good quality. We do not want to get brick-dust for quinine, or any of the substitutes for wholesome medicines that are sold by small and needy druggists or apothecaries. The Department, having a just regard for the health of the men, thought the first requisite was to get the best article possible, and they purchased from Kenneth Campbell & Co., of Montreal, who, as the hon. gentleman, perhaps, knows, are dealers of the first rank and respectability, with great capital and enormous business, and cannot afford to sell an inferior article. The same thing may be said of the firm of Hooper & Co., of Toronto, and the orders are always given to one or the other of these. The requisition for the medicines required up there come from respectable and responsible medical men. I do not know if my hon. friend knows his professional confrère, Dr. Jukes.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Yes; I have not a word to say against him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is, professionally and socially, a man of the first rank, and he takes the greatest care possible with respect to his requisitions for medicines. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there has been a large saving since he was appointed surgeon to the force. Before his time the orders were very large, and I believe made with very little regard to economy. Dr. Jukes, I am satisfied, keeps that constantly in view, and I do not think it would be well for the Department to criticise his order. He understands his business, is a thoroughly honorable and honest man, and he will not order medicines that he does not think are required. I am informed by the Comptroller that in one or two places there are respectable drug stores, and we will, as those stores grow, follow the advice of my hon. friend, and when it is thought proper by the responsible medical officers, we will transfer the business by degrees from the Montreal and Toronto houses to the local druggists. I agree with my hon. friend that that system must be adopted by degrees, when the responsible medical officer thinks it ought to be done, and to the extent he thinks it proper. I am quite sure that if the force had the good fortune to have my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson) as the senior surgeon, we would listen with complete credence to his requisition. Certainly, we would not doubt the economy of his orders in any way. Now, with respect to the medical men, I think, that for a regiment of infantry consisting of about

600 or 700 men there is a surgeon and two assistant surgeons. Here, there is a senior surgeon and four assistant surgeons for a force of 1,000 men wandering over a continent. My hon. friend says, that these five surgeons are not wanted for the force, but yet they are continually employed. The force, as I have already stated, is not only watching the frontier from the foot of the Rocky Mountains to Edmonton; and sometimes at the request of the British Columbia Government, a portion of the force is sent there; but they are obliged to send divisions of these men hundreds and hundreds of miles from Regina, the headquarters, where the recruits are trained, to Edmonton, to Prince Albert, to Calgary, to Fort Macleod, and to all the various posts which are occupied by this force. As a proper precaution, whenever a body of men of any size is sent, say from Regina to Prince Albert or Edmonton, there is always a medical man sent with them, taking with him some medicines and surgical appliances which might be called for. So that there really cannot well be, in justice to the force, a smaller number of surgeons at present. It would be miserable economy to have any squads or divisions of this force without a medical man accompanying them. The cost is not great, and the service is well worth the expenditure.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would not have the hon. First Minister imagine that I was saying anything derogatory of the senior surgeon. So far as he is concerned, he is required by all means, and I do not think a more efficient man could be got than Dr. Jukes. But there are two contract surgeons already, and does the hon. gentleman say that the service they perform for \$600 a month is not well performed, or that they in any way impair the service? Do these contract surgeons not serve the force quite as well as the regular surgeons, and at a much less cost? The hon. Minister should have enquired and found out whether that is the case or not. If it is, it is his duty to try and adopt this system as soon as possible, though keeping the senior surgeon to look after the junior branches. Is it likely that respectable drug stores in the North-West, which are anxious for a reputation for supplying proper drugs as the firm in Montreal, would fail to supply the force with good and reliable drugs, when they would be largely depending upon it for their business? I do not think there is much in that consideration of the hon. First Minister. I think the druggists up there would be anxious to supply as good drugs as those got from Montreal. I am inclined to think that the hon. First Minister will consider this matter before another Session, and if he does, I think he will come down with a proposition to save this expenditure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly, I will consider it.

Fisheries..... \$236,500

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is unfortunate that we have not the Fishery Report down yet.

Mr. COLBY. I am very sorry to say that I am afraid that will not be down for some time yet. As hon. gentlemen are aware, the report is made up to the end of the calendar year. It is now in the printers' hands, but the Deputy informs me that it is doubtful if it can be laid on the Table in

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

less than ten days, or possibly two weeks. I would suggest that we go on with the vote, and if there is any information required on any item on which a satisfactory explanation is not given, the item might stand over.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It would have been more fitting if we had the report before us before discussing the items, although I am not disposed to offer any objection to proceeding without it.

Mr. COLBY. The hon. member will find all the details of the expenditure in the Auditor General's Report.

Fisheries, N.S..... \$20,000

Mr. COLBY. The vote of \$18,000 last year was found to be insufficient, as \$20,201 was expended.

Mr. KIRK. It has been stated this Session that Mr. Rogers was superannuated, and two others appointed in his place. What salary do they receive?

Mr. COLBY. \$600 a year each.

Mr. KIRK. How many fish wardens are there in Guysborough, and what are their salaries?

Mr. COLBY. That will be fully set out in the departmental report for 1889.

Fisheries, N. B..... \$20,000

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the revenue from the fishing licenses?

Mr. COLBY. The largest item is for smelt licenses in Miramichi.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Must every fisherman take out a license in Miramichi?

Mr. COLBY. They are all required to take out licenses for river fishing, and also for salmon fishing.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have had a communication from Digby, asking for information respecting the order restraining fishermen in St. Mary's Bay, from setting their trawl nets from October to June. It seems a recent order has been issued preventing the fishermen from Long Island and the Deep Passage, and all along Sandy Cove, from setting their trawl nets as they have been accustomed to do for years past. Was this an Order in Council or a departmental regulation, and what is the reason for it, and have the Department received remonstrances from the fishermen of the district against it? I am informed these people, who had made all their preparations, will, if this order be enforced, either have to starve or emigrate to the United States. I am not aware that hitherto it has been the custom to restrict the trawl fishing in a bay so large as St. Mary's Bay.

Mr. COLBY. I am informed that was done on the recommendation of the overseer, but I am not in a position to give the reasons assigned. I will, however, give the information at a later stage.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would suppose the Department had better grounds than the mere recommendation of an overseer, for with all due deference to that class, they are not always the best judges. They are sometimes influenced by local considerations and prejudices.

Mr. COLBY. While it was done on the recommendation of the overseer, it was not done until

after careful enquiry, and full particulars of the reasons will be furnished the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Who is the present inspector of fisheries in New Brunswick.

Mr. COLBY. Mr. Chapman and Mr. Morrell are the names of the two inspectors.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Mr. Morrell resides some distance up the St. John river.

Mr. COLBY. He resides sixty-five miles from the mouth of the river St. John, but he has supervision over the fisheries.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What are the salaries of these gentlemen?

Mr. COLBY. \$600 each. The two combined get less than Mr. Perry did.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Has Mr. Morrell made any report with regard to seining in St. John river?

Mr. COLBY. Yes; his opinion is against seining at all in the St. John river.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Then I cannot see why they should now abolish the weirs. I think they have existed for about 90 years.

Mr. COLBY. The practice which has hitherto existed has been contrary to the regulations.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This existed long before Confederation. In regard to Mr. David Morrow, I know him personally and have no objection to him, but he has been in the woods, and it is an extraordinary thing to put him in charge of the fisheries, because he has no acquaintance with the subject.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What decision has the Minister arrived at in regard to the sawdust question? Has any change been made, or do the Government adhere to the views which they expressed last year?

Mr. COLBY. I think there will be a Bill on that subject submitted to the House on the next Government day.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I had previously called attention to the speech of the Lieutenant Governor of the Province in regard to the claim of the Province.

Mr. COLBY. I was informed that this correspondence was in the hands of the Minister of Justice, and would be immediately laid on the Table of the House.

Fisheries, P. E. I. \$3,500

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it true that the fine imposed in Prince Edward Island on the lobster catchers has been \$50, while it has been only \$10 on those on the west coast of Nova Scotia? I would also ask if it is the intention of the Government to place an inspector in each lobster factory during the season?

Mr. COLBY. The fines imposed in Prince Edward Island ranged from \$2.50 to \$20. That was for having lobsters below the size provided by law.

Mr. KIRK. Is that the practice in the different Provinces? Is it uniform? I have heard of several fines of \$50 being imposed in my county.

Mr. COLBY. I suppose that is within the discretion of the court. The law is applicable to the whole country alike. There might be mitigating or aggravating circumstances, or the courts might take different views.

Mr. FLYNN. I think the overseer, if he discovers an undersized lobster, imposes the fine without going to any court at all.

Mr. KIRK. Have not the overseers power to let some good Tories go free while they fine others?

Mr. COLBY. They might have the power, but they would be departing from their duty if they did so.

Mr. KIRK. Have they not done so?

Mr. COLBY. If the hon. gentleman will refer to any officers who have done so, it will be soon shown that they have not performed their duty.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Minister has not answered my question. I asked whether they were not fining people in my county \$50, while on the western coast of Nova Scotia they were only fining them \$10 for the same offence.

Mr. COLBY. I think I showed the hon. gentleman that the maximum fine in Prince Edward Island was \$20, which, I understand, is the maximum under the Act.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am aware that two people in my county were fined \$50 each, one for having three small lobsters only a quarter of an inch under the legal size.

Mr. COLBY. I am informed that the fines in those two cases were reduced by the Minister to \$20.

Mr. FLYNN. I desire to bring to the notice of the Minister a case which occurred in my own county last year, which, I think, was one of very peculiar hardship. A person there who owns property leased the establishment for five years to a person who was engaged in the lobster packing business. The latter, like most men engaged in that business, had some undersized lobsters, and he was fined once or twice for that. The second or third time he left the country, left all the people to whom he was indebted, and the officers exacted from the proprietor a fine of \$20. He had nothing to do with the business. He had simply leased these premises. He lost his rent, the person to whom he leased the premises absconded, and the fine was exacted from him.

Mr. COLBY. That is the law.

Mr. FLYNN. I think that is a case of peculiar hardship. In addition to losing his rent, the proprietor has to pay the penalty imposed upon the person who absconds.

Mr. COLBY. There are many analogies to that in our civil law.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to bring to the notice of the Minister the case of a factory run by Mr. J. W. McPhee, of King's County, who was fined \$50 for packing lobsters under size, although he maintains they were full size.

Mr. COLBY. The memorandum that I have in my hand shows that John W. McPhee was subjected to two fines of \$20 each. Very likely his case was one of those which were reduced by the Minister, as I stated before, where the magistrate had fixed the fine at some \$50, but the Minister

subsequently looking over the case thought it was excessive, and reduced it to \$20.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Has the money been refunded?

Mr. COLBY. If it was paid it has been refunded, or it will be refunded.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I consider this case one of considerable hardship. This is a very important industry in our Province, particularly in my county. If the inspectors go around and fine men for such trifling faults as this, it will be almost impossible for these men to conduct their business. I think I am within the mark in saying that in our Province there is half a million of capital invested in these factories and in supplies for these factories which are to be run next year, and if an inspector is to be placed in each of these factories the result will be that they will have to be closed and the Island will suffer the loss of half a million dollars. If in some cases they pack lobsters that are a little under size, I think it would be much better for the Department to make an arrangement to allow the matter to be settled between the lobster fishermen and the packers. The packer cannot take any lobster that is too small for use; anything under nine inches, or a little under nine inches, would be of very little use for him to put up. I agree with the Government in trying to protect the fishery as much as possible, but the practice of tyrannising over the fishermen in this way, will ultimately destroy the business altogether, and cause the loss of a great amount of money to the people of that Island. I have another little complaint to make in regard to cutters. I have been very credibly informed that these cutters are acting in a very partial manner: they pass some factories and go to others. I do not mean that they are actuated by political motives, that they pass by factories run by Conservatives and go to those run by Reformers; but I mean to say that some of them seem to have their particular friends, that they pass by some men and pounce upon some others, and fine them in the most arbitrary manner, if they find a lobster a quarter of an inch or an eighth of an inch under size. This practice will ultimately prove the destruction of that business in our Province, if the rules are carried out in the future as they have been in the past.

Mr. COLBY. The question the hon. gentleman raises involves the whole question of lobster protection. He states there is a large amount of capital invested in these canneries in his county in that Province. What the Department is endeavoring to do is to protect those gentlemen who have invested their capital in that way, and to protect this very industry, and as at present advised, the true method is to protect the lobsters. If we allow the fishery to be exterminated, as the Department is informed would take place within a very few years if precautionary measures were not taken, all that capital would be wiped out, and the industry would be destroyed. It is possible the Department is not adopting exactly the best methods, but it is endeavoring to do the best it can, as at present advised, in order to protect the industry in which the hon. gentleman is so much interested. Speaking of the limitation of the size of the lobster, the limit we have adopted is smaller by about one inch than that adopted by the

Mr. COLBY.

United States authorities; ours is nine and a half inches as against ten and a half in the United States. If these young lobsters are permitted to be taken, we shall have to give up all idea of maintaining the lobster fisheries. That is the opinion of the Department. However, I think this question would be more properly discussed on some substantive motion, or on the occasion of a Fishery Bill, than incidentally upon an item of this kind. To show the hon. gentleman how much some protection is needed, I have only to cite the great falling off in the catch in his own Province. The figures placed in my hands show that in 1881 there were 6,312,820 one-pound cans packed; in 1882, that quantity fell to five millions; in 1883, there were three millions; in 1884, the quantity was four millions; in 1886, three millions; in 1887, two millions; in 1888, 1,446,000; in 1889, two millions, showing a great falling off in the packing; and this decrease is, to a considerable extent, owing to the fact that the law which the Government desires to enforce in the interest of this very important industry, as a matter of fact cannot be, or is not, as thoroughly enforced as it should be. This great falling off certainly shows the importance of strengthening the hands of the Government, in their laudable efforts to protect, in the best way possible, this important industry. I regret that the hon. gentleman, coming from a Province which is so largely interested in this industry, has to find fault with the administration of the law. I cannot conceive that the officers of the Department, in those cases he has mentioned, could have intentionally and deliberately wronged those men engaged in that industry. He says, they did not discriminate on political grounds, but that they seemed to have their friends. It may be that they are more friendly with some than with others; and it also may well be that they have information that some were doing a greater amount of injury than others, and that they give their attention to those who they believe are doing the most mischief. I am not as conversant with the facts as the hon. gentleman is. If he desires to have them investigated, the Department will look into them. Certainly the officers will not be upheld in discriminating between individuals, upon any personal ground whatever.

Mr. FLYNN. I regret that the Minister at the head of the Department is not present when these items are being discussed. Now, I have never known, and, I believe, no one else has ever known, the reason why the size of the lobsters has been reduced from 9½ inches to 9 inches. I say no reason has ever been made public.

Mr. COLBY. I have here the regulation of the Department, declaring that it shall be unlawful to catch lobsters under nine and a half inches in length. The length has not been changed, as the hon. gentleman appears to imagine.

Mr. FLYNN. I said the limit before was nine inches, and it is now nine and a half inches.

Mr. COLBY. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that a change had been made from nine and a half inches to nine inches.

Mr. FLYNN. The length is now half an inch more than before, but no reason has been assigned for the increase. About ten or eleven years ago the fishermen had a right not only to fish up to

August, after which there was a close season of six or eight weeks, but they had also the right to fish in the fall. In 1879 it was stated by the head of the Department that it was necessary to have a close season and no fall fishing, and that the length of lobsters taken should be limited to nine inches. The Department adopted that course on the best information they could obtain. They considered a nine-inch lobster was a good one for packing, and from information obtained from the packers they established that limit. For several years that limit remained in force. Every one was satisfied, until last season the Department added half an inch to the length, making it nine and a half inches. No reason has as yet been assigned for the change. I do not understand how you are going to preserve the lobsters by changing the limit from nine to nine and a half inches. The lobster fishermen have been very unfairly dealt with. A large number of fishery overseers and wardens have been appointed in every county. Surely they are sufficient in number to enforce the lobster fishery laws. We pay \$150,000 for half a dozen cruisers and the steamship *Acadia*.

Mr. COLBY. \$69,000.

Mr. FLYNN. Whatever the sum is. For what purpose do we pay it? We pay it for the purpose of protecting, as I presume, our fisheries from the encroachments of foreign fishermen, and with a view to keep them outside the three-mile limit. This year on several occasions, notwithstanding the fact that these overseers have been appointed to see that the fishery laws are not violated, the steamer *Acadia* has entered the port of Arichat when she should have been in the ocean, and when at the same time Yankee fishermen were seen along the coast. Some of the other cruisers adopted the same practice. I hold they were not commissioned to do such work. I do not think the cruisers were commissioned to harrass and annoy our own fishermen, and to see if they can find an under-sized lobster in our factories. That is what they did do, while I maintain they should have been outside protecting our fishermen from the encroachment of foreign fishing vessels. I have a further complaint to make on behalf of the fishermen of a large portion of the Island of Cape Breton. Last year the departmental regulation limited the season to the middle of July. A petition was sent here from the County of Cape Breton, very numerously signed, asking for an extension of time until the last of August. The petitioners stated their reasons for presenting this request; among others, that there were certain conditions existing, such as the presence of ice and other matters, which entitled the fishermen on the coast, from a given point to a point near Cape North, to an extension of time until 1st August. This petition was presented early in the season. Some of the parties interested and myself had interviews with the Minister of Marine and with his deputy. The Department considered there was a good deal of force in the contention, and they would consider it. They did consider it, and an Order in Council was passed extending the time for fishermen from a point starting west of St. Peter's Island, and running east to Cape North, extending the time to 1st August, which concession was made in accordance with the prayer of the petitioners, and the people were satisfied. Those packers west who had to close

their factories two weeks earlier were not displeased. This year an Order in Council was passed, some time in April, again extending the time of the fishing season until the last of August within the limits I have mentioned. Under that Order in Council these people made their preparations. Of what did these preparations consist? They had to obtain boxes and tins; they know the number of fishermen they employ and the limit of the fishing season, and they made all their preparations on this Order in Council. I am speaking from information obtained from a lobster packer who had done packing within these limits. After they had made these preparations another Order in Council was passed, returning to the date of 15th July. These people complain, and very properly so, that the season is too short, because on that part of the coast when there was ice, the traps must be taken up, or they will be destroyed. The regulation nominally gives from the 1st April to the middle of July as the fishing season; but on our part of the coast it is very often the middle of May before the traps can be set. I say on behalf of these people that they have a great deal of which to complain. I should like to know why the order was changed, after having been made on statements contained in a petition signed by 5,000 people, and on representations of some of the packers themselves, and after interviews with the Minister and his Deputy and that after having extended the time, because of certain conditions, which existed there and which did not exist further west in the county, until last of August, and again by Order in Council in April extended it again, they then reversed it. These are the facts as given to me and I present them to the House.

Mr. McKEEN. There is something in the contention of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn). I remember last year having had charge of the petition, and it was alleged by the petitioners at the time, that the reason they asked an extension of time on the north shore of Cape Breton was that the season is nearly one month later than it is to the west. This petition was very numerously signed, and we succeeded in inducing the Minister of Marine to grant the extension of time asked. Considerable dissatisfaction existed when the time, after being lengthened as the hon. member states, was restricted to the usual limit. I remember having heard it stated, that the reason why the Government was induced to go back to the old limit of time, was that the ice last year went off the coast a good deal earlier than usual. That may or not be the case, but it was one of the reasons given. The contention of our lobster fishermen is, that notwithstanding the ice goes off earlier, yet the season at that time of the year is so stormy that usually very little fishing can be done until June. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) knows whether I am correct in that or not. I must endorse some of the remarks that the hon. gentleman has made; but, on the other hand, representations have been made to me by fishermen, that unless protection is afforded to lobsters, in a short time our fisheries will be in a similar position to those on the Prince Edward Island coast, where they are, if I am not mistaken, practically extinct. Many of the thinking men among our fishermen uphold these regulations with regard to the close season, and also with regard to

the size of the lobster. I am not at all practically posted on the question, but I have had some correspondence with our lobster packers during the past few years, and they have frequently made representations to myself and to my colleague on the subject. I know that one or two small fines of \$5, I think, were imposed last year, but I believe that when proper representations were made, in one case anyway, the fine was remitted. I do not think, as far as I know, that it is the desire of our inspectors to be unduly harsh in imposing fines; but, at the same time, they believe it to be necessary that, if the regulations are to be carried out, the law must be upheld.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The statistics given by the Minister in reply to my hon. friend, with regard to the catch of lobsters in Prince Edward Island, is the best answer with reference to the necessity of increasing the size of the lobsters. Of course, the Government, like every hon. member who is discussing this question to-night, have but one object in view, namely, the preservation of the lobster industry, which has grown to very large proportions in the Maritime Provinces. I have always advised with and assisted the Government in the regulations with regard to these fishery questions. I believe that we know very little more about the habits of the lobster than we did some years ago, but it has been tolerably manifest that if there is to be indiscriminate fishing at all seasons of the year, and if lobsters of all sizes are permitted to be taken, we shall have soon very few lobsters on our coast. That is, I think, a pretty well established fact, and under these conditions I think we have to meet this question frankly. Is it not better to have a close season, and to fix the limit at which lobster shall be taken, and to adhere rigidly to that? I am quite well aware of the difficulties which my hon. friend for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) has referred. I know of the complaints that are made by the fishermen all along the coast, and it does seem hard, as I intimated the other night, that when the first of July comes and the fishermen find that after a boisterous spring and perhaps only a month or six weeks' fishing, they have very little success for their labors, and for their very arduous undertakings, precarious at the best of times. But I believe that the law must fix a time, and it would be inconvenient to these fishermen whether it was a little later or not. I do not object, under certain conditions, that the time shall be extended when the season is exceptional as in the case referred to in Cape Breton. Sometimes, from the fact of there being ice on the coast, and on account of the weather being boisterous, the fishermen have been unable to do much, and I think, under those circumstances, the time should be extended on the special report of those who understand the subject well. I start with this idea, that the Government should be firm in carrying out all their regulations, and not yield too much and not be too arbitrary at the same time. I cannot imagine that there is any disposition on the part of the Government to be arbitrary in a matter of this kind, because their object must be the object we all have: that is, to preserve the fisheries. I have not referred to the statistics from Nova Scotia for the last six or seven years, but I am given to understand that the fishery has fallen off considerably there. If it

Mr. McKEEN.

is anything like the alarming proportion of the falling off in Prince Edward Island, I think every one interested in that industry will come to the conclusion that it is time to cry halt, and to see what we should do to preserve that fishery before it becomes extinct.

General LAURIE. My hon. friend who has just spoken says, with a great deal of truth, that we know but little about the habits of the lobster. That is a fact. We do not know as much about their history as we should like to, and we do not know enough to frame regulations that will satisfy those who make their living by catching lobsters. It is in their interest that the lobster fishery should not be destroyed, and it is in their interest, also, that the lobsters they do catch shall go into the market in good condition. These are two points we have got to bear in mind when we are considering the subject. The packers now will not buy lobsters in bad order, because, when the lobster is not good, it costs more than the lobsters canned will sell for afterwards. It takes nine pounds of soft shell lobster to make one pound canned in the lobster factories, and the price which the canners pay, and the price for which they sell the canned lobster, will not leave them any profit if they attempt to use bad lobsters. There is a large trade in live lobsters sent to the United States which also protects itself. The laws in the United States require that lobsters shall be ten and a half inches in length, and purchasers there will only buy lobsters when they are sound and fit for market. Not only will they refuse to buy them out of season, but they go further than that; they will charge every expense on the consignment of all bad lobsters against the consignor, and he will charge it against the fishermen. Consequently, the fishermen find that it is not in their interest to send to market any fish but those that are thoroughly good. I spoke of our not knowing much about the habits of the lobster, and to show how difficult it is to fix a time, I may say that last year, on the coast of the county I represent, the first consignment of lobsters taken off Seal Island, one of our best fishing stations, was only received early in June from that point, and actually they had only two consignments of lobsters from there before, by law, they were compelled to discontinue fishing, and just when the lobsters were commencing to be good. We now ask that the time should be extended for fifteen days. I hope I have shown that bad lobsters are not likely to be purchased, and that, therefore, the fishery protects itself to that extent. There was a time when bad lobsters were bought by the canneries, when anything would do. The fishery did not then protect itself, but now it does, so that the time may reasonably be extended for fifteen days. Lobsters are good up to the 15th of July, and the time might be extended to that date. We are told that there is a shortage in the lobster fisheries last year. Of course there is, because the time is shortened during which we can catch them. We have plenty of time at the beginning of the season, but it is practically worth nothing to us, because we cannot go out and catch lobsters then; what we want is a longer time at the end. Therefore, I hope there will be a reconsideration of this matter, and that we may have an extension of the time, say, to the 15th of July, because, if the

lobsters become unfit for market, the trade will protect itself: if the fishermen find that they cannot sell their catch, as bait is expensive, they will take up their lobster pots and stop taking them.

Mr. COLBY. I must express my thanks to the hon. senior member for Halifax for having, with the very great knowledge which he has on these matters, given the House the benefit of his judgment. I think it is the duty of hon. members, representing constituencies where the enforcement of the law is somewhat difficult, to strengthen the hands of the Government in their honest endeavors, and so far as they can get information, their intelligent endeavors, to encourage this great industry. As the hon. member very properly suggested, the Government do not expend this \$69,000 on the fishery protection service out of mere wantonness. They have only one object in view, that is, to protect this very important industry for the benefit of the country at large and the fishermen in particular. They are obliged to act in accordance with the best information they can obtain from disinterested sources, and they are obliged to attach some credence to their own officers, who are presumed at any rate to be disinterested. With regard to this lobster business, when the Government saw the falling off in the product in Prince Edward Island from 6,000,000 lbs. in 1881 to 1,400,000 lbs. in 1888, it became a serious question as to whether it would not be necessary to prevent the catch for a certain number of years in order to allow the lobster to recover itself and prevent its entire extermination. The Government at that time did not consider it wise to take that extreme step; but they became convinced that it would be necessary, for the preservation of that great industry, to make their regulations more stringent, and to see that they were efficiently enforced. I think it hardly fair for my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Flynn) to blame the Government, because having in an exceptional season, when the ice was late in departing, extended the period a little for his constituents, they did not make the extension permanent. The Government will have to be very careful if it is to be made a reproach to them that they do not continue at all times and in all circumstances those privileges and relaxations which they have only made temporarily. The hon. gentleman well knows, as I understood him to say himself, that the relaxation was granted in that instance owing to the lateness of the ice, and it was done in response to strong pressure which was brought to bear on the Minister; but it was not intended by him that there was to be a permanent change in the policy of the Department. My hon. friend who has last spoken thinks that the season should be extended along the coast of his county. Great weight should be attached to his views, because he lives in the locality; yet I am told that they are quite at variance with the opinion of the lobster commission who were expressly deputed to examine into this question. It was their opinion that in certain localities the lobster began to be soft-shelled by the 1st of July, and at the latest by the 15th of July. I think the Department are acting intelligently in this matter. They have only one object in view, that is, to protect the lobster industry for

the benefit of the country at large, and especially for the benefit of those who have invested their capital in it. I am quite aware that it has been said, and properly said, that the habits of the lobster are not as well known yet as those of other fish; but the Department are obtaining all the information possible: and, as they are making these regulations in the interest of the fishermen, I think they are entitled to expect the moral support of every member representing a fishing constituency. Perhaps there is no law more difficult to enforce than this fishery protection law. I suppose every member in Parliament who represents a fishing constituency finds his constituents continually pressing upon him their views, which are always in the line of a further relaxation of what are deemed by them to be stringent regulations; and it requires a good deal of moral courage, I know, in a member of Parliament, not to fall in with the current sentiment among many of his own constituents; but I think, on reflection, we must come to the conclusion that the sound, conservative way, if we are to preserve and perpetuate these valuable fisheries, is to secure a proper enforcement of the regulations, which are conceived by the Government in the interests of the fishermen, and under the best advice they can get.

General LAURIE. As the hon. Minister has referred to the report of the Fishery Commission, I wish to say, in regard to that report, that the commission spent but half a day in Shelburne county, and took the evidence of one gentleman largely engaged in the trade, who was reported to have said that the lobsters were soft-shelled after the 1st July. That gentleman wrote to me to say that he was incorrectly reported, and that the season for catching lobster should be continued until the 15th or 20th. That is the only evidence given in that district on which the commission based their recommendation. I may say further, that I went to Boston the year before last and spent a week or ten days there in order to investigate this particular subject in the market to which the fish was sent, and I found that the receivers of those fish which are purchased there, while they took account of every soft-shell fish that came to their market, stated that none came before the 15th. I think that in this case we could take the fish themselves as, on the whole, better evidence than the reports of the commissioners.

Mr. FLYNN. I am perfectly in accord with the views of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) as to the necessity of protecting the lobster fisheries, and I agree to a great extent with those of the hon. gentleman representing the Fishery Department, but I would particularly call the attention of that hon. gentleman to two facts. I stated that when this matter had been fully represented to the Government as far back as ten years, and they found that necessity existed for fixing a close season and limiting the size of the lobsters caught, they found that a nine-inch lobster should be the limit of size. They continued that for ten years, and then, without assigning any reason, they made the limit nine and a half inches. If they prevented fishermen from taking lobsters that are spawning, I could understand their action, but when they prevent one season the taking of lobsters of only nine inches, and the next year increase the

size to nine and a half, how can the lobster fisheries be protected by just adding this half inch? Nothing in this discussion has tended to show me how you are going to preserve the lobster fisheries by adding this half inch. If you would prevent, by imposing stringent regulations, fishermen from taking the lobsters in spawn, you would perpetuate the lobsters to a great extent. But that is not the point I wish particularly to bring to the notice of the Minister. There is another point. The Department, upon representations made in 1888—upon the petition spoken of by the hon. member for Cape Breton—found a condition of things existed on the eastern part of Nova Scotia which demanded an extension of time. But I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that where this extension of time was given is very nearly in the hon. gentleman's own county and the County of Victoria. The western limit commenced in my county, St. Peter's Island—a very small portion of it—and then got into the County of Cape Breton, and then into Victoria. Therefore, the extension of time was a benefit to the constituents of my hon. friends from Cape Breton and Victoria, and not in my county. The other point I would specially call the attention of the Minister to is that, having extended the time for a year by an Order in Council in April, when these men were making their preparations, why not carry it out for the year? If the Department found it necessary in the interests of the lobster fishery to go back to the old limits and to restrict lobster fishing to the 15th July, they should have given these people timely notice. These men told me they had got all their materials, calculating on being able to fish until the last of August, and mark you, Sir, where you have a fishery that does not practically continue more than two months on that coast, one-fourth of the time is a very large portion taken. The packers had all the material required for the taking and preservation of lobsters, and were then told that another Order in Council was made restricting to the 15th July. These are the two points I complain of. I do not complain of the Department making all the necessary regulations for the sake of preserving the fish. I am willing to do all in my power to assist them in carrying out these regulations. I know that some restrictions are necessary, but I mean to say that the regulations should be neither arbitrary nor capricious as they have been in this instance. I will say nothing with regard to the overseers who enforce the regulations. The gentleman who occupies that position and lives in the County of Cape Breton, I believe, enforces the law as mildly as he possibly can. If he finds a man with an undersized lobster in his possession, he is simply the instrument of carrying out the law. These are the only points I call the attention of the Minister to. There is no reason assigned why by taking nine and a half inch lobsters in place of nine inches, you are going to perpetuate the fishery.

Mr. KIRK. I do not wish to prolong the discussion on this subject, but coming, as I do, from a county largely interested in this industry, I cannot allow this vote to pass without saying a few words. I regret very much that the report of the Fisheries Department is not in the hands of hon. members, because I think it would likely

Mr. FLYNN.

throw some light on the subject under discussion. The hon. Minister has appealed to members of this House representing fishing constituencies, to assist the Government in enforcing the laws which are made to protect the lobster fisheries. I think there is not an hon. member in this House representing the fishing constituencies, who is not willing to support the Government in any proper regulation the Government may make to protect the fisheries. It is in the interest of the fishermen that proper regulations should be made, and, when made, strictly adhered to. But it is not in their interest that regulations should be made which they cannot possibly respect, and to observe which would entail starvation on their families. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) has complained, with regard to Cape Breton, and I think justly, that the time is so short, that it would be better for the fishermen if they were not allowed to fish at all. I find in the report of 1888 that the fisheries inspector for Cape Breton reports that the fishermen had but twenty-five days in the whole year to fish for lobsters. Will any hon. gentleman pretend to say, that in twenty-five days a fisherman is going to make a living for his family? Fishermen have represented to me that they cannot afford, many of them, to keep sufficient plant in order to follow other fishing industries as well as the lobster, and in this connection I will read what Mr. Bertram says in the report of 1888:

"This fishery was by no means remunerative. The ice remained somewhat late on the coast, and fishing did not commence until the 1st of June, when it had not even then become general. Frequent storms prevented anything like a steady prosecution of the fisheries. The most disastrous occurred early in July, and destroyed a large amount of lobster fishing appliances. After this, but very little was accomplished for the remainder of the season. Packers say that, owing to frequent storms, they had not, along the coast line from Cape North to St. Peters, more than 25 days out of the entire season to carry on their work. The fish were large and plentiful, and there were no indications of an exhausted supply, either in quantity or in quality. No soft-shell fish were found up to the close on 28th July. Lobsters inhabiting the deep and cool waters outside the headlands are not subject to the annual changes of softening and shedding which affect those inhabiting the warm waters within the bays. By a careful inspection of the canning factories and other safeguards pointed out in my report of 1887, lobster fishing on the coast of Cape Breton is likely to remain a permanent and unimpaired source of supply."

It will be seen by this report that after all these cannot be any great necessity for shortening the time so much. Mr. Bertram points out that the lobsters are large and the supply plentiful. Why, then, should the fishermen be confined to so short a time? The Minister refers to the report of the commissioners who were appointed a few years ago, and says that the lobsters were found to be getting soft by the end of July.

Mr. COLBY. In some places on the 15th of July.

Mr. KIRK. That may be true, but it will be seen that these commissioners simply gave their own opinion, and that opinion does not correspond with the majority of the witnesses whom they examined. The hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) says that they paid only a flying visit to Shelburne, and only examined one man, and that they did not report him as having told them what he really did say. Guysborough County, which I have the honor to represent, is a very large fishing county. The commissioners only visited two

points in that county. I believe they took evidence from two or three parties, all of whom are engaged in canning, and none in fishing. If you look at all the evidence, you will see that only a few fishermen were examined. Nearly all the witnesses were packers. Was that the kind of evidence which these gentlemen were sent to gather? The Government could have obtained all the evidence they wanted from these packers by issuing a circular. While the evidence which these gentlemen took is valuable, their report, apart from the evidence, is valueless, except as to the southern coast of Nova Scotia, where I believe their opinion in regard to soft-shell lobsters is correct. Our people do not complain that the spring season for fishing is too short. They are quite satisfied that fishing should be prohibited on the 1st July, because they admit that lobsters are beginning to get soft at that time, and that they remain so until some time in September, but they claim that, by the 1st October, lobsters are as good as they are at any other time of the year, and they ask that the close time should cease on the 1st October instead of on the 1st January, as it does at present. That would give them six or eight weeks of fishing in the fall. It is true, as the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) and the hon. member for Cape Breton have stated, that the lateness of the season interferes with the fishing on account of the ice and the stormy weather. I have myself seen, in the Strait of Canso and on the coast of Guysborough, ice jammed up to the 6th June, and no lobster fishing could be prosecuted at all under those circumstances. What the fishermen complain of is the shortness of the season. I do not agree with the hon. member for Halifax that the time might be extended later than the 1st July in special seasons, because, I believe, that it would be detrimental to the fisheries. I believe that the killing of one lobster in the month of August would do more to destroy the fisheries than to kill a dozen at any other season. I remember that Mr. Hamblin, who was a large packer in Pictou County, pointed out, in a letter which was published in the press, that the system of extending the fishing to the end of August—which had been done by the Government on the application of the packers, in order to enable them to continue their canning—would exhaust the fisheries of Prince Edward Island, and, in fact, that system was continued until the fisheries were nearly exhausted. Mr. Hamblin pointed out that more lobsters were destroyed during the month of August than during the whole of the rest of the year. He pointed out that if this fishing were not prevented during that month of August, the lobster fishery would be killed, but the Government did not take his advice until they finally awoke to the necessity of it and prohibited this fishing for that month and for some other months. As far as the southern coast of Nova Scotia is concerned, the lobster fishing has not been exhausted. The lobsters there are just as large and plentiful as ever. Hon. gentlemen will find that Mr. Rogers, in his report of 1888, in regard to lobsters, says :

“There is a small decrease in the yield of this important item, caused by limited time given by the law in which to take them. They were very plentiful on most of the coast, and of a good size.”

That is to say, that, while the lobsters were

very plentiful and of a good size, still, as the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) has stated, the falling off was caused by the shortening of the time allowed by the Government for the catch. The fishermen feel that to be very hard. Providence has provided lobsters in abundance on their coast; they float immediately in front of their doors; but the Government say you shall not take them. That does seem hard, and the fact is that so far as the County of Guysborough is concerned, this last two or three years, at any rate, since the time has been cut short, if it were not for the fact that the lobster packers advanced very largely money upon the strength of the next year's catch, many families would actually be in want. Is that a condition of affairs that ought to exist, seeing that the lobsters are as plentiful as they ever were, and as large? When the Government steps in and says: You shall not take them, you must find some other means of getting a livelihood, it is a great hardship for the fishermen, and they complain bitterly about it. They feel that the law is very arbitrary, and I think if the Minister would make some enquiries of the fishery officers in the County of Guysborough, he would find that they have difficulty in enforcing the law, a difficulty which might be avoided by a change in the law.

Mr. FREEMAN. I think, the Committee will excuse this extended discussion, when they remember that the lobster fishing interest is an exceedingly important one in the Province of Nova Scotia, and those hon. members who have never been in that part of the country, and who have not seen with their eyes and heard with their ears the complaints that are continually made by the fishermen, can hardly understand the importance of that fishery. I have listened to this discussion and endeavored to gather information from it, and I have observed that the conflicting views of those hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this question, resemble the conflicting views of the fishermen themselves, with regard to the protection of the fisheries. They all agree that the fishery must be protected; they differ, however, as to the mode of protection. In the eastern part of Nova Scotia they differ as to the time; in some places the fishermen contend that the claims of other places are unreasonable; each portion, however, desires to have the time for catching lobsters lengthened. There are, however, a good many fishermen now who are considering the propriety of allowing fish to be taken in the fall of the year. I think that by-and-by, when the Fishery Department has a more extended and a more complete report of the fisheries, they will be in favor of giving the fishermen an opportunity to catch lobsters in the fall of the year. With regard to the commissioners' report, I have very little confidence in it, indeed. I have no particular charge to make against the commissioners, but I know that in Queen's County, which I represent, a very important county so far as the lobster fishing is concerned, we have men engaged in canning, and men engaged in fishing, who have observed the habits of the lobsters and could have given very important testimony; but they were not consulted at all. I doubt very much whether any evidence was taken, or any person consulted, in the County of Queen's; I never heard of any, but I heard a good many who complained that they were not consulted, that their views were

not taken. I have heard other straggling complaints and particulars given, but they are not of such a character as that it would be wise to name them now. I will say this, however, that I have very little confidence in that report, and while I am not prepared to say that it was an improper report, it does not secure my confidence, at least. There is another point to which I wish to call the attention of the Minister. The law forbids the catching of fish under nine inches and a half.

Mr. COLBY. The regulation is that if they are caught they have to be thrown back.

Mr. FREEMAN. However, it says that you are not to catch them. I have given my views to the Minister of Fisheries, he knows them well, and I need not repeat here what I said to the Minister. However, I will observe that the fisherman is forbidden to catch fish under nine inches and a half. Half an inch is a very small portion of a fish, and those who have never caught lobsters will find that they are a fish not very easily measured; any fish is not very easily measured. As some officers carry out the regulations, when a fisherman takes his pot up in which he catches the fish and takes them out, he is required to measure those fish exactly within half an inch. Now, I ask the members of this Committee to consider the difficulty, and the labor, and the hardship of the fisherman who goes on a cold morning, perhaps, to pull up his pot, and the possibility is that there may be ice about when he is taking his fish out of the pot; he has to have a measure, and every fish he takes out he has to lay the measure upon it exactly within half an inch. I ask whether that can be fairly expected of a fisherman. The habit of the fisherman, however, is not to lay them on the measure or to lay the measure on the fish, but to measure the fish with his eye, and we can well understand that the fisherman wishes to secure every fish that will come within the law, and he is very likely to let his eye favor himself. That is very reasonable, but to say that if he takes any fish that happens to be a little under nine inches and a half, he is to be fined, is exercising too much severity towards him. In many cases he goes alongside the cutter with his fish, for in many places the cutters buy the fish from them, and the captain of the cutter comes down and takes all the fish in his little boat that are nine inches and a half, he places them on his vessel and he leaves what is under nine inches and a half. I know a case where the officer of a cutter jumped into the boat of a man who had a few fish that were just under nine inches and a half, he took them out and would not allow the man to throw them overboard, but he took him off to a magistrate and made the poor fisherman pay a heavy fine. There is a hardship for the fisherman. Now, I am not blaming the Government, or the officials of the Government at Ottawa, who carry out that law; but I want to present this enforcement of it as a hardship for the fisherman, as it is sometimes improperly administered. I do not attach any blame to any one, nor make any complaint against any one except the officer himself. I did make some effort to have this matter investigated, but there was a good deal of difficulty about it, and I did not press the matter. But there is danger here as well as difficulty, and this is the place where the fishermen and their interests

Mr. FREEMAN.

must be represented and protected. Reference has been made here to the fishermen presenting their views to the members who represent the counties. Well, Sir, it is a good thing for the fishermen that they have somebody to represent their claim and to represent their views, and to represent the hardships which are imposed upon them. I have no doubt but that the Minister of Fisheries, and those acting with him and under him, are ready, at all times, to give relief; but they are a long distance from the fishermen, and we feel it is our imperative duty to bring those matters from time to time before the Minister of the Department, and his officials, and I must say I have received all the consideration I could have asked when I have made my representations, as I have made them. I feel that the Minister of Fisheries and his officials are desirous—and when I say officials I do not speak of the officials who are looking out as regards the measurement of the fish—and I have no complaint to make against them in regard of a sincere desire to protect the interests of the fishermen and to promote the fishing industry. Let me say one word with respect to the alleged falling off of lobsters in the western part of Nova Scotia. The experience of the fishermen in my county agrees with the experience of the fishermen of Guysborough, as stated by the hon. member for the county (Mr. Kirk). The general report in my county is that the fish are not falling off with regard to numbers, but the fishermen have to go in many cases further out to find them. The fish are quite as large as formerly—they vary in different years, for which I cannot give a reason—and last year the fish were of very good size, being somewhat larger than the year previous. I repeat there was no scarcity; but the fishermen had to go further from shore for them. It would be unfortunate if the western Nova Scotia fishery should be linked with the Prince Edward Island fishery, or that the Prince Edward Island fishery should be taken as the groundwork on which to frame regulations for the western part of Nova Scotia. The coast is entirely different, the feed for the lobsters is different, and the home for the fish is very different; our coast is rocky, which, I believe, is not the case on the Island coast, and there is abundance of shelter and lodging places for lobsters on the Nova Scotia shore which is not the case in the Island. I am satisfied you could hardly extirpate the lobsters, with the laws we now have, in the western part of Nova Scotia. While I would not advocate, because the opinions of fishermen are conflicting on that point, an extension of the time after 1st July, I would certainly impress on the Minister the necessity of taking the matter into consideration, as to whether it would be wise—I am not prepared to recommend it, but a good many of our fishermen ask for it—in the interests of the fishermen, and without injuring the fisheries, to allow them to fish during a few weeks in the fall of the year. I feel assured the Minister will take this matter into his consideration, and arrive at such a decision as will promote the interests of the fishermen, and at the same time not injure the fisheries.

Mr. CAMERON. I have no opinion of my own to express on this subject, but I have lately received a letter from a lobster packer, who runs two factories on the north-west shore of Cape Breton, and I

desire to express his views as given to me. The letter is dated 12th March. He says:

"I am anxious to find out if the lobster season is to be extended in this Gulf. I see by the papers it is not to be on the southern and eastern shore of Nova Scotia. I take it that means south of Canso. If the season is not extended to the middle of September, in the north Gulf, the business will have to be abandoned. This is the opinion of all the packers, and the fishermen too. I can get a strong company to take my factories if the law is changed in this way. As it is now, they are all going to Newfoundland, and something should be done at once. Last year the business would have paid if we could have fished during the fine weather, after 15th July. As it was, our boats only fished twenty-two days, and consequently a heavy loss to all concerned. They have two months of a start on us to the south, and that gives them the benefit of the market which is always good early, and that should satisfy them. Packers for their own sake will not put up fish that are unfit to can. The day for reckless packing is past and gone, as no fish can be sold unless properly handled, and no factory can run unless there are fish enough on the ground to make it pay. So you will easily see to continue the business in our Gulf there must be a change made in the law. Please let me know what the Government intends to do."

By this letter, the Committee will observe that the fishermen of north-west Cape Breton had only twenty-two days' fishing during the past season.

Mr. KIRK. And twenty-five days the year before.

Mr. CAMERON. They complain that when the ice is late in the gulf and in St. George's Bay, they should be allowed a longer time.

Mr. COLBY. To what date do they wish the time extended?

Mr. CAMERON. Until the middle of September. I quite concur in the opinion that the packers disagree and that this is a difficult question to settle. That is the reason I presented the views of a packer who has had a very long experience in the business, and I believe, to a very great extent, he is correct, so far as the north-west shore of Cape Breton is concerned. If the ice is late in North Bay, an extension of time should be allowed, at any rate until the middle of August.

Mr. McINTYRE. I desire to ask the Acting Minister if he can tell me who is the fishery warden at Bay Fortune River and adjoining streams in King's County, Prince Edward Island?

Mr. COLBY. Not having the report before me, I am not able to inform the hon. gentleman, but I will give him the information.

Mr. McINTYRE. The reason I ask the question is this: the fishery warden for Bay Fortune River and adjoining streams sold out his farm a year ago and left for the United States, so that this river, which is one of the most valuable in the Island, was left without a fishery warden last summer. I merely bring this subject to the attention of the Department for the purpose of having a fishery warden appointed there, because this is one of the most valuable rivers for trout fishing and is a great resort for sportsmen. I do not know whether there has been any representation made to the Department in this regard, I deem it my duty, in case the Department has not been advised in reference to it, to bring the question to their attention. Of course, I have many friends there, but it would be useless to make any recommendation. However, so far, as the hon. gentleman is concerned, a large number of his own political friends are there, and any of them in fact would be willing to take the position if they could get it.

I think I have now discharged my duty so far as this question is concerned, and I hope the Department will take immediate action and see that an appointment is made within a very short time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not wish to prolong the discussion on this important question, but as the Minister has been so kind as to give us his marked attention, I wish to say that all the restrictions you have put on the lobster fishery are utterly useless, and that the money expended in maintaining them is wasted, because the fishermen will catch these fish that are under size no matter what you do. When they see your cutters and your fishery wardens coming, they will destroy the fish that are not of size, so that the money spent in enforcing the regulations is lost. It would be much better to leave that matter entirely between the fisherman and the packer, and neither is so foolish as to do anything which would utterly destroy his own business. It is very easy to account for the great amount of fishing carried on in Prince Edward Island during the years mentioned. The lobster fishing business had then first commenced, and at that time there was a large amount caught, but now it has come to be a regular industry and there is not much fear that either the fishermen or the packers will utterly destroy their own business. The best way to protect the men employed in the business would be to close down on it altogether for some time, and to give the packers and fishermen ample warning that you intended to do so, in order that they will not invest their capital and lose it, as they will do if the present regulations are strictly enforced.

Mr. LOVITT. I am surprised to hear my hon. friend make the remarks he did. It is not the fishermen who are fined. The inspectors go to the packers pots, and if they discover lobster under size, they fine the packers. The warden in our county fines the factory men and does not fine the fishermen.

Fish-Breeding Stations, Clearing Rivers,
&c..... \$40,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This question has been discussed several years, and we do not seem to have made much progress in arriving at any satisfactory conclusion with regard to the expenditure on these salmon hatcheries. I am not criticising the vote in any unfriendly spirit, because I have always taken the greatest interest in those hatcheries, but I have come to the conclusion with a great many others, that the advantages gained have not been commensurate with the expenditure. I know that we have one establishment near Halifax, which was started by the Government of which I was a member, and I was very hopeful that it would be of use in distributing salmon fry to the rivers in the immediate neighborhood and along the coast, and that we would in time reap advantage from it. Those who have watched that hatchery carefully up to the present, have come to the conclusion that there has been no advantage from it at all, and I am very sorry that it is so, because I was very hopeful that it might be the means of increasing the salmon catch all along our coast. I wish merely to enquire, if the Government have any further information with reference to the mode of procedure as to the time for keeping the young salmon in the hatcheries. I saw a correspondence some time ago with the head of a similar establishment in France, and

he expressed the opinion that possibly we have been putting out our salmon fry too early, and that they become a prey to the fish in the rivers in which they are placed. I ask whether the Government could not make further enquiry on this very important point. I do not think it would be desirable to abandon now what was considered a very promising undertaking, but I think the Government should endeavor by experiment, or by correspondence with similar establishments elsewhere, to ascertain where the fault lies, and what was the cause of the failure, because failure it has been, I am very sorry to say. My own impression is that probably we are aiming at putting out too much of the salmon fry, and that we should keep them in for a longer time in the hatchery, until they have grown a little more, and are better able to take care of themselves. I would ask whether the Government has taken any means to ascertain what has been the experience of other places in this matter?

Mr. COLBY. I would say that this matter of fish-breeding is, of course, even yet experimental, but I think that evidences are accumulating, not only in this country, but in other countries, that such undertakings have been, on the whole, very beneficial.

Mr. GILLMOR. How long is it since it has been started?

Mr. COLBY. Twelve or fourteen years. I think a greater interest is being taken in this matter in the United States than ever before, as a result of the experiments that have been made by the various states. Congress itself is making very large appropriations for this purpose, and among the States which have taken an interest in the matter, and are making appropriations for it, I find the following: California, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Wyoming Territory. The officers of the Department here are in almost constant and certainly in very frequent communication with all these states, and they are most interested in these experiments. They are comparing notes constantly. They are exchanging the fish and fish fry, and they are solving the problem together, each availing itself of the experience of the other as best it may. I may say to the hon. member, that when the report of the Department is published, I think he will be pleased to see the evidences which have come from various parts of the Dominion, and particularly from British Columbia, as to the success of the methods which have been adopted there. A few brief extracts have been handed to me which I will read. The Board of Trade of New Westminster, British Columbia, says:

"The success is so great that another hatchery is wanted. The Kirkland Canning Company ask that the present hatchery be kept and others built."

Mr. W. H. Viance says:

"Have fished for thirty years and caught more last season than ever before. I am convinced that this is attributable to the hatcheries."

Many others use very strong expressions, some speaking of the result as remarkable and phenomenal. There seems to be very great enthusiasm in British Columbia as to the results of the hatchery, which have been obvious during the last year. These statements may be exaggerated, or may in some instances come from interested sources, and

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

therefore should perhaps sometimes be taken with a grain of allowance. But I know that lakes and ponds in my own county contain fish which are not indigenous to them, but which have been propagated from the local hatchery; I speak of the Ontario whitefish, which are becoming very numerous in some of our lakes and ponds. I believe the officers of the Department, who have watched this subject very carefully, have been strengthened in their opinion that this system will be a success. Of course they are availing themselves of all the knowledge and information they can obtain from their own experience, and from others, and every year they are learning something new.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am glad the Government are alive to this question, and are acquainting themselves with the progress made in the United States and elsewhere. I would ask whether the attention of the Department has been drawn during the past year to the question I brought to the notice of the Minister a year or two ago, namely, the advisability of their seeking some concerted action with the United States, with the view of prohibiting the use of purse seines and drag nets. There seems to be an impression, which I believe is well founded, that our fisheries along the coast are being destroyed by the use of these things; and when I brought the matter to the notice of the Minister a year or two ago, he said that the Department had it under consideration. Of course, nothing we could do on our own part would avail unless the United States would join heartily in the arrangement. It is easy to understand that when these purse seines are drawn, for instance, for mackerel, they take in herrings and all other kinds of fish, and the fishermen take out the best fish, and throw the rest overboard. In this way a great variety of fish, on which, it is said, the larger fish feed, are destroyed and pollute the water, driving the fish from the coasts. It is well known that during the last few years the mackerel have hardly frequented our coasts at all. They seem to have gone over to the coast of Ireland, and the Americans, instead of sending their mackerel vessels into our waters, are sending them to Ireland. It is evident that these fish are changing their habits, whether from the cause I speak of or not no one can determine. I think the Government would act wisely if they would invite the attention of the United States Government to this subject, because they are equally interested with ourselves, and I have no doubt, from the vast interest which they attach to this important industry, they would be disposed to join heartily in some such arrangement. I hope the Government will not lose sight of the matter.

Mr. COLBY. No person can have stronger opinions in the same direction as the hon. gentleman than the Minister; and the reports of the Department, and all the information we have on the subject, fully corroborate the impression the hon. gentleman has with regard to the destructiveness of purse seines, which, if they continue to be permitted, will lead to the total extermination of the fish in a very few years. The destruction is almost incredible, and it is believed that the authorities in the United States are becoming alive to the importance of the subject. They have already gone a considerable length by prohibiting the use

of purse seines on the Atlantic coast until the 1st June. The Minister has such a strong feeling on this subject that I have no doubt he will avail himself of every opportunity to impress his views on the Government of the United States.

General LAURIE. There is a precedent for action in this matter in the practice followed by the Governments of countries engaged in the fisheries of the North Sea between Great Britain and the continent. The North Sea Convention, which has been entered into by all the nations fishing in those waters, contains very stringent rules with regard to the destruction of immature fish. There is also a National Sea Fish Protection Association organised in England, and largely composed of men interested in those fisheries, who have devoted themselves to obtaining full information as to the best way of protecting the sea fisheries, as we are striving to protect the river fisheries.

Mr. KIRK. I should like to know whether this Government have authority to prohibit the use of purse seines within the three-mile limit, and if they have, why they do not exercise that power?

Mr. GILLMOR. We have heard a great deal about our fish becoming exhausted. When we look at our Trade and Navigation Returns, we find that we are exporting and selling more than ever before. There is no danger of exhausting the herrings. We have heard this alarm for many years, but our fish are not going to be exhausted, and you must allow the fishermen to take fish where they can catch the most of them. Preserve your spawning grounds, but let the fishermen catch fish where they can in the cheapest possible way.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). While on the fisheries, it would not be respectful to the Government to pass over the report of the Herring Commission which they have presented to the House. Can the hon. gentleman tell us what it cost? Because I am not disposed to attach much value to it. One of the commissioners I think belonged to Ontario. He may have had some knowledge of the herring fishery. Who is Mr. Gunn, and where is he from?

Mr. COLBY. He is supposed to have been very competent to take information on the question. He was from the county of Bruce.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I think in one place in that report they recommend the curing of the fish before they are taken out of the net.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Where is Mr. McLeod from?

Mr. COLBY. Cape Breton.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have gone very carefully over this report. It is chiefly valuable for the plates it contains of some trawls used in the old country which our people would laugh at. I am sure our fishermen would consider them curiosities. You may gather the value of the report from one or two recommendations. On page 67 it says:

"There should be imported and established in each sea-board county, where the importance of the herring fishing may so warrant, a thoroughly trained Scotch herring cooper, of long experience in the herring curing business, who should act as head inspector for his district, with power, after instructions, to appoint his deputies."

The idea of importing a Scotch herring cooper to teach the coopers of the Maritime Provinces how to put up herrings is a very good joke. Again it goes on to state:

"There should be imported from Scotland for each such county a crew of expert gutting girls."

If the Government are going to pay for an expensive commission such as this, they should pay some respect to the recommendations of the commissioners, and not fail to bring out these girls. I read this report very carefully for this reason: A year or two ago a member of my firm happened to be in Italy, in Genoa, and was much interested in observing that large quantities of herring came there from Scotland, which he found were all put up in a patented preparation. I believe it was an American invention. He could not find out exactly what it was. It was not a pickle, but a different sort of process altogether. There is a very large consumption of herring in Italy put up in that way; and I looked naturally in a report of this kind for some reference to this, and some suggestion as to how we could discover the methods used in the preparation of those fish, but I looked in vain. If the commissioners had given us some information of that kind, their report would have been of some value.

Mr. COLBY. The report has not been entirely unprofitable, since it has furnished the hon. gentlemen some amusement and may likely furnish the fishermen with entertainment as well. I believe it is a fact that the herring packages recommended in that report are superior to those used in this country, and it would be a good thing if they were introduced here. It has not been a very expensive commission, and if it has done a little emigration work for the Minister of Agriculture by promoting the immigration of a class of respectable girls from the other side, that should not be brought up as a charge against it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The packages they make in the old country will cost about six shillings or eight shillings sterling, or half what the herrings are worth. The packages we use, and which answer every purpose, cost from 30 cents to 40 cents. The hon. member from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) would tell the hon. gentleman that he could get a barrel of herrings down there for \$1.50.

Mr. MCNEILL. With regard to Mr. Gunn, who has been referred to in this discussion, I believe he is a gentleman specially well qualified for the work. He was brought up on the coast of Scotland, where herring fishing is carried on, and is particularly well informed with reference to the way the herring fisheries are conducted there. He has been in the habit of going down frequently to the coast of Nova Scotia, and is really an expert on the subject.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). So I should think.

Mr. MCNEILL. He has taken great interest in the matter for years past, and is a man of very good judgment and particularly suitable in every way.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Before passing this item I wish to bring to the notice of the Minister some complaints with reference to the difficulty of procuring blanks from some of the agents throughout the country. I wrote to the Department, and they

gave me a prompt and courteous reply enclosing the blanks I required. The practice seems to be, and it is a very objectionable one, that these blanks are placed in the hands of certain persons who will only give them to the fishermen, on their paying to have them filled up at the rate of 20 cents each. This should not be allowed.

Mr. COLBY. The agents have no right to charge anything, and the person who was guilty of this has been reprimanded.

Cost, maintenance and repairs of fishery protection steamers and vessels..... \$100,000

Mr. WELDON (St John). I see that little vessel called the *Dream* seems to be rather expensive. The *Acadia's* crew costs only \$2,700, and that of the *Dream* costs \$1,166, or about half of the other. The whole expenditure on the *Dream* is \$7,351, and she is only of five or six tons. In fact, she was a pleasure yacht, and it seems to me that the expenditure is very large. She is so small that I do not think she could carry the Ontario contingent of members here now, and that is the smallest I have ever seen. They appear to flit away on account of the holidays.

Mr. COLBY. The *Dream* runs the whole year round, and the *Acadia* only for a few months.

Mr. GILLMOR. The *Dream* is needed the year round. She is a beautiful little steamer, and the principal cost in connection with her is the charter, for which I think they pay \$300 a month. If that is deducted from the total cost, I think it is very moderate indeed. There could not be a vessel that would suit the service in the Bay of Fundy better than the *Dream*. She is small, and handy in going around the islands, and is most suitable for the service in which she is employed. I have no hesitation in saying that she is doing very good service, and that it is important to have just such a vessel as that in that place. There are hundreds of American boats that were in the habit formerly of fishing in our waters, but the service of watching them has been very faithfully performed by the commander of the *Dream*, and, I think, very economically. I think the price paid for the charter is rather large, but she is a splendid boat and the commander can get her ready and under way in a wonderfully short time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before this amount of \$100,000 for the protection of the fisheries is passed, I would enquire from the Ministers whether they can give the House any information as to the negotiations with the United States in regard to this matter, and as to what they propose to do in regard to the continuation of the *modus vivendi*?

Mr. COLBY. I think it would be better to ask that question when the First Minister is here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not press the question. I only asked whether the Ministers could give the information.

Mr. COLBY. Not at present.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I brought a matter to the attention of the Minister of Marine last year. Along the shores of Lake Erie a great many American fishermen have nets, and it is said that the mesh is too small and that they throw overboard the small fish as well as those which are of no value. Complaints are made that the waters are polluted in that way, and the fish which are thrown overboard are driven on the shore and become a nuisance to the people. I asked the Minister of Marine last year to instruct the fishery overseer there to look after this matter, and to see that the fishermen were prevented from creating a nuisance along that shore.

Mr. COLBY. I will have a note made of that subject.

Mr. ELLIS. There is a similar complaint in regard to the gaspereaux which are taken at the mouth of the St. John River, that the small fish are destroyed by the traps. Undoubtedly all the fish that enter the weirs, whether great or small, are destroyed, and if there were any means of setting free the young fish it would be a very good thing.

Mr. COLBY. I understand that the Department is now considering the adoption of a method that will allow the young fish to escape.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Has that been tried?

Mr. COLBY. It has been tried and has been found to answer very well.

Services and expenses in connection with the distribution of the fishing bounty, and collection of statistics.. \$6,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That appears to be a large item for that service.

Mr. COLBY. I believe there will be a Bill introduced, probably on the next Government day, by which the fishery overseers will be made justices of the peace in order to undertake this duty.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 26th March, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

Mr. SPEAKER communicated to the House the following letter which he had received from His Excellency the Governor General's Secretary:—

"OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY,
OTTAWA, 24th March, 1890.

"SIR,—I have the honor to inform you that the Honorable Sir William Ritchie, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Wednesday, the 26th instant, at 4 o'clock p.m., for the purpose of giving assent to the Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present Session,

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"CHARLES COLVILLE, Captain,

"Governor General's Secretary.

"The Honorable

"The Speaker of the House of Commons."

GODERICH AND STRATHROY POST OFFICES.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. BARRON) asked, How many tenders were received for the heating of the Goderich and Strathroy Post Offices respectively? What were the names of the different persons who tendered? What was the amount of each tender?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There were twelve tenders for each of these works. The lowest tender in each case was that of Messrs. Garth & Co., of Montreal. For Goderich, \$950; for Strathroy, \$1,220. As these works are not executed, it is not found proper to give, now, the prices of the others, but they are much higher.

MANITOBA MUNICIPAL ACT.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) (for Mr. WATSON) asked, What are the reasons for the disallowance of an Act of the Legislature of the Province intitled: "An Act further to amend chapter 52 of 49 Victoria," being the Manitoba Municipal Act of 1886 and amendment?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are several reasons, which are set out in my report to Council. That report was approved, and will be brought down to the House.

BELLE CREEK HARBOR.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, Were there a survey and report made upon Belle Creek harbor and breakwater last summer? If so, by whom was it made, and will the Minister lay copies before the House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have received a note from the Department saying there was no survey made. Has the hon. gentlemen heard that a survey was made?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood that Mr. Coste, or some engineer from the Department, made a survey of the place at the same time that he made a survey of Wood Island.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will enquire again.

MR. TOURIGNY, M.P.P.

Mr. GAUTHIER asked, Whether Honoré Tourigny, Esq., M.P.P., Provincial Land Surveyor, of Gentilly, is employed by the Dominion Government, or any Department thereof? If so, in what capacity, since when, and how much money has he received since he has been so employed? Has the said H. Tourigny any contract with the Government, and what is the purport and amount thereof?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Tourigny is not employed, nor has he any contract with this Department.

TRAWL FISHING.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) asked, Upon what principle has the Government prohibited trawl fishing in St. Mary's Bay, County of Digby, from 1st October to 1st June, the width at the entrance being nearly twenty miles? Was it done under Orders in Council or under departmental orders? Have representations been received from fishermen,

or other parties, complaining of said regulations, and do the Government intend to continue or to amend and abolish the order?

Mr. TUPPER. About a year ago, an Order in Council was passed prohibiting trawl fishing in St. Mary's Bay, and very recently a subsequent Order in Council was passed defining more accurately the limits of St. Mary's Bay. No complaints had been received with regard to this regulation until after the second Order in Council was passed defining the limits, when the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jones) brought to my attention the fact that this Order was very much complained of. Since then, I have asked for a further report in the matter. The first Order was passed on the report of the local overseer, the former inspector of fisheries, Mr. Rogers.

MILITIA—PRIVATE HURRELL.

Mr. MULOCK asked, When was Private C. T. Hurrell notified by the Government of the passage of the Order in Council of the 13th November, 1888, granting him a pension? What moneys have been paid him by way of gratuity or pension? On what dates were such payments made?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Most of the information required is contained in the papers already brought down. As to the amounts paid, it is very inconvenient to give them in the shape of an answer to the question put; but if the hon. gentleman wishes to move for a return, I am quite prepared to bring down an extract from the books containing these things.

Mr. MULOCK. The first question is in no way answered in the return. With the consent of the House, I beg to move for:

Return showing when Private Hurrell was notified by the Government of the passage of the Order in Council of the 13th November, 1888, granting him a pension? 2. What moneys have been paid him by way of gratuity or pension? 3. On what dates were such payments made?

Motion agreed to.

CAPE TRAVERSE WHARF, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, How much money was expended in 1889 in repairing the Cape Traverse Wharf, P. E. I.? Was the work let by tender? If so, who was the contractor? If by days' work, who had charge and superintended the work?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was expended on the wharf in 1889, \$13,017.44. The work was not let by tender. There was no contractor. The work was done by day labor. Track-master John Macpherson had general charge and supervision of the work, A. Strong being the foreman of the men employed.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY.

Mr. GUAY asked, 1st. Have the Government paid to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company for the twenty miles of railway, the whole of the \$300,000 they undertook to pay to that company for the twenty miles of railway comprised between Metapedia and Cross Point? 2nd. On what dates were the several sums paid, and to whom? 3rd. If the \$300,000 have not been paid in whole, what balance remains to be paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To the first question the answer is, no. To the second: 1886

—September 28th, \$60,000; November 3rd, \$60,000; November 30th, \$60,000. 1887—February 4th, \$40,000; August 17th, \$20,000; December 28th, \$6,700. 1888—December 3rd, \$15,200. 1889—February 27th, \$17,100; August 2nd, \$18,950; October 21st, \$1,850; all paid to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company, \$299,800. To the third: \$200.

Mr. GUAY asked, 1st. What sums were paid on account of subsidy to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company, from 1st July, 1889, to 15th March, 1890? 2nd. On what dates were the payments made, and to what persons were the sums paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, \$148,675. 2nd August, 1889, \$94,360; October, 1889, \$54,305. Paid to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.

GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY.

Mr. GAUTHIER asked, Whether the Government have received an engineer's report for that part of the railway of the Great Northern Railway Company comprised between the village of New Glasgow, County of Terrebonne, and the parish of Ste. Julienne, County of Montcalm, traversing the parish of St. Lin, County of L'Assomption? If so, what is the purport of the said report? Have the Government paid to the said company any part of the subsidy granted to it for the construction of its railway, and, if so, what is the amount so paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; the Government have received an engineer's report, the purport of which is that the subsidy applicable to the ten miles is \$32,000; that the value of work remaining to be done to complete on the amended location, is estimated at \$12,000; that the balance of subsidy represented by work done is \$20,000, and that payment has been made to the amount of \$20,000.

I. C. R.—NEW TARIFF OF RATES.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would ask the Minister of Railways, if, before he takes the final votes on the Intercolonial Railway, he will lay on the Table the new tariff of rates on that railway? I think he must have been led into some inaccuracy the other night, when he stated that there had been no average increase in the rates charged by the Intercolonial Railway. I know he must have had his information from the engineer, who was then present, but information which I have since had leads me to infer that there has been a very large increase in the average rate, which seriously affects the trade of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. If the hon. gentleman will lay that tariff on the Table before we discuss the item finally, we would have a better idea of the way in which the matter stands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The information which was communicated to me, and which, I have no doubt, is accurate, is that the proposed alteration in the classification of the rates was to bring that classification in accordance with that of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that throughout Canada the classification made should be the same. The different classification made it very inconvenient and disturbed the whole of the relations between the In-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

tercolonial Railway and the other railways of Canada. That is the first point. Then a statement was made to me that, on the whole, the alteration of the classification does not increase the rates, but rather diminishes them. On some articles the effect would be to diminish the rates, while on others it might be to increase them, but that on the whole it was a fair average. The hon. gentleman asks me to bring down the rates as settled. I cannot well do that, because they are not yet settled. The representations which had been made from every interest that has been affected in any way where there has been the slightest increase, has been such, that I am now considering the whole matter. I do not think any remonstrance has been made by any persons who are interested where the rates have been reduced. Strange to say, not a remonstrance has been made against the reduction, but there has been a continual stream of remonstrances where the tariff has been increased. These remonstrances deserve consideration, and are receiving consideration, and when the tariff is settled, I will bring it down.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There must be some schedule under which the Government are now acting, and that should be made public. It is very important that we should get it and understand the rates which they are now charging. There are very serious complaints from the trade of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick that this tariff is seriously interfering with them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This matter will be attended to at once, but it would be very inconvenient to bring down a tariff which might possibly be altered the next day.

REVISED VOTERS' LISTS PRINTING.

Mr. COOK. I see the Secretary of State is in his seat, and I congratulate the hon. gentleman on having so far recovered from his illness as to be able to put in an appearance here. Some time ago I sent a letter to the Queen's Printer asking for a copy of the revised voters' list for the County of East Simcoe. In course of time, I received a reply stating that the list was not yet printed. My constituents are very anxious to have a copy of the revised voters' list so as to compare it with the voters' list before this revision. Of course, in a business-like manner, they wanted to see that no clerical errors are being made in the Department of Printing.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have just received a statement of the printed lists of voters which have been completed, and I see that East Simcoe is on the list. The hon. gentleman has the right to obtain his copy from his revising officer.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would ask when the hon. gentleman expects to have that list completed? My constituency is about the end of the list, if it is treated alphabetically.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The list is not dealt with according to the alphabet, but according to the order in which they are received from the revising officers who make the lists. I see on the statement I have just received, that the lists for North, South and Centre Wellington are completed and printed.

Mr. COOK. Do I understand the Secretary of State to say that a copy can only be obtained through the revising officer?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The revising officer is obliged, by law, to send a copy to each member of the House, because it must be certified. At the printing office it can be obtained at any time, at a price fixed by the Queen's Printer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Can each member receive only one copy?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. According to statute.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What will it cost for a riding to buy them?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. You must ask the Queen's Printer.

Mr. CASGRAIN. When I was in my constituency the revising officer told me that the law provided that copies should be sent to the members elect, but he did not know by whom, and, therefore, he did not send me a copy.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It stands to reason that where the regular copy must be certified by the revising officer, he is the party who must send it to the member.

Mr. CASGRAIN. He does not know that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Well, he should.

SUPPLY—LOAD-LINE FOR CANADIAN SHIPPING.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine to a Bill now before the Imperial Parliament, and which, as I am informed, will very seriously affect the shipping of Canada. It is a Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts relating to the load-line. The Bill leaves it in the hands of the Board of Trade from time to time to indicate the maximum load-line, in salt water, of ships. This will very seriously affect our vessels, which are principally, as the Minister is well aware, under the French Bureau Veritas classification, and not under Lloyds' classification. Then, again, our vessels are somewhat different from the English vessels, which are principally iron and engaged on long voyages, in which there is very little competition with foreign vessels, or in the coasting trade, where there is no competition at all. On the other hand, our vessels have to compete with foreign vessels belonging to Norway, Italy and Germany, and the result of this Bill may, therefore, be very seriously to affect our shipping. I have received several letters on the subject, but I will only read an extract from one firm, who are largely engaged in the shipping of New Brunswick:

"We presume you have read in the papers of the proposed 'compulsory Load-line Bill,' now being promoted and likely to pass into the law this sitting of Parliament. It is intended to apply to all British registered vessels, and as the placing of the maximum load-line is to be left in the hands of Lloyds' Registry, we fear that it will discriminate against wooden vessels, particularly Colonials, who, as a rule, are not classed in their Book. We do not know if Canadian shipowners are aware of the proposed measure, or if so, whether they have considered its probable effect upon their interests. Our idea is that so large a ship-owning country as Canada should have something to say about such a Bill before it passes into a law that will affect their citizens' interests, and at least, insist upon the right to appoint its own surveyors and mark its own vessels, without the interference of either English Board of Trade or Lloyds' officials, either of whom are pretty sure to be unduly prejudiced against Colonial wooden vessels. We are also mentioning the matter to our other St. John and Yarmouth friends, as we deem it

our duty to endeavor to give a timely warning, and we hope some concerted action may be taken to represent the matter to the Canadian Minister of Marine, who may possibly get the home authorities not to extend the Act to Canadian registered vessels. Shipowners on this side who are opposed to the Bill have compromised matters by agreeing to Lloyds' marking the ships instead of the Board of Trade, and as this association has, for the past two or three years, been marking iron vessels for owners on application, and allowing them a reasonable load-line from owners' point of view, we do not think it will affect their interest very much, but we fear the case will be different when they get hold of what they consider unclassed wooden vessels, and that this class of shipping will be seriously handicapped, not only in carrying such dead weight cargoes as coal and iron, but also with timber and deals. We have been unable to, so far, get a printed full draft of the Bill, but expect to do so shortly, when we will send you a copy. The Act is also proposed to be applied to foreign vessels, loading in a British port, but we don't see how that is going to work."

Now, the Bill is a very short one, two sections of which read as follows:—

"The centre of this disc shall be placed at such level below the deck line, marked under the provisions of this Act, as may be approved of by the Board of Trade from time to time, and shall indicate the maximum load-line in salt water, to which it shall be lawful to load the ship, until the position of the disc is altered by direction of the Board of Trade.

"The Board of Trade, from time to time, may appoint any of their surveyors or other officers, or any surveyors or officers of any corporation or association, for the survey or the registry of shipping, to approve on their behalf, from time to time, the position of any such disc as aforesaid, and any alteration thereof, and may appoint fees to be taken in respect of any such approval."

This Bill was introduced on the 12th of last month. Now, it seems to me that, under the British North America Act, Canadian shipping is entirely under the control of this Parliament, and it is proper that we should have something to say about that Bill. As I said before, English shipping is composed almost entirely of large iron and steel vessels and steamers. Wooden ships are principally owned by the colonies, and chiefly by Canada, and it is very important that we should have control of the load-line as regards ourselves. As I have pointed out, our vessels have to compete with foreign vessels, while the English vessels do not; our colonial vessels have to compete largely with Norwegian vessels, particularly in the timber trade between Canada and England, and with German vessels in other trades, and if our vessels have to be subjected to these regulations of the Board of Trade from time to time, it is going very seriously to affect our trade. I hope the Minister of Marine will take some steps to bring this matter to the notice of the English Government, to see if Canadian vessels cannot be exempted from the operation of this law.

Mr. TUPPER. I fully appreciate the great importance of the matter to which the hon. gentleman has called the attention of the House. During my recent absence from Ottawa my attention was called to the subject, and I gave directions to obtain a copy of this Bill, but, so far, I have not had an opportunity of seeing it. I have given instructions to the Department to look into the subject, so that I may be able to decide what representations to make to the Imperial authorities with regard to this matter. I shall lose no time in looking into the question and taking what action may be deemed necessary.

Mr. KENNY. In this connection I desire to point out to the hon. Minister, that most of the wooden ships that have been built in Canada—and I understood the hon. member for St. John (Mr.

Weldon), when he asked for an explanation of this proposed Imperial legislation respecting colonial ships, to refer only to wooden ships, because a certain number of iron ships have been built in England and registered in Canada—have been constructed under the inspection of Bureau Veritas. There is a certain amount of jealousy existing between that office and the office of the great English Lloyds, and one apprehension which the owner of wooden ships feels is this: that, under the new law, as I understand it, I have not yet had an opportunity of reading the English Act, it is contemplated that a surveyor of English Lloyds shall be sent to survey any vessel when the load-line is not considered satisfactory by the Board of Trade. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Marine that, when he places his views on this matter before the Imperial Government, he should endeavor to secure what the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) asks, that this Parliament should regulate all matters pertaining to our own shipping; but if that cannot be obtained, at least he should ask that when a survey is required in consequence of any dispute arising between an officer of the Board of Trade and the captain of a ship, and an additional surveyor is required, a surveyor from the office from which the ship is cleared should be selected to survey the vessel. This practice of placing a load-line, as a matter of fact, has been in existence for several years, and we have not experienced any great difficulty in regard to the load-line. The rule has been that the line should be fixed by the master of a ship. This question concerns us mostly in regard to colonial ships engaged more particularly in the coal trade of Great Britain, that is, with Wales and Newcastle, and with regard to certain cargoes of cement and mixed cargoes from London and other ports. I should be very glad indeed if the hon. Minister of Marine could secure for Canada the entire control of her own shipping.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Experimental Farm \$75,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I observe that \$80,000 were voted in 1887 for buildings for the model farm, \$70,000 in 1888, another \$70,000 in 1889, or a total of about \$220,000, of which amount, according to the report of the Auditor General, \$94,481 have been spent. I think it is due to this Committee that the Minister should state what contracts are in existence, if any, and how much of the \$30,000 asked for extra buildings is to be spent on the different farms; also how much is required to finish the buildings on the farms. There is a large sum of which no statement yet appears in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. CARLING. The appendix on the model farms, prepared by the director, has not yet been brought down to the House, a delay due to no fault of the Department because it was placed in the hands of the printers six weeks ago. That report will give the details of the expenditure. I understand the hon. gentleman to ask the amount that will be required to complete the buildings on the farm. The estimate is \$30,000 to complete the buildings on the different model farms in the different Provinces. The amount asked this year

Mr. KENNY.

by the Department of Public Works, \$30,000, is expected to complete all the buildings.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The hon. Minister gave this answer last year: that we would obtain the detailed statement of the expenditure and the experiments in the appendices to the report when they are brought down; but those appendices did not contain the information. The hon. gentleman should be ready to make a statement in regard to all the contracts, before the Committee voted this large sum.

Mr. CARLING. The estimate for the buildings mentioned comes under the Department of Public Works, and when that item is reached, no doubt the Minister of Public Works will be quite prepared to give all the details. The appendix to my report will be in the hands of hon. members tomorrow or the following day, when this item of public buildings will come up, and will there find details in regard to all the contracts made and the amounts required to complete them.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Then the Minister should allow this vote to stand over until these documents are before hon. members.

Mr. CARLING. The item to which the hon. gentleman is speaking, namely, contracts for buildings and amount required to complete, is not in my estimate, but in that of the Minister of Public Works. We have not reached that item yet, and we will not reach it until the appendix is brought down. If it is the wish of the hon. gentleman that the matter should stand over until the appendix is laid before the House, I have no objection.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that the hon. gentleman says we will have a good deal of information in this appendix, and if that be so, it is quite proper that the item should stand over until the appendix is brought down.

Mr. CARLING. Very well.

Mr. COOK. Who is doing the printing?

Mr. CARLING. It is being done in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. COOK. I understood that when we would have this Printing Bureau there would be no more delays in printing. We are just now in as bad a state as before we had the Bureau. It has cost the country a great deal of money, and we have not benefited by it in the least, and the hon. gentleman makes the same excuse as he did in other years. I would advise the Minister to send the report to be printed in the Montreal *Herald* office, and the gentleman who owns that paper will see that the printing is done in good time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Better let the matter stand over until we get this appendix, so that we can discuss it intelligently.

Agricultural Societies, North-West Territories \$10,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How is this money distributed among these societies?

Mr. CARLING. In the same way as the grant in the Province of Ontario is distributed. When a certain sum of money is subscribed by each society, and when it has fifty members, we give so much to that society. Last year we gave something like eight or nine thousand dollars to the

twenty-seven agricultural societies in the North-West.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows :—

MR. SPEAKER,—

His Honor, Chief Justice Sir Wm. J. Ritchie, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Honorable House in the Chamber of the Honorable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :—

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.

An Act to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Goderich and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to "The Goderich and Wingham Railway Company."

An Act to incorporate the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canada Cable Company.

An Act to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1889, and for other purposes.

An Act respecting the People's Bank of New Brunswick.

An Act respecting the St. Stephen's Bank.

An Act to incorporate "Belding Paul and Company (Limited)."

An Act to amend "The Public Stores Act."

An Act to incorporate the Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Railway Company.

An Act relating to the Canada Southern Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company (Limited).

An Act respecting the Hereford Railway Company.

An Act to change the name of the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company to "The Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company."

An Act to amend the Act fifty-second Victoria, chapter four, intitled: "An Act to authorise the granting of subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies."

An Act to amend the Act respecting Trade Marks and Industrial Designs.

An Act further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chapter eight of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the Northern and Western Railway Company of New Brunswick, and to change the name of the company to "The Canada Eastern Railway Company."

An Act to incorporate the Brandon and South-Western Railway Company.

An Act to confirm an agreement between the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Moncton and Prince Edward Island Railway and Ferry Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.

An Act respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Shore Line Railway Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

MR. CARLING. Before the House proceeded to the Senate Chamber, I said there were twenty-seven agricultural societies in the North-West Territories, and we granted \$3 for every \$1 they raised by subscriptions. Finding that the societies were struggling to get along in that new district, and that we had sufficient in the vote, we gave them one-third more last year than the \$3, which amounted to \$8,854, out of the \$10,000 voted for these twenty-seven societies.

MR. McMULLEN. That would be \$4 for every dollar they raised, and that is much in excess of what is given to the other societies throughout the Dominion.

MR. CARLING. It must be remembered that these societies in the North-West Territories extend over a very large tract of country, and that they have a great deal to contend with. We raised the grant to the societies last year, as we found the vote had not been all expended, and I do not think the House will object to our giving them that encouragement.

MR. McMULLEN. We have no objection to encourage the development of the North-West Territories, in offering prizes for products that may be successfully produced there. At the same time the North-West has cost a great deal of money, and we should be careful that we should not deal out with, perhaps, too liberal a hand. It is desirable that this money should be properly expended, and some basis should be laid down for its distribution. I do not think the Minister of Agriculture should ask the House to consent that he would distribute it in whatever way he wished. Last year he gave \$3 to every one subscribed and then increased it to \$4. What is the intention for next year?

MR. CARLING. We gave them \$3 for every dollar they subscribed, and finding we could give them more out of the vote we increased the grant.

MR. McMULLEN. That is virtually discouraging subscriptions on their part.

MR. CARLING. Not at all. They must have a society of fifty members subscribing a dollar each before they can get anything. This year the societies may number a great many more than last year, and we may consequently have to reduce the amount given to each society.

MR. McMULLEN. Could the Minister say about what was the average number of the members of each society?

MR. CARLING. About eighty-three, I think.

Census and Statistics.....\$200,000

MR. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Will the hon. gentleman state whether any Order in Council has been passed, to declare how this census shall be taken, whether on a *de jure* or *de facto* system?

Mr. CARLING. No; because we do not take the census until next year, and we do not make any appointments until next year.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Has the hon. Minister made any recommendations on the subject?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Has any determination been come to with regard to what principle shall be adopted?

Mr. CARLING. It is the intention to take them in the same manner as the last census was taken, that is, by the *de jure* system.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Is that system in force in England or in the United States?

Mr. CARLING. It is the one in force in the United States, but not in England.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). I think that system was found to work very unsatisfactorily at the last census. The enumerator is made the judge to decide whether a party is to be entered or not, and the enumerators differ widely in their judgments. I know in some cases young men who have been absent from Canada for years, and who do not belong to Canada in any sense, were still returned in that census as belonging to Canada. In many cases names of parties who are absent in the States, are entered or left out at the mere caprice of the enumerator, who is left to say whether such persons are to be counted as belonging to Canada or not. Under that system we cannot really know what the actual population of this country is, and the census is worthless unless it gives us that information. From this country there is a large outgo of population to the United States, and the *de jure* system, so-called, as applied to Canada, is not, in fact, a *de jure* system, but it is an imaginary system which gives to Canada an imaginary population. I think, if it is desired to keep that system, we should also have a *de facto* system at the same time, so that we may ascertain what is the real population of Canada, and also how many of those who would be counted as belonging *de jure* to Canada, belong *de facto* to this country.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) If the statute upon this subject is carried out in its spirit, the system my hon. friend has just referred to, gives us the enumeration of the actual population of Canada on a given day. The fifth section of the Act provides that the enumeration shall be taken so as to ascertain with the utmost possible accuracy, with regard to the territorial divisions of Canada, their population at a given time. Now, we in Canada occupy a peculiar situation with regard to the neighboring country. We know that there has been, for a number of years back, a steady flow of population from this country to the United States, people who are not temporarily to reside there, but permanently; and if the census is taken in the same way it was taken before, the results will be largely inaccurate and largely misleading. Now, speaking on matters which came to my knowledge with regard to the last census, I noticed that many enumerators, taking, as they said, their returns under instructions from those who appointed them, took from the head of the house, not only the number of his family and of the servants who were at home with him, but the names and numbers of

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)

those who had left many years before; the only question being asked was: "Do you think that he will ever return?" Well, "ever" is a big word, and the father of the house did not want to banish all hope that some time or another his son, who had left home to make a living abroad, and was continuing to make his living abroad, and to be a resident of another country, might at some future time return; and in this way the names of hundreds and thousands were put down who had, for all practical purposes, left Canada, made a new home for themselves in another country, and become naturalised in the United States. So far as my knowledge goes, and I took pains to enquire at the time, all these names were entered in the enumerator's list and returned as comprising a part of the population of Canada. Well, if the same system was followed in the larger Provinces, from which a larger exodus had taken place, the total results would be so misleading that no one could form even an approximate idea of what the population of this country was. I think, myself, the hon. gentleman should reconsider his determination in this respect, and if he desires that the census is to be of any value whatever, so far as the population is concerned, he should adopt the English system, which will give us a fair idea of the number of inhabitants in Canada on a given day. Possibly there might be a few thousands, one way or the other, who would be abroad for temporary purposes, and he might include those; but if the *de facto* system is adopted, on the other hand, he would have nearly the same number of people who were here temporarily from other countries. At any rate, we would have a knowledge of what the population was on a given day; but under the system the Government proposes to carry out, we will get a return which will be very misleading.

Mr. CARLING. I think my hon. friend must have been misinformed as to an enumerator taking parties who had permanently left the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) No; I was not.

Mr. CARLING. Then the enumerator went contrary to the instructions given by the Department, because the instructions are to take the parties living in the house at the time, and those that are temporarily absent—those, for instance, who are away fishing, or travelling, or who may be out of the country for three or four months only. But parties who have left the country and been absent all through the year, are not to be taken.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Are there any terms of limitation in the Orders in Council, giving an idea to the enumerators what length of absence would preclude a party from being taken?

Mr. CARLING. There was no fixed time in the Order in Council, but instructions were given each enumerator to consider those who were absent on employment during the summer as temporarily absent, and to include them as belonging to the house. The enumerators are sworn, and receive instructions as to how the census shall be taken. There may be mistakes, but I am sure every precaution was taken and will be taken that none shall be entered on the lists but those that are in the house at the time and those who are considered temporarily absent for a month or two during the summer.

Mr. BLAKE. Quite a number of communications were sent me, after the last census, intimating that if such an understanding as the hon. gentleman has just told us existed at the head office, it did not reach the enumerators in many quarters. I am very glad to hear what the hon. gentleman has said, as he has taken a reasonable view of the matter; but the information I received from many parts of the country is that people who had been more than twenty years away, and were permanently away, were put on the enumerator's list. As the hon. member for Queen's County has said, if a father were asked whether he expected his boy, who had been away some fifteen or twenty years, never to come back, of course the father, in the hope of having his son pay him a visit, would say that certainly he expected him back. The son's name would be put down. That is the report I have received from many parts, and my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Langelier) confirms it with regard to that Province. Under these circumstances it would be very important for the hon. gentleman to prescribe a maximum of absence, not within which everybody should be counted—because a man who left yesterday may have gone permanently, and others may leave with the intention of remaining several months and coming back—but after which no man should be counted. It is impossible, from the information I have received, to come to any other conclusion than that, by reason of this system, a laxity, or discretion, was exercised which was grossly misleading. You can put no greater restraint upon the exuberant patriotism of some enumerators, who may be disposed to count a great many more than he ought as likely to come back, than to adopt a check system. I recommended such a system on the occasion of the last census, and I reiterate, with added emphasis, from past experience, the necessity of having the enumerator report every absentee he enters on his list. The mere statement of the total number of absent persons who are counted in the population of any particular district would be a great check. It would enable us to know to what extent the population of the country is supposed to be—not merely a transitory population, but a population living away from its fixed abode. This would involve no extra trouble, and would not require even another column. You need not mark those who are present at the time; but if you make some particular mark against those who are absent, and give us the figures in each district, that will be a security against laxity and against intentional over-stating, and will of itself form an important element in the formation of a conclusion as to how far the census is really correct.

Mr. CARLING. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it is of the greatest importance that we should have our census properly taken, and I think the instructions which were given, and which we intend to give were that the greatest care should be taken in the enumeration of those who were present and those who were absent. I am informed that the enumerator was instructed to take those actually living in the house and those to whom the house was their place of abode, but who were temporarily absent on work or on leisure. I promise the House that the greatest care shall be taken in the instructions given to the commissioners and the enumerators to see that a

correct and proper census shall be taken, and people who have gone to the United States for any length of time cannot be considered as belonging to the house. The same system is adopted in the United States, and it is most important that we should have our census accurately taken.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman prepared to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake)?

Mr. CARLING. I would not say positively just now, but I think the suggestion a good one and shall give it every consideration.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Has the hon. gentleman a copy of the instructions furnished by his Department to the Census Commissioners, and the Order in Council passed previously to the last census?

Mr. CARLING. I shall be glad to furnish them.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will not forget the suggestion of the hon. member for West Durham. It is a most important one: that all absentees' names should be checked. It is of the highest importance that instructions should be given to the enumerators with regard to persons who have left, and who may have left permanently, although they left but the day before. The errors that undoubtedly exist in the last census render it, to a great extent, untrustworthy—as a report of the population—in one Province at least.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister appears to have shown that reasonably fair instructions were given to the enumerators, but the trouble seems to have been that the system itself was defective, and under it there was no certainty of the instructions being carried out. In fact, there is almost a certainty that they will not. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) alluded to the exuberant patriotism of the enumerators. It is very probable that patriotism might not be so general as local, and that an enumerator might wish to show a large population in his own neighborhood. It is also within the limits of possibility that the amount paid per name to the enumerator might have something to do with the number of names he counted. With regard to absentees, we all know that a large number of the population do spend, notwithstanding the benefits we enjoy under the National Policy, a very considerable part of the year in the United States—especially our French Canadians of the Province of Quebec. A great many of our young men from Ontario do the same thing, and some of them are actually engaged on American sailing vessels during the summer. If you adopt the *de jure* system at all, this fact of course leads to a great deal of trouble in order to ascertain what time is to be allowed for the return of these people. As my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) has pointed out, the *de jure* system, without any time being specified, leaves the census open to a great deal of misrepresentation; and if, on the other hand, you adopt a time limit, a sailor on the great lakes, a servant girl from Ontario who hires in Michigan for a period of the year and then returns home, a sailor from the Maritime Provinces who goes on a voyage around the world, and the local fisherman from those Provinces who may be absent for no

particular time, may not be properly counted. In fact, it is impossible to adopt any fair system of that kind, and therefore the only logical system appears to be the system of a *de facto* census, by counting the number of people in each house on a particular day. The circumstances of England are not more favorable to that system than are the circumstances of Canada. There is no country in the world that has a greater number of seamen abroad than England. Their sailors are countless, their fishermen are numerous, a great many of their population are away from the country as soldiers. I do not know whether there is any special arrangement for counting the sailors. Of course, the number of soldiers is known by the Army List. If it is possible to work a *de facto* system in Great Britain without missing many names, it is possible to work it here without missing a great number of those who are temporarily absent. In any case, the burden of proof rests upon the Government to show why they have, from one census period to another, refused to adopt the plan which has been followed in the mother country so easily. The burden does not rest upon us to show that the present plan is mischievous, or even to show that the scheme which has been pursued elsewhere has been a good one. The simple plan pursued in Great Britain is to leave the schedule some time in advance at each house, and allow the head of the house to fill it out. If he has neglected to do so at the time when the enumerator calls, he can be assisted by the enumerator. The fact of this schedule being before the people for a little time enables them to enquire what it means, and to discover that it is simply a matter of statistics, and that does away with any feeling against it. I think all the arguments to be drawn from experience and from theory and from practical utility are in favor of the *de facto* system. I would be glad if the Minister of Agriculture, after his long study of this subject, could give us some information as to the reasons why we should any longer adhere to the antiquated system which has so far been adopted.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think, at all events, it is desirable to have an accurate census if we have one at all. We should certainly observe the suggestion which was made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and ascertain those who have left this country. It would be most important if we could find out how many of our people have gone away and are not likely to return. It is also important that we should find out how many have gone away temporarily. Let us have something to show for the money we are expending. Let us have an accurate statement of the facts as they exist. That is what the country wants, that is what the House should desire, and that is what the hon. Minister should endeavor to bring about. Whether it shows that the country is progressing or not, let us know how we are going on, and whether our population is increasing or not. There is another point in connection with this matter. In all the census enumerations which we have had, under all the origins of the people which are set forth, there is not a single column in which a Canadian can be found. Is there no Canadian sentiment in this country? Is there an idea on the part of the Government to crush out Canadian sentiment, and not to give a single subdivision

Mr. CASEY.

which would show the number of the people who are born in Canada? That is a matter which should be carefully looked into. We find here that we have the African, the Chinese, the Dutch, English, French, German, Icelandic, Indian, Irish, Italian, Jewish, Russian and Polish, Scandinavian, Scotch, Spanish and Portuguese, Swiss, Welsh and other origins, but there is nothing for those who are Canadian born. I think that should be amended. If a stranger were to take this book up, unless he looked at the back of it, he would not know where the census was taken. When we take a census of Canada, I think we ought to show how many of these people were born in Canada, and I also think that, above all things, we should know how many people we have in this country, how many of our citizens have gone to other countries, how many have made their home there permanently or temporarily; and I do not think that any other census than one made in that way is of any use or should receive the sanction of the House or of the country. I hope there will be an amendment moved, and another division on this subject, and I feel determined, as far as I can, to see that there shall be a division on the question, that the enumeration shall be so made as to show how many Canadians we have in this country. I think that, in order to cultivate a Canadian sentiment in harmony with that of the British people with which we are in accord, it is proper that Canadians should be enumerated with the other nationalities. To ignore Canada altogether is hardly in keeping with a Government which is charged with protecting the interests of this country. While I am proud of our attachment to the mother country, I will not be satisfied unless the origin of those who are born in Canada is shown. I want an accurate census. I think the suggestion which was made by the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and by other members, should be taken into consideration when the enumeration is being made.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I concur in the sentiment expressed by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Landerkin), as to the desirability of having some division in the census which will show all those who claim to be Canadians. In my own constituency, when the last census was taken, there were many who came to me and said: "When the census enumerator comes to us and asks what nationality we are of, we say we are Canadians." He says: "I have got no division in this census paper that will enable me to put you down as a Canadian. You must be either an Englishman, a Scotchman, an Irishman, or of some other nationality, but for Canadians we have got no division in this census paper at all." I think it is very desirable that there should be some heading in the census paper that would indicate those particular citizens who claim to be Canadians. Referring to what was said by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), respecting the advantages of the *de facto* system, I would like to say a word or two. Our circumstances in Canada, I take it, are not similar to the circumstances in Great Britain. The enumeration we have in Canada is not taken merely for the purpose of indicating what the whole population of Canada may be, but it is also an enumeration for the purpose of indicating the number of inhabitants in each particular Province,

for the purpose of adjusting the representation. I would like to point a case as an illustration, that the *de facto* system would not be a proper one to adopt in this country. Take the case of the Maritime Provinces, where, perhaps, a large number of the population might be absent upon the seas at the time of the taking of the census. It would not, I think, be a proper thing for us to leave out those people, as inhabitants of the Maritime Provinces, that are upon the high seas at the time of the enumeration; if they were left out the result might be, that the Maritime Provinces would not have the representation in this House to which their numbers entitled them. Let us also take the case of the Province of Quebec. A comparatively large number of the population of that Province might be engaged in the lumber woods of the Province of Ontario, and if they were counted in the Province in which they were working, it would swell the numbers in the Province of Ontario and diminish those in the Province of Quebec, and consequently give to Ontario, perhaps, a larger representation than it was entitled to, and to Quebec a lesser representation than it was entitled to; so I think that the *de facto* system, which might work very well in England, would not be satisfactory in this country.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think the hon. gentleman has established any such difference between the circumstances of Great Britain and Canada, as would justify his contention. Of course, it is the object here to ascertain the population of each Province; so it is the object of a census in the United Kingdom, to ascertain the relative population in England, in Scotland, and in Ireland; it is just as necessary there, for many reasons, to ascertain the correct population of each locality, as it is here. The British census is not merely directed to finding out the total number of people in the country, it is directed also to finding out the distribution of it. In regard to sailors, as I said when I spoke before, the argument against the *de facto* system would apply in England as much as here, because they certainly have as large a proportion of the population at sea as we have, and, I think, a much larger proportion. I do not know what means are adopted in England to ascertain the number of sailors, or whether they are counted at all; but I think it would be very easy to ascertain the number and residence of the sailors, from the shipowners, treating each Canadian vessel as a Canadian home, and taking the number of people present on that vessel on a fixed day, although she might not be in Canadian waters at the time. I take it for granted that every shipowner has the means of ascertaining who are on board ships at a certain time, as sailors—of course, I would not count the passengers. That plan, I think, would entirely dispose of my hon. friend's argument as regards any possible loss to the Maritime Provinces. But probably a stronger argument exists in the fact that members here from the Maritime Provinces do not seem to feel that they would be under any disadvantage from the introduction of this system. As regards Quebecers being employed in Ontario lumber camps, I fancy that about the border here, the number in each Province would pretty nearly balance itself. I have no doubt that a good many of the inhabitants of Ottawa go up the Gatineau, in the realm of our

revered friend, the King of the Gatineau, as many, perhaps, as those from the other side of the Ottawa river who go into the lumber camps in Ontario. I do not think the difference between the two, at all events, would be so great as to make any difference in the representation of the Provinces.

General LAURIE. I must emphatically disagree with the proposition of my hon. friend who has just sat down, that the members from the Maritime Provinces would be satisfied with a *de facto* census. We should not be at all satisfied—it would not work, Sir. The proposition of my hon. friend defeats itself in his own argument, because he suggests that if a *de facto* census is adopted, an allowance should be made for sailors who are away. Well, is not that, *per se*, a *de jure* system? When the men are at sea, as my hon. friend says, they are not at home. But I would point out that we could not rely upon record of the crews of vessels registered in one county, because many men sail in vessels registered in other counties. Also, there is a large proportion of fishermen from the Maritime Provinces manning fishing vessels of the United States, and I do not know how we could take a record of these. Still, they are certainly inhabitants of our Province, and have their homes there. Therefore, I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman's suggestion would work a great injustice to the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). A great many of our ships are manned by men who are only transient residents of Canada. The officers, as a rule, are Canadians, and I think their number can be very easily ascertained. The difficulty of the *de jure* system is, that a great many people are put down who have practically ceased to reside in Canada. It seems to me there would be very little difficulty in employing both systems, so as to ascertain the number of those who are temporarily absent, and of those who are to be counted by the *de facto* system. I think hon. members on the opposite side ought to be glad to adopt that suggestion, because, according to their contention, very few Canadians have left this country.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Grey speaks, and I can understand his speaking, of a growing desire on the part of Canadians to be returned as belonging to the Canadian nationality, but I was surprised to hear the member for Renfrew (Mr. White) second the observation, that we should find this evidence in the census, because he with his sentiments must have been gratified to feel that we can find the true elements of Canadian nationality and unity in another part of the Statute-book, that is, in the Tariff Act. There it is that, according to his view, we find our common bond, or rather our most uncommon bonds. That is our national unity, and it is in that Act that we find the signs and symbols of our being, at the same time, one and a self-separated and a self-contained people.

Mr. CASEY. For the word "bond" my hon. friend might substitute the word "mortgage." Our National Policy is more of a mortgage on our nationality than a bond of union. But, in regard to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, I think the Government would certainly have no logical reason for rejecting it. If they do not want to adopt the *de facto* system in its entirety, there can be no objection to stating on the face of the return how many people were in Canada on a certain day,

and how many were temporarily absent, and where they were reported to be. Take a given entry. It should show that there were, for example, six of the family at home, that two sons were away, that they were at a certain place, either in the United States or in the woods, or sailing. These facts and statements might be given with great advantage to the country, and they would supply information which we have a right to demand. When the Government maintain, from year to year, that the policy they have pursued has had the effect of keeping Canadians at home, and of providing them with employment within our own borders, and that if there was an exodus, even a temporary exodus for the purpose of obtaining work, it was not such as occurred under the old regime, when such claims are made, the Government should furnish a definite information as to the existing state of things. We should know how many people were domiciled in Canada at a fixed date, and how many others were temporarily absent, and, as far as possible, the reasons of their absence. If hon. gentlemen opposite have the confidence they profess to have in the effects of their policy, they can have no objection to furnishing this information. If they refuse we can only believe, and we will be thoroughly justified in asserting, and I intend to assert, that they refuse to furnish this information for fear of showing a state of things the contrary of which they are constantly ascribing to their policy. If they choose to refuse this information, which is necessary, they must take the consequences. I do not know which will be more hurtful to them; if they think the facts will be more hurtful to them than the suspicions, they will choose the former; if not, they will choose the latter; at all events, they must take their choice.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister has stated that no instructions have as yet been issued with respect to the census. I have observed in the public journals a statement that sometime ago a circular was issued to medical men throughout the Dominion with respect to the approaching census, asking them to obtain and transmit to the Department certain information in regard to sanitary matters, hygiene, mortality, and so forth. Is that so? If it is so, will the hon. gentleman bring down the papers?

Mr. CARLING. I shall be glad to bring down the information. The circular was sent out by Mr. Johnson, statistician of the Department, in order to ascertain more correctly the returns as to the number of deaths and the causes of death.

Mr. BLAKE. Having to do with the census?

Mr. CARLING. I suppose it is an enquiry having relation to the census. No steps have been taken in regard to the census; but Mr. Johnson, statistician, has sent a circular to medical men, asking them to furnish him with such information as they possess with respect to deaths and causes of death.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say this: The census is a solemn operation which ought to be entered upon and executed as a whole, and the information sought, and enquiries made, with respect to the census, ought to be authorised and sanctioned with that object and aim. The hon. gentleman says that certain information has been asked by the statistician of the Department, and he supposes

Mr. CASEY.

it will have some relation to the census. Whatever is going to be done to form a part of that compilation, which is to form our decennial census, ought to be done under Order in Council or departmental regulation, and with direct reference to the census, and under all the sanction and arrangement necessary for the procuring of that especially accurate information which belongs to such a national transaction.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I heard some of my colleagues criticise with much severity the manner in which the last census was taken in the Dominion, and the patriotism of my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin) was shocked by the fact that in the census there was, so he says, no column for the classification of the Canadian-born subjects of Her Majesty; because, as he alleges, no care was taken to ascertain the Canadian population of the Dominion. With a little more attention and care in the study of the last census taken in the Dominion, the hon. member, and others who have expressed the same views, would feel satisfied that the wishes of their patriotism were fully complied with, for any one might find out in the last census the Canadian-born subjects of Her Majesty, those born in each of the several Provinces, and those born in foreign lands. So that, in this respect, the last census is perfect. Moreover, we have the population by origin, as stated by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin). We have also the population as to creed. As to the population residing in the country at the time the census was taken, I think the Government might also obtain the statistical data. But it is of the utmost importance that the enumerators should include in the Canadian population those Canadian citizens who are absent but for a time, either in the United States or elsewhere, and that with respect to each Province, at the time of the taking of the census, there may be a larger number of temporary absentees in one Province than in another, and by not including those in the Canadian population, we might be exposed later on, when fixing the representation, to act unfairly towards one Province which might, at the time, have a greater number of temporary absentees than another Province. I therefore think, Mr. Chairman, that it is important, with respect both to population and representation, to include in the census as Canadian citizens those who are but for a time away from the country. I wish to make another observation in reference to the census. I have noticed a missing feature of the last census with respect to one branch of our agricultural industry. I readily agree that, at the time of the taking of the census, that particular industry had not the extension it has to-day. I am referring to the dairy industry. Thus we find that the last census contains no statistical data showing the quantity of cheese and butter manufactured in each of the Provinces of the Dominion. The dairy industry has become one of the most remunerative to the Canadian farmers and the export of the products of that industry ranges among the largest. The Canadian citizens who have taken to farming in the several Provinces of the Dominion are interested to know what districts manufacture the largest quantity of cheese or butter, and it is important that the hon. Minister of Agriculture should take some means to ascertain how far each Province supplies the dairy

industry; what quantity of cheese for consumption or export is supplied by each Province, or, at all events, that the census should give the total production of cheese manufactured in each Province; the total quantity of cheese manufactured, not only by the factories, but also by the home dairy; the quantity of butter manufactured by the butter factories, and the quantity of the same manufactured by the home dairy on the farm. I think it is important, in the interest of that industry, that the next census should give us all these informations.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member I must say that I fully agree with the remarks he made on the question of absentees. Of course, abuses must be avoided on that point as much as in any other matter, but there is no doubt, as the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) pointed out, that if absentees are not to be put down in the census, for instance, those parties who leave for the woods for lumbering during winter, and who are absent from their homes during five, six or seven months of the year, we would do an injury to those who are engaged in that trade. Moreover, there are in the Province of Quebec workmen whom we call ship laborers and who leave during winter for Pensacola, Baltimore and other places in the United States, to work at their trade, having then nothing left to do here. Their absence lasts from five to six months. Those workmen leaving for winter time, absent only during winter, return every spring to resume their trade. There are the fishermen, too, as an hon. member mentioned, and I do not allude to the maritime Provinces only, but also to the Province of Quebec, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Well, all these fishermen are people who leave their homes to carry on their trade on Newfoundland banks or elsewhere. If the census was to take place after their departure or during their absence, it would not be a reason not to include them in the census. On the contrary, it would be an injury made to the Provinces. We have still quite a number of young men travelling in foreign countries, such as merchants, who go in the midst of winter, to make their own business through England, France and Germany, or elsewhere. They are absent for two, three, four months, and sometimes more. Those people should have their names put down in the census. I am sure that amongst those hon. members who spoke on the matter, who have insisted to prevent all abuses on that point, none of them meant that those parties should not have their names registered in the census. As to the second observation, relating to butter and cheese trade, it has been developed and regulated since the last census has taken place. I was just talking about it with my hon. colleague, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Carling); he told me that in previous censuses a special statistics had been made about that trade, but not as extensive as the hon. member for Bagot would desire. There is no doubt that, considering the development of that trade in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, there should be in the census a special mention to that effect. It would be probably hard to make what the hon. member desires, that is to say, statistics gathered from door to door; but it could be done by counties or by parishes separately, and

then the total quantity that will be most approximate possible could indicate the bulk of cheese and butter manufactured in each county and parish; and thus we would have the total for each Province. I think that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is well disposed to accept with good feelings the suggestion of the hon. member for Bagot, and to see what is practically to do, but it will not be possible to collect this statistics for each house, because the trouble would be too considerable.

Mr. BLAKE. There may and will be great difficulty in getting the correct amount of the quantity of butter and cheese manufactured in the different farm houses, but certainly it would be still more difficult to do what the hon. Minister has as just suggested, that is, to give the total for the parish or county, without getting the returns from the houses. You must get the details, in order that you may get the totals. My own impression is, that if it is proposed to obtain an account of the strictly domestic manufacture, it will be found to be very vague and far from approximate. I would suggest, while not dissenting from the notion that this should be attempted, that there should be made a separate account as to the condition of the creameries or factories, for by getting these returns, we will know exactly what is produced. The rest will be to a large extent guesswork.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is what I intend. I do not know what is the system in Ontario, but I know that in a number of parishes in the Province of Quebec, there are one, two or three factories. The farmers take their milk to factories, and a record is kept of the quantity. From that, you can have a fairly correct return.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise for the purpose of making a suggestion to the Minister of Agriculture with regard to the enumeration. I do not know whether the suggestion will be deemed of any worth or not, and I should not make it, but for the fact that the United States superintendent of the census intends, in the census to be taken in the present year, to enumerate all persons of British American birth, distinguishing those of French Canadian origin from the others, in order to show the number of persons in the United States of French Canadian birth. I would suggest that it might be interesting to make such a separation in the enumeration of this country. It would make the statistics, which the United States Government propose to take in this respect, complete. Otherwise the census would not be complete as to the number of French Canadians in America. I mention this fact in the way of suggestion to the hon. Minister.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Public Works referred to the unfairness that would ensue, if the fishermen and persons in such employment were to be excluded from the census. That, of course, cannot be permitted under any circumstances, because they are only absent for a short time. The hon. gentleman also pointed out, that travellers would come under the same category. There is no disposition on the part of the House, or of the country, to exclude persons engaged in such employment who are only out of the country for a short time, but there does seem to be an im-

pression, that a great many people who leave Canada for the United States, and who remain there for an indefinite period, say four or five years, and longer even in many cases, are put down in the census.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, no.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says "no." I am glad to hear it, but that is the impression which has been generally entertained in the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am glad to hear that such is not the case, because that would render the census returns very unsatisfactory and misleading. Those persons who leave Canada stand in a very different position from those who, in their ordinary occupation, are obliged to travel, and who are kept abroad for a short time only.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Such as stevedores.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes. These would stand in a very different position from others who have left the country to be absent for years. As it seems to be understood that the Minister is going to consider the proposal of adopting the maximum period of absence during which such persons shall not be considered as belonging to the country, the difficulty I have referred to may be obviated. I am glad to understand, from the hon. gentleman's statement, that the view which is generally entertained with regard to the census is not correct.

Mr. CHARLTON. At what time of the year is it proposed to take the census?

Mr. CARLING. Next April.

Development of Dairying interest in
Canada..... \$5,000

Mr. INNES. I would ask the hon. Minister how he proposes to expend this money? Is it to be devoted to the Dominion Dairymen's Association which was organised last year, or is it to be expended in connection with the new Department recently created by the Government? A short time ago, the Department made an engagement with Professor Robertson, who, while Professor of Dairying at the Agricultural College of Ontario, rendered very important services to the dairying interests of the country, and whose connection with the Experimental Farm will, I am sure, be a decided acquisition to the Department and to the country at large. In what way does the Minister propose to expend this money? Is it in connection with this new Department, or is a portion to go to the Dairymen's Association, and a portion to be spent in connection with Professor Robertson's work. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be good enough to explain, also, the nature of Professor Robertson's duties, as to whether he is to be engaged entirely in work at the Experimental Farm, or in connection with the branches throughout the different Provinces?

Mr. CARLING. This vote of \$5,000 is to pay the salaries of the Dairy Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioner, as well as their travelling expenses.

Mr. INNES. Who is the Assistant Commissioner?

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Mr. CARLING. A gentleman named Mr. Chapais, from Lower Canada, has been appointed. He is a prominent gentleman in connection with agricultural matters there.

Mr. INNES. What will be the nature of Professor Robertson's duties?

Mr. CARLING. Professor Robertson's duties are to take charge of the dairy interests of the Dominion, and it is possible that we may have a practical dairy establishment at the farm. He is to give lectures in different parts of the country, to correspond with the farming community, and to visit the different Provinces. These are chiefly his duties.

Mr. INNES. Will there be any grant made this year, as there was last year, to the Dominion Dairymen's Association?

Mr. CARLING. The Supplementary Estimates will state that, when they are brought down. The association has applied for a grant, similar to the one they got last year, and that matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. INNES. The Minister will notice that in regard to this vote the printer evidently made a muddle of it. The Estimates say, that last year \$5,000 were granted, and that this year that \$5,000 are asked, and it states that this is a decrease of \$3,000.

Mr. BOWELL. That is an error.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman will find that in the Supplementary Estimates last year, there were \$3,000 for the Dairymen's Association, \$2,000 for the Fruit Growers' Association, and this is \$2,000 decrease from the grant to the Dairymen's Association last year. This vote is now to be applied separately from the vote to the Dairymen's Association and the Fruit Growers' Association, which will both be considered when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the agriculturists of this country owe a debt of gratitude to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Government, for the initiation of this system, and for appointing a Commissioner of Dairying. I think, also, that the selection made for this position is the very best that could be made inside of Canada, and, perhaps, outside of it either. The gentleman selected as Dairy Commissioner, we in Ontario know, is eminently fitted for that important post, and, no doubt, when he becomes known all over the Dominion, as well as he is in Ontario, he will be appreciated elsewhere as he is in that Province. I would beg to recommend in this connection that the means should be adopted which were suggested by the Dairy Association, not long since, when they met in Ottawa, for the purpose of giving greater stimulus to the manufacture of butter. The manufacture of cheese has been established for a great many years, and the education given our people in that line has proved most valuable, whereas the manufacture of butter has been neglected. Last year, while the agriculturists of the Dominion received over \$8,000,000 for the cheese they exported, they received less than \$1,000,000 for the butter they exported. It seems to me that the difficulties in the manufacture of butter and in placing it on the market at the proper time, are so great, that we are destined for a long time to receive only a partial reward for our labor expended in that line. It

was suggested by the Dairy Association that the Government should vote a much larger amount than is placed in the Estimates to-day for dairy purposes, and that part of the sum should be used to indemnify a certain number of creameries, which would agree to supply an amount of butter weekly to be shipped to the old country; so that it could be put on the English market in the best possible condition. It was suggested that a number of creameries might be selected throughout the country, and arrangements made with them to supply every week or month, butter in a proper condition suited for the English markets, and at the end of the season, indemnify those creameries, in the event of the butter having sold for less than other creameries around them obtained. By this means, our butter will be put on the English markets in a proper condition, which is not the case to-day, as to-day it is kept too long before being shipped. It is also suggested that the manufacturers of butter should market their stuff at an earlier part of the season. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will consider these suggestions of the Dairy Association, and consider whether or not it will be advisable to adopt the suggestion made by that important body, the dairymen of the Dominion. They pressed it very strongly, and, I believe, a resolution was moved to that effect, but after considerable discussion, it was thought better to withdraw it, and bring it to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, and the Dairy Commissioner, who was present.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). As far as the cheese interests of the Province of Ontario is concerned, the greatest benefit we ever derived in that connection was, in the first place, from the labors of Professor Arnold, who was engaged by the Ontario Government to educate our people to operate that industry. He went from factory to factory, giving previous notice of his coming, and invited all the cheese makers to be present. At the factories he took the milk as it came from the waggons and put it through the whole process until it was put into the vat; and cheese making in Ontario received a great impetus from this system of education. Before he visited the factories, a large amount of leaky cheese existed in every factory, but after he had given instructions this leakage cheese almost entirely disappeared. With respect to the creamery interest, Professor Robertson should give a considerable portion of his time to visiting the creameries throughout the country and giving the people practical information in butter making, in the same manner as they were given in cheese making. As many of the farmers' wives and daughters as possible should collect and receive practical lessons in the making of butter, and I believe this system of education would be more beneficial to the country than to establish a creamery or a cheese factory. I do not think it would be wise to establish a cheese factory. If there is to be a dairy established, I hope it will be for the making of butter, and I hope Mr. Robertson will devote a great deal of his time to going through the country giving instructions in the art of butter making.

Mr. MULOCK. I congratulate the hon. the Minister of Agriculture on the choice he has made for Commissioner of Dairies, and, to that extent, endorse the sentiments of the hon. member for

East Grey. I congratulate the Minister of Agriculture upon the prudence with which he is proceeding in developing his Department, by following so good an example as that of the Ontario Agricultural College; for, I believe, that was the model on which the hon. gentleman founded his experimental farms. Many of the features of that worthy institution have been copied, and to that extent I commend the Minister of Agriculture for his action in connection with these experimental farms. I congratulate him, and through him, I think, we can fairly congratulate the Ontario Agricultural College, that members of its staff are picked up as soon as possible by the Dominion Government and enter upon a larger field of usefulness; and as long as the Department of Agriculture here proceeds on these safe lines, following the example of the Ontario Agricultural College, I think the people will join in the congratulations of the hon. member for East Grey with regard to the work we may expect from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CASEY. It may be on account of my natural dullness, or on account of the extreme brevity of the hon. Minister's explanation of this item, or the considerable length of the remarks of the heir-apparent for the same portfolio, or on account of the amount of floating curd in both explanations, that I do not see exactly why this item should appear in the shape it does.

Mr. CARLING. Last year the item was \$3,000 for the dairy interest, and \$2,000 for the fruit-growers' interest in the Supplementary Estimates, and they did not appear in the ordinary Estimates. This is a mistake in the Estimates this year. We have \$5,000 for the dairy interest, and this is for salaries of the commissioner and assistant commissioner, and travelling expenses. The salary of the commissioner is \$3,000, and of the assistant commissioner, \$1,200.

Mr. CASEY. We are having this year the same amount of money as last, only differently applied?

Mr. CARLING. We only voted \$3,000 last year to further the dairy interest, and we are voting \$5,000 this year—an increase of \$2,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can hardly endorse what has fallen from the hon. member for North York with regard to the qualifications of the gentleman whom the Minister of Agriculture has chosen to superintend the dairy interest. The production of butter under the creamery system is a matter of vital importance, and I should like to see Professor Robertson devote his time largely to that subject. Our cheese has now taken a high stand in competition with other countries, which our butter does not, owing to the fact that we had not given our attention to the production of creamery butter. If the gentleman appointed would devote his time largely to that matter he would accomplish great good for the farming community. It is well known that in producing cheese you cannot raise stock, whereas you can produce butter and raise stock at the same time. I would like very much to see a great increase in the number of creameries throughout the Dominion. Wherever they are established they are doing admirably good work. It is highly desirable that the commissioner should spend the principal portion of his time in urging on the farm-

ing community the necessity of forming associations for the purpose of getting creameries established amongst them, and turning out a much larger percentage of creamery butter than they now make. I believe that we could make great improvement in the right direction if the commissioner would do this.

Mr. CASEY. I see \$3,000 for the salary of the commissioner, and \$1,200 for his assistant's salary. I think that the allowance of \$800 for travelling expenses would only go a short way. It is not proper to put travelling expenses under an item of this kind. They should come under the general contingencies of the Department, or the estimates prepared for the travelling expenses of officials.

Mr. CARLING. This is only an experiment. The amount may not be sufficient, as this is merely experimental.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the intention of Professor Robertson to act in concert with the professors of other colleges, such as the Ontario College? They have got a gentleman presiding over the dairy interests, and it would not be at all desirable that these two gentlemen should come into collision.

Mr. CARLING. I fancy they have only one object in view, and that is the improving of the dairy interest in different localities and parts of the country, and will be only too glad to give each other mutual assistance.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Immigration..... \$101,525

Mr. McMULLEN. How many officials are employed at Quebec?

Mr. CARLING. I will give the hon. gentleman the information presently.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see by page 31-D of the Auditor General's Report, that Mr. P. Doyle is paid \$1,100. What does he do?

Mr. CARLING. He is the assistant agent.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the agent?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Stafford.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And a very good agent, too.

Mr. McMULLEN. There seems to be a good deal charged for travelling expenses in connection with this agency. There is a large amount charged for Mr. Doyle, and then I see that George Hayden is paid for 365 days at \$1.50. What does he do?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Doyle is largely engaged in travelling from Halifax to Quebec. The other gentleman was the guardian for that year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I suppose there is more travelling in connection with that agency than in connection with any of the others?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I see there is \$660 asked here for an interpreter. Is that the Norwegian interpreter?

Mr. CARLING. Yes; and other Scandinavian languages, also German.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I know Mr. Andersen—I think that is his name—is a very efficient interpreter, but I do not see that there is much necessity for his services there, because immigrants pass through Quebec without stopping any length of time.

Mr. MULOCK. Under the subject of immigration, I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to certain statements contained in a book entitled "An Official Hand-Book of Information relating to the Dominion of Canada; published, with the approval of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, by the Government of Canada (Department of Agriculture)." That book is in the hands of the public. Turning to page 59 of this book, I find this paragraph, speaking of the requirements of the Province of Ontario:

"Men to work and develop the agricultural and mineral resources are, therefore, the kind of immigrants Ontario is most in need of. Agriculturists, from this being the leading industry, stand in the first place. But, as well as wanting men to clear its forests and cultivate its soil, it requires men to build its houses, to make furniture and household goods, and to open up communication from one part of the country to another by the construction of roads and railways."

Here we have an announcement made by the Dominion Government, a portion of which I can entirely agree with, but a portion of which I think is questionable. I think the Department is correct in saying we require agriculturists here, and I suppose the writer has reference to the virgin soil which is in the gift of the Government, and which may be properly developed if those who come here are able to cultivate it. But where he says we are in need of mechanics or artisans to build houses, to manufacture furniture and household goods, then that is a question about which there may be a very considerable difference of opinion. This amounts to a statement that this country is at present short of all the class of workmen necessary for that kind of thing, such as carpenters, joiners, masons, bricklayers, plasterers, painters, plumbers, gas-fitters, tinsmiths, and so on, and the same thing holds good in regard to the manufacture of household goods and furniture. The Department has given notice to the world that this country is short of all this class of workmen, and is inviting them from the rest of the world to our already overstocked markets. Is the state of the building trade, or of the furniture trade, or of the manufacture of household goods, in that state of prosperity that we are not able to supply the demand at present, but that it becomes necessary for the Government to advertise it to the world, and to ask for assistance from outside? If that is the case, then, of course, the Government is justified in making the announcement and calling for help from outside. But, I venture to say, there are those in this country to-day who will not endorse this statement. I believe there are carpenters in this country who are out of employment. I believe he will find mechanics of various kinds, such as he is advertising for, to come into Canada, who are at present unable to find employment wherewith honestly to maintain themselves and their families. I believe that this state of things is not confined to one part of the country, much as I regret to have to say so; and I think it is due to those who are at present living here, due to our own citizens, to enter a protest against an appeal of

this kind being sent broadcast to the world, asking others to come in and divide with our own citizens the limited employment which is not even now adequate for the skilled laborers within our borders. Therefore, I think it is the duty of the Department, at the earliest possible moment, to correct this statement—unless, of course, the Department take the ground that this statement is true, and that we require such assistance. Such is not my opinion, and I doubt that such is the experience of any hon. gentleman in this Chamber.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a good deal in what my hon. friend says, and I think it is a mistake that this paragraph should be placed under the heading of the Province of Ontario. I quite agree with my hon. friend that for Ontario alone, what we require are agricultural laborers, farmers, men to work in the mines; I agree with him that these are the chief purposes for which immigrants are wanted in Ontario. But if this paragraph that has got in under the heading of Ontario, were placed under the heading of the Dominion, I think it would be very proper, because we have got a great North-West which is just opening up, wanting settlers of all kinds, wanting farmers, wanting farm laborers, wanting miners, wanting artisans of all kinds. Therefore, since my hon. friend has called the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to this matter, if this hand-book is to be reprinted—I suppose it will have to be, because there is a great demand for such things—I hope this sentence, so far as it applies to the building of houses, or to the manufacture of furniture, will be transferred to the general heading of the Dominion and especially excluded from Ontario.

Mr. McMULLEN. I endorse what has been said by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). I have personal knowledge that some factories in the Province of Ontario have been recently running on half time, I think there are a good many of them yet running on half time, and so I think it would be imprudent to lead people from the other side of the water to suppose that men of that class would receive ready employment in that line here. With regard to the North-West, I think the First Minister will admit that the establishment of factories there for the production of furniture would be rather premature at this period in its history. The furniture used there is mostly sent from Ontario, and will be for a good many years to come, I fancy. With regard to the class of immigrants that we want to come to this country, I think the better class of tenant farmers, the crofters from England and Scotland, would be the best, and they should be encouraged to come here, men who would take the places of the farmers in Ontario who are going to the North-West, and where they make the best pioneers. We notice every day by the papers that large numbers of farmers and their sons are moving to the North-West, not merely as a matter of choice, but in some cases as a matter of actual necessity. They have, for many reasons, found themselves in financial embarrassment, which necessitates their moving to the North-West. Now, if you could encourage immigrants to come out and take up the places of these men, pay a moderate sum down for the land, and go to work systematically as intelligent agriculturists, they would be, in my opinion, the best

class of immigrants that we could encourage to come to this country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt that is so.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we should do that. I would like to see the Government try, if possible, to encourage men of that stamp to come here, and take the places of those that are moving to the North-West, and so prevent the land in our Province, at least, from dropping down to a very low price, which it is evidently doing just now. It has been running down considerably. In my own section there are farms which, I have not the slightest doubt, will remain uncultivated this year. Some of the people are going to the North-West, and some of them have got to leave their places for one reason or another. It is a pity this thing should be, and in order to prevent the land from lying idle we want a class of immigrants that will go in and replace those who are moving away.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad the First Minister has admitted the inapplicability of this condition of affairs in the Province of Ontario, but I regret that he insists upon its being fairly applicable to the Dominion. I regret that he thinks it necessary to apply his proposition to any part of this Dominion. I think he would be making a mistake in inviting the skilled laborer of the outside world to rush into Manitoba or the North-West Territories or into any other part of the Dominion, to the prejudice of that portion of the skilled labor of this Province. The First Minister, perhaps, will not think it worth while to consider the conditions of the skilled laborers of this Province, for I see he does not approve of my proposition. For the present, Ontario and some of the older Provinces supply the North-West and the newer parts of the Dominion with manufactured goods such as furniture and household goods—the word “household” is a most comprehensive term—and it is a mistake to urge the skilled foreign laborer to go to the North-West Territories and to that extent close up the factories, the infant, struggling industries which have been established at such a cost to this country in the older Provinces. Yet that must be the consequence of the First Minister's proposition. We tell him that the older Provinces are overstocked with this skilled labor, and that they are manufacturing more household goods than there is a market for; part of their market is the North-West, but the Minister's answer to this is: We will let the outside workmen go to our Territories, establish themselves in the North-West and there set up industries which will close up those in the older Provinces. Now, does the First Minister think that is fair to those who have borne the heat and burden of the day? Does he seriously mean to say that it is in the best interest of this country? Why cannot he say candidly: This is an entire mistake, that it ought to come out, that it shall come out, that there shall be no more chance of this paragraph deceiving and misleading foreign immigrants? I hope now, as he has agreed to a part of my proposition, that he will go further and endorse the rest of it, and so prevent further trouble.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid I cannot do that. The hon. gentleman says that this is not only a mistake with respect to Ontario, but

a mistake with respect to the North-West, and his line of argument is this: that no one is to go there but farmers or farm laborers. He says it is very wrong that we should hurt mechanics in Cape Breton, or the Maritime Provinces, or Ontario, or Quebec, by having a single blacksmith or carpenter go to the North-West. When the hon. gentleman settles in the North-West, as I dare say he will do some day, and buys a magnificent ranche and have a great many horses, it will be very hard to compel him to send his horses to Ontario to be shod. And the hon. gentleman's argument goes to that extent. He could not get a box made or any mechanical work done, because it is very wrong, he says, to encourage skilled labor to go to the North-West. But they want skilled labor there, as in other parts of Canada and they must have skilled artisans there. My idea is that, for the future of the North-West, we should encourage every healthy man with strong hands and a willing heart to go up there to work, whether he be a tradesman, artisan or farm laborer. There they are sure to work out a good future. I remember well what immigrants have done when placed under favorable circumstances. Look at the County of Lanark, which is close to us here. That county was settled in consequence of starvation among the Paisley weavers of Scotland, my country. They came out here. They were not farmers; all they knew about work was to throw the shuttle from right to left, and yet see what the County of Lanark is now. They were placed on the soil, they had active hands and willing hearts, and they made that county what it is to-day. And so my strong opinion is this, that we should encourage, for the settlement of the North-West, every kind of settler, no matter whether he has worked at a trade or not, for he will soon find the occupation that is most useful to himself, and that which will prove most useful to the country.

Mr. MULOCK. The First Minister does not quite touch the point I raised. I am not objecting to skilled labor going to the North-West; on the contrary, I endorse to that extent the First Minister's remarks. What I do object to is that steps should be taken to attract that kind of labor which is most desirable to the North-West from without the Dominion of Canada, and to that extent displace the skilled labor of the older portions of the country. We have plenty of that kind of labor to send to the North-West, and why, therefore, should we close up that avenue to our own people by inviting to the North-West people, not only from the Empire, but from other countries in the world. That is the effect of the proposition of the First Minister. I do not think it is one in the interests of the country. I do not think it is one which is fair to the older Provinces, and I exceedingly regret that the First Minister is determined to take his stand upon that proposition.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is exceedingly unfortunate in his statement, that this is an attempt to close up certain avenues in the North-West, a country consisting of over 300,000 square miles of territory, where there is scarcely a settler for every 15,000 acres. That does not look very much like closing up the country. But if the hon. gentleman expects

that that country is going to be settled from the settlers, laborers or mechanics of Ontario, he will have to wait a long time before it is done. It would be a most parsimonious policy, on the part of the Government, not to invite the people of other countries to come and settle in our North-West, where almost every man can settle and do well if he is only willing to work. The hon. gentleman, in company with hon. gentlemen on the opposite benches, appears to be very much afraid of our having too many people in this country. The whole argument this afternoon was directed towards showing that some change should be made in taking the census in order to show there are not so many people in the country as claimed to be. The contention of hon. gentlemen now is in the same direction, and their whole argument is directed with a view to presenting our population at the smallest possible figure. In no part of Ontario is there lack of demand for farm laborers, or for any one to buy farms. There is no part of the Province where there is an adequate supply of domestic servants. As regards Manitoba, the North-West and British Columbia, we could continue almost for centuries to carry out a much more active immigration policy than has been pursued in the past, without filling up the country; and it must be remembered that this is the only hope of our country, and it is the only way in which the North-West can be built up rapidly. We should invite people of all classes, creeds and races to go there, and we should encourage immigration to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. WATSON. As regards the question whether a mechanic will make a good farmer in the North-West or not, I may say, from personal knowledge, that some of our best farmers are men who have been mechanics; that any man who is willing to work, and who has learned some trade or calling requiring manual labor, will make a first-class farmer. He has no lack of intelligence; for he must be something more than the ordinary farmer to have been able to qualify as a mechanic. It is, in fact, very important that the new settler should be able to build his own house, do his own blacksmithing, and so forth. It has appeared to me for some time that the opinion of some members of the House appears to be that we should proceed, as we have proceeded during the past two or three years, and obtain little or no settlement in the North-West. If that country is ever to be of any use to the Dominion, or to itself, we must have people there; and I hope the Government will act differently from what they have acted during the past two years, and no longer listen to the representations of some hon. members, who have a few mechanics in their constituencies and a few votes to be influenced, because they say we do not want skilled labor to come to our country. We should use every effort to bring all classes of people, who are intelligent and willing to work, into our Canadian North-West, and it is only by adopting a policy which will settle that country, that we will be able to make it what we expect it to be. There are no men more capable of settling the country than those who are skilled in some trade, if they are willing to work. The only class, I think, not suitable for settlers, is the class called the English dude. We do not want them there, unless they have a supply of sove-

reigns. If they are sent there with lots of sovereigns, we can make good use of them for a short time, but as soon as the sovereigns have disappeared, these dudes are the most helpless individuals on the face of the earth, and they utterly fail to earn an honest living for themselves. Any man who is willing to work, even if he comes with small means and takes up a piece of land, will, in the very near future, be able to make for himself a comfortable home, and thus assist in building up Manitoba and the North-West to that position which we expect them to reach.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). As regards the Province of Ontario, I say it is in a condition in which I have never seen it since I came to it. I have lately been up west, and there I found for the first time a surplus of labor, because every farmer is endeavoring to perform his own labor; and there are a number of workmen in the settlement from which I come who have hardly had a day's work during the winter, and a large number will have to seek employment elsewhere. The immigration we want into Canada consists of men with a small amount of capital, men from the Province of Ontario, who can purchase farms; and from what I know of the North-West, I believe it is folly to encourage men without any capital to go to that country, because in its present condition the farmers are not able to engage laborers and pay them for their labor. We had a noble example, in the report last year, of what became of those who went there without any capital, when we found that over 30,000 who had gone to the North-West and British Columbia, had found their way into the Northern States of the American Union. These were men who could not find that employment which they were promised. No greater injury could be perpetrated on people who come to this country as workmen, than to encourage them to come here, when in reality they cannot find employment. What the country wants to-day is men who will be able to go to the North-West with a small amount of capital, to make a start, or men who will go to Ontario, able to purchase farms, where there are plenty of them to be purchased to-day. No other class of immigrants should be encouraged to come here under any circumstances at the present time.

Mr. BLAKE. I see that the Government have themselves declared their policy—and I am glad to notice that they have obtained the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies—in a pamphlet which has just been distributed to the House. At page 28 of "An Official Hand-book of Information relating to the Dominion of Canada," and under the head of "Advice to Emigrants," I find views stated, which I do not think are far removed from some of the views I have heard expressed on this side of the House. It reads thus:

"Young men should go to Manitoba, the North-West or British Columbia. Older men, with capital, and young families, should go to one of the older Provinces, and either buy or rent an improved farm. This, however, is only a general statement, and individual cases must be decided by the special circumstances of each. In Manitoba and the North-West, and in some parts of British Columbia, pioneer life on free grants, or away from railways, is attended with a certain amount of inconvenience, and an absence of those social surroundings which may be obtained in the older settled parts of these and other Provinces, and this fact should be borne in mind by those who are considering the subject. It is difficult to lay down a hard-and-fast rule as to the amount of capital

necessary to start farming. The answer depends upon the energy, experience, judgment, and enterprise of the person who is to spend the money, the Province selected, whether free grant land is to be taken up, or an improved farm rented or purchased, and many other details. It may safely be said, however, that if a man has about £100 clear on landing, he is in a position to make a fair commencement on the free grant land in Manitoba and the North-West, though not on a large scale. A larger capital is, of course, necessary if an improved farm is to be taken."

I think that is a much more moderate statement, and much more in accordance with the general position of things than some statements which have been made in times past.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the position of affairs in Canada is also very fairly stated on page 29 of the book referred to by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). The member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has referred to some supposed statements in the pamphlet regarding mechanics and laborers. It says here:

"These are advised to obtain special information as to their respective trades before going out. The demand for these classes is not now so great as it was a few years ago, and such men, especially with large families, are not encouraged to go out on the chance of finding employment. Any men of the callings alluded to may be safely advised to start if they are going to join friends who advise them to do so, or if they have the inclination and the knowledge to enable them to change their callings and become agriculturists. * * * The Government agents in Canada (page 24) should be consulted by all new arrivals immediately they land. It will be found to save much time, trouble and expense, and be in every way to the advantage of the settler."

I think that is a very moderate, and not at all an exaggerated statement of the condition of affairs in Canada.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I see, according to the Auditor General's Report, that a very large sum of money was paid last year for assisted passages of immigrants. The Allan Line received \$34,000, the Torrance Company \$14,000, together with some sums paid to others. I would like to know if the Minister can give the House any assurance that this money is spent in the interest of the country, and that the parties who immigrated on these assisted passages intended settling in the country and remained here? Is it not a fact that a very large amount of money is wasted in bringing immigrants here who merely pass through the country and settle in the United States? Is there any check on the immigrants coming to the country, in order to see that those who obtain assisted passages remain here?

Mr. CARLING. That \$48,000 was not paid for assisted passages last year; it was for arrears of passages previous to April, 1888. We have assisted nobody since that date, and we have evidence that the parties who came out to this country appeared before the High Commissioner, and made a statement that they intended to emigrate and reside in Canada; and on that statement a ticket was issued by the High Commissioner at a reduced fare. All that we paid on the ticket was something like \$4 or \$5.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Am I to understand that there are no assisted passages paid at all now?

Mr. CARLING. Not since April, 1888.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the system of paying \$2 each for children brought out here? I see by the

Auditor General's Report that the following amongst other sums, were paid last year for this purpose:—Barnardo Home, Peterboro', \$1,322; E. A. Bilborough, Belleville, \$244; Mrs. Birt, Knowlton, \$460; James Burgess, Brockville, \$740; J. Rossel, \$70; and M. L. Ryan, Niagara, \$340. Now, as I understand, in a large number of places in Ontario, at all events, the parents of children have great difficulty in finding employment for them, and many children who are grown up are unable to obtain employment in consequence of the influx of the immigrant children, who are hired out to farmers and others in the towns and cities. These immigrants simply displace the children of our own people, who are obliged to find work in the United States. I know it to be the case in the town in which I live, that a great many young people have to leave the country to obtain employment. I think the system of paying bonuses for bringing out these children is wrong, and I believe it is not in the interests of the people of this country that it should be continued. I see also that, on page 38-B of the Auditor General's Report, bonuses of \$5 each, amounting to \$365, were paid to Paul Watelet for bringing out immigrants. Is that system to be continued, or what is that money paid for?

Mr. CARLING. That means the bonus that has been given for immigrants from the Continent of Europe. We do not give any assistance to the immigrant himself; but there are a large number of steamship agents on the Continent of whose services we avail ourselves to induce immigrants to come to Canada, instead of going to the United States and other countries; and on the arrival of an immigrant at Winnipeg, having a certificate from one of these Continental agents, the sum of \$5 is paid to the agent, instead of a salary, for having sent the immigrant to Canada.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. With regard to the bonus to the boys of \$2 each?

Mr. CARLING. That arrangement has been carried on for some years. It has been discussed in this House, and it was fully discussed before the Agricultural Committee last year and the year before, and I think it was approved of by the majority of the Committee on both sides. That system has been continued to the present time. Whether it will be continued for another year or not, remains to be decided; but thus far, I think, it has been beneficial to the country. Large numbers of these boys and girls have been brought to the country, and we have had very favorable reports regarding them from the people with whom they have been placed.

Mr. MULLOCK. Can the hon. Minister tell us what the prospects of immigration for this year are?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say what the prospects are. There is at present great competition in England from Australia and the Argentine Republic for immigrants, and great inducements are being offered to them to go to those countries. Besides, agricultural laborers are in greater demand and are receiving better pay in England at the present time than hitherto. These things make it more difficult to move people from the old country to come to Canada.

Mr. MULLOCK. Can the hon. gentleman tell us what the immigration has amounted to this year to the present time?

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

Mr. CARLING. The total number of people who have come into the country as settlers, from the 31st of January to the 31st of December, 1889, has been 91,000.

Mr. MULLOCK. Have there been any statistics for this year, from the 1st of January?

Mr. CARLING. No. I might explain to my hon. friend that we have statements from the collectors of Customs showing the number of people who came across the border to settle in Canada, bringing their effects with them; and the number of those, together with the number who came by the St. Lawrence, and the number who came by Suspension Bridge, altogether amounted to about 91,000.

Mr. MULLOCK. How many went out during the same period?

Mr. CARLING. It is reported that 176,000 came into the country altogether, of whom about 91,000 remained.

Mr. MULLOCK. I notice in the papers from time to time reports, said to have been obtained from statistics taken by officials, showing the number of Canadians leaving Canada to settle abroad. For instance: last year I observed frequently in the press statements that so many people had left the Ottawa district to settle in the United States! Those statistics, I supposed, were obtained from the United States Consul here, in consequence of the emigrants obtaining certificates from him to enable them to take their household effects into the United States duty free. I do not know whether the Government have a system for acquiring such information.

Mr. CARLING. No; we have no statistics showing the number of people who went out.

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand that the 91,000 referred to comprise, first, those who come from the other side of the water to settle in Canada, and, secondly, those who come from across the border, either Americans, or repatriated Canadians?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And what is the proportion of the two classes—how many come from the other side of the Atlantic, and how many from the United States?

Mr. CARLING. The number from the United States, reported by Customs officers as bringing in settlers' goods, was 38,000, and the number from the other side of the Atlantic was 52,983.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, to understand the net gain we have to ascertain how many we lost during the year, as to which the hon. gentleman has no information.

Mr. MULLOCK. Can the hon. Minister explain the increase of \$6,300 in the estimated immigration expenses?

Mr. CARLING. The amount of money voted last year was not sufficient.

Mr. MULLOCK. Have there been any new appointments of agents?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We will now return to the question raised by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville). We were asking for information in reference to assistance given to

immigrants coming from the old country to Canada. With regard to the question of bonuses granted to children, the hon. Minister stated that the discussions and the reports received from different parts of the country, indicated the general opinion to be that these children were a benefit and a gain to the country at large. Admitting that to be the case, and that the hon. Minister said, quite correctly according to the book, that no aid had been granted since April, 1888, I would call his attention to page 40-D of the Auditor General's Report, and ask him how we find there an item of \$2,150 granted in aid of 430 immigrants sent out to this country at \$5 a head, through the High Commissioner's office?

Mr. CARLING. I explained that some time ago. This was a bonus given to steamboat agents on the Continent to induce people coming to America to come to Canada. On the certificate of the Winnipeg agent that they had arrived there, that money was paid to the steamboat agent on the Continent for services rendered.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). When was that paid?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know the date it was paid. We are paying it now whenever such immigrants are sent by these agents.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). This is \$5 a head, or over \$4,000 paid to the High Commissioner's Office in England, and must be for aid granted. These men do not pay their way out, or the company get \$5 per head, to enable them to bring these men out, under the actual amount of fare. It may be a handy way for the Minister to cover this up, and lead the people to believe that the Government are giving no assistance.

Mr. CARLING. I have tried to explain that there are no assisted passages.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What is this?

Mr. CARLING. We have agents in Great Britain to whom we pay salaries, but on the Continent we have none. There are, however, those steamboat agents all over the Continent inducing people to come to Canada instead of to the United States. They act really as agents for Canada, although they receive no salary; but when a passenger is landed at Winnipeg, through their means, we send home to the High Commissioner an order to pay \$5 which he pays to these steamboat agents.

Mr. DALY. Before this item is passed, I must say, in my position as a representative of a constituency in Manitoba, in which Province immigrants are required almost more than anything else, I cannot agree with the policy of the Government in reference to immigration. We find by the Estimates that there is a total of \$101,525 for immigration purposes, and we find, towards immigration and immigration expenses, the insignificant, infinitesimal amount of \$55,000. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), drew the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that there is an increase of \$6,390 between the estimate of this year towards immigration and the expenses of last year; but when we have expended millions of dollars in opening up that great country, this insignificant amount of \$55,000 towards bringing immigrants out there, and not only there, but to the Province of Ontario as well, is altogether out of proportion. The time has come when this Government must take a most active and vigorous

policy with reference to immigration. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture said, in reply to a question put to him a short time ago, that we had to meet such competition on the part of the United States, and upon the part of representatives from the Cape Colonies, and from Australia and the Argentine Republic, that our immigration was necessarily more limited than it otherwise would have been. But all that we require, Sir, to meet this competition, is that the Government should contribute more money towards immigration. To spend \$1,250,000 on the Department of Militia and Defence, and only the insignificant and altogether inadequate sum of \$101,521 on immigration, causes one to wonder what the Government really proposes doing towards building up and developing this great country. Every other colony in Her Majesty's possessions is making the most vigorous efforts to obtain immigrants from England, Ireland and Scotland. I have frequently made representations to the hon. Minister on the necessity of more vigorous action in this respect, but he has been unable to carry out my ideas, owing to the small amount placed in the Estimates towards what he himself feels should be our proper policy. I have asked the hon. gentleman to allow myself and others from the North-West and Manitoba, to give him the names of men who have come from England, Ireland and Scotland and settled in our country, and have lived four or five years there, so that he might send these men back to the various countries and districts from which they came, and let them report to their own people and illustrate from their own practical experience what a glorious country this is for any man to come to. For, Sir, ours is indeed a glorious country. Hon. gentlemen from Manitoba and the North-West will bear me out in saying that the men who came out there with the least capital are those who have been the most successful. Men of every class, so long as they are industrious, sober and willing to work, have succeeded. I do not care what a man's profession or calling may be, he will find he can get along and succeed better in our country than in any other, provided he chooses to work. I can cite numerous instances of men who came there not long ago with scarcely a dollar in their pockets and are to-day practically independent. Any person who chooses to come to our country and expend there the same amount of courage and industry which would gain him but a mere subsistence in the older world, will make himself solid with us and establish a home for himself and family such as he could not make in any other land in the British possessions. Let me read a letter from a gentleman I well know, and who is well known to other hon. gentlemen in this House, and which was written under these circumstances: Last autumn a Mr. W. Douglass, living near Alexander, Manitoba, wrote to a local paper in Eastern Canada, the *Gananoque Journal*, complaining as to the result of his farming operations. On investigation it turns out that he had rented two farms in that neighborhood, and, like most such tenants, expected to get a good return from the smallest possible outlay in cultivation. His complaints were promptly taken up by two of his neighbors. One of them, Mr. J. H. Griggs, living on section 19, township 9, range 21 west, wrote as follows:—

“ Mr. W. Douglass had two farms rented, and in going from one to the other he had to pass the crops of R. Y.

Griggs and J. Bedford. If he had told about their crops instead of the worst he could find, his letter would have had a different tone. From 71 acres of wheat, Griggs had 1,075 bushels, while from 37 acres of wheat Bedford had 700 bushels; on neither of these farms was there any new land under crop. The land was well worked both before and after seeding. The result was over 14 bushels to the acre in one case, and over 18 in the other. Part of Griggs' land, which was a good deal better fitted than the rest, yielded 22 bushels of wheat to the acre. I am confident that if Mr. Douglass' land had been as well fitted and the seed as well put in his crop would have been as good. It is a deplorable fact that the farmer who, considering the way he worked his land, should least expect a crop, is the quickest and surest to complain of a dry year like the present when it affects the crop."

Another neighbor, Mr. Alex. Nichol, Reeve of Whitehead Municipality, wrote :

"As I live only about seven miles from Mr. Douglass and know the farm well, I would just say that the land was not in good condition for a crop, and was not well put in; and further, in a dry season like the present he could not expect to get a crop. In a good season it would have given a fair crop; but in Manitoba, like all other farming countries, it will pay to have the work done well. I raised my first crop in 1883 from land broken in 1882, and backed in the spring of 1883, and had from 54 acres sown, 196 bushels of wheat No. 1 hard. In 1884 I had 40 acres rented to another party that yielded 32 bushels per acre. In 1885 the yield was 34 bushels per acre. In 1886 (another dry season) the yield was 20 bushels to the acre. In 1887, 160 acres yielded 6,900 bushels, an average of 43 bushels per acre. In 1888 the average was 32 bushels per acre. In the present year the average was 15 bushels on 220 acres sown. I had 125 acres that yielded 20 bushels per acre; the balance, on account of a very hard stubble ploughed under last fall, and a very dry season, only yielded 10 bushels per acre. Now, for seven years I have had a crop, the average for wheat was 29 bushels per acre, and oats 43 bushels. And for five years the average for barley has been 25 bushels per acre. With the exception of 1887, when oats ranged 75 bushels, and the present season at 12 bushels, the general average was 50 bushels per acre. Mine is not an exceptional case. There are plenty of others who have as good a record as mine, and some better."

"The present dry season may be discouraging to newcomers, yet it would be unfair to judge our country by the present dry season, and it convinces me that our soil with proper farming will raise a fair crop, under almost any circumstances. My crop this year had almost no rain, as not an inch fell from seeding to harvest. I came here from near Guelph, Ontario, with a capital of about \$700, and now have a farm of about 1,000 acres of land, 450 under cultivation; will sow about 355 acres next spring and break 100 more. I have 11 horses, 7 good colts rising 2 years old, 4 colts rising one year, 12 cattle and 20 hogs, in all worth \$2,500. Implements worth \$1,000. Dwelling-house, granary and stables cost \$1,500. Now, it would have taken me a long time in Ontario to have gathered this much together on my capital. The difference between me here and there—six good crops, and one poor one in seven years in Manitoba, and one good crop and six poor ones in seven years in Ontario. I must say I am well pleased with the country and the prospects before me, and I think that any one who is able and willing to work, and who has some capital to start upon, can do well in this country a great deal easier than in the older country. I can point you to hundreds of settlers who seven years ago had hardly enough money left, after coming here, to buy a yoke of oxen, who to-day have a good half section (520 acres) of land, two good teams and everything needed to work their farms, and living comfortably."

I may have wearied the House by this citation, but this last letter was written by Mr. Alexander Nichol, the Reeve of Whitehead, who is well known to me, and who, I may say, was a good supporter of the gentleman who was opposed to me at my last election. As he says, his is only one instance in a hundred of the inducements which our country up there can hold out to the immigrant. What we want this Government to do in order to give a proper assistance to the whole of Canada, and not simply to the North-West, is not to put this paltry sum of \$101,000 in the Estimates for the purposes of immigration, but to put a sum of a million

Mr. DALY.

dollars to encourage the influx of immigrants to the country. I do not say that we want them only in Manitoba and the North-West. I think you want them in the Province of Ontario as much, or even more than we do. The best settlers we have in Manitoba and the North-West come from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec; and when, as you can see by the papers, there are thousands of people going into the North-West every year, they must naturally be draining the old Provinces; and, while the settlers in the old Provinces may be doubling the size of their farms, there ought to be a concurrent immigration to fill up the places of those who are going to the West. Can we expect the country to develop in the way it ought, unless the Government take a better course in regard to this matter than they have done. When you consider the course which has been taken by almost every other British colony towards securing immigration, I almost wonder that the Minister of Agriculture has the temerity to ask us to vote such a small sum as this for such an important purpose. There are, no doubt, two questions to be considered in this matter. A few years ago, at the solicitation of some hon. gentlemen from Ontario and Quebec, the Government did away with the system of assisted passages. It is true that we do not want some classes of immigrants. We do not want mechanics or those who have no taste for farming, or those who have small capital to engage in farming. We want men who have some knowledge of farming, or some capability and endurance and pluck which will enable them to work until they obtain the experience which will enable them to manage a farm and to become successful farmers themselves. I think the Government could not do better than to go back to that system of assisted immigration and my scheme would be that they should pay the passages, or should pay the steamboat companies so much per head for men who would come here in order to settle on our lands, and that the Government should not pay that amount over to the steamship companies until these men had settled on homesteads in the North-West or in Manitoba. You in Ontario and Quebec seem to think that that is not a proper measure, but you are as much interested in the development of that country as we who come from Manitoba and the North-West. I want you who come from Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick to understand that the very best of your people are living in the North-West, that we have representatives from all these Provinces, that there is not one of those Provinces that is not well represented in every walk of life in Manitoba and the North-West. From the Maritime Provinces, as well as from Ontario and Quebec, professional and every other walk of life has good representatives. Every constituency in old Canada is as much interested in the development of Manitoba and the North-West as we are who come from that part of the country. I therefore call the attention of the Government to the absolute, immediate necessity of attending to this matter. I see some hon. gentlemen on the other side smiling at this statement, but we hold out the right hand of fellowship to people from all parts of the Dominion, and we tell any man of energy that he can come up to that country and can build up a home for himself. For instance, take the Scandinavians; they make

the best class of immigrants; they assimilate themselves with us and become Canadians, they become British subjects almost at once, they learn our language quickly. You will find those men coming out in immigrant ships this year. You will probably get a man to dig your garden, or to saw your wood, and next year when you want that man you will not find him, you will find that he has made an entry for a homestead and is working on his farm, and in the course of three years you will find that man a very successful farmer. We have got thousands of acres of arable land waiting for settlers, and in order to bring settlers there the Government must assist them to come. I do not agree, as you are aware, with the policy of the present Government in power in Manitoba, but there is one thing that I can say on behalf of Mr. Greenway, and that is, that he is adopting a very vigorous immigration policy. We shall have to-morrow, in the Immigration Committee, the pleasure of meeting and examining Mr. Greenway's commissioner, McMillan, a most amiable young man, whom I have known ever since he came to the Province of Manitoba, and whom I had the pleasure of recommending to the Minister of Agriculture a few years ago. That gentleman has been employed by Mr. Greenway, and he is doing a good work all through the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and doing a good work in the old country. I would like to remind the Minister of Agriculture that there is no better field for the Government to work in, if they want to induce immigrants to come to this country, than the United States of America. You will find in the State of Michigan, in the State of Illinois, in Montana and in Minnesota, hundreds of men who are dissatisfied with their lot, and who want to have the reserves of our western Provinces opened out to them. I have not the slightest doubt that they will come in by hundreds and thousands, if proper inducements are held out to them. I would ask the hon. gentleman, in conclusion, to try to bring the minds of his colleagues to bear upon this question; and if he will call upon the members of the North-West and Manitoba, we will give him more facts than I have been able to lay before this House to-night, which will convince him of the absolute necessity of the Government adopting a more vigorous immigration policy than they have done in the past.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman who has spoken last is very ungrateful to this paternal Government. Have they not been striving to promote immigration in every suitable way for this many years? Have they not more than doubled our taxes for that purpose, these ten years, and more than doubled our debt? Have they not, for the purpose of promoting immigration, maintained a rigorous land monopoly and a rigorous railway monopoly in Manitoba for many years, until they were compelled, by threats of downright rebellion and armed interference, to abandon their policy, which they had declared was essential to the welfare of this country? Have they not been so successful in making Canada a desirable country for immigrants to come to that, whereas Canada, a few years ago, was really a cheap country to live in, it is now among the dearest countries you can find? Have they not exerted themselves in every possible shape to promote immigration? And the

hon. gentleman states how well they have succeeded. Now, I want to ask one question of the Minister of Agriculture. He stated a little while ago, if my memory is correct, that 90,000 immigrants had settled in Canada within the last 12 months. I would like to know, if he can inform us, how that immigration of 90,000 was distributed, how many he supposes to have gone to Manitoba, how many to Ontario, how many to the Maritime Provinces, how many to Quebec, how many to British Columbia and the Territories?

Mr. CARLING. I will give the hon. gentleman the figures. Quebec, 26,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Settlers?

Mr. CARLING. Yes. A large number of these were returned Canadians. Ontario, 30,000; Manitoba, 13,000; North-West Territories, 1,033; British Columbia, 1,829; Nova Scotia, 3,801; New Brunswick, 6,015; Prince Edward Island, 454. These figures are made up from the agents' returns, and the arrivals reported through the Customs Department.

Mr. FISHER. Can the hon. gentleman state how many of these 26,000, who were supposed to have settled in the Province of Quebec, came from the United States?

Mr. CARLING. That is the number that were entered in the Province of Quebec by certificate through the Customs house, and including all others.

Mr. FISHER. How many came across the American frontier, and how many came from Europe?

Mr. CARLING. I stated in the House, before the hon. gentleman came in, that 38,000 had come from the United States.

Mr. FISHER. Do I understand the Minister to say that 26,000 came from the United States into Quebec?

Mr. WELSH. I venture to contradict the statement of the Minister, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. I do not believe there were ten immigrants, or even five, let alone 400.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. gentleman has stated there were 3,801 came to Nova Scotia. Where did they settle? in what county?

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman will see that I could not answer that. I know we have evidence that they came to settle in Nova Scotia.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman stated, as I understand, that 6,015 came to New Brunswick. I beg leave to say that he is about 6,000 astray. It is ridiculous for the hon. gentleman to make such a statement to the House in the face of men who know better.

Mr. BLAKE. I fancy it will be found that a large number of these indignant denials are attributable to the circumstance that the great bulk of the figures the hon. gentleman has mentioned, are figures of repatriated Canadians, people who have come back from the United States.

Mr. CARLING. I dare say a very large number are. In 1889 the following were entered as settlers at the Custom houses in Quebec: 466 English; 220 Irish; 87 Scotch; 65 Germans; 625 from the United States; 15,517 Canadians; other countries, 2,688.

Mr. BLAKE. That would leave 7,000 to have come across the Atlantic.

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. WELSH. I should like to know who made up those returns for the Island, because, when I get back, I will look into them and see who made them up.

Mr. CARLING. This return from the Island is made by the Custom house officers. We can give the names.

Mr. BLAKE. What are the figures?

Mr. CARLING. Nova Scotia, 1,390: English, 206; Irish, 18; Scotch, 79; Germans, 3; from United States, 80; Canadians, 948; from other countries, 56. New Brunswick: 117 English, 12 Irish, 23 Scotch, 9 Germans, 157 from United States, 942 Canadians; from other countries, 148. Prince Edward Island: 46 English, 15 Irish, 51 Scotch, 25 from United States, 195 Canadians, 18 from other countries.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Are they families or individuals?

Mr. CARLING. They are individuals.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Those figures do not make 6,000.

Mr. CARLING. These are the figures from the Customs houses; they are not the figures by way of Halifax or the St. Lawrence.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). When did the immigrants to New Brunswick arrive? I live at St. John, and I never saw a ship arrive with immigrants.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman knows that last year there arrived at Halifax 18,000. They came by way of the Intercolonial; no doubt a large number remained in New Brunswick. Those entered by Customs house came *via* United States.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What number remained in New Brunswick?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot tell further than reported by the agent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How can he tell that?

Mr. BLAKE. The First Minister says: "How can he tell that." But the Minister of Agriculture does tell it, because he gives us 6,015 as the total number of immigrants who settled in New Brunswick; and he now gives the numbers who were reported through the Custom houses; and if he gives the total, and deducts that from 6,015, it will show to a dot the number who came the other way.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope the time of the Committee will not be taken up in cross-examining a Minister on his own blue-book. The hon. gentleman can get all the facts in the blue-book, and I must say that the hon. and learned gentleman who has just spoken is certainly the greatest man in small things and the smallest man in great things with whom my reading has brought me in contact. Even he has come down to this contemptible wrangling about what is in the blue-book. Anybody who wishes it, can get what has been obtained to-night, from the blue-book. Deal with the policy, deal with the Minister, deal with the Government if you like, but the idea of asking questions and cross-examining a Minister about a blue-book, and carefully getting out the facts which are already in the blue-book, seems to me the most ridiculous thing that can possibly be

Mr. CARLING.

conceived, and it is certainly a waste of the time of Parliament and the Committee.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to one curious thing. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has urged that immigration to the North-West has been a failure, and the Opposition have always maintained that the young people of Canada have been going to the United States; but the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has just said that the returns which the Minister of Agriculture has just read, show principally that Canadians are returning from the United States to Canada. That is, therefore, very good evidence that the policy of the Government is, so far, good. But, as a representative of the North-West, I must say that I agree with the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), in the general tenor of his remarks. I believe it is necessary that a more energetic policy should be adopted with regard to immigration to the North-West. What is needed there is population, and you cannot have population unless you offer the attractions, to the emigrating populations of the older countries, which are presented by other colonies and other countries; and, therefore, what we have to urge on the Government and on the consideration of this House, is that such encouragement should be given as is afforded by those countries which are successful in obtaining immigrants. Immigration is not a matter of a moment, but a growth of time. No man farming in the old country, makes up his mind in five minutes to sell his household goods and stock and go to a new country of which he knows nothing but what he has heard by hearsay or has read in immigration literature. It takes time for him to learn about the country, and to make up his mind to emigrate, and then he determines to go to that country where he thinks he can have a prosperous future. Then the question arises as to the expense of getting out there. That is very much greater than it is to other countries, and the inducements held out to come to Canada are very much smaller than those to go to other countries. We cannot promote immigration by taking a pessimistic view of the question. We cannot induce immigration by abusing our country. I look upon the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a great national work, in which all the Provinces of Canada are as much interested as is the North-West; and, at the same time, as regards the North-West, I think only the first round of the ladder was reached when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built. It is the beginning of a policy, but that policy must be continued if we are to obtain immigration; and, therefore, I urge upon this House and upon the Minister of Agriculture the very great necessity of doing something to obtain greater immigration. What is worth having is worth paying for, and if we are to have immigrants we must pay for them, as do other countries.

General LAURIE. Doubts have been thrown, I understand, on two points in regard to Nova Scotia; first, whether we wanted any immigration of labor, and, second, whether we received it. In regard to the want, I may say, as a comparatively large employer of labor, that we very much wanted labor last year. I was in Nova Scotia, unfortunately, very few weeks, but the statement of my

foreman was that we must have labor, and that he did not know where to turn to get it. A party of immigrants was sent out to me, and I could have found for each ten or fifteen places; or, in other words, I could have placed ten or fifteen times the number very readily. Hon. gentlemen have asked where they were placed? They went on the public works which were being carried on; for it must be remembered that the Local Government undertook to spend \$300,000 last year on a special vote for roads. It was generally understood to be expended because the Provincial elections were coming on, and it was desirable to spend as much money as possible. That employment absorbed the labor that otherwise might have been at our disposal, and we had to replace that labor, and a supply was unavailable to a very great extent. We had to use immigrants, and so scarce was labor that we had to request the Superintendent of Government Railways to have ballasting operations suspended during the haying season in order to be able to gather in the crops. I want to show there was a demand for labor, and although I do not know anything about the actual number arriving, I know from those I saw coming in, from the immigration agent at Halifax and from ladies and gentlemen who sent out immigrants, that there was a large number sent to Nova Scotia, who remained in the Province during the year.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). This statement as regards the enormous number of immigrants to the Province of Quebec last year, must be considered a joke by every one acquainted with that Province. When it is stated that 26,000 have actually come to the Province of Quebec last year, and out of that number that there were 19,000 French Canadians returning from the United States, there must certainly be some misunderstanding somewhere. We who know the Province of Quebec pretty well, find that it is certainly amusing to hear such a statement coming from the Department of Agriculture. It could easily be understood if it was stated that 20,000 or 25,000 emigrated from the Province into the United States, but the idea that 19,000 French Canadians from the United States returned to Canada is simply preposterous. Evidently the Customs house officers have been imposed upon. I can only explain it by the fact that last year there was a great national demonstration at the city of Quebec, and that thousands and thousands of French Canadians from the United States came to be present at it, and also by the fact that large numbers of French Canadians living in the States and who have no idea of returning permanently to this country, have come on pilgrimages to the shrine of Ste. Anne de Beaupré. These people must have been counted as French Canadians coming back from the United States. This matter was recently discussed by the Quebec Legislature, and I am quite surprised that the Department here were not aware of the determination on this matter, which had been come to by both sides of the Legislature. The Local Government appointed a very intelligent gentleman, named Mr. Choquette, as repatriation agent, and he went to the Eastern States of the Union, where the great bulk of the French Canadians are to be found, and tried to induce as many as possible to come back; but in his report pre-

sent to the Legislature, he states that the idea of bringing French Canadians back from the United States, in any large numbers, is simply a farce; and both sides of the House agreed the other day, when the question was discussed, that it would be a waste of money to make any further expenditure for this purpose. A few might come at their own expense, but they could not be induced to come in numbers. That shows how well the opinion is formed, in the Province of Quebec, that we need not expect any large number of French Canadians to return. The people of the Province of Quebec will be startled when they hear that 19,000 French Canadians returned from the United States last year.

Mr. CARLING. I will just read a certificate from the Collector of Customs at the port of Cornwall. It reads as follows:—

“Port of Cornwall, entry 50. Arrivals 17th September: number of male adults, 1; female adults, 1; children, none. Where from, Chicago, U. S.; place of destination, Vaudreuil, Que.; nationality, Canadians. Value of effects, \$250.”

That is the manner in which we obtained those statistics which I have given the House to-night, and it is upon that we base our information. I do not know that there is any better way. We have also a record of those who come by the way of the St. Lawrence and the United States into Canada. These are parties who come from the United States into Canada, and the evidence we have of it is that they enter their goods and give us the value of their effects.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I think, with the hon. member for Assiniboia East (Mr. Davin), that these immigrants exist only in the blue-books. Every one of us, who has any experience in this thing, knows that there is a fluctuating population crossing to and from the United States, and whatever goods and chattels they take with them either way, they avoid paying duty upon by entering them as settlers' effects. I find in the official report of the United States Consul of the Hamilton district for last year, that 536 persons left that consular district, and that they took goods to the value of \$130,000 to the United States. To my personal knowledge, I have known a number of young men who go to work temporarily in the lumber woods of Michigan, to take their teams and equipments with them, and to enter them as settlers' goods; and when they return to Canada they do the same thing. I have no doubt that these men are counted both as immigrants to the United States and also as immigrants into Canada, when they return. I think the sooner the Department drops this system, as an evidence of a substantial gain to Canada in the way of immigration, the better. It is a recognised fact, known to every one living along the boundary line who has taken an interest in the matter, that certain persons, in order to get their goods back and forth across the boundary line, enter them as settlers' effects. It is simply preposterous, if the Department wishes to impress this House with the idea that we are making this substantial gain to Canada's population from the United States. It is no such thing, and the sooner the system is dropped the better for the official records of the Department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Complaint has been made by the members from the North-West, that immigration is not going into that country fast

enough: It seems to me that the Department of Agriculture, by the figures they publish, necessarily gives an impression to the world, which is adverse to the Province of Manitoba and to the North West Territories. As, I think, has been urged from this side upon the Government, and also upon the Committee having charge of this matter, there is nothing which can militate more against our success in inducing immigration to that country, than the giving of false and misleading statistics in reference to this matter. Now, what impression would be formed of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, by any intelligent immigrant who will read the reports of the Department of Agriculture and dissect them for himself? The report of the Minister of Agriculture, for instance, showed that between 1881 and 1885, 154,403 settlers went into Manitoba and the North-West. The Department published that to the world as the actual number of settlers going into Manitoba and the North-West during that period. We know that by the census of 1881, the population of these countries was already given as 122,400. These two figures would give a population in 1885 of 276,803 souls there, without including any natural increase at all. However, in the year 1885, this same Department of Agriculture, under its signature, published to the world in their official document, that the actual count of the people in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, was 173,363. Their estimate of the population of Manitoba five years ago was 125,000, and they now estimate it as only 120,000, 5,000 less than their estimate of five years ago. But taking their estimate at 125,000, added to the population of 48,363 in the Territories at that time, gives a total population of 173,363, whereas, if the figures given by the Department, of settlers who have actually gone into the country, be added to the census population, there should be in that country 276,803; in other words, over the signature of the Minister of Agriculture, the fact is proclaimed to the world that in five years 103,440 settlers had left that country, leaving out of consideration the natural increase. What impression would any-one derive from that? Would it not be naturally inferred that it was a country not habitable? Now, I do not believe that that many people left Manitoba and the North-West Territories; but if I do not, I am forced to the other conclusion, that the Department's figures, showing an aggregate increase of 154,403, are wholly fictitious, without any foundation whatever, and in the same line as the figures the Minister is giving us to-night. I do not say that he intends to mislead the House; but his figures must be wrong. I am not giving my own figures; I am merely putting the figures of the Department of Agriculture against the figures of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CARLING. I have explained that there is no desire on the part of the Department or the Government to give statements that are not strictly accurate, and I am satisfied that the statements given in the report now before the House are accurate in every particular. In the case of the Custom house returns, the collector signs them, and, I believe, makes an affidavit as to their correctness, as to the arrivals from the United States bringing household effects, and in each case the number of males and females in the family is

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

given. Then, we can easily ascertain the number who come by the St. Lawrence and *via* Halifax, as well as the number who come from New York by way of Suspension Bridge. The figures given to the House in this report are figures which we have reason to believe are correct in every particular, and I am sure it is very unfair for hon. members opposite to try to persuade the House and the country that false returns are being brought down.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then, if the returns are correct, 103,440 souls left Manitoba and the North-West Territories during the last five years? That is the other horn of the dilemma, and the hon. gentleman must take one or the other.

Mr. CARLING. It has been stated by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain), that there is a large floating population coming into and going out of the country. I am not here to state how many went out. I can only state the number that came in as returned to us by our collectors and officers at the frontier.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The report of the agent at St. John states that 26 immigrants came into Albert County, 207 into Westmoreland, 164 into Charlotte, 127 into Victoria, 29 into Restigouche, 66 into Northumberland, and 3,093 into York County, including McAdam Junction, making a total of 3,712. The report says that the total settlers in the Province, by all other inlets than Halifax and Quebec, are 3,712, with 183 at the St. John office, making a total of 3,895. Of this number there were 3,093 Canadians, which, I see, is exactly the number represented as coming into York County. Now, York County is close to St. John, and I would like the hon. member for York, or the hon. member for Sunbury, to state where those people are situated in the County of York.

Mr. CARLING. I am sure the hon. gentleman must admit that the whole Province of New Brunswick is not in the neighborhood of St. John. It is a very large Province, and Mr. Gardner, the agent, is a highly respectable man, who would not make returns that are not strictly correct. He does not know anything about the number returned by the Custom house collectors.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I quite agree with my hon. friend that New Brunswick is not all in the neighborhood of St. John, but York County is a river county with which I am familiar, and when it is stated that 3,093 immigrants came into that county, I should like to know where they are. After the Short Line was opened down to McAdam Junction, I suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway Company sent some men there to take charge of their rolling stock.

Mr. WALLACE. It seems to cause hon. gentlemen opposite a great deal of annoyance that a large number of immigrants are coming into this country. Since the hon. Minister of Agriculture mentioned that over 90,000 immigrants arrived in this country during last season, a dozen on the opposite side rose to contradict him, being dissatisfied with such a statement. As patriotic citizens of Canada, I think we should rejoice in any evidences of the prosperity of our country; but these hon. gentlemen do not rejoice to hear of the prosperity of the country. If a little further

information will do them any good, I may say that the constituency which I have the honor to represent, at the time the census of 1881 was taken, had a population of 18,800; but I have no hesitation in saying that to-day the population of that constituency is considerably over 40,000, an increase of about 150 per cent. in less than ten years.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). From the United States?

Mr. WALLACE. They must have come from somewhere. If they are Canadians who remain in this country, so much the better, because we know that the Canadians are the best settlers we can have; but if a large portion of them come from other countries, as they do, we should rejoice to see them coming here, and I believe they are all fairly prosperous.

Mr. CASEY. The little bit of bombast with which the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) led off his speech is aptly matched by the delicately cooked statement of the truth with which he wound up. He said that on this side we seemed to be greatly troubled at finding that so many immigrants had come into the country, and that the country was so prosperous; but the hon. gentleman is wrong. What really grieved us was to find that so many of those immigrants, who were stated to have come in, did not come in. I do not accuse the Minister of Agriculture of making what he knows to be a false statement, but evidently matters have been misrepresented to him in some way, for his own returns and the documents of his own Department contradict each other. Both cannot be true, and what troubles us is the lack of immigration, and the lack of prosperity, and not the increase of immigration and prosperity. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) told the House that his constituency had grown from 18,800 in 1881 to over 40,000 now. We in Ontario know very well, but hon. members from a distance may not know, that his constituency is largely composed of the suburbs of the city of Toronto, and its growth simply shows the tremendous growth of Toronto at the expense of other towns and rural districts in Ontario. The hon. gentleman asked where they came from, since they must have come from somewhere. Well, they came from every railway centre with which Toronto is connected, and from every farm in the neighboring counties. Not one per cent. came from the States. How many may have come from Europe it is impossible for the Minister of Agriculture to tell us, but the bulk of the increase in the hon. gentleman's constituency simply represents drainage from one part of Ontario to the other.

Mr. WALLACE. Before 1878 the people used to go to the United States. Now they remain in their own country.

Mr. CASEY. We have the authority of the Minister of Agriculture for the statement that 103,000 people left Manitoba in five years to go somewhere else, and the less the hon. gentleman says about any exodus from this country the better for his party. Everyone knows that as many people at least go to the States now as used to go.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). More.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend from Quebec says "more;" and I know that more have left my county for the United States than did formerly. A certain

number go to Manitoba, of course, but the total exodus is larger now than it was in former days, and a good many of those who go are good strong Conservatives, supporters of my hon. friends opposite, who, in going, pay a left-handed compliment to the National Policy. The Minister of Agriculture has tried to get out of the difficulty by saying his agents are honest and have reported these matters on oath. Well, if misrepresenting reports come in from honest men, there must be something wrong with the machinery, or the masters, from the highest quarters down. The hon. Minister has confessed that he did not believe these figures in regard to Manitoba represented the real state of affairs. He said he was not here to tell us how many people left the country, but only how many came in, and that he could not keep track of the movements of all those that came in. That has always been our opinion, but not that of the hon. Minister and his friends. They have always told us that they did keep track, that a certain number came in and a certain number went out, and the difference remained. Now, however, the hon. Minister has to confess that this method of subtraction does not lead to a very correct result. The Minister of Agriculture has confessed the utter inefficiency of his Department and the uselessness of his officers, so far as keeping a record of additions to the population of Manitoba is concerned. He is not here to tell us how many went out, but only how many came in. It would be much better if the hon. gentleman would dispense altogether with statistics, and give us mere guess work, than to build up in our minds the hope that the population is increasing, and then have the First Minister lay before this House statistics which, compared with other statements from the Agriculture Department, are evidently false.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am sure the House was much pleased to hear of the great progress made by the constituency represented by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). It is gratifying always to hear of the great strides made by the constituencies throughout the Dominion. Every member of the House will be pleased to hear statements of that kind. I wanted to verify the statement of the hon. member by the blue-book, which we are told to look to for information under these heads. The hon. member represents West York, and I believe he resides at Woodbridge. We have blue-books relating to Woodbridge. We have the Postmaster General's report of the postal departments throughout the country. The revenue derived by the postal service is an indication of the population and the business in the different places mentioned, and I have looked at this report. In 1878, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) says the people left this country for the States, but that now they are flourishing and that his constituency had largely increased in population. I thought I would like to verify that statement. The hon. gentleman talked very candidly, and in a manner which pleased me very much. He told us of the growth, and the development, and the increased revenue of the village so ably represented by himself. I will read the figures. In Woodbridge, in the County of West York, we find that, in 1878, when everybody had gone to the States, according to the statement of the hon. member for West York (Mr.

Wallace), when all the industries of the country were depressed, when nothing but starvation was stalking abroad through the land, and when the hum of industry was no longer heard, the revenue of the post office there was \$910.83. But a change came over West York and over the whole of this country. Progress was the watchword of the present Government and was to be carried out by the policy which it initiated. Great strides in progress were made in that division. The result is that, in the town of Woodbridge, we find, by the last return, dated the end of the fiscal year 1889, the revenue, when the times were so good and the people so numerous, was \$793.73—a falling off of \$120 or thereabouts, under the régime of prosperity inaugurated by this Government, and when all the people had come back from the United States to Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) is just about as logical as those on the other side of the House generally. Everything is pressed in to show that people are going out of this country and that none are coming in, and this is a sample of the statements which are made. I showed, when he drew a comparison between last year and this in regard to the town of Woodbridge, that the Abell Manufacturing Company had transferred their operations from Woodbridge to Toronto, and had taken with them about 300 of their people, most of whom would write letters and keep up business correspondence, and that would reasonably account for the decrease in the revenue of the Woodbridge office. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) stated that there was an increase in the population of his constituency. It is true that they did not move out of his constituency, but that does not affect the fact that the population of that constituency increased from 18,000 to 40,000. No doubt they did not all come from Canada; some may have come from other countries. Perhaps some were Canadians who may have come back from the United States to live in Canada, finding that they were doing worse elsewhere. Whenever any evidence is given as to the going out of Canadians from this country to the United States, hon. gentlemen insist upon the correctness of the statements, but when evidence is given as to the entrance of people into Canada, they say it is untrustworthy, and they will not even accept the affidavits of those who come in with their goods and state that they are settlers' effects. No matter what the nature of the evidence may be, they will not believe it. We have had a statement as to the difference between the population of the North-West five years ago and the population to-day, and it is said that that is evidence that people are leaving the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite ignore the fact that people came in to work on the railway. Probably they intended to remain in that country when they passed their goods through the Customs. But that railway was completed, and many of those people, who were of the laboring class, transferred themselves to other fields of labor, and it is, therefore, not to be wondered at that there should be a change in the population, and that many of those people should probably be working in other parts of this country. We have heard constantly that there has been a great exodus of Canadians to the United States, and hon. mem-

Mr. LANDERKIN.

bers opposite seem to gloat over it. They are willing to accept the figures of the United States as to the number that are going out, but they are not willing to accept the official figures as to those who are coming in.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I may have done the hon. gentleman injustice in quoting the figures in regard to the town where it appears he lives, because I did not know of the local fluctuations. However, if the operatives have moved from Woodbridge to Toronto, I do not suppose they have moved there from every town in that riding. I believe the village of Kleinburg is in that constituency, and I find that, in 1878, the revenue from Kleinburg was \$285.16. According to the statement of the hon. gentleman, there was not anybody in Kleinburg, or, for that matter, in the County of York, or in Ontario, or in the Dominion at that time; they had all gone to the States. At the present time, that revenue ought certainly to be about a quarter of a million from Kleinburg, to correspond with the great growth of population in the County of York. I find, however, that the revenue last year from that village was \$248.34, a falling off of nearly \$40.

Mr. DENISON. Will the hon. gentleman give us the figures for Toronto in 1878 and 1889?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman had better keep his seat. I will attend to him afterwards.

Mr. McMULLEN. At West Toronto Junction there are about 150 people from my own town who have settled. The hon. member knows that the Hess Bros. factory, which used to be in Listowel, has now located half of its business at West Toronto Junction, and has taken its men there. In western Ontario, there is not a town or village in which you cannot count men by the dozen who have gone to Toronto, and, particularly, to West Toronto Junction, and that is the reason why the hon. gentleman's constituency has increased as much as it has. I was amazed when the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) made his remarks as to the people who were flowing out of the country in 1878 and those who were coming back now, and complaining that we were finding fault on that ground. The First Minister appeared to be pleased at that statement. I remember once when the First Minister went to the Maritime Provinces and was presented with an address. In reply to that address he referred to the condition of things between 1874 and 1878; he said that during the Mackenzie régime the weevil and the potato bug had made their appearance. Well, Sir, the weevil has gone away, but the potato bug is here yet. However, the hon. gentleman has managed to humbug the people with regard to his National Policy, he has not been able to humbug the potato bug. Now, the Minister of Agriculture has not made any reply to the statement presented by the hon. member for Brant. It is evident that the figures he has been presenting to Parliament from year to year with regard to the influx of population have not been correct; or if they have been correct, if these people have come in here, they have gone out again. The Minister tries to evade the point by saying that they came in, but he cannot exactly say where they are located. He says he has evidence that they came in, but we have evidence from the very

same source that they have gone out again. They are not here. Now, a different system should be adopted if we are going to get anything like a correct account of those who come here. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to turn up page D—38 of the Auditor General's Report, where he will find that certificates of repatriation were issued to four individuals during last year, amounting to \$87.50. I was glad to find that so many Canadians were returning from the States to Canada, and I would like to know what made these individuals so valuable that it was thought advisable that certificates of repatriation should be issued to them, one at a cost of \$27.50, two at a cost of \$22.50, and one at a cost of \$15. Now, I want to know where they came from, where they are now located, and what they are now doing ?

Mr. HESSON. I rise to correct a statement of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, with reference to the alleged increase of the population of West Toronto Junction. I was in that factory to-day, and it will not be completed and ready for occupation for more than a month yet. I went through the premises with Mr. William Hess. He has only two men at work besides himself and his son, and that is all the population this factory had added to West Toronto Junction. That factory was originally established in Toronto, after removal from Listowel, until they were burnt out, when they came to West Toronto Junction. Consequently that portion of the population from Listowel that went there with this factory had no influence whatever on Parkdale or West Toronto Junction. There is no possibility of that factory being ready to work for five or six weeks yet. Mr. Hess told me himself that he would not get his engine in for, perhaps, two weeks; the machinery and tables are not yet in. So there is no addition to the population of West Toronto Junction.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg to tell the hon. gentleman that I know better. I know there are a dozen people living there, anticipating employment in that factory. I could name half a dozen to him, who are living there now, expecting to get work in that very factory.

Mr. COCKBURN. Perhaps I could relieve hon. gentlemen opposite from the anxiety that seems to pervade their minds by giving them some figures from a paper that has just been put into my hands, the *Toronto World*, which is published at the Hub of Trade. These figures may account for the loss of that 90,000 population that seems to be distressing the hearts of our friends. In 1880, the population of Toronto was only 71,236; five years afterwards, it was 128,179; and to-day it is 216,000. These are figures on which our friends can rely.

Mr. LISTER. That includes the suburbs.

Mr. COCKBURN. Toronto has no suburbs, you may say.

An hon. MEMBER. It has swallowed them all up.

Mr. COCKBURN. Now, with reference to the wealth which is represented by this ever growing population, in 1880 the assessment for the city amounted to \$50,533,000; five years afterwards, in 1885, it was \$69,533,000; while to-day it is no less than the colossal sum of \$137,230,773. Now, let us look at the growth of the schools to

meet this ever increasing population. In 1870 there was a school attendance of 4,106; in 1880 it had risen to 8,997; while in 1889, it was 28,287. I think it but right to add, also, with reference to loanable capital in that city, in which hon. gentlemen may, perhaps, take an interest, that there is no less a sum than \$65,228,200. I mention these figures to my hon. friends in order to cheer them up a little. If they find their farms so depleted, I may tell them that there is plenty of loanable capital in Toronto. If the people are leaving the country, we have still an army of 216,000 people in Toronto with which to meet any of the growing wants of this ever growing Province.

Mr. LISTER. Give us the statistics for Kingston.

Mr. COCKBURN. The member for Kingston is here, and I have no doubt he will be able to furnish the information. Canada would be the most peculiar country on the face of the globe were every city growing equally. Why, the whole population of Prince Edward Island is not one-half the population of Toronto, and I suppose the loanable capital of that Province is not one-tenth that of Toronto. Still we all admire Prince Edward Island, and we do not look with any jealousy on its growth. We cannot expect the population in every part of the country to be growing with equal rapidity. The development caused by the National Policy and the confidence of the people in the policy of the Government have attracted many persons also from the United States to cast their fortunes in Toronto; and once they are assured by hon. gentlemen opposite that the policy which has been inaugurated by this Government is to be maintained and confirmed, and that manufacturers are not to be terrorised every year with threats of the demolition of that policy, instead of thousands of capital coming from the United States to Toronto, the capital that will be brought over to that city from the United States will be millions, and instead of our having an assessment of 137 millions, we shall in a short time have an assessment of 237 millions.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I should like to know how much has been contributed to the increase of the growth of Toronto by a gentleman who has been drawing a very large salary for some years past in Europe. Hon. Hector Fabre, I believe is in connection with the immigration department, and his salary does not appear among the regular list of salaries under the head of immigration, but it is hidden away among miscellaneous, and with difficulty I discovered it in the Auditor General's Report. At page 167-E I see Hector Fabre received a salary of \$2,500, and an allowance for contingencies of \$1,000, or a total of \$3,500. It is important that this Committee should be placed in possession of any information with respect to the services which this gentleman has performed to the country. He has been drawing this salary for a number of years. I believe it is on record that the Minister on one occasion stated that the Hon. Hector Fabre had been the means of sending one immigrant to this country, and we have never heard since that time that he has sent another. It is of no use to this country to continue paying this salary unless we obtain some benefit from it, and so far as this House is in possession of information, the Commit-

tee must come to the conclusion that he has performed no services to this country. It is just possible that he has been the means of increasing the population of Toronto very extensively of late years, and if so we should like to hear from the Government on that point. At all events we should like to know what the gentleman has been doing for his salary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After this agreeable and instructive debate I think we should do a little business. We are now getting on towards June, and if we do not proceed with business we may enter July. With respect to Mr. Fabre, that expenditure is under miscellaneous, I understand. We have not reached miscellaneous yet, and if the hon. gentleman will only curb his impatience until we get there, we will give him full information about Mr. Fabre. As to the prosperity of Kingston, I am very glad to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that Kingston is very prosperous and has been growing very rapidly. For a long period of years I must admit it was rather stationary, from causes which can be easily explained; but for the last two or three years it has had a course of steady prosperity and steady growth. I will, however, patiently await the census, and then, I fancy, it will be shown that my constituency has grown very much in population and in wealth, and that it has very good prospects of increased prosperity. No doubt all hon. gentlemen opposite will be glad to hear that statement. I think after this debate, we might, before the small hours arrive, do a little business.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure the House and the country will be glad to learn that the city of Toronto has made the substantial progress stated by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). It is true the hon. gentleman travelled a little out of the record in the quotations he made; we were simply discussing the question of population, but he wandered into the region of finance. However, I can excuse him for that, for we know he is near the very door that leads to the Cabinet, and is of course acting in the absence of the Minister of Finance who is at present engaged in the process of incubation for to-morrow's effort. I was going to say the Minister, but I will say the member for Centre Toronto, has told us much in regard to Toronto's growth of population; and while we should all rejoice in its prosperity, I think there must be some element of regret when we remember that that prosperity is acquired largely at the expense of outlying parts of the country. It was well and correctly stated, in anticipation of that policy which the hon. gentleman so admires to-day, that it would have the effect of destroying small centres and building up large ones, the same as it has had this effect of adding to the wealth of those who have been prosperous, and taking as it were from those who had little. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who is naturally proud of his own riding, will join with me to a certain extent in regretting that its increased property has been obtained at the expense largely of other districts. I am sure he will admit that, and he would not desire it to go forth to the country that he would hold up his riding as a fair sample of the general growth of the country, however much he and I would desire that the country had grown to that extent. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn)

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

has become a strong admirer of the policy of this Administration in all its features. I can well remember when he had no decided views whatever on this question. I remember a paper some years ago which described an interview between the hon. gentleman and the editor. On that occasion the hon. gentleman was a free-lance, untrammelled by party allegiance, and in the course of that interview he intimated to the editor that it was his intention at an early date to enter into public life. When asked by the interviewer into what political camp he was about to enter, he stated that his mind had not yet been made up and that it would depend upon circumstances. Then shortly after this the hon. gentleman, according to a certain utterance of his own, travelled abroad, and took two years to inform himself in regard to all the systems of government in Europe, and he returned, and then, having been offered a nomination for Centre Toronto, he suddenly found he had always loved Conservative principles, had always loved the National Policy, and especially the wards of St. John and St. James, and he offered his hand and heart to that riding, and was accepted. There is not a member on that side of the House to-day, there is not the strongest Conservative and supporter of the National Policy, who can equal in loyalty to that party the hon. member for Centre Toronto, and the fact that he entertains those views, and that he can be relied upon, is made manifest to us, in that he has been pitchforked over the heads of back bench members, until to-day he is just ready to enter the Cabinet. I, therefore, felt it to be my duty, to a certain extent, to refer to those observations made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto, inasmuch as they are semi-official.

Mr. COCKBURN. I cannot thank too highly the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), for his very kind observations this evening. It is always pleasing to receive a certificate of character from a man who stands so high in the moral atmosphere of political life, and, doubly so, when it comes from one who is so learned, and one who holds so high and distinguished a position in the educational world. I need not say I thank the hon. gentleman for his remarks, particularly when he took care to inform the House that the step I took in political life, was no incautious, no sudden step, but one which was the result of calm, quiet deliberation; that for two years I travelled the length and breadth of Europe, to inform myself of the various systems of government, that I studied this question closely in the various countries of Europe, that after due deliberation and consultation with leading statesmen and others, I came to the conclusion that the only party that could save this country was the great Conservative party. I wish I could say that the opinions the hon. gentleman has expressed in this House, were the result of calm and deliberative study. I wish I could say that he had travelled through the length and breadth of Europe, before he formed the crude opinions, and the still cruder utterances, he has given expression to. The hon. gentleman, burthened as he is with wealth, could not do better than to spend the interval between this and the next session, in going over Europe, enlarging his mind by foreign travel. Perhaps when he comes back after having all the advantages he says I have had, he might then be able to come back to this House, and be of more

service to the country that he has hitherto been. I have to thank the hon. gentleman for the prospective title he has been pleased to bestow upon me. I have heard it reported—although I do not give much attention to reports, especially when I find reports of a certain character, associated with certain names—that the hon. gentleman wished a title for himself. If the hon. gentleman has been kind enough to dignify me with a seat in the Cabinet, I must confess that I have been regarding him for some time with reverential awe as having the prospect of a distinguished and high title, such as is enjoyed by several hon. members of the Cabinet. At all events, it is evident that the hon. gentleman has been fishing well around to earn and secure such a title as a due recognition of his loyal, patriotic declarations.

Mr. MULOCK. In reply to the hon. member I might say—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the discussion has now wandered far enough from the subject before the House.

Mr. WALLACE. I desire to say a few words in regard to the remarks of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). He was unfair enough to make reference to the postal receipts of the village of Woodbridge—

Mr. McMULLEN. I rise to a point of order. If you rule my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) out of order, I call your attention to the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is speaking to a matter quite outside the discussion altogether. If you rule one member out of order you should rule the other out too.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The matter referred to by the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was a purely personal matter. It is quite in order to speak in connection with the population of a certain district, under a resolution referring to immigration. The personal discussion between the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and the member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) is not in order.

Mr. WALLACE. I was referring to the reference which was made by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) as to the postal revenues for the village of Woodbridge. He turned to that village, either for the purpose of showing that the population of West York was not increasing, or for the purpose of making a statement, which without the necessary explanation, would be entirely misleading to this House. It is true, Sir, that in 1878 the postal receipts from Woodbridge were \$910, and in 1889 they had decreased about nine or ten per cent., but, as has been stated to this House, a large establishment, employing more than a hundred hands, had left Woodbridge, taking away within a few months a population of two or three hundred, out of a population of 1,100. That reduced the postal receipts and the general business of the place for some time, but I am happy to inform the hon. member for South Grey, that Woodbridge has pulled itself together again, and I believe next year will show larger postal receipts than for any previous year. I may also state another fact which the hon. gentleman did not mention to the House, namely, that since 1878 four post offices have been established in

the immediate neighborhood of Woodbridge, all of which drew away a considerable portion of the revenue formerly enjoyed by the Woodbridge post office. If the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) was as fair as he professes to be, he might have stated that, in 1878, the Parkdale post office had a revenue of \$28.48 while the revenue last year had increased to \$3,916. He might also have told you that the Brockton post office, which had no existence in 1878, had a revenue of \$1,139 last year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What did you say the revenue in Parkdale was?

Mr. WALLACE. \$28.48.

Mr. LANDERKIN. For a year did you say?

Mr. WALLACE. For a year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then you said what was not so. You made a great mistake. That was only for a month or thereabouts. It is well to be correct when you come into figures.

Mr. WALLACE. If I am mistaken, I will be able to correct that before I sit down.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It will be just as well to have it right.

Mr. WALLACE. The post office at West Toronto Junction, which a few years ago had no existence at all, has now a revenue of \$1,681. These facts prove the statement I set out with, namely, that the population of West York had increased from 18,800 in 1881, to more than 40,000 people to-day. The population of Parkdale was, I think, about 1,000, according to the census of 1881, and it was over 6,000 in the census recently taken, before the suburb was annexed to the city of Toronto. We have been told many times that there was a great exodus from this country, and that our population was going to the United States instead of remaining in our own country. We have evidence now that a great number of our people are going to the North-West, and we are glad to see them going there; that is satisfactory in this respect. If any portion of the population of this country is moving, it is satisfactory to find that, instead of going to the manufacturing centres of the United States, they are going to the manufacturing centres of Canada. We find, therefore, that places like Toronto, and places in the immediate vicinity of Toronto, are rapidly increasing in population, and that these people who were denied employment in 1878 are finding profitable employment to-day in the cities and the suburbs surrounding the great manufacturing centres of our own country.

Mr. KIRK. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture how he reconciles the figures he has given to-night, in regard to the immigration into Nova Scotia, with a statement contained in his report which has just been laid upon the Table of the House? He told us to-night that the number of immigrants arrived and settled in Nova Scotia last year was 3,801. I thought that was a very extravagant statement; and I find that there is a discrepancy of 1,406 persons between the figures given to-night, and the number stated in the report. Can the hon. gentleman explain how this large discrepancy occurs? The report submitted to the House shows that there were last year 18,955 arrivals; less United States citizens on coasting steamers, 7,906; leaving 11,049.

Mr. Clay reported that the destination of 8,654 of these people was the other Provinces, and that but 2,395 immigrants were supposed to settle in the Province of Nova Scotia. He will find these figures on page 23 of his report. There is another table, on page 35, which shows the actual settlers to be 1,390. These are the arrivals of immigrants with settlers' goods passing through the Customs house, but of these 948 were Canadians returning from the United States, leaving but 442 immigrants from other countries. Now, we know perfectly well, so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, that a large number of our people go to the United States every spring and return in the fall. So far as they are concerned, I dare say the figures are correct, and I will not dispute the report. But 442 is not a large number of immigrants to settle in Nova Scotia, and it is far different from the number of 3,801 given by the hon. gentleman. I am sure everybody in Nova Scotia will be surprised to hear that that number settled there, for I am sure that it is not the case. The hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) tells us that labor was in demand and sadly needed in Nova Scotia last season. I do not know where it was sadly needed—certainly not in the county I come from. He said the Legislature of Nova Scotia voted \$300,000 last year for roads, for which a large amount of labor was required, and, consequently, a large number of immigrants came into the country. The hon. gentleman gave us to understand that immigrants were required because the Local Government had voted that sum of money for roads; but he told us that this money was expended on the electors, giving the House to understand that it was not spent on the roads at all, because there was going to be a general election. But there was no general election; the Government knew that there was not going to be a general election last year; and I venture to say that the whole of that money was spent by laborers belonging to the country, and not one dollar by immigrants. If there was ever any money voted by the Nova Scotia Legislature for which the people feel grateful, it was that \$300,000 voted last year to put the roads in proper condition to be travelled on. Now, it seems to me strange, if so many immigrants came to Nova Scotia to look for work, and if laborers were so much in demand, that wages were not higher, for we know that the wages of day laborers on the railways and elsewhere was from 80 cents to \$1 a day, which would not induce many immigrants to come to the country. I do not dispute that some laborers may have come to the country to work on public works. Mr. Clay reports that some hundreds of laborers were employed on the Amherst Ship Railway. If any immigrants came in, it must have been there that they obtained labor, and not anywhere else. I would like the Minister to explain where he got the figures of 3,801 immigrants as coming into Nova Scotia.

General LAURIE. The hon. gentleman who has spoken has altogether misrepresented what I said. What I stated was that the \$300,000 voted as a special grant by the Legislature of Nova Scotia was distributed among the electors, not spent among immigrants, and that it was generally believed, in view of the general election coming on shortly, that it would be very useful to spend it for the purpose of obtaining support for the Local Govern-

Mr. KIRK.

ment. I say so still, and in the county I represent it was so understood.

Mr. KIRK. Did the roads require it?

General LAURIE. Yes, and a good deal more, but, unfortunately, it was not spent to benefit the roads, but the party now in power, which the hon. gentleman supports.

Mr. MULOCK. A coalition Government, is not?

General LAURIE. No, not much of a coalition—just about as much as you have here. I do not wish to be misrepresented, and I thought it well to emphasise the statement I made before.

Mr. KIRK. I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, nor did I. I took down what he said, that the money was spent on the electors. Now, he corrects himself; he says he did not mean that.

General LAURIE. Yes; I said it was spent on the electors, and they were employed on the road.

Mr. COOK. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) stated that a large manufacturing concern had left the village of Woodbridge where he resides and moved to Toronto, which was the cause of the decrease of population at Woodbridge. But he forgot to tell the House the result of the gentleman's operations who moved to the city of Toronto. He was glorified by the National Policy. Woodbridge was too small a place for him; 300 operatives were not sufficient. He was going to clap on all sail, and become a millionaire in a short time. What is the result? Owing to the National Policy, that gentleman to-day is not worth a cent, and is not employing a single man. Then the hon. gentleman for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) glorified the increase in the population of Toronto. He probably forgot the manner in which so many suburbs were taken into the city. If he did, I will give him some information. The town of Parkdale was taken in to assist the citizens to pay the taxes, which are pretty heavy in that city; and that town was taken in by fraud. The gentlemen in favor of the union manufactured 400 votes to override the honest voters of the town of Parkdale, and yet they only carried the union by a majority of 127, showing how faithfully the Parkdadians stood aloof from the city of Toronto. I was very sorry that we became connected with the city of Toronto. We had fine streets, fine sewage, a good waterworks, and everything necessary to live in comfort, but we were dragged into the muddy streets of Toronto, and we have to pay the taxes of the hon. gentleman and others there. It is well known that the city of Toronto has increased very largely in number, but it is not by means of any foreign element, but by people from other sections of Ontario. Toronto has grown at the expense of every other municipality in the Province, and then these gentlemen will hold up their hands and say amen to the National Policy. Why the National Policy has nothing at all to do with it. If you take the manufacturers of the city of Toronto, and even outside of the city of Toronto, they will tell you, when you converse with them fairly and freely, what they think of the National Policy. They say it is an injury to them, because the raw materials are taxed for the sake of revenue,

and, therefore, they are not benefited by the National Policy. Parkdale is not the only place taken in. They have extended Toronto clear out to Hog's Hollow on Yonge street. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has gone into speculations as far north as that—eight miles from the centre of the city? Toronto has also extended east and west from below Leslieville to the Humber. It is large enough to maintain a population of 200,000 no doubt, and probably twice that number, but it has extended in such proportions that to-day the wisecracs, the financial men of the city, are looking forward with great dismay for fear of a financial crisis, and await with caution their investments at present. Many of those with means are paying off their mortgages and putting themselves in a position to meet the contemplated crash that is bound to come upon this country if this iniquitous policy is continued.

Mr. WALLACE. I said that the postal receipts for Parkdale in 1878 were \$28.48. In that statement I was strictly correct, but I should have said that the post office was established in that fiscal year, so that \$28.48 does not represent the returns of the whole year. The next year, ending 30th June, 1879, the receipts were \$125.04, and in 1889 they amounted to \$3,916. Now, one word with respect to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook). He speaks of a manufacturing firm which left Woodbridge and settled in Toronto. Surely he does not refer to the John Abell works of Toronto?

Mr. COOK. I do.

Mr. WALLACE. Two months ago, when I left home, he was employing 150 to 200 men, and no doubt he is employing more men to-day. I know he has employed more than 150 men. Yet we have the statement of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) that he is not employing one man—a statement wholly at variance with the facts.

Mr. COOK. I may inform the hon. gentleman of a fact which, perhaps, he does not know, that Mr. Abell is not doing business at all. He failed because of his removal to Toronto, and the enlargement of his works. He used to employ from 300 to 400 men in his town at Woodbridge. And now the hon. gentleman states that he employed 200 men at Toronto. His establishment has gone into the hands of Rice, Lewis & Co., and Mr. Abell is only the manager.

Mr. WALLACE. I said it represented a population of 300 or 400. He employed 100 to 120 men in Woodbridge, and is employing more than that in Toronto. I have here a letter headed from Mr. Abell—Jno. Abell, Agricultural Works, Ontario. I have no doubt Mr. Abell is as solvent to-day as any member of this House.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to call the attention of the Committee to a statement made by the hon. member for Centre Quebec (Mr. Langelier) and the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) in reference to the manner in which the returns are made by the Customs Department. These gentlemen, in order to throw discredit upon the returns which are made, or have been made in the past, made these statements. The hon. member for Centre Quebec (Mr. Langelier), stated that he thought the Customs officers must have been

grossly imposed upon, if they had made the returns which have been read to the House by the hon. members for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) and North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), stating that when young men and others passed through this country to the United States to work in the shanties, he had no doubt they took with them horses and other necessary implements to work, and were entered in the United States as emigrants. That may be the case, but if these young men return, they would not return as immigrants to this country and be so entered, unless they made an affidavit before the collector, or some other official, that they had owned certain portions of the property; that is the house furniture, implements, books, professional books, wearing apparel, and that all these articles had been in their possession at least six months before their arrival in Canada; and as to other articles, such as agricultural implements, live stock, sewing-machines, carts, they must have been owned for twelve months. Now, it is scarcely possible that any person coming to Canada would take the trouble to make an entry of his effects as separate effects, and take an affidavit that he had certain portions of them in his possession for six months and others for twelve months, for the purpose of humbugging and deceiving the collector, or whatever Custom house officer may have taken the entry. These returns, which are made to the Department of Agriculture and also to the Customs Department, are made from the records of the entries, and the oaths taken by the settlers in the manner indicated. So, without expressing any opinion as to what becomes of the people and their families, or the individuals who come here after they have made their entries, I do not think it at all likely that people, even Canadians returning to Canada, or foreigners, would go to the trouble I have indicated, in order to obtain free entry of these effects, merely for the sake of deception, and certainly the collectors of the different ports would have no possible reason for making statements other than those indicated.

Mr. WALDIE. I have listened to the debate, and as I do not often take the floor, I feel that I could say a few words to our common advantage. It is important to the country that we should have some reliable statement of our population who go to the United States. I think the Minister of Customs is quite correct in stating that, when a person arrives from the United States and makes an entry under the regular form of declaration, he makes an honest entry, and has had the property which he so enters in his possession for six months or longer before coming into the country. This is quite in accordance with the statement of the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), that these people had the property when they went out of the country—in fact they had it all the time. The mistake is that the same interest is not taken in the outward reports as in the inward reports. If there was some substantial, honest statement made as to the number of Canadians who had gone to the United States with their effects during the current year, and as to Canadians who had come back from the States with their effects during the current year, and these were put side by side, we could see whether we were gaining or were losing population. I think that could be easily got by the Customs officials or by the immigration agents. For instance, the

immigration agent at Niagara Falls could get that information as well as the railway people can. The railway people, when they are taking goods to enter in the United States, have got to get a consular statement, and the immigration agent could easily get a copy of that, and so could find out how many people were going out of this country; and I have no doubt, that in some way of this kind, the Government could obtain statistics which could not be challenged by either side of the House. While I think this can be done, and while I hope it will be done, I do not think it is desirable that either side of this House should be charged with speaking against the interests of the country. I do not think it is the desire of hon. gentlemen on this side to speak against the interests of the country. They are only sorry that the development of the country is not more rapid. I am glad that the grants to steamships for bringing immigrants are to cease. I think the best immigrants are the people of means who come here without any assistance at all, and I believe the best immigration agents are those who have resided in this country for some time, and who correspond with their friends in other countries, and induce them to come here by making true representations of what has taken place in their own cases. I think the best mode of getting immigrants is that which has been adopted by the people of Manitoba. That is, to let the Provinces send out immigration agents instead of the Dominion. The town of Brandon is sending an immigration agent of its own, and having the resources of that place and its neighborhood represented. I do not think immigration agents should be paid commissions on the immigrants they send out, as I think a better class of immigrants will come if no commissions are paid.

Mr. FISHER. I had not any intention of saying anything on this question until I heard with astonishment the statement of the Minister of Agriculture that so many people had settled in the Province of Quebec. When I enquired for some details in reference to that, I understood him to say that about 15,000 of this number were French Canadians who were supposed to be repatriated in the Province of Quebec. I have looked over these figures with some care and have taken some time in examining them, and I find it very difficult to make the statements tally one with the other. I do not intend to say that there is any intention on the part of the Minister to in any way mislead the public or this House. I know the Minister of Agriculture too well to suppose for a moment that he would countenance anything of that kind. But I do think that the system which is adopted is one open to so much error that, practically, the tables and figures are worthless. I know a good deal of what is occurring along the border in the Province of Quebec, and especially in regard to the immigrants who are stated to be coming to that Province from the United States. The return makes out that 15,900 have come from the United States to settle and stay. Yet I find, on looking through the reports of the various immigration agents in the Province of Quebec, not one single reference to these repatriated French Canadians.

Mr. CARLING. Of course not. This comes through the Customs officials.

Mr. WALDIE.

Mr. FISHER. I understand that. I understand that these people are supposed to come under the notice of the Customs officials, but we would suppose that the agents at the different points—there is one gentleman at Danville, another at Canterbury, another at Sherbrooke, another at Montreal, and several others—would be aware that these French Canadians had come back and had settled in their respective districts. They refer to others who have come from other countries.

Mr. CARLING. Those are immigrants.

Mr. FISHER. We find these gentlemen telling us all about their different districts, giving the price of labor and the value of land, but we find no reference whatever to these people who are supposed to have come in and settled there. Moreover, everyone who lives on the frontier knows that the French Canadians are constantly passing backwards and forwards between the United States and Canada. Everyone who is acquainted with their mode of acting knows perfectly well that they go to the States to work for a few weeks, for a few months, or a year or so sometimes. They often come to Canada to pay visits to their friends, and to bring them presents. Sometimes they stay for a few weeks or months and then go back again.

Mr. CARLING. They do not bring their household effects.

Mr. FISHER. They do bring household effects. I have seen feather beds and other things of that kind brought in by people who have told me personally that they were going back to the United States in a few weeks or a few months. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that we are glorying in the fact that the immigration returns are incorrect. There is nothing of the kind on this side. What we want is to find out the truth in these matters. We believe, if the truth is put before the world, it is better for us in Canada.

Mr. CARLING. Does the hon. gentleman think it is unwise to give the statistics which are obtained from the Customs returns, and to put them before the country and the world?

Mr. FISHER. Most certainly; if those statistics are misleading, I think it is unwise.

Mr. CARLING. When we have the affidavits of the officers of the Department of the number of those coming into the country.

Mr. FISHER. I am showing the Minister that these affidavits do not amount to a row of pins. I do not deny the returns made by the Customs officers, but I say their figures do not truly represent the facts, that the people who were stated to have come to this country from the United States, have not come in to settle, therefore the figures are misleading. When you tell us that 19,000 people have come into Quebec from the United States and settled in that Province, everybody who is familiar with that Province knows that such is not the case. A great many of these people who are represented to have come in, have gone back to the United States. Everybody who is familiar with that Province must know that no such valid and honest immigration of that kind has come into Quebec during the last year. I find in looking over these papers that the hon. gentleman has stated that 26,000 had come into the Province of Quebec. I find in one place he gives, by the Customs returns, 19,600; and in another place he gives the entries

at the Port of Quebec, instead of the Province, as 2,474; in another place he gives as entered in the port of Halifax, with the intention of going to the Province of Quebec, 924. That makes 23,000 who intended to settle in Quebec, while the Minister said a little while ago there were 26,000. Now, I do not pretend to say where the error is, but it is very difficult from the figures in this book to make head or tail out of the statements. There is another point to which I wish to allude. The hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) has spoken about the report of Mr. Choquette to the Local Government, which has been a good deal talked about in the Province of Quebec. That report is entirely contrary to the statement contained in this book, the deductions from which must either be absolutely false, or else these statements are entirely misleading.

Mr. CARLING. What means have they of arriving at the correctness of that information?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say what those means were. I have only the newspaper report and the debate which occurred in Quebec, but both sides of the House accepted that report as a correct statement. Now, I find in the Minister's own report on this question of repatriation, the report of the Rev. C. A. Beaudry. This gentleman does not say one word about the repatriation of 17,000 people into the Province of Quebec. Instead he talks of the French Canadians who have been going to the west, and whom he would have liked to attract to Manitoba, whereas they went to the western States. But he says nothing whatever about the French Canadians who have been directed into the Province of Quebec. His report contains some startling statements, and they do not at all agree with what the Minister has said, and they do not bear out the accusation that we on this side of the House are the only ones who are depreciating our country. The Minister's own report confirms the statement of the hon. member for Brant, that the Government reports are not flattering to our own country. Mr. Beaudry states:

"It is a fact well ascertained in spite of the several political systems, and denials or affirmations of politicians, that emigration keeps on its devastation at the rate of a national plague. This disastrous stream could certainly be stopped and turned in favor of Manitoba."

Then he makes a suggestion how it could be stopped, and proceeds to say:

"This consideration explains the fact that 30,000 French Canadians have chosen Dakota preferably to Manitoba." I do not know whether this is a correct statement, I trust it is exaggerated. According to the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite, there are not so many Canadians in Dakota as that. According to the statements of members of the North-West and Manitoba, these French Canadians have not gone to Manitoba, or the North-West, and if they have gone from the Province of Quebec, where have they gone to? We find by the Minister's own report that they have gone to Dakota, that they are now under a foreign flag. The question is not as to whether the Customs returns are technically correct. The Minister of Customs himself was too careful to say where these people had gone to that were represented to have come into the country. He also asserted that his own officials had given correct Customs returns; but we say that these returns do not represent an honest and clear immigration into this country, and until the hon.

Minister can give facts that will disprove the charges of the member for Brant, we shall be justified in asserting that his report in this respect is misleading, and that the figures are absolutely worthless.

Mr. BORDEN. I agree with what has fallen from the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) as to the unreliable character of the statistics given by the immigration agents. Take, for instance, the agent at Halifax, and I would ask the Minister's attention to statement A in his report. The immigration agent there says, that 6,627 immigrants arrived at Halifax, and he gives particulars of these in a table headed "Statement of immigrant arrivals at Halifax." Now, I find that of this total, 5,368 were stated to have come from the United States, so I think it is very evident that these were simply tourists, travellers who came from the United States to Canada *via* Halifax, during the past year. I find that during the months of May, June, July and August, a very much larger number came than during the rest of the year. Now, *bond fide* immigrants usually come much earlier in the year, in February, March or April. I cannot see what possible good can arise from publishing a table of that kind. It seems to me that it is very misleading, and does not give any reliable information whatever. The agent does not pretend to say where those people have settled in Nova Scotia, I cannot find that he states where a single one of the alleged immigrants has settled in that Province. In regard to New Brunswick, the report condescends to some particulars. It states that they settled as follows:—Albert county, 26; Westmoreland, 207; Charlotte, 164; Victoria, 127; Restigouche, 29; Northumberland, 66. Now I come to a most interesting point: "York county, including MacAdam Junction, 3,093." It is very clear that those people have not settled at MacAdam Junction, and I have not heard of any such wonderful increase of population there. It is very evident that they were going through the country and out of the country, and gave their destination as MacAdam Junction, and out of the total for the Province of 3,712, no less than 3,093 are put down for York county, including MacAdam Junction. In all seriousness I would impress on the Minister the importance of carefully investigating these reports. They are entirely misleading, and I must say in reference to the expression that has fallen from the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) that I do not think it is a disloyal act to point it out to the Minister, in fact, I consider it my duty as a member of Parliament to do so. I do not believe any statements of this kind put forward can be of any possible utility, on the contrary they must be injurious.

Mr. BOWELL. The statement is not that they settled at MacAdam Junction. I understand the entries were made there. The member does not pretend to say, nor is it pointed out in this report, as to what became of them afterwards. They simply were entered there.

Mr. BORDEN. Why then put it in the report?

Mr. BOWELL. Because the entry was made at the Customs there. Where their destination was, the Customs officials do not pretend to say.

Mr. BORDEN. I am discussing the utility of publishing these statements.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the only statement that could be made.

Mr. BORDEN. If we are going to have lists of all the tourists published, let us have them stated. The statement in the report is headed: "Statement of immigrant arrivals."

Mr. BOWELL. These immigrants must have made entry there, or they would not have appeared in the report.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I desire to ask the member for York county whether he can state where any of those immigrants now are?

Mr. TEMPLE. I cannot say, of course, where the immigrants settled, but I know they are not settled at MacAdam Junction but are scattered throughout the county. York County is a very large one, and has a very great many back settlements, and they are settled throughout the county from one end to the other.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Did the hon. gentleman say that that large number of immigrants came into that county last year?

Mr. TEMPLE. I am not saying how many came in, I did not keep count; but no doubt there are many scattered throughout the length and breadth of the county.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to obtain an answer to a question I put to the Minister about two hours ago, respecting payments on page 38—D of the Auditor General's Report, the payments of \$87.50 for certificates issued. I desire to know who these individuals were, where they were settled and what they are doing?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot state where they settled. This money was not contracted for last year. It was a disputed account, and we did not pay it until we had obtained the necessary further information.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman be able to furnish the names?

Mr. CARLING. I will bring them down.

Mr. WATSON, I should like to ask the Minister if the same means are adopted for gathering these Custom house figures as were employed between the years from 1882 to 1885.

Mr. CARLING. Yes; I presume so.

Mr. WATSON. Then, I say, the hon. gentleman should not be surprised that we should discredit the figures, because we had a discrepancy in the statement made by the hon. Minister in his reports to this House from year to year, of 103,000 as regards the number of persons who settled in the Province of Manitoba, and I feel satisfied a great portion of those people never went there. I pointed out year after year that those statements yearly made to the House were not accurate and reliable, and we found this to be the fact when the census was taken in 1885, and that our contention was correct. I believe our present contention will be found to be correct when the census is taken in 1891. So strongly did the Deputy Minister feel on this point that when before the Immigration and Colonisation Committee he attempted to bring me to book for a statement made by me in this House, that the figures given

Mr. BOWELL.

by me were not accurate. That gentleman cannot prove that I ever made a statement that was not correct, and the census has proved conclusively that my statements were perfectly accurate. I am glad the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) referred to the immigration policy of the Local Government of Manitoba, and said they were doing a good work in regard to drawing settlers to the country. The Local Government is alive to the importance of settling the Province of Manitoba, and are adopting other measures in the interests of settlement, and are endeavoring by every means in their power to remove all obstacles out of the way of intending settlers. I do not propose to discuss the National Policy on this occasion, but I desire to call attention to the fact that the Local Legislature of Manitoba, including the Conservative members, has unanimously passed a resolution in favor of petitioning this Government to endeavor, if possible, to secure unrestricted trade with the United States, as one of the great means by which Manitoba can be settled and peopled. I hope the hon. Minister will take this matter into consideration. A statement was made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) with which I agree, as to the necessity of employing suitable immigration agents. A compliment has been paid to the Local Government for securing the services of a very able gentleman who has been engaged in immigration matters for some years, and who was employed, to a limited extent, by hon. gentlemen opposite, and who has done good work in the old country in securing immigrants for Manitoba. He is to be examined before the Committee on Immigration and Colonisation to-morrow, and no doubt he will give good evidence. The Minister should be very particular as to the class of men he employs as immigration agents, and he should employ only practical men, who have a knowledge of the country to which they are directing others. There have been good grounds in the past for criticisms by the Opposition in regard to the action of the Government in spending large sums to little or no purpose, that the settlers who have come to this country have been very few in proportion to the large amount of money expended in inducing them to come here. I am told that this is mainly due to the class of immigration agents that are employed by the Government. I have been informed by gentlemen who have visited these agencies in the old country, that the men who are in charge of these offices are men who have no knowledge of any portion of Canada, men who are not practical at all, and that if an intending emigrant asks for advice as to what he should do with reference to any part of the Dominion, he is simply thrown a pamphlet which he can read for himself.

Mr. CARLING. Will the hon. gentleman give the name of any one of those agents who has not a knowledge of Canada.

Mr. WATSON. I will not name now.

Mr. CARLING. Why not do it now?

Mr. WATSON. I make the statement, believing it to be true, as I make every other statement on the floor of this House.

Mr. CARLING. The agents we have at the present time are: Mr. Dyke at Liverpool, who I

think every one admits is a most competent emigration agent. The agent at Glasgow, who represented a constituency in the Ontario Legislature for a number of years, and had the confidence of the people of York, and the agent in Belfast who represented a constituency in eastern Ontario, and had the confidence of the people there. I think it ill-becomes the hon. gentleman to say that these gentlemen know nothing whatever about Canada.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask what these people know about the North-West or Manitoba.

Mr. CARLING. You said the whole of Canada.

Mr. WATSON. I made the statement on the authority of credible gentlemen who have told me what they themselves have seen in those offices. I must say that I do not think some of these are competent agents, even though they had the confidence of some of the constituencies in the Province of Ontario. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to Mr. J. F. Metcalfe, who has to-day the confidence of one of the constituencies of Ontario, and is at the same time an immigration officer of this Government. I find that, last year, he was paid \$1,400 for acting as immigration agent in the office at Winnipeg. He received a salary from July 1st to December 31st of \$900, and from April 1st to June 30th, \$450. I believe that this money, voted for the purpose of immigration, is not judiciously expended. I do not think it is fairly or honestly spent, because Mr. Metcalfe is a representative in the Local Legislature of the Province of Ontario; he is engaged in that House attending to his sessional duties at a most important time of the year, when he should be in the city of Winnipeg, if he is a competent man. He is in Toronto to-day, when immigrants are going to the North-West by the thousands. Some 1,400 immigrants left Toronto for Manitoba last night, while this intelligent gentleman is probably engaged doing his duty to his constituents in the city of Toronto. I find, also, that the Minister allowed Mr. Metcalfe his expenses from the city of Winnipeg to Kingston, for the purpose of attending his sessional duties in the Local Legislature.

Mr. CARLING. He is not employed by the year.

Mr. WATSON. I find that Mr. Metcalfe has been engaged all the time during the last twelve months, with the exception of three months he sat in the Local Legislature.

Mr. CARLING. He was not employed then.

Mr. WATSON. I find that Mr. Metcalfe received travelling expenses from Winnipeg to Kingston on January 3rd, 1889, about the time the Local Legislature in Ontario opened.

Mr. CARLING. He was employed up to the first of the year and allowed his travelling expenses home.

Mr. WATSON. When was he employed again?

Mr. CARLING. In April or May.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; immediately after the Local House adjourned. I find that on May the 16th, just after the Ontario Legislature prorogued, he was allowed \$52.45 for travelling expenses from Kingston to Winnipeg. I think the hon. Minister must know that from April to May is the most

important part of the year for an agent to be in Winnipeg to look after immigrants, because they are the months that the largest number of immigrants go to Manitoba and the North-West. I do not know that Mr. Metcalfe possesses any qualities which fit him more than anybody else for this position. I believe his time has been occupied at home in being an auctioneer and schoolmaster, and he is known to be a pretty good sport. I do not find any fault with him for that, but I believe more suitable men could be employed for one-half the salary—men who have a practical knowledge of farming, and who could give more information to intending settlers than Mr. Metcalfe could. I believe there are practical men there who have such a wide knowledge such as possessed by Mr. McMillan, who is employed by the Local Government of the Province of Manitoba, and who has several years' experience in farming as an old country settler, and knows thoroughly the necessities of immigrants going into Manitoba. I believe that even the small amount voted for the purposes of immigration is not judiciously expended. I have cited one case here, in which I believe Mr. Metcalfe receives a good deal more money from the country than he gives a return for. Two men could be employed for this salary in the city of Winnipeg, either of whom would be able to give more information in this office than Mr. Metcalfe can.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Metcalfe's services have been very highly appreciated by members on both sides of the House. Hon. gentlemen who have gone to Winnipeg and who have visited the immigration office and have seen what Mr. Metcalfe has done, have spoken to me, highly approving of his occupying that office, and referring to the services he has rendered to that country. I think no man has done more to divert the attention of our Ontario people from immigrating to the United States than he has, and in inducing them to move to Manitoba in preference to the United States. Mr. Metcalfe being well known in Ontario, and being a member of the Local Legislature, has come into contact with people from all parts of the Province, and he has been enabled to explain to them the great advantages that were offered in the North-West for people who wished to leave Ontario, as compared with Dakota and other States. I think Mr. Metcalfe has rendered good services. He is a man who is well thought of; a man that is popular in his own district, and I am quite satisfied that the Government could not spend money better than in paying Mr. Metcalfe for the services he has rendered.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Agriculture Committee meets to-morrow, and Mr. McMillan, who is immigration agent for the Manitoba Government, will, I presume, appear before that Committee. I am satisfied that if any member of that Committee asked Mr. McMillan his opinion as to Mr. Metcalfe's abilities, he would refute every statement the hon. gentleman has made, and would speak in the highest praise of Mr. Metcalfe's abilities. I was in Winnipeg last season, and made enquiries throughout the city in regard to Mr. Metcalfe, and the universal opinion was that no better man could be selected for the office.

Mr. DAVIN. But for the speech of the last speaker, I should hardly have intruded myself

into this debate ; but it really trenches upon the inquisitorial power of Parliament. This Parliament is the highest court in the realm, and its most ancient and important function is that of enquiring into every detail of public action. It so happens to-night that we are discussing one of the most important matters that could possibly occupy the attention of the House, and how are we placed? All the leaders of the Opposition are gone, and all the Government leaders are gone, with one or two exceptions. Anyway, we are discussing a question that is at the heart of Canada—a question that is at the vitals of Canada—without the leaders on either side being present. I know that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is there, but after all he only represents a section of the Cabinet. I say it is a serious thing for Canada, that we should discuss the greatest question that could possibly be discussed in this country, and that the leaders of the Opposition and the leaders of the Government are practically absent. We look for them—where are they? I am sorry the question is forced upon us, but now I have to discuss it a little. On this question of immigration, I agree with what my friend the hon. member for Marquette said as to its importance. As far as his speech was political or made against the Government, I did not agree with him. That was the only weak part of his speech—where he tried to make a point against the Government. Hon. gentlemen may laugh at that, but I will show them in a minute that that is a thoroughly logical position. Every Government that has attempted to deal with this immigration question has made great mistakes. You cannot discuss the policy of this Government, or the policy of the Mackenzie Government, with regard to immigration, without putting your finger on spots which show that they both made great mistakes. In this country we have not yet solved the problem how to deal with this question of immigration. There has never yet been a Minister that understood how to grapple with it. We have had at the head of the Government a great Minister, a great manager of men, a brilliant man, a statesman, yet this question has not been solved. Take the portfolio of my hon. friend. A more amiable man or a finer man you could hardly dream of ; and take my hon. friend at the head of the cognate department, the Department of the Interior. Sir, at this moment we ought to have at the head of one or other of these Departments a man of genius, a man of great energy, but at the present moment we have a Cabinet of antiques ; I do not care how broadcast it is sent to-morrow morning, it has to be spoken out—we have a Cabinet of antiques. We have one splendid brain in the person of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, and power and knowledge in the person of the Minister of Justice. Now, I speak here not only as a representative of my own constituency, but I speak for Canada, I speak for the young men of Canada, and I say that what we want here to-day in Canada is a strong, vigorous Government. We could save a million dollars, nay, two million dollars a year, if we once fell back on the true principle of putting capable men at the head of affairs. My idea is that we could save \$2,000,000 a year to this country if only the proper policy were adopted. I say it is a thing not to be stood any longer, and I am very glad I find an

Mr. DAVIN.

echo in the House. I say that the proper plan to manage a department is for the Minister, who is responsible to this House, to control it. But ours is a government by deputy Ministers, who are not in any way responsible, and we are bossed by deputy Ministers. The thing must be stopped. I am very sorry this immigration question has forced itself on the House, because I had a motion on the paper and had arranged with my friends from Manitoba and the North-West that I would introduce the question in a few words, and then they would discuss it, but my hon. friend from Selkirk has brought this question before the House. I want to tell this Committee that they are utterly mistaken if they think we in the North-West are in a position of dependency or mendicancy. Instead of coming to them as mendicants, we can come to them as masters. That is our real position, because we have the resources. You may say, Sir, by law, that we cannot control our land, but do you mean to suppose for one moment that once the population come in any law will prevent our having control of our land? We come as men who hold in our hands the destinies of Canada. I say that the great question of the day is the immigration question. I am not going now to discuss any scheme. You may ask me, what is your scheme? Well, I am not a Minister. I have no responsibility, and I agree with Mr. Burke, who said : There is nothing more ridiculous than for a man who has no responsibility to propound a scheme. I only lay down general principles, and I say there ought to be a great system of immigration to bring people in and to keep them in, and that whatever aid be given should have a relation to their settlement. Canada will not tolerate any Government that is not determined to deal vigorously with pressing questions like immigration. I will explain at a later period my views about immigration, because I have a motion on the paper, and have arranged with my friends about it, but I will say that is the heart, the vital thing, the only sane, far-seeing policy, and any Ministry—I do not care whether the right hon. gentleman is at the head of the Government or not, or whether the Minister of Public Works is at the head or not—cannot be true to Canada if they do not deal with that question.

Mr. WATSON. I will just say in answer to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that I do not care what Mr. McMillan will say before the Committee on Agriculture. I stated what was correct ; that two men, each of them as competent as this Mr. Metcalfe, could be employed by the Government, and would give more information to intending settlers than he. I do not care what Mr. McMillan or anybody else says, I speak of what I know.

Agent at Ottawa\$1,800

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice we have an interpreter at Ottawa. What particular language is he to interpret? I can understand that it might be necessary to keep an agent here at Ottawa, but I do not see why there is any necessity for an assistant or an interpreter.

Mr. CARLING. There is Mr. Akerlindh, who is acquainted with the German and Scandinavian

languages, and is a very excellent young man. He has charge of the office when the agent is away.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can understand that, at a point where immigrants arrive, it may be necessary to have a man of that stamp, but I cannot understand the necessity for keeping a man of that stamp at such a place as Ottawa.

Mr. CARLING. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by "a man of that stamp." He is very intelligent, and acts as messenger and attendant to the office, and he speaks German and Scandinavian, and writes well.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do any German or Scandinavian immigrants stop here?

Mr. CARLING. Quite a number.

Mr. McMULLEN. But this is not the first place that they stop at?

Mr. CARLING. They come from Quebec to Ottawa, and there is quite a large settlement of Germans and Scandinavians in this agency.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The Minister ought to be able to make some statement as to the number that arrive here every year. Is it one hundred?

Mr. CARLING. Oh, yes; more than that.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We ought to know the number. Is not the agent competent enough to do the work?

Mr. CARLING. Yes; but he has to go off into the country very frequently, and to look after the settlement of the immigrants.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Has the agent here more work to do than the agents in Toronto, Hamilton or London?

Mr. CARLING. They all have assistants.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). At the same salary?

Mr. CARLING. Perhaps not quite so much, though I am not certain. This is a very intelligent man.

Agent, Halifax.....\$1,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What does the Minister propose to do with the vote for the immigrant shed in Halifax?

Mr. CARLING. The contract has been let and the work is going on.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Who has the contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Connor, who was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Was it let by public tender?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Agent, Winnipeg.....\$1,000

Mr. MULLOCK. Who is the agent at Winnipeg?

Mr. CARLING. The agent is Mr. Bennett.

Mr. MULLOCK. What are the duties of the agent?

Mr. CARLING. To take charge of the agency, and all those who are connected with the office, and to make reports to the Department, and to see that immigrants are properly cared for, and to assist in having them properly located, and to give them all the information possible.

Mr. MULLOCK. Does he come personally in contact with the immigrants or is he simply in charge of the office?

Mr. CARLING. He is a very industrious man, and looks after all the details of his work.

Mr. MULLOCK. What are the duties of the intelligence officers?

Mr. CARLING. The intelligence officers are employed for the purpose of giving information to immigrants on their arrival, to assist them to their locations, to communicate with them, and to make themselves generally useful to the immigrants.

Mr. MULLOCK. I observe that at Winnipeg there are a great many officers employed. On page D-32 of the Auditor General's Report of 1888-89 I find the following: Anderson, Baldwinson, Bardal, Bennett, Grahame, Herbert, Jacobson, Metcalfe, Ohlen, Peterson, Robinson and Savage, in all thirteen persons. Might I ask the Minister who is at the head of these thirteen persons?

Mr. CARLING. All we have at Winnipeg are eight. Mr. Grahame is not connected with the Department. He was, but he is not in the service of the Government now. Mr. Bennett is the agent, and Mr. Tétu, the assistant agent. Mr. Ohlen is also assistant agent and interpreter, Mr. Robinson is a clerk in the office, and Mr. Herbert is a caretaker. Those are all the permanent officers we have there. That is all the permanent officers we have. Mr. Metcalfe is employed temporarily.

Mr. MULLOCK. Is there any one appointed in the place of Mr. Grahame?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Bennett. He was on the staff at Brandon, and was put on at the same salary as Mr. Grahame.

Mr. MULLOCK. At the agency at Winnipeg, the highest salary, I find, any one receives all the year round, is \$1,400, and certain allowances; but I find Mr. Metcalfe gets \$1,400 for a much shorter period; he is paid at the rate of \$1,800.

Mr. CARLING. He is paid by the month. He is paid \$150 a month for 8 months in the year. He is not in a permanent position.

Mr. MULLOCK. Last year Mr. Metcalfe was absent from Winnipeg from the first of May to the first of June. He left to return to his duties on the 16th May, but his new salary began on the first of June. Who discharged his duties from the first of May till the time when he resumed his duties?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Jacobson, who was in the office.

Mr. MULLOCK. Then if Mr. Jacobson could discharge the duties for Mr. Metcalfe—

Mr. CARLING. He did not alone, he did it with the assistance of those connected with the agency.

Mr. MULOCK. Was any person employed to discharge Mr. Metcalfe's duties during the time he was absent?

Mr. CARLING. He was absent during the winter time. He left on the first of January, and returned in May.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there anything required from Mr. Metcalfe until the 16th May each year?

Mr. CARLING. We do not pay him when he is absent. I explained that Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Rowland, and those gentlemen connected with the office, discharged the duties.

Mr. MULOCK. To my mind it is most incomprehensible that it should be necessary to employ Mr. Metcalfe in the dull season, from June to January, when business is on the wane, and to relieve him and let him go away from January to June, the time when business is brisk.

Mr. CARLING. It is only for a short time.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Metcalfe may be a very efficient officer, and we must have his services if we pay for them. I presume he is employed in order to give intelligence to incoming settlers; and if those duties can be efficiently discharged by the remaining members of the staff during the busiest portion of the year, I cannot conceive any reason for his being appointed during the dull portion of the year. The Minister has not made that clear. I do not want to say what the transaction appears to my mind to be, but the Minister must feel himself that the only conclusion one can draw from this is not favorable for his Department. I think this item should stand over till the Minister gives a detailed statement of the duties of that office. I think we should have statements showing the times when immigration is brisk. I presume the books in the office in Winnipeg will show the number of immigrants that passed through the office daily, would they not?

Mr. CARLING. I fancy so.

Mr. MULOCK. We ought to know what the business of the Winnipeg agency is, the number of immigrants passing through the office, and then we can see whether this whole staff is necessary. That we should employ a man when business is dull, contrary to all business principles, and relieve him when business is brisk, contrary to all business principles, is something that I cannot understand. I ask the Minister if he can give us the information?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot give such details. The hon. gentleman wants us to bring the books down from Winnipeg to know the duties of Mr. Metcalfe, is that it?

Mr. WATSON. Surely your Department knows the duties of Mr. Metcalfe here.

Mr. CARLING. I stated that he is employed nine months in the year at \$150 a month. He is an outside man, he is not confined to the office. Immigrants are arriving there every month and week. If he was not there in the month of April, he was not paid for it. He is only paid for the time he is there. He is a most efficient and active officer, and he looks after the immigrants to see that they are properly located and get their location tickets. He acts between the immigration department and the land department, and all par-

Mr. CARLING.

ties who have been there, whether friends or foes of the Government, have said that he has done excellent service, and rendered great assistance to the immigrants who arrive there.

Mr. WATSON. Who will give information to the immigrants now?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Bennett and his staff.

Mr. WATSON. Have they any more leisure time now than they will have three or four months hence?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know that Mr. Metcalfe will need any more assistance.

Mr. WATSON. Will the hon. gentleman tell me why Mr. Grahame severed his connection with the Department.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Grahame sent in his resignation and it was accepted.

Mr. MULOCK. Was he asked to send it in?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know that he was asked officially.

Mr. WATSON. Was Mr. Grahame an efficient officer?

Mr. CARLING. He had been there for some time.

Mr. WATSON. I think we should have this information. When a member asks why Mr. Grahame was dismissed, I think the Minister should tell us.

Mr. HESSON. We are not voting money for Mr. Grahame.

Mr. CARLING. We considered that the present man would suit the position better.

Mr. WATSON. Was Mr. Grahame asked to resign?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Grahame wrote a letter stating that he intended to embark in another business, and we accepted his resignation.

Mr. WATSON. Was it suggested that he had better do so rather than be dismissed?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Was there any complaint made as to the manner in which Mr. Grahame had performed his duties?

Mr. CARLING. There were some complaints.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Under these circumstances we should have information as to what complaints were made. It is due to the Committee that if an employé, who has long been in the service of the Government, is removed, an explanation should be made by the Minister of the reasons of his resignation. Further, if Mr. Metcalfe's duties at Winnipeg are required during nine months of the year, were they not required during twelve months, and during the most busy part of the season? Mr. Metcalfe was only retained in that position to suit his convenience, and because he happened to represent Kingston in the Ontario Legislature. It is the duty of this Government to ask him to resign one position or the other. This Government, moreover, are so generous as to pay his travelling expenses to Winnipeg and return, and in the Auditor General's Report will be found several accounts for his travelling expenses. This item should be allowed to stand until full information is submitted with respect to Mr. Grahame and Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Metcalfe is not at present in the employ of the Government; there is no understanding that he shall be employed; but if the Government think it necessary to have an efficient man like Mr. Metcalfe again, they will employ him.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Does the Government consider it necessary that Mr. Metcalfe should be employed again from June or July.

Mr. CARLING. April is the time.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). May last year.

Mr. BOWELL. The Auditor General's Report says he was employed since 1st April.

Mr. WATSON. He did not go to Winnipeg before 16th May.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) has made the very reasonable proposition that this item should stand over until the Minister is prepared to lay on the Table a report as to the arrivals of immigrants at Winnipeg during the several months of last year. This information is necessary, in order to consider whether the Government were justified in employing Mr. Metcalfe from 1st July to 31st December.

Mr. CARLING. There is no undertaking before the Committee to employ Mr. Metcalfe; there is no salary in the Estimates for Mr. Metcalfe; he is not now in the employ of the Government, and he has no intimation that he will be employed. If it should be thought necessary to employ Mr. Metcalfe subsequently, that would be another matter. At present he is not in the employ of the Government in any way whatever, and he has no promise of any such employment.

Mr. McMULLEN. There was no vote before the Committee last year with respect to Mr. Metcalfe. The question connected with his employment only came up because it appeared from the Auditor General's Report that he had received \$150 a month from 1st July to 31st December. We want the reasons why he was so employed.

Mr. CARLING. The Government thought it necessary to employ him, or they would not have employed him; and if the Government think it necessary to employ him, they will employ him. That is the information I have given to the House, and that is all the information I am able, at this moment, to give.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have a right to demand this information, for it is our duty to enquire into these matters. The Government have no right to say they will employ a man and the Opposition have nothing to do with it. We have a right to enquire into these matters and to get satisfaction on the different points. We now ask a reply from the Minister with respect to the arrivals of immigrants at Winnipeg during the 12 months, which will enable us to decide whether the Government were warranted in employing Mr. Metcalfe during that period or not.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is very exacting, and I doubt whether he knows himself what he wants. The item under consideration is one connected with immigration to that part of the country, and the Minister has explained very elaborately what is intended to be done, what is

intended to be paid, and what has been done in the past. Every intelligent man knows the months during which immigration is most likely to flow into that country, during April, May and June, and if the Government decide to employ certain additional officers at busy seasons, the time to criticise the items is when the Government puts an item in the Estimates for that purpose, but in this case no sum is asked; therefore, the information asked is decidedly unreasonable.

Mr. McMULLEN. Last year no intimation was made to the Committee that the Government intended to employ Mr. Metcalfe, and his name was not in the Estimates before the Committee. It fact, it was only known from an item appearing in the Auditor General's Report, showing that he had received \$150 per month from 1st July to 1st January. The Committee are now enquiring as to the reasons why the Government saw fit to employ him during that period. The Minister does not ask us to consent now to the passage of any item to pay Mr. Metcalfe, even though he should consider it necessary to employ him, and consequently we are justified in enquiring into his employment in the past. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Sproule), seems to constitute himself the funnel of the Minister of Agriculture, as the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) did for the Government last session, but he has not answered the question. We want to know why it was considered necessary to employ Mr. Metcalfe—who is a member of the Local Legislature, and an out-and-out follower of the First Minister, representing the same constituency in the Provincial Parliament that the right hon. gentleman does here—at \$150 a month, to go to Winnipeg and sport himself there for six months, or to discharge certain nominal duties in the immigration office? We want to know, was there such a rush of immigrants to Winnipeg between the 1st July and the 31st of September, that a man occupying the distinguished position of member in the Local Legislature, had to be sent there to meet that emergency? The only way we can find out if such an emergency existed, is for the Government to comply with the request of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock).

Mr. CARLING. I may say, as I have said before, that Mr. Metcalfe is not now in the employ of the Government. His employment ceased on the 1st January, and he may or may not be employed again. If the hon. gentleman thinks the Department has been wrong in employing Mr. Metcalfe as assistant in the immigration office at Winnipeg, he can vote want of confidence condemning the Government. Mr. Metcalfe has been paid for his services and has ceased to be in the employ of the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the Minister refuses to give the reasonable information we have asked for, the only thing we can conclude is that the engagement of Mr. Metcalfe is nothing short of a barefaced job. Any man who lives in Winnipeg, or any one who knows anything about the immigrants coming to that country, knows that from July to December is not the period at which immigrants arrive.

Mr. CARLING. Immigrants arrive at all periods of the year.

Mr. McMULLEN. The early part of the spring is the time the immigrants arrive, and I am informed that some 1,400 left for Winnipeg last night. If a man like Mr. Metcalfe is required at all, he is required in April, May and June, and not between July and December.

Mr. CARLING. Did you say we employed him in July?

Mr. McMULLEN. He was employed, according to the Auditor General's Report, from 1st July to the 31st December.

Mr. BOWELL. Read the next item.

Mr. McMULLEN. The next item says that he was employed from 1st April until the 30th June, and we find that on the 16th May he was paid his travelling expenses from Kingston to Winnipeg. It would thus appear that he was engaged on the 1st April, and that he did not start for Winnipeg until the 16th of May. That bears out the statement I have made that there is a job about this matter. He was a month and a half in the employ of the Government, at \$150 per month, before he went up there at all. Will the Minister of Customs, who drew my attention to the second item, explain on what ground the Government paid him wages for a month and a half when he was not at his office at all?

Mr. BOWELL. I will try to.

Mr. McMULLEN. We want the explanation.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman had the ordinary courtesy of a member of Parliament, he would not continue to interrupt before a Minister, or any member of Parliament, from whom he asked a question, has been able to give a reply. That is the ordinary course the hon. member pursues, especially with regard to myself, and I am not at all astonished.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). We are waiting for the explanation.

Mr. BOWELL. I expected better from the member for Elgin. Whatever he may be here, I know what he is outside.

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is not in the Chair and I do not propose to be ruled by him.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not say "order."

Mr. BOWELL. The account as it appears here, shows that Mr. Metcalfe was employed from the 1st April to the 30th June, for which he received \$150 a month. It shows that he was afterwards employed from the 1st July to 31st December, and there is an item for travelling expenses from Kingston to Winnipeg on 16th May, 1889. From this last item the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) infers that he did not go to Winnipeg until that time, and that he received his pay from the 1st April to the 16th of the following month without doing anything for it. I am not prepared to answer that question, because I know nothing about it. It may be that he was in Winnipeg and was called on to return for some purpose, but, at all events, I have no doubt that the Minister of Agriculture, when he enquires into the matter, can answer, and will no doubt answer that question satisfactorily. It strikes me that the items before the House at present are for the pay-

Mr. CARLING.

ment of an agent and an interpreter at Winnipeg. What the employment of Mr. Metcalfe has to do with these items I do not understand. I am as ignorant on that point as I am as to the whereabouts of Mr. Metcalfe from the 1st of April to the 16th of May. The hon. member for North Wellington says there is no vote in these Estimates out of which Mr. Metcalfe is to be paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not say that. If the hon. gentleman will allow me I will tell him what I did say.

Mr. BOWELL. I certainly understood him to say so. There is the last item, under which this discussion, I think, would fairly arise. But I do not wish to be understood as saying that the information asked for by the hon. member for North York is not properly asked for under this item. If the question were put with the view of ascertaining whether there are sufficient immigrants going to the North-West to justify the retention of an agent at that point, I could understand the force of it, and the necessity for an explanation by the Minister of Agriculture; and when you come to the last item in the Estimates, the propriety or impropriety of employing any assistants to the agent at Winnipeg might very fairly be brought to the attention of the Committee and the Government. I know, from a little personal knowledge I have of Mr. Metcalfe, that he is a very active and energetic man in the performance of that work and every other which he undertakes. I know also that during my visits to the North-West I heard him spoken of in the most laudatory terms, as being the very best man we could have for the peculiar position he occupies, that is, to inform and instruct immigrants as to where they can locate. He is not only at Winnipeg, but he goes to Calgary, Fort McLeod, and almost every other section of the North-West, giving necessary information to immigrants. Whether it is necessary to have such an officer is a fair question for the Opposition and the Government to consider. It has been said that Mr. Metcalfe knows nothing of the North-West, or not as much as others who have lived there longer than he. I believe there are few men in Canada who have a better general knowledge of the capabilities of the different localities, and the best places to which to direct immigrants, than Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. McMULLEN. I just wish to correct the hon. Minister of Customs with regard to some words which he put into my mouth. He said that I had stated that there was no item in the Estimates out of which Mr. Metcalfe could be paid. I did not say anything of the sort. I stated that there was no item in last year's Estimates with which Mr. Metcalfe's name was associated so as to enable the Committee to understand that it was the intention of the Government to engage him. The hon. Minister endeavored to read me a lecture on parliamentary etiquette. I have heard the hon. gentleman called to order as frequently as I have been. I have endeavored to be courteous to him, and although I have not been as long in the House as he has, I think I understand parliamentary etiquette as well as he does, and he need not read me a lecture on the subject. I still contend that before we pass this item, the Government should supply us with the information we ask. We know from the Auditor General's Report that Mr.

Metcalfe was engaged on the 1st of April, and that he did not leave Kingston to go to the North West until the 16th of May, and we do not know that he started then; we only know that he drew \$52 for his expenses. What we want to know is why his visit is deferred until then, when the seeding is all past, and the period for the influx of immigrants is past also. Why is it necessary to send him there then, and keep him until the 30th of December at \$150 a month payable from the 1st of April? My hon. friend at my left suggests that before we pass the item we should have laid on the Table the number of immigrants who went into the country during each month, so that we could see whether his employment is justified or not. If the Minister does not produce that information to the Committee, we have a right to come to the conclusion that it was a job to find Mr. Metcalfe a place.

Mr. CARLING. If the hon. gentleman looks at page 82 of the report, he will see the number that arrived at Winnipeg in each month.

Mr. MULOCK. While the hon. gentleman is looking into that, I would like to bring the Minister back to the question I asked him some time ago in reference to the removal of Mr. Grahame. I understood that Mr. Grahame's withdrawal from the public service was not voluntary. Perhaps the Minister will inform us exactly under what circumstances he left the public service?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know that I can give all the information the hon. gentleman asks for. I know that Mr. Grahame was an officer for some years, and that he was not altogether satisfactory to the people; and we thought, and he thought himself, that it would be better to retire, and he sent in his resignation to the Government on the 1st January, and was allowed to continue up to the 1st July.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman say when the Government came to the conclusion that his management was not satisfactory?

Mr. CARLING. At the time he sent in his resignation.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister a moment ago said the resignation followed that. We may as well strip the transaction of the gauze thrown over it. I think the hon. Minister knows pretty well why Mr. Grahame left the service, and I think it would only be candid on his part to tell us. If he does not, somebody else must tell the Committee for him. It is well known that Mr. Grahame was an honest and candid officer, who in his reports told the truth, but because they did not commend themselves to the Administration, he was crowded out. That I understand to be the reason he left. I ask the hon. Minister whether that is the case or not?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Grahame was not removed from office for the purpose of putting some one else in his place. A reduction was made in the service; Mr. Bennett was brought from Brandon to Winnipeg, and Mr. Baker from Qu'Appelle to Brandon. We did away with the immigration office at Brandon and at Medicine Hat, and sent Mr. Sutherland to Vancouver.

Mr. MULOCK. Was the change made in the interests of economy so as to reduce the staff?

Mr. CARLING. The reduction was made in the interests of the public.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman must see that his explanations are lacking in candour. First of all he told us that Mr. Grahame's administration was not altogether satisfactory, and that he was induced to send in his resignation. Now the Minister tells us that the change was made in the public interest. A moment previous he gave us to understand that the change was made in the interest of economy, in order to reduce the staff. They removed Mr. Grahame and removed the agent at Brandon to Winnipeg, and from Qu'Appelle to Brandon.

Mr. CARLING. The Qu'Appelle office was done away with.

Mr. MULOCK. So, in consequence of there being no business at Qu'Appelle to require an agent, that agent was removed. If there was to be a reduction made in the staff it should have been made in the office where the reduction should take place. If the object was economy, the Minister did an unfair thing in sacrificing the man at Winnipeg, whose services were wanted, and putting in another person from another office which he closed. The hon. gentleman admits that pressure was brought on Grahame to induce him to resign. First of all he admitted that the change was made in the interests of economy, and when asked the question blank, he says, in the public interest. It is forced upon my mind that the man was removed because he had the courage to do his duty. I would call the attention of the Minister to another very unsound doctrine. When my hon. friend asked for information with regard to certain expenditure, and as to whether or not it was the intention of the Government to continue a certain policy, the reply was that the Government had decided on its course, and if the Committee was not satisfied, they could move a motion of want of confidence. We have certain rights and obligations with respect to public expenditure. It is our duty to see that the Government give the information required by the people's representatives and the Minister of Agriculture repudiates that doctrine when he declines to give the information required. His Department will not stand such a mode of procedure. It is costing the country a great deal of money, and, if the Minister chooses to continue that course, it will ruin his Department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to draw attention to the immigration report. This report, at page 82, gives a record of the immigrants who arrived at Port Arthur *en route* for Manitoba and the North-West Territories:—

January	529	July	2,422
February	700	August	1,282
March	6,521	September	1,841
April	4,907	October	1,157
May	4,167	November	1,125
June	2,369	December	659

There are not more than one-third in the other months over April and May, and he was not there then at all. March, 6,800, and April 4,900, and he was not there. We want to know why, in the months when the arrivals were least numerous, it was necessary to engage Metcalfe?

Mr. TAYLOR. A great number of the immigrants who went in in March and April were im-

migrants who had been out there the year before, and made their locations, and then came back in the spring. The same thing is going on to-day. I know of great numbers from my own county who were out there last year, and went with Metcalfe through the country, settled their locations, and are leaving this spring with their families for those locations.

Mr. WATSON. It appears to me we are getting further evidence all the time, even from hon. gentlemen opposite. We now find that hon. gentlemen who have been out there last year, and are going out again this spring, are still counted as immigrants.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; the Minister of Agriculture tells us that he counts them at Port Arthur. That is the way in which these statements are misleading to this House. I think I can throw some light on the manner in which Mr. Grahame was dismissed. He was giving satisfaction to the people of Manitoba, and, when occasion required it, he made a true statement in his report. In the report of 1888, I was surprised to find that he would dare to make such a statement as he did, but he did not refuse to do his duty. In his report, dated the 31st December, 1887, Mr. Grahame says:

"During the present year there has been a large amount of work performed, and this, I may say, under great difficulties, which was chiefly owing to want of proper accommodation for the immigrants, the old sheds having been partly destroyed by fire, and the remaining portion being unfit for human habitation. You will readily understand that, had it not been for the strenuous exertions of the medical attendant, myself and staff, during the past three or four years, and by a large expenditure for drugs, disinfectants, medical attendance, scavenging, &c., &c., the premises would have been the scene of a large amount of disease, most of it doubtless ending in death to the sufferers. These difficulties necessitated the almost constant attendance of the medical officer, while either myself or staff were in or about the premises in most cases until after midnight. We are still compelled to be at our posts for very long hours, but as soon as the new immigration premises will be completed, we expect the necessary conveniences for making the immigrants comfortable during their stay with us. I regret to have again to call your attention to the fact that we get too many of the laboring class without means, and not a few who are physically unable to earn their own livelihood."

And further on he says:

"Several of these people came to me on their arrival, complaining that persons calling themselves immigration agents induced them to come to this country with a promise of immediate employment, at fabulous wages."

Now, I submit that that report of Mr. Grahame's was the cause of his dismissal. He reported there contrary to the wishes of the Minister of Agriculture, and contrary to the views advanced by his deputy. The other day before the Immigration Committee we had such men as Mr. Webster making comparisons between Manitoba and Dakota, which to my mind are exaggerated. It is on the strength of these exaggerated reports that men are induced to go there, and they find they are deceived, and then they curse the Department or any one else who has induced them to go there. The Government should be very careful to select men as Government agents who are thoroughly conversant with the country, who can advise the immigrants well, and can prove the truth of what they are telling to them. It is not at all necessary to exaggerate the true state of affairs in the Province of Manitoba in order to induce men to go there if they are advised

Mr. TAYLOR.

by competent men who know all about the country to which they are advising them to go.

Mr. BORDEN. I understood the Minister of Customs to say, with regard to some strictures of mine on the tables of the officer at Halifax, that these tables were made up from entries in the Custom house, and, therefore, these people could not be tourists or ordinary travellers. Since then, I have had an opportunity of examining the tables further, and I will call further attention to the report of the Minister of Agriculture at page 27. If these people entered at the Custom house as immigrants, I presume they would bring with them certain effects, particularly as I find they were cabin passengers. I find in this table, effects, nil; cash, nil; total, nil. I think that establishes beyond a question that these people were not immigrants but were tourists. They were cabin passengers who, it is alleged, came into this country as immigrants with absolutely nothing. I would further point out that of these people the nationality of 5,368 appears under the heading United States citizens, and there are 1,180 English. The declared destination of 5,840 is Nova Scotia. Who can pretend to say for a moment that 5,368 citizens of the United States, and cabin passengers at that, came to Nova Scotia and settled there last year as immigrants? The thing is perfectly absurd. The fact is that these people entered Nova Scotia *via* the city of Halifax as tourists, passed up through these Provinces, and went home to the United States by some other port. It is worse than useless, because it is misleading, to supply information of this kind to this House.

Mr. CARLING. If the hon. gentleman will look at page 23 of the same report, he will see that the tourists have been deducted from the total number.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The facts which appear to have been disclosed in relation to the retirement of Mr. Grahame from the public service seem to indicate a state of affairs which it is not in the public interest should exist, and I think the Minister would have done more credit to his Department if he had complied with the usage that Ministers should give every information to the Committee, and had disclosed the reason why Mr. Grahame retired. I understood the hon. gentleman to say distinctly that Mr. Grahame was not officially asked to retire. That clearly means that he was unofficially asked to retire. Then, in the face of a report which Mr. Grahame made to this House a year or two ago, and which was made the subject of comment both in this House and in the press, it became the duty of the hon. gentleman to state distinctly whether Mr. Grahame's retirement was asked for because he discharged fairly, fully and frankly the duties which he was asked to perform. If a public officer is discharged from the public service because he tells the truth, it is a system which strikes a fatal blow at the efficiency of the public service altogether. If public officials understand that their only hope of retention or promotion depends upon their making reports satisfactory to the Department, although those reports may be a suppression of the truth, or a violation of the truth, then I say it will be a sad day for the public service at large. Now the facts are before us. Mr. Grahame made a report a year or two ago which was not satisfactory to the Department, but

was satisfactory to the public at large, because it disclosed the truth, and it is the truth we are all seeking to obtain. Now, whether that report was palatable or not, it contained a fair statement of facts, and the officer who made that report was entitled to expect that he would be commended by the head of the Department, and not reprimanded; and if it is a fact that because he made that report he was asked to resign, I say it is a circumstance which calls for the fullest enquiry and the fullest explanation. I did myself, personally, regret very much that the Minister should have exhibited a rather uncandid spirit in his answers to the hon. gentleman who spoke on this side, on that point. It is an important point, involving not only Mr. Grahame's personal position, but involving the public interest at large. It is well that public officials should know whether they are to be commended or whether they are to be reprimanded when they disclose fairly the facts with reference to the service in which they are engaged. I will add this further, merely with reference to Mr. Metcalfe. It does appear to me that the facts disclosed in that matter require some further explanation than the Minister has given. It appears that this gentleman holds a position in the Local Legislature, and he is allowed by the Department to return from Winnipeg and discharge his duties as representative of the people in that Legislature, and the hon. gentleman pays him for travelling from Winnipeg down to discharge his duties and back again to his work. I find that in the Auditor General's Report, that so flagrant did the payment of this money appear to the Auditor General, that he called the attention of the Department to it in the most official way, and he asked how it was that this gentleman was permitted to leave his post of duty in Winnipeg and travel back to Kingston, and from Kingston on again to Winnipeg when he resumed his duties, and was paid for these travelling expenses out of the public purse? He travels, not in the public interest, not in the discharge of any duties connected with his appointment, but to carry out some personal object of his own, to attend to certain duties in the Local Legislature with which we have nothing to do. I find under date of 18th November, 1889, the Auditor General calls attention of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture to this charge, and asks him:

"Would you please explain why J. H. Metcalfe, Intelligence Officer at Winnipeg, was paid his travelling expenses from Winnipeg to Kingston in January, 1889, and return from Kingston in May, 1889? Unless this trip was on official business it is not a proper charge against any vote, and the amount, \$104.90, should be refunded."

The Deputy Minister replies:

"As respects the item of travelling expenses to Mr. J. H. Metcalfe, Intelligence Officer at Winnipeg, at the dates stated in your letter, in January and May, 1889, I have to say that such travelling was directed and authorised by the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Metcalfe lives at Kingston, being employed during a certain portion of the year at Winnipeg. I hope you will permit me to observe that we do not recognise your right to enquire into the propriety of any authorisation to his agents to incur travelling expenses by the Minister of Agriculture, he being alone responsible for matters of this nature."

Well, that is not a very courteous reply, I must say, on the part of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. It is perfectly apparent to the Committee that if the Auditor General has no right to enquire into the propriety of that payment, then the duty devolves still more strongly upon the Committee of this House to ascertain under whose authority this

gentleman was paid. Now, I venture to say that the explanation, so far as it is an explanation, which the Deputy Minister of Agriculture gave, was distinctly misleading. This gentleman was not authorised to be paid his travelling expenses, because he resided at Winnipeg. It is in evidence before the Committee that he came back to discharge his duties as a member of the Legislature in Toronto. The Auditor General was not satisfied with that report, and on 27th November, he says:

"Mr. Metcalfe's account of expenses from Kingston to Winnipeg on May 16th, 1889, was not certified as being necessary and in the interest of immigration, by yourself or any one in your Department."

To which the deputy replies:

"You state that Mr. Metcalfe's account for expenses from Kingston to Winnipeg, on the 16th May, 1889, was not certified as being necessary and in the interest of immigration, either by myself, or any one in this Department. On this point I beg to point out that the account was initiated by myself, having been made out in the first place on a slip of paper, and subsequently pasted on one of the Departmental forms, containing the declaration to which you refer."

That explanation appears to have been disingenuous again, and the Auditor General writes again:

"With reference to the account of Mr. Metcalfe for travelling expenses from Winnipeg to Kingston, it appears to me that your initials were put on the account before Mr. Metcalfe's certificate. If I understand your contention rightly, it is that your initials on an account should carry with them the evidence, that unless the contrary is proved, all the requirements of the Audit Act, and every Act affecting expenditure in your Department, have been complied with. Everything affecting the Department of Agriculture is not known to you, just as everything affecting the Audit Office is not known to me, and it is important to know what each of us implies by his signature. An easy, and it appears to me, a rational way of knowing what is conveyed, is by putting it in writing over the signature."

That is a very common sense and very practical statement by the Auditor General. Now, under these circumstances, it does appear to me that the Auditor General having been refused an explanation, the whole circumstances connected with the payment of this gentleman's salary and the payment of his travelling expenses, appears to be, to say the least, exceedingly exceptional and hardly defensible, and this Committee should have the fullest information before they are asked to vote the sum of money in the Estimates here, out of which the same expenditure may be made the next year. If the hon. gentleman says it is not his intention to re-appoint this gentleman, so far so good; but he has not said so, so far as we can gather. He reserves to himself full right to allow this gentleman to travel backwards and forwards at the expense of the public, attending to his parliamentary duties at Toronto. The whole thing appears to me to require very much fuller explanation than the gentleman has deemed fit to give, and I will express the hope that when he does give it, he will do so with his accustomed courtesy, and with full facts the Committee have a right to expect.

Mr. CARLING. I think I have given every explanation which can possibly be expected of me. I may say that the report made by Mr. Grahame had nothing whatever to do with his resignation, I say that most distinctly. With regard to Mr. Metcalfe, his home is in Kingston, and the agreement with Mr. Metcalfe was that he should be employed at Winnipeg at so much a month, and his fare paid there and return. That is a plain statement of the whole case. He was considered a

most active and useful man, and it was thought necessary to engage his services. Every one who has been in the North-West testifies to that.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the state of the facts disclosed by the report and statistics embodied herein. The Minister of Agriculture stated that the work of the Winnipeg agency depended on the number of immigrants passing through the office; and, that being the case, by reference to the statistics contained in his report for the year ending December, 1889, we can form a very accurate idea as to the demands made on the staff at Winnipeg for each month during the year. In April last, 4,967 immigrants arrived at Port Arthur for settlement in the North-West, and we may assume that about the same proportion passed through the Winnipeg agency one month as another month. If so, it would appear that the staff, minus Mr. Metcalfe, were able to handle the Winnipeg portion of 4,967 immigrants who arrived in Port Arthur in April. Mr. Metcalfe resumed his duties in May or June following. In June 2,366 immigrants arrived at Port Arthur. In other words, in April you had a smaller staff, or a staff minus Mr. Metcalfe, able to discharge their proportion of the business of dealing with 4,967 immigrants, and yet the Government hired Mr. Metcalfe to come in and help the staff when the work has fallen to less than half that it was in April. This transaction cannot possibly be justified. In the face of these figures, how can the Minister justify the increase of the staff in May? He has stated that Mr. Metcalfe's appointment was a temporary one, and that he was liable to removal at any time. Why was he engaged in May, when the work was less than one-half what it was in April?

Mr. CARLING. I considered that Mr. Metcalfe had rendered such excellent services the previous year that his services would be most beneficial to the Government for that year.

Mr. WATSON. Why did he not go to Winnipeg in April?

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman knows that immigrants are not always distributed immediately they arrive, and that weeks and months elapse before they are located.

Mr. WATSON. I think I know something about the time at which immigrants arrive in Manitoba and the North-West. There are no months when so many arrive as during April and May. The hon. gentleman has stated that some of those who go in the spring have been in the country before. In coming down from St. Mary's the other day, there were 25 young men on the cars who had never been in Manitoba. These people wanted information, and I gave them some information myself. A competent officer is required at Winnipeg to give information to immigrants on their arrival. The report I read from Mr. Grahame should lead the Minister to see that the Public Works Department build at once a new immigration shed at Winnipeg.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E. I.) Will the Minister explain how it occurs that Mr. Metcalfe received payment from 1st April when he only left to discharge his duties on the 16th May? If he was at his home at Kingston, how came he to obtain payment of one and a half month's salary?

Mr. CARLING.

Mr. CARLING. I cannot, at this moment, explain that. I do not know whether he was in Kingston or not; he may have been in Ottawa.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is evident that he travelled from Kingston to Winnipeg on 16th May. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite do not wish us to believe that this man is a pet of the Government, who has received payment for work he has not performed. In view of the Auditor General's statement showing that Mr. Metcalfe went to Winnipeg on 16th May, I am justified in my statement.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has given no evidence to show that Mr. Metcalfe was not employed during the balance of that time. He has taken up the item of payment for travelling expenses, and he has stated the date at which Mr. Metcalfe travelled. There is no statement as to how he was employed for the balance of the time. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) considers he is asking questions that should be asked, and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) holds a like opinion in regard to his question; but, after referring to the fact that Mr. Grahame was dismissed, and after enquiring for a long time why he was dismissed and assigning various reasons, he told the Committee he knew all about it.

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. SPROULE. And he read the evidence. He is only taking a leaf from the book of his own friends, because his friends in Toronto, when the report of the agent at Hamilton was given, would not allow it to be published but cut it out, because it told the truth and thereby made a point against them. And because the Minister of Agriculture was honest enough to allow his officer to report, and to print that report, and distribute it, they assumed that because he happened to be dismissed, or because he happened to leave the Government employ, his dismissal must have been for that purpose, because they would be likely to do that themselves. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has been very persistent in asking questions and seeking for irrelevant information, and because he has been interfered with he retorts in insolent and offensive remarks.

Mr. MULOCK. I rise to a point of order. The member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in accusing the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) of having used insolent and insulting remarks, is out of order. I think that is not parliamentary language.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman —

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hickey). Let it be parliamentary and proceed with the discussion in that way.

Mr. WATSON. Take it back.

Mr. SPROULE. Take what back?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; chair.

Mr. WATSON. I rise to a point of order. The point has been raised that the language used by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is unparliamentary, in his saying that the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) used offensive and insulting language.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; chair.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Committee ask for your decision, Mr. Chairman, as to whether the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) had a right to use the language?

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the hon. gentleman gave his decision.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What was his decision?

Mr. SPROULE. The decision was that I was quite within order. I wish to say further—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair; sit down.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hickey). I think the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is making an explanation of what he intended by his language.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask for the information of the Committee, what was your decision, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the point of order has been disposed of.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. I made the remark in connection with what was said by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is the funnel of the Government, as the hon. member for East Grey is the funnel of the Minister of Agriculture. If that is not an offensive remark, why did he make it? What did he intend to refer to, and what inference did he expect the House or country would draw from it—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; order; Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. If it is not offensive, would any gentleman use it in the sense he did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair; withdraw.

Mr. SPROULE. If he intended to be insolent I am justified in replying to it, and so long as the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) shows the same disposition to members on this side of the House, we have a right to criticise him, and I for one will feel it my duty to do so on every occasion where it is necessary. When I was speaking on the agricultural interests of the country the other night, the member for North Wellington acted in the same way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We want your ruling on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hickey). I think this discussion has been a little careless on both sides, and that too strong language has been used. It is better to have this discussion go on and to let these questions pass by.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is your ruling on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hickey). The insolence was unparliamentary without doubt.

An hon. MEMBER. The use of the word.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hickey). Yes, the use of the word. There has been language quite as unparliamentary used on the other side and nothing said about it.

Mr. WATSON. Take it back.

Mr. SPROULE. Take what back?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair; withdraw.

Mr. SPROULE. In speaking to this question—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; order; Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. I repeat it again—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. I repeat, that when an hon. gentleman in this House is entitled to speak upon any question, and he addresses himself to the Chair the member for North Wellington has no right to act as he did. When I spoke on the question of agricultural depression the other night the member for North Wellington also made some unbecoming remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair; order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman is setting your authority at defiance, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not. I have very great respect for the authority of the Chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think we had better call in the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to call attention to the remarks made by the member for King's (Mr. Borden) in which he attempted to set me right as to the question of immigration to Nova Scotia. If he had read the report as he should have done, he would not have spoken as he did. I find on page 23 of the report the following:—

"The total number of settlers in Nova Scotia during the past year *pro* Halifax, a careful revision of the tables rendered by Mr. Clay gives the following result:—Total arrivals by steamer, 12,328; cabin, 6,627; total, 18,955; less United States' citizens by coasting steamers, 7,906, leaving a balance of 11,049."

After giving Mr. Clay's report of destinations of the parties, it closes with these remarks:

"From this we have the net result that Nova Scotia may be considered to have gained as settlers 2,395. The reason for eliminating the United States' citizens by coasters, is that the probability is greatly in favor of the fact that as many went out as came in, and therefore the nationalities alone and the passengers, by ocean steamers have been considered settlers, after deducting those who have declared their intention of proceeding elsewhere."

The report, I think, is quite clear and quite distinct. It may be possible, as the hon. gentleman says, that all these immigrants may not have reported to the Customs, from the fact that Mr. Clay reports that not less than 2,591 went to Ontario and 1,386 to Manitoba, their entries may have been made at these ports.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We have quite an important matter as the Minister is referring to before the House. The Minister of Customs is, in a measure, leading the House to-night; and we have had an instance of the authority of the Chair being set at defiance, while he rises in his place to introduce another subject. It is incumbent on him, Sir, to preserve the dignity of the House. The Chair ruled distinctly that the language used by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was unparliamentary, and he was asked to withdraw.

Mr. BOWELL. Who asked?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The very fact of the ruling of the Chair required him to withdraw it, and he was asked from this side of the House as well. A gentleman, understanding his position in the House, recognises the fact that when the Chair rules he has used unparliamentary language, as a matter of course, and in order to preserve the dignity of

the House, he should withdraw the expression. In defiance of that, the member kept on making his speech, and did not withdraw the statement. I think it was the duty of the Minister of the Crown, instead of speaking on another subject, to see that the dignity of the Chair was sustained.

Mr. SPROULE. The Chairman said the language used on the other side was just as bad.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That makes no difference; there was no exception taken.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. member for East Grey, having spoken and put his foot in it very badly, undertakes to set this House at defiance by refusing to withdraw the unparliamentary expression he used. We all use improper expressions in the heat of debate, and the hon. gentleman must see the necessity which rests upon him as an old member of the House of withdrawing the expression. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to request the hon. member to withdraw the offensive expression which you have ruled to be unparliamentary.

Mr. BOWELL. I should like to know whether hon. gentlemen on that side of the House are to rise whenever they please to discuss questions of order, but the moment a gentleman on this side rises he is called to order. Under the Rules of the House every man has a right to speak to the question of order, or to take exception to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not after the ruling is given. He can only appeal to the Speaker.

Mr. BOWELL. He can move against the ruling of the Chair also. What I contend is, that if the gentlemen on one side have a right to rise and address the Chair on a question of order, surely members on this side have a right to do that without being constantly interrupted.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister is quite in error in saying that we discussed the question of order. We did not. That had been discussed and ruled upon by the Chair. We are merely calling on the Chair to enforce its own ruling. It is not open to any member to discuss the ruling of the Chair, only to move a reference to the Speaker.

Mr. HESSON. I think the hon. member for East Grey has been grievously insulted in this House; I have no hesitation in saying that. I say it was insolent of any member of the House—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. HESSON,—to address to a member of this House language that tended to lower him in the eyes of the House; and when he was addressed by the hon. member for North Wellington as being the funnel of the Minister of Agriculture, I would appeal to any hon. gentleman whether he would desire to be put in that unpleasant position. I ask if there is a gentleman on that side of the House who would like to have that hurled at his head; and when the hon. member for East Grey used the language he did, he used it in the truest sense of the word, and I think that the House could not but appreciate the hon. gentleman's feelings.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hickey). I am satisfied that the hon. member for East Grey did not mean to be insulting; but I am quite satisfied that the language is unparliamentary, and in order to preserve the decorum of the House I think any hon.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

member to whose attention such language is called is in duty bound to withdraw it.

Mr. SPROULE. In obedience to your ruling, I withdraw the language, but I believe it all the same.

Mr. MULOCK. I am greatly pleased to find that the hon. member for East Grey has taken this course. It has been a cause of great pain to me to find him using such language, and I trust that hon. members will endeavor to preserve their tempers and in no way get excited.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the point we were discussing when the hon. member for East Grey interfered. The hon. Minister informed us that the duties of this gentleman are in Winnipeg. He was allowed to leave there and come to Kingston on his own business; whence he returned on the 16th of May. I asked the Minister how it was that he was paid for the month of April and the first half of May? That is a plain question, which he can easily answer.

Mr. CARLING. I have explained over and over again, that he was only employed up to the 31st of December, and that on the 1st of April he was re-employed for another nine months.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He did not go to discharge his duties until the 16th of May.

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say at this moment, and my deputy says he cannot remember, but that this money might have been paid later than the time he went up.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that is a reason why the Minister should consent to this matter standing over until he gives us the information, or until he ascertains whether he can get it from his Department.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think that information really ought to be given. The Minister admits that he knows apparently nothing about it. He is unable to say whether Mr. Metcalfe was there from the 1st of April to the middle of May. He might have been there or he might have been in Ottawa or in Toronto, attending to his parliamentary duties.

Mr. CARLING. We are not on that item at all. We are now dealing with the assistant immigration agent in Winnipeg, and not with Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman agree to furnish the information before passing the item of \$48,000?

Mr. CARLING. I will give any information on concurrence.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has not got it and neither has the Department. Will he furnish the information before asking the Committee to pass the item of \$48,000?

Mr. CARLING. I have no information to give.

Mr. HESSON. That is a question for the Public Accounts Committee. The hon. Minister has stated repeatedly that he does not propose to engage Mr. Metcalfe as agent for the current year, and the item we are now on has no reference to any payment to him. The Committee cannot get this information when the Minister declares he is not in a position to give it. If Mr. Metcalfe was

not in the employment of the Government last April and was paid for April, let the Public Accounts Committee investigate that. All this Committee have to deal with is the Estimates for next year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I entirely disagree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. The Minister of Agriculture asks us to vote a certain amount for a certain purpose, and we have the right to know for what purpose that money is to be used. It is the duty of the Minister and of his deputy to give us the information on this and other questions. Here is a question comes up about a gentleman who was appointed at \$150 a month, and it is shown that he received pay for a month and a half for work he never did.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. The point is that this discussion is not on the item under discussion. We are asked to vote \$800 for an assistant immigration agent at Winnipeg. If that amount is not required strike it out, but whether Mr. Metcalfe was paid too much or not has nothing to do with it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think, Mr. Chairman, you will not consider that point of order well taken.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will ask the Chairman to rule.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This is a vote for an assistant agent at Winnipeg. I understand that the assistant agent at Winnipeg is required because Mr. Metcalfe is away from his duty there, and is attending to his duties in Parliament in Toronto. I think, therefore, it is quite pertinent to the argument.

Mr. CASEY. The matter under discussion is the vote of \$101,525 for immigration. Any point in regard to that can be discussed. We are not confined to the item of the assistant agent at Winnipeg any more than to any other. All the older members of the House know very well that that is the case, though my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Hickey) does not seem to be aware of it. As to the point taken by my hon. friend from Perth—or rather as to the point raised by him—as to the propriety of this discussion taking place here instead of in the Public Accounts Committee, I think he has been long enough here to know—

The CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, I beg your pardon; that is another matter.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I move that the Committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the point of order is well taken. The Committee should confine itself to each of the several items. That is the object of dividing them.

Mr. CASEY. Item 75 is the only item before us.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the resolution, but we are discussing a particular item.

Mr. CASEY. I move that the Committee rise, and that this point be submitted to the House with the Speaker in the Chair, and then to the House from the Speaker's ruling if necessary. This is too important a matter to have it decided by a gentleman who is not even really the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. BOWELL. I agree to a certain extent with the hon. gentleman that there is but one item, No. 75, before us, but he knows very well that the practice has been to read each sum under that item to the Committee, and to allow that sum alone to be discussed. If the contention of the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) is correct, then the item put from the Chair should be the whole of No. 75, and the whole should be discussed at the same time. That, however, has not been the practice, and no one knows it better than that hon. gentleman. It has been ruled over and over again that each item in the resolution should be read to the Committee and then discussed upon its merits, and that those items should be taken up *seriatim* as you reach them. I know the rule has been departed from, and that, instead of adhering to the particular item, the whole resolution has been discussed. The effect of that departure from the practice has been shown to-night. One item was passed, and the whole discussion was repeated on the next item, and then it was re-repeated, and now we are having the same discussion over again. Remembering the practice in the past, the Chairman is literally correct, unless you were to adopt the practice of taking the whole item at once.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No doubt that has been the practice in the past, based on considerations of convenience, which should be the controlling rule with both sides of the House; but, if the Chairman rules, as a matter of parliamentary procedure, that a member cannot discuss any other item in the resolution, that is a very different thing. I think it would be a pity to appeal the question. There should be an amount of give-and-take on both sides, and I think the Government should see that it is as much for their interest as for ours that that should be understood. However, the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) is right in his contention, and the matter should not be settled arbitrarily in the way suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. My ruling is strictly in accordance with parliamentary rule.

Mr. TAYLOR. The statement was that Mr. Metcalfe was paid for a month and a-half, and there is nothing about that in this vote.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman fails to see the point, which is that the objectionable vote is taken in this total resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. I find that my ruling that the discussion should be confined to the item was quite correct:

"Sometimes there are a number of items in a vote or resolution, and then these may be generally discussed as forming part of a single question. Each item may then, if the Committee think proper, be taken up as a distinct question, and so discussed and amended. The debate in such a case must be confined to the item, and when it has been disposed of no reference can again be made to it when the subsequent items are under consideration."

Mr. CASEY. Yes, if the arrangement has been made. However, if you rule absolutely that we have no right in this matter, I must appeal to the Speaker.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think, apart from the point taken by the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), this discussion is germane to and belongs to this vote. This vote is to defray the expense of an assistant agent at Winnipeg who would not be required if this gentleman were there.

The CHAIRMAN. That has been decided. Question, gentlemen.

Mr. CASEY. I move for a reference to the House for an authoritative ruling on this point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. CASEY. It is not for the Committee to decide. I have a right to appeal.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I desire to say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASEY. You cannot speak to that. It is not open to debate. I move that the Committee rise and that the matter be referred to the Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. Shall the motion be adopted?

Mr. CASEY. There is no necessity to put the question. It goes to the House as a matter of privilege. There must be a reference from the Committee to the full House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Are we to understand, Mr. Chairman, that on the motion of one member to have the Speaker take the Chair as an appeal from your decision, that that motion must go without a division of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Does the hon. member insist upon that?

Mr. CASEY. To save the convenience of the House, without withdrawing my objection to the ruling, I withdraw my motion to refer.

Assistant Interpreter at Winnipeg..... \$500

Mr. CARLING. This gentleman, Mr. Ohlen, is a very energetic and influential man, and he speaks the Scandinavian and German languages.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman spoke some time ago about these agents at Winnipeg being employed in conducting settlers to their locations; are these interpreters employed for that purpose?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Ohlen has been employed to assist the Scandinavians.

Mr. WATSON. Do these agents proceed from Winnipeg to the settlements with the people to locate them?

Mr. CARLING. Ohlen pays occasional visits to the settlements to see how they are getting along.

Mr. WATSON. When an immigrant arrives in Winnipeg, do these interpreters proceed to the colonies and assist these immigrants in locating on their lands?

Mr. CARLING. I think Mr. Ohlen goes with the parties of Scandinavians. He goes to the colony with them, to see that they are properly settled.

Agent at Victoria, B.C..... \$1,000

Mr. EARLE. I would ask the Minister how it is that the agent at Victoria is only paid \$1,000, while the agent at Vancouver is paid \$1,200.

Mr. CARLING. The agent at Medicine Hat was appointed at \$1,200, and he was removed to Vancouver at the same salary; whereas the officer at Vancouver was getting \$1,200.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Agent at Vancouver..... \$1,200

Mr. MARA. I may say that the efforts of the officer at Vancouver are very much hampered from the fact that there are no accommodations of any kind at that place for immigrants. Very often they take the steamer and go over the Sound. On the other hand, they have to go to boarding-houses or hotels, and as their money does not last very long, they often find themselves a burden on the people of Vancouver. I think sheds ought to be erected there for immigrants. It is the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if immigrant sheds are needed at any place along the line, they are needed there.

Mr. CARLING. The office has only been established a year and a half, and we rented premises for accommodation in the meantime. But I will take a note and consider the matter in order to have sufficient accommodation for immigrants.

Mr. MARA. An application was made for sheds some time ago.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We had better now adjourn, as it is impossible to pass these large items under this head.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not worth while to stop now before we reach the end of this resolution. All the items are the ordinary ones, and the small increases which occur in one or two of them will be explained by the Minister, and if on concurrence more information is required, it can be furnished.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister makes a mistake if he thinks that anything is to be gained by attempting to force through these items. They involve a discussion of the whole immigration policy. I think I am able to assure him that if they are allowed to remain to a later date there will be only a legitimate discussion instead of one which will be scrappy and fragmentary, as the discussion has been for some time. Much time has been wasted to-night on account of the excessive zeal of some hon. members who wished to explain everything for the Minister.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think we should proceed. We have already spent much time this evening on the discussion, and the whole question of immigration has been discussed already.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. The general immigration policy has not been discussed except in scraps and patches. If the Minister insists in trying to force this vote through, he will do so simply by virtue of his majority, and by compelling the Committee to discuss the question at an improper hour and in an improper way. It is against the moral sense of the House and the country. If the Minister of Agriculture had been prepared with his explanations, the items would have been passed long ago. The delay is his fault, it being due either to his lack of knowledge or his unwillingness to impart the information he possesses. I move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. McMULLEN. The request made is a very reasonable one. We have endeavored to gather information from the Minister in regard to many matters of importance, and there remains a general discussion in regard to the whole question of immigration. This is the first night the Opposi-

tion have asked the Government to consent to an adjournment, and it is reasonable the Government should grant that request. If the leader of the Government were present he would doubtless consent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the Minister is bound to go on, we are prepared to go on, but it is certain that the item will not go on. If the Government will not meet us in a proper manner, we will meet them in a parliamentary spirit and discuss the matter at even an improper hour; but the Minister must not think that because he has a majority he is able to force through items without the same having been properly ventilated and discussed. To-day we are going to have the Budget, and at this hour, three o'clock, we should be preparing ourselves for the reception of that speech, and it is unreasonable to ask us to continue. It appears from the Auditor General's Report that Mr. Metcalfe was paid for nine months when he was employed only seven and a-half months, and that he was paid his travelling expenses from Kingston to Winnipeg and return.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You did that once before to-night; you can only do that once in a night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is just as much in order as if he was speaking on a motion to adjourn.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am pleased to know, Mr. Chairman, that your ruling is in accord with my own, for it is very strong presumptive evidence that you are right. When I told the member for Leeds that I knew he was out of order, I felt certain that he was out of order or I would not have told him so. This motion for adjournment is one that requires a good deal of discussion, because it is almost unfortunate that the Minister of Public Works should expect us to finish up all this immigration policy in one evening. I think the requirements of Manitoba and the North-West, demand a more liberal and enlightened policy than has been followed for the past two years. It is about time that a more vigorous policy were adopted, so that that country would be settled up and our countrymen coming back from the United States. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture could tell us some of the causes which have driven Canadians out of Canada into the United States. I hope this motion made by the member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) will carry, because it has my hearty support, and I think it should have the support of the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The motion to adjourn is a proper one, but of course, it has to be regretted that it has to be moved in the face of the declaration of the leader of the House that he wants to finish these items. He was fairly and courteously appealed to by the gentleman leading the House on this side to adjourn, and I think that if the Minister will not now signify his dissent from the proposition, the member for West Elgin will withdraw his motion and permit the Minister of Public Works to substitute a similar one instead. If the leader of the House to-night desires to put items through without discussion at 3 o'clock in the morning, he will find that the country will sustain the members of the Opposition in asking for an adjournment. If the time had been wasted

by the Opposition in discussing these items the Minister might have some reason to refuse the adjournment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will hon. gentlemen say that the discussion with reference to a gentleman drawing a salary apparently without doing any work, for one month and a half at \$150 a month, and of which no explanation is given—will they say that is of no importance to the country? Will gentlemen say that the discussion which took place on the Minister's figures, with regard to immigration has been out of order, when it has been shown conclusively by the Minister's own figures, that he has either misled the country and the House in the statement that 105,000 immigrants had gone into the North-West for five years, or the conclusion must be drawn that there has been an exodus of that amount from the country? I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to point to any single statement made by any gentleman on this side of the House that was not worthy of being made, or that was not pertinent to the subject. If the Opposition had behaved in this matter, as I have known the Minister of Customs and the Postmaster General to act when they were in Opposition, there might be some reason for refusing to adjourn. The Minister of Customs remembers well that on a certain occasion he and his friends then in Opposition were factious, and that they discussed one item all the afternoon and during the long night.

Mr. BOWELL. We did not get out until next night at six o'clock. Sunday was approaching.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I speak only from memory as to the details of the Opposition then, but I know that the Opposition was factious, and when at a late hour they asked for an adjournment the Government of the day would not consent to it. The Minister of Customs shakes his head, but that is my recollection of the incident. There was a motion to adjourn and there was a humorous and witty speech made by the present Postmaster General for two hours, with reference to what Julien had to say or something like that. I say that this side of the House to-night has discussed these matters in a fair manner. If they had acted as the Postmaster General and the Minister of Customs and their friends did on the occasion I have referred to, there might be some reason for the Minister of Customs refusing to adjourn now.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will remember that the speech of the Postmaster General on the occasion referred to, had nothing to do whatever with Estimates. It was a question of adjournment with reference to the dismissal of his Ministry by Lieutenant Governor Letellier.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman knows that he did not pursue as fair a course as we pursued to-night. We have treated this discussion fairly, but he did not act then as we have done on this—

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, no, I would not think of

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am quite sure that if the leader of the House signifies his intention to adjourn now, my friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) will withdraw his motion. If the House does not adjourn it will look as if the Government wish to get through some items which will not bear inves-

tigation. I have a Committee at half past ten this morning, and another at eleven o'clock, and I suppose most hon. gentlemen present have business to attend to.

Mr. HICKEY. If you had made that speech to the subject, we would have it decided now.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In all probability there will be a long sitting of the House to-day as the Budget will be brought down. I am, therefore, in favor of the Committee rising, and if it should come to a division I shall feel compelled to vote in that direction. I think, under the circumstances it would be nonsense to go on discussing this question, which will bring in the whole subject of the exodus.

Mr. CASEY. I have stated that if we are compelled to go on, it will be necessary to discuss the general policy of the Government in regard to immigration; but I think with my hon. friend who has just sat down, that the attempt to secure grants of money by physical torture can hardly be endorsed by this Committee or by the public at large. I do not know any phrase which will more correctly describe the conduct of the hon. Minister of Public Works in compelling us to pass these items before leaving this House, under the threat of the most overwhelming fatigue if we go on. I think physical torture to extract money has long been considered contrary to the British constitution; and whether that torture is applied by thumbscrews or by speeches from the hon. member for North Perth, or explanations from the hon. member for East Grey made on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, I believe it to be equally unconstitutional. We have been delayed by the inefficiency of the Minister in charge of these estimates. He has sat with an expression of apathy on his countenance, apparently the least interested man in the House, while discussions of the most vital nature connected with this Department have been going on; and when he has been at last forced to his feet, he has had to consult the deputy who sits for his convenience on the floor of the House, and has given us the most lame, inconsequential and sometimes contradictory explanations of the questions that have been asked. In other cases he has refused to give us explanations, saying that he did not know whether the information was in his Department or not. It appears that there are a great many things in the Department that the Minister of Agriculture does not know. It is impossible that he should have listened to the impassioned discourse of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) without having some inkling of his duties. That hon. gentleman said, and I must repeat it with strongest approbation, that the heart, the very vital essence of a truly national, patriotic policy was a good policy of immigration. We have vast, unknown, natural resources, which a good system of immigration would develop by bringing the right people into the country.

Mr. POPE. Spend your money if you want immigrants.

Mr. CASEY. I would recommend to the Minister the axiom that out of the mouths of babes and sucklings he may gather wisdom, and he may gather from the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and who has not been quite a Session in

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

the House—he may gather even from this parliamentary babe and suckling—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The expression is not parliamentary.

Mr. CASEY. If that be not parliamentary language I will withdraw the one or the other. I will withdraw the babe—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Both expressions are out of order.

Mr. CASEY. I withdraw both at your request Sir, though I do not think the language is unparliamentary. Well, even this young member of the House is able to give a pointer to the Minister of Agriculture as to the best means of getting immigration. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will make a note of it. You must spend money in a judicious way, and not by paying a bonus of \$2 a head for the pauper children imported from England last year, according to the Auditor General's Report. That is not the way to make the prairie blossom like the rose. I require before the Committee rises a statement as to the reasons for giving a bonus for imported pauper children from the workhouses of England. We have established a great railway company that owns most of the land in the North-West, and the argument at one time was that this company would take active measures to promote immigration in order to develop its own lands, but so far it has left practically everything to the Government, and instead of being an immigration agency the railway line has been an agency for transporting people from one end of the Dominion to the other, and has done a great deal to diminish the value of land in the Province of Ontario by this means. I have yet to learn of any large scheme planned by the Canadian Pacific Railway at its own expense to bring in people to this country. If they did not spend so much money in building competing lines against existing railways, they would have benefited the country, and would have had a large traffic from the North-West, that would have rendered them quite independent of the lines in older Canada and enabled them to pay handsome dividends. They would have had from their own land such quantities of wheat to carry to the seaboard that they would have been independent of all these considerations. The company then have been derelict in their duty in not carrying out their promise—for I believe it was a promise—we were told in this House that it was a promise—to relieve the Government from the burthen of promoting immigration. The Government, on the other hand, failed in their duty in not compelling the company to do that which they agreed to do. Of course it is absurd to speak of the Government compelling that company to do anything. It would be more reasonable to speak of the company compelling the Government to do what it wanted. Still, the Government might have used their influence as benefactors of that company; they might have tried to influence these capitalists, whom they have so enormously enriched, to relieve the taxpayer of the burthen placed upon him. This they have not done, and they are therefore equally to blame with the railway company for this state of affairs. Those of us who then sat in this House at the time may remember the glowing statistics which were presented to the House by the Premier when he was asking us to give further

aid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in regard to the tremendous influx of immigration which was to come into that country.

Mr. HESSON. I think it is hardly fair to attack the Canadian Pacific Railway Company when its solicitor is not present.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think any one could be more solicitous on behalf of that railway company than my hon. friend who has just interrupted me. I think the interests of that company are quite safe in his hands, especially as he has another friend of the company on his right and another on his left, besides an isolated case (Hon. Mr. Bowell) in another direction. I think the hon. gentleman may be quite easy in his mind as to the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway. However, I was going in another direction when the hon. gentleman headed me off, and I may now have to go in a third direction in consequence of his interruption. There are several things that must be said and that will be said before this item can pass. I will call attention to another class of immigration which I think should be encouraged. I spoke of the importation of pauper children, and of the Government giving bonuses to that class of immigrants, but I desire now to call the attention of the Government to the fact that there are many young men in England with sufficient means to buy farms in Manitoba or the North-West, or even in Ontario, young men with say £1,000 or able to obtain that amount from their friends after showing that they would have a good investment for it on this side. A few of this class have come out to this country and have done well, but the larger number have gone to Australia or New Zealand, colonies which are perhaps better known than Canada to the people of England—better known perhaps, because there have been young men of good means, who have gone there and succeeded, and who, through their relatives, have advertised those colonies and have kept the people of Great Britain interested in the progress of those colonies. They not only take out large amounts of capital with them, but young men of the class to which I refer generally become useful citizens. Now, what has been done to encourage the immigration of that class of young men to Canada? Most of that which has been done has been done by people who have advertised in England themselves, or by the means of agencies, that they would receive young men who desired to learn farming, would give them instruction, and supply them with proper food either for the payment of a bonus, or for a regular payment for a certain time. This business has fallen largely into the hands of irresponsible people. Parents in the old country have concluded bargains with people here about whom they knew nothing, they have paid down large bonuses, and afterwards they have discovered that they have got nothing for their money. This sort of thing has perhaps done more to discredit Canada in the eyes of the English people than anything which the Minister has hitherto done can possibly counteract. It is sad to have to say it, but the very tragedy which occupies so much attention nowadays—the murder of poor Benwell—has a connection with this matter. No doubt that murder has attracted great attention in the old country, and the manner in which it has been discussed in our press has tended to lead people to the view that this was a deliberate plot to bring that poor young man out

here for the purpose of murdering him when he got here, and to secure what money he had, or the money that was to be paid for him by his friends. It does not take many of these suspicious circumstances to cause a vast growth of suspicion in the British mind, which is rather home-keeping and insular in the class to which I refer. Rival immigration agents will endeavor to create the impression that any young Englishman who comes out here on such an errand may be enticed into a cedar swamp and shot in the back of the head, and there are many people in England, I am sorry to say, who are so ignorant of Canada as to believe the statement. There may be some things, however, to create confidence. There are now two serious problems before the Minister of Agriculture. First, how is he to get rid of the shade thrown on Canada by this tragedy; and then, how is he to get rid of the lesser scandal as to the way in which these young Englishmen have been treated when they have come here. As to the case of murder itself, I think it will be sufficient to prove to the English people that full justice has been done to get rid of their suspicions on that account. As to the other question, there is some ground for the suspicion which is entertained in the old country. It is clear that these young men have been brought here, swindled out of their money, and turned loose in a country they practically knew nothing about. I would make a suggestion to the Minister in this connection. It would not be difficult to organize in Canada respectable associations composed, say, of respectable stock-raisers or farmers in each neighborhood, who had land to sell. These associations, having plenty of capital and thoroughly respectable, might take charge of the young English emigrant and educate him for farming, and put him in a position to make his living upon the farm. The great question for the people of England is to satisfy themselves that they can safely entrust their sons in the hands of these associations. Now, here is my proposition—that a register should be opened in the office of the High Commissioner in London for the registration of parties willing to accept and to board young emigrants, and teach them farming. The High Commissioner should first satisfy himself of the *bona fides* of these applicants, and of their standing, and, if found satisfactory, he should then enter their names upon this register, and it should be made known by advertisement to all intending emigrants, that everybody entered on the High Commissioner's register was known by him to be a respectable and proper person to take charge of young men wishing to learn farming. If that policy were carried out, I think we could secure a class of young men very valuable to the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to this question of agencies in Europe, I have always thought that money has been uselessly squandered in connection with the offices which have been kept up in London, Glasgow and other places. A great deal of money has been spent in distributing pamphlets, in travelling expenses of European agents, in order to encourage emigrants to come to this country. I think that a complete change should be made in that system, and that we could do very well, say, with one agent at leading shipping points such as Liverpool and Glasgow. We are now subject to a debt that requires us to pay something like ten

millions and a quarter of interest annually, and in the face of that, it is the duty of the Opposition in this House, and it should be the duty of the supporters of the Government, to seriously consider every item in the expenditure that is proposed. I contend that in connection with immigration a great deal of money has been uselessly squandered. It appears to me that whenever a devoted supporter of the Government wants a position in which he can draw a respectable salary, he is shelved into some position in the Department of Agriculture. I believe we should largely curtail the expenses connected with immigration. It is quite clear that we assist a large number of immigrants who eventually become residents of the United States. This is much to be deplored, and we should endeavor to ascertain the reasons before we vote \$48,000 for immigration expenses. At present our people are paying money for the purpose of bringing over immigrants to subsequently leave us. The embarrassed condition of our people, due to our enormous debt, created partly for public improvements and partly for unnecessary works, should forbid further expenditure on immigration unless we are convinced beyond doubt that the people we bring here will remain with us. If we could erect a barrier to prevent them going to the United States, as we have erected a commercial barrier by adopting the National Policy, immigration might be useful. If the Government could change their policy so as to secure beneficial results from this immigration, we might continue the present policy. We all admit the country must be filled with people, and that this is an absolute necessity. The condition of the country is such and our present debt is so enormous that the people can no longer bear it unless we add very largely to our population. Nothing will tend to relieve our burden so much as a large influx of population. If the people brought here are found to remain only a year or two and afterwards leave for the United States that is a matter to be deplored, and if our money is being spent uselessly and the United States are obtaining our immigrants, it is a serious matter. It is highly important in the public interest that full time should be allowed to discuss our immigration policy. We are entitled to the information we have asked from the Minister, and we have already allowed several items to pass without discussion simply because the Minister has not been able to answer questions previously submitted to him. I hold that under these circumstances the Minister should consent that these items should stand over, and that he should present to this Committee a reply to the questions which have been put with regard to Mr. Metcalfe, and other matters to-night, and which have not been answered by the Minister of Agriculture. His deputy sits beside the hon. gentleman, and is no doubt capable of discharging his duty as Deputy Minister, but yet we have been unable to get any information. The Opposition has a high duty to perform as well as the Government, and what would the country think if the Opposition allowed these items to pass the House without getting information. We have a painful duty to perform in taking this course, but we must discharge the duty that devolves upon us. I hold that the immigration policy of the Government is a most important one. We have a vast domain which we want to fill up with settlers, and when we go to enormous expense to bring emigrants out here,

Mr. McMULLEN.

we should take some steps to ensure their permanent residence amongst us. It is not right nor just, that people should be brought out here at the expense of the country, and then that they should go across to the United States. Notwithstanding that the Minister reported to-night, that there was a large increase of population in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, yet when we took the census we found they were 103,000 short of the number there ought to be there. We should have some information as to where these people went to. Again, the hon. Minister referred to the increase of population in the different Provinces last year, and we found hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario and Quebec, who thoroughly know the Provinces they spoke of, showing conclusively that this increase in population as stated by the hon. Minister, did not take place. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) endeavored to argue that the increased population of the city of Toronto showed the destination of these immigrants, but it was conclusively shown by hon. gentlemen, as I know it to be the case in my own district, that the population of the city of Toronto is increased, not by immigration, but by people leaving the towns and villages adjoining, and congregating in that city. If we pay \$300,000 a year to bring people into this country, we should see that we get some return for it, and that the people when they do come, will remain here. Unfortunately we have been making this country a very expensive one to live in, and people from the old country who are induced to come out here, on the representation that it is a cheap country to live in, soon find by bitter experience, that Canada is not the country they had supposed it to be. I should like to see some system inaugurated by which immigrants should be induced to stay in this country, and some evils remedied, the removal of which would tend in the same direction. In place of helping immigrants to come out here to become paupers in many cases, I think it would be much better for us to offer a bonus of ten or twenty or thirty dollars to those who should become residents, erect a house, cultivate a portion of land and make certain improvements. At present many of those who come out have nothing left by the time they come here, and they go around from town to town and from village to village, in many instances contributing to the large army of tramps. That is not a desirable class to bring out. Then, the hon. member for Marquette spoke of that stamp of Englishman known as the "dude," who is a totally useless kind of immigrant. If he has plenty of sovereigns in his pocket he may make a desirable settler, but after he spends the few dollars he has, he becomes a burden to those he has got acquainted with, and turns out to be perfectly useless. There are many possible improvements in our immigration system that we should seriously consider, and it is unfair that the Minister of Agriculture should ask us to consent to the continuation of votes to employ men as immigration agents to dance about from pillar to post assisting the Tory party in elections. Instead of attempting to force through this committee items which should not be passed at all, the Government should consent to adjourn and give the Minister of Agriculture an opportunity of studying the records that he must have in his Department so as to enable

him to give answers to many of the questions to which we have received no reply. We have dealt fairly and generously with the Minister of Public Works when passing the items of his Department. Although we have been here some two months, we have not before to-night asked the Government by resolution to agree to an adjournment, and they have refused to grant that simple request, although nearly all the items in the first statement of the Estimates have passed. We are to have the Budget Speech to-day, and we shall be in a very poor condition to listen to it if we should be compelled to sit up all night. So far as I am concerned, I should be glad to see a compromise arrived at, so that we might go home and get some rest to prepare for the duties of to-morrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the question of adjournment was mooted by hon. gentlemen opposite, the offer I made to them on behalf of the majority of this House, was that the items to complete this resolution should be passed now, because if we do not do it, all the items that we have been discussing could not be reported to-day, but they would remain as if not passed at all. I suggested that the discussion should continue on concurrence, and if this will meet the views of hon. gentlemen, let it be understood between the two sides of the House that hon. gentlemen may speak to this resolution on concurrence as if in the Committee of the Whole, not being limited to one speech. I renew that offer, and I think hon. gentlemen should accept it; otherwise, let us go on.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I cannot agree to that, because we know very well that even though this agreement may be entered into, it is impossible to have a proper discussion on concurrence, because the members are then anxious to get away and will not listen. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works should allow an adjournment. I do not think that in discussing the Estimates we have so far shown any disposition to delay them wherever they have been fair and proper. While the hon. Minister's own estimates were under consideration and were criticised freely, there was no unnecessary delay or undue criticism. The estimates of the Minister of Marine were also passed with very little objection; and as the hon. member for North Wellington has said, this is the first time that we have asked for an adjournment of any votes. The question of immigration is a very important one and ought to be discussed fully and freely, and I think we are not asking anything unreasonable in asking that the subject should stand over for the purpose of fuller discussion. If that is done, the Minister of Agriculture will probably be able to give information which will shorten the discussion, and our duty on both sides will be done.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The discussion can be had on concurrence on this resolution. Where there is an understanding between the two sides of the House it will be kept, so that on concurrence this discussion can be renewed if hon. gentlemen choose. I have no doubt any other information the Minister of Agriculture may be able to give, he will give with pleasure on concurrence. If hon. gentleman will not accept that, but wish us to go on with the discussion, we are ready.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Public Works cannot deny that the Minister of Agriculture has not been able to answer the questions we

have asked him as to why Mr. Metcalfe was paid for work done at Winnipeg, when he never left Kingston. Neither the Minister nor the Deputy is in a position to answer, and all we ask is an adjournment until such time as they can give us the necessary information.

Mr. HESSON. Hon. gentlemen opposite have had a very wide field in discussing the items before the committee, and on the very next vote, that of quarantine, they will be able still further to discuss questions connected with immigration. It would be a waste of time to leave this vote entirely open so that we could have a renewed discussion on every one of the items. We ought to look at this matter in a reasonable light, and nothing can be gained by our sitting here, and if the leader of the Opposition were here, or the gentleman who discusses financial matters on the other side we would not have drifted into the position we are now in. I had hoped the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) would have realised the position and induced his hon. friends to consent to the item being passed. For this is really not such an important question that we should sit up all night over it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Hon. members on this side are as willing as hon. gentlemen opposite that an amicable arrangement should be come to, and we were willing early in the evening that certain items should pass through, but the Minister of Public Works said that if we did not pass all the items, we might remain here all night. That was a very unfair proceeding on his part, in reply to the very fair proposition of gentlemen on this side. There are many reasons why we should not take this matter into consideration on concurrence. The hon. gentleman has his deputy here, and ought to be in a position to give us the information we require, and, failing that, should allow the item to stand until he is able to give it to us. The hon. gentleman is placing himself in this position before the people, that the Opposition were compelled to keep up the debate the whole night in order to obtain the information necessary to an intelligent understanding of the item under discussion. It would be nothing more than right for the Minister of Public Works to accord that opportunity now to the Minister of Agriculture so that he may not be placed in this wrong position. I do not complain of the Minister of Agriculture, because, no doubt, he relies to a large extent upon his deputy to supply him with this information. For some reason the deputy is unable to give the information to the Minister, and, therefore, we are in the disagreeable position of differing with the Minister of Agriculture with whom we would desire to be on the very best of terms, and to whom we would yield almost anything, because we all hold him in high esteem. We are not blaming him, but his deputy, who could have provided the necessary information. This is a late hour. We have been sitting thirteen hours, and this is a hard strain physically and mentally upon those who take a lively interest in the affairs of the country; but it is the bounden duty of the Opposition to insist that, when full information is not given, a delay shall take place in order that we may obtain the information we require. We are asked to allow this item to pass with the promise that on concurrence we will have every opportunity to discuss it freely, but

we know the unusual sounds which occur in the dying hours of the Session, when members desire to return home, and it requires more cheek than either you, Mr. Chairman, or I possess, to address the House at that time and resist those interruptions. That sort of promise is a fallacy. We have been caught in that sort of a trap, and misled in that way before. The innocents on this side have been misled by the astute ones on the other side. My friend from Perth (Mr. Hesson), comes to the rescue of the Minister, and says we have had ample opportunity of discussing this question. No doubt, with his powerful ability, with his large grasp of abstruse and difficult subjects, he may have been in possession of all the information necessary to form his opinions, but it is not everyone in this House who is capable of understanding a subject so readily and so thoroughly as that hon. gentleman. Ample information may have been given to satisfy him, or perhaps he may accept things blindly. Some members are not desirous to have very great information before they form an opinion, and it may be from the intelligent view my hon. friend has taken, or from his zeal to show himself an ardent, a faithful and almost a servile supporter of the Government, that he has come to the conclusion that we have discussed this question long enough.

Mr. HESSON. Not discussed it at all.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am glad to hear the confession of the hon. gentleman. I think that is about the amount of intelligence he brings to bear upon any subject before the House. He does not discuss any subject, but he tries to lead us to believe that this matter had been thoroughly discussed and that we had all the information we desired. If there be one more important subject than another for us to consider here, it is the immigration policy of the country. We found to-night one of the faithful supporters of the Government, a gentleman of great ability, who frequently comes to the defence of the Government, denouncing their immigration policy, and straightly objecting to their want of ability and their inefficiency. When we find an important question of this kind, on which even the supporters of the Government cannot agree, these items ought not to be rushed through in a few hours. How does the Minister of Public Works know, when he finds one of his principal supporters differing from him on this subject, whether he might not have been defeated in a vote of this committee if the question had gone to a vote? The question then naturally arises whether we ought to continue the system of importing immigrants from the old country to Canada in the manner in which we have been doing it. Then we have another class of immigrants coming from the old country, what is called the pauper class; we have children being imported here from various institutions. I am well aware that some defend the idea of bringing these little waifs out here to be raised in this country, to intermingle and intermarry with the citizens of Canada. Now, so far as I have been able to ascertain, after careful consideration, I am led to the conclusion that the system is a bad one, and that it ought no longer to be continued. Again, we elicited the information to-night that the agents of steamboat companies receive \$5 a head for every individual they induced to come to Canada. Now, will the

Mr. WILSON (Elgin),

Minister of Agriculture tell me that that is a proper system, that it is a judicious system, to bring that class of people out here, perfectly regardless of their character or condition, just for the sake of the steamboat agent getting his \$5 a head? That is a system which, I think, cannot be defended in the interest of this country. We were told to-night, also, that it was a right and proper thing that an individual should be appointed to a position in Winnipeg, in the intelligence office in that city, and that he should be paid for his time, while occupied in doing something else. The question is as to why Mr. Metcalfe is so highly recommended by the Minister of Agriculture. Is it not because he occupies a position in the Tory ranks and as a member of the Ontario Legislature acts as a sort of lieutenant and follower of Mr. Meredith? We have not heard of any wonderful work he has accomplished in Winnipeg. We found, on the contrary, that the department was able to run many months without his services and that no complaints were received respecting the management during his absence. It is no doubt true that the gentleman was placed in the public service in order to do service to Mr. Meredith and the Opposition in the Local Legislature. It has been shown that he was paid a salary from 1st April although he did not go to Winnipeg until 16th May, and probably during the interval he was doing battle for Mr. Meredith. Although the Minister pretends that his engagement was in the interest of the Department his real object was to do service to Mr. Meredith and the Opposition in the Local Legislature. The Minister of Agriculture has to-night declared that if they wish to do so they will employ Mr. Metcalfe in the future. We know that the Government will so act from our experience in the past, but that is no reason why the Opposition members of this House should not have something to say in regard to all public affairs. We cannot forget that the Budget speech has to be delivered to-day, and that we should have an opportunity for rest before that is delivered. No doubt hon. gentlemen opposite have been waiting information from Washington as to the tariff changes. It may not be so, and I hope it is not. I believe it is their duty to do what is right and proper in the interests of the Dominion of Canada. If it pleases the American people, well and good, but we have rights we ought to contend for, and to uphold, and I do not think we ought to delay the matter, awaiting the course they intend to pursue on the other side. We know that when information is desired on this side of the House, we have been told that it is not prudent in the interests of the country that that information should be given. We have been treated with that reservation of information, and to-night information of the most trivial kind, is withheld from us. I should think that the Minister who is leading the House might consider this matter and allow us to go home, provided we say to him we will reserve the last item, and we will let you pass all the others. That is all we now ask. For my part, if I had my own way, I would not concede any more than to move that the committee should rise, because I feel that we have been treated badly by the Government to-night. If ever there was an Opposition treated unjustly and unfairly we have been treated in that manner to-night. We asked for reasonable information and we were told by the Minister of Agri-

culture that if we did not like what we got we could move a vote of want of confidence. That is a cool proposition for a member of the Government to make, whose duty it is to give the public information. I really think the Opposition is deserving of an apology from the Minister of Agriculture. A wrong has been committed against us and it should be apologised for. I do not believe that the Minister of Agriculture is cowardly, for his boldness to-night would indicate the reverse, but it is his duty to apologise for his action. We do not want to move a vote of want of confidence in him, because we are not so anxious as that to drive him out of power; but we want the information we are entitled to in reference to Metcalfe and to the dismissal of Mr. Grahame. We heard something about Mr. Grahame's dismissal, but would not have got even that if we did not extract it from him. Now, Mr. Chairman, what would you do under the same circumstances if you were a member of the Opposition? Do you not think we ought to feel aggrieved; would you not under the circumstances feel very indignant? I can imagine your countenance, and how furiously you would look if you were in the Opposition. I am sure that smiling face would not continue if you were placed in the same position as we are. I know that the other Ministers would not treat us in the same manner as the Minister of Agriculture did to-night. They are kind-hearted, generous people, and I thought the Minister of Agriculture was one of them as well, but I am disappointed and I am sorry for it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Give him a chance and he will give you the information.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Did I hear a sound in the distance; not a very intelligent sound, but a sort of breathing as of some person in agony. I think I heard that voice before; it was not long ago since I heard its owner rise to a point of order and he found his point of order as well taken as his knowledge of other subjects which he brings forward on the floor of the House; just a little mistaken. I have here a pamphlet issued by the Government, and sent broadcast throughout Great Britain, inviting artisans and mechanics to come to this country to compete against the workingmen who have to contribute towards the expense of issuing this pamphlet and bringing those men here. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whether petitions have not been sent to him and, whether deputations have not waited upon him in opposition to such a course, claiming that it is unjust and unfair to the laboring classes. The hon. leader of the Government, when the Knights of Labor waited upon him in Toronto, said that it was right of the workingmen to have ample protection. I would call the attention of the hon. member for West York to the fact that he has many labor organisations in his constituency, and I would ask him to put his veto on a pamphlet like this. But I suppose this book had to be written; I suppose the Minister had some hanger-on whom he wanted to benefit, and some newspaper which had to be subsidised; I suppose, if we could find out, we should learn that this book has been overpaid for. Although the Government appointed a commission to go from one end of Canada to the other to obtain information on which to base legislation for the protection of the laboring classes,

and although that legislation was promised in the speech from the Throne, we do not see any sign of it yet, and we have no hopes that they are going to protect as they ought the laboring classes with whom they pretend to have so much sympathy. We find this immigration business a very fruitful source of corruption. You can hardly find a Conservative newspaper from one end of the Dominion to the other which does not receive large sums for printing pamphlets or some other kind of immigration documents; and will any one tell me that a paper receiving large subsidies from the Government will be likely to express an independent opinion on the measures of the day? They will not be as independent as the hon. member for Assiniboia, who, although getting large grants for his paper, came forward and condemned the Government's course; but the majority of these papers will of necessity speak favorably of the Government. Now, we should have some information in regard to the contracts let for printing immigration pamphlets and similar documents. Under the circumstances I do not think any good purpose can be served by the Minister of Public Works in trying to force this discussion through, when we desire to obtain from the Minister of Agriculture information which we are entitled to have. I am perfectly satisfied that if the hon. Minister persists, this discussion must go on, as we cannot neglect our duty by allowing this item to pass without the information we desire. When the information is given and the explanation made, then we should be justified in allowing the item to pass, but until then I think it should stand.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I feel much as my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, that it is a great pity indeed that the hon. Minister of Public Works did not accept the offer made to him on this side of the House early in the evening. We have been discussing a very important question, and one in which the people are deeply interested, and the discussion has been carried on in that calm and judicial spirit that ought to be exhibited in the House of Commons. We made very good progress, but when two o'clock in the morning arrived, the proposition was made that we should adjourn. That was only a reasonable proposition, and it should have met with acceptance by the Government, especially in view of the fact that we have been looking forward to the Budget speech this afternoon, as the most important event of late years, in view of the changes which the Government intimated would be made in the tariff. There are many reasons why these items should be allowed to stand. Here is the next clause which we have been discussing, \$5,900 for agents in Europe. There are a hundred questions which will suggest themselves before that is voted. Between business men, in such a transaction as that, it would be asked where the money was to be spent, and how the money which was last provided was spent. These and a hundred other questions would arise, and it is, therefore, reasonable that a question of this kind should have been allowed to stand when it was requested at the hour of half-past three in the morning. One could hardly believe that the Minister of Public Works, who is leading the House, would be so cruel as to compel us to sit until now, when it is a quarter past five in the morning, and to ask us to let these large amounts go through without our

asking a question or getting any information in regard to them. The old saying is "better late than never," and I think even now the Minister of Public Works ought to relent and allow the motion to carry. The Opposition would be utterly neglectful of their duties if they did not discuss these items fully and freely. It is our money you are spending as well as yours, and the people have a right to know how the money is spent. It is the duty also of the supporters of the Government to criticise this expenditure. It is not their duty to simply vote blindly for anything the Government proposes. They are human, as well as the rest of us, and, therefore, it is the duty of their supporters to investigate every item, as well as it is our duty. Here is an item of \$55,000, and another of \$16,000, and the Minister of Public Works asks that we shall allow these to go through without any criticism. Otherwise, he compels us to sit up all night, and endure all this fatigue simply because he has got his back up and is determined to push this through, and throttle the Opposition or make them suffer these consequences. I do not think in this age any Minister can afford to take a stand like that. When we look over the Auditor General's Report, we see an utterly wilful waste of public money. In regard to the item of \$5,900 for agents in Europe, a great many questions will come up for discussion. I find in the London agency a gentleman of the name of J. G. Colmer, secretary, who receives a salary of \$2,195. One would expect that for that amount he ought to perform his duties very faithfully, but, further on, we find that he also received an amount of money for his fares and his living expenses for so many days, his cabs and telegrams, and even his income tax. It seems strange that this Dominion should pay the tax on this gentleman's income. Surely his salary is large enough to enable him to pay his own taxes. That is only one instance, and I venture to say the discussion of this vote will take at least two days, and yet the Minister of Public Works wants to force it through in a few hours and without any information as to how the money voted last year had been spent. I find another matter which certainly requires investigation. I find the name of Mr. C. C. Chipman, who figures in the Public Accounts, in connection with the London agency in England, for the amount of \$422. Now, I would like to know who Mr. Chipman is? What are his duties? What has he been doing? Then I find that Sir Charles Tupper figures here for \$210 more. Who is Sir Charles Tupper? There is a gentleman by that name, a High Commissioner in London, drawing his salary of \$10,000 from the people of this country. I think probably it is the same gentleman, and he is supposed to take a lively interest in every thing that pertains to the welfare of Canada. On page C—76 you will find that Sir Charles Tupper figures again in the Public Accounts. We have been paying him ground rent of his official residence, \$332.15; taxes, \$97.33; income tax, \$250. Then we paid insurance premium on the house, \$35.90; parochial rates of official residence, \$324.34. I find we are paying Sir Charles Tupper, besides his salary, \$1,250.10, and then we make him an allowance of \$2,000. That makes \$13,250 that Sir Charles Tupper gets as High Commissioner for Canada. Then you go through the different offices, we find various large sums of expenditure which ought to be thoroughly investigated. An enormous sum is paid in connection with the

Mr. CAMPBELL.

different agencies which requires explanation. I desire to enter my solemn protest against the proceedings of this evening. They have not been creditable to the Government or to the House or to the Minister of Public Works. An effort has been made to force the Opposition to yield to the pressure of superior numbers and to neglect their duties to the country. During these fourteen years we have spent \$3,595,818 on immigration, a large amount of which has been literally wasted. Attention was called to the fact by the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie), that out of the militia appropriation of \$1,250,000 for militia, only \$250,000 went to pay the members of the force. The same remark would apply to our immigration system, a large amount of money being spent each year on maintaining an army of agents in England, Ireland and Scotland, and in this country and elsewhere. It is a useless expenditure to maintain an agent in London or Hamilton. There is no field for immigrants at these places. Some years ago a number of immigrants came to Chatham and remained a short time as a burden on the municipal council, drifting away afterwards to the other side the line. These immigrants do not remain in the country but go to the Western States. The large proportion of the immigrants are literally no good, because they are unfitted for the needs of this country. From 1881 to 1885 the Minister of Agriculture presented a carefully prepared statement of the number of immigrants who had settled in the Dominion during the past year. He stated how many English, Irish, Scotch and other immigrants settled in the North West. They had no means of contradicting the accuracy of those statements, and so it went on from year to year, and the Minister actually told us that from 1881 to 1885, there settled in Manitoba and the North-West 154,403 persons. This statement was said to be from a carefully prepared report, and there was supposed to be no doubt about its accuracy. Unfortunately, however, the census was taken in 1885 and the castles built up by the Government as to the condition of things in the North-West fell to the ground. The census proved that the statements submitted to this House were utterly unreliable and misleading in all their details.

Mr. HESSON. That is awfully stale.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. member for North Perth no doubt does not like that. The medicine may be a little strong for him, but it is good for his health, and I recommend him to take it like a little man. By the census taken in 1881, the population was shown to be 122,400 in the North-West Territories and Manitoba, so that if the hon. gentleman's statements were correct we ought to have had in 1885, 276,803 of a population. When the census was taken in 1885, however, there was only 173,363. With such mis-statements before us, is it any wonder now that we should complain when this same Deputy Minister, who has shown himself incompetent, and ignorant of the simplest details of his office, comes down and tells us he has placed so many in Manitoba, and the North-West, and the Provinces of the Dominion, that we should doubt the accuracy of his statement? I wish to bring before this House the policy that ought be pursued towards settling up our North-West. We have a magnificent and fertile country there, but it struck me when the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly)

was speaking to-night as rather strange that we had to pay so much money to induce farmers to go up there. I have no doubt that the statements he made about the prosperity of certain men who have gone to the North-West were strictly accurate; but, on the other hand, a very large number of the people who went up there have had their crops destroyed by frosts during the past few years. I know one smart intelligent young man from my own town who went up there five years ago, and his father told me a short time before I left home, that he just had a letter from his son and that during the last five years he had not one single crop because the frost killed them. The National Policy of the Government has also injured the farmers in that country, because they have got to pay duties of from 35 to 40 per cent. on everything they import into Manitoba for use on their farms. If you could only relieve the settlers of this incubus, you would settle up the country faster than you could in any other way. The taxes are especially burdensome on the North-West, as they have no factories, and are compelled to bring all their manufactured articles from Ontario or the United States. I desire also to call attention to a valuable and authentic work entitled "An Official Handbook of Information relating to the Dominion of Canada, published with the approval of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, by the Department of Agriculture." This was published in January, 1890, and I find on page 59 a paragraph which I think ought to be repudiated at once by the Government, and ought never to have appeared, because it inflicts great injustice on the mechanics and artisans of this country. In speaking of the manufacturers and the demand for labor, it says:

"Men to work and develop the agriculture and mineral resources are therefore the kind of immigrants Ontario is most in need of. Agriculture from this being the leading industry, stands in the first place, but as well as wanting men to clear its forests and cultivate its soil, it requires to build its houses, to make furniture and household goods and open up communication from one part of the country to the other by the construction of roads and railroads."

Now, Sir, I do not think the Government ought to have allowed a paragraph like that to appear in an official document intended to be circulated broadcast in all European countries. The Government are using the money of the artisans and mechanics of this country to bring people out to compete with them. We are now protecting the manufacturers by placing heavy duties on imported goods which compete with their products, and instead of granting the same privilege to the mechanics and artisans, we are actually taking money from them to bring competitors into their field of labor. The Government ought to withdraw this document altogether from circulation, because this paragraph is utterly untrue. We have in Ontario plenty of men to build our houses, to make our furniture and household goods, and to open up communication by the construction of roads and railroads without importing a single man. A great many of our mechanics and artisans in the town I come from have been obliged to leave to seek for work in other fields, some going to California, some to Windsor and some to Chicago. Therefore, I think this whole matter of the immigration policy of the Government ought to receive our earnest consideration, and ought to be fully and freely dis-

cussed. I think the Government ought even now to accede to the request from this side of the House and allow the Committee to rise and report progress. I am quite sure, if the hon. First Minister had been in his place, he would not have objected to the reasonable request of the acting leader of this side of the House.

Motion that the Committee rise negatived: Yeas, 16; Nays, 24.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Committee seem disposed to go on with the work. As motions similar to the one just voted on allow a little more latitude in discussion, I intend to close my observations with the motion that the Committee rise. However, before doing so I would say that I am afraid the Minister of Public Works who is compelling the Committee to sit until this unreasonable hour, has not been paying attention to the proceedings of the Committee. He has been anything but active in the discharge of his duties. He folded his arms and did not steal silently away, but fell silently asleep. I suppose he felt conscious of his strength, and wished to show what a grand and magnificent leader he would make, if he were only at the head of the Conservative party. He may have had great dreams in that respect, but I question very much if his tactics were those of a prudent general, because, if he thinks he is wearing out his opponents, he is also wearing out his friends. His conduct can only be susceptible of one interpretation in the country, and that is that when a responsible head of a department found himself unable to account satisfactorily for expenditures, he had recourse to superior numbers at his back in order to prevent a fair and proper discussion of the expenditure of the people's money being made. I cannot tell what the intention of the hon. Minister may be, but the disposition of the Opposition is not, at present, so long as they are able to carry on a discussion in the interests of the country, to allow tens of thousands of dollars of the money of the people to be voted away and expended in a manner not warranted in the public interest, without endeavoring to find out the particulars. We have no desire to delay business; we desire to accelerate business as much as possible consistently with the public interest. The Committee know that when questions were asked with reference to the subjects under discussion, how utterly unable the Government were to supply such information as could be accepted by this side. We could not be charged with being hypercritical. When the hon. Minister announced the figures of the immigration into the different Provinces, the members from the different Provinces could not accept his statement as correct. It was their bounden duty to ascertain, if possible, what machinery had been made use of to obtain these results and produce these misleading statements, which have been placed before the House and the country by the Department of Agriculture—statements calculated to do harm instead of good. The Department of Agriculture declared by these statements that there was a large immigration into the fertile prairies of the North-West, but we had a subsequent statement from the same Department which showed that in five years over 100,000 people had left the North-West and Manitoba, and gone out of our Dominion altogether, so that that Province and those Territories had become depopulated by one-

half. We endeavored to ascertain where the mistake was and information was not vouchsafed. Unwilling to believe that there was such a vast migration from the small population of Manitoba and the North-West, I was inclined rather to accept this solution: not that these people had actually left the country but that the Department of Agriculture, when they said they went in, had placed a false and misleading statement before us. There was no reflection cast upon the *bonâ fides* of the Minister of Agriculture, but his attention was called to the fact that there evidently were errors, and that there must be defective machinery somewhere to have led us astray. It was only right and proper that the Committee should bring its mind to bear on the subject and help the Minister to solve the difficulty, and devise better machinery to obtain better results. Hon. gentlemen on this side pointed out that if the head of the Department found he was right, and that he had ascertained the correct number from the Custom house entries of those who came in, the weakness of his machinery must have been that of having no check of those who went out, and that if he could devise some means whereby the latter would be counted, as well as the former, the result would be more correct. These suggestions were thrown out in the best spirit by hon. gentlemen on this side. We will not say it was an unprofitable discussion. Then we had a discussion in reference to the mode of taking the census. I desire to remind the committee that we had been sitting from 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon to 3 o'clock this morning when the modest request was preferred from this side of the House that we should adjourn, and it was thrice refused. That led to the motion which was made by the hon. member for West Elgin that this Committee should rise, and cogent reasons were given in support of that motion. Your own bodily condition, Mr. Chairman, was proof that this resolution should be passed. The appearance of the Minister of Public Works himself is now such that he has not the bright look in his eye which he generally has. He appears to be sleepy. He is tired. He has been a little cross, and it is not often that he is cross, but, if he is cross, it must be against himself, and, in that case, he deserves it. The Minister of Justice, also, is compelled to sit here throughout the long night, when he knows that it was proper that the House should adjourn. On this side, we have been compelled to remain here until daylight. It is impossible that nature can stand this strain, and, therefore, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest to the Minister of Public Works, in the interest of economy, that at this hour instructions should be given to have the lights in this Chamber extinguished. I endorse everything which has fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson). If there is anything which is important in parliamentary consideration, it is the expense of public money, and I am sorry that the Government has endeavored by force to wring from the people's representatives their consent to any expenditure of public money. Any attempt of this kind must receive the condemnation of the country. It is, therefore, the duty of those who have any regard for the public interest to prevent any forced abstraction of money from the public. In a few hours we

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

shall be called upon to meet in a Committee to consider an important matter, the Alien Labor Bill, and yet the mover of that Bill sits here and endeavors to prevent any adjournment. If the desire is to strangle that measure I can understand his action. At a later hour, there is a Committee which meets in the Senate which some members of this House feel it to be their duty to attend. In any case, our presence is desired in bed, in order to be prepared for the serious duties of the day when, we are told, at three o'clock the Budget will be laid before us and the tariff changes announced. What is the meaning of the Minister's action? Is it simply that he desires to tire us out, in order that he may obtain votes for money? Did it ever happen in the history of Canada that the people's representatives were coerced into voting money at the demand of the Government? It appears that we are going back three hundred years in the history of British institutions. If the Minister of Public Works ever expects to succeed to the premiership, he will have to show a better example; he will have to show that he is not altogether an ultramontane, but that he desires to act progressively and constitutionally. The course he is now taking will alarm the people of this country, and deservedly so, and will interfere with his political progress. He may think that he is tactically right in the action he has taken in leading the House, but he will find that, in leading the House, he is losing the country. I agree entirely with what has fallen from my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and I would urge upon the Minister of Public Works, in order to prevent any further mistake on his part, that he should allow this House to be adjourned forthwith. The action he has taken strikes me as a very peculiar one. I had occasion some time ago to comment on some transactions in his Department in strong language. I do not want to repeat that, but such actions as he is taking now are calculated to justify what I said at that time. I will reserve any further remarks until the Ministry have had the opportunity to express their opinions. If they feel it necessary to go on, it may be necessary for me to review the course taken in other countries, and to compare it with the plan which is now adopted.

Mr. McMULLEN. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works will make some statement in regard to this matter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have nothing to say except what I said before. If this motion now before the House were carried, it would close the Commons, and we would have to begin again as if we had done nothing at all. We are ready, as I stated in the beginning, if these last items are adopted, to come to the understanding that on concurrence the discussion may take place in the same way as if it were in Committee of Supply. In that case, the Minister of Agriculture will give the explanations he may have to give.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman knows very well that the discussion on concurrence amounts to nothing but a farce. When the last hours of the Session arrive, members are so anxious to leave for home that they will not stay to discuss these matters. I do not think the Minister has done himself or friends justice in the course he has taken in this matter. We discussed

it from a very friendly standpoint. There was nothing said on this side but what was kind, and, when we reached two o'clock, I suggested to the hon. gentleman that we should take the smaller items and reserve the larger. I think, if he had taken the advice of his friends, he would have adopted that course. If he adheres to the course which he has apparently decided on, we must go on, and we are prepared to discuss these items.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that discussion does not take place on concurrence. If he looks at the record of last year, and the year before, he will find that we had motions made on concurrence, and these motions were discussed and were voted upon. Therefore it shows that it is time enough, and the House will have ample opportunity to discuss them on concurrence.

Mr. MULLOCK. According to parliamentary practice, we are entitled to certain information at this stage of the discussion, but the Minister now proposes that the information can only be given at the last stage. This is unjust and unfair.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will be better to discuss on concurrence, because then the Minister of Agriculture will have all the information that is needed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I may say that I have taken no part in this lengthened discussion and as an impartial onlooker, I am enabled to give an unbiased suggestion as to the course I think it would be desirable to pursue. An experienced parliamentarian like the hon. gentleman who leads the House knows that rights belong to the Opposition as well as to the Government. It is impossible that legislation can be carried on except by mutual concession, and the hon. Minister of Public Works should have remembered what occurred in this House a few years ago and should have accepted the just and reasonable proposition made by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) who leads the Opposition to-night, and who made the suggestion at a convenient hour for adjournment this morning. The suggestion of the leader of the Government to defer the matter for concurrence could not be accepted, because any one of experience in this House knows, that on concurrence there is usually no opportunity for bringing very important public matters before the attention of the House, and which matters have been deferred during the course of the present Session. I may say, on behalf of the gentlemen with whom I have the honor to act, and I am quite sure the statement will receive the assent of the House—

Mr. BOWELL. Not much.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Yes; and the assent of the Minister of Customs.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman does not know what I am going to say.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) There was a Mr. Stewart Cumberland here some years ago who was a mind-reader, but I never understood that he imparted his gift in this respect to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs.

Mr. BOWELL. He did not know you as long as I do.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I dispute with the Minister of Customs the possession of the faculty which he claims, of telling what is in the mind of another man. I was about to say that in the discussion of the Estimates this Session the Opposition have shown a desire to facilitate the business of the House, and for the last eight years the Estimates have never been passed with the same despatch as this year. It should be remembered that after all we have discussed a number of very important items during this sitting, and I have no doubt that many of the suggestions thrown out by the members on both sides of the House may be of service to the hon. gentleman who presides over the Department of Agriculture. We had a very important debate on the census, and I venture to say that the suggestions made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) if they are adopted by the Government—as we have some reason to hope they will be, on account of the cordial reception given them by the House—the country will be repaid fifty times over for the delay and the expense of the long sitting, in that one regard alone. The hon. Minister of Agriculture should at least acknowledge that the exposé of the immigration returns which he gave to the House shows, that there is something radically wrong in their compilation and that the system should be changed. He stated that in the little Province of Prince Edward Island from which I come, there were some 454 immigrants last year. My hon. colleague expressed the opinion from his great personal knowledge that there were not ten immigrants to that Island, and I have no hesitation in saying that the statement made by my hon. friend in that regard is absolutely correct. I believe that you cannot find four out of the alleged 454 immigrants in Prince Edward Island. I think where the hon. gentleman has been led astray is that a certain number of Prince Edward Islanders returned to spend a month or two during the summer in the salubrious climate of the Island; a climate that I say is unrivalled in the Dominion of Canada or in the known world. There is no better health resort in the world than Prince Edward Island.

Mr. ELLIS. Could we adjourn there now?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no doubt that if this sitting is prolonged to the extent it may be, and if the hon. gentleman requires some ozone, he will no doubt find an adjournment to that place very beneficial. I think that it would be a good thing for the Department of Agriculture if the hon. Minister were to hold an enquiry as to these immigration returns which have been furnished by his subordinates, because it is a very serious thing to mislead the public with regard to these statistics. The hon. Minister found during the discussion that the subject of the repatriation of French Canadians to the Province of Quebec had engaged the attention of the people of that Province. If my memory serves me right, the Minister of Public Works, referring to this matter some years ago at an historical banquet, expressed his sincere desire and determination to repatriate these people. Notwithstanding this it appears that the exodus from that unfortunate province has been increasing every year. Surely the bone and sinew of the country should not be permitted to leave without some effort being made to stay the exodus. I quote the following from the report of the Rev. C. A. Beaudry on this repatriation work, a gentle-

man who was specially appointed to enquire into the matter and who seemed to have been thoroughly competent for the position. He says :

"During the months of May and June last I visited the New England States with the intention of studying the question on the spot, and of making known the advantages of our Canadian North-West for such of our countrymen as might be desirous of returning and taking up farming.

"During that year I met nearly all the French Canadians of the following cities:—Nashua, Manchester, N.H.; Worcester, Mass.; Gardner, N.Y.; Fall River, Providence, R.I.; New Bedford, Woonsocket Falls, Boston, Lynn, Lowell, Mass., and other places of less importance.

"I found these places filled with French Canadians. The latest arrivals generally came from the poorest parts of the Province of Quebec. Especially from the counties below Quebec.

"The earlier arrivals and those already settled in the United States for some years, and known as skillful mechanics, receive generally good wages, and moreover many of them are now proprietors, and have no wish whatever to move. However, even among those there are some affected with home-sickness, and anxious to go back with the intention of taking up farms."

Then after giving some information with respect to their wages and the number of mechanics out of work there, he says—and to this I wish to draw the particular attention of the Minister of Public Works :

"There is no doubt that among the last arrivals a deduction must be made for families leaving the villages who go and remain in large cities with the hope of getting work; but it is a fact well ascertained, in spite of the several political systems, and denials or affirmations of politicians, that emigration keeps on its devastation at the rate of a national plague."

Now, what conclusion should we draw from this? I draw the conclusion that it behooves hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, I care not what their political proclivities are, to give their best thoughts to the means for staying that national plague and keeping our people in the country. This gentleman is evidently in earnest, because he winds up his report by saying that he is willing gratuitously, or as he says *pro patria*, to circulate immigration pamphlets, providing the necessary postage stamps are supplied to him. This is the most moderate offer I ever knew, and even the necessity for stamps could be obviated, because the Minister could frank the pamphlets from his Department. That is only one phase of this vast subject. We were willing, provided the hon. gentleman gave us the facts, to allow him to mature the steps that should be taken. We wish to ascertain something about the \$2,000 for the contingencies of the High Commissioner. That subject was brought up in the Public Accounts Committee, but no details of the expenditure were obtained. Then having exhausted all the evidence, we thought it was the proper time to lay before the House our views on that expenditure, and on the policy of allowing any public officer to expend \$2,000 or \$3,000 of public money without accounting for the details. Then there is the large item of \$55,000 for immigration and immigration expenses generally, under which item the broad question of the policy of the Department would be opened up. Judging from the results in the past, there is no defence to be put forward for this vast expenditure, and why? I think the answer was given in the speech of my hon. friend from Brant who showed that the immigrants only come to Canada nominally, but really pass through to make more rich our rivals to the south. If these are the facts, it does not become this House to shut

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

its eyes to them. It is not right that this House should accept unreservedly the statements made by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture from year to year as to our immigration statistics, in which we know that he has been egregiously wrong for many years, and that his statements have become a regular laughing stock both in this House and out of it. Although very little attention is paid to the Maritime Provinces in respect of immigration, I venture to say that if it were pointed out to the farmers of England, Scotland and Ireland who have a little capital, that there has been such an exodus from the Maritime Provinces to the North-West and the United States, that many farms fairly cultivable and improved could be purchased for a very small sum, there would be a considerable immigration of that class into those Provinces. I venture to say that there is no spot in the world where a farmer who knows his business and possesses a small capital could locate himself and his family to better advantage than in the Province of Prince Edward Island or in the fertile valleys of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. I am not disparaging at all the great agricultural capabilities of the Province of Ontario; but it is well known that the farms in that Province are very expensive, and it requires a large capital to enable an intending immigrant to purchase and carry on one of them, while a valuable farm could be obtained in Prince Edward Island for one-third or one-fourth of the money. It has a soil and climate which admits of farming being carried on profitably if we had a good market. Then, where could a man settle more advantageously than in the Annapolis Valley, which nature has endowed so richly that it is capable of maintaining four or five times its present population? An hour or two of the time of this Committee might be most profitably spent by the members representing these different Provinces in setting forth their advantages for immigrants with capital, and circulating those speeches among that class. In the North-West they are anxious to obtain Canadians as settlers; they prefer them to settlers from the old country; then, why could not the older Provinces supply the North-West with Canadian settlers, and let their places be taken by the incoming immigrants? But the immigration policy of this Government has been almost to entirely ignore the Maritime Provinces, and it would be somewhat to the advantage of the country if some of the \$100,000 spent on this matter should be spent with the object of promoting such an immigration to the Provinces down by the sea. I was a boy when the last immigrant ship arrived there in 1851, but since that we have only had the natural increase of population. This evening we were twitted by the member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Cockburn) with the fact that we only had a population of 120,000, but that Island is capable of maintaining in comfort a population of over 500,000. I was in conversation with Prof. Saunders the other day, and he stated that perhaps farming was carried on in Prince Edward Island more carefully and scientifically than it is elsewhere, except in some small sections of Ontario. The farmers have been carefully trained, and understand scientific farming better than most of their confrères in other Provinces. As to the results, he said, I do not know enough to enable me to give you a proper statement on that subject, but you have a very fine soil. I have come to the conclusion that Prince

Edward Island is the place for an intending emigrant to come to with £400 or £500. I know no place where he can expend it more judiciously. We have a fine system of education and everything to make life happy. From May to November we have one of the most lovely climates in the world, and more of the faded citizens should come there from the towns and cities, and they would not regret it. We have only touched upon the fringe of this question now, and I will see how some of my hon. friends from the other Provinces feel about it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the Government desire to adjourn now, I will not proceed with any remarks. If they desire to continue the debate, it will be well to consider our diplomatic service in connection with the service of immigration agents. We have had recently a Minister at Washington.

Mr. TAYLOR. I just telephoned for him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. As a result of his visit to Washington, I understand there is to be an increased duty on eggs, and I believe he has also succeeded in obtaining an additional duty to be placed upon sheep. I believe the cattle trade also came within the purview of his great intellect and the result is that a duty of \$10 per head is to be placed upon cattle. This diplomatic service is like the immigration service, in this respect, that it requires to be very carefully looked after. If the efforts of the Government had been intentionally directed against the freer interchange of products between Canada and the United States, they could not have been more successful than they have been. When our friends opposite came into power, they provided for reciprocity in certain products whenever the Americans were willing to make the same provision. The Americans did that, but the Government of Canada failed to keep their promise. Then the attention of Parliament was called to that outrage, and they were obliged to permit reciprocal trade in those products. For instance, they took the duty off peaches, but they rose equal to the occasion and placed a duty on peach baskets. Another circumstance which was calculated to irritate the people of the United States was that when an employé of the Government at Halifax was courteous to an American there and allowed him to ship some goods in bond on our railways, that officer was dismissed. It may be that they consider this sort of action statesmanship. The book published by the authority of the Government, which has already been referred to, contains suggestions booming the Government savings banks and, at the same time, advocating the introduction of skilled labor in developing the resources of the country. I think this book ought to be referred to the Committee on the Contract Labor Bill, and I call the attention of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to it. If the hon. member is out of the proclamation business now, he might induce his committee to issue a proclamation of this kind to the workmen telling them that the market is sufficiently full now. I heard the Premier himself say that there was a great demand for artisans in the North-West. Some of my constituents went to Manitoba and the North-West last year, where they were told they could get steady employment. They went there in the spring, but before the fall they came back again, and were convinced that they had more steady

employment at home than they could obtain there. If the North-West was well governed, I think a great deal of employment might be found, but for ten or twelve years past the people there have been injured by misgovernment. While the Liberal Government was in power population poured into that country, but ever since our friends went out of power, the population seems to have gone out of the North-West. We have spent a lot of money to settle that country, but we have had so many monopolies in land and in railways, and in other matters, that I think that we cannot look for much prosperity there until these monopolies are abolished. The Minister of Agriculture might retrieve his reputation to some extent if he would give us the information which has been asked for. He may think that a system of coercion will work here, but he will find it just as objectionable as it is elsewhere. If he is not posted in regard to his Department, his deputy should be. In regard to this hand-book of information, does the Minister intend to cancel those clauses which invite competition with our own workmen? I regret to see that the Government have not extended to the working classes the protection they have given to other classes. We see that they are putting on duties to prevent competition in manufactured articles, but we do not see that they are preventing skilled workmen from entering Canada to enter into competition with our own workmen. If this Government will consent to adjourn this branch of the discussion, until we study the clauses that the Minister of Agriculture thinks are of importance, I will take my seat. I ask if they are willing to adjourn until we study these matters?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will adjourn when this item is passed.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I am afraid that some of the predictions I heard from my constituents during the recent recess, are going to prove correct. When I visited my county within the last few days I was told by Conservatives and Reformers, that the Opposition had not done their duty in criticising the Estimates, and that the Government got large sums of money voted without due consideration to the interests of the country. The people consider that it is the duty of the Government to give all necessary information to Parliament and to the country on every point. I was amazed at the statement made with respect to Mr. Metcalfe by the Minister of Customs. He said that this gentleman might have been recalled from Winnipeg, during the six weeks that he drew his salary, that the Government could give no account of what he was doing, but I am quite sure, that if he was brought down to Ottawa he would have charged his train fare from Ottawa to Winnipeg, and not from Kingston to Winnipeg. This immigration system adopted by the Government is part and parcel of the National Policy. When I was crossing the ocean in 1888, I met on board of the steamer five young men, just such as we want in Canada. They told me they were not going to settle in Canada, but intended to seek homes in Washington Territory, and as a reason for this they stated that they had friends in Washington Territory who had tried to make a living in Ontario and Manitoba and British Columbia, and had crossed over to the United States. As a reason

for this they stated that clothing was dearer in Canada, and that agricultural implements especially were much higher than they were in the United States. I can tell the Government that the reports of immigrants themselves which they send home to their friends, are of far greater value than all the immigration agents they can appoint. We were told by an agent at the Agriculture Committee the other day, that he did not know of a single man who left the Province of Ontario for the United States during the last 12 months. I can inform him that I have a nephew who went from this country some years ago, and after he wrought in the North-West he went across the line. There was another brother of his, who went up there last summer, and after he had gone through the North-West and made enquiries there, they both went to the United States and took up land in Dakota, principally for the reason that it would require so much more money to give them a fair start on a farm in Manitoba than it would take in Dakota. This is a very serious condition of things for Canada. Our system here has provoked retaliatory measures in the United States, but I am glad to see that we have introduced before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, what is known as the Hitt Bill, by which it is provided that the United States Government shall appoint three commissioners to meet commissioners from the Dominion of Canada, as soon as the Government will appoint such commissioners, to take into consideration the question of unrestricted reciprocity between the two countries. We have always heard since our National Policy was adopted that the Government of the Dominion of Canada, whether Conservative or Reform, has always been in favor of reciprocity with the United States. I hope the Government will stick to that policy now, and that they will consider the very grave position into which they have brought Canada. We have heard from the Treasury benches time and again, that it was in the interest of Canada that if we could not have reciprocity in trade, we should have reciprocity in tariff, and we were told by the First Minister, in 1878, that the only measure we could adopt to get reciprocity with the United States, was to pursue a retaliatory policy. I believe that the Government of the United States has taken a leaf out of the book of the Canadian Government, and that they have come to the conclusion that they will have reciprocity, or cease to trade with us altogether. That policy of the United States is foreshadowed in the draft of a Bill before Congress which I had an opportunity of seeing. Now we have been told by the members from Prince Edward Island to-night, that one of the best places for immigrants to go at the present time is to Prince Edward Island, because the land is so cheap there now. I am sorry to have to say that in the fertile Province of Ontario, the land is nearly as cheap as it is in the Island Province. I have a statement here taken from one of the local papers of the County of Perth which reads as follows:—

“Mr. W. Porteous, of Mitchell, bought a 50-acre farm in Logan a few days ago for \$1,600. There is a bank barn and house on the place which would cost at least \$1,000. What about farm lands not decreasing in value?”

I know a farm very well. It has a dwelling with good buildings upon it, and five or six years ago it could not have been got for \$5,600, while a short time ago that 100 acres of the very

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron).

best land was sold for \$4,500. I believe myself that this National Policy has done more to bring about the present state of things than all other adverse circumstances combined. I have a circular here issued by the Government which says that the taxation is very low in Canada, but as against that I may state that when I was at home a few days ago I met a young man recently out from Scotland, who had travelled all through the Province of Ontario, and who told me that he could live more cheaply at home and buy clothes cheaper than he could in this country.

An hon. MEMBER. He would buy shoddy.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). No shoddy at all. I could show you a suit of clothes that I have on my back, that I bought in Argyle street, in Glasgow, from one of the best furnishing merchants in the country, for \$16.30, and I was told by a tailor in Canada that he could not make them for me less than \$23.

Mr. BOWELL. I bought a first-class suit in London for \$7.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I know a first-class farm hand and he would not work for me longer than he could get back to Glasgow, because he said his clothes were nearly worn out and it would pay him to go over with cattle to England, and buy his clothes there, and come back again, as he could enter them free of duty. I was putting up a farm building this spring, and although we did not advertise, it became known that we wanted to build and we had contractor after contractor driving eight and ten miles asking to get the work. They stated that there were almost no buildings going on in the country, and that they never had such hard experience for ten or twelve years in the County of Huron. I again tell the Government, that all their money spent for the purpose of immigration is of no avail until they can show that Canada is a cheap country to live in. At the present time Canada is one of the dearest countries to live in on the continent of America, and it requires more money to furnish a farm here than in any other place. We are told that coming events cast their shadow before, and if the events which are promising on the other side of the line have the effect of inducing Canada to take a leaf out of our neighbor's book and establish free intercourse on this continent at any rate, it would be of the greatest possible advantage to this country. We used to be told that the policy the Government were adopting with regard to the North-West would have the effect in 1890 or 1891 of returning from that country to the Treasury at least \$70,000,000 of the money spent in building the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is one of the predictions that has not been fulfilled. On the contrary, the expenses of surveying and administering the lands of the North-West are greater than the revenue received from sales. The people of the old country are becoming acquainted with the history of Canada and the United States, and I regret to say that in my rambles in Scotland during the last few years, I have found that the reports sent there are inducing a great majority of those crossing the Atlantic to settle in the United States, where the people are not so heavily burdened with taxation as our people, except, perhaps, in woollen goods. We have been told that the Province of New

Brunswick is a fine Province to settle in. Why, Sir, we have farm after farm in the Province of Ontario which can be got for 20 or 30 per cent. less than it could be got for six or seven years ago. The kind of settlers we want are men with £1,000 or £1,500, who could get their choice of some of the best lands in the Province to-day at these reduced prices. I hope the Government will so change their immigration policy as to induce many of these people from foreign lands to seek a home in Canada, which is a very desirable country to settle in, either for the mechanic or the agriculturist, apart from the drawbacks of the National Policy. The promises made to the workingmen and the agriculturists of the country have never been fulfilled, and if the present condition of things continues, I am afraid that many of our desirable young men will continue to leave this country and go to the United States, where they secure better wages. I do not intend to say anything more on this very important question at the present time.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the dissertation given by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down is, to say the least, rather inconsistent. I have listened to several editions of his speech on the subject of immigration. At one time he praised the country very much. He held up Canada to be a very fine country—one to which he had come with comparatively little, but with a strong arm and a stout heart, he had worked his way up until to-day he has an extensive farm and may be considered wealthy. He has succeeded so well in this country that he has now a hundred head of cattle feeding for the old country market. He has told the House that we wanted men with money. I believe the openings are better to-day for men without money but willing to work than they were twenty or thirty years ago. If men could succeed so well in a wooded country, where they had so much labor to prepare the soil before crops could be put in the ground, how much better will they succeed on the prairies of the North-West, where it only requires to plough the ground and put in the grain. I say it is very inconsistent in hon. gentlemen opposite to condemn the immigration policy of the Government. Now, with regard to the tactics of hon. gentlemen opposite, I think they are decidedly unbecoming of an Opposition in this House or in any other House. If there is any member of the Government who is distinguished for his courtesy and kindness, and who endeavors to give full and complete information with regard to the affairs of his Department, it is the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Notwithstanding the attacks made on him from time to time, often very unseemly attacks, he invariably rises with unflinching courtesy and gives all the information he can. When he was badgered last night he gave replies which I think should have satisfied any reasonable man, but he was attacked all the more fiercely and offensively, and the hon. gentlemen showed by their opposition that they did not want information, but rather obstruction. I think hon. gentlemen should see that there is no reason for wasting any more of the time and money of the country in this way. We had an unseemly display of this kind a few years ago; but I think hon. gentlemen will have to use better logic in the country than they have been using in the House to convince the people that they have been doing their duty. We

have displayed extreme courtesy towards them on this side of the House; we have quietly listened to them, and yet they are not satisfied; but it seems that their determination has been to obstruct the business of the House rather than to obtain such information as might be expected to enable them to discharge their duty faithfully.

Mr. FISHER. I really think the hon. member has not been courteous to the leader of the House. He said we had all the information that we asked for, and had plenty of opportunity to ask all the questions we chose, while the leader of the House told us that while he would not grant an adjournment, he was quite ready to make an arrangement by which this question could be brought up on concurrence, when he would give us all the information we ask for. No man knows better than the hon. Minister himself, that for several years past it has been the policy of his leader and his Government to postpone the business of this House as far as possible to the last moment. He knows that for a number of years past, concurrence has been gone through with lightning rapidity in the last few days of the Session, at a time when the Ministers themselves and their followers, and even the members of the Opposition, are determined to get away to their own business, and will not stop to discuss public affairs; and, knowing this, he has attempted to turn away our demand for information by this offer. But my hon. friend on this side is too well versed in the rules of parliamentary practice to be taken in by such a proposition, even from such an experienced member as the hon. Minister of Public Works. I must say I differ a little from the hon. gentleman as to the manner in which the hon. Minister of Agriculture has met us on this occasion. Far be it from me to accuse him of discourtesy; but he has hardly given us the information which the subject demands, and which it is our duty to call for. There is no doubt that in these two items which have been brought under discussion there are grave suspicions of improper conduct in the Department, and I am quite sure the public will justify us in demanding full information regarding them. There is no doubt that the circumstances of the dismissal of Mr. Grahame demand the closest scrutiny. Then, the simple fact that a member of the Ontario Legislature, who is in political alliance with hon. gentlemen opposite, is in the employ of this Government, is sufficient of itself to throw suspicion on the transaction. Notwithstanding our weariness of this long sitting, I am rather glad it has occurred, because I believe that it will cause the public to more clearly apprehend the nature of these immigration items than they would otherwise have done, and the result will be a much more searching investigation of the affairs of this Department than would otherwise have taken place. I do not remember any Session in which this item has been passed at one sitting of the House. We cannot formulate a motion on concurrence without having the information first. I may repeat what I have already said as to the reported influx of immigrants into the Province of Quebec, that I have never been able to ascertain where they have gone, and the immigration agents do not refer to them. Mr. Beaudry's report says: These men state distinctly that they find themselves better off in the United States than in Canada. No wonder the hon. gentleman

finds it difficult to turn the stream of immigration back into this country. After all these discussions, it is absurd for the Minister of Public Works to insist upon a vote of this kind passing through at this hour of the day, and we would be lacking in our duty if we did not insist upon full investigation. I do not desire that the Committee should rise in order to block further work, and, if the leader of the House would yield to a reasonable proposition, I have no doubt my hon. friend who moved the resolution would be willing to withdraw it and allow the Committee to meet again to advance the public business. Until some arrangement is come to, however, I do not see how we can possibly allow this to pass.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). In reply to a remark of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I say that Canada is one of the finest countries that any man ever set foot upon, but the policy of this Government has interfered with its prosperity. He says I am a newcomer in this country. I think I have been in Canada since he sat at his mother's knee. I have spent nearly 50 years in Canada, and what little I have in this world I got before the National Policy was introduced, at a time when a man got the due reward of his labor, and was allowed to sell in the dearest and buy in the cheapest market.

Mr. BRIEN. A great deal of light has been thrown on this subject during this discussion. We are bound to enquire into all the details of this matter, and I think the Public Accounts show that a great amount of money is expended on useless purposes. I find that at Detroit no less than 2,199 families are stated to have gone into the United States from Canada with effects valued at \$261,632. Supposing there are five persons in each family, that would give a total of 10,995. We should be cautious in expending money to encourage immigration as we have in the past, simply that the immigrants may pass through to another country. With the amount of immigration which we have had, added to our natural increase, we ought now to have a population of seven millions and a half. This Committee should seriously consider the cause of the exodus which has taken place. It is not the soil, or the climate, or the institutions of the country, that will induce people to live in it. The better mode would be to make it a cheaper country to live in. We find, that in 1878 the duties of the country amounted to about 14 per cent., while in 1889 it was 21.65 per cent. In 1878 it amounted to \$3.46 *per capita*, and in 1889 to \$4.68 *per capita*. No wonder the people are leaving the country, when we find such an enormous increase both in the duty and in the debt. I hope this motion will not be carried until the question has been more thoroughly discussed.

Motion that the Committee rise negatived.

Mr. MULOCK. I find that at Quebec we have a staff of seventeen people, and I find that Mr. Anderson last year received within \$100 of his salary for travelling expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. This item is for salaries.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that J. G. Colmer has drawn \$45 for fares. Where was he travelling when he drew that amount?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot state at the moment where he was travelling, but it was in England, by Mr. FISHER.

instruction from the High Commissioner. Perhaps he was attending the Glasgow Exhibition. I can get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Auditor General's Report shows that he was receiving \$4.50 a day, in addition to his fare. I want to find out where he had to pay \$4.50 a day. He also puts in charges for cab-hire and telegrams, and I want to have an explanation of all these matters. The Minister, or his deputy, should have been prepared to answer these enquiries.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentlemen are most unfair. I stated at the commencement that we are prepared to go on with each item in the immigration vote and explain each as we come to it, but the hon. gentleman got up a discussion in reference to the agent at Winnipeg.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is for the salaries of agents in Europe.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. member for North York asked a question in reference to the salary of Mr. Anderson in Quebec. If I knew what information hon. gentlemen wanted to get I would endeavor to supply it. There is no doubt we have the details in the Department, similar to those furnished by the Auditor General's Report, but if Sir Charles Tupper sent Mr. Colmer to any place, I am not in a position to state where he was sent to.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is surely reasonable for us to enquire what this expenditure was for, and it is because we find that the Minister of Agriculture is embarrassed that we suggested the adjournment.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, does not want an answer, and he is doing this for the purpose of killing time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CARLING. I have already stated that Mr. Colmer is in Sir Charles Tupper's office and under his control.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has not the Minister got Sir Charles Tupper's report?

Mr. CARLING. Yes; it is in the hands of the printer.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. Minister of Agriculture is not in a position to give any information on a single question that has come before the House. Had the Minister taken the frank course at first and admitted that the appointment of Mr. Metcalfe, and the dismissal of Mr. Grahame was a political job, to assist a political friend, he would have, perhaps, received different treatment at the hands of the House. Every one must admit that the appointment of Mr. Metcalfe was of a suspicious character, and required full explanation. I think that, under the circumstances, the Minister should consent to the motion which I now make, and which is, that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister is unable to give us any information whatever with regard to these agencies in Europe. From the Minister's own official report we have the direct statement which shows that Sir Charles Tupper's report is absolutely necessary before we can discuss these Estimates. If the Minister of Public

Works who leads the House insists on our passing those items without any information whatever, I believe that he will damage his reputation. I bring to his notice now the statement in the Minister of Agriculture's report that Sir Charles Tupper's report which is not yet before the House is of the utmost importance as a reason why he should consent to an adjournment until we get the information. I tell the Minister of Public Works, and let my voice reach the country, that as we have not the report of Sir Charles Tupper, and as the Minister of Agriculture cannot explain these items, it is an injustice to force the House to pass these items.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, I say let my voice reach the country, that both Ministers are to blame if they attempt to force these Estimates through, without giving us information as to their nature. I do not see how the Minister can ask even his own supporters to pass these items, without any explanation whatever. I ask gentlemen on the opposite side of the House are they prepared to do so?

Mr. RYKERT. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) is the only member of the House who has ventured to consent to vote moneys without any information to this Parliament, and without this report of Sir Charles Tupper being before him which the Minister of Agriculture himself says "contains important facts respecting trade and industry in Great Britain which bears on this question of immigration." I suppose if we had Sir Charles Tupper's report we would see what Mr. Colmer has been doing for this money. I am not disposed to blame the Minister because he has not the information in his memory, but he will see the reasonableness of our having such information before we pass this item. The Minister cannot expect this side of the House, and he should not be able to expect even his own supporters to allow these items to pass without giving a reason for them. I submit that, under these circumstances, it is impossible to proceed, unless the House is willing to vote money blindfolded. I do hope that with these facts before the Government they will not persist any longer in the line of conduct they have pursued. How would it be viewed in the country if he allowed such a thing to occur? The Opposition cannot afford to do it, and in my judgment a Minister of the Crown, acting under a responsible government, cannot afford to do it either. I again appeal to the leader of the House that he do not persist in this course.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This delay is entirely in consequence of our not having the report of the High Commissioner before us. The report of the Department is not complete without the report of Sir Charles Tupper, and we have a right to obtain it before we proceed. Last year on this very subject of immigration, the hon. First Minister suggested that all the items should be passed, except the last one, which he agreed to allow to stand, with the understanding that all the discussion should be had on that, and it stood for the 2nd to the 16th of April, before it was discussed. That is exactly the proposition now made by the hon. member for Halifax, and it is only fair that the

same course should be followed. I entirely agree with the remarks that have been made by the hon. member for East Grey as to the courtesy of the hon. Minister of Agriculture; I do not blame him, but I think his subordinates are to blame for not having given him the information which he ought to have had for the discussion of these items. Therefore, I think, the hon. Minister of Public Works should agree to the passage of all the items except the last, until we get the report, and I think I can safely say that if that is done, there will be no disposition to prolong the debate. If hon. members will revert to the discussions which have taken place on the Estimates of the various Departments hitherto, I think they will find that they have been conducted in a fair and reasonable spirit on our part throughout. The case of Mr. Metcalfe is one which would naturally excite discussion. We prevent members of the Local Legislature from being in any way connected with the Dominion Government, and it seems to me equally contrary to correct constitutional principles that a member of a Local Legislature should be in the employ of the Dominion Government. Besides, the peculiar circumstances under which that gentleman was employed, and his return to Kingston for the purpose of attending to his legislative duties justify all the criticisms uttered on that case. The hon. gentleman surely understands also that the general vote on immigration involves some discussion which it is unfair to carry on at four o'clock in the morning. On all grounds I think hon. gentlemen opposite should agree to postpone this discussion.

Mr. CARLING. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the item now under discussion is the salaries of agents in Europe, and I can give hon. gentlemen the name of each officer and the amount of his salary.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is what they are doing we want to know.

Mr. CARLING. The amount for Sir Charles Tupper's office has been voted already under Civil Government. I can give the name of each officer and the salary paid him. I could not give any further information than that, and what other information can hon. gentlemen ask?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The information which will undoubtedly be given in the report of Sir Charles Tupper, when we receive it, namely, the work done by those men.

Mr. CARLING. We know that there are agents at different points. As to the work they have done during the year, I have not the information by me at present.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The information the hon. gentleman proposes to give we can find for ourselves in the Auditor General's Report. But we find that certain sums were charged last year for travelling expenses, and we want to know where Mr. Colmer travelled or spent his time, and what the High Commissioner reports as to the doings of the various agents last year to promote immigration. The same question was raised the other day in regard to the item for the Experimental Farm, which was allowed to stand over until we had the report before us for the last year. The hon. gentleman knows how absurd it would be to have the Estimates for the public works passed before we

had the report of that Department, showing how the votes of last year had been applied. It would be a most dangerous system to establish in view of the new practice which now prevails, of passing the Estimates before the Budget speech is delivered. You may talk about courtesy, but there is something more wanted than outside courtesy. I would confidently re-enforce the appeal my hon. friend has made to the Minister, and ask whether it would be reasonable to press these items through under these circumstances?

Mr. CARLING. There is one point which shows the hon. gentleman to be rather inconsistent. He has voted to-night the salaries of the different immigration agents in Canada without asking for information.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. The information with regard to them is in the hon. gentleman's report, and the reports with regard to Halifax, St. John, Winnipeg, Quebec, and other place, were fully discussed in the early part of the evening.

Mr. BOWELL. Move to strike it out.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How can we do that until we see the report?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman desires to have his vote recorded against the expenditure of money, the only course he could pursue would be to propose to strike out that amount on concurrence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I know I could not put myself on record in Committee, and if, after a discussion there, we were not satisfied, we could put ourselves on record on concurrence; but the hon. gentleman would make Committee of Supply of no use at all.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman and one of his colleagues have made an appeal to me, as leading the House for the time, to change the decision to which I came last night, that is to say, to ask the Committee to pass these four items forming part of the resolution, and then to adjourn. The hon. gentleman gives as his reason that the report of Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner in London, is not before us. As far as the expenses of that office are concerned, the hon. gentleman has the report of the Auditor General, which shows all the details, how the money was expended, and what was voted last year. The Minister of Agriculture is not asking one cent more than was voted last year, and he is ready to state the use which he proposes to make of the vote. If the hon. gentleman finds that the explanations given are not satisfactory, he may afterwards move to reduce the amount, and I do not see why this should prevent our going on. He says he cannot record his vote in committee, but in any case he would have to make his motion and record his vote on concurrence. I could understand the objections which have been raised if these were extraordinary votes, but they are dollar for dollar the same as last year except in the last item of \$6,390, and the Minister of Agriculture said he would explain that when we reached it. I think hon. gentlemen should accept the situation, and, under the circumstances, we must ask the House to pass these items.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister, then, assumes the responsibility of requiring the House
Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

to sit to this time of the morning in order to pass votes the results of which we cannot have any account of. Up to 3 or 4 o'clock this morning, questions of interest were reasonably discussed, but, when details were asked for on this subject, members from the different Provinces recognised that the figures given in the report were inaccurate, and legitimately criticised the statements which were made, but further information was refused. I prefer to take the view which does not reflect upon the country, and to believe that the number of people who appear to have left the country have not left it, but that rather for five years misleading statements have been given to us by the Department of Agriculture as to those who have gone in there. Member after member has pointed out that the statement that 96,000 have been added to the population there cannot be true. That is not with the object of disconcerting the Minister, but simply to point out that it is evident that the machinery which we have had for ascertaining the immigration was defective; that, while the Ministry had a machinery by which they could count the ins, they had none by which they could count the outs. We have had statements of a large increase year after year of a population which we do not believe is here, and the census taken in the North-West clearly shows that. Surely that is legitimate criticism. The discussion of the amount asked for the taking of the census was also criticised, and it was surely legitimate to discuss whether the *de facto* or the *de jure* system was the best. The items were discussed in this way until a very large number were passed. When 2 o'clock arrived, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) proposed that we should adjourn, but the Minister of Public Works did not desire to adjourn then. At 2.30, the hon. gentleman again suggested that we were wearied and tired, and should adjourn, and it was not until 3 o'clock that the motion that the Committee rise and report progress was made by the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), and on that the discussion proceeded, until about 9 o'clock this morning the motion was withdrawn. Then we asked if the Minister could give us the information required, but he could not. We asked for information on several subjects, but could not get it. We wanted more information in regard to the dismissal of Mr. Grahame. If a public servant is to be dismissed because he proves his efficiency and truthfulness—I do not charge that that is the case, but it is the suspicion in the minds of some members—we ought to be made aware of it. An hour ago an attempt was made to go on with the next item, which the Minister says must be forced through, right or wrong—the salaries of agents in Europe. We asked what Mr. Colmer did last year, and the Minister's reply was that he could not tell us. He said the report of Sir Charles Tupper was in the hands of the printer, and we ought to be content with the fact that last year the same amount was paid. That is not an answer. We want to know whether it is in the interests of the people to pay a dollar for this service, or whether it is in their interests that instead of \$5,000 we should spend \$50,000 on immigration agents there. We cannot be satisfied to vote this or any other amount without any information at all, and the Ministers place themselves in a very invidious position by demanding

that this money should be voted without giving any information whatever. It is true that we voted the salary of Mr. Stafford and others, but we had the information in those cases, and we have no information as to the work which has been performed in Europe. Yet the Minister who is now leading the House assumes the responsibility of saying that Parliament must go on sitting from 3 o'clock yesterday, when we are to be wearied out and grants of money are to be forced through this House by wearying out members of this House. If they get their votes in this way, it will not redound to their credit in the country. What was the offer made by the Minister when he said: Let these items pass and on concurrence you shall have the same latitude as you would have in committee? What time would be saved by that? Might we not as well have discussed the question the next time in committee as to wait until the Speaker is in the chair?

Mr. COLBY. But you would have the report before that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Ministers are perfectly aware that members have been charged with neglecting their duties in allowing moneys to be voted at lightning speed on concurrence. Although items were allowed to pass quickly through concurrence, it was because those items were discussed fully in Committee. There seems an attempt by the Government to force these items through, without giving the slightest explanation as to the work done by these officials. It will be for the hon. gentlemen opposite to support the Ministry in this or not. As far as I am concerned I feel that I have done my duty in the matter. I have not spoken in order to take up the time of the House, and so far as I am aware I think that my colleagues on this side of the House, have been fair and candid in their criticisms. After the precedent read by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) in which the First Minister admitted that it was an unreasonable thing to ask money to be voted before an explanation was given, and with that recorded on *Hansard*, I think that it was the duty of the leader of the House to consent to an adjournment. We have not tried to be factious in our opposition, but we leave the responsibility on the Ministers for asking us to vote sums of money without giving us any explanation as to what they are for.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have not had the great privilege and advantage of hearing this discussion on through the night, but it is quite evident to me that the Government is standing on a mere question of punctilio. I think it is a reasonable question on the part of the Opposition, and in fact on the part of each member of the House, that they shall have reasonable information before they vote money. I believe that, beyond all question, the Government is wrong in this matter. I think they should have acceded to the reasonable request, which was made by the Opposition, to postpone this matter, and they should have remembered the consequence of their obstruction in the memorable franchise debate. I can assure the hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Opposition is not disposed, in this matter, to allow these items to pass, without obtaining full information as to what they were for. It would be a reasonable and a gracious act on the part of the Government to allow this item to stand,

and it is an act which they will have to perform whether either graciously or ungraciously. I appeal to the Minister of Agriculture that he should allow these items to stand until he is able to afford the House information.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). We cannot allow these items to pass without getting the information from the source from which we are entitled to get it. It would just be the same principle, if the Estimates were brought down without a single blue-book being laid on the Table, and if we were asked to vote it without that information. As guardians of the public treasury we are bound to protect the rights of the people, and we maintain that Parliament cannot vote money without knowing what it votes it for.

Mr. COLBY. The members of this House are not asked to vote these items finally, for they will have an opportunity of discussing them later on.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We have heard that before.

Mr. COLBY. These items are almost identically the same items as were passed last year, and there is nothing in them which ought provoke any special criticism on the part of the hon. members opposite. They are asked simply to vote them *pro forma*.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. COLBY. There is a fact entirely beyond the control of the hon. Minister at the present time which renders it impossible for him to give that full information which hon. gentlemen opposite say they ought to have. The fact is, that the report of Sir Charles Tupper is now in the hands of the printer. However, that information will be forthcoming in due time and before the members of the House are asked to concur in these Estimates. It seems to me that, under these circumstances, obstruction at this late period of the Session is something very near pure captiousness. Suppose we should adjourn until the afternoon and return to this question; that report would still be in the printers' hands and we would find ourselves in the same position as we are in at the present time. Consequently the adjournment would not be productive of any advantage to hon. members. I think hon. gentlemen opposite should not ask an unreasonable thing, and I think that the threats used by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) are entirely unworthy of the position he occupies. He has used threats to delay the business of the House, as upon a memorable occasion, unless the members of the Government can see their way to accept his wishes. I think that is no spirit in which to approach this matter. I believe that it is in the interest of the progress of the business of this House that these being ordinary items should pass this Committee, and that we should be permitted to proceed with the business of Parliament. When Sir Charles Tupper's report is laid before Parliament I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen will have no reason to complain that they deferred this matter if they now agree to do so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the request made by the Opposition is a very reasonable one, and I think the speech which has just been made by the President of the Council will not stand discussion, for the simple reason that the members of the Government, if they are desirous for the despatch of

business, can send a messenger down to the printing bureau and have the report of Sir Charles Tupper here in ten minutes. Is there anything unreasonable in this proposition? Should we be asked to vote blindfolded sums of money without any information whatsoever. It is quite clear to my mind that in this matter the Government is pursuing a factious course and not the Opposition. We are told that because these sums were voted last year it is right to vote them this year. That is no reason why this Committee should neglect its duty to investigate the votes in every possible way. If the report of Sir Charles Tupper is of the value placed upon it by the Minister of Agriculture himself, why not give the Committee the information it contains? If he cannot get the printed report, the printer has no claim on the manuscript copy, and he can send his deputy for it, and demand it for presentation to this House. There are large sums of money represented in these items which require explanation. The travelling expenses of a number of gentlemen mentioned ought to be explained. If I am not mistaken, J. G. Colmer, whose head office is in England, was travelling in the North-West last year, and we have a right to know what he was doing there. Then, there are the removal expenses of Mr. Reynolds, who was removed from Brandon to the office in England. Why was it considered necessary to remove him? Is it possible that there is such a scarcity of applicants, that the Government must go to the prairie Provinces to get a man to fill an unimportant position in the High Commissioner's office? It is necessary for the Committee to have this information, and I accuse the Government of displaying a factious opposition to the business of this House, in refusing to give the Committee the information which it is entitled to. It is a paltry excuse to say that it cannot be obtained because it is in the hands of the printer. The hon. Minister knows that it can be obtained, and he knows that by giving us the delay we ask for until that report is presented, the Committee will be placed in a position to intelligently vote on the question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have been very much surprised at the demand made by the President of the Council, and the argument with which he supported it. There is no man in the House who knows better than he does that there will not be the slightest opportunity to discuss this question on concurrence.

Mr. HAGGART. You have two opportunities before concurrence: you have the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. BOWELL. And you can move to strike it off the Supply Bill if you want to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Government go on the supposition that the members of Parliament are only here to register decisions: but I say it is the duty, not only of the Opposition, but of every private member of this House, to insist on the fullest investigation of every appropriation before it is passed. If we are to vote every item that the Government demands without discussion, then we are of no use here, and only an unnecessary expense to the country. It would be better to abolish all the private members of the House and let the Government do as they please. Do the Opposition ask anything unreasonable, when

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

they ask that the item should stand until the information is brought down to the House?

Mr. MITCHELL. I have heard with a great deal of regret the attitude in which this question stands before the House. It does appear to me that the members of this Parliament have been acting like school-boys in this matter. It is possible that not having been up all night with the rest of this committee, I do not thoroughly understand the question; but so far as I understand it, I will repeat it. In the early part of the evening up to 12 o'clock I sat listening to the discussion, thinking the House would adjourn about one o'clock, as usual, and I must say I thought the criticisms of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were not captious, but were reasonable and just. In old times, when I used to take an active part in these discussions, before so many bright young statesmen grew up on this side of the sea, I felt that had I done anything less than they have done I should not have been doing my duty to my constituents or to the country. As I understand, all these items have been practically assented to except the last one of \$55,000 towards immigration and immigration expenses. An establishment is maintained in London at very considerable expense, with agents all over the country, having extensive duties to perform. The Minister has stated that the report of Sir Charles Tupper on the subject of immigration is in process of being printed and will shortly be submitted to the House; and the contention of hon. gentlemen on this side is that Parliament has the right to the fullest information the Government can give on the subject before the vote is passed. Now, that is the one blue-book which I contend of all others should be placed before the House before it is asked to vote money. The Government now control every day in the week except Monday, and why should they insist on going on with this debate until they are able to lay that report before the House? I am very glad to see the great seer of this House, the hon. First Minister, come in, and I hope he will pay some attention to the utterances of one who has not taken part in this exciting debate, but has enjoyed a good night's sleep. Now, the whole kernel of the matter is this: is the contention of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House based on constitutional and just principles? If it is, I contend that my hon. friend who has led the House since last night has allowed his temper and his determination to get the better of his judgment. It is the first time that I have known the hon. Minister of Public Works take that position. He has led the House generally with a discretion and a tact which marks him as a statesman, and I am surprised that he should have kept hon. gentlemen here to so late an hour in the morning on so frivolous a pretext. What harm can it do to let this vote stand over until to-morrow's sitting? I contend that the Government should not insist on the committee passing this vote without first giving them the fullest information they can give, and I trust that the leader of the Government will see the propriety of allowing the vote to stand over until the report of Sir Charles Tupper is given to the House.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I have been absent during the night while this discussion has been going on, and I have only gathered the

essence of the discussion since I came in about an hour ago. When the vote for the Experimental Farm was before the House the other night, the hon. Minister of Agriculture consented to let it stand over until the appendix to his report relating to it, which he said was in the hands of the printer, should be brought down; and if that rule was followed in that case, I ask in common sense if it is not right that the same rule should be applied in this case? Moreover, is it not surprising that on the 72nd day of the Session the reports giving the necessary information on the items which we were called on to discuss are not in the hands of the members? I think the Government are standing in their own light before the House and the country, in not allowing the item to stand until the information is ready. Therefore, I think, taking the whole matter into consideration, it would be right for the Minister of Agriculture to allow this to stand over until this report of Sir Charles Tupper is before us.

Mr. MULOCK. I think, if the First Minister had been in the House when the President of the Council gave his opinion, he would have dissented from the doctrine laid down by that hon. gentleman. He says that we should pass this *pro forma* in Committee of the Whole without knowing what we are about or having any investigation. I think that is a dangerous proposition. If it were assented to, all a Minister would have to do to get any questionable item passed would be to say that the information cannot be given and the item should be passed. I protest against that proposition. The responsibility for this report not being here appears to rest on the Printing Bureau—in other words, on the Secretary of State. It is all in the family, and the hon. gentleman is only shifting the responsibility. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Brant, that the original report should be read here as a way to relieve the Government of the difficulty, because I think that reports should be in the hands of all members of the House if they are to be valuable. What reason has the Minister of Agriculture for suppressing this report?

Mr. CARLING. I have not suppressed it. I endeavored to have it here a week or two ago. It has been in the hands of the printer, and I have been waiting for it.

Mr. MULOCK. The President of the Council made a very absurd proposition when he asked if the House was to wait for this item to be passed before the business of the country could be proceeded with. Is this the only business for consideration? Surely the Government have some other business to go on with.

Mr. LAURIER. I think it must strike the Minister of Public Works that he has not, on this occasion, displayed his usual fairness. At two o'clock a motion was made to adjourn, and there can be no reason whatever why this House should not adjourn at 2 o'clock in the morning. If the majority of the House insists upon sitting at that hour, it abuses its power and makes a comedy of our proceedings. One of the most important items we have to discuss is the item of immigration, and after that has been discussed for several hours, it is not unreasonable to ask for an adjournment at 2 o'clock. The majority would not adjourn simply on a matter of mere stubbornness. The Minister of Public Works is doubly wrong. He is

wrong in refusing to adjourn at 2 o'clock, and he is wrong in insisting that an item should be carried, upon which no information could be given. It is not fair for the Government to insist that such an item should be discussed, but it is their duty to supply all the information necessary for its intelligent discussion. If they are not ready to supply that information, the least they can do is to allow the matter to stand until they can. I believe that the Minister of Public Works knows in his conscience that our attitude is right, and I think I am justified in appealing to him to consent to the adjournment. If he does, I pledge myself and my friends to discuss it in a business-like way, so that it will not retard for one moment the end of the Session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think the hon. member should refer to the action of this House as a comedy. Otherwise, I cannot find fault with what he said. No doubt it was a *lapsus linguae*, when he used that word. If the hon. gentleman had been here—and I know it was the state of his health which prevented him—I have no doubt he would not have reasoned as he has done. There is no rule that the House should adjourn at 2 o'clock, though it is not an ordinary thing for us to sit up to this time. In this case, I offered, if hon. gentlemen would pass the balance of these items *pro forma*, so that they might appear in the Votes and Proceedings, that they should have the opportunity of discussing them on concurrence, and then hon. gentlemen would have the right to propose, to amend the resolution, or to strike it out. The objection as to the absence of Sir Charles Tupper's report, was not made until after 7 o'clock this morning. If the hon. gentleman would consent to pass this resolution, we would see that, as soon as the report to which so much importance is attached, is laid before the House, we would call concurrence on this resolution, so that hon. gentlemen could not say that we would defer the opportunity of discussing it. I think hon. gentlemen opposite should accept this proposition. Sometimes we pass a Bill *pro forma* through its second reading, with the understanding, that the principle is not involved. Let this resolution be reported to the House, and we will pledge ourselves to call for concurrence on it within a few days afterwards, so that they may have every opportunity of discussing it in the same way as they would in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman objected to the use I made of the word "comedy," but what is his offer but a comedy? He offers to pass this now on certain conditions, but that is not the way of doing business in Parliament. Why should the minority be compelled to yield to the demand of the majority in this matter? The hon. gentleman knows he has a majority behind him who are ready to support him, but it is only abusing the power of numbers for him to insist upon passing this vote. I will leave it to the fairmindedness of any hon. gentleman, whether it is proper to dictate to the minority that they must pass this resolution *pro forma* or must be compelled to sit. I protest against conduct of this kind. Hon. gentlemen opposite may be stronger than we are, but we can stand it as long as they can.

Mr. MITCHELL. I could understand the action of the Minister of Public Works if the policy of the Opposition during this Session had been to obstruct public business, but I have never seen less obstruction shown to the Estimates in any Session that I have been here since 1867 than has been shown this Session. Of course, there has been criticism, but it is the duty of those gentlemen to see that the Government do their duty. The only justification the Minister of Public Works could have for what I call his obstinacy—he may not like the word, but it is true—would be that the Opposition had pursued a course of obstruction, and has delayed public business unnecessarily. I say there has been no obstruction during the present Session. The hon. gentleman speaks of it as not being an extraordinary thing to sit after two o'clock. I say it is an extraordinary thing, it has not often occurred, and it is only in emergencies that the thing is justifiable, looking at the health of the members, and at the progress of public business. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman has not pursued either a prudent or a judicious course in refusing the reasonable request of the leader of the Opposition. The other day when the right hon. gentleman, not now in his place, was putting through his Estimates, he was unable to reply to some of the questions that were asked. It was evident that the right hon. gentleman had not been able to master the details of his office, yet, with remarkable forbearance, we allowed him to go on, giving such information as he could. It cannot be said that hon. members on this side of the House have in any way retarded the business of the country. As the leader of the Opposition has truly said, the course of the Government on this occasion is simply exercising the power of numbers. The Government have every day of the week but one, they control the business of the House absolutely, and is it to be said that they shall ask us to sit here, day after day, at the expense of comfort and health, unless we pass, blindfolded, without information, the Estimates they present to us? If the hon. gentleman persists in what I cannot help describing as childish obstinacy, I think it is the duty of hon. gentlemen behind him to remember that they have some rights also to be considered in this matter. This question is one of principle, the principle that every man in this House has a right, when he is asked to take the responsibility of voting such a large sum of money as \$55,000, to have all the information necessary in order to enable him to judge of the wisdom of that vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. For the information of those who were not here when this trouble arose, I will give a short account of the proceedings that took place in the Committee. Item 75, on page 36 of these Estimates, was moved. We took the first item, and went on to the item of the assistant agent at Winnipeg, on which there was an extended discussion. Then we came to the assistant interpreter at Winnipeg, on which there was considerable discussion. When we came to the item of immigration agent at Victoria, and an hon. member from that Province asked why the agent of Victoria was only receiving \$1,000, while the agent at Vancouver was receiving \$1,200, the Minister made some explanations, and when he had finished two o'clock had arrived. The hon. mem-

Mr. LAURIER.

ber for Halifax (Mr. Jones) courteously suggested an adjournment, but the Minister of Public Works refused to grant it. The hon. member for Halifax drew attention to the next three items as being important, and upon which an extended discussion would take place, and tried to induce the hon. Minister to consent to an adjournment, but the Minister persistently refused to consent to an adjournment. Then the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) moved that the Committee rise and report. That motion was discussed for some time, and a vote was taken, but still the Minister of Public Works refused to adjourn. Another motion was moved that the Committee rise and report progress. That motion was discussed until 4 o'clock this morning, when those on this side decided, in order to meet the Government as far as possible, that we would consent to the passage of all the items from the item concerning the agency at Vancouver, if the Government would reserve the item of \$55,000. The Minister would not consent to that unless all the items were passed. Then the Chairman called the item of \$5,900, and I asked the Minister of Agriculture with regard to J. G. Colmer, secretary in London. I pointed out that he had drawn certain moneys for travelling expenses, and we wanted to know how it was that he drew that money. The Minister replied that Sir Charles Tupper's report would show that he was in Sir Charles's office, and would show what the money was drawn for, and where he was travelling. Then we asked that Sir Charles Tupper's report should be produced, and the Minister replied that it was in the hands of the printer. Then we again suggested an adjournment, and asked that the Minister should not press the consideration of that item; from that time up to the present the Minister has endeavored to force this Committee into adopting that item, although the Minister of Agriculture declares that he has not in his possession, that he has not in his office, and neither has his deputy, the necessary information to answer the questions we have put.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think hon. members will agree that in discussing the Estimates I have never offered any factious opposition. Perhaps I have hardly done my duty in that respect, but there are so many hon. gentlemen on this side of the House so anxious to discuss the Estimates, that I have allowed them to do so. But, on the present occasion, I cannot keep silent. This House is being asked blindly to vote the Estimates of the Government without having any information respecting the way the money is to be expended. That is the question that the Committee is now discussing, and it will be taken as a precedent for the action of the Government in the future. I submit that the Government have had plenty of time to bring down the needed information. They called this House together on the 16th day of January, and we may assume they believed that they had all the information necessary to lay before the House, to enable us to discharge our duties to the country in a faithful manner. But they were not in possession of it. They have not yet given it to the House, and they have failed to perform the first duty of a government towards the representatives of the people. The Postmaster General said that we would have two opportunities to discuss this question. What does he mean by that? As I understand, there are

two Supplementary Estimates to come down. I ask : Is this item going to be in the Supplementary Estimates? If not, how are we going to discuss it when these Estimates are before the House? Such talk is merely childish. The Minister of Public Works says: "Vote it now and discuss it afterwards." Is that consistent with the dignity of a House like this? When we vote an item it is passed to all intents and purposes, and the only way to undo it is to move an amendment to strike it out when it comes up for concurrence. A vote of that kind is looked upon as a vote of non-confidence, and every member of the other side is expected to vote against it.

Mr. WATSON. Coming from a Province interested in this matter of immigration, I feel it my duty to protest against this item going through without the fullest information of what the Government are doing in Europe in regard to immigration. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) has admitted that it was almost impossible to get an answer, or to get satisfaction from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. We also had the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) who found fault with the Government for the manner in which they were carrying on their immigration policy. We had the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who dealt the most severe castigation to the Government that I ever heard in Parliament. The Government should realise that in this important matter we should have the fullest possible information in regard to these items. The Minister of Agriculture has not given us that information, and I have reason to suppose that the officers who are employed by the Minister and his deputy know little more about immigration matters than they do themselves. We discussed last night the salary that was being paid to Mr. Metcalfe. It was shown that he had been drawing \$150 a month from the 1st of April to the 16th of May, and the Minister of Agriculture cannot state that he had rendered any service at all for that money. If the agents that are employed in the old country are similar to those employed in this country, I think it is a question to consider whether we ought not to remodel the whole immigration system of the country, and the whole staff. It appears to me that the time for such a man as the Deputy Minister of Agriculture has gone by. If we are to compete in Europe for immigration, we must have men who are a little more alive, more able to grasp the situation, than the present Minister of Agriculture and his deputy. We have received very little information with regard to some of the agents in this country who are practically under the immediate supervision of the Department at Ottawa. I am prepared, if the Ministers do not yield, to sit here until Saturday night at 12 o'clock. The Opposition is comprised of an able body of men, and we can sit day and night if necessary, as I hold that we are entitled to obtain from the Minister the information asked.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken boasts of his physical endurance. I cannot make the same boast, I am sorry to say, and, therefore, I am anxious that this little deadlock—it is a small deadlock, but it is a deadlock for the present—should be unlocked. It appears to me that the proposition made by the Minister of Public Works was a reasonable one.

I can quite understand the position of the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) that if it was the rule, as he suggested, that the House was committed to this vote finally and irretrievably, because it was passed in Committee. That is not the case. Every one who has been in Parliament one Session knows that arrangements are continually made by which votes are passed in Committee to be afterwards settled on concurrence. I hear an hon. gentleman say, that, from his experience, members are impatient when we get into concurrence, and that even his own side are impatient. We can avoid that. Let it be understood that this item is passed *pro forma* to get it through Committee; let it be understood that this item shall be brought up separately, that it shall be brought up before any Supplementary Estimates are asked to be voted, and let it be understood also that there shall be the same full discussion as if we were still in Committee, although the Speaker is in the Chair. The majority will then not be subjected to the humiliation of fighting a battle and being defeated by the minority. And you can well understand the feeling of the majority. On the other hand, the minority will feel that they have substantially succeeded in carrying what they wanted, and we will resume our old position of joint action for the good of the country. I think that is a reasonable proposition. My proposition is simply this: pass this *pro forma* in Committee, and let it be reported. It will then be brought up again, before any attempt is made to go into Committee on the Supplementary Estimates, and, therefore, there is no chance of its being kept over till the end of the Session when both parties might be impatient, and it would go through. Further, that when the question of concurrence in this item comes up, full discussion can take place, and hon. gentlemen can speak as often as they like upon it, as if we were in Committee. I know it is an unpleasant thing that we should be in this fix. If this proposition is adopted, the majority will have in one sense their way, as majorities ought to have; and, on the other hand, the minority will succeed in carrying their point.

Mr. LAURIER. It is evident that the First Minister is not aware that this offer has been made again and again from that side of the House. The hon. gentleman says it is not pleasant to the majority to submit to the minority. It is also not pleasant for the minority to submit to the majority, although they are sometimes compelled to do it. It is right, however, that the party which is in the wrong should submit, and if the majority are in the wrong they should submit all the more gracefully because they are the stronger party in the House. I leave it to the judgment of the First Minister himself. This vote is composed of twenty-six items, and it is one of the most important that can come up for discussion. It was discussed in a fair and temperate manner, and I appeal with great confidence to the First Minister that he cannot charge the Opposition with unduly obstructing the business of the House. We have discharged our duties throughout this Session to the best of our judgment, and the First Minister cannot say that on any occasion there was an obstructive spirit displayed by the Opposition. This group of items, twenty-six in number, was

discussed up to 2 a.m. Was it not right that when the Committee had reached that hour it should rise, and a proposition to that effect was made from this side of the House. How was that met by the other side? It was met by a refusal, and a declaration that the whole item should be passed. It was objected by this side of the House that it was not proper to discuss the subject at that hour. Under these circumstances, I am satisfied that if the First Minister would give his fair and unbiassed opinion, he would agree that the Opposition, in thus acting, was quite within its privilege and its right. I firmly believe that if the First Minister had been in his place, this request would have been granted at once. While I quite admit that the Minister of Public Works is usually a fair-minded man, every one can be impatient sometimes and get out of temper and the hon. gentleman did so on this occasion. I know it is hard for any party to admit, and especially so for a majority, that it is wrong. It is hard for men to believe they are in the wrong. But they are not infallible, and the First Minister should agree that the proposition from this side of the House is a fair and reasonable one, that the item should stand over for further information and discussion.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is not quite correct in the statement he made in the beginning of his speech, that this proposition submitted by the leader of the Government had been repeatedly made previously. That proposition was only made by the Minister of Public Works the last time he spoke. The proposition which had been made by the leader of the House during the night, was that the question should be considered and fully debated on concurrence. To that proposition the members of the Opposition took objection, on the ground that concurrence generally occurs at the close of the Session when there was not time to give the subject full consideration. That objection was met the last time the Minister of Public Works spoke, by his statement that if it would meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen opposite he would pledge the Government to move concurrence on item 75 as soon as the report was laid on the Table. That was the first proposition, and it was considered a proposition which might fairly and honorably be accepted by those who have taken the position they have taken on this question, because the objection urged about 2 o'clock this morning was that no time would be given for the full consideration of this question on which they contended they had not sufficient information. The leader of the Opposition was comfortably snoozing, I have no doubt, during the night, but I had the great pleasure of sitting here without a wink of sleep since the House opened yesterday. But I feel about as fresh as the hon. gentleman, and I am quite able to stand another 24 hours if necessary.

Mr. LISTER. Go on. You have thrown down the gauntlet.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not thrown down any gauntlet. What I was going to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite was that the discussion for from four to six hours was upon the item for an assistant immigrant agent at Winnipeg, upon which the question arose as to the propriety or impropriety of employing Mr. J. H. Metcalfe, a member of the

Local Legislature of Ontario, and the whole night until the motion for adjournment was made, was wasted on that question alone.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not wasted.

Mr. BOWELL. That is a matter of opinion; I say wasted. The demand was made on the Minister of Agriculture that he should give certain information in regard to the whereabouts of Mr. Metcalfe from 1st April until 16th May, when it appears, according to the Auditor General's Report, he proceeded to Manitoba. The Minister stated that he was not in a position to give the information as to what that gentleman was doing during that period, but he would at the earliest moment obtain it and inform the Committee. It is true I said there might be reasons, with which I was not acquainted, being in another Department, why he could not give that information; but the Minister of Agriculture gave all the information in regard to the employment of that hon. gentleman, what his business was in the North-West, how he had been employed, how long he had been there, and the necessity which the Government considered sufficiently strong to justify his employment. When asked the question as to his re-employment by the Government the Minister further stated that if the Government deemed it necessary in the interest of the immigration department that he should be employed, they would re-employ him; and he promised further, and he pledge himself as straightforwardly as a Minister could pledge himself, to give to the Committee that information which hon. gentlemen sought. But that was not satisfactory. The system pursued was one of cross-examination that more became the pettyfogging of a police court than anything else, and it was a system of badgering not creditable to the House nor respectful to any Minister. Had that badgering been directed to me, I should not have through it very strange, because I am very apt to strike back, but my hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture is of a mild disposition, exceedingly courteous and never loses his temper.

Mr. LISTER. You were the worst man from 1874 to 1878 in the whole Opposition.

Mr. BOWELL. That statement comes from a gentleman who was not here at that time, and who consequently knows nothing about it. Had it come from a gentleman who knew something about the proceedings of the House then, I would treat it differently. But the hon. gentleman on this occasion, as on most others, has spoken either from hearsay or recklessly. In Opposition I did what I considered to be my duty, but I never badgered any Minister as the Minister of Agriculture has been badgered to-night. When the Minister of Agriculture had given all the information in his possession to hon. gentlemen opposite, when he had stated the reasons for the employment of Mr. Metcalfe and had offered other explanations, it was then the threat came from the other side of the House that the item should not be allowed to pass and no further work should be done until we had acceded to their request. No threat came from this side of the House further than what I said in the way of being able to remain another twenty-four hours if necessary. Although older than some hon. gentlemen opposite, I have the good fortune to be able to stand a little fatigue, and I am quite prepared to do so in the interest of good government.

Mr. LAURIER.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. Minister has been a little inaccurate in some of his statements just addressed to the House, and I desire to give my version of the affair, so that members who are now present and the country may understand how the discussion proceeded. This is not a contest on the part of the Opposition for supremacy over the Government, but it is a contention on their part for the principle that before we vote the people's money we have a right to obtain information as to what is to be done with that money; while the position of the Government, led by the Minister of Public Works, was this: We, by force of our superior number, will compel you to vote money without giving the information. That was the plain, straight, clear issue last night. I agree that there will be a compensating advantage to this debate having been carried on all night, in the fact that the attention of the people will be called to the subject of immigration and to the conduct of Government business in a more marked manner than could otherwise have occurred. If the First Minister were to read the proceedings as recorded in *Hansard* he would admit that no factious opposition had been offered, and that no speeches had been delivered except such as were justly called for by the circumstances of the case and the information sought to be elicited. As to the relevancy or irrelevancy of the speeches made by members of the Opposition, you will not find, Sir, on the pages of *Hansard* of to-night's proceedings any evidence to show that this debate was conducted by the Opposition with the view of wasting time. I was out of the House for a little while and heard nothing of the taunt which the Minister of Customs said was thrown across the House in reference to the Metcalfe matter, that if the Government would not adjourn no more items would pass. If the hon. gentleman is correct in that statement, I beg to remind him that after that several items were passed. That taunt was made over the item concerning the agent at Winnipeg, but after that the item regarding the salary of the assistant agent at Winnipeg and of the agents at Brandon and Calgary, and Port Arthur, and Victoria, and Vancouver were passed. My recollection of the matter is that at 2 o'clock in the morning—and I am able to speak the more freely because I took no part whatever in the discussion with reference to Mr. Metcalfe—when we were endeavoring to elicit information from the Minister which he was either unwilling or unable to give, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), who was leading the Opposition, said in the most courteous way to the Minister of Public Works: It is now 2 o'clock and I think we had better adjourn, as we cannot hope to carry all these items to-night. To this the Minister of Public Works replied, in my judgment rather curtly: No; we will take the whole item. The discussion went on; the items I have read were passed, and the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), again at 2.30, suggested that as it was evidently impossible to finish all the items to-night, we had better adjourn. Again as firm a refusal came from the lips of the Minister of Public Works; and it was not until 3 o'clock, when the Minister of Public Works had announced in the same imperious manner that this item had to go through, information or no information—by sheer force—because he, the great acting First Minister, willed it, then and not till then was the motion moved by

the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. A discussion took place over that motion; about 4 or 5 o'clock we had a vote, and the Chairman declared, I think correctly, that there was a majority against us, both of members asleep and awake. Another motion was made to rise, and at 7 o'clock or 8 o'clock that was also declared lost. We then endeavored to go on with this item of salaries to agents in Europe. The First Minister will admit that it was with a laudable desire for information, the hon. member for North Wellington asked with reference to the amount paid to Mr. Colmer, Secretary of the High Commissioner's office, what services had been rendered by him. The Ministers of Justice and Customs will bear me out when I state that the Minister of Agriculture replied that he could not tell what Mr. Colmer or any of these agents did, but only what they were paid. We insisted on knowing what services were performed by these gentlemen, and he again said: I cannot tell you. I asked: Is there not a report of Sir Charles Tupper, under whom these agents are commissioned, for in previous years we always had such a report. The Minister replied that it was in the printers' hands. Very well, I said, it is necessary that we should have that statement of Sir Charles Tupper, and as evidence of that necessity I read what the Minister of Agriculture said of it in his report:

"The report of Sir Charles Tupper and those agents acting under his instructions affords many interesting details respecting trade and industry in Great Britain which affect more or less immigration to this country."

That is what we want, and the Minister recognises the fact that it is something Parliament should be possessed of, but he asks us to vote this sum before that report is in our hands. Not having that report, we are forced to ask the Minister to tell us what these agents have done, and he replies that he cannot, but that the information is in the report. If the First Minister insists on our going on without the report, he is insisting on our acting in opposition to what they laid down as the correct principle the other night, namely, that when a sum appeared in the Estimates and the House was asked to vote that sum, if the report bearing on it was not in the hands of members, it was right, reasonable and proper that that item should stand. If the First Minister insists on this item being now voted; he insists on a course being taken which he himself has condemned. At 8 or 9 o'clock this morning we said: if it was necessary for the despatch of business, we are prepared to sit here night and day, and will take up item after item, on which you can give us information. Let us go on with those, but not with items on which you can give us no information. Oh, no, simply because the Minister of Public Works attempted to act as an autocrat, and said this matter must go through, it must, forsooth, go through. The Minister of Public Works said we could debate the item on concurrence and have as wide a latitude then as in Committee of the Whole. But if we did, there would be no saving of time, and that only shows the unreasonableness of the Minister in attempting to force the vote through to-night; and besides in concurrence we all know that the items are passed with great rapidity, merely as a matter of form, and that in all probability the Minister relies on this item, sharing the same fate as the others in that respect.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Paterson) requested me to send to the printers for the manuscript report. I have it here and am prepared to answer any question respecting it.

Mr. CHARLTON. We must be put in possession of the contents of the report, and I would call on the hon. gentleman to read it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If the Minister is in possession of the information the Committee is seeking to obtain, he ought to proceed to give it to us.

Mr. LISTER. We are asked to vote an expenditure of \$55,000, and it would be impossible for hon. members to interrogate the Minister on every particular item. The only way we can examine into the question is by reading the report, or being made acquainted with its contents. The Secretary of State abolished the system of printing by contract and took into his own hands the public printing, not for the purpose of saving expense, but for the purpose of acquiring patronage. Every one knows that if there is a man in the world who loves patronage, it is the Secretary of State. We know he wants to be Minister of Railways because it is the biggest patronage department in the whole Government. It is simply amusing to hear the Minister of Customs get up and badger the Opposition. Why, Sir, of all the members on the Government side, the Minister of Customs is the last man in whose mouth such a charge should find such an utterance; because if there was a man in the old days, between 1874 and 1876, who felt his duty to act as the division court lawyer or a petty cross-examiner, that man was the Minister of Customs. He has no right to charge the Opposition with being guilty of factiousness. We are here in the discharge of a public duty, and before we vote items of this kind we want the fullest information. The Minister of Customs says he will be as fresh in forty-eight hours as he is to-day. Perhaps he will. We know that in 1885 the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Fisheries, who were then private members, brought pillows into this room, and if there had been a space in their seats they would have brought in beds upon which to repose themselves. Perhaps the Minister of Customs means to resort to the same device now. It is merely begging the question to ask the House to put this discussion off till concurrence, because everybody knows that we will then have less time to discuss it than we have now. Now, I would remind the Minister of Agriculture, who pretends to be the special champion of the farmers of Canada, that he is spending their money recklessly in refusing to give the members of this House an opportunity of judging as to the propriety of the expenditure. Sir, it is pitiable to see an hon. gentleman who has been so long in Parliament as the Minister of Agriculture, sit perfectly dumb in his seat unable to give any information upon the subject under discussion. I have no doubt that he has never read the report which he has in his hands. He knows no more about that report than any member of this Opposition, who has never seen it. For the sake of his own reputation the hon. gentleman ought gladly to have accepted the suggestion of the Opposition to let this item stand over, at all events, until he himself had acquired some information as to what that report contains.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the remarks of the gentleman who has just sat down, are a sample of the oratory that has been inflicted upon this House during the night, I think those who were not present have escaped a severe trial. I think the time of the House should be better employed than in listening to such elucubrations as we have just heard. The hon. gentleman has spoken of my ambition to be Minister of Railways. I do not thank him for interfering with my own affairs. Judging from his own dignity, and his own pomposity when he is addressing this House, we might conclude that nothing short of the position of Prime Minister would satisfy his ambition. He has a chance to see patience tried. The hon. gentleman says that I wished to be Minister of Railways because of my love of patronage.

Mr. LISTER. Everybody knows it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. member does not know it. The character which he attributes to me is entirely foreign to my disposition. If there is one man in this House who hates patronage more than another, that man is myself. Nothing like the possession of patronage so quickly wears a man out in political life. When I proposed in this House to establish a Government Printing Bureau, I simply proposed to follow the precedent established in other countries, and particularly in the United States, a country which the hon. gentleman admires so much, where the institution has proved a great success. The hon. gentleman complains that he is not able to read the report of the agents in Europe. When the hon. members of the Opposition get this report, they will see that our agents in Europe have been doing for the past year pretty much the same as they have been doing for the last ten years; they have been trying to bring immigrants to this country, and have been doing as well as they could. Their instructions have been the same as they have received in previous years. I am perfectly sure, that when the report is in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite they will find nothing in it to complain of, I dare say they won't read it; still, for the last twenty-four hours they have been calling to see that report, and they refuse to pass this vote until they do see it. Why should they not allow this item to go through now, and after they have seen the report they can object to it on concurrence, if they deem it their duty to do so. They must know, that it is only on concurrence that an item is finally accepted or rejected, and the sense of the House tested by motion. I remember, that when Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Public Works, items involving great sums of money were allowed to pass the Committee and taken up again on concurrence, under the promise of the Minister that he would give full information at that stage, and I think we might well do the same with this unimportant item.

Mr. TROW. The more this subject is discussed the more mysterious it appears to be. The Opposition proposed, very reasonably, that we should get some more information before passing this item. The hon. member for Brant proposed to send a messenger to the Bureau in order to get a copy of the report. It appears that the Minister of Agriculture has sent for that report, and now has it in his hands. That makes the matter still more mysterious, because, although he has the report in

his hands, he still declines to read it. I have been struck with one thing during the progress of this discussion, and that is to see the Secretary of State come to the relief of the Minister of Public Works. We have been informed that those gentlemen are not on the best of terms, but it is evident that a conciliation has now taken place, and this discussion has done that much good, at all events. The members of the Government charge the Opposition with being factious. There is no factiousness in our course at all. Even the Minister of Customs charges us with being factious, but we all remember that during the Mackenzie Government he was one of the most factious of men. I have seen the present Minister of Customs, spend three or four hours in discussing paltry items, not amounting to more than \$50. He was, in fact, the most factious member of the Opposition. After this discussion that has taken place, I think, the First Minister should allow the matter to stand over.

Mr. COOK. When any difficulty arises with the Government, it is now always stated that the Printing Bureau is at fault. We remember when the bureau was inaugurated, it was contended by the Government that delays in printing would not occur. I have been very anxious to see the revised voters list for my county from that bureau. An opinion prevails that there will be a great many clerical errors in connection with the voters' list, and that they will be almost invariably on one side of politics. I warn every Reform association in Canada to get a revised list, and compare it with the voters' list and see if some names are not left off. I believe the Government inaugurated this bureau to perpetuate their lease of power, and they made a good selection when they selected the Secretary of State as its head. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten an article published with a portrait of himself, and giving a description of his political doings? Was that article written by the hon. gentleman, or did he get one of his employés to write it?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. What article?

Mr. COOK. If ever there was a piece of egotism displayed it was in this case. "The Pericles of Modern Days." I wish to emphasise this question of voters' list, and if I find one name of a friend off the list, the Secretary of State will have to give an account of himself. I warn him in that regard. I was surprised that the Minister of Customs should have made such statements in regard to the Opposition. The Opposition have been very lenient in dealing with the Government, and they might be censured for allowing items to pass, as they did not wish to offer factious opposition. When the member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) stated that the Minister of Customs was one of the most factious opponents in the time of the Mackenzie Administration, he spoke by the book. Then the Minister had the hardihood to say that this was like all the hon. gentleman's statements, as he was not here. I was here, and I remember well, as stated by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), that he dealt in small things, that he was engaged in two-penny-half-penny business. He has enlarged a little since he got into the Government where he handles millions of the people's money. I remember the way in which he worked himself from seat to

seat until he forced himself into the Government, and in fact he played his cards pretty well. It was stated by the Minister of Public Works, that it was not until after seven o'clock this morning that the demand was made for the report in question. It is only by such discussions that we get at the underground workings of the Government; they have so many underground wires it is impossible to discover them until brought to light accidentally by one of themselves. During the earlier part of the discussion efforts were made by the Government to show that the country was prosperous and was filling up with immigrants, and Toronto was cited as an instance. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) gloried in the increased number of people that came to that place. I glory with him. But they were not immigrants; they were Canadian people, who came there from different sections, lured by a class of people who would make Annanias tremble for his supremacy to-day. I refer to the land-sharks and speculators, and the hon. gentleman is one of them.

Mr. COCKBURN. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not understand the hon. member to use the word land-shark to any member of this House.

Mr. COCKBURN. He said I was one of them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If so, the hon. gentleman must retract the word.

Mr. COOK. Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has withdrawn the expression, if he did use it, and the House must accept his withdrawal.

Mr. COOK. The cap appears to fit the hon. gentleman. From what I have gathered, I think the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has given the most true statement of the Government's abilities ever given by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House. I understand that hon. gentleman stated that they had not brains enough to manage one department if all their brains were rolled into one. The Agriculture Department is a disgrace to this country. In regard to the management of the Agriculture Department, a gentleman, who knows more about it than I do, states that the officials are not capable men, that they are either too old, too inexperienced, or too dishonest.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the word "dishonest."

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman did not apply it to any member of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am advised and believe that it is against the rules of the House.

Mr. COOK. I do not wish to violate the rules of the House, and if it is a violation of the rules I withdraw it; but I was speaking of a Department, not of a member of the House. But I may say this of the Minister of Agriculture, that he has either shown a lack of ability in his Department or else a stubbornness that does not become a Minister of the Crown. He is a pretty smooth man with a clean shaved face and he usually gets his items through the Committee without a great deal of trouble; but he is like all the other members of the Govern-

ment. He must not hold himself up as a paragon of perfection because, like all the rest, either he does not know anything about his Department, or he does not care to give the information which the House desires. He must, therefore, not think he is an exception to the rule; he must be judged according to his acts, and I am glad to say he will be so judged. This affair is a sad commentary on the wisdom of the Government so far as their interests are concerned; but, so far as the interests of the country are concerned, it is the very best thing that could happen. This will lead the people to look into this immigration matter, and perhaps the Minister of Agriculture may be the means of defeating this Government at the next election, and he would feel very badly over that. Although the hon. gentleman may be perfectly pure and truthful and high-minded, I do not see why he should say to the Opposition that these items must be passed, because not only have the Opposition, but members of his own side have criticised the management of his Department. The country will notice that members of the Government, in administering public affairs, have made statements one day and contradicted them the next. I will not refer to particular Ministers, but I could mention more than one who this Session has made statements one day which were truthfully contradicted the next. How can we believe them when we find they have committed acts of that sort? I believe, even at this late hour, the Government should submit to the will of the Opposition, and I use the word "submit" advisedly, because they are in the wrong. If we were in the wrong I would rise at once and ask the leader of the Opposition to submit. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about factious opposition. I have not heard a speech during the debate that was not to the point, but I remember during the Mackenzie Administration, from 1874 to 1878, that members of the Opposition talked six hours at a time on an item, but they did not talk, but read from musty books from the library hour after hour. We have not attempted to prolong the Session or offer factious opposition, but we do want to get the plain honest facts, and to know exactly what we are voting upon and for what purposes we are voting away public money. In my own business I would not allow an employé to expend a dollar, without knowing for what purpose it was expended. If I would not do that in my own business, why should I allow public money to be voted away by a set of men in whom I have no confidence?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would forgive readily the aspersions or insinuations which the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has cast upon myself, for I know that if the scales in which he weighs his words were inspected by the proper officer they would be confiscated; but I cannot forgive him the unjustifiable and undeserved slander which he has thrown upon as faithful and loyal a body of men as there is in this Dominion—the printers of the Printing Bureau. The hon. gentleman said that the voters' lists were likely to be, if they had not been, tampered with in the printing office, and that the Government, in selecting for the head of the Printing Department the Secretary of State, had made the right selection for the perpetration of that infamy. What concerns me I can readily forget and forgive, knowing the source from which the insult comes; but

Mr. COOK.

what concerns the officers of my Department I cannot leave unnoticed and unavenged. If the hon. gentleman knew what he was talking about, he would know that the voters' lists are not completed until they have been carefully compared, corrected, and reconsidered by the revising officer and bear his signature.

Mr. COOK. I understand all that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman understands it now, and will understand it better when called on to withdraw his charge. He may find himself in the same position as that in which he was placed a moment ago when, having misrepresented a member of this House, and being forced to withdraw what he had said, he meekly withdrew his aspersions. I repeat that the hon. member for Simcoe did not know what he was talking about, because if those lists be tampered with at all, they would be tampered with by the revising officers, who, in the case of the hon. gentleman's county, is one of the county judges of Ontario. I leave these judges to say what they think of the aspersion of the hon. member. The hon. gentleman said he had long ago foreseen the difficulties of the Printing Bureau, and that the printers in the Department were always on strike, or on the eve of a strike. This is again a slander against these men. Printers have done what they had a right to do in forming part of a trades union. They made their representations in a calm and clear manner; we discussed the question with them, and we came to an agreement honorable to the Government and creditable to the workmen; and I know who are sorry that an amicable settlement was come to, and no opportunity given to cast discredit on the Government among the workmen! It is well, when we see erratic public men and newspapers trying to set employes against their employers, that the workmen should know who are their slanderers! I will not follow the example of the hon. gentleman and go outside this discussion as he did, I would have to go too far. I would have to go into the forest, and there he would have the advantage over me.

Mr. COOK. You would not say that out of the House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I know that whoever meets the hon. gentleman in the forest has always got the worst of it. I know that he got the best of no less a shrewd man than the leader of the preceding Administration in a timber limit deal, and afterwards brought to grief no less shrewd men than Scotch capitalists when the timber was taken out of the limit. I cannot say it in Gaelic, and I do not wish to use the language of the courts in relation to that transaction of his, or I might have something to say to the hon. gentleman which it would not be pleasant for him to hear, and which would create a greater impression than even my Printing Department has created on the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think we ought to settle down to work and not lose the time of the Committee in useless discussion. The hon. Minister has now the report which we all desire to see, and he should proceed to make us acquainted with its contents.

Mr. SPROULE. Hon. gentleman opposite are either inconsistent or dishonest or both.

MR. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. SPROULE. If the word "dishonest" as used here is unparliamentary, I certainly withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN. A statement made hypothetically is contrary to the rule.

Mr. SPROULE. I bow to your decision, Sir. They are inconsistent for this reason: that while they complained previously that the Minister could not answer the questions they put, now that the Minister has the report of the Department in his hands and is prepared to answer their questions, they will not put them, but insist that he should read this voluminous report through. These hon. gentlemen are merely trifling with the dignity of the House, and with the business of the country, in making such a proposition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I desire to point out is, that were this a mere question of personal feeling between the two sides of the House I would use all my influence with my friends to induce them to waive their objections, but really this is a question of grave importance, although the amount involved is small. I would ask the First Minister whether the rule has not always been that, when Ministers brought down any item on which reports had been presented, the Government would not, unless by consent of both sides, press these items without submitting the report? The reason is obvious. Before members are called upon to discuss a particular item, it is only just that the report of the work performed by the officers, whose salaries we are called on to vote, should be in the hands of members. It is quite true that, in Sir Charles Tupper's time, the Opposition at his request, and as a matter of courtesy, have often waived the production of the report before voting the item, but I do not think the First Minister can point to any instance in which a Government insisted on forcing through an item before the report of the Minister was laid before the House. In the present case my hon. friends, while willing to dispense with having that report in their hands, insist that they should have cognisance of its contents, if the Minister chooses to read it. That certainly is as great a concession as they can make, having reference to parliamentary usage and custom which has hitherto prevailed. I do not know what the Ministers are going to do. Within two hours and a half we are to have an important deliverance of the Finance Minister, for which the public are anxiously waiting, and it is unfortunate that we should be called upon to discuss so important a matter when members are exhausted by a long night's sitting and unable to give it that attention it demands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In answer to the hon. gentleman I must state that he is quite correct in saying that items are not forced through when reports connected with them are not before the House, but there is no attempt in this case to fight the vote through. A proposition was made that the whole item should be adopted, *pro forma*, and that it should be reconsidered with the Speaker in the chair. It was alleged, and truly, that, as a general rule, concurrence comes late in the Session when both sides are weary of discussion, and when there would be little opportunity for criticism. In

answer to that my hon. friend made a proposition this morning, which I repeated, that this item should pass, *pro forma*, and that when it came up on concurrence, it should be dealt with fully, and that it should be discussed before the Supplementary Estimates came down. Therefore, the objection that if it was postponed to the end of the Session, it would not be fully discussed, was done away with. It got to be a matter of feeling on both sides. I made a suggestion that the majority would be satisfied by the *pro forma* acceptance of the motion in Committee, and that later we should discuss it very fully before the Supplementary Estimates came down.

Mr. CHARLTON. Where is the saving of time by that proposition?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We do not save any time, but we have a resolution to report. There would be no feeling of humiliation on either side. In the first place, the majority would be satisfied by getting the resolution adopted *pro forma*; on the other hand, the Opposition will have full opportunity to discuss the item after the report has been brought down. That is a pretty fair compromise, I think, on the whole.

Mr. LAURIER. It is no compromise at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want, in the slightest degree, to humiliate hon. gentlemen opposite. I think it is better to follow our parliamentary usage and to accept the proposition which was made by my hon. friend behind me, and which was this: Let us pass all the items in this resolution except one or two in dispute, and, if you like, all but the last one, so as to save the feelings of hon. gentlemen, and then let the Committee rise. I am contending simply for the custom which the hon. gentleman contended for when he was on this side, and that is the custom that the reports of the various Ministers should be in our hands before the items are discussed to which those reports refer.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, would be a reasonable one, that is to say, that the item of \$5,900 should be passed, and, if necessary, the next two items also, and leave the last item of \$55,000, to be considered hereafter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think both sides are anxious to get out of this little rut. Suppose we split the difference.

Mr. MITCHELL. You have done it already. We have given you three items out of the four.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In this item 75 there are a great many sub-items. Suppose we take all these and pass them as one resolution, and let the others stand over as resolution 75a, to be considered afterwards.

Mr. MULOCK. That proposition I made about half-past two o'clock this morning, but the Minister of Public Works would not accept it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think it should be understood that if we pass, *pro forma*, these salaries of agents in Europe we ought to be allowed to discuss that question again when we get the report.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand it the proposition of the First Minister is to allow the sub-items

which have been passed already, to be reported as resolution 75, and the others to stand for discussion as resolution 75a.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. 75a will be composed of these items which are not passed. The last item passed was the agent at Vancouver. This will be reported as resolution 75 and the others will stand as 75a.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand from my hon. friends around me, the proposition made last night was that if the last ones were allowed to stand, the others would be passed.

Mr. LAURIER. The proposition was made, as I understand, to carry the whole item except the last sub-item, but that was not agreed to. I agree to the proposition of the First Minister to report sub-items which have been passed as resolution 75, and let the others stand as resolution 75a.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The First Minister will see that this item of salaries to agents in Europe has not passed, and the whole fight has been that we have not got anything printed in relation to them. When the Experimental Farm was called, the hon. member for Huron, who desired to speak upon it, was told that the Minister of Agriculture was not in possession of the needed information, but that it would be found in an appendix to his report. It was pointed out that the appendix was

not yet down; hon. gentlemen opposite saw that was reasonable, and they let the item stand. This report of Sir Charles Tupper dealing with the salaries of agents in Europe, is not down, and there is the trouble.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My proposition is to pass all the items except the last one, and that the last one should stand as 75a. The hon. member for South Oxford will see that, under that item regarding immigration and immigration expenses, every possible subject connected with immigration can be discussed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that no objection will be raised under the last item to the discussion of the three preceding ones which have not been discussed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No objection whatever.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That being understood, I would suggest to my hon. friends that the proposition be accepted.

Resolutions reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.50 p. m. (Thursday).

INDEX.

FOURTH SESSION—SIXTH PARLIAMENT, 1890.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1^o, 2^o, 3^o, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adj., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; D.v., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negated; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret. Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl. Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in *Italic* and parentheses are those of the mover.

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse*.

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4082 (ii).
Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4584 (ii).
Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1793 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 963; (personal explanation) 1069 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Tenders for Supplies (Ques.) 1120.
Grandin's, Mgr., Letter to Cardinal Taschereau (Ques.) 119 (i).
Independence of Parlt. B. 12 (Mr. *Casgrain*) on M. for 2^o, 2212 (i).
I. C. R., Freight Rates on Flour (Ques.) 248 (i).
Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4845 (ii).
Laurie, Gen., Mileage, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4003 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2073 (i).
Loyalty to Her Majesty, on prop. Address (Mr. *Mulock*) 126 (i).
Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1811 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Deudney*) in Com., 4467 (ii).
Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3^o, 1348 (i).

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued*.

Otter, Steamship, and Mail Service (Ques.) 123 (i).
Printing Com.'s Rep. (6th) on M. to conc., 4659.
Provincial Govts., transfer of Property authorisation B. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1^o, 1515 (i).
Quebec Post Office, Superannuation of Employés, on M. for O.C.'s, &c., 62 (i).
Queen's Counsel, position of (Ques.) 1486 (i).
— Appointments (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2099; wthdn., 2124 (i).
Revising Officer, Champlain (Ques.) 2022 (i).
St. Michel Wharf, Repairs (Ques.) 246 (i).
SUPPLY:
Indians (Surveys) 2161 (i).
Militia (Monuments) 4652 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des familles Canadiennes) 4116 (ii).
Railways—*Capital*: I. C. R. (Moncton, increased accommodation) 4016 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J., *South Middlesex*.

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4379, 4523; on M. for 3^o (Amt.) neg. on a div., 4590 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 1831 (i).
Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2030 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 315 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1032 (i).

Armstrong, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1288 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt.
(Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1134 (i).

SUPPLY :

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2511 (i).
Indians : Ont. (Oneida) 4784 (ii).
Militia (compensation in lieu of land) 1288 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3239,
3402, 3538 (ii).

Bain, Mr. J. W., *Soulanges.*

Beauharnois Canal enlargement (M. for Reps.,
&c.) 517 (i).

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth.*

Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr.
Taylor) on M. for 2^o, 1258 (i).

Dundas and Waterloo Macadam Road (Ques.) 68.
— (M. for Ret.) 149 (i).

Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop.
Res. (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) 2027 (i).

Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists, on
prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1502 (i).

Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res.
(Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) 1057 (i).

Grand Trunk Railway B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on
M. to suspend Rules, 2180 (i).

Oleomargarine, Imports from U.S. (Ques.) 122.

SUPPLY :

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2422 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3288,
3544 (ii).

Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Co.'s
B., on M. to suspend Rules, 4822 (ii).

Baird, Mr. G. F., *Queen's, N.B.*

SUPPLY :

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and W. Indies
and S. America) 1990 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3755 (ii).

Barnard, Mr. F. S., *Cariboo.*

Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on prop.
Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1131 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) 1143.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3138 (ii).

Barron, Mr. J. A., *North Victoria, Ont.*

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com.,
4281 (ii).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John*
Thompson) in Com., 107 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M.
for 2^o, 2711 (ii).

Debates, Official, accommodation for Staff, 3723.

Franchise Act Amt. (B. 44, 1^o*) 184 (i) ; Order for
2^o read, 3703 (ii).

— B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3901 (ii).

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt.
to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o B.
10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 905 (i).

Goderich and Strathroy P.O., Tenders (Ques.)
2377 (i).

Barron, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*

Hudspeth, Mr., late M.P., deceased (remarks)
4831 (ii).

Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt.
(Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3^o, 1345 (i).

Quebec Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 4500 (ii).

— article in *Le Canadien* (remarks) 4825 (ii).

— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Telegram read)
4563 (ii).

Sultana Island, Lake of the Woods (M. for Ret.)
140 (i).

— incomplete Rets. (remarks) 2186 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals—*Capital* (Trent River Nav.) 2277 (i).

Collection of Revenues : Canals (Maintenance,
&c.) 3871 (ii) ; Post Office, 2290 (i).

Indians (Annuities under Robinson Treaty) 2154 ;
(N. W. T., Schools) 2173 (i).

Militia (Armories, care of, &c.) 1325 (i).

Miscellaneous (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4071.

Public Works—*Income* : Buildings (Ont.) 4703 (ii).

Toronto Harbor Improvements, Tenders, &c. (M.
for Ret.*) 1712 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Bridge (remarks) 3703 (ii).

— Commission (Ques.) 118 ; (M. for Ret.*)
145 (i).

Voters' Lists, Revising Officers' Rets. (Ques.)
2827 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir
Richard Cartwright) 3016 (ii).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*

Berthier County Mail Service (M. for Pets., &c.)
529 (i).

Drill Hall, Montreal, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 883 (1).

Fernetville P. O., Closing (M. for Pets., &c.)
529 (i).

Fishermen in St. Lawrence, Licenses, on M. for
Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4569 (ii).

Floods in Laprairie (Ques.) 884 (1).

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) B. 10 (Mr.

McCarthy) on M. for 2^o (Amt. to Amt.) 554 ;
neg. (Y. 63, N. 117) 876 ; on Amt. (Sir *John*
Thompson) 997 (i).

Montreal Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 884 (i).

St. Edmond, Erection of P. O. (Ques.) 91, 401 (i).

St. Gabriel and St. Damien Mail Service (M. for
Pets., &c.) 529 (i).

Béchar, Mr. F., *Iberville.*

Calvin, services *re* prosecution (Ques.) 4399 (ii).

Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson*, *Elgin*)
to repeal, 1154 (i).

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt.
to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o B.
10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 926 (i).

Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt.
(Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3^o, 1350 (i).

Pagans in Joliette County, on M. for Ret., 513 (i).

St. Hyacinthe, purchase of Land (Ques.) 4399 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3121,
3747, 3884 (ii).

Bell, Mr. J. W., *Addington.*

- Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 92, 1^o*) 883 (i).
 Thousand Islands Bridge and Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 94, 1^o*) 883 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*

- Ballot Boxes, Patent, on Rep. of Sel. Com., 4658 (ii).
 Beauharnois Canal, Enlargement (Ques.) 187 (i).
 Beauharnois Junction Ry. Co., Subsidies voted (M. for Stmnt.) 3693 (ii).
 Canada Atlantic Ry. Bridge, Subsidies voted (M. for Stmnt.) 3663 (ii).
 Columbia and Kootenay Ry. Co.'s (B. 128) Rep. of Standing Com. (presented) 2310 (i).
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4586 (ii).
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2178, 2184 (i).
 "Hungry Bay" Dam, Engineers' Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 3319 (ii).
 Private Bills Pets., extension of time (Ms.) 84, 449 (i).
 St. Louis River Public Works (Ques.) 245 (i).
 Valiquette and Col. Hughes (remarks) 3592 (ii).
 Valleyfield Dam, Public use (remarks) 884 (i).

Bergin, Mr. D., *Cornwall and Stormont.*

- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2^o, 2713 (ii).
 Cornwall Canal, letter of John Page presented to Parlt. in Ret., 1122 (i).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3371; on M. for 2^o (Amt.) 3441; neg. (Y. 36, N. 124) 3446 (ii).
 Cruelty to Animals B. 5 on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 1854 (i).
 Experimental Farm Rep., recommendation to print, 1792 (i).
 — Stmnt. of cost for Printing, 1856 (i).
 Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) 1056 (i).
 Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1779 (i).
 Ontario Pacific Ry. (B. 123, 1^o*) 2020 (i).
 Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2^o, 3712 (ii).
 Printing Com.'s Rep. (remarks) 3440 (ii).
 — 9th Rep. (M. to conc.) 4928 (ii).

Bernier, Mr. M. E., *St. Hyacinthe.*

- Lebourdais Bros., case of (Ques.) 187 (i).

Blake, Hon. E., *West Durham.*

- Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) procedure, 2198 (i).
 — on presentation of Rep., 3367 (ii).
 Ballot Boxes, Patent, on M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2231 (i).
 — on Rep. of Sel. Com., 4656 (ii).
Baltic, Steamer, outrage (remarks) 4027 (ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 2243 (i); on M. for 2^o, 3815; in Com., 3881, 4277, 4375, 4508 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1080, 1519 (i); on Sen. Amts. (Amt.) 4411; agreed to (Y. 58, N. 43) 4413 (ii).
 Bills, Royal Assent, informality of procedure, 2594 (ii).
 Bresaylor Half-breeds, &c. (remarks) 1518 (i).
 Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com. (remarks) 4449 (ii).
 — on M. to conc. in Rep., 4732 (ii).
 B. C. Defences, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 1199 (i).
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3875, 4505 (ii).
 Can. and Jamaica, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 1199 (i).
 Caraqueet Ry., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4601, 4606 (ii).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3164, 3368; on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3^o, 3448; (Amt.) 3459 (ii).
 — on drafting Amts. (remarks) 3456 (ii).
 Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 1854 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. 4488 (ii).
 Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 1265 (i).
 — 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4584 (ii).
 Deceased Wife's Sister Marriage B. 126 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4035 (ii).
 Disallowance, Power of (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4084; agreed to, 4094 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3317 (ii).
 Easter Adjmt. (remarks) 2673, 2742 (ii).
 Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1793 (i).
 Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigon*) on M. for 2^o, 3193; in Com., 3195 (ii).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3910; on Sen. Amts., 4664 (ii).
 French Language in N. W. T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 670 (i).
 Geological Survey B. 116 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4032 (ii).
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2181 (i); in Com., 3229, 3622.
 Hudspeth, Mr., late M. P., deceased (remarks) 4831 (ii).
 Hurrell and Valiquette Pensions (remarks) 2259 (i).
 Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2^o, 3606; in Com., 3626.
 — B. 153 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2^o, 4904; in Com., 4905 (ii).
 I. C. R., Branch Lines, on M. for Com. of Sup. 4601 (ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Interest Act Amt. B. 140 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4924 (ii).
- Interpretation Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3157, 3603 (ii).
- Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4210 (ii).
- Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 4836 (ii).
- Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) *re* documents, 724 (i).
- on consdn. of documents presented, 1476.
- on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2087 (i).
- on presentation of Rep. of Com., 4397 (ii).
- Militia Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1^o, 4170 (ii).
- Mining Machinery, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) procedure, 1144, 1145.
- Mounted Police, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com. *re* Management, 2695 (ii).
- Newfoundland and Can., Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 1199 (i).
- N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2^o, 4452; in Com., 4466 (ii).
- Printing Com.'s Rep. (remarks) 3440 (ii).
- 6th, on M. to conc., 4661 (ii).
- Private Bill Legislation (remarks) 2312 (i).
- Privileges and Elections Com. See "Lincoln, Member for."
- Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) Gas Well, 2255 (i).
- Provincial Govts., transfer of Property authorisation B. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1^o, 1514 (i).
- Public Accounts Com., non-meeting of, 2596 (ii).
- Public Lands Grant B. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4035 (ii).
- Quebec Harbor Improvements, article in *Le Canadien*, 4828 (ii).
- Railway Statistics, Rep. (remarks) 4658 (ii).
- Religious disturbances in Hull, on M. to adjn. Hse., 511 (i).
- Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4108 (ii).
- Seamen's Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2^o, 4359; on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to M. for 3^o, 4400 (ii).
- Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2706 (ii).
- SUPPLY :**
- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Census and Statistics) 2389.
- Canals—Capital* (Trent River Nav.) 2281 (i).
- Collection of Revenues* (Ordinance Lands) 4122. Rys. (P.E.I.) 4124 (ii).
- Immigration* (Agents' salaries) 2409 (i).
- Indians* (B. C.) 4044; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4049 (ii).
- Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Can. and United Kingdom) 4776 (ii); (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1972; (Halifax and W. Indies and S. America) 1996 (i).
- Militia* (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1276 (i).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- SUPPLY—Continued.**
- Miscellaneous* (C.P.R. Lands, examination) 4058 (Govt., N.W.T.) 4066; (Seed-grain, collections) 4060 (ii).
- Penitentiaries* (Man.) conc., 4911 (ii).
- Public Works—Capital: Buildings* (N.S.) 4914.
- Income: Roads and Bridges*, 4767 (ii).
- Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 129 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3160 (ii).
- Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4668 (ii).
- (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4850 (ii).
- Temp. Colonisation Co., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4910 (ii).
- Territories Real Property Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2^o, 3199 (ii).
- Timber Limits, Applications, on M. for Ret., 2191 (i).
- Toronto University conflagration, 1950 (i).
- U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* B. 134 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3595, 3877 (ii).
- Valiquette's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1276; (remarks) 2311 (i).
- Valiquette and Col. Hughes (remarks) 3592 (ii).
- Vivian, H. H., & Co.'s B. 124 (Mr. *Dawson*) in Com., 3232 (ii).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff*, in Com., 3391, 3524, 3557, 3735 (ii).

Boisvert, Mr. F., Nicolet.

- Nicolet, construction of Piers (Ques.) 4588 (ii).
- Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2^o, 3706 (ii).

Borden, Mr. F. W., King's, N.S.

- Hall's Harbor, N.S., Engineers' Reps. (M. for copies) 2031 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Immigration* (Agents' salaries) 2442 (i).
- Public Works—Income: Dredging* (N.S.) 1641 (i).
- Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Liverpool or London, St. John and Halifax) 1961; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1963 (i).
- Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation)* 1924 (i).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff*, in Com., 3270, 3430 (ii).

Bourassa, Mr. F., St. John's, Que.

- Isle aux Noix Wharf, construction (Ques.) 1357 (i).
- Mount St. Nicholas P. O., change of Name (M. for Cor.*) 3319 (ii).

Bowell, Hon. M., North Hastings.

- American Freight in Bond, on M. for O.C., 99 (i).
- Beef (Fresh) Importations, on M. for Ret., 89 (i).
- Bridgevater*, Ship, seizure (Ans.) 248 (i).
- Chinese Immigration, on M. for Ret., 87 (i).
- Corn for Seed, Duty on (Ans.) 2829 (ii).
- Corn, Rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 204 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.

- Crow Harbor Postmaster (Ans.) 400 (i).
 Customs Collectors, Instructions (remarks on adjnmt.) 4083 (ii).
 Customs Duties, *per capita* (Ans.) 188 (i).
 — B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4497 (ii).
 Debates, Official (M. for Sp. Com.) 4 (i).
 Fish, Bonded, Regulations (Ans.) 248; (remarks) 275 (i).
 Flour and Wheat Importations (Ans.) 55 (i).
 Flour, Can., Imported to Mar. Provs. *via* U. S., &c. (Ans.) 2671 (ii).
 Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) 1038 (i).
 — (explanation) 1049 (i).
 Laurie, Gen., Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4648 (ii).
 Lincoln, Member for (prop. Res.) *re* documents, 723 (i). See "Privilege."
 — additional documents (presented) 795, 1652.
 — on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1770 (i).
 Logs, Export Duty, Amount (Ans.) 884 (i).
 Manufacturing Machinery, arrears of Duty (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
 Mining Machinery, Importation (Ans.) 562 (i).
 Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 231, 358, 368 (i).
 Oleomargarine, Imports from U. S. (Ans.) 122 (i).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Mulock*) unparliamentary Language, 2466 (i).
 Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 4930 (ii).
 Privilege, on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*) *re* Timber Limit, 571 (i).
 Registered Letters and Dead Letter Office, on M. for Ret., 83 (i).
 Roberts, E. K., American Tug (Ans.) 3291 (ii).
 Rooth, Tug, seizure, on M. for papers, 1699 (i).
 Standing Com. on Banking and Commerce (remarks) 91 (i).
- SUPPLY:**
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 720.
Charges of Management, 167 (i).
Civil Govt. (Customs) additional clerk, 4574 (ii); (Printing and Stationery Dept.) contingencies, 358; (Privy Council) contingencies, 231 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1420 (i). Excise (Patrick Cullen, extra services) 4020 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2437 (i). *Miscellaneous* (John Dyke) 4119; (Salaries, &c.) 2330 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Gratuity, late Dr. Wilson) 4011 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1469 (i); (Drill shed, Brantford) 4707 (ii). Roads and Bridges, 1650 (i).
- Tobacco Seizures in N. W. T. (Ans.) 4171 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff (remarks) 2565; in Com., 3082, 3129, 3206, 3241, 3387, 3475, 3726, 4482 (ii).

Boyle, Mr. A., Monck.

- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3864 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 4412 (ii).
 Chinese Immigrants, par. in *Empire* (remarks) 3624 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3405, 3469, 3547 (ii).
- Brien, Mr. J., South Essex.**
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2713 (ii).
 Corn, Rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 453 (i).
 Essex County Jr. Judgeship (Ques.) 563 (i).
 Exodus of Canadians to U. S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 409 (i).
 Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson*, *Elgin*) to repeal, 1158 (i).
 — (B. 114, 1°) 1581 (i); 2° m., 3720 (ii).
 — B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3936; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 3938; neg. (Y. 51, N. 87) 3948 (ii).
 Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1272 (i).
 New Canada, establishment of P. O. (Ques.) 563.
 Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3714 (ii).
 Mail Clerks, additional Appointments (Ques.) 562 (i).
 Stephenson, Rufus, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 92 (i).
- SUPPLY:**
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2503 (i).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1272; (Rifle Associations) 1332 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3460, 3532 (ii).
- Brown, Mr. A., Hamilton.**
 Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1075 (i).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3959 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1404 (i).
 Canadian Millers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 62, 1°*) 342 (i).
 Cruelty to Animals prevention (B. 5, 1°*) 26; 2° m., 1203; Order for Com. read, 1506; in Com., 1835; (M.) to restore to Order Paper, 1854 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4497 (ii).
 Fire Arms, &c., improper Use (B. 148, 1°*) 2311.
 Gas Inspection B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4271 (ii).
 Hamilton Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 66, 1°*) 449 (i).
 Hereford Ry. Co.'s (B. 51, 1°*) 244 (i).
 Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson*, *Welland*) 1811 (i).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1132 (i).

Brown, Mr. A.—*Continued.*

National Construction Co.'s incorp. (B. 40, 1^o*) 184 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) salaries, 221 (i).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 45, 1^o*) 212 (i).

Walker, Emily, Relief (B. 142, 1^o) on a div., 3624; 2^o m., 3694 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2767; in Com., 4482 (ii).

Bryson, Mr. J., *Pontiac.*

Fort Coulonge and La Passe Interprovincial Bridge, Engineers' Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 1065 (ii).

Lumber, Import Duties (Ques.) 4662 (ii).

North Canadian Atlantic Ry. Steamship Co.'s incorp. (B. 88, 1^o*) 794 (i).

Pontiac Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 87, 1^o*) 794 (i); M. to receive Pet., 3511 (ii).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4888 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income : Roads and Bridges, 4771.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3501, 3582.

Burdett, Mr. S. B., *East Hastings.*

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 116, 343, 1089, 1520 (i).

Cereals, prevention of Fraud in Sale (prop. Res.) 184; Order for Res. called, 1148 (i).

Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2^o, 2729 (ii).

Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 232, 360 (i).

Pictou Harbor, Dredging, &c., on M. for Cor., 2194 (i).

Read and Shannonville Mail Service, Contracts, Cor., &c. (M. for Ret.) 1486 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. (Privy Council) contingencies, 232 (i).

Justice, Administration of (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 489 (i).

Burns, Mr. K. F., *Gloucester.*

Caraquet Ry., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4618 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3^o, 3941; on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3950 (ii).

Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4111.

Cameron, Mr. H., *Inverness.*

Inverness Ry. incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2^o, 1355 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2368 (i).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, W. Indies and S. America) 1984 (i).

Public Works—Income : Dredging (N.S.) 1638 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3012; in Com., 3274 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.*

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4310 (ii).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 351, 1082 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4406 (ii).

Dredging, &c., McGregor's Creek (M. for Ret.*) 530 (i).

— River Thames (M. for Pets., &c.*) 144 (i).

— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4894 (ii).

— removal of Bar (Ques.) 55 (i).

Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3195 (ii).

Flour and Wheat Importations (Ques.) 55 (i).

Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 318 (i).

— B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3936 (ii).

Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4843 (ii).

Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1908 (i).

Rondeau Point, Govt. Lands (Ques.) 2022 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Capital (Lachine) 2275 (1).

Collection of Revenues : Excise (salaries) 2322.

Post Office, 2292 (i).

Fisheries (Protection Service) 2375 (i).

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2486 (i); (expenses) 3649 (ii).

Indians (B.C.) 2168; (P.E.I.) 2164 (1).

Legislation : House of Commons (contingencies) 711 (i).

Militia (Armories, &c., care of) 1321, 1327 (i); (Estate R. S. King) 4161; (Monuments) 4652 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Labor Congress Rep.) 4903 (ii).

Public Works—Income : Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 4727; (Repairs, &c.) 4166. Roads and Bridges, 4771 (ii).

Railways—Capital : I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 1925 (i).

Steamboat Inspection, 2020 (i).

Superannuation, 1312 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3423, 3463, 3502, 3589 (ii).

Cargill, Mr. H., *East Bruce.*

Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1052 (i).

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 2306 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3503 (ii).

Carling, Hon. J., *London.*

Agricultural Bulletins, publication in German (Ans.) 1796 (i).

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2260 (i).

Barley, Two-rowed, distribution and purchase (Ans.) 4172 (ii).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4504 (ii).

Canadian Historical MS. (Ans.) 1021 (i).

Cattle Disease in Western States (Ans.) 85 (i).

— Quarantine Stations on Frontier (Ans.) 92 (i).

Census, next Enumeration (Ans.) 2827 (ii).

Carling, Hon. J.—Continued.

- Copyright Act Amt. (B. 19, 1st) 90; on Sen. Amts. (M. to conc.) 2098 (i).
 Exodus of Canadians to U. S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 408 (i).
 Engineers' (Steamboat) Licenses (remarks) 4925.
 Experimental Farm (Central) establishment of Dairy (Ans.) 145 (i).
 ——— Rep., on recommendation to print, 1793 (i).
 ——— Rep. (presented) 3104 (ii).
 High Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 3104 (ii).
 Immigrant Rates to Winnipeg (Ans.) 186 (i).
 Patent Act Amt. (B. 17, 1st) 90; in Com., 1076 (i).
 Seed Barley, Date of Arrival (Ans.) 1795 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Census and Statistics) 2387; (Criminal Statistics) 498; (Dairying, development) 2399; (Experimental Farms) 715, 2383 (i), 3783 (ii); (Health Statistics) 499; (*Patent Record*) 496 (i), 4000; (Seed, distributing) 3999 (ii); (Societies, N. W. T.) 2384 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 179; (Contingencies) 473; (Printing and Stationery) contingencies, 372 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2403 (i); (expenses) 3647, 4001 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1455 (i).
Quarantine, 4001; (Grosse Isle) 3654; (Public Health) 3655, 4001; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3654 (ii).
 Trade Marks and Industrial Designs Act Amt. (B. 18, 1st) 90; 2nd m., 1076 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3406 (ii).

Caron, Sir A. P., K. C. M. G., Quebec County.

- "A" Battery, Officers' Quarters (Ans.) 1358 (i).
 A. D. C., Appointment (Ans.) 2669 (ii).
 Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4748 (ii). See "Middleton, Maj.-Gen."
 British Columbia Defences, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 1199 (i).
 Canteens, Fredericton (remarks) 3079 (ii).
 Cavalry School, Que., Officers' promotion (Ans.) 3292 (ii).
 Drill Hall, Montreal, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 884 (i).
 Esquimalt Fortifications and Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 1485 (i).
 Forrest, Lieut.-Col., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4565 (ii).
 French Language in N. W. T. (abolition) on Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2nd B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy* (explanation re vote) 882 (i).
 Helmets for Active Militia (Ans.) 886 (i).
 Hurrell's Militia Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1272 (i).
 ——— Ans., 2378; (remarks) 2312 (f).
 Hurrell and Valiquette Pensions (remarks) 2259 (i).
 Land Slide at Quebec, on M. for O. C., &c., 65 (i).
 Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1805; (Amt.) 1809 (i).
 Middleton, Maj.-Gen., Rep. re Bremner Furs (remarks) 4928 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P.—Continued.

- Military College, Kingston, Board of Visitors (Ans.) 245 (i), 3662 (ii).
 ——— Inspection (Ans.) 4026 (ii).
 ——— prop. Changes (Ans.) 3662 (ii).
 Militia Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1st, 4170 (ii).
 Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 275 (i).
 Militia Camp Ground at Moncton, 4926 (ii).
 ——— Clothing Supplies, Tenders (Ans.) 3811 (ii).
 ——— Deptl. Sec., Appointment of (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
 Official Documents Disclosure (B. 122, 1st) 2020 (i); 2nd m., 3203; in Com., 3599 (ii).
 Portneuf Battalion of Militia (Ans.) 245 (i).
 Powell, Col. Walker, resignation (Ans.) 562 (i).
 Queen's Wharf, Annapolis, Govtl. Control (Ans.) 2828 (ii).
 St. Sauveur Fire and "B" Battery (Ans.) 1200 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4891 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Civil Govt.* (Militia) contingencies, 375 (i), 4012 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition, &c.) 1316; (Armories, care of, &c.) 1321; (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1267 (i); (Estate R. S. King) 4156, 4898 (ii); (Military College) 1337 (i); conc., 4273 (ii); (Military properties, &c., care of) 1336 (i); (Monuments) 4651 (ii); (Ordnance, Rifled) 1335; (Permanent Forces) 1341; (Rifle Associations) 1332; (Salaries, Militia Branch, &c.) 1315 (i).
Miscellaneous (Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des familles Canadiennes) 4116 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Drill Shed, Brantford) 4708 (ii).
 Territorial Accounts, 4253 (ii).
 Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 375 (i).
 Valiquette's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1267; (remarks) 2311, 2259 (i).
 Valiquette, Sergeant, and Col. Hughes' declaration (read) 3592 (ii).

Carpenter, Mr. F. M., South Wentworth.

- Ways and Means*—The Tariff, in Com., 2532 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J., K. C. M. G., South Oxford.

- Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1072 (i).
 Alcoholic Liquors, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3633 (ii).
 Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2nd, 1228; procedure, 2194 (i).
 Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for adjmnt., 2309 (i).
 Atlantic Mail Service, Contracts (remarks) 3522.
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4637, 4694 (ii).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 2241 (i); (remarks) 3155; on M. for 2nd, 3811; in Com., 3860, 3893, 3957, 4074, 4377, 4416, 4512 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, papers respecting (remarks) 30 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 351, 1078, 1522 (i).
 Bresaylor Half-Breeds Claims, on M. (Mr *Lister*) for Sel. Com. (Amt.) 1399 (i).
 BUDGET, The, Reply to Annual Stmt., 2566 ; (Amt.) 2584 ; neg. (Y. 60, N. 97) 3075 (ii).
 — (Ques.) 1094 ; (remarks) 1475, 2312 (i).
 — Delay, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1946 (i).
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 1859, 2098, 2228 (i) ; 3875, 4504 (ii).
 Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4419 ; in Com., 4436 (ii).
 Census, next Enumeration (Ques.) 402 (i) ; 2827 (ii).
 Chartered Banks and Liquidation since Confed., on M. for Ret., 82 (i).
 Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 452 (i).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3170, 3369 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 443 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4488 ; on M. for 3^o (Amt.) 4527 ; neg. (Y. 62, N. 93) 4544 (ii).
 Cypress Hills, Timber Limits (remarks) 531 (i).
 Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).
 Debates, Official, accommodation for Staff, (remarks) 3724 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*) remarks *re* Vote of Member, 2228 (i).
 Easter Adjmnt. (remarks) 2742 (ii).
 Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1792 (i).
 Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2^o, 3194 (ii).
 Fish Commissioners' Rep. (remarks) 213 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 838 (i).
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2182 (i).
 Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1273 (i).
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2^o, 3626 ; in Com., 3627 (ii).
 I. C. R., Branch Lines, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4601 (ii).
 — Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 68, 1357 (i).
 — Steel Rails, Purchase (Ques.) 2021 (i).
 Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2^o, 4836 ; in Com. on Res., 4837 (ii).
 Laurie, Gen., Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4648 (ii).
 Lincoln, Member for (Ques. of Priv.) 449 (i).
 — (Ques. of Priv.) documents submitted, 638 (i). *See* "Privilege."
 — on presentation of additional documents, 812 (i).
 — further documents asked for, 1094 (i).
 — Cor. (remarks) 1402 (i).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Lincoln, Member for, on consdn. of documents presented, 1474. (i).
 — (prop. Res.) *re* Timber Limits, 1714 (i).
 — on rsmng. adjd. deb. (remarks) 1936 (i).
 Middleton, Maj.-Genl., Rep. *re* Bremner Furs (remarks) 4928 (ii).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1141 (i).
 Ministerial Expenses from Confed., on M. for Ret., 73 (i).
 Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2828, 4322 (ii).
 Port Arthur Harbor (Dredging, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
 Privilege, on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*) *re* Timber Limits, 570, 638 (i).
 Public Accounts Com., non-meeting (remarks) 2186 (i), 2596 (ii).
 Public Works, P.E.I. (remarks) 4830 (ii).
 Receipts and Expenditure (M. for Ret.*) 83 (i).
 Rockport dep. Postmaster, dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4895 (ii).
 Senate, Stationery and Contingencies, on Mess. (remarks) 1342 (i).
 Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1539 (i).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys. B. 160 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on prop. Res., 4589, 4669, 4917 ; in Com., 4919 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4852, 4873 (ii).
 SUPPLY on M. for Com. (remarks) 160 (i), 4499 (ii) ; in Com. :
Arts, Agriculture, &c., 4650 (ii) ; (Experimental Farms) 721 (i).
Canals—Capital : (Cornwall) 2275 ; (Lachine) 2275 ; (Murray) 2277 ; (Sault Ste. Marie) 2273 ; (Tay) 2288 ; (Tay) 4652 ; (Welland) 2277 (i). *Income* (Carillon and Grenville) 4655, 4913 ; (Lachine) 4653 ; (Welland) 4654 (ii).
Charges of Management, 161 (i).
Civil Govt. (Agriculture) 179 (i) ; (Contingencies) care, &c., Buildings, 4575 ; (Finance Dept.) contingencies, 4571 (ii) ; (High Commissioner's Office) contingencies, 213 ; (Indian Affairs) 173 ; (Interior) 171 ; (Marine) 179 ; (Postmaster General) 177 ; (Railways and Canals) 180 (i), 3779)
 Accountant's salary, 4570 (ii) ; (Sec. of State, 168 (i).
Collection of Revenues : Canals (additional pay, &c.) 4152 ; (gratuities) 4150 ; (Maintenance, &c.) 3865 (ii). *Excise* (Culling Timber) 2343 (i), 4121 ; (salaries, &c.) 2328 ; (Travelling expenses, &c.) 2338 (i). *Post Office*, 4153, 4794. *Railways* (Cape Breton) 3809 ; (I. C. R., Repairs, &c.) 3804 ; (P.E.I.) 3809, 4144. *Slides and Booms*, 3872. *Telegraph Lines*, 3872 (ii).
Dominion Lands :—*Income*, 3660 (ii).
Fisheries (Protection Service) 2375 (i).
Geological Survey, 2124 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2417 (i) ; (expenses) 3647, 4797, 4805 ; conc., 4915 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

- Indians* (B.C.) 2165 (i), 4043 (ii); (Man. and N.W.T.) 2170, 2172 (i), 4049; (Ont. and Que.) Annuities, 4051 (ii); (Two Mountains) 2156 (i).
- Insurance* (Superintendence) 2124 (i).
- Justice, Administration of*, 477 (i).
- Legislation*: House of Commons (Salaries) 704; (N.W.T.) 2307 (i); Senate (Salaries, &c.) 3873 (ii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lower Traverse River) 2019 (i).
- Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Canada and United Kingdom) 4773; conc., 4915 (ii); (Halifax, St. John and S. America) 1984 (i).
- Marine Hospitals* (Gratuity to Dr. Wells) 4043 (ii).
- Militia* (Ammunition, &c.) 1316; (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1268 (i); (Estate R. S. King, rent, &c.) 4156, 4899 (ii); (Military College) 1337; (Militia Branch, &c.) 1315 (i).
- Miscellaneous* (C. P. R. Lands, examination) 4067; (Defalcations, Kingston) 4162; (Labor Congress, Rep.) 4815, 4901; (St. Catharines Milling Co., costs) 4058 (ii).
- Mounted Police*, 2345 (i), 4053 (ii).
- Ocean and River Service* (Can. Registration of Shipping) 2017; (Que. River Police) 2018 (i).
- Penitentiaries* (B.C.) 3647; (Dorchester) 3637; (Kingston) 3635; (Man.) conc., 4910; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3635, 4649; (Regina Jail) 3647 (ii).
- Public Works—Capital*: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1099; (Ont.) 1095, 1621 (i); Buildings (Ottawa) conc., 4913 (ii). *Income*: Buildings (Conservatories) 1469; (Major's Hill Park) 1466 (i); (Military College, Kingston) 4704 (ii); (N.S.) 1445; (N.W.T.) 1443; (Ont.) 1437 (i); (Ottawa Deptl. Buildings) 4696 (ii). Repairs, &c., 1455 (i). Dredging (N.S.) 1645 (i). Roads and Bridges, 1649 (i), 4769 (ii).
- Railways—Capital*: C.P.R., conc., 4911; (Onderdonk Contract, arbitration) 4653 (ii). I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 1927; (Rolling Stock) 1928. Oxford and New Glasgow (Rolling Stock) 1933 (i). Short Line Ry., 4796 (ii).
- Quarantine* (Grosse Isle) 3654; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 2654 (ii).
- Superannuation* (Wallace, R. W.) 1290, 1315 (i).
- Unprovided Items*, 4156 (ii).
- Supply B. 158 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 1^o, 4917 (ii).
- Tariff, The, rumored Changes (remarks) 1070 (i).
- Temp. Colonisation Co., on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 4909 (ii).
- Valiquette's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1268 (i).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff, 2566; (Amt.) 2584 neg. (Y. 60, N. 97) 3075; in Com., 3083, 3213, 3233, 3390, 3484, 3523, 3725, 4480 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin.

- Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. Taylor) on M. for 2^o, 1242; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com. (Amt.) 2206 (i).
- Ballot Boxes, on M. (Mr. Chapleau) for Sel. Com., 2234 (i).
- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 2^o, 3823; in Com., 4315 (ii).
- Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4760 (ii).
- Bressaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. Lister) for Sel. Com., 1394 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

- Chartered Banks and Liquidation since Confed., on M. for Ret., 80 (ii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. Cook) on M. for 2^o, 2716 (ii).
- Commercial Treaties with Foreign Countries, on M. for Ret., 3680 (ii).
- Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 3171 (ii).
- Currency, Public (prop. Res.) 189 (i).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Charlton) (explanation) *re* vote, 2227 (i).
- Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 3935; on Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) to M. for 3^o, 3949 (ii).
- on prop. Res. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) to repeal, 284 (i).
- Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1288 (i).
- Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Doyon) on M. for 2^o, 2724 (ii).
- Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4243 (ii).
- Kettle Creek, Engineer's Rep. *re* Canal, on M. for Ret., 155 (i).
- Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) Timber Limits, 2069 (i).
- London and Port Stanley Ry., Tolls, &c., on M. for Stmtt., 157 (i).
- Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. Mulock) to prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 1137 (i).
- Montreal P.O., Drop Boxes (Ques.) 3512 (ii).
- Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).
- Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Wallace) on Amt. (Mr. Curran) to M. for 3^o, 1350 (i).
- Order, Ques. of, M. that Com. rise, 2469 (i).
- unparliamentary Language, 378 (i).
- Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 4350.
- Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Patterson, Essex) Gas Well, 2255 (i).
- Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1907 (i).
- Ry. Mail Clerks, Pet. *re* increase of Salaries (Ques.) 187 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Arts Agriculture, &c.* (Census and Statistics) 2390; (Criminal Statistics) 498; (Dairying, development) 2402; (Health Statistics) 501; (Agents' salaries) 2425 (i).
- Charges of Management*, 166 (i).
- Civil Govt.* (Agriculture) contingencies, 473; (Civil Service Examiners) 218; (Geological Survey) 173, 2126 (i), 4790 (ii); (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 223; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 387; (Interior) contingencies, 382; (Marine) contingencies, 474; (Militia) contingencies, 378; (Privy Council) contingencies, 225; (Public Works) contingencies, 470, 472; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 461 (i).
- Immigration (Expenses)* 3649 (ii).
- Indians* (B.C.) 2165 (i).
- Militia* (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1288; contingencies, 1331; (Drill Instruction) 1320; (Mili-

Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

- tary College) 1339 (i); (Monuments) 4652 (ii); (Ordnance, Rifled) 1335; (Permanent Forces) 1341; (Rifle Associations) 1332 (i).
Miscellaneous (Gophers, destruction) 4790 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 4038; (N. W. T.) 4039; (Ont.) 4036 (ii); (Repairs, &c., Ottawa) 1474 (i).
Quarantine (Public Health) 3655 (ii).
Railways—Income (Gov. Gen.'s Car) 4021 (ii).
 Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 378, 382 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. P. B., L'Islet.

- Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com. (remarks) 4450 (ii).
 — on M. to conc., 4757 (ii).
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4505 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4587 (ii).
 Electoral Lists for Dom., Expenses (M. for Ret.) 83 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1005 (i).
 Independence of Parlt. (B. 12, 1°) 67; 2° m., 2208 (i).
 Land Slide at Quebec, on M. for O.C., &c., 65 (i).
 Lebourdais Bros., case of (Ques.) 187 (i).
 Priv. and Elec., *re* ex-Member for Lincoln, on M. to conc. in Rep., 4731 (ii).
 Quebec P. O., Superannuation of Employés, on M. for O.C.'s, &c., 62 (i).
 Voters' Lists Revisions, Printing (remarks) 2381 (i)

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., Terrebonne.

- Ballot Boxes, Patent (M. for Sel. Com.) 2230; Rep. of Com. (presented) 4656 (ii).
 Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com. (remarks) 4449 (ii).
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4505 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act, Working, &c. (Ans.) 1021 (i).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2715 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4583 (ii).
 — on M. to conc. in 1st Rep., 1261 (i).
 Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 275 (i).
 — B. 44 (Mr. *Barron*) on Order for 2°, 3703.
 — (B. 136, 1°*) 3196; in Com., 3995; 3° m., 3937; further consdn. of Sen. Amts., 4663 (ii).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 53; on Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2°, 816 (i).
 Labor, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 3662 (ii).
 Labor Statistics (prop. Res.) 4590; provision (B. 148) 4398; 2° m., 4835; in Com. on Res., 4836; in Con. on B., 4838 (ii).
 LeSueur, P., Dual Salaries (Ans.) 504 (i).
 Secy. of State's Deptl. Rep. (presented) 118 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4877 (ii).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A.—Continued.

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record)* 4000 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Sec. of State) 169 (i); Civil Service List, 3992; (Queen's Printer) extra salaries, 2992 (ii); (Printing and Stationery) 170; contingencies, 461 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Rys. (P.E.I.) 4133 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2524 (i).
Legislation (French Translators, extra pay) 4008.
Miscellaneous (Débats Parlementaires de Québec) 4113; (Labor Congress Rep.) 4902; (Printing Bureau, plant) 4118; (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4069 (ii).
 Voters' Lists and Franchise Act (Ans.) 3154 (ii).
 — Receipt of (Ans.) 3724 (ii).
 — Revising Officers' Reps. (Ans.) 2827 (ii).
 — Revision, Printing (remarks) 2380 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk.

- Alaskan and Canadian Boundary (Ques.) 188 (i).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Fostèr*) in Com., 3856 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries and U.S. Protection (remarks) 725 (i).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 107, 351, 1522 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4410 (ii).
 Blackfeet Indians, capture of White Girl (remarks) 815 (i).
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4504 (ii).
 Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4426; in Com., 4440 (ii).
 Census Return of Pagans (M. for Ret.) 513 (i).
 Copyright Act (remarks) 4606 (ii).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3165; on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) to M. for 3°, 3445 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 3°, 4536 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4579 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 38, 1°) 159; 2° m., 2212 (i).
 Exodus of Canadians to U.S., M. for Sel. Com., 403; neg. (Y. 63, N. 94) 447 (i).
 Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) on Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) to M. for 2°, 4447 (ii).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Brien*) on M. for 2°, 3722 (ii).
 — B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3939 (ii).
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1166 (i).
 Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists (prop. Res.) 1489 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 651; on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 970 (i).
 Grazing and Pasture Leases in N.W.T. (M. for Ret.°) 3693 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Hull, Religious Disturbances (remarks) 393, 506.
 Jesuits' Estates Act, Ret. (Ques.) 1071 (i).
 — (Enquiry for Ret.) 2020 (i).
 — (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4173; neg. (Y. 32, N. 130) 4252 (ii).
 Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1762; (personal explanation) 1789 (i).
 Lord's Day Observance (B. 110, 1^o) 1477; (remarks) 3720 (ii).
 Lucas, S. E., Indian Agent, N.W.T., Charges against (M. for Ret. *) 3319 (ii).
 Lumber Duties, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3989 (ii).
 Maybee, Miss, Dismissal from P.O. at Quebec (M. for Cor., &c.) 2187 (ii).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1136 (i).
 Newfoundland, admission into Confederation (remarks) 4927 (ii).
 N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4467 (ii).
 Pagans, Census Returns of Ste. Elizabeth (M. for Ret.) 513 (i).
 Pasture and Grazing Leases in N.W.T. (M. for Ret. *) 3693 (i).
 Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4332 (ii).
 Ry. Statistics, delay in Issuing (remarks) 3663 (ii).
 Religious Disturbances in Hull (remarks) 398, 506 (i).
 Rooth, Tug, seizure, Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 1698 (i).
 Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4113.
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2^o, 3187 (ii).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys. B. 160 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 4680; on M. for 3^o, 4922 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2390 (i); (Seed, distributing) 4000 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Post Office) Savings Banks, 3994 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 4121. Rys. (P.E.L.) 4123 (ii).
Geological Survey, 4053 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2509 (i); (expenses) 4001 (ii).
Indians (Man., and N. W. T.) 4050 (ii).
Legislation (J. S. Thompson, Indemnity) 4004 (ii),
Mail Subsidies (St. John, S. America and W. Indies) 1987 (I).
Miscellaneous (C. P. R. Lands, examination) 4068; (Seed Grain, collections) 4060; (Skeena Expedition) 4057 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4053 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1620 (i).
 Tassé, E., and Duvernay, L. D., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 4026 (ii).
 Timber Limits granted by Dom. Govt. since March, 1885 (M. for List) 2188 (ii).
 — Enquiry for Ret., 2674 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Timber Limits, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4554 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2634 (ii).
 — in Com., 3100, 3135, 3474, 3533, 3746 (ii).
 — (Amt.) neg. (Y. 44, N. 85) 3777 (ii).
 — on relevancy of Amt., 3779 (ii)
 Wrecking and Towing in Can. Waters (B. 2) 2^o called, 146; 2^o m., 1202 (i); Order for 2^o dschgd., 3704 (ii).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., Montmagny.

- Ballot Boxes, Patent, on Rep. of Sel. Com., 4656.
 Crane Island Mail Service (Ques.) 121 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. (B. 11, 1^o) 67 (i).
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1162 (i).
 Greenly Island Lighthouse-keeper, dismissal (Ques.) 3154 (ii).
 Montmagny and Beauce, Judge's Residence (Ques.) 2021 (i).
 — Wharves, Coll. of Tolls (Ques.) 4026 (ii).
 Pierreville Post Office (M. for Reps., &c.) 517 (i).
 River du Sud Public Works (M. for Reps. *) 530.
 St. Rosaire Post Office (Ques.) 400 (i).
 Savings Banks in Ont. and Que. Act Amt. (B. 115, 1^o*) 1652 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Legislation* (French Translators) 4009 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 4726 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Moncton, increased accommodation) 4014 (ii).

Cimon, Mr. S., Charlevoix.

- Can. Temp. Act, Working, &c. (Ques.) 1021 (i).
 Experimental Farm (Central) establishment of Dairy (Ques.) 145 (i).
 Judge's Residence, Saguenay District (Ques.) 3292 (ii).
 St. Roch's Traverse Lighthouse, Erection (Ques.) 1656 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E., East Northumberland.

- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4304 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3748 (ii).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R., Toronto Centre.

- Abell, Mr. John, alleged Insolvency (Remarks) 3513 (ii).
 Bankers' Safe Deposits and Warehousing Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 73, 1^o*) 449 (i); in Com., 3323 (ii).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 2246 (i); on M. for 2^o, 3845; in Com., 3863, 3879, 3956, 4078, 4278, 4513 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1521.
 Confederation Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 74, 1^o*) 449 (i).
 Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to M. for 2^o, 1219 (i).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R.—*Continued.*

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 752 (i).

Penny Postage (Ques.) 4762 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) Loyalty to Her Majesty and newspaper par., 184 (i).

Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3716 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2429 (i).

Legislation (N. W. T.) 2306 (i).

Threats, Intimidation, &c., Legislation (Ques.) 1857 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3482 (ii).

Colby, Hon. C. C., Stanstead.

Alberton Lighthouse, Expenditure for Breast-working (Ans.) 1657 (i).

Baltic, Outrage on Steamer (Ans.) 1859 (i), 4027. — Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4663 (ii).

Buoys in St. Lawrence River, contract (Ans.) 2185 (i).

Casumpec Harbor, Expenditure for Repairs (Ans.) 1655 (i).

Duvar, Lt.-Col., Superannuation (Ans.) 1485 (i).

Engineers' (Steamboat) Licenses (remarks) 4925.

Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3193 (ii).

Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) on M. for Com., 3325; (Amt.) 6 m.h., 4441; agreed to, 4447 (ii).

Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1497 (i).

Gauthier, Fishing Licenses (Ans.) 3077 (ii).

Govt. Steamers, Tenders for Supplies (Ans.) 1120.

Greenly Island Lighthouse-keeper, dismissal (Ans.) 3155 (ii).

Greer, James, late Fishery Overseer (Ans.) 3811.

Hereford Ry. (B. 147) in Com., 4503 (ii).

Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2084 (i).

Lonely Island Lighthouse (Ans.) 2670 (ii).

Lotbinière County Mail Service (Ans.) 85 (i).

Marine Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1020 (i).

Montagny County Wharves, Coll. of Tolls (Ans.) 4026 (ii).

Pictou Harbor Acts Amt. (B. 152, 1°) 4588 (ii).

Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 2047 (i).

Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 161, 1°*) 4924 (ii).

Reuter's Telegraph Agency (Ans.) 145 (i).

Ste. Croix Floating Light (Ans.) 2021 (i).

St. Roch's Traverse Lighthouse, Erection (Ans.) 1656 (i).

Salmon Fishing with Nets (Ans.) 4399 (ii).

Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4098 (ii).

Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 135, 1°) 3153; 2° m., 4359; 3° m., 4400 (ii).

Smelt Fishing in the Miramichi (Ans.) 2229 (i).

Colby, Hon. C. C.—*Continued*

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 118, 1°*) 1792 (i); 2° m., 3186; 2° m. and in Com., 4362, 4663 (ii).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4889 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. (Privy Council) contingencies, 224 (i). *Fisheries*, 4041 (ii); (Protection) 2375 (i), 4779 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 2351 (i).

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2510 (i). *Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lower Traverse River) 2019 (i).

Marine Hospitals, &c., 2019 (i).

Miscellaneous (classification of Old Records) 4791. *Ocean and River Service* (Que. River Police) 2018; (Registration of Shipping) 2017 (i); (Tidal Observations) 4041 (ii).

Yamachiche Floating Light, on M. for Pets., &c., 1702 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2585, 3411 (ii).

— in Com., 3140 (ii).

Cook, Mr. H. H., East Simcoe.

Abell, Mr. John, alleged Insolvency (remarks) 3514 (ii).

Christian Island Indians, distress (remarks) 4926.

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 30, 1°*) 118 (i).

Collingwood Harbor, Expenditure (Ques.) 1655 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4494 (ii).

Dom. License Act (enquiry for Ret.) 4906 (ii).

Engineers' Examination and Licensing provision (B. 31, 1°*) 118 (i); (remarks) 4925 (ii).

French Language in N.W.T. (remarks) *re* 2°, 160.

— (abolition) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 918 (i).

Govt. Property, Damage to by Steamers, &c., Claims (M. for Ret. *) 1488 (i).

LeSueur, P., Dual salaries (Ques.) 400, 504 (i).

Lincoln, Member for, on presentation of additional documents, 814 (i).

Liquor License Act, Cost of Enforcement, &c. (M. for Ret. *) 1713 (ii).

Lundy's Lane, Protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1805 (i).

Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1137 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 29, 1°*) 118 (i).

Roberts, E. K., American Tug (Ques.) 3291 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farm) 2383 (i). *Canals—Capital* (St. Lawrence) conc., 4912 (ii).

Civil Govt. (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 222; (High Commissioner) contingencies, 214; (Privy Council) contingencies, 233 (i); (C. S. Examiners) 4272 (ii).

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2436 (i).

Justice, Administration of (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 490 (i).

Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Ottawa) 4914.

Income : Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) conc., 4275 (ii)

Superannuation (LeSueur, P.) dual salary, 1304 (i).

Cook, Mr. H. H.—Continued.

Voters' Lists, Revision, reprinting, 2380 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3476,
 3528, 3736 (ii).

Corby, Mr. H., West Hastings.

Belleville and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co.'s incorp.
 (B. 22, 1st) 104 (i).
 Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 86, 1st) 794 (i).
 Corn, Rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 198 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J., Victoria, N.B.

Adulteration Act Amt. B. (No. 9, 1st) 37 ; in
 Com., 1071 (i).
 Dom. License Act, on enquiry for Ret., 4906 (ii).
 Fertilisers, Agricultural (B. 95) 2^o m., 3190 ; in
 Com., 3195 (ii).
 Gas Inspection Act Amt. (B. 137, 1st) 3290 ; 2^o m.,
 4266 ; in Com., 4271 (ii).
 General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 117, 1st) 1792 (i).
 Grain Tester, prop. Change (Ans.) 4399 (ii).
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. (Bill 133, 1st) 3151 ;
 2^o m., 3626 ; in Com., 3627 (ii).
 — re Tobacco Sales (Ans.) 85 (i).
 Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (remarks) 2258 (i).
 Malt, Rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 516 (i).
 Salt Manufacturers, prosecution (Ans.) 1654 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4897 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 390 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 2344.
 Excise (Culling Timber) 2343 ; (Distillery Officer,
 extra pay) 2337 ; (Fréchet, translation) 2339 ;
 (Methylated Spirits) 2342 (i), 4792 (ii) ; (Preventive
 Service) 2335 ; (salaries, &c.) 2313 (i), 4792
 (ii) ; (Travelling Expenses, &c.) 2338 (i). Liquor
 License Act, 1883 (Cost, &c.) 4255 (ii). Weights
 and Measures (Mr. McDonell, increase of salary)
 2343 ; (Rents, &c.) 2344 (i) ; (salaries) 4792 (ii).
 Tobacco, Law respecting Native Grown (Ans.)
 2229 (i).
 — Pets. from Manufacturers (Ans.) 275 (i).
 Weights and Measures, Inspection Fees (Ans.)
 1121 (i).

Couture, Mr. P., Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Escoumains, proposed Wharf (Ques.) 274 (i).
 Malbaie and Tadousac Mail Service (Ques.) 275 (i).
 Saguenay River, Winter Crossing (Ques.) 274 (i).
 Seeds and Grains Vote (personal explanation)
 1069 (i).
 Tadousac Wharf, Sum for completion (Ques.)
 274 (i).

Curran, Mr. J. J., Montreal, Centre.

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com.,
 3891 (ii).
 Belding, Paul & Co.'s incorp. (B. 23, 1st) 104 (i).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M.
 for 2^o, 2712 (ii).

Curran, Mr. J. J.—Continued.

Court House, Montreal, Cost of Construction
 (M. for Ret.) 2188 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (M.) to ref.
 back, 4578 (ii).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*)
 in Com., 3370 (ii).
 Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*)
 to repeal, 300 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt.
 to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o B. 10
 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 592 (i).
 Grand Trunk Ry. (B. 125) M. to suspend Rules,
 2178 ; 1st, 2184 (i) ; in Com., 3228, 3621 (ii).
 Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*)
 in Com., 4843 (ii).
 Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop.
 Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1810 (i).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on prop.
 Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1131 (i).
 Montreal Court House, Cost of construction (M.
 for Ret.) 2188 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 2914 ;
 (remarks) 3077 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Police, Gratuity to Sergeants,
 &c. (Ques.) 92 (i).
 Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 3^o
 (Amt.) 1293 ; neg. (Y. 23, N. 124) 1353 (i).
 Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on
 M. for 2^o, 3713 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Improvements, Memo. of Mr.
 McGreevy (read) 4566 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 1114.
 Tidal Observations in Gulf and Atlantic Coast
 (M. for Ret.) 527 (i).
 Vessels Lost in Gulf and on Atlantic Coast (M.
 for Ret.) 527 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3209,
 3548 (ii).

Daly, Mr. T. M., Selkirk.

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com.,
 4292 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir
John Thompson) in Com., 1408 (i).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in
 Com., 3185 (ii).
 Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on
 Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4431 ; in Com.,
 4438 (ii).
 Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*)
 to repeal, 340 (i).
 Hudson's Bay Ry. (B. 155) M. to suspend Rules,
 4821 ; 1st, 4822 (ii).
 Mounted Police, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for
 Sel. Com. re Management, 2697 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr.
Watson) 3358 (ii).
 Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*)
 4344 (ii).

Daly, Mr. T. M.—Continued.

- Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4684 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2988 (ii).
 Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. B. (M.) to conc. in Sen. Amts., 4930 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H., Queen's, P.E.I.

- Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2^d, 1852 (i).
 — on M. to print extra copies, 2912 (ii).
 Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for adjnmt., 2308 (i).
 Atlantic Mail Service (remarks) 3516 (ii).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3959, 4077, 4285, 4373, 4415, 4511 (ii).
 Belle Creek Harbor and Breakwater (Ques.) 2377 (i), 2669 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 351, 1091, 1406, 1552 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4265, 4405 (ii).
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3875, 4504 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 2^d and in Com., 3719 (ii).
 Cove Head Harbor Surveys, Reps. of Engineers, &c. (M. for copies*) 1065 (ii).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3183, 3369; on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3^d, 3451 (ii).
 Easter Adjnmt., on prop. M., 2914 (ii).
 Franchise Act Amt. (B. 108, 1st) 1343 (i); Order dschgd., 3720 (ii).
 — B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1st, 3196; in Com., 3913; on M. for 3^d, 3938; on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) 3942 (ii).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^d B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 941 (i).
 Forrest, Lieut.-Col., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4564 (ii).
 Gas Inspection B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4271 (ii).
 Govt'l. Expenditure in Ottawa (remarks) 1860 (i).
 Grain Elevator at Halifax (Ques.) 3291 (ii).
 Interest Act Amt. B. 140 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4414 (ii).
 I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Workshops, Pets. *re* Increase of Wages (M. for copies) 1711 (i).
 — Employés Insurance Scheme (M. for Ret.) 1710 (i).
 — Employés Wages payments (Ques.) 1357 (i).
 — Official Cars (M. for Ret.) 1710 (i).
 Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1771 (i).
 Marine Hospital, Sackville, original Cost (M. for Ret.*) 1713 (ii).
 Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 364 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3^d, 1300 (i).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Hesson*) unparliamentary language, in Com. of Sup., 1451, 2467 (i).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., construction (Ques.) 505 (i).
 Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4327.
 Privilege (Ques. of) 3591 (ii).
 Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).
 Railway Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3328 (ii).
 Sackville Marine Hospital, original Cost (M. for Ret.*) 1713 (i).
 St. John and S. America Mail Service, on Ques. of Order, 1985 (i).
 Senate, Stationery and Contingencies, on Mess. (remarks) 1341 (i).
 Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1543 (i).
 Sick Mariners' Fund, on M. for Cor., 525 (i).
 Smith, late Mr. Justice, on M. for Ret., 1695 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2^d, 3188; in Com., 4363 (ii).
 Summerside Bank (B. 72, 1st) 449 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Census and Statistics) 2386; (Experimental Farms) 716 (i).
Civil Govt. (Militia) contingencies, 378; (Printing and Stationery) contingencies, 364 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1424 (i). Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4255 (ii). Post Office, 2290 (i); (defalcations, Kingston) 4166. Rys. (I.C.R., repairs, &c.) 3807, 4125 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2148 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2413, 2450 (i), 4812.
Justice, Administration of (Judge's salary, P.E.I. Admiralty Court) 3995, 4575 (ii); (Librarian, Supreme Court) 481; (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 485 (i).
Legislation: H. of C. (Indemnity to J. S. Thompson) 4003 (ii). (Senate) miscellaneous, 700 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1964, 1970; (Halifax, W. Indies and S. America) 1980 (i).
Militia (Estate R. S. King, rent, &c.) 4158 (ii); (Military College) 1340 (i).
Miscellaneous (collection, seed grains) 4063; (Débats Parlementaires de Québec) 4113; (Dictionnaire Généalogique des familles Canadiennes) 4116; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 3658; (O. C.'s, collection) 3658; (Royal Society's Proceedings) 3659; (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4070 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Que. River Police) 2018; (Registration of Shipping) 2017 (i).
Open Account (Seed Grain for N.W.T.) 4167 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 3646; (Man.) 3637; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3636 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1098; (Que.) 1105. *Income*: Buildings (Conservatories) 1468; Major's Hill Park) 1465; (N.S.) 1108, 1447; (Removal of Snow) 1464; (Repairs, &c.) 1457. *Dredging* (N.S.) 1643. *Harbors and Rivers* (Mar. Provs.) 1615; (N. B.) 1624; (P. E. I.)

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

1577. Roads and Bridges, 1649. Telegraph Lines, 1649 (i).
Railways—Capital: Cape Breton (construction) 1932 (i), 4019 (ii). I.C.R. (Rolling Stock) 1928 (i). Oxford and New Glasgow (construction, &c.) 4017 (ii); (Rolling Stock) 1933 (i). *Income*: Gov. Gen.'s Car, 4021 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection, 2019 (i).
 Tracadie Harbor Survey, Engineers' Reps. (M. for copies*) 1065 (i).
 Trade Combinations Act Amt. B. 77 (Mr. Wallace) in Com., 3704, 3810 (ii).
 Trade Relations with U.S. (remarks) 2313 (i).
 Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 378 (i).
 U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* B. 134 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 3593; in Com., 3597, 3876 (ii).
 Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. Brown) on Amt. (Sir John Thompson) to M. for 2°, 3698.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3248, 3438, 3546, 3571, 3743 (ii).

Davis, Mr. D. W., Alberta.

- Alberta Colonisation Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 83, 1°*) 722 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 4487 (ii).
 Elbow River Water Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 76, 1°*) 449 (i).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. Mulock) to prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 1137 (i).
 N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. Dewdney) in Com., 4467 (ii).
 Qu'Appelle and Long Lake and Saskatchewan Steamship and Ry. Co.'s (B. 36, 1°*) 159 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F., West Assiniboia.

- Agricultural Bulletins, publication in German (Ques.) 1796 (i).
 Bressaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. Lister) for Sel. Com., 1302 (i).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 3166 (ii).
 Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. Brown) in Com., 1823 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Foster) on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 3°, 4540 (ii).
 Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in 1st Rep., 1263 (i).
 — 3rd Rep. (presented) 4396 (ii).
 — on M. (Mr. Curran) to ref. back, 4581 (ii).
 Doig, Mrs. A. A., Claims for Improvements (Ques.) 1486 (i).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. (prop. Res.) 3316 (ii).
 Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. Charlton) for Sel. Com., 433 (i).
 Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1792 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) B. 10 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 532; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Beausoleil) 873 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—Continued.

- Geological Survey B. 116 (Mr. Dewdney) in Com., 4032 (ii).
 Half-breeds' Claims in N.W.T. (prop. Res.) 3309.
 Herchner, L. W., contingencies (M. for Ret.)* 3319 (ii). See "Mounted Police."
 Homesteads in N. W. T. (Ques.) 2023 (i).
 — (prop. Res.) 3298 (ii).
 — Memorials of J. Holden and J. Shera (M. for copy*) 1065 (ii).
 Irrigation in N.W.T. (prop. Res.) 3292 (ii).
 Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4228 (ii).
 Militia Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 1°, 4170 (ii).
 Mounted Police, N.W.T., Commissioner (prop. Res.) 1503 (i).
 — Commissioner, Res. from Leg. Assembly, N.W.T. (Ques.) 1485 (i).
 — (prop. Res.) Management, &c., 2674; neg. (Y. 52, N. 76) 3367 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Mr. Watson) deb. rsm'd., 3332 (ii).
 N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. Dewdney) on M. for 2°, 4451; in Com., 4468 (ii).
 N.W.T. Memorials, &c., passed by Leg. Assembly (M. for copies*) 212 (i).
 — Registry Offices, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 885.
 — (M. for Ret.)* 1065 (ii).
 Printing Com.'s Rep. (6th) on M. to conc., 4662 (ii).
 Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1876 (i).
 Rys. B. 151 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 4818 (ii).
 Rys. in N.W.T., Fire-guards (prop. Res.) 3315 (ii).
 Scrip, Volunteers', &c., Rep. in ref. (Ques.) 1485 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 4373 (ii).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4675 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Immigration* (Agents' salaries) 2419 (i).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 4048 (ii).
Militia (Rifle Associations) 1331 (i).
Miscellaneous (collection, seed grains) 4061; (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4070 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4056 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1471 (i); (Man.) 4038 (ii); (N.W.T.) 1441 (i), 4040, 4719 (ii).
 Territories Real Property Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 3201 (ii).
 Tobacco Seizures in N.W.T. (Ques.) 4171 (ii).
 University for N.W.T. (prop. Res.) 3315 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3071; in Com., 3090 (ii).

Dawson, Mr. S. J., Algoma.

- Baltic*, Steamer, alleged Outrage (remarks) 3080, 4027 (ii).
 Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) to repeal, 1160 (i).
 — B. 136 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 3911; on Sen. Amts., 4664 (ii).

Dawson, Mr. S. J.—*Continued.*

- French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 598 (i).
 Geological Survey B. 116 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4028 (ii).
 Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 153 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4904 (ii).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1132 (i).
 N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4465 (ii).
 Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4356 (ii).
 Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 14, 1^o) 84 (i).
 Rainy River Boom Co.'s incorp (B. 60, 1^o*) 342 (i).
 Sault Ste. Marie and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 27, 1^o*) 104 (i).
 Sault Ste. Marie and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 93, 1^o*) 883 (i).
 Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4113.
 Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1969 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Fisheries* (Protection) 4781 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2140 (i).
Indians (Annuities) 2153 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 4719 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1619 (i).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 2270 (i).
 Timber Limits, Applications, on M. for Ret., 2189 (i).
 Vivian, H. H., & Co.'s (B. 124, 1^o*) 2097 (i); in Com., 3231, 3622 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3480 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C., C.M.G., *West Toronto.*

- Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2^o, 1241 (i).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2^o, 3852 (ii).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3933 (ii).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 557 (i).
 Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1804 (i).
 May, Samuel, Relief *re* Patent (B. 16, 1^o) 86 (i).
 Military College, Board of Visitors (Ques.) 3662.
 — Inspection (Ques.) 4026 (ii).
 Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2^o, 3715 (ii).
 Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1968 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Immigration* (Agents' salaries) 2428 (i).
Militia (Ammunition, &c.) 1320; (Armories, care of, &c.) 1324; (Military College) 1339 (i); (Monuments) 4651 (ii); (Rifle Associations) 1332 (i).
Miscellaneous (Georgian Bay Survey) 3657 (ii).
 York County Bank incorp. (B. 39, 1^o*) 184 (i).

Desaulniers, Mr. F. S. L., *St. Maurice.*

Shawinegan Senatorial Division (Ques.) 27 (i).

De St. Georges, Mr. J. E. A., *Portneuf.*

Portneuf Battalion of Militia (Ques.) 245 (i).

Desjardins, Mr. A., *Hochelaga.*

- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3862, 4080, 4304 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1085, 1525 (i).
 Debates, Official (M.) to conc. in 1st Rep., 1261.
 — (M.) to ref. back, 3153 (ii).
 — 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 3368 (ii).
 — (M.) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4578 (ii).
 Montreal and Western Ry. Co. and the C. P. R. Co. confirmation of Agreement (B. 82, 1^o*) 638.
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4890 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Canals—Income (Lachine) 2288 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1102. *Income*: Buildings (Que.) 1115 (i).

Dessaint, Mr. A., *Kamouraska.*

- Bélanger, P. R. A., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 1797, 2024 (i).
 Dionne, Jos., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 2023.
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 784 (i).
 I.C.R., Passenger and Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 147 (i).
 Kamouraska Wharf, accounts *re* Building (M. for Ret.) 97 (i).
 Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Wharf, repairs (Ques.) 92 (i).
 St. Roch's Traverse Lighthouse (Ques.) 2826 (ii).

Dewdney, Hon. E., *East Assiniboia.*

- Alaskan and Canadian Boundary (Ans.) 188 (i).
 Bélanger, P. R. A., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 1797, 2024 (i).
 — Payments as Surveyor (Ans.) 4500 (ii).
 Blackfeet Indians, capture of White Girl (remarks) 815 (i).
 Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4439 (ii).
 Cape Crocker Indians, Annuity paid (Ans.) 505 (i).
 Caughnawaga Indians, engagement for Circus (Ans.) 1655 (i).
 — Indemnity for encroachments on Reserve, on M. for Cor., 1709 (i).
 — Letter of Agent to Council (Ans.) 1797 (i).
 — Moneys in hands of Supt. Gen., on M. for Stmt., 1712 (i).
 — Reserve, Rep. of Mr. Walbank's Survey (remarks) 1069 (i).
 — Cost of Survey (Ans.) 247 (i).
 — Quarries (Ans.) 86, 247 (i).
 Christian Island Indians, distress (remarks) 4927.
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3176 (ii).

Dewdney, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Crofter Immigrants at Pelican Lake (Ans.) 1796.
Dom. Lands Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3316 (ii).
Doig, Mrs. A. A., Claim for Improvements (Ans.) 1486 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 932 (i).
Geological Survey Dept. (B. 116, 1*^a) 1792; 2° m., 2099 (i); in Com., 4028 (ii).
Geological Survey Reps., on M. for Ret., 1027 (i).
Half-breeds' Claims in N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3310 (ii).
Homesteads in N.W.T. (Ans.) 2023 (i).
— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3301 (ii).
Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2°, 2726 (ii).
— Amt. (B. 132, 1°) 3151; 2° m., 3604; in Com., 3625, 4034 (ii).
Indian Act Amt. (B. 153) 2° m., 4903; in Com., 4905 (ii).
Interior Dept., Extra Clerks (Ans.) 2827 (ii).
Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 33 (i), 2739 (ii).
Land Claims under Man. Act (remarks) 514 (i).
Micmac Indians, Pet. *re* spearing Salmon (remarks) 4926 (ii).
Mississauga Indians, settlement of Claims (Ans.) 1656 (i).
Mounted Police Management, on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3340 (ii).
N.W. Council, Memorials, &c., *re* French Language (Ans.) 402 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. (B. 146, 1*^a) 4373; 2° m., 4449; in Com., 4465 (ii).
N.W.T. Registry Offices, Receipts (Ans.) 885 (i).
— Surveys, Cost per acre (Ans.) 403 (i).
Paul, Peter, expenses of Trial (Ans.) 505 (i).
Prince Albert, Settlers' claims (Ans.) 2668 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson*, *Essex*) Gas Well, 2257 (i).
Rys. in N.W.T., Fire-guards, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3316 (ii).
Rondeau Point, Govt. Lands (Ans.) 2022 (i).
Saw Logs, rebate of Duty (Ans.) 3662 (ii).
School Lands in Man., Sale (Ans.) 145 (i).
Settlers on Ry. Reserve, B.C., on M. for Pets., &c., 129 (i).
Stephenson, Rufus, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 92 (i).
Subsidies (Land) to Rys. Act Amt. (B. 43, 1°) 184; 2° m., 1079 (i); (prop. Res.) 4589; in Com., 4669; (M.) to conc. in Res., 4832 (ii).
— (B. 160) prop. Res., 4917; in Com., 4919 (ii).
Sultana Island, incomplete Rets. (remarks) 2186 (i).
— Sale, on M. for Ret., 140 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Govt.* (Indian Affairs) 174 (i), Byshe, F. R., salary, 4574 (ii), contingencies, 387; (Interior) 171, contingencies, 381 (i); Rowatt, H. H., salary, 4572 (ii).

Dewdney, Hon. E.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Collection of Revenues* (Ordnance Lands) 4121 (ii).
 Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys, &c.) 4155.
Income, 3660 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2124 (i), 4053; (Artesian Wells) 4789 (ii).
Indians (B. C.) 2165 (i), 4043, 4789; (Ont. and Que.) 2151 (i), 4051; (Oneida) 4783; (Ont.) 4787 (ii); (Man. and N.W.T.) 2170, 2172 (i), 4047, 4788; (N.S.) 4052 (ii); (P.E.I.) 2164; (Que.) 2156; (Surveys) 2157 (i).
Legislation (N.W.T.) 2306 (i).
Miscellaneous (B.C. Appeal to Privy Council) 4118; (Banff Hot Springs) 3658; (Bow River Lumber Co.'s costs) 4060; (C. P. R. Lands, examination) 4067; (Govt. N. W. T.) 4066; (Gophers, destruction) 4789; (Half-breeds, N. W. T.) 4069; (Seed Grain collections) 4060; (Skeena Expedition) 4057; (St. Catharines Milling Co., costs) 4059 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4054 (ii).
Open Account (Seed Grain, purchase for N.W.T.) 4167 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 4720 (ii).
Unprovided Items, 4156 (ii).
Surveys in Montcalm County (Ans.) 186 (i).
Temp. Colonisation Co., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4909 (ii).
Timber Limits, Enquiry for Rets. (Ans.) 2074 (ii).
Tourigny, Mr., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 2377 (i).
University for N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315 (ii).
Vancouver Island Ry. Lands, Squatters' Rights (Ans.) 274 (i).

Dickey, Mr. A. R., Cumberland.

- Bankers' Safe Deposit, &c., Co.'s B. 73 (Mr. *Cockburn*) in Com., 3323 (ii).
Can. Temp. Act Amt (B. 102, 1°) 1198 (i).
— B. 103 (Mr. *Luvergne*) 2° m., 3717; 3° m., 3720 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3168 (ii).
Easter Adjmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 3701 (ii).

Dickinson, Mr. G. L., Carleton, Ont.

- Benevolent Societies, Legislation (Ques.) 188 (i).

Doyon, Mr. C., Laprairie.

- Caughnawaga Indians, Claims for Indemnity, (M. for Cor., &c.) 1703 (i).
— Engagement for Circus (Ques.) 1654 (i).
— Letter of Agent to Council (Ques.) 1797 (i).
— Moneys belonging to (M. for Stmnt.) 1711.
— Reserve, Rep. of Mr. Walbank's Survey, 1069 (i).
— Cost of Survey (Ques.) 247 (i).
— Quarries (Ques.) 85, 247 (i).
Floods in Laprairie (Ques.) 884 (i).
Immigrant Rates to Winnipeg (Ques.) 186 (i).

Doyon, Mr. C.—*Continued.*

Indian Advancement Act Amt. (B. 42, 1^{**}) 184 ;
on Order for 2^o, 1507 (i) ; 2^o m., 2718 (ii).

— B. 132 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2^o, 3608.
Legal Services, Amounts paid certain Firms
(Ques.) 3292 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of), par. in *Empire*, 84, 90 (i).

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 2302 (i).

Indians (Surveys) 2157 (i).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*

C.P.R. and Ry. Bridges in Bagot Co. (M. for
Pets., &c.) 141 (i).

Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr.
Charlton) for Sel. Com., 439 (i).

Experimental Farm (Central) establishment of
Dairy (Ques.) 145 (i).

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt.
to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o B. 10
(Mr. *McCarthy*) 1006 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2395.

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*

SUPPLY :

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2471 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Sir *James Douglas*,
steamer to replace) 4779 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., *West Ontario.*

Bank Charters, B.N.A. and B.C. (M. for copies)
255 (i).

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com.,
4392 (ii).

Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, Telegraphic intelli-
gence from Washington, 1510 (i).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John
Thompson*) in Com., 1404 (i) ; on Sen. Amts.,
4265 (ii).

Bresaylor Half-Breeds' Claims on M. (Mr. *Lister*)
for Sel. Com., 1377 ; on Amt. (Sir *Richard
Cartwright*) 1401 (i)

Bridgewater, Ship, seizure (Ques.) 248 (i).

Chinese Immigrants, par. in *Empire*, 3624 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt., Proclamation (Ques.) 84 (i).

English Periodicals, Cost of Mailing, 1919 (i).

Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*)
to repeal, 298 (i).

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt.
to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o B.
10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 895 (i).

Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop.
Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1804 (i).

Royal Legislation (Ques.) 248 (i).

Royal Prerogative (M. for Cor.) 88 (i).

Welland Canal Commission, Mr. Wood's Rep.
(Ques.) 885 ; (remarks) 1515 (i).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John
Thompson*) in Com., 1083 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3749 (ii).

Eisenhauer, Mr. J. D., *Lunenburg.*

Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*)
on Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) to M. for 2^o, 4445 (ii).

Fish, Bonded, Regulations (Ques.) 248 (i).

Mahone Bay Lighthouse (Ques.) 885 (i).

Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties (prop. Res.) 1811 (i).

Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills*,
Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1908 (i).

Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup.,
4094 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues : Post Office, 2299 (i).

Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 2373 (i).

Mail Subsidies (Halifax and W. Indies and S.
America) 2010 (i).

Public Works—Income : Buildings (N.S.) 1108.
Dredging (N.S.) 1641. Harbors and Rivers
(Mar. Provs.) 1615 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3396 (ii).

Ellis, Mr. J. V., *St. John, N.B., City.*

Albert Ry. Grant, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4559.

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com.,
3859, 3880, 3963 (ii).

Caraquet Ry., Financial Aid (Ques.) 3723 (ii).

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*)
on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to M. for 2^o, 1217 (i).

Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in 1st
Rep., 1261 (i).

— 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to
ref. back, 4587 (ii).

Easter Adjmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on
Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3^o, 3942 (ii).

Geological Survey Reps., on M. for Ret., 1028 (i).

Maritime Provs., delay of Mails (remarks) 1582 (i)

Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of
Sup., 232 (i).

Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res.
(Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1816 (i).

Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in
Com., 4820 (ii).

Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M.
for Com., 1969 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr.
Colby) on M. for 2^o, 3189 (ii).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A.
Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4891, 4896 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. (Postmaster General) 177 ; (Public
Works) contingencies, 471 ; (Privy Council) con-
tingencies, 232 (i).

Collection of Revenues : Customs (N.S.) 1425. Ex-
cise (salaries) 2323. Post Office, 2289 (i). Rys.
(I.C.R., Repairs, &c.) 3808 (ii).

Fisheries (Protection service) 2376 (i), 4783 (ii).

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2318 (i).

Justice, Administration of (Vice-Admiralty Court,
Que.) 493 (i).

Legislation : H. of C. (Library, salaries) 714 (i).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and W. Indies,
&c.) 4276 (ii) ; (Liverpool or London, and St. John
and Halifax) 1960 ; (St. John and Basin of Minas)
1963 (i).

Ellis, Mr. J. V.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

Militia (Armories, care of, &c.) 1327 (i).

Miscellaneous (Débats Parlementaires de Québec) 413 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 1112; (N.S.) 1108; (Repairs, &c.) 1460. Dredging (N.S.) 1645 (i), 4729 (ii). Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 1616; (N.B.) 1613 (i).

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (St. John, City front) 1932 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2970; in Com., 3245, 3435, 3488, 3545 (ii).

West India Steam Communication, Advtsmts., Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 1713 (ii).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., Leeds and Grenville.

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3240, 3575 (ii).

Ferguson, Mr. J., Welland.

Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. Taylor) on M. for 2^d, 1252 (i).

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 4286 (ii).

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. Brown) on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 6 m.h., 1854 (i).

Detroit River Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 89, 1st) 794 (i).

Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 2027 (i).

Geological Survey Rep., on M. for Ret., 1028 (i).

—— Repts. published and Sold (M. for Ret.) 530 (i), 1027 (ii).

Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 1056 (i).

Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery (prop. Res.) 1798 (i).

SUPPLY :

Indians (B.C.) 2168 (i).

Militia (R. S. King, Estate) 4899 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Roads and Bridges, 4768 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2656; in Com., 3419, 3533 (ii).

Welland Canal Commission, Rep. of Mr. Wood (M.) 1515 (i).

Fiset, Mr. J. B. R., Rimouski.

Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) to repeal, 1152 (1).

I. C. R., Pets. of N. and A. Ouellet, G. Voyer, F. Coté, &c., *re* Damages to Properties (M. for copies*) 1713 (i).

Matane Branch Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 561 (i).

—— Pets., &c., *re* Building (M. for copies*) 3693 (ii).

Portneuf Battalion of Militia (Ques.) 245 (i).

Rimouski Mail Service (M. for Cor.) 1063 (i).

Ste. Angèle de Merici Mail Service (Ques.) 561 (i).

Telegraph, North Shore St. Lawrence (Ques.) 4762 (ii).

B $\frac{1}{2}$

Fisher, Mr. S. A., Bromé.

Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. Trow) for Adjmt. 2309 (i).

Census, next Enumeration (Ques.) 402 (i).

Chambly and Longueuil Canal (Ques.) 401 (i).

Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Landerkin) 207 (i).

—— removal of Duty (prop. Res.) 1583 (i).

Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. Charlton) for Sel. Com., 414 (i).

Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 2^d, 3192 (ii).

Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 1049 (i).

Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4248 (ii).

Montreal Harbor Commission, abolition (Ques.) 401 (i).

Mounted Police Management, on Amt. (Mr. Watson) to prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 3355 (ii).

St. Edmond Post Office (Ques.) 401 (i).

St. Louis Lake, erection of Piers (Ques.) 401 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 3794 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2289 (i).

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2418 (i).

Legislation: Senate (Miscellaneous) 702 (i).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1468 (i).

Tariff, The, extension of Free List (Ques.) 403 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2892; in Com., 3143, 3506, 3571 (ii).

Flynn, Mr. E. P., Richmond, N.S.

Easter Adjmt. (remarks) 2744 (ii).

Fisheries Question and negotiations at Washington (Ques.) 1021 (ii).

Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 2032 (i).

Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1869 (i).

Purse Seines and Gill Nets, on M. for Ret., 249 (i).

Religious disturbances in Hull, on M. to adjn. Hse., 511 (i).

Sick Mariners' Fund (M. for Cor.) 519 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2354 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Excise (salaries, &c.) 2331.

Mail Subsidies (Campbellton and Gaspé) 1961 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2782 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E., King's, N.B.

Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Alcoholic Liquors, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3634 (ii).

Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 1021 (i).

—— Anderson's Contract (remarks) 3440 (ii).

—— Contracts (remarks) 3521 (ii).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4696 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- Banking Act Amt. (B. 127) prop. Res., 2234; 1^o* of B., 2249 (i); 2^o m., 3811; in Com., 3853, 3879, 3995, 4074, 4310, 4373, 4415, 4507; 3^o m., 4590; on Sen. Amts., 4929 (ii).
- BUDGET, The, Annual Statement, 2531 (ii).
 — (Ans.) 1094 (i).
 — Delay, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1942 (i).
 — (remarks) 1475, 2312 (i).
- Benevolent Societies, Legislation (Ans.) 188 (i).
- Business of the Hse. (remarks) 1860 (i).
- Chartered Banks and Liquidation since Confed., on M. for Ret., 82 (i).
 — on Enquiry for Ret., 2252 (i).
- Contractors' Cheques and Govt. Banks (Ans.) 28, 29 (i).
- Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 458 (i).
 — removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1609 (i).
- Currency, Public, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 193.
- Customs Act Amt. (B. 143, 1^o) 3779; in Com., 4484; 3^o m., 4527; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4530 (ii).
 — (B. 159) 1^o*, 2^o* and 3^o*, 4910 (ii).
- Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in 1st Rep., 1266 (i).
- Estimates, The (presented) 149 (i).
 — 1889-90 (presented) 2531, 3955 (ii).
 — 1890-91 (presented) 4479 (ii).
- Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2026 (i).
- Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1180 (i).
- Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1042 (i).
- Insolvency, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 1122 (i).
- McLaggan, Customs Officer (Ans.) 4500 (ii).
- Meat Imports, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) 123.
- Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 149 (i), 2531, 3955, 4479 (ii).
- Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. to Amt. to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1139 (i).
- Order (Ques. of) St. John and S. America Mail Service, 1985 (i).
- Pig Iron Bounty (prop. Res.) 2828, 4321; agreed to (Y. 69, N. 45) 4403 (ii).
- Pork, &c., increase of Customs Duty (Ans.) 55 (i).
- Public Accounts Com., non-meeting, 2596 (ii).
- P. E. I. Govt. and Dom. Capital Account (Ans.) 27 (i).
- Returns, incomplete P. O. (remarks) 394 (i).
- Savings Banks Quebec (B. 154, 1^o*) 4761; 2^o m. and in Com., 4847 (ii).
- Senate, Stationery and Contingencies, on Mess. (remarks) 1342 (i).
- Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4876 (ii).
- SUPPLY (prop. Res.) for Com., 25; (remarks) 160 (i), 4499 (ii); in Com. :

Foster, Hon. G. E.—Continued.

- SUPPLY—Continued.
- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Experimental Farms) 722 (i), 4795; (G. L. Macdonald) 4796; (Jamaica Exhibition) 4796; (*Patent Record*) conc., 4272 (ii).
- Charges of Management*, 161 (i).
- Civil Govt.* (Agriculture) 179; (Civil Service Examiners) salaries, 219 (i); (Contingencies) care, &c., Buildings, 4575 (ii); (Customs) 176; (Deptl. Buildings) cleaning, 474 (i); (Finance) contingencies, 4751 (ii); (Fisheries) 180; (Geological Survey) 173; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 168, contingencies, 223; (High Commissioner's Office) contingencies, 213; (Indian Affairs) 173; (Inland Revenue) 176; (Interior) contingencies, 382; (Justice) 168; (Penitentiaries Branch) 168; (Marine) 179; (Militia) 168, contingencies, 377; (Post Office) 176 (i), Savings' Banks, 3994 (ii); (Privy Council) 168 (i), conc., 4272 (ii); (Public Works) 180; (Railways and Canals) 180; (Printing and Stationery) 169; (Printing Bureau) cleaning, 475.
- Collection of Revenues*: Culling Timber, 4121; Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4258 (ii).
- Immigration*, 4815 (ii).
- Insurance Superintendence*, 2124 (i).
- Legislation*: H. of C. (Dep. Speaker's salary) conc., 4273 (ii); (contingencies) 713; (Library, salaries) 713; (Miscellaneous, Printing, &c.) 715 (i). (Indemnity to J. S. Thompson) 4003 (ii). Senate (Miscellaneous) 700 (i); (salaries, &c.) 3873 (ii).
- Mail Subsidies, &c.* (Can. and United Kingdom) 4773, 4915 (ii); (Gaspé and Campbellton) 1961; (Grand Manan and Mainland) 1958; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1964, 1971; (Halifax and W. Indies and S. America) 1973 (i), 4276 (ii); (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 1990; (Magdalen Islands) 1955; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 1961; (San Francisco and B. C.) 1972 (i).
- Militia* (Military College) conc., 4273 (ii).
- Miscellaneous* (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 3658; (Georgian Bay Survey) 3657; (L'Abbé Tanguay's Dictionary) 3659; (Labor Congress Rep.) 4815; (O.C.'s, collection) 3658; (Quebec Debates, 1888, 1889, 1890) 4791; (Science, N.W.T.) 4167 (ii).
- Ocean and River Service* (O'Brien's claim) 4042 (ii); (Que. River Police) 2018 (i); (Sir *James Douglas*, steamer to replace) 4779 (ii).
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Drill Shed, Brantford) 4705 (ii). Harbors and Rivers, 1631 (i).
- Quarantine* (Cattle) 2657 (ii).
- Territorial Accounts*, 4254 (ii).
- Supply (B. 158) Res. rep. from Com. on Ways and Means, 4916; 1^o, 2^o, 3^o, 4917 (ii).
- Tariff, The, extension of Free List (Ans.) 403 (i).
- Three per cent. Loan of 1888 (Ans.) 27 (i).
- Trade Relations with U.S. (remarks) 2314 (i).
- Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 377, 382 (i).
- Ways and Means*—The Budget, 2531; Res., 2552.
 — The Tariff, in Com., 3081, 3225, 3233, 3461, 3523, 3725; M. for 2^o of Res., 3776, 4880, 4910 (ii).
 — on relevancy of Amt., 3779 (ii).
- Freeman, Mr. J. N., Queen's, N.S.**
- Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 1848 (i).
- Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 434 (i.)

Freeman, Mr. J. N.—Continued.

Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3^d, 3946 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2366 (i).

Public Works—Income: Dredging (N.S.) 1647 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3110, 3271, 3734 (ii).

Gauthier, Mr. J., L'Assomption.

Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 2379 (i).

Tourigny, Mr., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 2377.

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^d B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 589 (i).

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., Charlotte.

Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2^d, 1250, 1853 (i).

— on M. to print extra copies, 2912 (ii).

Canteens, Fredericton (remarks) 3078 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4486 (ii).

Flag's Cove Breakwater, erection (Ques.) 1795 (i).

Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4105.

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 2371; (Protection service) 2375 (i).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1454 (i).
Telegraphs, 4773 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3149, 3248, 3391, 3421, 3529, 3589, 3746 (ii).

Guay, Mr. P. M., Lévis.

Baie des Chaleurs Ry., completion (Ques.) 2671 (ii).

— Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 2378 (i).

Buoys in St. Lawrence River, Contract (Ques.) 2185 (i).

Great Eastern Ry., on M. for Pets., &c., 144 (i).

I.C.R., St. Jean Chrysostome Siding (M. for Pets., &c. *) 530 (i).

— Station at Lévis, Property Sold for extension (M. for Stmnt. *) 531 (i).

Lévis P.O., Pets. *re* erection (Ques.) 506 (i).

Loans, Public, negotiations (Ques.) 4589 (ii).

Ste. Croix Floating Light (Ques.) 2021 (i).

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2291 (i).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 1116 (i).

Girouard, Mr. D., Jacques Cartier.

Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4759 (ii).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4505 (ii).

Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2078 (i).

— reprint of documents, &c., *re* investigation (M.) 2185 (i).

— (M.) to summon Senator Macpherson, 2311 (i).

Priv. and Elects. Com. (M.) to employ Short-hand Writer, 2098 (i).

Girouard, Mr. D.—Continued.

Priv. and Elects. Com.'s Rep. *re* ex-Member for Lincoln (presented) 4397 (ii).

— 1st Rep. (M. to conc.) 4730 (ii).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4878 (ii).

Gordon, Mr. D. W., Vancouver Island.

Chinese Immigration, repeal of Act (Ques.) 68 (i).

Easter Adjmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).

Nanaimo and Vancouver Mail Service (Ques.) 2668 (ii).

Ry. Lands in Vancouver, Squatters' Rights (Ques.) 274 (i).

Settlers on Ry. Reserve, B.C., on M. for Pets., &c., 138 (i).

SUPPLY :

Militia (Monuments, &c.) 4651 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 4738. Dredging, 4729 (ii).

Guillet, Mr. G., West Northumberland.

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4378; on Sen. Amts., 4930 (ii).

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 1847 (i).

Eggs, Imports and Exports to and from Ont. and Que. (M. for Ret. *) 3693 (ii).

Insolvency, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Ministerial Expenses from Confed., on M. for Ret., 72 (i).

Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2708 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3088 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., South Lanark.

Atlantic Mail Service (remarks) 2251 (i).

— Allan's Contract (remarks) 3519 (ii).

— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).

Berthier County Mail Service, on M. for Pets., 529 (i).

Bliss' Patent Letter Box (Ans.) 2827 (ii).

Crane Island Mail Service (Ans.) 121 (i).

Crow Harbor Postmaster (Ans.) 400 (i).

English Periodicals, Cost of Mailing (Ans.) 1857, 1919 (i).

Fertilisers, Agricultural (prop. Res.) 1402 (i).

Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1189 (i).

Gaspé County Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 194 (i).

Greer, James, appointment as Fishery Overseer (Ans.) 3662 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).

Little Dover P.O., on M. for Pets., &c., 94 (i).

Malbaie and Tadousac Mail Service (Ans.) 275 (i).

Maple Hill P. O. (Ans.) 27 (i).

Maritime Provinces, delay of Mails, 1582 (i).

Megantic County Mail Service, on M. for Pets., 1148 (i).

Montreal P.O. Drop Boxes (Ans.) 3512 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*

- Moreau, Elie, payment of Account, 1797 (i).
 Nanaimo and Vancouver Mail Service (Ans.) 2669 (ii).
 New Canaan, establishment of P.O. (*£.s.*) 563 (i).
New York Mercury, circulation in Dom. (Ans.) 4500 (ii).
Otter, Steamship, and Mail Service (Ans.) 123 (i).
 Oyster Ponds P.O., on M. for Cor., 93 (i).
 Palmer Road Chapel P.O. (Ans.) 92 (i).
 — on M. for Ret., 519 (i).
 Pembroke P.O. Robbery, on M. for Ret., 159 (i).
 Penny Postage (Ans.) 4762 (ii).
 Petit Cascapedia Savings Bank (Ans.) 2669 (ii).
 Pierreville P.O., on M. for Ret., 517 (i).
 Postmaster Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 69 (i).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) Gas Well, 2256 (i).
 Quebec P.O., Superannuation of Employés, on M. for O. C.'s, &c., 61 (i).
 Ry. Mail Clerks, Pet. *re* increase of salaries (Ans.) 187 (i).
 — additional Appointments (Ans.) 562 (i).
 Read and Shannonville Mail Service, on M. for Ret., 1488 (i).
 Registered Letters, reduction of Fees (Ans.) 1122 (i).
 — Fees and Guarantees (Ans.) 2022 (i).
 Returns, incomplete P. O. (remarks) 394 (i).
 Rimouski Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 1064 (i).
 Ste. Angèle de Merici Mail Service (Ans.) 561 (i).
 St. Edmond, erection of P.O. (Ans.) 92, 401 (i).
 St. Edouard Mail Service, on M. for Pets., &c., 1680 (i).
 St. Rosaire P. O. (Ans.) 400 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 177, contingencies, 472 (i); Finn, M., re-appointment, 4574 (ii); (Sec. of State) contingencies, 465 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2288 (i), 4794; (C.P.R., service) 4155; (defalcations, Kingston) 4163; (salaries, &c., Halifax) 4153 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2146 (i).
Superannuation, 1315 (i).

Hall, Mr. R. N., *Sherbrooke.*

- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3864, 3881, 4079, 4284 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3030 (ii).

Hesson, Mr. S. R., *North Perth.*

- Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1231; on M. to adjn. Hse., 1249 (i).
 Ballot Boxes, Patent, on M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2232 (i).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3836; in Com., 4393 (ii).
 Banks, Chartered, in Liquidation, Names, &c. (M. for Ret.) 76 (i).
 — (enquiry for Ret.) 2251 (i).

Hesson, Mr. S. R.—*Continued.*

- Can. Cable Co.'s incorp. (B. 41, 1°*) 184 (i).
 Dunnville Dam, damages at Loomis Creek (Ques.) 2021 (i).
 Exodus of Canadians to U. S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 417 (i).
 Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2026 (i).
 Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 328 (i).
 — and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1501 (i).
 Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1053 (i).
 Grain Tester, prop. Change (Ques.) 4399 (ii).
 Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary language, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i), 2567 (ii).
 Portage la Prairie and Duck Mountain Ry. incorp. (B. 78, 1°*) 561 (i).
 Public Accounts and Auditor General's Rep. (M. to ref. to Standing Com.) 184 (i).
 — Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1916 (i).
 Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2705; on M. for 3°, 3320 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 717 (i).
Civil Govt. (Finance) contingencies, 4573 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2429 (i); (expenses) 3650 (ii).
Justice, Administration of (Judge's salary, P.E.I., Admiralty Court) 3996, 4576 (ii).
Legislation: H. of C. (salaries) 709 (i).
Militia (Armories, care of, &c.) 1326 (i).
Quarantine (Public Health) 4003 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2787; (personal explanation) 2861 (ii).
 — in Com., 3267, 3751, 4484 (ii).
 Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s (B. 156) M. to suspend Rules, 4822; Rules suspended and 1° of B., 4846 (ii).

Hickey, Mr. C. E., *Dundas.*

- Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3°, 3944 (ii).
 Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1787 (i).
 Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1802 (i).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Mulock*) unparliamentary Language, 2465 (i).
 Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 28, 1°*) 104 (i).
 Smith, Geo. T., Relief B., on M. for 3° (Amt.) 6 m.h., 3320; neg. (Y. 37, N. 93) 3321 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4861 (ii).
 Timber Limits, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4545; Amt., 4554; withdn., 4559 (ii).

Holton, Mr. F., Chateauguay.

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4506 (ii).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt.
 (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr.
McCarthy) 981 (i).

Hudspeth, Mr. A., South Victoria, Ont.

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*)
 on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to M. for 2°, 1216 (i).
 Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1285 (i).
 Imperial Trust Co. of Can. incorp. Act Amt. (B.
 37, 1°*) 159 (i).
 Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s
 (B. 21, 1°*) 104 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1285 (i).

Innes, Mr. J., South Wellington.

"A" Battery, Officers' Quarters (Ques.) 1358 (i).
 Cattle Disease in Western States (Ques.) 85 (i).
 Chicago World's Fair, Can. Representation
 (Ques.) 1357 (i).
 Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 1st Rep., 1262.
 Dom. Voters' Lists, Revision (Ques.) 1357 (i).
 Printing Com.'s Rep. (6th) on M. to conc., 4658.
 Voters' Lists (1889) printed outside of Printing
 Bureau (M. for Ret. *) 29 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying, development)
 2399; (*Patent Record*) 497; (Health Statistics)
 502 (i).
Civil Govt. (Printing Bureau, cleaning) 475 (i).
Dominion Police, 496 (i).

Ives, Mr. W. B., Richmond and Wolfe.

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop.
 Res., 2249 (i).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir
John Thompson) in Com., 1404 (i).
 Criminal Law Act Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thomp-*
son) in Com., 3171 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr.
Curran) to ref. back, 4579 (ii).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt.
 to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B.
 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1015 (i).
 Hereford Ry. Co.'s (B. 147) Rule suspended, 4396 ;
 (1°*) 4397 (ii).
 Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills,*
Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1875 (i).
 Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4108.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3747 (ii).

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., Gaspé.

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 7, 1°) 26 ; 2° m.,
 1220 ; in Com., 1221 (i).
 Fish-breeding Establishment (Ques.) 85 (i).
 Gaspé County Mail Service (M. for Cor., &c.)
 193 (i).

Jones, Hon. A. G., Halifax.

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in
 Com., 1071 (i).
 Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Tay-*
lor) on M. to print extra copies, 2912 (ii).
 Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 1022 (i).
 ——— Contracts, 3519 (ii).
 ——— Anderson's Contract (remarks) 3440 (ii).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop.
 Res., 2247 (i) ; in Com., 3956, 4075 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries (remarks) 886 (i).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John*
Thompson) in Com., 1079, 1414 (i).
 Customs Collectors, Instructions, on Adjmnt. (re-
 marks) 4083 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com.,
 4485 (i).
 Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to
 print, 1794 (i).
 Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on
 M. for 2°, 3191 (ii).
 Fisheries Question and negotiations at Washing-
 ton (Ques.) 1021 (i).
 Fishermen's Safety (B. 96, 1°) 1198 (i) ; on Order
 for Com., 2710 ; M. for Com., 3325 ; 2° m.,
 4440 (ii).
 Forrest, Lieut.-Col., on M. for Com. of Sup. (re-
 marks) 4569 (ii).
 Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists, on
 prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1498 (i).
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal,
 1185 (i).
 ——— Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapman*) on Amt. (Mr.
Brien) to M. for 3°, 3946 (ii).
 Gas Inspection B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for
 2°, 4267 (ii).
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*)
 on M. for 1°, 3153 (ii).
 I. C. R. and C. P. R. Freight Rates (Ques.)
 2024 (i).
 I. C. R. Freight Charges on Coal (Ques.) 1796 (i),
 4503 (ii).
 ——— amended Tariff, 3078 (ii).
 ——— Pig Iron rates (Ques.) 2828 (ii).
 ——— Tariff of Rates, change (Ques.) 2379 (i).
 ——— Tenders for Supplies (Ques.) 1796 (i).
 Jamaica, Govtl. relations with (remarks) 1201 (i).
 Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1097 (i).
 Military College, Students' Marks, on M. for
 Ret., 1026 (i).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on prop.
 Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1132 (i).
Modus Vivendi (remarks) 814 (i).
 Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res.
 (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 2043 (i).
 Port Arthur Harbor, &c. (dredging, &c.) in Com.
 of Sup., 1096 (i).
 Provincial Govts., transfer of Property authori-
 sation B. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for
 1°, 1514 (i).

Jones, Hon. A. G.—Continued.

- Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1873 (i).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4099.
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1557 (i).
—— (Ques.) 2674 (ii).
Smith, late Mr. Justice, N.S., Cor. *re* leave of absence (M. for Ret.) 1681 (i).
—— on M. for Ret., 1692 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Census and Statistics) 2393 ; (Experimental Farms) 716 (i), 3800 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Maintenance) 3867 (i). Customs, 1420. Excise (salaries, &c.) 2321. Post Office, 2289 (i). Railways (I.C.R., Repairs) 3802 ; (P.E.I.) 4136 (ii). Weights and Measures (McDonnell's salary) 2343 (i).
Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2351, 2370 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2449 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 487 (i) ; (Judge's salary, P.E.I.) 3966 (ii).
Legislation: H. of C. (Miscellaneous, Printing, &c.) 715 ; (salaries) 704. Senate (Miscellaneous) 703 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and W. Indies, &c.) 1973, 2002 (i) ; conc., 4275 (ii) ; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1964 ; (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 1958 ; (St. John and Annapolis) 1973 ; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1963 (i).
Militia (Ammunition, &c.) 1316 ; (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1267 (i) ; (Contingencies) 4012 (ii) ; (Military College) 1339 (i), conc., 4273 (ii) ; (Ordnance, Rifled) 1335 (i).
Miscellaneous (O'Brien, Jotham) conc., 4277 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Que. River Police) 2018 (i) ; (Tidal Observations) 4041 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1096 ; (Que.) 1103 (i). *Income*—Buildings (Conservatories) 1470 ; (Major's Hill Park) 1466 ; (N.S.) 1106, 1448. Dredging (N.S.) 1631, 1637. Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 1615 ; (Miscellaneous) 1651 (i), 4167 (ii) ; (N.S.) 1568 ; (Que.) 1616. Telegraph Lines, 1648 (i).
Railways—Capital: Cape Breton Ry., 1932 (i), 4019 (ii). Grand Narrows Bridge, 4021. I. C. R. (Dartmouth Branch) 4014 (ii) ; (Halifax, increased accommodation) 1920 ; (Rolling Stock) 1929 (i). Oxford and New Glasgow (construction, &c.) 4017 (ii) ; (Rolling Stock) 1933 (i) ; (St. Charles Branch) 4014 (ii).
Superannuation, 1309 (i).
Supreme Court, filling Vacancy (Ques.) 885 (i).
Trawl Fishing in St. Mary's Bay (Ques.) 2377 (i).
Valiquette's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1267 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2829 (ii).
—— in Com., 3081, 3262, 3393, 3503, 3560 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., Halifax.

- Atlantic Mail Service (remarks) 2250 (i), 3518 (ii).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2^d, 3829 ; in Com., 3891, 4080, 4383, 4418, 4526.
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1086, 1411 (i).
Easter Adjmt., on prop. M., 2915 ; (remarks) 2673 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E.—Continued.

- Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) on Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) to M. for 2^d, 4447 (ii).
Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1098 (i).
Merchant's Shipping Acts, Imp. Legislation (remarks) 2382 (i).
Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to M. for 3^d, 1299 (i).
Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1819, 2036 (i).
—— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4351 (ii).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4101 (ii).
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).
Smith, late Mr. Justice, on M. for Ret., 1694 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Collection of Revenues*: Rys. (I.C.R., Repairs, &c.) 3806 ; (P.E.I.) 4145 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Magdalen Islands) 1953 (i) ; (Halifax, W. Indies and S. America) 1980 (i) ; (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 1959 ; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1964 ; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1963 (i).
Militia (Military Properties, &c., care of) 1335 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1098 (i). *Income*: Buildings (Military College, Kingston) 4704 (ii) ; (N.S.) 1107. Dredging (N.S.) 1635. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1568 (i).
Steamboat Inspection, 2019 (i).
Rys.—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 1921 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2930 (ii).
—— in Com., 3283, 3496, 3561 (ii).

Kirk, Mr. J. A. Guysborough.

- Crow Harbor Postmaster (Ques.) 400 (i).
Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) on Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) to M. for 2^d, 4446 (ii).
Fish Commission, Cost, in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).
Little Dover P.O. (M. for Pets., &c.) 94 (i).
Lobster Fishing Regulations (Ques.) 885 (i).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., construction (Ques.) 402 (i).
Oyster Ponds P.O. (M. for Pets. and Cor.) 93 (i).
Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1817 (i).
Ry. Communication with Eastern N.S. (remarks) 3324 (ii).
Salmon Fishing with Nets (Ques.) 4399 (ii).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4110 (ii).
Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1553 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 3794 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Excise (salaries, &c.) 2323 (i). Rys. (I.C.R., Repairs, &c.) 3806 ; (P.E.I.) 3809 (ii).
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 2352 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2434 (i).
Indians (N.S.) Medical services, 4052 (ii).

Kirk, Mr. J. A.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

- Mail Subsidies* (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1971 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1454.
Dredging (N.S.) 1639. *Harbors and Rivers*
 (Mar. Provs.) 1615; (N.B.) 1612 (i).
Superannuation, 1306 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3466,
 3561 (ii).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., Frontenac.

- Banking Act* Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com.,
 3879, 3960, 4277, 4373 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John*
Thompson) in Com., 115, 344, 1413, 1520 (i);
 on Sen. Amts., 4408 (ii).
Bremner Furs, Payment (remarks) 4932 (ii).
C. P. R. Act (1889) Amt. (B. 56, 1st*) 342 (i).
Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*)
 in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (personal explanation)
 392 (i).
Dom. Mineral Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 121,
 1st*) 1936 (i).
Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res.
 (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1045 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*)
 in Com., 3631 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard*
Cartwright) *Timber Limits*, 2050, 2097 (i).
Mounted Police, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for
 Sel. Com. *re Management*, 2690 (ii).
Private Bills, suspension of Rules (M.) 1936 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr.
Colby) in Com., 4370 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Militia* (Ammunition, &c.) 1319; (Armories, care
 of, &c.) 1320 (i); (Military College) conc., 4273 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3090 (ii).
Wrecking in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*)
 on M. for 2^o, 1202 (i).

Labrosse, Mr. S., Prescott.

- Indemnity to Members, &c.*, increased (Ques.)
 4907 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A.*
Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 4851 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., South Grey.

- Annapolis P. O.*, purchase of Site (Ques.) 2229 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com.,
 4300, 4416, 4526 (ii).
Baltic, Outrage on Steamer (Ques.) 186, 1858 (i).
 — (remarks) 3079, 4028 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John*
Thompson) in Com., 106 (i).
Bliss' Patent Letter Box (Ques.) 2827 (ii).
Cape Crocker Indians, Annuity paid (Ques.) 505.
Corinth P.O. (remarks) 94 (i).
Corn, rebate of Duty (prop. Res.) 195; neg. (Y.
 54, N. 70) 211 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com.,
 4498 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—Continued.

- Disallowance of Provincial Bills since Confed.*,
 &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 28 (i).
English Periodicals, Cost of Mailing (Ques.) 1856,
 1918 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*)
 to repeal, 332 (i).
Goderich and Strathroy P.O., Tenders (Ques.)
 2377 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on
 M. to suspend Rules, 2184 (i).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Regulations (M. for copy)
 145 (i).
Indians, Selling Liquor to (M. for Ret.*) 29 (i).
Iroquois Lockmaster, Superannuation (Ques.)
 3077 (ii).
Legal Services, Sums paid to Firms in Peter-
borough (Ques.) 1199, 1484 (i).
Malt, rebate of Duty (prop. Res.) 516 (i).
Maple Hill P.O. (Ques.) 27 (i).
Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup.,
 229, 372 (i).
Paul, Peter, expenses of Trial (Ques.) 505 (i).
Peterborough Public Buildings, Expenditure
 (Ques.) 1366 (i).
Postmasters in Rural Districts (salaries) on M.
 for Ret., 93 (i).
Private Bills, suspension of Rule (M.) 60, 1936 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) *Gas*
Well, 2257 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills,*
Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1899 (i).
Registered Letters, Fees and Guarantees (Ques.)
 2022 (i).
 — Reduction of Fees (Ques.) 1121 (i).
Reuter's Telegraph Agency (Ques.) 145 (i).
Sawdust in Ottawa River, Sandford Fleming's
Rep. (M. for copy*) 1065 (ii).
Saw Logs, rebate of Duty (Ques.) 3662 (ii).
Seed Corn, Duty on (Ques.) 2829 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A.*
Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 4853 (ii).
- SUPPLY :
- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Census and Statistics) 2391.
Civil Govt. (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) contingen-
 cies, 223; (High Commissioner's Office) contin-
 gencies, 216; (Postmaster General) 178; (Privy
 Council) contingencies, 224; (Sec. of State) contin-
 gencies, 466; (Printing Bureau) contingencies,
 372; (Railways and Canals) 181 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (additional pay)
 4153 (ii). *Excise* (salaries, &c.) 2319 (i). *Liquor*
License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4255 (ii). *Post*
Office, 2297 (i); (defalcations, Kingston) 4166 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2141 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2426 (i).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 4048 (ii).
Militia (Estate R. S. King, rent, &c.) 4159 (ii);
 (Military Properties, &c. care of) 1336 (i).
Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs)
 4058; (Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des familles
 Canadiennes) 4116 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 4703 (ii).
Superannuation, 1306 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—Continued.

- Temp. Colonisation Co., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4907, 4910 (ii).
 Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 375 (i).
 Vollett, Robert, expenses of Trial (Ques.) 27 (i).
 Voters' Lists, Receipt of (Ques.) 3724 (ii).
 ——— Revision, reprinting (remarks) 2381 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3081, 3114, 3146, 3222, 3407, 3464, 3503, 3585, 4481 (ii).
 Weights and Measures, Inspection Fees (Ques.) 1121 (i).

Landry, Mr. P. A., Kent, N.B.

- French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 769 (i).
 Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1621 (i).
 Moncton and P.E.I. Ry. and Ferry Co.'s incorp. (B. 64, 1*) 342 (i).

Langelier, Mr. C., Montmorency.

- Cavalry School, Que., Officers' promotion (Ques.) 3291 (ii).
 Drill Hall, Montreal, repairs, &c. (Ques.) 883 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 949 (i).
 Govt. Steamers, carriage of private Merchandise (Ques.) 504 (i).
 Imperial Federation Association and Govt. Employés (Ques.) 886 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 884 (i).

Langelier, Mr. F., Quebec Centre.

- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3854, 3888, 4278 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 106, 1093 (i).
 C. P. R. and North Shore Ry. Debentures (M. for Cor.) 55 (i).
 Cullers' Office, Quebec, Superannuations (M. for O.C., &c.) 66 (i).
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4579 (ii).
 Easter Adjnmt., on prop. M., 2915 (ii).
 Gareau, Joseph, Appointment and Removal (M. for Cor., &c.*) 66 (i).
 I. C. R. Passenger and Mail Service (M. for Cor.) 146 (i).
 Land Slide at Quebec (M. for O. C.) 63 (i).
 Lépine, L. P., Appointment as Supt. of Govt. Works (M. for Cor.*) 66 (i).
 Marine and Emigrant Hospital, Quebec, Expenditure (M. for Stmnt.) 75 (i).
 ——— (M. for O.C., &c.*) 66 (i).
 Montreal Bridge and Terminus Co.'s incorp. (B. 97, 1*) 1019 (i).
 Provincial Govts., transfer of Property authorisation B. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1514 (i).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 1582 (i).

Langelier, Mr. F.—Continued.

- Quebec P. O., Superannuations (M. for O.C.) 60 (i).
 St. Sauveur Fire and "B" Battery (Ques.) 1200 (i).
 SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Census and Statistics) 2387 (i).
Collection of Revenues : Post Office, 2293 (1).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2404, 2421 (i).
Indians (Surveys) 2162 (i).
Miscellaneous (Débats Parlementaires de Québec) 4115 (ii).
Public Works—Capital : Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1099. *Income* : Buildings (Que.) 1112 (i).

Langevin, Sir H. L., K.C.M.G., Three Rivers.

- Annapolis P. O., on M. for Ret., 254 (i).
 ——— purchase of Site (Ans.) 2229 (i).
 ——— Public Building, on M. for Cor., 3689 (ii).
 Ash Wednesday, Adjnmt. (M.) 794 (i).
 Bell Creek Harbor, Survey and Repts. (Ans.) 2377 (i), 2669 (ii).
 Bills, Royal Assent, on informality of Procedure (remarks) 2594 (ii).
 Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on Order for resuming adjnd. deb. on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1508 (i).
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4505 (ii).
 Cascapedia River, Great, Bridge (Ans.) 2669 (ii).
 Carlton Point, North (P. E. I.) Survey (Ans.) 1484 (i).
 Collingwood Harbor, Expenditure (Ans.) 1655 (i).
 Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
 Debates, Official, Accommodation for Staff, 3724.
 Derby Branch Ry. extension, on M. for Cor., 516 (i).
 Dionne, Jcs., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 2023.
 Dundas and Waterloo Macadam Road (Ans.) 68.
 ——— on M. for Ret., 152 (i).
 Easter Adjnmt. (M.) 2914 (ii).
 Elbow River Water Power Co.'s B. 76 (M. to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c.) 1019 (i).
 Escoumains, proposed Wharf (Ans.) 274 (i).
 Esquimalt Dry Dock, enlargement (Ans.) 1120.
 Fisheries and *Modus Vivendi* (remarks) 2916 (ii).
 Fertilisers, Artificial, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) to remove Duty, 1811 (i).
 Flag's Cove Breakwater, erection (Ans.) 1795 (i).
 Floods in Laprairie (Ans.) 884 (i).
 Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 267 (i).
 French Language in N. W. T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 600 (i).
 Goderich and Strathroy P. O., Tenders (Ans.) 2377 (i).
 Tenders for Repairs (Ans.) 84 (i), 3154 (ii).
 Govt. Business (M.) to take in Thursdays, 794 (i).
 ——— on M. for Adjnmt. (remarks) 1511 (i).
 Gov't. Expenditures in Ottawa (Ans.) 1858 (i).
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2181 (i).
 Hall's Harbor (N.S.) on M. for Repts., &c., 2032.
 Hereford Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (M.) to place on Order Paper, 4499 (ii).

Langevin, Sir H. L.—Continued.

- Isle au Noix Wharf, construction (Ans.) 1357 (i).
 Independence of Parlt. B. 12 (Mr. *Casgrain*) on M. for 2°, 2210 (i).
 Indian Advancement Act B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on Order for 2°, 1507 (i).
 I. C. R., Freight Rates on Flour (Ans.) 248 (i).
 ——— Passenger and Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 146 (i).
 Kamouraska Wharf, Building, on M. for Ret., 99.
 Land Damages, Yamaska County, on M. for Cor., 530 (i).
 Legal Services, Payments (Ans.) 246 (i).
 Lévis P. O., Pets. *re* erection (Ans.) 506 (i).
 Lincoln, Member for, on resuming adjd. deb. (remarks) 1936; (M.) for special Order, 1937 (i).
 McKinack River Works (Ans.) 4172 (ii).
 Maine Central Ry. Co.'s B. (M.) to place on Order Paper, 4499 (ii).
 Miminegash Breakwater, repairs (Ans.) 122 (i), 3077 (ii).
 Miminegash (Little) Harbor Survey (Ans.) 2022.
 Montreal Harbor Commission, abolition (Ans.) 401 (i).
 ——— Improvements (Ans.) 884 (i), 2914; (remarks) 3077 (ii).
 Nicolet, construction of Piers (Ans.) 4588 (ii).
 N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4468 (ii).
 Ottawa (new) Deptl. Building Expenditure (Ans.) 1859 (i).
 Picton Harbor, Dredging, &c., on M. for Cor., 2193 (i).
 ——— Rep. of Engineer (Ans.) 2186 (i).
 Post Offices, erection (Ans.) 1485 (i).
 Prieur, Arthur, employment as Translator (Ans.) 2022, 2185 (i).
 Printing Com. (M. to add name) 1651 (i).
 ——— (9th Rep.) on M. to conc., 4929 (i).
 Private Bills, Reps. from Coms., extension of Time (Ms.) 1198 (i), 2531, 3540 (ii).
 ——— B's. 155 and 156 (M.) to place on Order Paper, 4906 (ii).
 Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1908 (i).
 Public Works Deptl. Rep. (presented) 212 (i).
 Quebec Harbor Improvements (Ans.) 4500 (ii).
 ——— on reading of Telegram, 4564 (ii).
 ——— article in *Le Canadien* (remarks) 4827 (ii).
 ——— papers, &c. (Ans.) 4907 (ii).
 ——— alleged Irregularities (remarks) 4935 (ii).
 Railway Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3327 (ii).
 Rainy River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 60 (Mr. *Dawson*) on M. for 2°, 531 (i).
 Revising Officer, Champlain (Ans.) 2022 (i).
 Rimouski Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 1064 (i).
 Saguenay River, Winter Crossing (Ans.) 274 (i).
 Seed Barley, distribution (remarks) 1510 (i).
 Select Standing Com. (Rep. presented) 30 (i).

Langevin, Sir H. L.—Continued.

- Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Wharf, repairs (Ans.) 92 (i).
 St. Louis River Public Works (Ans.) 245 (i).
 ——— erection of Piers (Ans.) 401 (i).
 ——— (N.B.) completion of Wharf (Ans.) 506 (i).
 St. Michel Wharf, repairs (Ans.) 246 (i).
 St. Peter's Bay, Survey for Wharf (Ans.) 247 (i).
 Standing Indemnity (Res.) 4935 (ii).
 Standing Com. on Banking and Commerce, M. to add name, 91 (i).
 ——— Rys. (M. to add name) 1651 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4368 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4889 (i).
 Summerside Harbor, Breakwater (Ans.) 121, 247 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2397 (i).
Civil Govt. (Public Works) contingencies, 470 (i).
Collection of Revenues : Telegraph Lines, 3872 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2449 (i).
Legislation : H. of C. (salaries) 704 (i).
Public Works—Capital : Buildings (N.S.) 4915; (Ottawa) 4913 (ii). Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 1105; (Que.) 1100; (Ont.) 1095; (N.B.) 1098. *Income* : Buildings, 1443; (B.C.) 1443; (Conservatories) 1468 (i); (Drill Shed, Brantford) 4706 (ii); (Gas, &c., Ottawa) 1465; (Man.) 1439 (i), 4038 (ii); (N.B.) 1111 (i), 4700 (ii); (N.S.) 1109, 1444, (i), 4056, 4699 (ii); (N.W.T.) 1440 (i), 4039, 4719 (ii); (Ont.) 1437 (i), 4036, 4702; (Deptl. Buildings, Ottawa) 4696; Govt. Printing Bureau) conc. 4274 (ii); (Heating, &c.) 465; (Removal of snow) 1464; (Telephone) 1465; (Que.) 1112 (i), 4036, 4702 (ii); (Repairs, &c.) 1455. Dredging (Man.) 1648; (N.S.) 1643. Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 1630 (i), 4739, (dredging) 4729 (ii); (Man., repairs, &c.) 1627; (Mar. Provs.) 1615 (i), 4040; (Miscellaneous) 4167 (ii); (N.B.) 1610; (N.S.) 1568 (i), 4721 (ii); (Ont.) 1617 (i), 4727, conc., 4275 (ii); (P.E.I.) 1571 (i), 4723 (ii); (Que.) 1616 (i), 4727; (Repairs, &c.) 4166 (ii); (Miscellaneous) 1651; (Major's Hill Park) 1465; (Surveys and Inspections) 1651. Roads and Bridges, 1649 (i), 4766 (ii). Telegraph Lines, 1648 (i), 4041, 4772 (ii).
 Tadousac Wharf, Sum for completion (Ans.) 274 (i).
 Telegraph, North Shore St. Lawrence (Ans.) 4762 (ii).
 Thames River dredging, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4895 (ii).
 ——— removal of Bar (Ans.) 55 (i).
 Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B. 156 (Mr. *Hesson*) on M. for 1°, 4846 (ii).
 Wrecking and Towing in Can. Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Order for 2°, 146 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., Provencher.

- Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 433 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Sen. Amts., 4666 (ii).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—Continued.

- French Language in N. W. T. (abolition) B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 51; on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 983 (i).
 Indian Reserves in Man. (M. for List) 514 (i).
 Man. and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 90, 1°*) 794 (i).
 N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Devdney*) on M. for 2°, 4454 (ii).
 Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3714 (ii).
 Land Claims under Man. Act (prop. M. withdn.) 514 (i).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4682 (ii).

Laurie, Lieut.-Gen. J. W., Shelburne.

- Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 4412 (ii).
 Canada and Treaties of Commerce, communications between H. M.'s Govt. and Dom. Govt. (M. for copies) 3666 (ii).
 Easter Adjmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
 Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) on Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) to M. for 2°, 4445 (ii).
 Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1048 (i).
 Health Dept., establishment, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1667 (i).
 Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4003, 4646 (ii).
 Mounted Police Management, on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3351 (ii).
 Newfoundland Harbor Fees, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4893 (ii).
 Personal explanation *re par.* in *Globe*, 3197 (ii).
 Pig Iron and Fishery Bounties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1814 (i).
 Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2°, 3716 (ii).
 Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).
 Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4879 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Census and Statistics) 2394 (i).
Collection of Revenues : Post Office, 2289 (i).
Fisheries (Protection) 4782 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 2360 (i).
Geological Survey, 2141 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2420 (i).
Legislation (Indemnity to J. S. Thompson) 4004 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax and West Indies and S. America) 2012; (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 1960; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1963 (1).
Militia (Ammunition, &c.) 1320; (Armories, care of, &c.) 1325 (i); (Monuments) 4652 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Dredging (N.S.) 1642 (i).
Rys.—Capital : I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 1927 (i).
 Treaties of Commerce, Comms. between H. M.'s Govt. and Dom. Govt. (M. for copies) 3666 (ii).

Laurie, Lieut.-Gen. J. W.—Continued.

- Ways and Means*—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2845 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 3287, 3396, 3587 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W., East Quebec.

- Address, on the, 13 (i).
 Albert Ry. Grant, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4560.
 Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1231 (i).
 ——— procedure, 2202 (i).
 ——— on M. to print extra copies, 2911 (ii).
 American Freight in Bond (M. for O.C.'s, &c.) 99 (i).
 Atlantic Mail Service and Messrs. Anderson (M. for Cor.) 100, 1021 (ii).
 ——— on M. for Cor., 1022 (i).
 Ballot Boxes, on M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2231 (i).
 ——— on Rep. of Sel. Com., 4656 (ii).
Baitic, Steamer, Outrage (remarks) 4027 (ii).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on Sen. Amts., 4930 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, papers respecting (Ques., 30 (i)).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c. B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 116; on M. for Com., 343 (i).
 Bremner Furs, Payment (remarks) 4933 (ii).
 ——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 4759 (ii).
 See "Middleton, Maj.-Gen."
 Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1385; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1400 (i).
 ——— on Order for resuming adjd. deb. on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1508; (remarks) 1517.
 ——— Precedence (M.) 1654 (i).
 ——— on presentation of Rep. of Com., 3810 (ii).
 BUDGET, The, &c., Delay (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1937; (Amt.) 1940; neg. (Y. 57, N. 95) 1950 (i).
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 637, 1511 (i), 3875, 4505 (ii).
 Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4427 (ii).
 Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy for Bridge, on M. for Stmnt., 3665 (ii).
 Cardin, Elphège and Jean, Claims for Damages to Lands (M. for copies*) 1065 (ii).
 Caughtnawaga Indians, Indemnity for encroachments on Reserve, on M. for Cor., 1709 (i).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2°, 2714 (ii).
 Corn, rebate of Duty (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 390; neg. (Y. 69, N. 104) 459 (i).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3165; (remarks) 3368 (ii).
 ——— drafting Amts. (remarks) 3455 (ii).
 Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).
 Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 1262 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4582 (ii).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to M. for 2^o, 2218 (i)
- (remarks) *re* Vote of Member, 2228 (i).
- Easter Adjmt. (remarks) 2596, 2671, 2674, 2741, 2915 (ii).
- Fertilisers, Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2026 (i).
- Fish Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 213 (i).
- Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 262 (i).
- and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1493 (i).
- Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1^o, 3196; in Com., 3900; on M. for 3^o, 3937; on Sen. Amts., 4664 (ii).
- Forrest, Lieut.-Col., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4568 (ii).
- Freight in Bond on American Vessels (M. for O.C.'s, &c.) 99 (i).
- French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 1^o, 53, 54; (remarks) *re* 2^o, 160; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o, 725; on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1012 (i).
- Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Wednesdays, 2228, 2250 (i).
- on M. to take in Thursdays, 794, 1066 (i).
- Half-breeds' Claims, and Res. of Leg. Assembly, N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
- on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3310 (ii).
- Health Dept., establishment, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1679 (i).
- Hereford Ry. B. 147 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4503.
- Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 155 (Mr. *Daly*) on M. to suspend Rules, 4821 (ii).
- Hull, Religious disturbances (remarks) 394, 510 (i).
- Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on Order for 2^o, 1507 (i); on M. for 2^o, 2725 (ii).
- B. 132 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2^o, 3604; in Com., 3625, 4034 (ii).
- L.C.R., Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 1357 (i).
- Steel Rails, purchase (Ques.) 2021 (i).
- Interpretation Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2^o, 3156; in Com., 3158 (ii).
- Jesuits' Estates Act, on proposed Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4226 (ii).
- Kent (N. B.) representation, Issue of Writ, 3591.
- Land Damages in Yamaska County (M. for Cor.) 530 (i).
- Laurie, Gen., Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4646 (i).
- Lincoln, Member for, on Ques. of Priv., 451 (i).
- on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 723 (i).
- on additional documents, 812 (i).
- on consdn. of documents presented, 1476.
- on further Cor., 1654 (i).
- on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2059, 2097 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Loyalty to Her Majesty, on prop. Address (Mr. *Mulock*) 132 (i).
- Lonely Island Lighthouse (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
- Maybee, Miss, on M. for Cor., 2188 (i).
- Middleton, Maj.-Gen., Rep. *re* Bremner Furs (remarks) 4927 (ii).
- Ministerial Expenses from Confed., on M. for Ret., 70 (i).
- Ministers' Salaries and Expenses, on M. for Ret., 103 (i).
- Modus Vivendi*. See "U.S."
- Mounted Police, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com. *re* Management, 2687 (ii).
- on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3355 (ii).
- North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for Cor., 59.
- N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2^o, 4450; in Com., 4469 (ii).
- N. W. T., Res. of Leg. Assembly *re* Moneys voted by Parlt. (M. for Ret.*) 104 (i).
- Pagans in Joliette County, on M. for Ret., 513 (i).
- Perley, late Mr., remarks on decease, 2740 (ii).
- Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) Gas Well, 2258 (i).
- Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1868 (i).
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners B. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2^o, 1533 (i).
- Quebec Harbor Improvements, Article in *Le Canadien*, 1827 (ii).
- Papers, &c. (Ques.) 4907 (ii).
- Quebec P. O., Superannuation of Employés, on M. for O. C.'s, &c., 62 (i).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M. for Com., 3325 (ii).
- Religious disturbances in Hull, 394, 510 (i).
- St. Germain, Bruno, Claims for damages to Land (M. for Ret.*) 1065 (ii).
- St. Sauveur, Fire, application for Aid (Ques.) 1121 (i)
- Saskatchewan Provisional District, Populations by Origin (M. for Stmnt.*) 1065 (ii).
- Savings Banks, Quebec, B. 154 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4847 (ii).
- Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4106.
- Seamens' Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2^o, 4359; in Com., 4360; on M. for 3^o, 4402 (ii).
- Settlers on Ry. Reserves, B.C. (M. for Pets., &c.) 137 (i).
- Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch (Ques.) 399, 505.
- (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1533; neg. (Y. 61, N. 98) 1566 (i).
- Speaker, Deputy, and Chairman of Coms., on M. to appoint, 32 (i).
- Standing Com. on Banking and Commerce (remarks) 91 (i).
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2^o, 3187 (ii).
- Subsides (Land) to Rys., on prop. Res., 4824 (ii).
- Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4849 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY: On M. for Com., 161 (i), 4499 (ii); in Com.:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 2383.
Civil Govt. (Interior) contingencies, 381 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2295 (i). *Liquor License Act*, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4259 (ii).
Fisheries, 4041 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2513 (i).
Legislation (French Translators, extra pay) 4008 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Canada and United Kingdom) 4774.
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1276 (i); (R. S. King, Estate, &c.) 4899 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Bow River Lumber Co.'s Costs) 4060; (Half-breeds, N. W. T.) 4069; (Le Vieux Lachine) 4791; (St. Catharines Milling Co.'s Costs) 4059; (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4069 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 4650 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1468; (N.S.) 1109 (i), 4696; (Que.) 4036, 4702. *Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.)* 4723 (ii); (Que.) 1616 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Moncton, increased accommodation) 4015 (ii).
 Timber Limits, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4558 (ii).
 Tonnancourt, Geo., Claims for damages to Land (M. for copies*) 1065 (ii).
 U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* B. 134 (Sir John Thompson) on M. for 2°, 3594 (ii).
 Valiquette's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1276 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3082, 3472, 3730 (ii).
 Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B. 156 (Mr. Hesson) on M. to suspend Rules, 4823; on M. for 1°, 4846 (ii).
 Yamaska River Dam, Claims for damages to Land (M. for copy*) 1065 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. J., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4590; neg. on a div., 4595 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 103, 1°) 1199 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Beausoleil) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. McCarthy) 614 (i).
 Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Wallace) on Amt. (Mr. Curran) to M. for 3° (Amt.) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 63, N. 86) 1349 (i).
 Stoney Mountain Penitentiary, Convicts' punishment (Ques.) 1120, 2836 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3055 (ii).

Lépine, Mr. A. T., *East Montreal.*

Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. Taylor) on M. for 2°, 1247 (i).
 Labor, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 3661 (ii).
 Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 4841 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 2914 (ii).
 Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. Purcell) on M. for 2°, 3709 (ii).

Lister, J. F., *West Lambton.*

A. D. C., appointment (Ques.) 2669 (ii).
 Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. Taylor) on M. for 2°, 1233 (i).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 344 (i).
 Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4749 (ii).
 Bresaylor Half-Breeds' Claims (M. for Sel. Com.) 1358, 1398 (i).
 Civil Service, appointments of Professional Men without passing C.S. Exam., Names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 3693 (ii).
 Erie and Huron Ry. Co.'s (B. 57, 1°*) 342 (i).
 Fishing Licenses, Unsettled Returns (M. for Cor.*) 1065 (ii).
 Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wilson, *Elgin*) to repeal, 294 (i).
 Gas Inspection B. 137 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 2°, 4268 (ii).
 Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 155 (Mr. Daly) on M. to suspend Rules, 4822 (ii).
 Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1283 (i).
 Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Dewdney) on M. for 2°, 3604 (ii).
 McGirr, William, Travelling Expenses (M. for Cor.*) 1065 (ii).
 Militia Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 1°, 4171 (ii).
 Militia and Defence Dept., Promotions and Changes (M. for O.C.'s*) 3693 (ii).
 ——— Clothing Supplies, Tenders (Ques.) 3811.
 ——— Deptl. Sec., appointment (Ques.) 2670.
 Mining Machinery, Importation (Ques.) 562 (i).
 Orange incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Wallace) on Amt. (Mr. Curran) to M. for 3°, 1301 (i).
 Powell, Col. Walker, resignation (Ques.) 562 (i).
 SUPPLY:

Civil Govt. (Interior) contingencies, 384; (Militia) contingencies, 380 (i).
Geological Survey, 2149 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2523 (i).
Legislation: H. of C. (contingencies) 712. Senate (Miscellaneous) 701 (i).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1283 (i).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 3640 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Deptl., Ottawa) 4698; (Ont.) 4710 (ii).
 Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 380, 384 (i).
 Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to suspend Rules, 4823 (ii).

Lovitt, Mr. J., *Yarmouth.*
 Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. Trow) for Adjnt., 2308 (i).
 Atlantic Mail Service (remarks) 2251 (i).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1526 (i).
 Green Cove Breakwater, repairs (Ques.) 84 (i), 3154 (ii).
 Newfoundland Harbor Fees, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4894 (ii).

Lovitt, Mr. J.—Continued.

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2^o, 3190 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Income (St. Peter's) 4655 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Excise (Preventive Service) 2335 (i).

Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2370 (i).

Legislation: H. of C. (contingencies) 712 (i).

Mail Subsidies (Grand Manan and Mainland) 1957; (Liverpool or London, and St. John and Halifax) 1960 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Que. River Police) 2018 (i).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1468. Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 1615; (N.S.) 1568 (i), 4720. Telegraphs, 4772 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection, 2020 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3589 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., G.C.B., Kingston.

Address, on the, 22 (i).

Adjmt. (M.) 4924 (ii).

Albert Ry. Grant, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4561 (ii).

Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2^o, 1228, 1850; on procedure, 2195; on Amt. (Mr. *Casey*) 2206 (i).

Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for adjmt. 2308 (i).

Atlantic Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 100, 1022 (i).

— (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4695 (ii).

Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 2378 (i).

— completion (Ans.) 2671 (ii).

Ballot Boxes, Patent, on M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2231 (i).

Baltic, Steamer, alleged Outrage (remarks) 3080.

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3991 (ii).

Beauharnois Canal, construction, on M. for Ret., 517 (i).

— enlargement (Ans.) 187 (i).

Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, papers respecting (Ans.) 30 (i).

— Protection by U. S., 513, 725 (i).

— (remarks) 886 (i).

— on Telegram from Washington, 1068 (i).

— negotiations at Washington (Ans.) 1201 (i), 4907 (ii). See "Fisheries."

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for Com., 343 (i).

Bremner Furs, payment (Ans.) 4931 (ii).

— Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4756 (ii). See "Middleton, Maj.-Gen."

Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1388; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1399; (remarks) 1517 (i).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 631, 2098 (i), 3874, 4504 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (prop. Res.) 4261, 4404; M. for Com. on Res., 4419; in Com., 4435; 1^o* of P., 4440 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Cont'd.

Can. and Jamaica, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 1199 (i).

Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy for Bridge, on M. for Stmnt., 3664 (ii).

C. P. R. Bridges in Bagot County, on M. for Pets., &c., 141 (i).

— Telegraphic Rep. in *Mail re* stoppage of traffic through Maine, 1791 (i).

Can. Commissioners Abroad, on M. for Ret., 101 (i)

Cape Traverse Wharf, expenditure (Ans.) 2378.

Caraquet Ry. Co., Financial Aid (Ans.) 3723 (ii).

— Earnings (Ans.) 3811 (ii).

Census, next Enumeration (Ans.) 402 (i).

Chambly and Longueuil Canal (Ans.) 401 (i).

Chicago World's Fair, Can. Representation (Ans.) 1357 (i).

Chinese Immigration, Repeal of Act (Ans.) 68 (i).

Chisholm, late Mr., deceased (remarks) 3081 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2^o, 2713 (ii).

Commercial Treaties with Foreign Countries, on M. for Ret., 3683 (ii).

Copyright Act (remarks) 4606 (ii).

Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) M. to adjn. deb., 392 (i).

— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 451 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Letter of John Page, presented to Parlt. in Ret. (remarks) 1125 (i).

Criminal Law Act Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3180 (ii).

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 1855 (i).

Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).

Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4579 (ii).

Disallowance of Provincial Bills, on M. for Stmnt., 29 (i).

— Man. Municipal Acts (Ans.) 4906 (ii).

— Power of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 4093.

Divorce Bills, introduction (remarks) 3324 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38, on M. for 2^o (Amt.) 6 m. h., 2212; agreed to (Y. 103, N. 60) 2226 (i).

— (remarks) *re* Vote of Member, 2228 (i).

Dom. Voters' Lists, Revision (Ans.) 1357 (i).

Dunnville Dam, damages at Loomis Creek (Ans.) 2021 (i).

Easter Adjmt. (remarks) 2671, 2741 (ii).

Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1793 (i).

Fertilisers, Agricultural (B. 95, 1^o*) 963 (i).

Fish Commissioners' Reps. (remarks) 395 (i).

Fisheries Question and negotiations at Washington (Ans.) 1021 (i), 4930 (ii).

— Newspaper par. (remarks) 752 (i).

Fishermen in St. Lawrence, Licenses, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4570 (ii).

Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1492 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Cont'd.
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Brien*) on M. for 2^o, 3721 (ii).
 ——— B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3^o, 3940 (ii).
 French Language in N. W. T. (abolition) B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 1^o, 53; (remarks) *re* 2^o, 160; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o, 745; on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 890 (i).
 Geological Survey Dept. B. 116 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4032 (ii).
 Govt. Business (M.) to take in Mondays, 3937 (ii).
 ——— (M.) to take in Thursdays, 1066 (i).
 ——— (M.) to take in Wednesdays, 2241 (i).
 Govt. Ry. Subsidies (Ans.) 4173 (ii).
 Grain Elevator, Halifax (Ans.) 3291 (ii).
 Grandin's Letter to Cardinal Taschereau (Ans.) 121 (i).
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2182 (i); in Com., 3230 (ii).
 Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 2379 (i).
 Half-breeds' Claims in N. W. T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3312 (ii).
 Health Dept., establishment, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1677 (i).
 Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 155 (Mr. *Daly*) on M. to suspend Rules, 4821 (ii).
 Hudspeth, Mr., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 4831 (ii).
 Hull, Religious disturbances (remarks) 394, 508.
 Imperial Federation Association and Govt. Employés (Ans.) 886 (i).
 Indemnity to Members, &c., increased (Ans.) 4907 (ii).
 Independence of Parlt. B. 12 (Mr. *Casgrain*) on M. for 1^o, 68; on M. for 2^o, 2211 (i).
 Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2^o, 2733 (ii).
 I. C. R. and C. P. R. Freight Rates (Ans.) 2024 (i).
 ——— accommodation at Bryanton (Ans.) 1187 (i).
 ——— amended Tariff, 3073 (ii).
 ——— Branch Lines, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4627 (ii).
 ——— Employés Wages, payment (Ans.) 1357.
 ——— Freight charges on Coal (Ans.) 1796 (i), 4503 (ii).
 ——— on Pig Iron (Ans.) 2828 (ii).
 ——— Passenger and Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 148 (i).
 ——— Receipts and Expenses (Ans.) 68, 1357 (i).
 ——— Steel Rails, purchase (Ans.) 2021 (i).
 ——— Tariff of Rates, change (remarks) 2379 (i).
 ——— Tenders for Supplies (Ans.) 1796 (i).
 Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 31 (i).
 Iroquois, Lockmaster, Superannuation (Ans.) 3077 (ii).
 Jamaica, Govtl. relations with (remarks) 1202 (i).
 Jesuits' Estates Act, Ret. (Ans.) 1071 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Cont'd.
 Laurie, Gen., Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4647 (ii).
 Legal Services, Amounts paid certain Firms (Ans.) 3292 (ii).
 LeSueur, P dual Income (Ans.) 400 (i).
 Library of Parliament, Joint Com. (M.) 31 (i).
 Lincoln, Member for, on Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 450 (i). See "Privilege."
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) *re* documents, 724 (i).
 ——— on presentation of additional documents, 813, 1095 (i).
 ——— Cor. (remarks) 1402 (i).
 ——— on consdn. of documents, 1475 (i).
 ——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2097 (i).
 Loans, Public, negotiations (Ans.) 4589 (ii).
 Loyalty to Her Majesty, on Address (Mr. *Mulock*) 132 (i).
 Lumber, Import Duties (Ans.) 4662 (ii).
 ——— Duties, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3991 (ii).
 Malt, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lan-derkin*) 516 (i).
 Matane Branch Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 562 (i).
 Maybee, Miss, dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2187 (i).
 Message from His Ex. (presented) 275 (i).
 Middleton, Maj.-Gen., Rep. *re* Bremner Furs (remarks) 4927 (ii).
 Military College, Students' Marks, on M. for Ret., 1025 (i).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on procedure, 1146 (i).
 Ministerial Expenses from Confed., on M. for Ret., 70 (i).
 Ministers' Salaries and Expenses, on M. for Ret., 102 (i).
Modus Vivendi (remarks) 532, 814 (i), 3076 (ii).
 Mounted Police Commissioner, Res. from Leg. Assembly, N.W.T. (Ans.) 1485 (i).
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com. *re* Management, 2685 (ii).
 ——— on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3352 (ii).
 Newfoundland, admission to Confederation (remarks) 4927 (ii).
 ——— Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 1199 (i).
 North Shore Ry. Debentures, on M. for Cor., 60 (i).
 N.W.T. Act Amt. Bill 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2^o, 4460; in Com., 4466 (ii).
 Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1^o*) 2 (i).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., construction (Ans.) 402, 505 (i).
 ——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 187 (i).
 Peake's Ry. Station, P.E.I. (Ans.) 118 (i).
 Perley, late Mr., remarks on decease, 2739 (ii).
 Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s Employés (Ans.) 3722 (ii).
 Portage la Prairie and Duck Mt. Ry. Co.'s B. 78 (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 3322 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Cont'd.

Printing of Parliament, Joint Com. (M.) 31 (i).
 — (6th Rep.) on M. to conc., 4660 (ii).
 Privilege, on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*)
re Timber Limits, 570, 576 (i).
 Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 2186 (i).
 Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills*,
Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1865 (i).
 Public Works, P.E.I. (remarks) 4830 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on M. for
 Com., 3325; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 3325; agreed to
 (Y. 85, N. 47) 3332 (ii).
 Rys. (B. 151, 1***) 4480; 2° m. and in Com., 4816.
 Rys. and Canals, depl. Rep. (presented) 1343 (i).
 Ry. Communication in Eastern N.S. (remarks)
 3324 (ii).
 Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on
 M. for 2°, 3704 (ii).
 Ry. Statistics, delay in issuing (remarks) 3663 (ii).
 — Rep. (presented) 4658 (ii).
 Ranches, N.W.T., List of applications, on M.
 for Ret., 1698 (i).
 Religious disturbances in Hull (remarks) 304, 508.
 St. Sauveur Fire, application for Aid (Ans.) 1121.
 Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co.'s B. 15 (M.)
 to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 3321 (ii).
 Scrip, Volunteers, &c., Rep. in ref. (Ans.) 1485 (i).
 Standing Committees (M.) 3 (i).
 — Com. to prepare List (M.) 29 (i).
 — Rep. of Sp. Com. (M.) to conc., 33 (i).
 Shawinigan Senatorial Division (Ans.) 27 (i).
 Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch (Ans.) 399, 565
 (i), 2674 (ii).
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to
 Com. of Sup., 1536 (i).
 Snow Ploughs, "Rotary," Rep. *re* efficiency
 (Ans.) 1797 (i).
 — on Govt. Rys., purchase (Ans.) 1656 (i).
 Speaker, Deputy, and Chairman of Coms. (M.)
 32 (i).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr.
Dewdney) on M. for 1°, 184 (i).
 — (prop. Res.) 4824 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. (prop. Res.) in Com.,
 4762, 4848, 4896; 1** of B. 157, 4898; 2**, in
 Com. and 3**, 4917 (ii).
 — on M. for Ret., 69 (i).
 SUPPLY—on M. for Com. (remarks) 4499 (ii); in
 Com.:

Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 2275 (i); (St. Peter's)
 4653 (ii); (Lachine) 2275; (Murray) 2277; (Sault
 Ste. Marie) 2273; (Tay) 2288 (i), 4653 (ii); (Trent
 River Nav.) 2280; (Welland) 2277 (i). *Income*
 (Carillon and Grenville) 4913 (ii); (Chambly) 2288;
 (Lachine) 2288 (i), 4653; (St. Peter's) 4654; Wel-
 land) 4654 (ii).
Civil Govt. (C. S. Exams.) salaries, 220; (Privy
 Council) contingencies, 243; (Railways and
 Canals) 181 (i), 3779, Accountant's salary, 4570,
 contingencies, 3993, 4570; (Queen's Printer) sal-
 aries, &c., 3993 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (additional pay, &c.)
 4152; (gratuities) 4150; (Maintenance, &c.) 3866.

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Cont'd.

SUPPLY—Continued.

Rys. (additional pay, &c.) 4793; Cape Breton,
 3809; I. C. R. (repairs, &c.) 3803; P.E.I. 3809,
 4135 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2405, 2431 (i), 4797;
 conc., 4916 (ii).
Legislation: H. of C. (French Translators) 4009;
 (Indemnity to Mr. J. S. Thompson) 4003 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Canada and United Kingdom)
 4775 (ii).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1269 (i);
 (contingencies) 4013; (R. S. King, Estate, &c.)
 4901 (ii).
Miscellaneous (classification of Old Records) 4118;
 (Seed Grain collections) 4065 (ii).
Mounted Police, 2345 (i), 4063 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.)
 1086 (i). *Income: Buildings* (Military College,
 Kingston) 4704 (ii).
Rys.—Capital: C. P. R. (construction) 4013, 4653,
 conc., 4911. Cape Breton, 1932 (i), (construction)
 4019 (ii). Eastern Extension (Mulgrave, in-
 creased accommodation) 1936 (i). I. C. R.,
 (Dartmouth Branch) 4014; (Halifax, increased
 accommodation) 1951 (ii); (Rolling Stock) 1928;
 (Moncton, increased accommodation) 1927 (i);
 (St. Charles Branch) 4013 (ii); (St. John, City
 Front) 1931 (i). Grand Narrows Bridge, 4021 (ii).
 Oxford and New Glasgow (construction, &c.)
 4017 (ii); (Rolling Stock) 1933 (i). Short Line
 Ry., 4796. *Income* (Gov. Genl.'s Car) 4021; (Sur-
 veys, &c.) 4021 (ii).
 Tariff, The, rumored changes (remarks) 1070 (i).
 Timber Limits, Applications, on M. for Ret.,
 2189 (i).
 — on M. for Com. of Sup., 4557 (ii).
 Toronto University Conflagration (remarks) 1952.
 Trent Valley Canal Bridge (remarks) 3703 (ii).
 — Commission (Ans.) 119 (i).
 Valiquette's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1269 (i).
 Valleyfield Dam, Public use (Ans.) 885 (i).
 Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on
 Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2°, 3697.
 Welland Canal Commission, Mr. Wood's Rep.
 (Ans.) 885, 1515 (i).
 Wrecking in Canadian Waters B. 2 (Mr. *Charl-*
ton) on M. for 2°, 1202 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., East Huron.

Disallowance, Man. Municipal Act (Ques.) 2377.
 Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charl-*
ton) for Sel. Com., 419 (i).
 Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*)
 to repeal, 289 (i).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2512 (i).
Superannuation, 1313 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir
Richard Cartwright) 2856 (ii).
 — in Com., 3233, 3406, 3487 (ii).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H., Saskatchewan.

Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*)
 for Sel. Com., 1370 (i).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H.—*Continued.*

- Easter Adjmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
 French Language in N. W. T., redistribution (remarks) 882 (i).
 Homesteads in N. W. T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3306 (ii).
 Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1778 (i).
 Mounted Police Management, on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3339, 3361.
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com., *re* Management, 2689 (ii).
 Prince Albert, Settlers' Claims (Ques.) 2668 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Immigration* (Agents' salaries) 2420 (i).
Indians (B.C.) 2168 ; (Man. and N.W.T.) 2170, 2174.
Penitentiaries (Man.) 3645 (ii).
Mounted Police, 2347 (i).

Mackintosh, Mr. C. H., *Ottawa City.*

- Prorogation (closing remarks) 4937 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*

- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4513 (ii).
 Disallowance of Man. Acts (Ques.) 4906 (ii).
 — Provincial Bills, on M. for Stmt., 28 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T., M. to read Pets., 504 (i).
 — Ordinances, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 83 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) (B. 10, 1^o) 38 ; (remarks) *re* 2^o, 160 ; 2^o m., 532 ; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o, 835 ; on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1016 (i).
 N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2^o, 4455 ; in Com., 4472 (ii).
 Privilege, on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert re* Timber Limits, 574 (i).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., *Victoria, N.S.*

- Cape Breton Ry., construction of Telegraph (M. for Ret.*) 3319 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Mail Subsidies* (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1970 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3261 (ii).

McDougald, Mr. J., *Pictou.*

- Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4338 (ii).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*

- St. Peter's Canal, unpaid Labor (i marks) 3665 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Railways*—*Capital*: Eastern Extension, 1936 (i) ; Oxford and New Glasgow (Rolling Stock) 1934 (i).

McIntyre, Mr. P. A., *King's, P.E.I.*

- Mackerel Fishing, Purse Seines and Gill Nets (M. for Pets., &c.) 248 (i).

- St. Peter's Bay, Survey for Wharf (Ques.) 246 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Fisheries* (salaries, &c.) 2356, 2360 (i).
Public Works—*Income* : Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1575 (i).

McKay, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*

- Glover, Christiana Filman, Relief (B. 120, 1^o) on a div., 3324 (ii).
 Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4844 (ii).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1138 (i).

McKeen, Mr. D., *Cape Breton.*

- Easter Adjmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2818 (ii).
 — in Com., 3275 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*

- Barley, Two-rowed, distribution and purchase (Ques.) 4172 (ii).
 Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lauderkin*) 201 (i).
 — removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1606 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4495 (ii).
 Fertilisers, Artificial (prop. Res.) 1811, 2024 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3915 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3^o, 3947 (ii).
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 337 (i).
 Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty (prop. Res.) 1029, 1041 ; neg. (Y. 59, N. 84) 1062 (i).
 N.W.T. Surveys, Cost per Acre (Ques.) 402 (i).
 Railway Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3330 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Dairying development) 2401 ; (Experimental Farms) 715, 2383 (i), 3780, 4795 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2409 (i).
Civil Govt. (Sec. of State) contingencies, 461 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2878 (ii).
 — in Com., 3112, 3281, 3395, 3470, 3526, 3566, 3751 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. H., *Vaudreuil.*

- Vaudreuil and Prescott Ry. Co.'s (B. 59, 1^o*) 342.

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*

- Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) M. to adjn. deb., 1853 (i).
 — on M. to print extra copies, 2912 (ii).
 Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for adjmt., 2308 (i).
 Ballot Boxes, Patent, on Rep. of Sel. Com., 4657 (ii).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3861, 3959, 4380 (ii).
 Bank of Upper Canada (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
 Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1201 (i).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1089 (i) ; on Sen. Amts., 4411 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

Cab Hire, in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
 Canadian Commissioners Abroad (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. Cook) 2^o m., 2710 (ii).
 Contractors' Cheques and Govt. Banks (Ques.) 27.
 Corn, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 1598 (i).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 3178 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 4485; on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 3^o, 4542 (ii).
 Dead Letter Office and Registered Letters (M. for Ret.) 83 (i).
 Deptl. Building (new) Ottawa, Expenditure (Ques.) 1859 (i).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Charlton) on Amt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) to M. for 2^o, 2219; (correction) 2225 (i).
 Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) to repeal, 303 (i).
 Govt'l. Expenditures in Ottawa (Ques.) 1857 (i).
 Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 1044 (i).
 Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Doyon) on M. for 2^o, 2738 (ii).
 Laurie, Gen., Mileage (remarks) 3198 (ii).
 ——— in Com., of Sup., 4003 (ii).
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4644 (ii).
 Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) Timber Linnits, 1785 (i).
 Manufacturing Machinery, arrears of Duty (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
 Members, imperfect hearing (remarks) 3878 (ii).
 Ministers, &c., Expenses since Confederation (M. for Ret.) 70 (i).
 ——— Salaries and Expenses (M. for Ret.) 101 (i).
 N. W. Council, Memorials, &c., *re* French Language (Ques.) 401 (i).
 Order (Ques. of) 4557 (ii).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., Total Expenditure (Ques.) 187 (i).
 Post Office Savings Banks Deposits (M. for Ret. *) 29 (i).
 Post Offices, erection (Ques.) 1484 (i).
 Printing Com.'s Rep. (6th) on M. to conc., 4661 (ii).
 Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1916 (i).
 Registered Letters and Dead Letter Office (M. for Ret.) 83 (i).
 Religious disturbances in Hull, on M. to adjn. Hse., 506 (i).
 Returns incomplete (enquiry) 394 (i).
 St. Romaire Post Office (Ques.) 400 (i).
 Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 15, 1^o) 84 (i).
 Savings Banks Deposits in Dom. (M. for Ret. *) 29 (i).
 Seed Barley, Date of Arrival (Ques.) 1796 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. Small) on M. for Com., 2709 (ii).
 Snow Ploughs on Govt. Rys., purchase (Ques.) 1656 (i).
 ——— "Rotary," Rep. *re* efficiency (Ques.) 1797.
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. on Res., 4850 (ii).
 ——— since Confed. (M. for Ret.) 69 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying development) 2402; (Experimental Farms) 715; (*Patent Record*) 497 (i); (Seed distribution) 4000 (ii); (Societies, N.W.T.) 2384 (i).
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 2276; (Trent River Nav.) 2283; (Welland) 2277. *Income* (Chambly) 2288 (i).
Charges of Management, 162 (i).
Civil Govt. (Agriculture) 179, contingencies, 473; (Deptl. Buildings) cleaning, 474 (i); (Queen's Printer) salaries, &c., 3992; (Finance) contingencies, 4572 (ii); (Fisheries) contingencies, 474; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 222; (High Commissioner's Office) contingencies, 213; (Indian Affairs) 176, contingencies, 387; (Interior) 172, contingencies, 381; (Justice, Penitentiaries Branch) contingencies, 355; (Marine) 179; (Printing and Stationery) 170, contingencies, 244, 353 (i); (Post Office) Finn, M., re-appointment, 4574 (ii); (Public Works) contingencies, 472 (i); (Rys. and Canals) 3780 (ii); (Sec. of State) contingencies, 461 (i).
Collections of Revenues: Excise (Distillery Officers, extra pay) 2337; (Fréchette, payment for translation) 2339; (Preventive Service) 2336; (salaries) 2315 (i), 4792 (ii). *Liquor License Act, 1883* (Costs, &c.) 4255 (ii). *Post Office*, 2288. *Weights and Measures* (McDonell's salary) 2343 (i).
Immigration, 4850 (ii); (Agents' salaries) 2403 (i).
Indians (B.C.) 4044 (ii).
Legislation : H. of C. (contingencies) 712; (Indemnity to J. S. Thompson) 4003 (ii). *Library* (contingencies, salaries) 713. *Senate* (Miscellaneous) 700 (i).
Mail Subsidies (Can. and United Kingdom) 4779 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Seed Grain collections) 4062; (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 4058; (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4069 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4055 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 496 (i); (Man.) 3999; St. Vincent de Paul) 4650 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (N.B.) 1111; (N.S.) 1106 (i); (Ont.) 4036, 4702 (ii); (Que.) 1114, (i), 4036; (N.S.) 4036 (ii). *Roads and Bridges*, 4766 (ii).
Rys.—Capital : I.C.R. (Rolling Stock) 1928; (St. John, extension) 1931. *Oxford and New Glasgow* (Rolling Stock) 1933 (i). *Short Line Ry.*, 4796 (ii).
Superannuation (LeSueur, P.) 1304; (Wallace, R.W., allowance) 1290 (i).
Territorial Accounts, 4254 (ii).

Upper Canada Bank (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
 Voters' Lists Revision, reprinting (remarks) 2380.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2745 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 3119, 3219, 3244, 3387, 3485, 3526, 3735; (Amt.) 3776; neg. (Y. 44, N. 85) 3776, 4481 (ii).

McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.

- Baltic*, Steamer, Outrage (remarks) 4027 (ii).
 ——— Rep. *re* (Ques.) 4668 (ii).
 Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com. (presented) 4732, 4754 (ii).
 Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 3810 (ii).
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3875 (ii).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3^o, 3454; (Amt.) 3460 (ii).
 Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 1843 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt., to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 688 (i).
 Printing Com.'s Rep. (9th) on M. to conc., 4929.
 Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4107.

SUPPLY :

- Fisheries* (Fish-breeding) 2374 (i).
Mail Subsidies (Can. and United Kingdom) 4778 (ii).
Quarantine (Public Health) 5002 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3484 (ii).

Madill, Mr. F., North Ontario.

- Mississauga Indians, settlement of Claims (Ques.) 1656 (i).

Mara, Mr. J. A., Yale.

- Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 128, 1^{o*}) 2594 (ii).
 ——— Rep. of Standing Com., on presentation, 2310 (i).
 Easter Adjnt., on prop. M., 2915 (ii).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1126; (Amt. to Amt.) 1138; agreed to (Y. 109, N. 77) 1144 (i).
 South Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67, 1^{o*}) 449.

SUPPLY :

- Immigration* (Agents' salaries) 2472 (i).
Geological Survey, 2132 (i).
Indians (B.C.) 2166 (i).
 West Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 68, 1^{o*}) 449.

Marshall, Mr. J. H., East Middlesex.

- Grain Tester, prop. change (Ques.) 4399 (ii).
 Meat Imports (prop. Res. withdn.) 123 (i).
 Pork, &c., increase of Customs Duty (Ques.) 55 (i).

Masson, Mr. J., North Grey.

- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3888 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1405, 1529 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 936 (i).
 Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 4820 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Fisheries* (Protection) 4780 (ii).
Legislation : Library (salaries) 714 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3426; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3022 (ii).

Mills, Mr. J. B., Annapolis.

- Annapolis Public Building, on M. for Cor., 3690.
 Privilege (Ques. of) Sale of Land to Govt., 1515.
 Queen's Wharf, Govtl. Control (Ques.) 2828 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D., Bothwell.

- Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1072 (i).
 Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. No. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 1^o, 32; on M. for 2^o, 1239; on M. to adjn. Hse., 1259; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2205 (i).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 2249 (i); in Com., 3881, 3980, 4277, 4375.
 Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, protection by U.S., (remarks) 513 (i).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 105, 347, 1405, 1528 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4404 (ii).
 Bremner Furs, payment (remarks) 4931 (ii). See "Middleton, Maj.-Gen."
 Bresaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1388 (i).
 Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4425; in Com., 4433 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2^o, 2715 (ii).
 Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 456 (i).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3380; on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3^o, 3452 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Joncas*) in Com., 1221 (i).
 Easter Adjnt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
 Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 412 (i).
 Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2^o, 3193 (ii).
 Fish Commissioners' Reps. (remarks) 395 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3907; M. for 3^o, 3948; (Amt.) 3949; neg. (Y. 49, N. 83) 3954; on Sen. Amts., 4666.
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1176 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 618 (i).
 Geological Survey Dept. B. 116 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4081 (ii).
 Half-breeds' Claims, N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3313 (ii).
 Independence of Parlt. B. 12 (Mr. *Casgrain*) on M. for 2^o, 2211 (i).
 Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2^o, 2730 (ii).
 ——— B. 132 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2^o, 3619; in Com., 3625 (ii).
 Interest Act Amt. B. 140 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4414 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Jesuits' Estates Act, Papers (remarks) 189 (i).
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4236 (ii).
 Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 4835; in Com., 4838 (ii).
 Laurie, Gen., Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4648 (ii).
 Lincoln, Member for, on presentation of additional documents, 813 (i). See "Privilege."
 — on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1749; (personal explanation) 1777.
 Middleton, Maj.-Gen., Rep. *re* Bremner Furs (remarks) 4927 (ii).
 Mining Machinery, on procedure, 1145 (i).
 Ministerial Expenses from Confed., on M. for Ret., 74 (i).
 Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 228, 360 (i).
 N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 4462; in Com., 4466 (ii).
 Privilege, on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*) *re* Timber Limits, 571 (i).
 Public Expenditure (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1860 (i).
 Queen's Counsel, Appointments, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2119 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2°, 3187; in Com., 4362 (ii).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4686.
 — (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4848 (ii).
 Sultana Island, sale, on M. for Ret., 140 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Experimental Farms) 3792.
Civil Govt. (Customs) additional clerk, 4574 (ii); (High Commissioner's Office) contingencies, 215; (Indian Affairs) 174; (Interior) 171; (Postmaster General) 177; (Printing and Stationery) contingencies, 360; (Privy Council) contingencies, 228 (i), conc., 4272 (ii); (Sec. of State) contingencies, 468 (i).
Geological Survey, 2143 (i).
Immigration, 4798 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 2165; (Ont. and Que.) 2151; (Man. and N.W.T.) 2175 (i), 4045 (ii); (P.E.I.) 2164 (i).
Justice, Administration of, 478 (i); (Judge's salary, P.E.I.) 3998 (ii); (Librarian, Supreme Court) 480.
Legislation : H. of C. (Dep. Speaker's salary) conc., 4273; (Indemnity, J. S. Thompson) 4003 (ii); (salaries) 708 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, W. Indies and S. America) 2014 (i).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1270 (i).
Miscellaneous (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4071 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (N.S.) 1110; (N.W.T.) 1440 (i).
Railways—Capital : C.P.R. (construction) 4013 (ii).
 Temp. Colonisation Co., on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 4909 (ii).
 Vivian, H. H., & Co.'s B. 124 (Mr. *Dawson*) in Com., 3231 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3097, 3131, 3255, 3475, 3529, 3732 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P., Northumberland, N.B.

- Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1229, 1238, 1850; procedure, 2195; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2205 (i); on M. to print extra copies, 2913 (ii).
 Annapolis, Sale of Land to Govt. (remarks) 1515 (i).
 Atlantic Mail Service, Contracts (remarks) 3521
 — on M. for Com. of Sup., 4695 (ii).
 Ballot Boxes, Patent, on M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2230 (i).
 — on Rep. of Sel. Com., 4656 (ii).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3834; in Com., 3957, 4309, 4378, 4509 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, Telegram from Washington (remarks) 1068, 1509 (i).
 — negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1201 (i), 4906 (ii). See "Fisheries."
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 105 (i); on Sen. Amts. 4265 (ii).
 Bremner Furs, Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4757 (ii).
 — payment (remarks) 4932 (ii).
 Bresaylor Half-Breeds' Claims, on order for rsmng. adjd. deb. on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1509; (remarks) 1518 (i).
 Budget, &c., Delay, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).
 Business of the Hse., on prop. Res. to take in Wednesdays, 2229 (i).
 — (remarks) 3874, 4504 (ii).
 Columbia and Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B., Rep. of Standing Com., on presentation, 2310 (i).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3163; in Com., 3163, 3371; on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) to M. for 3°, 3443; (Amt.) 3447; neg. (Y. 74, N. 88) 3458 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4485 (ii).
 Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2267 (i).
 Debates, Official, accommodation for Staff, 3724; 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4588 (ii).
 Derby Branch Ry., extension (M. for Papers, &c.) 514 (i).
 Divorce Bills, introduction (remarks) 3324 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Joncas*) in Com., 1221 (i).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3317 (ii).
 Easter Adjmt. (remarks) 2744, 2915 (ii).
 Engineers (Steamboat) Licenses (remarks) 4924.
 Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1792 (i).
 Extradition Treaty with U.S. (remarks) 3810 (ii).
 Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3193; in Com., 3195 (ii).
 — Artificial, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2026 (i).
 Fisheries and *Modus Vivendi* (remarks) 2916 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

- Fisheries, negotiations at Washington (remarks) 4930 (ii).
 ——— Newspaper par. (remarks) 752 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3902; on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3^o, 3939, 3942; on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3952 (ii).
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 325 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 887 (i).
 Gas Inspection B. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2^o, 4268; in Com., 4271 (ii).
 Govt. Business, to take in Thursdays, 794, 1067 (i).
 ——— on M. for adjmt. (remarks) 1511 (i).
 Govt. Ry. Subsidies (Ques.) 4172 (ii).
 Grand Trunk Ry. B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2183 (i); in Com., 3229, 3622 (ii).
 Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4034 (ii).
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1^o, 3151; in Com., 3627 (ii).
 Interpretation Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1^o, 2826 (ii).
 I. C. R., accommodation at Bryanton (Ques.) 187.
 ——— Branch Lines, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
 Kent (N.B.) representation (remarks) 3440 (ii).
 Lincoln, Member for, on M. to reprint documents, &c., re investigation, 2185 (i). See "Privilege."
 ——— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2056 (1).
 Loyalty to Her Majesty, on prop. Address (Mr. *Mulock*) 133 (i).
 Maybee, Miss, on M. for Cor., 2188 (i).
 Micmac Indians, Pet. re spearing Salmon (remarks) 4926 (ii).
 Militia Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1^o, 4170 (ii).
 Militia Camp Ground at Moncton, 4926 (ii).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on procedure, 1146 (i).
Modus Vivendi with U.S. (remarks) 532, 814 (i), 2916, 3076 (ii). See "U.S. Fishing Vessels," "Fisheries."
 Official Documents prevention of Disclosure B. 122 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) on M. for 2^o, 3203; in Com., 3599 (ii).
 Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2628 (ii).
 Privilege, on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*) re Timber Limit, 575 (i).
 ——— Ques. of (Mr. *Cockburn*) Loyalty to Her Majesty (remarks) 185 (i).
 Provincial Govts. transfer of Property authorisation B. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1^o, 1513 (i).
 Purse Seines and Gill Nets, on M. for Ret., 252.
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3329 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

- Religious disturbances in Hull (M. to adjn. Hse.) 509 (i).
 Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4104.
 Sick Mariners' Fund, on M. for Cor., 527 (i).
 Smelt Fishing in the Miramichi (Ques.) 2229 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2^o, 3189; in Com., 4368 (ii).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 1^o, 184 (i).
 ——— to Rys., in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4690 (ii).
 ——— (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4882 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Canals—Income*, 2288 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (N.S.) 1422. Excise (salaries, &c.) 2314 (i). Rys. (P.E.I.) 4123 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2512 (i).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 4049 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, 478. (Supreme Court Reps.) 481 (i). Judge's salary, P.E.I., 3998 (ii).
Militia (Estate R. S. King) 4158; (Military College) conc., 4273; (Monuments) 4651 (ii).
Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 4058 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4057 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 3999 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings, 1443 (i); (N.B.) 4700 (ii); (N.W.T.) 1440; (Que.) 1116. Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1581 (i). Roads and Bridges, 4768 (ii).
Quarantine, 4001 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R., conc., 4912 (ii).
 Territories Real Property Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2^o, 3200 (ii).
 Trade Relations with U. S. (remarks) 2312 (i).
 U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* B. 134 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1^o, 3153; on M. for 2^o, 3594; in Com., 3598, 3877 (ii).
 Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o, 3696.
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2917 (ii).
 ——— in Com., 3082, 3236, 3390, 3464, 3529, 3560, 3727, 4480 (ii).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., Lambton.

- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4390 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 349, 1418, 1526 (i).
 Glover, C. F., Relief (B. 120) 2^o agreed to (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694 (ii).
 Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2701 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 4712 (ii).

Montague, Mr. W. H., Haldimand.

- Dunnville Dam, Damages at Loomis Creek (Ques.) 2021 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3918 (ii).

Montague, Mr. W. H.—Continued.

Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2^o, 2728 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Indians (Annuities under Robinson Treaty) 2154 ; (B.C.) 2169 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3488 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W., North York.

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1071 (i).

Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) procedure, 2202 (i).

Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for adjnmt., 2309 (i).

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3855, 3978, 4082, 4377, 4417, 4507 (ii).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 116, 352, 1078, 1414, 1528.

Caraquet Ry. Co.'s Earnings (Ques.) 3811 (ii).

Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3177 (ii).

Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to M. for 2^o, 1219 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4497 (ii).

Dead Meat Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2268 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o, 2223 (i).

Easter Adjnmt., on prop. M., 2915 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3913 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3^o, 3945 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3954 ; on Sen. Amts., 4666 (ii).

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 576 (i).

Forrest, Lieut.-Col., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4567 (ii).

Geological Survey, Instructions to Officers (M. for copies *) 1713 (ii).

Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1039 (i).

Hurrell and Valiquette Pensions (remarks) 2258.

Hurrell's Militia Pension (Ques.) 2378 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1274 (i).

I. C. R., Branch Lines, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4595 (ii).

Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4249 (ii).

Loyalty to Her Majesty, prop. Address, 96, 123 ; agreed to (Y. 161, N. 0) 186 (i).

Militia Act Amt. (B. 145, 1^o) 4168 (ii).

Mining Machinery, Free Importation (Amt.) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1133 (i).

— on procedure, 1147 (i).

Mounted Police, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com. *re* Management, 2692 (ii).

— on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3861 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4479 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) unparliamentary Language 2464 (i).

Priv. and Elec., Rep. of Com. *re* ex-Member for Lincoln, on M. to conc., 4730 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Shanly*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3325 (ii).

Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 4816.

Seed Barley, distribution (remarks) 1510 (i).

Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1563.

Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2709 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4370 (ii).

SUPPLY, on M. for Com. (remarks) 4499 (ii) ; in Com. :

Arts, Agriculture &c. (Dairying development) 2401 (i).

Civil Govt. (High Commissioner) contingencies, 216 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Canals (gratuities) 4151 ; (maintenance, &c.) 3867 (ii).

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2404 (i), 4908 (ii).

Justice (Judge, Vice-Admiralty Court, P.E.I.) 4578,

Legislation: H. of C. (French Translators, 4008 ; (Miscellaneous) express service, 4011 (ii).

Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1274 (i) ; (contingencies) 4012 ; (Estate R. S. King, 4162 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Legislation, N.W.T.) 2306 (i) ; (Seed Grain collections) 4060 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1450 (i) ; (Ont.) 4036 (ii) ; (Repairs, &c.) 1461 (i). Harbors and Rivers (Miscellaneous) 4167 (ii).

Railways—Capital: Oxford and New Glasgow (construction, &c.) 4017. *Income* (Gov. Gen.'s Car) 4022 ; (Surveys, &c.) 4021 (ii).

Territorial Accounts, 4254 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 129 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3160 (ii).

Territories Real Property Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2^o, 3203 (ii).

Toronto University, Conflagration (remarks) 1952,

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3082, 3125, 3235, 3245, 3435, 3542, 3737 (ii).

Neveu, Mr. H., Joliette.

Prieur, Arthur, amount paid as Translator of H. of C. (Ques. and M. for Ret.) 2185 (ii).

— employment by Govt. (Ques.) 2922 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Muskoka.

Bressaylor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1397 (i).

Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 455 (i).

Disallowance of Man. Acts (Ques.) 4906 (ii).

Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2673 (ii).

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 545 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E.—Continued.

- Grand Trunk Ry. B. 125 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. to suspend Rules, 2178 (i).
 Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1273 (i).
 Jesuits' Estates Act, Repts. and Opinions of Law Officers of Crown (M. for copies) 95 (i).
 Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2072 (i).
 N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4467 (ii).
 Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 4821 (ii).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4672.
 SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 3797.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2300 (i), conc., 4272 (ii).
Fisheries (protection) 4779 (ii).
Indians (Annuities under Robinson Treaty) 2155 (i); (B.C.) 4044 (ii); (Surveys) 2157 (i); (Man. and N.W.T.) 4046 (ii).
Militia (Armories, care of, &c.) 1322; (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1273 (i).
Miscellaneous (Customs, repairs, &c.) 4118; (L'Abbé Tanguay's Dictionary) 3659 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1618 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2853 (ii).
 — in Com., 3266, 3483 (ii).

Paterson, Mr. W., Brant.

- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4283 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 107, 1087, 1416, 1525 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4405 (ii).
 Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s (B. 58, 1st) 342 (i).
 Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 458 (i).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3168 (ii).
 Customs Duties, *per capita* (Ques.) 188 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3906; on M. for 3^d, 3938; on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) 3943 (ii).
 — and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1494 (i).
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal) 270 (i).
 French Language in N. W. T. (abolition) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^d B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1012 (i).
 Geological Survey B. 116 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4032 (ii).
 Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2^d, 2734 (i).
 — B. 153 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4905; on M. for 2^d, 3617; in Com., 3625, 4034 (ii).
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3628 (ii).

Paterson, Mr. W.—Continued.

- Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2079 (i).
 Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 230 (i).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Mulock*) unparliamentary Language, 2465 (i).
 Patent Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1076 (i).
 Reapers and Mowers, Self-binders, exported (M. for Ret.*) 1065 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 720 (i).
Civil Govt. (Post Office) contingencies, 472; (Privy Council) contingencies, 230; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 462 (i).
Charges of Management, 166 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 2344.
 Excise (Methylated Spirits) 2341; (Preventive Service) 2335; (salaries, &c.) 2320 (i).
 Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4121; 4257 (ii).
 Weights and Measures (rent, &c.) 2344 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2424, 2504 (i), 4801 (ii).
Indians (Annuities under Robinson Treaty) 2156 (i); (B.C.) 4789; (Man. and N.W.T.) 4788; (Ont.) Oneida, 4784 (ii); (Ont. and Que.) 2151; (Survey of Reserves) 2157 (i).
Legislation: Library (salaries) 714 (i).
 Mounted Police, 2345 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Brantford Drill Shed) 4706 (ii); (Conservatories) 1473; (Ont.) 1437.
 Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 404 (i).
 Roads and Bridges, 4772 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2596 (ii).
 — in Com., 3085, 3139, 3218, 3469, 3494 (ii).

Patterson, Mr. J. C., Essex.

- Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 26, 1st) 104 (i).
 Engineers' (Steamboat) Licenses (B. 139, 1st) 3512.
 Loyalty to Her Majesty, on prop. Address (Mr. *Mulock*) 135 (i).
 McLaggan, Customs Officer (Ques.) 4500 (ii).
 Patent Act Amt. (B. 144, 1st) 3811 (ii).
 Privilege (Ques. of Gas Well in Essex Co., 2252).

Perry, Mr. S. F., Prince, P.E.I.

- Alberton Lighthouse, Expenditure for Breast-working (Ques.) 1657 (i).
 Bedique, Wharfage Dues collected (Ques.) 561 (i).
 Cape Traverse Wharf, Expenditure (Ques.) 2378.
 Casumpec Harbor, Expenditure for repairs (Ques.) 1655 (i).
 — Improvements (M. for Ret.) 1711 (ii).
 Dredging by Str. *Prince Edward* (M. for Stmtnt.) 159 (i).
 Duvar, Lieut.-Col, Superannuation (Ques.) 1485.
 Fisheries Inspector for P.E.I. (Ques.) 55 (i).
 Lobster Factories in P.E.I. (remarks) *re* Ret. 650.
 Miminigash Breakwater, repairs (Ques.) 122 (i), 3077 (ii).
 Miminigash (Little) Harbor Survey (Ques.) 2022.
 Palmer Road Chapel P.O. (Ques.) 92 (i).
 — (M. for Pets., &c.) 517 (i).

Perry, Mr. S. F.—*Continued.*

P. E. I. Govt. and Dom. Capital Acc. (Ques.) 27 (i).
Prince Edward, Str., Dredging (M. for Stmnt.) 159 (i).

Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1879 (i).

Summerside Harbor Breakwater (Ques.) 121, 247.

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues : Customs (N.S.) 1429. Post Office, 2303 (i).

Public Works—Income : Dredging (N.S.) 1643; Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1569 (i).

Superannuation, 1306 (i).

Tignish Breakwater Repairs, Expenditure (M. for Stmnt.) 96 (i).

Tignish, Wharfage Dues collected (Ques.) 561 (i).

Wharves, Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I., Expenditure (M. for Stmnt.)* 1149 (ii).

Platt, Mr. J. M., *Prince Edward.*

"A" Battery, Officers' quarters (Ques.) 1358 (i).

Dom. Voters' Lists, Revision (Ques.) 1357 (i).

Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson*, *Elgin*) to repeal, 309 (i).

Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) 1042 (i).

Health Dept., establishment, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1670 (i).

Military College, Board of Visitors (Ques.) 245 (i).

— Students' Marks (M. for Ret.) 1025, 1064.

— prop. Changes (Ques.) 3662 (ii).

Mining Machinery, Free Importation (prop. Res.) 1125 (i).

— on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) 1142 (i).

Picton Harbor, Dredging, &c. (M. for Cor., *Pets.*, &c.) 2192 (ii).

— Rep. of Engineer (Ques.) 2186 (i).

Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1897 (i).

Quinté, Steamer, Rep., Evidence, &c., *re* loss (M. for copies) 149 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Health Statistics) 502 (i).

Collection of Revenues : Post Office, 2301 (i).

Public Works—Income : Harbors and Rivers, 1631.

Quarantine (Public Health) 4002 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3030 (ii).

— in Com., 3083, 3240, 3439, 3585 (ii).

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 4 (i).

Cattle Quarantine Stations on Frontier (Ques.) 92.

Corn, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1593 (i).

Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4588 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3147, 3570 (ii).

Porter, Mr. R., *West Huron.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to M. for 2^o, 2222 (i).

Goderich and Can. Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 20, 1^o*) 104 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2958 (ii).

Préfontaine, Mr. R., *Chambly.*

Chambly and Longueuil Canal (Ques.) 401 (i).

— Vessels, Tonnage, &c., passed through (M. for Stmnt.)* 1401 (ii).

Chambly Manufacturing Co.'s (B. 91, 1^o*) 794 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Commission, abolition (Ques.) 401 (i).

St. Louis Lake, erection of Piers (Ques.) 401 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 9 (i).

Esquimalt Dry Dock, enlargement (Ques.) 1120.
 — Fortifications and Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 1485 (i).

Keefer, Hugh Forbes, Relief B. 119 (Mr. *Weldon*, *Albert*) 2^o m., 3694; agreed to (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694 (ii).

Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1135 (i).

Purcell, Mr. P., *Glenarry.*

Ry. Employés protection (B. 52, 1^o*) 245 (i); 2^o m., 3704 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3582 (ii).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbinière.*

Great Eastern Ry., &c. (M. for *Pets.*, &c.) 142 (i).

Legal Services, Payments (Ques.) 245 (i).

Lotbinière County Mail Service (Ques.) 85 (i).

— (M. for *Pets.*, Cor., &c.)* 1680 (i).

Megantic County Mail Service, *Pets.* and Cor. *re* Change (M. for copies) 1147 (i).

Ste. Croix Floating Light (Ques.) 2021 (i).

— (M. for *Pets.*, Cor., &c.)* 2207 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2807 (i).

Yamachiche, Floating Light opposite (M. for *Pets.* and Cor.) 1702 (i).

Robertson, Mr. J. E., *King's, P.E.I.*

Peake's Ry. Station, P.E.I. (Ques.) 118 (i).

Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com., of Sup., 1876 (i).

Purse Seines and Gill Nets, on M. for Ret., 253.

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues : Customs (N.S.) 1426 (i).

Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 2353 (i).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (P.E.I. and Mainland) 1961 (i).

Public Works—Income : Dredging (N.S.) 1647. Harbors and Rivers, 1630 (i).

Roome, Mr. W. F., West Middlesex.

Health Dept., establishment (prop. Res.) 1660 ;
(wthdn.) 1680 (i)

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Health Statistics) 502 (i).

Ross, Mr. A. W., Lisgar.

Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4677 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3059 (ii).

Rowand, Mr. J., West Bruce.

Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1036 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 3798.

Robillard, Mr. H., Ottawa City.

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 595 (i).

Rykert, Mr. J. C., Lincoln.

Lincoln, Member for, on Ques. of Priv. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 450 (i).

— (personal explanation *re* Timber Limits) 563 (i).

— on presentation of further Cor., 1653 (i).

— further documents (presented) 1657 (i).

— on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1733 (i).

Resignation Tendered, 4355 (ii).

St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 69, 1^o*) 449 (i).

Stationery and contingencies of Senate, prop. Mess., 883 (i).

Ste. Marie, Mr. L., Napierville.

McKinack River Works (Ques.) 4172 (ii).

Scarth, Mr. W. B., Winnipeg.

Brandon and South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 71, 1^o*) 449 (i).

Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1906 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 718 (i).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories)

1471. Harbors and Rivers (Man. repairs, &c.) 1627 (i).

Scriver, Mr. J., Huntingdon.

Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2^o, 1247 (i).

Cruelty B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to M. for 2^o, 1218 (i).

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1011 (i).

Grain and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1061 (i).

Lundy's Lane, protection of Cemetery, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1811 (i).

Scriver, Mr. J.—Continued.

New York Mercury, circulation in Dom. (Ques.) 4500 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1430 (i).

Miscellaneous (Taschereau's Criminal Law) 4070 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1616 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3570, 4481 (ii).

Semple, Mr. A., Centre Wellington.

Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1191 (i).

Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1040 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3001 (ii).

Shanly, Mr. W., South Grenville.

Railway Act Amt. (B. 104, 1^o*) 1343 ; M. for Com., 3325 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (protection) 4783 (ii).

Skinner, Mr. C. N., St. John, N.B., City and Co.

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 350 (i).

Commercial Treaties with Foreign Countries, on M. for Ret., 3683 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Justice, Administration of (Vice-Admiralty Court) 486 (i).

Small, Mr., J., East Toronto.

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35, 1^o*) 159 (i).

Don Improvement, Toronto (B. 81, 1^o*) 638 (i).

Great North-Western and Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 106, 1^o) 1506 (i).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 79, 1^o*) 638 (i).

Home Benefit Life Association incorp. (B. 63, 1^o*) 342 (i).

Inland Revenue Act Amt., *re* Tobacco Sales (Ques.) 85 (i).

Inverness Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 100, 1^o*) 1066 ; 2^o m., 1355 (i).

Louisburg and Richmond Ry. Co.'s (B. 101, 1^o*) 1066 (i).

Owen Sound and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 99, 1^o*) 1066 (i).

Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 34, 1^o*) 159 (i).

Smith, Geo. T., Relief (B. 98, 1^o*) 1066 ; 2^o m., 1506 ; M. for Com., 1965, 2699 ; 3^o m., 3319 (ii).

Toronto Board of Trade (B. 109, 1^o*) 1420 (i).

Toronto Savings Bank Charitable Trust (B. 118, 1^o*) 1581 (i).

Smith, Mr. W., South Ontario.

Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1500 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2876 (ii).

Smith, Sir D. A., K.C.M.G., West Montreal.

- Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. Taylor) on Amt. (Mr. Casey) 2207 (i).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Foster) on prop. Res., 2248; on M. for 2^d, 3828; in Com., 3855, 3892, 4291, 4380 (i).
 Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. Brown) on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 6 m.h., 1856 (i).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. to prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 1141 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J., North Brunt.

- Colonisation Companies and Dept. of Interior (M. for Cor., &c.*) 66 (i).
 Debates, Official, on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 1264 (i).
 ——— 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Curran) to ref. back, 4583 (ii).
 Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1794 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 3924 (ii).
 Greer, James, appointment as Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 3662, 3811 (ii).
 Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1277 (i).
 Hydraulic Rents, Names of Parties in Arrears (M. for Ret.*) 1065 (i).
 Laurie, Gen., Mileage, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4003 (ii).
 Mounted Police Management, on Amt. (Mr. Watson) to prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 3342 (ii).
 Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 235, 360, 369 (i).
 Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s Employés (Ques.) 3722 (ii).
 Saskatchewan Colonisation Co. and Dept. of Interior (M. for Cor.*) 66 (i).
 Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. Small) on M. for Com., 1969 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Health Statistics) 501; (*Patent Record*) 496 (i), 4000 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) salaries, 221; (Deptl. Buildings) cleaning, 475; (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 223; (High Commissioner's Office) contingencies, 215; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 389; (Interior) contingencies, 382; (Justice, Penitentiaries Branch) contingencies, 354; (Militia) contingencies, 375 (i); (Post Office) Bank Deposits, 3994 (ii); (Printing Bureau) cleaning, 476; (Printing and Stationery) 169, contingencies, 360; (Privy Council) contingencies, 235; (Public Works) contingencies, 471 (i); (Queen's Printer) salaries, &c., 3993 (ii); (Secretary of State) contingencies, 465 (i), Civil Service List, 3992 (ii); (Railways and Canals) 180 (i), contingencies, 3993 (i).
Charges of Management, 165 (i).
Dominion Police, 493 (i).
Geological Survey, 2142 (i).
Indians (P.E.I.) 2164; (Surveys) 2159 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2410 (i).
Justice, Administration of, 479; (Supreme Court Reps.) 482 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Legislation*: H. of C. (French Translators) 4011; (Newspapers) 4011; (Indemnity, J. S. Thompson) 4004 (ii).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1277 (i).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3635 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1467; (N.S.) 1447; (Ottawa, heating, &c.) 1464; (Removal of Snow) 1464; (Repairs, &c.) 1455; (Telephone, Ottawa) 1465 (ii).
Quarantine (Public Health) 4001 (ii).
Railways—Income (Gov. Gen.'s Car) 4021 (ii).
 Temp. Colonisation Co. and Dept. of Interior (M. for Cor., &c.*) 66 (i).
 Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 375, 382 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3404, 3464, 3488 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. JOSEPH ALDRIC OUMET) Laval.

- Adjmt. of Hse. (remarks) 3516 (ii).
 Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. Taylor) Member called to Order, 1246 (i).
 ——— procedure, 2194 (i).
 Annapolis, Sale of Land to Govt., Members' remarks checked, 1516 (i).
Baltic, Steamer, alleged Outrage, Member ruled out of Order, 4028 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir John Thompson) in Com., 1519 (i).
 Bills, Royal Assent, 2385 (i), 3873, 4938 (ii).
 Cereals, prevention of Fraud in Sales, on M. to introd. B., 184 (i).
 Compton, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Controverted Elections (Haldimand) Judgment of Supreme Court, 83 (i).
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir John Thompson) on drafting Amts., 3455 (ii).
 Cruelty to Animals B. 5 (Mr. Brown) procedure, 1507 (i).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Charlton) ruling *re* Vote, 2227 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Chapleau) on M. for 3^d, Member called to order, 3942 (ii).
 Haldimand, Representation, Issue of Writ, 83 (i).
 ——— Return of Member Elect, 1402 (i).
 Internal Economy (H. of C.) Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 32 (i).
 Kent (N.B.) Representation, Issue of Writ, 3722.
 Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Costigan) Member ruled out of Order, 2258 (i).
 Interruptions from the Galleries, Orders to stop issued, 1279 (i).
 Lincoln, Representation, Issue of Writ, 4396 (ii).
 Lobster Factories, Members called to Order, 651.
 Member called on to withdraw unparliamentary Language, 1117 (i).
 Members' remarks checked, 1516, 2433 (i), 3514, 4113 (ii).
 Mess. from His Ex. (read) 32, 149, 275, 393 (i); 2531, 3955, 4479 (ii).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, procedure (ruling) 1144, 1146 (i).

Speaker Mr.—Continued.

- Members, New, notification of Ret., 1, 1402, 4449.
 New Westminster, Representation, Issue of Writ, 3439 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Hesson*) unparliamentary Language (ruling) 1452, 2476 (i), 4346 (ii).
 — on interrupting Members, 4557 (ii).
 Ottawa, Return of Member Elect, 4449 (ii).
 Parliament (4th Session) opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 4937 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Cockburn*) Loyalty to Her Majesty, ruled out of Order, 185 (i).
 — (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) Gas Well (ruling) 2258 (i).
 — (procedure) on personal explanation (Mr. *Rykert*) 571 (i).
 Prorogation, communication from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 4935 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Improvements, irregularity of Deb., 4825 (ii).
 Religious disturbances in Hull, Member called to Order, 506, 509 (i).
 Richelieu, Ret. of Member Elect., 1 (i).
 Royal Assent, Letters from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 2376 (i), 3810 (ii).
 Speech from the Throne (rep.) 2 (i).
 Stanstead, Ret. of Member Elect., 1 (i).
 Senate, Stationery and Contingencies, Mess. (read) 1341 (i).
 St. John and S. America Mail Service, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1986 (i).
- SUPPLY :**
Legislation: H. of C. (contingencies) 712 (i); (French Translators) extra pay, 4008; (Newspapers) 4011 (ii); (salaries) 709 (i); (Miscellaneous) Express service, 4011 (ii).
Tassé, E., and Duvernay, L. D., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 4026 (ii).
 Vacancies, notification, 1 (i).
 Victoria, B.C., Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Mr. Taylor) relevancy, 3778 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., East Grey.

- Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1074 (i).
 Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. to print extra copies, 2913 (ii).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4290, 4417 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 348, 1092, 1080, 1416, 1530 (i).
 C.P.R. (Aylmer Branch) Co.'s (B. 141, 1^o) 3591.
 Corn, rebate of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 199 (i).
 — removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1603 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. 4491 (ii).
 Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 409 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Continued.

- Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3^o, 3944 (ii).
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 312 (i).
 — and Provincial Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1490 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 758 (i).
 Gauthier, W., Fishing Licenses (Ques.) 3076 (ii).
 Health Dept., Establishment, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Rome*) 1674 (i).
 Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 46, 1^{**}) 212 (i).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Mulock*) unparliamentary Language, 2465 (i).
 Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2^o, 3709 (ii).
 Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1966 (i), 2706 (ii).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4685.
- SUPPLY :**
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying development) 2400 (i); (Experimental Farms) 3791 (ii); (Health Statistics) 500 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2407 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1111 (i).
Quarantine (Public Health) 4002 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3044 (ii).
 — in Com., 3235, 3535, 3553, 3749, 4481 (ii).

Stevenson, Mr. J., West Peterborough.

- Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4102 (ii).

Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford.

- Helmets for Active Militia (Ques.) 886 (i).
 Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1904 (i).
 Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1966 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Militia (Monuments)* 4651 (ii).
 Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 84, 1^{**}) 722 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds.

- Alien Contract Labor prohibition (B. 8, 1^o) 32; 2^o m., 1221; adjd. deb. rsmnd. on 2^o, 1850, 2194; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 2204.
 — printing extra copies (M.) 2911 (ii).
 — Rep. of Sel. Com., 3367 (ii).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4380 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref. back, 4581 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 88 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Sir *John Macdonald*) to M. for 2^o, 2225 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G.—Continued.

Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1794 (i).
 Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) 1047 (i).
 Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 61, 1st) 342 (i).
 Ministerial Expenses from Confed. (Amt.) on M. for Ret., 70 (i).
 Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 2469 (i).
 Printing Com.'s Rep., 6th (M. to conc.) 4658 (ii).
 St. Lawrence International Railway and Bridge Co.'s (B. 70, 1st) 449 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2446 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1439 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3407, 3486, 3755; (Amt.) 3777 (ii).
 York County Bank B. 39 (Mr. *Tisdale*) 2^o m., 352.

Temple, Mr. T., York, N.B.

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4892, 4896 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2443 (i).
Fisheries (Protection) 4783 (ii).

Thérien, Mr. O., Montcalm.

Hillaker, Mr., Claim (Ques.) 402 (i).
 Moreau, Elie, Fees *re* Queen *vs.* Boucher (Ques.) 1657 (i).
 ——— payment of Account (Ques.) 1797 (i).
 Survey in Montcalm County (Ques.) 186 (i).
 Tobacco, Pets. from Manufacturers (Ques.) 275.
 ——— Law respecting Native Grown (Ques.) 2229.

Thompson, Sir J. S. D., K.C.M.G., Antigonish.

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1073; on further consid., 2099 (i).
 Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2^o, 1233; procedure, 2202 (i).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2^o, 3822; in Com., 3857, 3882, 3957, 4077, 4278, 4375, 4415, 4512; on M. for 3^o, 4593 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, Telegraphic intelligence from Washington, 1509 (i).
 Bills of Exchange, &c. (B. 6, 1st) 26; 2^o m., 104; in Com., 106; M. for Com., 343; in Com., 345, 1077, 1089, 1403, 1519 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4261 (ii).
 Bressalor Half-breeds' Claims, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1379 (i).
 ——— on Order for rsmng. adjd. deb. on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1508 (i).
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 4505 (ii).
 Calvin, services *re* prosecution (Ans.) 4399 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Dickey*) on M. for 2^o, 3719 (ii).
 Chinese Immigrants, par. in *Empire* (remarks) 3624 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 30 (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for 2^o, 2711 (ii).

Thompson, Sir J. S. D.—Continued.

Criminal Law Amt. Seduction, &c. (B. 65, 1st) 342 (i); 2^o m., 3161; in Com., 3165, 3368; 3^o m., 3441 (ii).
 Copyright Act Amt., Proclamation (Ans.) 85 (i).
 ——— B. 19 (Mr. *Carling*) on Sen. Amts., 2098 (i).
 Deceased Wife's Sister Marriage (B. 126, 1st) 2739; 2^o m. and in Com., 4035 (ii).
 Disallowance, Man. Municipal Act (Ans.) 2377 (i).
 ——— Provincial Bills, on M. for Stmt., 28 (i).
 Dom. Police, Rep. of Commr. (presented) 33 (i).
 Essex County Jr. Judgeship (Ans.) 563 (i).
 Extradition Treaty with U.S. (remarks) 3810 (ii).
 Fertilisers, Agricultural, B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2^o, 3194 (ii).
 Fishermen's Safety B. 96 (Mr. *Jones*, *Halifax*) on Order from Com., 2710 (ii).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3913; on M. for 3^o, 3937; on Sen. Amts., 4667 (ii).
 Franchise Act and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1493 (i).
 French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) Amt. to Amt. to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 877; agreed to (Y. 149, N. 50) 1018 (i).
 Indian Advancement Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*) on M. for 2^o, 2737 (ii).
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3622 (ii).
 Interest Act Amt. (B. 140, 1st) 3624; 2^o m., 4266; in Com., 4414, 4924 (ii).
 Interpretation Act Amt. B. (130, 1^o) 2825; 2^o m., 3155; in Com., 3157, 3600 (ii).
 Jesuits' Estates Act, papers (remarks) 189 (i).
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4192 (ii).
 Judge's Residence, Saguenay District (Ans.) 3292.
 Laurie, Gen., Mileage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4645 (ii).
 Lebourdais Bros., case of (Ans.) 187 (i).
 Legal Services, payments (Ans.) 246 (i).
 ——— Sums paid to Firms in Peterborough (Ans.) 1200, 1356, 1484 (i).
 Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits 1745; (Amt.) to adjn. deb., 1749; agreed to (Y. 94, N. 72) 1790; on Res., 2093 (i).
Modus Vivendi. See "U. S."
 Montmagny and Beauce, Judge's Residence (Ans.) 2021 (ii).
 Moreau, Elie, Fees *re* Queen *vs.* Boucher (Ans.) 1657 (i).
 Newfoundland Harbor Fees, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4894 (ii).
 Official Documents prevention of Disclosure B. 122 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) on M. for 2^o, 3207 (ii).
 Order (Ques. of) deb. not before Hse., 1452 (i).
 Patent Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1076 (i).
 Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property authorisation (B. 112, 1^o) 1512 (i).

Thompson, Sir J. S. D.—Continued.

- Provincial Legislation (Ans.) 248 (i).
 Public Lands Grants (B. 138, 1*^{*}) 3624 (i); M. for Com., 4034; in Com., 4035 (ii).
 Public Stores Act Amt. (B. 53, 1^o) 245; 2^o m., 1077 (i).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 111, 1*^{*}) 1506; 2^o m., 1532; 3^o m., 1582 (i).
 Queen's Counsel, Appointments, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2112 (i).
 ——— position of (Ans.) 1486 (i).
 Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 4817 (ii).
 Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2^o, 3714 (ii).
 St. Hyacinthe, purchase of Land (Ans.) 4399 (ii).
 Steamers in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4103.
 Seamen's Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Colby*) on Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*) to M. for 3^o, 4401; in Com., 4360 (ii).
 Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1541.
 Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1965; in Com., 2702 (i), 3227 (ii).
 Smith, late Mr. Justice, on M. for Ret., 1685 (i).
 Stoney Mountain Penitentiary, Convicts punishment (Ans.) 2836 (ii).
 ——— Punishment by Flogging (Ans.) 1120 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4878 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Civil Govt.* (Justice, Penitentiaries Branch) contingencies, 355 (i); (Post Office) Finn, M., re-appointment, 4574 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Ordnance Lands, 4122. Post Office, 4795; (defalcations, Kingston) 4164 (ii).
Dominion Police, 493 (i).
Indians (Surveys) 2162 (i).
Justice, Administration of, 476; (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 483 (i); Vice-Admiralty Court, P.E.L.) 3994, 4576; (Man. Penitentiary) transfer of convicts, 3990 (ii).
Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co., Costs) 4058 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 3646; (Dorchester) 3637; (Kingston) 496 (i), 3634; (Man.) 3638, 4650; conc., 4910; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3635, 4649; (Regina Jail) 3647 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 4038; (N.S.) 4699 (ii).
Railways—Capital: Cape Breton Ry. (construction) 4019. C.P.R. (Onderdonk Arbitration) 4653. I. C. R. (Moncton, increased accommodation) 4016. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction, &c.) 4018 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 129, 1^o) 2595; in Com., 3160 (ii).
 Supreme Court (N.S.) filling Vacancy (Ans.) 885.
 Territories Real Property Act Amt. (B. 151, 1^o) 2014; 2^o m., 3198 (ii).
 Threats, Intimidation, &c., Legislation (Ans.) 1857 (i).
 Trade Combinations Act Amt. B. 77 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 3704 (ii).

Thompson, Sir J. S. D.—Continued.

- U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* (B. 134, 1^o) 3153; 2^o m., 3593; in Com., 3595, 3876 (ii).
 Vivian, H. H., & Co.'s B. 124 (Mr. *Dawson*) in Com., 3232 (ii).
 Vollet, Robert, expenses of Trial (Ans.) 27 (i).
 Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on M. for 2^o (Amt.) 6 m. h., 3695; agreed to (Y. 70, N. 35) 3702 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3096, 3244, 3553 (ii).

Tisdale, Mr. D., South Norfolk.

- Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2^o, 1260 (i).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3864, 3882, 3957, 4078, 4373, 4419, 4513 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1087, 1409; on Sen. Amts. 4410 (i).
 Calgary Water Power Co.'s (B. 75, 1*^{*}) 449 (i).
 Criminal Law Act Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3184, 3383; on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) to M. for 3^o, 3445; (Amt.) 3454; neg. (Y. 71, N. 98) 3457 (ii).
 Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com. (M. that Com. rise) 1823; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 1854; on M. for 2^o, 1209; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 1216; neg. (Y. 82, N. 91) 1219 (i).
 Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 442 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3922 (ii).
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 321 (i).
 Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s (B. 80, 1*^{*}) 638 (i).
 Haldimand Election (Ques. of Priv.) par. in *Globe*, 1344 (i).
 Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1767 (i).
 Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o, 3696 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3275, 3463, 3557, 3737 (ii).
 York County Bank (2^o m.) 352 (i).

Trow, Mr. J., South Perth.

- Alaskan and Canadian Boundary (Ques.) 188 (i).
 Annunciation Day (M.) for Adjnmt., 2308; a greed to (Y. 59, N. 24) 2309 (i).
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4524 (ii).
 Bremner Furs, payment (Ques.) 4931 (ii). See "Middleton, Maj.-Gen."
 Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4429 (ii).
 Caraqueet Ry. Co.'s Earnings (Ques.) 3811 (ii).
 Collingwood Harbor, Expenditure (Ques.) 1655.
 Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to M. for 2^o, 1216 (i).
 Easter Adjnmt., on prop. M., 2914 (ii).

Trow, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Franchise Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Brien*) 2^o m., 1581 (i).
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson*, *Elgin*) to repeal, 1149 (i).
 Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) 1048 (i).
 Homesteads in N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3308 (ii).
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3632 (ii).
 Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4226 (ii).
 LeSueur, P., Dual Salaries (Ques.) 400 (i).
 Middleton, Maj.-Gen., Rep. *re* Bremner Furs (remarks) 4928 (ii).
 Military College, Kingston, Board of Visitors (Ques.) 245 (i).
 Militia Clothing Supplies, Tenders (Ques.) 3811.
 Montreal P. O. Drop Boxes (Ques.) 3512 (ii).
 Newfoundland, admission into Confederation (remarks) 4927 (ii).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., Total Expenditure (Ques.) 187 (i).
 Prorogation (closing remarks) 4935 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 4500 (ii).
 Ranches in N.W.T., Applications, &c. (M. for Ret.) 1698 (ii).
 Roberts, E. K., American Tug (Ques.) 3291 (ii).
 Salt Manufacturers, prosecution (Ques.) 1654 (i).
 Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2^o, 1506; on M. for Com., 1966 (i), 2701; on M. for 3^o, 3320 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Seed distribution) 4000 (ii).
Geological Survey, 2138 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2524 (i), 4806 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 1630 (i).

Tupper, Mr. C. H., Pictou.

- Baltic*, Outrage on Steamer (Ans.) 187 (i).
 Bedique, Wharfage Dues collected (Ans.) 561 (i).
 Fish-breeding Establishments (Ans.) 85 (i).
 Fish Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 213 (i).
 Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 85, 1^o) 722 (i).
 — Inspector for P.E.I. (Ans.) 55 (i).
 Govt. Steamers, carriage of private merchandise (Ans.) 504 (i).
 Hillaker, Mr., Claim (Ans.) 402 (i).
 Lobster Factories in P.E.I. (remarks) 651 (i).
 — Fishing Regulations (Ans.) 885 (i).
 Mahone Bay (N.S.) Lighthouse (Ans.) 886 (i).
 Marine and Immigrant Hospital (Quebec) Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 75 (i).
 Merchants' Shipping Acts, Imp. Legislation (remarks) 2382 (i).
 Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 393 (i).
Modus Vivendi. See "U.S."
 Montreal Harbor Police, Gratuity to Sergeants, &c. (Ans.) 92 (i).

Tupper, Mr. C. H.—Continued.

- Navigable Waters protection Act Amt. (B. 47, 1^o) 212 (i).
 Newspapers Subscriptions and Advertisements (Stmnt.) 228, 357, 373 (i).
 Purse Seines and Gill Nets, on M. for Ret., 251.
Quinte, loss of Steamer, on M. for Ret., 149 (i).
 St. Roch's Traverse Lighthouse (Ans.) 2826 (ii).
 Sick Mariners' Fund, on M. for Cor., 522 (i).
 SUPPLY :
Civil Govt. (Agriculture) contingencies, 474; (Marine) 179; (Printing and Stationery) contingencies, 357; (Privy Council) contingencies, 227.
 Tidal Observations, on M. for Ret., 529 (i).
 Tignish Wharf, Dues collected (Ans.) 561 (i).
 Trawl Fishing in St. Mary's Bay (Ans.) 2378 (i).
 U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* (B. 133, 1^o) 3153 (ii).

Turcot, Mr. G., Megantic.

- Bélanger, P. R. A., payments as Surveyor (Ques.) 4500 (ii).
 Great Cascapedia River Bridge (Ques.) 2669 (ii).
 Interior Dept., Extra Clerks (Ques.) 2826 (ii).
 Petit Cascapedia Savings Bank (Ques.) 2669 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2903 (ii).

Trywhitt, Mr. R., South Simcoe.

SUPPLY :

- Territorial Accounts*, 4254 (ii).
Militia (Rifle Associations) 1334 (i).

Vanasse, Mr. F., Yamaska.

- Canadian Historical MS. (Ques.) 1020 (i).

Waldie, Mr. J., Halton.

- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2^o, 3842; in Com., 3855, 3879, 4308 (ii).
 Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 1087 (i).
 English Periodicals, cost of Mailing (remarks) 1919 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3915 (ii).
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson*, *Elgin*) to repeal, 335 (i).
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3630 (ii).
 Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (Ques.) 2258 (i).
 Mining Machinery, Free Importation, on Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Platt*) 1144 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4367 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Collection of Revenues* : Excise (Fréchette, Trans-lation) 2341 (i).
Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2410, 2438 (i).
Miscellaneous (Customs) 4120 (ii).
 Voters' Lists and Franchise Act (Ques.) 3154 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3069, 3128, 3430, 3470, 3523 (ii).

Wallace, Mr. N. C., West York, Ont.

- Abell, Mr. John, alleged Insolvency (remarks) 3512 (ii).
 Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2672 (ii).
 French Language in N. W. T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^d B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1001 (i).
 Manitoba and North-Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 50, 1st) 244 (i).
 Orange incorp. (B. 32, 1st) 145; 2^d m., 395; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 69) 398; 3^d m., 1293, 1298; agreed on (Y. 86, N. 61) 1354 (i).
 Religious disturbances in Hull, on M. to adjn. Hse., 512 (i).
 Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 2699; on M. for 3^d, 3320 (ii).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4365 (ii).
 Temp. Colonisation Co., Cor., Memorials, &c., (M. for Ret.) 2032 (i).
 — on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 4909.
 Trade Combinations prevention Act Amt. (B. 77, 1st) 504 (i); 2^d m., 3703; 3^d m., 3810 (ii).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3221, 3395, 3490, 3550 (ii).

Ward, Mr. H. A., East Durham.

- Timber Limits, Applications, on M. for Ret., 2192 (i).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3008 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R., Marquette.

- Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4305 (ii).
 Bressaylor Half-breeds' Claims on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1373 (i).
 Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4430; in Com., 4438 (ii).
 Cruelty to Animals prevention B. 5 (Mr. *Brown*) on Order for Hse. in Com., 1507 (i).
 Disallowance, Man. Municipal Act (Ques.) 2377.
 Exodus of Canadians to U.S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 431 (i).
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 3^d, 3938 (ii).
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 339 (i).
 Franking Privilege, abuse (remarks) 1582 (i).
 French Language in N. W. T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^d B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1002 (i).
 Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1060 (i).
 Homesteads in N. W. T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3305 (ii).
 Hurrell's Pension, in Com. of Sup., 1286 (i).
 Mounted Police, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) for Sel. Com. re Management (Amt.) 2690; neg. (Y. 52, N. 76) 3867 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R.—Continued.

- N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4476 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Mulock*) unparliamentary Language, 2464 (i).
 Pig Iron Bounty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4342 (ii).
 Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1905 (i).
 Rys. B. 151 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 4820 (ii).
 Ry. Laborers protection B. 52 (Mr. *Purcell*) on M. for 2^d, 3717 (ii).
 Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co.'s B. 15, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 3322 (ii).
 School Lands in Man., Sale (Ques.) 145 (i).
 Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for Com., 1965 (i), 2699; on M. for 3^d, 3320 (ii).
 Subsidies (Land) to Rys., in Com. on Res., 4676.
 — B. 160 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on prop. Res., 4918; in Com., 4920; on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 4832; neg. (Y. 48, N. 83) 4834 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Experimental Farms) 719 (i).
Civil Govt. (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 389 (i); (Interior) *Whitcher, A. H.*, salary, 4572 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Liquor License Act, 1683 (Costs, &c.) 4255 (ii). Post Office, 2304 (i); (C.P.R. service) 4153 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys, &c.) 4155.
Income, 3660 (ii).
Immigration (Expenses) 3647, 4809 (ii); (Agents' salaries) 2408 (i).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 2171 (i).
Legislation (N. W. T.) 2307 (i).
Militia (Compensation in lieu of Land) 1286; (Military properties, care of) 1336; (Rifle Associations) 1332 (i).
Miscellaneous (Gophers, destruction) 4790 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 3638 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Deptl., Ottawa) 4697 (ii); (Gas, &c.) 1465; (N. S.) 1454 (i); (N. W. T.) 4720 (ii); (Repairs, &c.) 1463. Dredging (Man.) 1648. Harbors and Rivers (Man., repairs, &c.) 1627. Roads and Bridges, 1650. Miscellaneous (Surveys and Inspections) 1651 (i).
Quarantine Cattle (3657); (Public Health) 3656 (ii).
 Territories Real Property Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2^d, 3203 (ii).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3432, 3493, 3542, 3744 (ii).
 — on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2951 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., Albert.

- Albert Ry. Grant, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4561.
 Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3887 (ii).
 Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2671 (ii).
 French Language in N. W. T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2^d B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 780 (i).
 Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4222 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C.—Continued.

Keefer, Hugh Forbes, Relief (B. 119, 1^o*) on a div., 3324 (ii).

Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1788 (i).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 157 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 4891 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt. (Justice) Judge's salary, P.E.I., 3997.

Collection of Revenues: Rys. (P.E.I.) 4124 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax and W. Indies and S. America) 1999 (i).

Weldon, Mr. C. W., St. John, N.B., City and County.

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1072 (i).

Albert Ry. Grant on M. for Com. of Sup., 4562.

Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2^o, 1253 (i).

Annapolis P.O. and Custom House Building, purchase of Site (M. for Cor.) 3686 (ii).

—— Tenders for Erection (M. for Ret.) 254 (i).

—— Sale of Land to Govt. (remarks) 1517 (i).

Annunciation Day, on M. (Mr. *Trow*) for adjnmt., 2308 (i).

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3853, 3879, 3957, 4077, 4416, 4513 (ii).

Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 105, 343; in Com., 1080, 1404, 1519 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4406 (ii).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3874, 4505 (ii).

C.P.R., telegraphic Rep. in *Mail re* stoppage of Traffic through Maine, 1791 (i).

Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3183 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4486 (ii).

Digby Wharf, Dues collected (M. for Ret. *) 530 (i).

Easter Adjnmt. (remarks) 2672; on prop. M., 2915.

Flour, Can., Imported into Mar. Provs. via U.S., &c. (Ques.) 2670 (ii).

—— (M. for Stmt.) 2671 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) to M. for 3^o, 3942 (ii).

Grain Elevator, Halifax (Ques.) 3291 (ii).

—— Tariff of Rates, change (remarks) 2380 (i).

I.C.R., Casualties, &c., and Compensation allowed (M. for Ret. *) 1065 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 140 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4414 (ii).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2^o, 3155; in Com., 3157.

Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4248 (ii).

Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 2075 (i).

Logs, Export Duty, Amount (Ques.) 884 (i).

Merchants' Shipping Acts, Imp. Legislation (remarks) 2381 (i).

Modus Vivendi. See "U.S."

New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B. 49, 1^o*) 244 (i).

D

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.

Newspapers Subscriptions, &c., in Com. of Sup., 239, 356, 369 (i).

Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 48, 1^o*) 244.

Patent Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Carlting*) in Com., 1076 (i).

People's Bank of N.B. (B. 33, 1^o*) 159 (i).

Provincial Govts., Transfer of Property authorisation B. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1^o, 1514 (i).

Ste. Croix Ry. Bridge Co., suspension of Rules re Pet. (M.) 212 (i).

St. Louis (N.B.) completion of Wharf (Ques.) 505.

St. Stephen's Bank (B. 24, 1^o*) 104 (i).

Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4103.

Shore Line Ry. Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 55, 1^o*) 274 (i).

Short Line Ry., Harvey Branch, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt to Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).

Sick Mariners' Fund, on M. for Cor., 523 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 2^o, 3189 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2394.

Civil Govt. (Printing and Stationery) contingencies, 356; (Privy Council) contingencies, 239 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (N.S.) 1422 (i).

Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4121 (ii).

Post Office, 2293 (i). Rys.: I.C.R. (repairs, &c.) 3807; P.E.I. Ry., 4129 (ii).

Fisheries (Protection Service) 2375; (salaries, &c.) 2352 (i).

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2319 (i).

Justice, Administration of (Judge, Vice-Admiralty Court, P.E.I.) 3994, 4575 (ii); (Vice-Admiralty Court) Que., 482; (Librarian, Supreme Court) 479.

Legislation: H. of C. (gratuity, late Dr. Wilson) 4011 (ii). Library (salaries) 713 (i).

Mail Subsidies (Campbellton and Gaspé) 1961; (Liverpool or London and St. John, and Halifax) 1959 (i).

Marine Hospitals, 2019 (i).

Militia (contingencies) 4012 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Que. River Police) 2018.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 1443; (Major's Hill Park) 1466; (N.S.) 1443. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1610, 1621. Roads and Bridges, 1649. Telegraph Lines, 1649 (i).

Rye.—Capital: I.C.R. (Dartmouth) 4014 (ii); (St. John, City front) 1981; Moncton, increased accommodation) 1927 (i). Grand Narrows Bridge, 4021. Oxford and New Glasgow (construction, &c.) 4017 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection, 2020 (i).

Superannuation, 1307 (i).

Tidal Observations, on M. for Ret., 529 (i).

Trade Combinations Act Amt. B. 77 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 3704 (ii).

U. S. Fishing Vessels and *Modus Vivendi* B. 134 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3878 (ii).

Vice-Admiralty Courts (Que., N.S. and N.B.) Cases entered (M. for Ret. *) 1065 (ii).

Walker, Emily, Relief B. 142 (Mr. *Brown*) on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o, 3700.

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—*Continued.*

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2978 (ii).
— in Com., 3082, 3739 (ii).

Welsh, Mr. W., *Queen's, P.E.I.*

Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 338 (i).
New London Harbor Survey, Engineer's Rep. (M. for copy*) 29 (i).
Pinette Harbor Survey, Engineer's Rep. (M. for copy*) 29 (i).
Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1895 (i).
Public Works, P.E.I. (remarks) 4830 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2418 (i).
Mail Subsidies (Halifax and Newfoundland) 1970 ; (Halifax and W. Indies and S. America) 1980 ; (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 1958 ; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 1962 ; (St. John and Annapolis) 1972 ; (St. John and Basin of Minas) 1963 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Conservatories) 1467 (i) ; (Deptl. Buildings) 4698 ; (N.B.) 4701 ; (P.E.I.) 4700 (ii). Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1611 ; (Mar. Provs.) 1615 (i) ; (N.S.) 4721 (ii) ; (P.E.I.) 1570 (i), 4721 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3527, 3564, 3746 (ii).

Wood Island Harbor Survey, Engineer's Rep. (M. for copy*) 29 (i).

White, Mr. R. S., *Cardwell.*

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 13, 1^o) 84.
Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2^o, 3816 ; in Com., 4395, 4524 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. (Mr. *Darvin*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 549 (i).
Labor, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 3661 (ii).
North-Western Coal and Navigation Co.'s (B. 25, 1^o*) 104 (i).
Three per Cent. Loan of 1888 (Ques.) 27 (i).

White, Mr. P., *North Benfrew.*

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3853, 3962, 4514 (ii).
Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. 6 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 196, 1091, 1410, 1527 (i) ; on Sen. Amts., 4407 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3^o, 3454 (i).
Exodus of Canadians to U. S., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 428 (i).
Experimental Farm Rep., on recommendation to print, 1793 (i).
Franchise Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to repeal, 1174 (i).
French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to M. for 2^o B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 902 (i).

White, Mr. P.—*Continued.*

Grains and Seeds, removal of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1059 (i).
Interprovincial Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 54, 1^o*) 273 (i).
Jesuits' Estates Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4241 (ii).
Lincoln, Member for, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Timber Limits, 1759, 2064 (i).
Lumber, Import Duties (Ques.) 4662 (ii).
N.W.T., Advisory Council, Resignation (M. for O. C.'s, &c.*) 104 (i).
Pembroke Post Office Robbery (M. for Cor., &c.) 158 (i).
Sawdust in Rivers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4112 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census and Statistics) 2392 (i) ; (*Patent Record*) conc., 4272 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 4036 (ii).
Timber Limits, Applications, on M. for Ret., 2191 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2616 (ii).
— in Com., 3099, 3224, 3738, (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. H., *East Elgin.*

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1072 (i).
Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2^o, 1852 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. B. 65 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3378 (ii).
Crofter Immigrants, Pelican Lake (Ques.) 1795.
Franchise Act, Repeal (prop. Res.) 257 ; (M.) 1193 ; neg. (Y. 78, N. 99) 1198 (i).
— and Provincial Voters' Lists, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1491 (i).
— Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Brien*) on M. for 2^o, 3721 (ii).
— B. 136 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 3913 (ii).
Kettle Creek, St. Thomas (M. for Cor., &c.) 153.
Labor Statistics provision B. 148 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4840 (ii).
London and Port Stanley Ry. (M. for Stmt.) 156 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) re Gas Well, 2256 (i).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Colby*) on M. for 3^o (Amt.) 4400 (ii).
Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. 98 (Mr. *Small*) on M. for 2^o, 1506 ; on M. for Com., 1967, 2707 (i) ; in Com., 3227 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. *Colby*) in Com., 4367 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Criminal Statistics) 496 (i) ; (Experimental Farms) 720 ; (Health Statistics) 498 (i).
Canals—Capital (Trent River Nav.) 2284 (i). *Income* (Welland) 4654 (ii).
Charges of Management, 167 (i).

Wilson, Mr. J. H.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

Civil Govt. (Deptl. Buildings) cleaning, 474; (Indian Affairs) 174; (Militia) contingencies, 376; (Public Works) contingencies, 471; (Rys. and Canals) 181 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 2344 (i). Canals (additional pay, &c.) 4152; (maintenance, &c.) 3869 (ii). Customs, 1432 (i); (contingencies) 4119 (ii). Excise (Fréchette, payment for Translation) 2341 (i). Liquor License Act, 1883 (Costs, &c.) 4121, 4257. Miscellaneous (Patrick Cullen, extra services) 4120 (ii); (salaries) 2330 (i). Post Office, 2292 (ii). Weights and Measures (salaries) 4792 (ii).

Dominion Lands—Income, 3660 (ii).

Dominion Police, 493 (i).

Geological Survey, 2143 (i).

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2412 (i); (expenses) 3648 (ii).

Indians (B.C.) 2167 (i), 4789 (ii); (Man. and N.W.T.) 2171 (i), 4788; (Ont. and Que., Oneida) 4785 (iii).

Justice, Administration of, 476; (Vice-Admiralty Court, Que.) 489 (i).

Legislation: H. of C. (contingencies) 713. Senate (Miscellaneous) 700 (i).

Miscellaneous (Banff Hot Springs) 3658; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 3658 (ii).

Mounted Police, 2347 (i).

Penitentiaries (B.C.) 3646; (Man.) 3639 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings, 1443; (Man.) 1439; N.W.T.) 1440; (Ont.) 1437 (i); (Printing Bureau, Plant) conc. 4274 (ii); (Que) 1113. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1627 (i), 4726 (ii); (Ont.) 1617 (i), conc., 4274 (ii). Roads and Bridges, 1649 (i), 4770 (ii).

Quarantine (Public Health) 3656 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. H.—Continued.

Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 376 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3122, 3209, 3234, 3467, 3489 (ii).

Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B. 156 (Mr. *Hesson*) on M. for 1°, 4847 (ii).

Wood, Mr. J. F., Brockville.

Alien Contract Labor prohibition B. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 1255 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., Westmoreland.

Banking Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3820; in Com., 4078 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Toronto Globe*, 4320.

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues: Rys. (P. E. I.) 4141 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 3395 (ii).

Wright, Mr. A., Ottawa County.

French Language in N.W.T. (abolition) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to M. for 2° B. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 761 (i).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: H. of C. (salaries) 707 (i).

Yeo, Mr. J., Prince, P. E. I.

Carlton Point North, Survey (Ques.) 1484 (i).

Public Expenditure, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).

INDEX.—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

- "A" BATTERY, KINGSTON, OFFICERS' QUARTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1358 (i).
- ABELL, MR. JOHN, ALLEGED INSOLVENCY : Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for Com. of Ways and Means 3512 (ii).
- A. D. C., APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2669 (ii).
- ADAMS, JOHN, purchase of Timber Limits. See "Lincoln, Member for."
- ACETIC AND PYROLIGNEOUS ACID, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3098 (ii).
- ACID, PHOSPHATE : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3099 (ii).
- ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH : moved (Mr. *Pope*) 4 ; seconded (Mr. *Prior*) 9 (i).
— His Ex.'s Reply, 275 (i).
— TO HER MAJESTY. See "LOYALTY."
- ADJOURNMENTS, ANNUNCIATION DAY : M. (Mr. *Trow*) 2308 ; agreed to (Y. 59, N. 24) 2309 (i).
— ASH WEDNESDAY : M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 734 (i).
— ASCENSION DAY : M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4928 (ii).
— GOOD FRIDAY : M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2914.
- Administration of Oaths of Office B.**
No. 1 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1^o*, 2 (pro forma).
- Adulteration Act (Chap. 107, Rev. Statutes)**
Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1^o, 37 ; 2^o and in Com., 1071 (i) ; reconsd. in Com. and 3^o*, 2099 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- ADVERTISING PAMPHLETS, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3243 (ii).
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD : in Com. of Sup., 2344 (i).
- ADVISORY COUNCIL, N.W.T., RESIGNATION : M. for O. C.'s (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 104 (i).
- AGRICULTURE AND COLONISATION COM. : List of Members, 37 (i).
- Agricultural Fertilisers B. No. 95** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1^o*, 963 (i) ; 2^o, 3190 ; in Com. and 3^o*, 3195 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
— See "FERTILISERS."
- AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY. See "Self-Binders," &c.
- AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION :**
AGRICULTURAL BULLETINS IN GERMAN : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1796 (i).
— SOCIETIES (N.W.T.) : in Com. of Sup., 2384 (i).
— DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 179 ; contingencies, 473.
- AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION—Con.**
ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 498, 715, 2384 (i), 3779, 4000, 4650, 4795 (ii).
BARLEY FOR SEED, EXPECTED ARRIVAL : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1795 (i).
— DISTRIBUTION : Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 1510 (i).
— PURCHASE OF CROPS : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 4172 (ii).
CANADIAN HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS : Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1020 (i).
CATTLE DISEASE IN WESTERN STATES : Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 85 (i).
— QUARANTINE STATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 92 (i).
CENSUS, NEXT ENUMERATION : Ques. (Sir *Richard Carterright*) 402 (i), 2827 (ii).
— RETURN re PAGANS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 513 (i).
CHINESE ADMISSION INTO CANADA, PAR. IN "EMPIRE : " read (Mr. *Edgar*) 3624 (ii).
— IMMIGRATION, RESTRICTION : Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 68 (i).
CROFTER IMMIGRANTS, PAR. IN "NORTH BRITISH DAILY MAIL : " Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 1795 (i).
DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Carling*) 2260 (i).
EXHIBITION AT JAMAICA : Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1201 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FARM REP., PRINTING EXTRA COPIES : remarks (Mr. *Bergin*) 1792 (i).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE REGULATIONS : M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 145 (i).
HEALTH, ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPT. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1660 (i).
IMMIGRATION : in Com. of Sup., 2403 ; Suppl., 4001, 4797 ; conc., 4915 (ii).
IMMIGRANT RATES TO WINNIPEG : Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 186 (i).
SASKATCHEWAN PROV. DIST., POPULATION BY ORIGIN : M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
[See "SUPPLY."]
- ALASKAN AND CANADIAN BOUNDARY LINE : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 188 (i).
- Alberta Colonisation Ry. Co.'s B. No. 83** (Mr. *Davis*). 1^o*, 722, 2^o*, 1019 (i).
- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 13** (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1^o*, 84 ; 2^o*, 91 ; in Com. and 3^o*, 352 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- ALBERT AND CAPE TORMENTINE RY., PAR. IN "GLOBE : " Personal explanation (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 4230 (ii).
- ALBERT RAILWAY GRANT : Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4559 (ii).

- ALBERTON LIGHTHOUSE QUES. (Mr. Perry) 1657 (i).
ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS AND TARIFF: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3633.
- Alien Contract Labor Prohibition B. No. 8** (Mr. Taylor). 1^o, 32; 2^o m., 1221; deb. adjd., 1259; rsmd., 1850, 2194; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2204; Rep. presented, 3367 (i).
Deb. on 2^o (Mr. Taylor) 1221; (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1228; (Mr. Mitchell) 1229; (Mr. Laurier) 1231; (Mr. Hesson) 1231; (Mr. Lister) 1233; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1239; (Mr. Denison) 1241; (Mr. Casey) 1242; (Mr. Scrivner) 1247; (Mr. Lépine) 1247; (Mr. Gillmor) 1250; (Mr. Ferguson, Welland) 1252; (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 1253; (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 1255; (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 1258 (i).
— M. (Mr. Taylor) to print extra copies, 2911 (ii).
— Rep. of Sel. Com.: presented (Mr. Taylor) 3367.
- AMERICAN FREIGHT IN BOND: M. for O.C.'s, &c. (Mr. Laurier) 99 (i).
- AMMUNITION, CLOTHING AND MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 1316 (i).
- ANDERSON CONTRACT. See "ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE."
- Animals, Cruelty to.** See "CRUELTY."
- ANIMALS, LIVING: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3099, 3104, 3208, 4480 (ii).
- ANNAPOLIS LAND PURCHASE, PAR. IN MONTREAL "HERALD:" Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Mills, Annapolis) 1515 (i).
— P. O. SITE: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 2229 (i).
— P. O. AND CUSTOMS BUILDING, PURCHASE OF SITE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 3686 (ii).
— TENDERS FOR ERECTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 254 (i).
- APPLES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3402 (ii).
- ARTESIAN BORINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).
- ARTILLERY AND RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1331 (i).
- ARMORIES (PUBLIC) AND CARE OF ARMS: in Com. of Sup., 1320 (i).
- ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE AND MESSRS. ANDERSON: M. for Cor. (Mr. Laurier) 100, 1021 (i).
— CONTRACT: Remarks (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 3440.
— Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4694 (ii).
- ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS. See "AGRICULTURAL" and "FERTILIZERS."
- AUDITOR GEN. REP.: presented (Mr. Foster) 90 (i).
- AXLE GREASE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3233 (ii).
- BANDS OF EFFICIENT CORPS: in Com. of Sup., 1331.
- BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 2671 (ii).
— SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 2378 (i).
- BALLOT BOXES, PATENT: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Chapleau) 2230 (i).
— M. (Mr. Chapleau) re Rep. of Sel. Com., 4655.
- "BAL TIC," STEAMER, AND ALLEGED OUTRAGE: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 186, 1858 (i); remarks, 3079 (ii).
— Ques. (Mr. McNeill) 4027, 4663 (ii).
- BANFF HOT SPRINGS, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).
- BANK CHARTERS, B.N.A. AND B.C.: M. for copies (Mr. Edgar) 255 (i).
- Bankers Safe Deposits, &c.** See "DOMINION SAFE DEPOSITS."
- Banking Act Amt. B. No. 127** (Mr. Foster). Res. prop., 2234; in Com. on Res., 1^o of B., 2249 (i); 2^o m., 3811; 2^o and in Com., 3853, 3879, 3955, 4074, 4277, 4415, 4507; 3^o, 4590; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4928 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 31.)
Deb. on 2^o (Mr. Foster) 3811; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3813; (Mr. White, Cardwell) 3816; (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland) 3820; (Sir John Thompson) 3822; (Mr. Casey) 3823; (Sir Donald Smith) 3828; (Mr. Kenny) 3829; (Mr. Mitchell) 3834; (Mr. Hesson) 3836; (Mr. Waklic) 3842; (Mr. Cockburn) 3845; (Mr. Denison) 3852 (ii).
- BANKING AND COMMERCE COM.: List of Members, 36.
— M. (Sir Hector Langevin) to add names, 91 (i).
- BANK NOTES, BONDS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3243 (ii).
- BANK OF UPPER CANADA: M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 100 (i).
- BANKS, CHARTERED, IN LIQUIDATION, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Hesson) 76 (i).
— See "FINANCE."
- BARLEY (TWO-ROWED) PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 3999 (ii).
— PURCHASE OF CROPS: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 4172 (ii).
- BAY OF QUINTE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4763; in Com., 4875 (ii).
- BEANS, TONQUIN, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3584 (ii).
- BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 187 (i).
— M. for Reprs., &c. (Mr. Bain, Soulanges) 517 (i).
- BEAUHARNOIS JUNCTION RY. CO., SUBSIDIES VOTED: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Bergeron) 3693 (ii).
- BEDIQUE WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 561 (i).
- BEEF, FRESH, IMPORTATIONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland) 88 (i).
- BEHRING'S SEA. See "FISHERIES."
- BÉLANGER, P.R.A., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 1797, 2034 (i).
— Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 4500 (ii).
- Belding, Paul & Co.'s incorp. B. No. 23** (Mr. Curran). 1^o*, 104; 2^o*, 186; in Com. and 3^o*, 1019 (i). (53 Vic., c. 103.)
- BELL CREEK HARBOR AND BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 2377, 2669 (ii).
- Belleville and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 22** (Mr. Corby). 1^o*, 104; 2^o*, 186; in Com. and 3^o*, 724 (i). (53 Vic., c. 65.)
- BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4763; in Com., 4875 (ii).
- BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Dickenson) 188 (i).

- BERTHIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c.**
(*Mr. Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
- Bills of Exchange, Cheques, &c., B. No. 6**
(*Sir John Thompson*). 1°, 26; 2° and in Com., 105, 343, 1077, 1403, 1519; 3°, 1582; consdn. of Sen. Amts., 4261; further consdn., 4404; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 4411; agreed to and Amt. as amended agreed to (Y. 58, N. 43) 4413 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- BILLS WITHDRN.**, 4667, 4924 (ii).
- BILLS ASSENTED TO**, 2385 (i), 3873, 4938 (ii).
- BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT**, communications from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s read (*Mr. Speaker*) 2376 (i); 3810 (ii).
- BILL (No. 1)** Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*.)
1°, 2; *pro forma*.
- BILL (No. 2)** To permit reciprocity in wrecking and in towing Vessels and Rafts.—(*Mr. Charlton*.)
1°, 26; 2° called, 146 (i); Order for 2° dschgd., 3704 (ii).
- BILL (No. 3)** To admit Vessels registered in the United States to wrecking, towing and coasting privileges in Canadian Waters.—(*Mr. Ferguson, Welland*.)
1°, 26 (i).
- BILL (No. 4)** To permit foreign vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters.—(*Mr. Kirkpatrick*.)
1°, 26 (i).
- BILL (No. 5)** To make further provision as to the prevention of cruelty to animals, and to amend Chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(*Mr. Brown*.)
1°, 26; 2° m., 1203; Amt. (*Mr. Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 1216; neg. (Y. 82, N. 91) 1219; 2°, 1220; Order for Com. read, 1506; in Com., 1823 (i); M. to further consdr. B. in Com. and Amt. (*Mr. Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 1854; M. and Amt. withdn., 1856 (i).
- BILL (No. 6)** Relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques and Promissory Notes.—(*Sir John Thompson*.)
1°, 26; 2° and in Com., 105, 343, 1077, 1403, 1519; 3°, 1582 (i); consdn. of Sen. Amts., 4261; further consdn., 4404; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 4411; agreed to, and Amt. as amended agreed to (Y. 58, N. 43) 4413 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 7)** Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(*Mr. Joncas*.)
1°, 26; 2°, 1220; in Com. and 3°, 1221 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 8)** To prohibit the importation and migration of Foreigners and Aliens under contract or agreement, to perform labor in Canada.—(*Mr. Taylor*.)
1°, 32; 2° m., 1221; deb. adjd., 1259; rsmtd., 1850, 2194; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2204 (i); Rep. presented, 3367 (ii).
- BILL (No. 9)** Further to amend the Adulteration Act, Chapter 107 of the Revised Statutes.—(*Mr. Costigan*.)
1°, 37; 2° and in Com., 1071 (i); reconsd. in Com. and 3°, 2099 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 10)** To further amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter 50, respecting The North-West Territories.—(*Mr. McCarthy*.)
1°, 38; 2° m. and Amt. (*Mr. Davin*) 532; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Beausoleil*) 554; neg. (Y. 63, N. 117) 838; Amt. to Amt. (*Sir John Thompson*) 877; agreed to (Y. 149, N. 50) 1017 (i).
- BILL (No. 11)** Further to amend the Act, Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(*Mr. Choquette*.)
1°, 67 (i).
- BILL (No. 12)** For further securing the Independence of Parliament.—(*Mr. Casgrain*.)
1°, 67; 2°, 2208 (i).
- BILL (No. 13)** To amend the Act to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(*Mr. White, Cardwell*.)
1°, 84; 2°, 91; in Com. and 3°, 352 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 14)** Respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(*Mr. Dawson*.)
1°, 84; 2°, 91; in Com. and 3°, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 15)** To incorporate the Saskatchewan Colonisation Railway Company.—(*Mr. McMullen*.)
1°, 84; 2°, 91 (i); ref. back to Ry. Com., 3321 (ii).
- BILL (No. 16)** To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Samuel May.—(*Mr. Denison*.)
1°, 86; 2°, 1019; in Com. and 3°, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- BILL (No. 17)** To amend The Patent Act.—(*Mr. Carling*.)
1°, 90; 2° and in Com., 1076; 3°, 1403 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 18)** To amend the Act respecting Trade Marks and Industrial Designs.—(*Mr. Carling*.)
1°, 90; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1076 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 19)** To amend The Copyright Act.—(*Mr. Carling*.)
1°, 90; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1077 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2098 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 20)** Respecting the Goderich and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Goderich and Wingham Railway Company.—(*Mr. Porter*.)
1°, 104; 2°, 185; in Com. and 3°, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 21)** To incorporate the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(*Mr. Hudspeth*.)
1°, 104; 2°, 186; in Com. and 3°, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 22)** To amend the Act to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company.—(*Mr. Corby*.)
1°, 104; 2°, 186; in Com. and 3°, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 65.)

- BILL (No. 23) To incorporate Belding, Paul & Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Curran*.)
1^o*, 104; 2^o*, 186; in Com. and 3^o*, 1019 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 103.)
- BILL (No. 24) Respecting the St. Stephen's Bank.—(Mr. *Weldon, St. John*.)
1^o*, 104; 2^o*, 186; in Com. and 3^o*, 531 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 25) Respecting the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, Limited.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell*.)
1^o*, 104; 2^o*, 186; in Com. and 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 26) Relating to the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Patterson, Essex*.)
1^o*, 104; 2^o*, 273; in Com. and 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- BILL (No. 27) To incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dawson*.)
1^o*, 104; 2^o*, 186; in Com. and 3^o*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 28) To incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hickey*.)
1^o*, 104; 2^o*, 186; in Com. and 3^o*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 29) To amend The Railway Act.—(Mr. *Cook*.)
1^o*, 118 (i).
- BILL (No. 30) To amend The Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *Cook*.)
1^o*, 118 (i).
- BILL (No. 31) To provide for the examination and licensing of persons having charge of stationary engines or other devices worked under pressure.—(Mr. *Cook*.)
1^o*, 118 (i).
- BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Grand Orange Lodge of British America.—(Mr. *Wallace*.)
1^o*, 145; 2^o m., 395; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 65) 398; in Com., 3^o m. and Amt (Mr. *Curran*) 1293; consdn. rsmd., 1345; Amt. (Mr. *Lavergne*) to Amt. 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 63, N. 86) 1349; Amt. neg. (Y. 23, N. 124) 1353; 3^o agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 1354 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
- BILL (No. 33) Respecting the People's Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. *Weldon, St. John*.)
1^o*, 159; 2^o*, 186; in Com. and 3^o*, 531 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 34) To amend the Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1^o*, 159; 2^o*, 186; in Com. and 3^o*, 2338 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1^o*, 159; 2^o*, 273 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 36) To confirm an agreement between the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company and the Canadian Pacific Company.—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1^o*, 159; 2^o*, 273; in Com. and 3^o*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 37) To amend the Act to incorporate the Imperial Trusts Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Hudspeth*.)
1^o*, 159; 2^o*, 273 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 101.)
- BILL (No. 38) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Charlton*.)
1^o, 159; 2^o m., 2212; Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 2218; agreed to (Y. 103, N. 60) 2226 (i).
- BILL (No. 39) To incorporate the York County Bank.—(Mr. *Denison*.)
1^o*, 184; 2^o*, 352 (ii); in Com. and 3^o*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 40) To incorporate the National Construction Company.—(Mr. *Brown*.)
1^o*, 184; 2^o*, 399 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 3227 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 102.)
- BILL (No. 41) To incorporate the Canada Cable Company.—(Mr. *Hesson*.)
1^o*, 184; 2^o*, 353; in Com. and 3^o*, 1019 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- BILL (No. 42) To amend Chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled: The Indian Advancement Act.—(Mr. *Doyon*.)
1^o*, 184; Order for 2^o read, 1507 (i); 2^o m., 2718; deb. adjd., 2739 (ii).
- BILL (No. 43) To amend Chapter 4 of 52 Victoria, entitled: An Act to authorise the granting of Subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Deudney*.)
1^o*, 184; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o*, 1077 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 44) To amend Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Mr. *Barron*.)
1^o*, 184 (i); Order for 2^o dschgd. and B. withdn., 3703 (ii).
- BILL (No. 45) To incorporate the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brown*.)
1^o*, 212; 2^o*, 273; in Com. and 3^o*, 1019 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 46) To incorporate the Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sproule*.)
1^o*, 212; 2^o*, 273; in Com. and 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 47) To amend Chapter 91 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled: An Act respecting the protection of Navigable Waters.—(Mr. *Tupper*.)
1^o, 212 (i); withdn., 4667 (ii).
- BILL (No. 48) Respecting the Northern and Western Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Canada Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Weldon, St. John*.)
1^o*, 244; 2^o*, 399; in Com., 1019; 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 74.)

- BILL (No. 49) Respecting the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Weldon, St. John.*)
1^o, 244; 2^o*, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 50) Respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Wallace.*)
1^o*, 244; 2^o*, 353; in Com. and 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- BILL (No. 51) Respecting the Hereford Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1^o*, 244; 2^o*, 399; in Com. and 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 52) For the protection of persons employed by contractors engaged in the construction of railways under Acts passed by the Parliament of Canada.—(Mr. *Purcell.*)
1^o*, 245 (i); 2^o, 3704 (ii).
- BILL (No. 53) To amend The Public Stores Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1^o, 245; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o*, 1077 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 54) To incorporate the Interprovincial Bridge Company.—(Mr. *White, Renfrew.*)
1^o*, 273; 2^o*, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1506 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Shore Line Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Weldon, St. John.*)
1^o*, 273; 2^o*, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1506 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 56) To amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1889, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1^o*, 342; 2^o*, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Erie and Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lister.*)
1^o*, 342; 2^o*, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Pater-son, Brant.*)
1^o*, 342; 2^o*, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1654 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 59) To change the name of the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company to the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *McMillan, Vaudreuil.*)
1^o*, 342; 2^o*, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 60) To incorporate the Rainy River Boom Company.—(Mr. *Dawson.*)
1^o*, 342; 2^o, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- BILL (No. 61) To amend the Act to incorporate the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1^o*, 342; 2^o*, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 62) For granting certain powers to The Canadian Millers' Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1^o*, 342; 2^o*, 531 (i).
- BILL (No. 63) To incorporate the Home Benefit Life Association.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1^o*, 342; 2^o*, 531 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Moncton and Prince Edward Island Railway and Ferry Company.—(Mr. *Landry.*)
1^o*, 342; 2^o*, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1506 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 65) Further to amend the Criminal Law.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1^o, 342 (i); 2^o, 3161; in Com., 3164, 3368; 3^o m., and Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) 3411; neg. (Y. 36, N. 124) 3446; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3447; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to Amt., 3454; neg. (Y. 71, N. 98) 3457; Amt. neg. (Y. 74, N. 88) 3458; Amts. (Messrs. *Blake and McNeill*) neg. and 3^o, 3460 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 66) To incorporate the Hamilton Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brown.*)
1^o*, 449; 2^o*, 1019 (i).
- BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the South Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1^o*, 449; 2^o*, 679 (i).
- BILL (No. 68) To incorporate the West Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1^o*, 449; 2^o*, 679 (i).
- BILL (No. 69) Respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Rykert.*)
1^o*, 449; 2^o*, 679; in Com. and 3^o*, 1505 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the St. Lawrence International Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1^o*, 449; 2^o*, 679 (i).
- BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Brandon and South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Searth.*)
1^o*, 449; 2^o*, 679; in Com. and 3^o*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Summerside Bank.—(Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*)
1^o*, 449; 2^o*, 679; in Com. and 3^o*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the Bankers' Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1^o*, 449; 2^o*, 679 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 3323; title changed to "Dom. Safe Deposit and Warehousing and Loan Co., Limited," 3324 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 100.)
- BILL (No. 74) Respecting the Confederation Life Association.—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1^o*, 449; 2^o*, 679 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1965. (53 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Calgary Water Power Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1^o*, 449; 2^o*, 679; in Com. and 3^o*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 76) To incorporate the Elbow River Water Power Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1^o*, 449; 2^o*, 679; in Com. and 3^o*, 2338 (i).

- BILL (No. 77) To amend the Act for the prevention and suppression of Combinations formed in restraint of Trade.—(Mr. *Wallace*.)
1^o, 504 (i); 2^o, 3703; in Com., 3704 (ii).
- BILL (No. 78) To incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Duck Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hesson*.)
1^o, 561; 2^o, 1019 (i); ref. back to Ry. Com., 3322 (ii).
- BILL (No. 79) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1^o, 638; 2^o, 1019 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 1965. (53 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale*.)
1^o, 638; 2^o, 1019; in Com. and 3^o, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Don Improvement, Toronto.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1^o, 638; 2^o, 1019 (i).
- BILL (No. 82) To confirm an agreement between the Montreal and Western Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Desjardins*.)
1^o, 638; 2^o, 1019; in Com. and 3^o, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the Alberta Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1^o, 722; 2^o, 1019 (i).
- BILL (No. 84) To amend the Act to incorporate the Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)
1^o, 722; 2^o, 1019; in Com. and 3^o, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 85) Further to amend The Fisheries Act, chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Tupper*.)
1^o, 722 (i); withdn., 4667 (ii).
- BILL (No. 86) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. *Corby*.)
1^o, 794; 2^o, 1019 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 1965. (53 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 87) Respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bryson*.)
1^o, 794; 2^o, 1019; in Com. and 3^o, 2338 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 88) To incorporate the North Canadian Atlantic Railway and Steamship Company.—(Mr. *Bryson*.)
1^o, 794; 2^o, 1019; in Com. and 3^o, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 89) To amend the Act to incorporate the River Detroit Winter Railway Bridge Company, and to change the name of the Company to the River Detroit Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*.)
1^o, 794; 2^o, 1020; in Com. and 3^o, 2210 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 90) To amend the Act incorporating the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *LaRivière*.)
1^o, 794; 2^o, 1020; in Com. and 3^o, 1654 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 91) To grant certain powers to the Chambly Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*.)
1^o, 794; 2^o, 1020; in Com. and 3^o, 2207 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- BILL (No. 92) Respecting the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to The Ontario Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bell*.)
1^o, 833; 2^o, 1020 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 3227 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dawson*.)
1^o, 833; 2^o, 1020 (i).
- BILL (No. 94) To incorporate the Thousand Islands Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bell*.)
1^o, 833; 2^o, 1020 (i).
- BILL (No. 95) Respecting Agricultural Fertilisers—(D) from the Senate.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
1^o, 963 (i); 2^o, 3190; in Com. and 3^o, 3195 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 96) For better securing the safety of certain Fishermen—(E) from the Senate.—(Mr. *Jones, Halifax*.)
1^o, 1198; 2^o, 1507 (i); M. for Com., 4440; Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) 6 m. h., 4443; agreed to, 4448 (ii).
- BILL (No. 97) To incorporate the Montreal Bridge and Terminus Company.—(Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*.)
1^o, 1019; 2^o, 1506 (i); in Com. and 3^o, 3227 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 98) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George T. Smith.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1^o, 1066; 2^o, 1506 (i); Ms. for Com., 1965, 2699; in Com., 3227; 3^o m., 3319; Amt. (Mr. *Hickey*) 6 m. h., 3320; neg. (Y. 37, N. 93) and 3^o, 3321 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 107.)
- BILL (No. 99) To incorporate the Owen Sound and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1^o, 1066; 2^o, 1355; in Com. and 3^o, 1823 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Inverness Railway Company.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1^o, 1066; 2^o, 1355 (i).
- BILL (No. 101) To incorporate the Louisburg and Richmond Railway Company.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1^o, 1066; 2^o, 1355 (i).
- BILL (No. 102) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Dickey*.)
1^o, 1198 (i).
- BILL (No. 103) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Lavergne*.)
1^o, 1199 (i); 2^o, 3717; in Com., 3719; 3^o, 3720 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 104) To amend the Railway Act—(A) from the Senate.—(Mr. *Shanly*.)
1^o, 1343; 2^o, 1507 (i); M. for Com. and Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m. h., 3325; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 47) 3332 (ii).

- BILL (No. 105) To amend Chapter 148 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled: An Act respecting the improper use of Fire-arms and other Weapons—(B) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. Brown.)
1^o, 2311 (i).
- BILL (No. 106) Respecti&g the Great North-West Central Railway Company—(J) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. Small.)
1^o and 2^o, 1506; in Com. and 3^o*, 1823 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- BILL (107) Respecting the Provincial Provident Institution of St. Thomas, Ontario.—(Mr. Ward.)
1^o*, 1343; 2^o*, 1506 (i).
- BILL (No. 108) To amend The Electoral Franchise Act.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)
1^o, 1343 (i); Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 3720 (ii).
- BILL (No. 109) Respecting the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto.—(K) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. Small.)
1^o*, 1420; 2^o*, 1506; in Com. and 3^o*, 1965 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 110) To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.—(Mr. Charlton.)
1^o*, 1792 (i).
- BILL (No. 111) Further to amend the Acts respecting the Quebec Harbor Commissioners.—(R) *from the Senate*.—(Sir John Thompson.)
1^o*, 1506; 2^o m., 1532; 2^o and in Com., 1533; 3^o m., 1582; Amt. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1583 (i).
- BILL (No. 112) Authorising the transfer of certain public property to the Provincial Governments.—(Sir John Thompson.)
1^o, 1512 (i); withdn., 4924 (ii).
- BILL (No. 113) To authorise the Toronto Savings Bank Charitable Trust to invest certain Funds.—(M) *from the Senatc*.—(Mr. Small.)
1^o*, 1581; 2^o*, 1610 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1965. (53 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 114) Further to amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Mr. Brien.)
1^o, 1581 (i); 2^o m., 3720; deb. adjd., 3722 (ii).
- BILL (No. 115) To amend Chapter 122 of the Revised Statutes, entitled: An Act respecting certain Savings Banks in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Choquette.)
1^o
- BILL (No. 116) Respecting the Department of The Geological Survey.—(C) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. Dewdney.)
1^o*, 1792; 2^o, 2099 (i); in Com., 4028; 3^o*, 4033 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 117) Further to amend The General Inspection Act, Chapter 99 of the Revised Statutes.—(Q) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1^o* 1792 (i);
- BILL (No. 118) To amend The Steamboat Inspection the Revised Statutes.—(O) *Colby.*)
1^o*, 1792 (i); 2^o m., 3186; deb. adjd., 3190; 2^o on a div., 4362; in Com., 4362, 4663; 3^o*, 4663. (53 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 119) For the relief of Hugh Forbes Keefer.—(G) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. Weldon, Albert.)
1^o, on a div., 3324; 2^o (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694; in Com. and 3^o on a div., 4026 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 108.)
- BILL (No. 120) For the relief of Christiana Filman Glover.—(H) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. McKay.)
1^o, on a div., 3324; 2^o (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694; in Com. and 3^o on a div., 4026 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 109.)
- BILL (No. 121) To amend the Act to incorporate the Dominion Mineral Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)
Rule suspended and 1^o of B., 1936; 2^o*, 2208 (i), in Com. and 3^o*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 99.)
- BILL (No. 122) To prevent the Disclosure of Official Documents and Information.—(T) *from the Senate*.—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)
1^o*, 2020 (i); 2^o, 3203; in Com., 3599; 3^o*, 3600 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 123) Respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)
1^o*, 2020; 2^o*, 2338 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 4026 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- BILL (No. 124) Respecting H. H. Vivian & Company (Limited).—(Mr. Dawson.)
1^o*, 2097; 2^o*, 2338 (i); in Com., 3231, 3622; 3^o*, 3623 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
- BILL (No. 125) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)
M. to suspend Rules, 2178; 1^o*, 2184; 2^o*, 2338 (i); in Com., 3228, 3621; 3^o*, 3622 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 126) To amend an Act concerning Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.—(U) *from the Senate*.—(Sir John Thompson.)
1^o*, 2739; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 4035 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 127) Respecting Banks and Banking.—(Mr. Foster.)
Res. prop., 2234; in Com. on Res., 1^o* of B., 2249 (i); 2^o m., 3811; 2^o and in Com., 3853, 3879, 3955, 4074, 4277, 4415, 4507; 3^o, 4590; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4928 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 128) Respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Mara.)
Rules suspended and 1^o*, 2594; 2^o—; in Com. and 3^o*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 129) Further to amend the Act 50 and 51 Victoria, Chapter 16 entitled: An Act to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, and to make better provision for the trial of claims against the Crown.—(Sir John Thompson.)
1^o, 2595; 2^o* and in Com., 3160; 3^o*, 3161 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- BILL (No. 130) To amend The Interpretation Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)
1^o, 2825; 2^o, 3155; in Com., 3157, 3600; 3^o*, 3604 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 7.)

- BILL (No. 131)** Further to amend Chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes, The Territories Real Property Act.—(Sir *John Thompson*.)
1°, 2914; 2°, 3198; withdn., 4924 (ii).
- BILL (No. 132)** To amend The Indian Advancement Act, Chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Deudney*.)
1°, 3151; 2° m., 3604; 2°, 3624; in Com., 3625, 4033; 3°, 4034 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 133)** Further to amend the Act respecting the Inland Revenue, Chapter 34 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
1°, 3151; 2°, 3626; in Com., 3627; 3°, 3633 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 134)** Respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States of America.—(Sir *John Thompson*.)
1°, 3153; 2°, 3593; in Com., 3595, 3876; 3°, 3878 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 135)** To amend The Seamen's Act, Chapter 74 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Colby*.)
1°, 3153; 2°, 4359; in Com., 4360; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Wilson*, *Elgin*) 4400; neg. on a div. and 3°, 4403 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 136)** Further to amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Mr. *Chapleau*.)
1°, 3196; 2°* and in Com., 3895; 3° m., 3937; Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) 3938; neg. (Y. 51, N. 87) 3947; Amt. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 3949; neg. (Y. 49, N. 83) 3954; 3°, 3955; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 4663 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 137)** To amend The Gas Inspection Act, Chapter 101 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
1°, 3290; 2°, 4266; in Com., 4271; 3°, 4272 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 138)** Respecting grants of Public Lands—(W) from the Senate.—(Sir *John Thompson*.)
1°*, 3624; 2°* and in Com., 4034; 3°*, 4035 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- BILL (No. 139)** To amend the Act respecting the Inspection of Steamboats and the examination and licensing of Engineers employed on them.—(Mr. *Patterson*, *Essex*.)
1°, 3512 (ii).
- BILL (No. 140)** To amend Chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled: An Act respecting Interest.—(Sir *John Thompson*.)
1°*, 3624; 2°, 4266; in Com., 4414, 4924; 3°*, 4924 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 141)** To facilitate the purchase by the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the Branch line between Hull and Ayler.—(Mr. *Sproule*.)
1°, 3591; 2°*, 3702; in Com. and 3°*, 4025 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 142)** For the relief of Emily Walker—(N) from the Senate.—(Mr. *Brown*.)
1°*, 3624; 2° m., 3694; Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., 3695; agreed to (Y. 70, N. 35) 3702 (ii).
- BILL (No. 143)** To amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°*, 3779; 2°* and in Com., 4484; 3° m., 4527; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4530; neg. (Y. 62, N. 93) 4544; 3°, 4545 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 144)** In amendment of The Patent Act.—(Mr. *Patterson*, *Essex*.)
1°, 3811; 2°* and in Com., 4484 (ii).
- BILL (No. 145)** To amend the Militia Act, Chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Mulock*.)
1°, 4168 (ii).
- BILL (No. 146)** To amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories—(V) from the Senate.—(Mr. *Deudney*.)
1°*, 4373; 2° m., 4449; 2° and in Com., 4465 (ii).
- BILL (No. 147)** Respecting the Hereford Railway Company and the Maine Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ives*.)
Rules suspended, 4396; 1°* and 2°*, 4397; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to place on Order Paper, 4499; in Com., 4503; 3°*, 4504 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 148)** To provide for the collection and publishing of Labor Statistics.—(Mr. *Chapleau*.)
Res. prop., 4590; in Com., 4836; ref. to Com. on B., 4837; 1°, 4398; 2°, 4835; in Com., 4838; 3°*, 4846 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 149)** To provide for the payment of a Bounty on Pig Iron made from Canadian ore.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop., 2828; M. for Com., 4321; conc. in (Y. 69, N. 45) 4403; 1°* of B., 4404; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4835 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 150)** Respecting a certain agreement therein mentioned with the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
Res. prop., 4261; M. for Com., 4419; in Com., 4433; conc. in and 1°* of B., 4440; 2°* and in Com., 4816; 3°*, 4832 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 151)** Respecting Railways—(Z) from the Senate.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
1°*, 4480; 2° and in Com., 4816; 3°*, 4821 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 152)** To amend the Acts respecting the Harbor of Pictou.—(Mr. *Colby*.)
1°, 4588; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4835. (53 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 153)** To amend the Indian Act, Chapter 43 of the Revised Statutes—(BB) from the Senate.—(Mr. *Deudney*.)
1°—; 2°, 4903 (ii); in Com., 4904; 3°*, 4905 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 154)** Respecting certain Savings Banks in the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°*, 4761; 2° and in Com., 4847; 3°*, 4848 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 155)** Respecting the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Daly*.)
Rules suspended, 4821; 1°* and 2°*, 4822; in Com. and 3°*, 4906; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4930. (53 *Vic.*, c. 80.)

- BILL (No. 156)** Respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hesson*.)
Rules suspended, 4846; 1° and 2° on a div., 4846; in Com. and 3*, 4906 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 157)** To authorise the granting of Subsidies to certain Railways and Railway Companies.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
Res. prop., 4762; in Com., 4848; conc. in, 4893; amended Res., 4824; in Com., 4896; 1* of B., 4898; 2*, in Com. and 3*, 4917 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 158)** For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the years ending respectively the 30th June, 1890, and the 30th June, 1891, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res., 4916; 1° of B., 2*, 3*, 4917 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- BILL (No. 159)** To amend the Act of the present Session, entitled: An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1* 2*, in Com., and 3*, 4910. (53 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 160)** To authorise the granting of Subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Dewdney*.)
Res. prop., 4589; in Com., 4668; rep., 4694; M. for conc. and Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 4832; neg. (Y. 48, N. 83) 4834; further Res., 4825; in Com., 4917; conc. in, 1*, 2* of B. and in Com., 4919; 3° m., 4920; 3°, 4923 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 161)** To amend The Pilotage Act, Chapter 80 of the Revised Statutes—(DD) from the Senate.—(Mr. *Colby*.)
1*, 4924 (ii).
- BINDERS, REAPERS, &c.** See "SELF-BINDERS."
- BLACKFEET INDIANS, CAPTURE OF WHITE GIRL:** Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 815 (i).
- BLACKING, &c.:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3243.
- BLAKE, CONVICT, TRANSFER TO ENG.:** in Com. of Sup., 3999 (ii).
- BLISS' PATENT LETTER BOX:** Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2827 (ii).
- Board of Trade.** See "TORONTO."
- BOARD OF TRADE, QUEBEC, AND NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES:** M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 55 (i).
- BOOKBINDERS' TOOLS AND IMPLEMENTS:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3244 (ii).
- BOOTS AND SHOES:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3561 (ii).
- BONDED FREIGHT.** See "American Vessels."
- Bounty on Pig Iron.** See "PIG IRON."
- BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, EXPENSES re DISTRIBUTION:** in Com. of Sup., 2376 (ii).
— See "Pig Iron."
- BRACES OR SUSPENDERS:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3244 (i).
- BRANCH AND DISTRICT STAFF (MILITIA,) SALARIES:** Com. of Sup., 1315 (i).
- Brandon and South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 71** (Mr. *Scarth*). 1*, 449; 2*, 679; in Com. and 3*, 1355. (53 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- BRANDON AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY:** prop. Rés. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4589; in Com., 4689 (ii).
- Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58** (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*). 1*, 342; 2*, 531; in Com. and 3* 1654 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BRASS FOR PRINTERS' RULES:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3244 (ii).
- BREMER FURS, REP. OF SEL. COM.:** presented (Mr. *McNeill*) 3810 (ii).
— EVIDENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4449 (ii).
— PAYMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 4931 (ii).
— M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 4732 (ii).
— See "Middleton, Maj.-Gen."
- BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1358; remarks (Mr. *Laurier, &c.*) 1508, 1517 (i); M. (Mr. *Laurier*) for precedence, 1654 (i).
Deb. on Res. (Mr. *Macdowall*) 1370; (Mr. *Watson*) 1374; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1377; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1379; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1385; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1388; (Mr. *Mills, Bohwell*) 1388; (Mr. *Davin*) 1392; (Mr. *Casey*) 1394; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1397; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1390 (i).
- "BRIDGEWATER," SHIP, SEIZURE:** Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 248 (i).
- BRITISH ASSOCIATION (re INDIANS) GRANT TO SUPPLEMENT VOTE:** in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA:**
ALASKAN AND CAN. BOUNDARY LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 189 (i).
BEHRING'S SEA. See "FISHERIES."
CHINESE ADMISSION INTO CANADA, PAR. IN "EMPIRE:" read (Mr. *Edgar*) 3624 (ii).
— IMMIGRATION, RESTRICTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 68 (i).
CHISHOLM, MR., M.P., DECEASED: Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3081 (ii).
COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
DEFENCES IN B.C., COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1199 (i).
ESQUIMALT DRY DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1120 (i).
— FORTIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1485 (i).
MAIL SERVICE IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2668 (ii).
MINING MACHINERY, FREE IMPORTATION: Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mara*) agreed to (Y. 100, N. 77) 1144 (i).
NEW WESTMINSTER REPRESENTATION, VACANCY: Issue of Writ (Mr. *Speaker*) 3439 (ii).
SETTLERS ON RY. RESERVE, B.C.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 137 (i).
SKEENA EXPEDITION: in Com. of Sup., 4057 (ii).
VICTORIA, B.C., RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- B.C. vs. ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA, COST OF APPEAL:** in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
- BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762; in Com., 4874 (ii).

- BUDGET, THE: Annual Stmtnt. (Mr. Foster) 2532 (ii).**
 — Reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2566 (ii).
 — DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1907; neg. (Y. 57, N. 95) 1950 (i).
 — Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1094 (i).
 — See "WAYS AND MEANS."
- BUILDERS, &C., HARDWARE:** in Com. of Sup., 3486.
BUILDINGS, PUBLIC. See "SUPPLY."
- BUOYS IN ST. LAWRENCE RIVER:** Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2185 (i).
- BUTTONS, VEGETABLE IVORY, &C.:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3384 (ii).
- CABINET, LIST OF MEMBERS, iii.**
- CABINET MINISTERS, REFLECTION ON BY MEMBER:** Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 2252 (i).
- CALDWELL, LOCKMASTER AT IROQUOIS:** Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3077 (ii).
- Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s agreement B. No. 150 (Sir John A. Macdonald).** Res. prop., 4261; M. for Com., 4419; in Com., 4433; conc. in and 1st of B., 4440; 2nd and in Com., 4816; 3rd, 4832 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
- Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. Small).** 1st, 159; 2nd, 273 (i); in Com. and 3rd, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
- CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY. CO.:** prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4261 (ii).
 — LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4689 (ii).
- Calgary Water Power Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. Tisdale).** 1st, 449; 2nd, 679; in Com. and 3rd, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- CALVIE, LEGAL SERVICES re PROSECUTION:** Ques. (Mr. *Bécharé*) 4399 (ii).
- CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ STEAM COM.:** in Com. of Sup., 1961 (i).
- CANADA ATLANTIC RAILWAY BRIDGE, SUBSIDIES VOTED:** M. for Stmtnt. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3663 (ii).
- CANADA AND JAMAICA, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1199 (i).
 — See "NEWFOUNDLAND," "WEST INDIES," &C.
- CANADA AND TREATIES OF COMMERCE, COMS. BETWEEN H. M.'S GOVT. AND DOM. GOVT.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 3666 (ii).
- CANADA AND UNITED KINGDOM STEAM COM.:** in Com. of Sup., 4773; conc., 4915 (ii).
- Canada Cable Co.'s incorp. B. No. 41 (Mr. Hesson).** 1st, 184; 2nd, 353; in Com. and 3rd, 1019 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- Canada Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 48 (Mr. Weldon, St. John).** 1st, 244; 2nd, 399; in Com., 1019; 3rd, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. No. 26 (Mr. Patterson, Essex).** 1st, 104; 2nd, 273; in Com. and 3rd, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 102 (Mr. Hickey).** 1st, 1198 (i).
- Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 103 (Mr. Laverne).** 1st, 199 (i); 2nd, 3717; in Com., 3719; 3rd, 3720 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, WORKING:** Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 1021 (i).
- CANADIAN COMMISSIONERS ABROAD: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. McMullen) 100 (i).**
- CANADIAN HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS:** Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 1020 (i).
- Canadian Millers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. Brown).** 1st, 342; 2nd, 531 (i).
- C.P.R. Act Amt. B. No. 56 (Mr. Kirkpatrick).** 1st, 342; 2nd, 531; in Com. and 3rd, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
 — See "MONTREAL AND WESTERN RY. CO."
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY:**
 ATYLMER BRANCH, SALE: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3591 (ii).
 BRANDON BRANCH LINE, LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4589 (ii).
 CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4013, 4653 (ii).
 GLENBOROUGH BRANCH, LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. 4589; in Com., 4668 (ii).
 NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Que.*) 55 (i).
 RY. BRIDGES IN BAGOT COUNTY: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Dupont*) 141 (i).
 VANCOUVER ISLAND AND JAPAN, &C., STEAMSHIP SUBSIDY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 861 (i).
- CANADIAN REGISTRATION OF SHIPPING:** in Com. of Sup., 2017 (i).
- CANALS:**
 BEAUHARNOIS CANAL ENLARGEMENT: M. for Reprs., &c. (Mr. *Bain, Soulanges*) 517 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 187 (i).
 CALDWELL, LOCKMASTER AT IROQUOIS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3077 (ii).
 CHAMBLY AND LONGUEUIL CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401 (i).
 — VESSELS, TONNAGE, &C., PASSED THROUGH: M. for Stmtnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1401 (i).
 CORNWALL CANAL, LETTER OF MR. PAGE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bergin*) 1122 (i).
 TRENT VALLEY CANAL BRIDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 3703 (ii).
 — COMMISSION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 145 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 118 (i).
 WELLAND CANAL, REP. OF MR. WOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 885 (i).
 — M. to lay on Table (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1515 (i).
 [See "P. W.," "RYS.," &c., under "SUPPLY."]
- CANTEENS AT FREDERICTON CAMP:** Remarks (Mr. *Gillmor*) 3078 (ii).
- CAPE BRETON RY. CONSTRUCTION OF TELEGRAPH: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonald, Victoria) 3319 (ii).**
 — in Com. of Sup., 3809, 4019 (ii).
- CAPE CROCKER INDIANS, ANNUITY PER HEAD:** Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 505 (i).
- CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOR:** in Com. of Sup., 1098 (i).
- CAPE TRAVERSE WHARF, REPAIRS:** Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2378 (i).
- CARAQUET RY., FINANCIAL AID:** Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 3723 (ii).
 — GROSS EARNINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3811 (ii).
 — Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4601 (ii).

- CARDIN, ELPHÈGE AND JEAN, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS : M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
- CARILLON AND GRENVILLE CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 4655 ; conc., 4913 (ii).
- CARTWRIGHT'S CASES, AID TO PUBLISH : in Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).
- CASCUMPEC HARBOR : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1655 (i).
- IMPROVEMENTS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 1711.
- CASCAPEDIA (GREAT) RIVER BRIDGE : Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 2669 (ii).
- (PETITE) P. O. SAVINGS BANKS : Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 2669 (ii).
- CATTLE DISEASE IN WESTERN STATES : Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 85 (i).
- QUARANTINE STATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 92.
- CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS FOR INDEMNITY, COR., &c. : M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1703 (i).
- AGENT'S LETTER TO COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1797 (i).
- ENGAGEMENT FOR CIRCUS : Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1654 (i).
- MONEYS BELONGING TO : M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1711 (i).
- QUARRIES : Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 85, 247 (i).
- SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 247 (i).
- SURVEYOR'S REP. : Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1069 (i).
- CAVALRY SCHOOL, QUE., OFFICERS' PROMOTION : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 3291 (ii).
- CENSUS AND STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 2386 (i), 4650 (ii).
- NEXT ENUMERATION : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 402 (i), 2827 (ii).
- PAGANS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 513 (i).
- Central Ontario Railway Co.'s B. No. 86** (Mr. *Corby*). 1st, 794 ; 2nd, 1019 ; in Com. and 3rd, 1965 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- CENTRAL RY. CO. OF N.B. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 ; in Com., 4876 (ii).
- CEREALS, FRAUDS IN SALE OF : prop. Res. (Mr. *Burdett*) 1148 (i).
- CHALK-STONE, CHINA, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3584 (ii).
- CHAMBLY AND LONGUEUIL CANAL : Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 2288 (ii).
- VESSELS, TONNAGE, &c., PASSED THROUGH : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1401 (i).
- Chamblly Manufacturing Co.'s B. No. 91** (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1st, 794 ; 2nd, 1020 ; in Com. and 3rd, 2207 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- CHAMPLAIN DISTRICT, REVISING OFFICER : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2022 (i).
- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 161 (i).
- CHATHAM (N.B.) QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 4001 (ii).
- CHICAGO WORLD'S FAIR, CANADIAN REPRESENTATION : Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1357 (i).
- CHINESE, ADMISSION INTO CANADA, PAR. IN "EMPIRE" read (Mr. *Edgar*) 3624 (ii).
- IMMIGRATION, RESTRICTION : Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 68 (i).
- CHISHOLM, MR., M.P., DECEASED : Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3081 (ii).
- CHISHOLM, KENNETH. See "Sick Mariners Fund."
- CHRISTIAN ISLAND INDIANS, DISTRESS : Remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 4926 (ii).
- CIVIL GOVT. : in Com. of Sup., 353, 460 (i), 3779, 3993, 4570 (ii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 30** (Mr. *Cook*). 1st, 118 (i).
- CIVIL SERVICE, APPOINTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL MEN WITHOUT PASSING C. S. EXAM., NAMES, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lister*) 3693 (ii).
- EXAMINERS, CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
- LIST, COMPILATION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3992 (ii).
- CLOCKS AND CLOCK CASES : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3388 (ii).
- CLOTHING (MILITIA) SUPPLIES, TENDERS FOR : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3811 (ii).
- READY-MADE, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3554 (ii).
- COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 ; in Com., 4875 (ii).
- COCOA PASTE, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3390 (ii).
- COINS, CABINETS OF, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3584 (ii).
- COLBY, HON. C. C., MEMBER FOR STANSTEAD : Introduced, 1 (i).
- COLLARS, COTTON, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3390, 3401 (ii).
- COLLINGWOOD HARBOR, EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1655 (i).
- COLONISATION COMPANIES AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
- COLORS, DRY : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3503 (ii).
- COLLECTION OF REVENUES : in Com. of Sup., 2288, 2313 (i), 3659, 3802, 4119, 4792 (ii).
- Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Navigation Co.'s B. 128** (Mr. *Mara*). Rules suspended and 1st, 2594 ; 2nd — ; in Com. and 3rd 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
- Combinations in Trade Prevention B. No. 77** (Mr. *Wallace*). 1st, 504 (i) ; 2nd, 3703 ; in Com. 3704 (ii).
- COMMERCIAL AGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).
- TREATIES. See "TREATIES."
- COMMITTEES :
- AGRICULTURE AND COLONISATION : List of Members, 37 (i).
- ALIEN CONTRACT LABOR B. 8 : M. (Mr. *Taylor*) for Sel. Com., 2204 (i) ; Rep. presented, 3367 (ii).
- BALLOT BOXES, PATENT : M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) for Sel. Com., 2230 (i) ; Rep. presented, 4656 (ii).
- BANKING AND COMMERCE COM. : List of Members, 36. — M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to add names 91 (i).
- BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS AND BREMNER FURS : M. (Mr. *Luster*) for Sel. Com., 1358, 1396 (i).

COMMITTEES—Continued.

- BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS: Rep. presented (Mr. *McNeill*) 4732 (ii).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL: M. for Sp. Com. (Mr. *Bowell*) 4.
- List of Members, vii.
- 1ST REP. OF COM.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 1261 (i), 3153 (ii).
- 2ND REP.: presented (Mr. *Desjardins*) 3368 (ii).
- 3RD REP.: presented (Mr. *Davin*) 4396.
- M. (Mr. *Davin*) to conc., 4578 (ii).
- Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) to ref, back, 4578 (ii).
- EXPIRING LAWS: List of Members, 34 (i).
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 31 (i).
- PRINTING, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 31.
- List of Members, 31 (i).
- M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to add names, 1651 (i).
- 3RD REP.: M. (Mr. *Bergin*) to conc., 1856 (i).
- objection (Mr. *Blake*) 440 (ii).
- 6TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to conc., 4658 (ii).
- 9TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Bergin*) to conc., 4928 (ii).
- PRIVATE BILLS (MISCELLANEOUS): List of Members, 35 (i).
- PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: List of Members, 33 (i).
- M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to employ shorthand writer 2098 (i).
- Rep. presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 4397 (ii).
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: List of Members, 35 (i).
- NON-MEETING: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2596 (ii).
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS, &c.: List of Members, 34 (i).
- M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to add names, 1651 (i).
- SELECT STANDING: prop. M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3 (i).
- M. for Com. to prepare Lists, 29; Rep. presented, 30 (i).
- STANDING ORDERS COM.: List of Members, 31 (i).
- COMMITTEES, CHAIRMAN OF. See "DEPUTY SPEAKER."
- COMPENSATION IN LIEU OF LAND: in Com. of Sup., 1267 (i).
- COMPTON, RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- Confederation Life Association B. No. 74** (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1*, 449; 2*, 679; in Com. and 3*, 1965 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 213, 1331 (i), 4575.
- CONTRACTORS' CHEQUES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 27 (i).
- CONTROVERTED ELECTION, HALDIMAND: Judgment of Supreme Court (Mr. *Speaker*) 83 (i).
- Copyright Act Amt. B. No. 19** (Mr. *Carling*). 1*, 90; 2*, in Com. and 3*, 1077; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2098 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- COPYRIGHT ACT AMT. (1889): Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 84.
- CORINTH P.O.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 94 (i).
- CORN DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1583; neg. on a div., 1610 (i).
- SEED, DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2828 (ii).
- INDIAN: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3584, 3588 (ii).
- REBATE OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 195 (i); neg. (Y. 54, N. 70) 211 (i).
- prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 390; deb. adjd., 393; rsmcd., 451; neg. (Y. 69, N. 104) 459 (i).
- REMOVAL OF DUTY: Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1583; neg., 1610 (i).

- CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2275 (i).
- LETTER OF MR. PAGE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bergin*) 1122 (i).
- CORSETS, CLASPS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3485 (ii).
- COTTON CORDAGE, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3392 (i).
- DENIMS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3400 (ii).
- TWINE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3541 (ii).
- COTÉ, F., PET. *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY BY I.C.R.: M. for copies * (Mr. *Fiset*) 1713 (i).
- COURT HOUSE, MONTREAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 2188 (i).
- COVE HEAD HARBOR SURVEYS, REPS. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
- CRANE ISLAND MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 121 (i).
- Criminal Law (seduction, &c.) Amt. B. No. 65** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 342 (i); 2°, 3161; in Com., 3164, 3368; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) 3411; neg. (Y. 36, N. 124) 3446; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3447; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to Amt. 3454; neg. (Y. 71, N. 98) 3457; Amt. neg. (Y. 74, N. 88) 3458; Amts. (Messrs. *Blake* and *McNeill*) neg. and 3°, 3460 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 498 (i).
- CROFTER IMMIGRANTS, PAR. IN "NORTH BRITISH DAILY MAIL": Ques. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 1795 (i).
- CROW HARBOR POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 400 (i).
- Cruelty to Animals prevention Act (Chap. 172 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 5** (Mr. *Brown*). 1*, 26; 2° m., 1203; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6 m. h., 1216; neg. (Y. 82, N. 91) 1219; 2°, 1220; Order for Com. read, 1506; in Com., 1823; M. to further consd. B. in Com. and Amt. Mr. *Tisdale* 6 m. h., 1854; M. and Amt. withdn., 1856 (i).
- "CRUISER," GOVT. YACHT, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
- CULLEN, PATRICK, EXTRA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 4120 (ii).
- CULLING TIMBER: in Com. of Sup., 2343 (i); suppl., 4121 (ii).
- CULLERS' OFFICE, QUEBEC, SUPERANNUATION: M. for O. C.'s, &c.* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).
- CUSTOMS:
- AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS EXPORTED. See "SELF-BINDERS."
- ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS AND TARIFF: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3633 (ii).
- AMERICAN FREIGHT IN BOND: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 99 (i).
- "BRIDGEWATER," SHIP, SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 248 (i).
- CORN FOR SEED, DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2828.
- REBATE OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 195; neg. (Y. 54, N. 70) 211 (i).
- REMOVAL OF DUTY: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1583; neg., 1610 (i).
- CUSTOMS DUTIES, AMOUNT PER CAPITA: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 188 (i).

CUSTOMS—Continued.

- EGGS, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS TO AND FROM ONT. AND QUE. : M. for Ret* (Mr. Guillet) 3693 (iii).
- FERTILISERS, ARTIFICIAL, REMOVAL OF DUTY : prop. Res. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 1811, 2024 (i).
- FISH IN BOND, DUTY : Ques. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 248 (i).
- FLOUR AND WHEAT, IMPORTATIONS : Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 55 (i).
- FLOUR, CAN., IMPORTS INTO MAR. PROVS. : Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 2670, 2671 (ii).
- M. for Stimt. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 2671 (ii).
- FREE LIST, EXTENSION TO CERTAIN ARTICLES : Ques. (Mr. Fisher) 403 (i).
- GRAINS AND SEEDS, IMPORTS : prop. Res. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 1029 (i).
- Personal Explanation (Mr. Couture) 1069 (i).
- LOGS, EXPORT DUTY : Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 884 (i).
- LUMBER DUTIES AND MCKINLEY TARIFF : Remarks (Mr. Charlton) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).
- LUMBER, DUTY ON : Ques. (Mr. Bryson) 4662 (ii).
- MACHINERY, DUTY ON MANUFACTURING : Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2670 (ii).
- MINING, FREE IMPORTATION : Ques. (Mr. Lister) 562 (i).
- prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 1125 ; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mara) agreed to (Y. 100, N. 77) 1144 (i).
- MALT, REBATE OF DUTY : prop. Res. (Mr. Landerkin) 516 (i).
- MCLAGGAN, CUSTOMS OFFICER, CHARGES AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 4500 (ii).
- MEAT, INCREASE OF DUTY : Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 55 ; Res. withdn., 123 (i).
- OLEOMARGARINE, IMPORTS INTO B.N.A. : Ques. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 122 (i).
- SAW LOGS, REBATE OF DUTY : Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 3662 (ii).
- SELF-BINDERS, REAPERS AND MOWERS EXPORTED : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 1065 (i).
- TARIFF, THE. See "WAYS AND MEANS."
- TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS : presented (Mr. Bowell) 26 (i).
- TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S. : Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) 2312 (i).
- TREATIES OF COMMERCE, COMS. BETWEEN H. M.'S GOVT. AND DOM. GOVT. : M. for copies (Gen. Laurier) 3666 (ii).
- [See "COLLECTION OF REVENUES" and "CIVIL GOVT." under "SUPPLY."]
- Customs Acts Amt. B. No. 143** (Mr. Foster). 1*, 3779 ; 2* and in Com., 4484 ; 3* m., 4527 ; Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4530 ; neg. (Y. 62, N. 93) 4544 ; 3*, 4545 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 20.)
- Customs Act Amt. B. No. 159** (Mr. Foster). 1*, 2*, in Com. and 3* 4910, (ii). (53 Vic., c. 21.)
- CUSTOMS DUTIES, AMOUNT PER CAPITA : Ques. (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 188 (i).
- CUSTOMS DUTY ON MEAT, INCREASE : Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 55 ; withdn., 123 (i).
- DAIRYING INTEREST, DEVELOPMENT : in Com. of Sup., 2399 (i).
- DAMAGES BY STEAMERS. See "Govt. Property."
- DARTMOUTH BRANCH RY. : in Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).
- DEAD LETTER OFFICE AND REGISTERED LETTERS : M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 83 (i).

- DEAD MEAT CO. : Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL, ACCOMMODATION FOR STAFF : remarks (Mr. Barron) 2723 (ii).
- DEBATES COMMITTEE, LIST OF MEMBERS, vii.
— See "COMMITTEES."
- Deceased Wife's Sister (Marriage) Act Amt. B. No. 126** (Sir John Thompson). 1*, 2739 ; 2*, in Com., and 3*, 4035 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 36.)
- DEFENCES IN B. C., COR. WITH IMP. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1199 (i).
- DEPTL. BUILDINGS, CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 474 (i).
- DEPTL. SECRETARY (MILITIA) APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. Lister) 2670 (ii).
- DEPOSITS IN SAVINGS BANKS. See "P.O." under "FINANCE."
- DERBY BRANCH RY., EXTENSION : M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. Mitchell) 514 (i).
- DESJARDINS' DÉBATS PARLEMENTAIRES DE QUÉBEC : in Com. of Sup., 4113 (ii).
- Detroit Winter Ry. Bridge Co.** See "RIVER DETROIT."
- DICTIONNAIRE GÉNÉALOGIQUE DE L'ABBÉ TANGUAY : in Com. of Sup., 3659 (ii).
- DIGBY WHARF, DUES COLLECTED : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 530 (i).
- DINGMAN, INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING EXPENSES : Statement (Mr. Dewdney) 2160 (i).
- DIONNE, JOS., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Pessaint) 2023 (i).
- DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL BILLS SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c. : M. for Stimt. (Mr. Landerkin) 28.
- MAN. MUNICIPAL ACT : Remarks (Mr. Watson) 2377 (i).
- POWER OF : prop. Res. (Mr. Blake) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4083 ; agreed to, 4094 (ii).
- DISCLOSURES, &c. See "OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS."
- DISTILLERIES AND FACTORIES (EXTRA PAY OF OFFICERS) : in Com. of Sup., 2337 (i).
- DIVISIONS :**
- ANNUNCIATION DAY, ADJNMT. : prop. M. (Mr. Trow) 2308 ; agreed to (Y. 59, N. 24) 2309 (i).
- BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES : on Sen. Amts., Amt. (Mr. Blake) agreed to (Y. 58, N. 43) 4413 (ii).
- BUDGET, THE, &c., DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN : Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1937 ; neg. (Y. 57, N. 95) 1949 (i).
- CORN, REBATE OF DUTY : prop. Res. (Mr. Landerkin) 195, neg. (Y. 54, N. 70) 212 (i).
- REBATE OF DUTY : prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 390 ; deb. adjd., 393 ; rsmtd., 451 ; neg. (Y. 69, N. 104) 459 (i).
- CRIMINAL LAW AMT. B. 65 (Sir John Thompson) : M. to recom. (Mr. Bergin) neg. (Y. 36, N. 124) 3446 ; Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 3454 ; neg. (Y. 71, N. 98) 3457 ; Amt. (Mr. Mitchell) 3447 ; neg. (Y. 74, N. 88) 3458.
- CRUELTY TO ANIMALS PREVENTION B. 5 (Mr. Brown) : on M. for 2*, Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 6m. h., 1216 ; neg. (Y. 82, N. 91) 1291 (i).

DIVISIONS—Continued.

- CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B. 143 (Mr. Foster): on M. for 3^o, Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) neg. (Y. 62, N. 93) 4544 (ii).
- DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. 38 (Mr. Charlton): Amt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 6 m.h., to M. for 2^o, 2216; agreed to (Y. 103, N. 60) 2226 (i).
- DIVORCE, KEEFER, H. F., RELIEF B. 119 (Mr. Prior): 2^o agreed to (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694 (ii).
- SMITH, GEO. T., RELIEF B. 98 (Mr. Small): on M. for 3^o, Amt. (Mr. Hickey) 6 m. h., 3320; neg. (Y. 37, N. 92) 3321 (ii).
- WALKER, EMILY, RELIEF B. 142 (Mr. Brown): 2^o m., Amt. (Sir John Thompson) 6 m. h., 3693; agreed to (Y. 70, N. 35) 3702 (ii).
- EXODUS OF CANADIANS TO U. S.: M. (Mr. Charlton) for Sel. Com., 403; neg. (Y. 63, N. 94) 447 (i).
- FRANCHISE ACT AMT. B. 136 (Mr. Chapleau): 3^o m., Amt. (Mr. Brien) to recom., 3938; neg. (Y. 51, N. 87) 3947; Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 3949; neg. (Y. 49, N. 83) 3954 (ii).
- prop. Res. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) to Repeal, 1139; neg. (Y. 78, N. 99) 1197 (i).
- FRENCH LANGUAGE IN N.W.T., (ABOLITION) B. 10 (Mr. McCarthy): on M. for 2^o, Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Beausoleil) 554; neg. (Y. 63, N. 117) 876; Amt. to Amt. (Sir John Thompson) agreed to (Y. 149, N. 50) 1017 (i).
- GRAINS AND SEEDS, REMOVAL OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 1029; neg. (Y. 59, N. 84) 1062 (i).
- HERCHMER, COMMISSONER, INVESTIGATION *re* MANAGEMENT MOUNTED POLICE: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) for Sel. Com., 2674; Amt. (Mr. Watson) 2690; neg. (Y. 52, N. 76) 3366; Res. neg. on same div., 3366 (ii).
- JESUITS' ESTATES ACT: prop. Res. (Mr. Charlton) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4173; neg. (Y. 32, N. 130) 4252 (ii).
- LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR, TIMBER LIMITS: Amt. (Sir John Thompson) to adjn. deb., 1746; agreed to (Y. 94, N. 72) 1790 (i).
- LOYALTY TO HER MAJESTY: prop. Address (Mr. Mulock) 123; agreed to (Y. 161, N. 0) 136 (i).
- MINING MACHINERY, FREE IMPORTATION: prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 1125; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mara) 1139; agreed to (Y. 100, N. 77) 1144 (i).
- ORANGE INCORPORATION B. 32 (Mr. Wallace): M. for 2^o agreed to (Y. 85, N. 69) 398; on M. for 3^o, Amt. (Mr. Laverne) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 63, N. 86) 1346, Amt. (Mr. Curran) Party Processions, neg. (Y. 23 N. 124) 1353; 3^o agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 1354 (i).
- PIG IRON, BOUNTY: on M. to conc. in Res. (Mr. Foster) agreed to (Y. 49, N. 45) 4403 (ii).
- RAILWAY ACT AMT. B. 104 (Mr. Shanly): on M. for Com., Amt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 6 m. h., 3325; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 47) 3331 (ii).
- SHORT LINE RY.: prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1536; neg. (Y. 61, N. 98) 1566 (i).
- SUBSIDIES (LAND) TO RAILWAYS, REP. OF COM. OF WHOLE: M. to conc. (Mr. Dewdney) 4832; Amt. (Mr. Watson) neg. (Y. 48, N. 83) 4834 (ii).
- WAYS AND MEANS, THE TARIFF: prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2584; neg. (Y. 60, N. 97) 3075.
- prop. Res. (Mr. McMullen) reducing Duty on Binding Twine and Crdage, neg. (Y. 44, N. 85) 3776 (ii).
- DIVORCE (Glover, Christiana Filman) B. No. 120 (Mr. McKay). 1^o on a div., 3324; 2^o (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694; in Com. and 3^o on a div., 4026 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 109.)
- DIVORCE (Keefer, Hugh Forbes) B. No. 119 (Mr. Weldon, Albert). 1^o on a div., 3324; 2^o (Y. 64, N. 21) 3694; in Com. and 3^o on a div., 4026 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 108.)
- DIVORCE (Walker, Emily) B. No. 142 (Mr. Brown). 1^o*, 3624; 2^o m., 3694; Amt. (Sir John Thompson) 6 m.h., 3695; agreed to (Y. 70, N. 35) 3702 (ii).
- DOIG, MRS. A. A., CLAIM FOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1486 (i).
- Dom. Elections Act (Chap. 8 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 7 (Mr. Joncas). 1^o, 26; 2^o*, 1220; in Com. and 3^o*, 1221 (i). (53 Vic., c. 9.)
- Dom. Elections Act (Chap. 8 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 38 (Mr. Charlton). 1^o*, 159 (i); 2^o m., 2212; Amt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 6 m. h., 2218; agreed to (Y. 103, N. 60) 2226 (ii).
- PASTURE AND GRAZING LEASES, N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3693 (ii).
- DOM. LANDS ACT: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 3298, 3316.
- CAPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 4155 (ii).
- INCOME: in Com. of Sup., 3659 (ii).
- Dom. Lands. See "PUBLIC LANDS."
- DOM. LICENSE ACT, EXPENSES: Remarks (Mr. Cook) 4906 (ii).
- Dom. Mineral Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. Kirkpatrick). Rule suspended and 1^o of B., 1936; 2^o*, 2208 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 3223 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 99.)
- DOM. POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 494 (i).
- Dom. Safe Deposit Warehousing and Loan Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. Cockburn). 1^o*, 449; 2^o*, 679 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 3323 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 100.)
- Don Improvement (Toronto) B. No. 81 (Mr. Small). 1^o*, 638; 2^o*, 1019 (i).
- DORVAL STATION AND RIVIÈRE DES PRAIRIES RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4824 (ii).
- DRAIN PIPES, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3401.
- DRAWBACK. See "SELF-BINDERS, REAPERS, &C."
- DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1631 (i), 4729 (ii).
- MCGREGOR'S CREEK: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Campbell) 530 (i).
- STR. "PRINCE EDWARD." M. for Stint. (Mr. Perry) 159 (i).
- RIVER THAMES: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. Campbell) 144 (i).
- REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 55 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Campbell) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4894 (ii).
- DRILL HALL, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 883 (i).
- DRILL INSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1320 (i).
- DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4764; in Com., 4889 (ii).
- DUAL LANGUAGE. See "FRENCH LANGUAGE, N.W.T."

- DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAM ROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 68 (i).
 — M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 149 (i).
- DUNVILLE DAM, DAMAGES AT LOOMIS' CREEK: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 2021 (i).
- DUTIES. See "CUSTOMS."
- DUVAR, LIEUT.-COL., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1485 (i).
- DYKE, JOHN, PAYMENTS FOR SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).
- EARLE, THOS., MEMBER FOR VICTORIA, B.C.: Introduced, 2 (i).
- EASTER ADJNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2596, 2671, 2741 (ii).
 — M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2914 (ii).
- EASTERN EXTENSION RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1936 (i).
- EAU CLAIR AND BOW RIVER LUMBER CO. vs. QUEEN, COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 4060 (ii).
- EDUCATION, LEGISLATION re. See "DISALLOWANCE."
- EGGS, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS TO AND FROM ONT. AND QUE.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Guillet*) 3693 (ii).
- Elbow River Water Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 76 (Mr. *Davis*). 1*, 449; 2*, 679 in Com. and 3*, 2338.
- ELECTION, CONTROVERTED. See "HALDIMAND."
- Electoral Franchise. See "FRANCHISE."
- ELECTORAL LISTS FOR DOM., EXPENSES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 83 (i).
- ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX; Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 3291 (ii).
- Engineers Exam. and Licensing provision B. No. 31 (Mr. *Cook*). 1*, 118 (i).
 — See "STEAMBOAT INSPECTIONS ACT."
- ENGLISH PERIODICALS, COST OF MAILING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1856, 1918 (i).
- Erie and Huron Ry. Co.'s B. No. 57 (Mr. *Lister*). 1*, 342; 2*, 531; in Com. and 3*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic., c. 59.*)
 — SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762; in Com., 4874 (ii).
- ESTIMATES, THE, 1890-91: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 149 (i).
 — SUPPL., 1889-90: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 2531 (i).
 — FURTHER SUPPL., 1889-90: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 3955 (ii).
 — SUPPL. 1891: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4479 (ii).
- ESQUIMALT DRY DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1120 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1105 (i).
- FORTIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1485 (i).
- ETHER, SULPHURIC: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3558 (ii).
- EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3647 (ii).
- Exchequer Court Act. See "SUPREME."
- EXCHEQUER COURT, 3RD CLASS CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
- EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 2313 (i), 4120, 4792 (ii).
- EXHIBITION AT JAMAICA: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1201 (i).
- EXODUS OF CANADIANS TO U.S.: prop. M. for Sel. Com.) (Mr. *Charlton*) 403; neg. (Y. 63, N. 94) 447 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. *Carling*) 408; (Mr. *Brien*) 409; (Mr. *Sproule*) 409; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 412; (Mr. *Fisher*) 414; (Mr. *Hesson*) 417; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 419; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 428; (Mr. *Watson*) 431; (Mr. *Davin*) 433; (Mr. *La Rivière*) 433; (Mr. *Freeman*) 434; (Mr. *Dupont*) 439; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 442 (i).
- EXPENDITURE ON RYS., & C., SINCE CONFED.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 69 (i).
- EXPENDITURE, PUBLIC: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1860 (i).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARM, CENTRAL: Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 145 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 715, 2383 (i), 3779, 4795 (ii).
 — REP., PRINTING EXTRA COPIES: Remarks (Mr. *Bergin*) 1792 (i).
- EXPIRING LAWS. See "COMMITTEES."
- EXPRESS SERVICE BETWEEN H. OF C. AND PRINTING BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (ii).
- FABRE, MR., SALARY AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).
- FACTORIES. See "ONT. MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION."
- FANCY WORKBOXES, & C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3244 (ii).
- FEATHERS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3225 (ii).
 — OSTRICH, & C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3402 (ii).
- FERNETVILLE POST OFFICE, CLOSING: M. for Pets., & C. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
- Fertilisers. See "AGRICULTURAL."
- FERTILISERS, AGRICULTURAL: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 1402 (i).
 — ARTIFICIAL, REMOVAL OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1811, 2024 (i).
- FERRO-MANGANESE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3486 (ii).
- FIBRE-WARE, INDURATED, & C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3554 (ii).
- FINANCE:
 AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 90 (i).
 BANK CHARTERS, B.N.A. AND B.C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 255 (i).
 BANKING AND COMMERCE COM. See "COMMITTEES."
 BUDGET, THE: Annual Statement (Mr. *Foster*) 2532 (ii)
 CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 161 (i).
 CHARTERED BANKS IN LIQUIDATION, NAMES, & C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hesson*) 76 (i).
 ESTIMATES, THE. See "ESTIMATES."
 INTEREST ON DEPOSITS, CALCULATING: in Com. of Sup., 3994 (i).
 LOANS AND POPULAR VOTE, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 4589 (ii).
 PAPER CURRENCY GUARANTEE BY GOVT.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Cas v*) 189 (i).
 P.E.I. AND DOM. GOVT., MONEY DRAWN: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 27 (i).
 PIG-IRON AND FISHERY BOUNTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1811 (i).
 PIG-IRON BOUNTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2828, 4221 (ii).
 P. O. SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 29 (i).
 PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM. See "COMMITTEES."
 PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 26 (i).

FINANCE—Continued.

- PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1860 (i).
 RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Carteright*) 83 (i).
 SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS IN DOM.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 29 (i).
 STATISTICAL DIAGRAMS: in Com. of Sup., 4571 (i).
 THREE PER CENT. LOAN OF 1888: Ques. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 27 (i).
 UPPER CANADA BANK: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 100 (i).

[See "Civil Govt." under "SUPPLY."]

- Fire-Arms, &c., Improper use Act** (Chap. 148 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 105** (Mr. *Brown*). 1^o, 2311 (i).
 FIRE-GUARD ALONG RY. TRACKS, N.W.T: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315 (ii).
Fisheries Act (Chap. 95 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 85** (Mr. *Trupper*). 1^o, 722 (i); withdn., 4667 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety B. No. 96 (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*). 1^o*, 1198; 2^o*, 1507 (i); M. for Com., 4440; Amt. (Mr. *Colby*) 6 m. h., 4443; agreed to, 4448 (ii).

FISHERIES:

- BEHRING'S SEA SEAL FISHERIES, NEGOTIATIONS AT WASHINGTON: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 886.
 — Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1201 (i), 4906 (ii).
 — COR.: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 513 (i).
 — NEWSPAPER PAR.: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1509 (i).
 — Telegram read (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1068 (i).
 DUVAR, LIEUT.-COL., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1485 (i).
 FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Joneas*) 85 (i).
 FISHERIES NEGOTIATIONS AT WASHINGTON: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2916, 4930 (ii).
 — Remarks (Mr. *Flynn*) 1021 (i).
 — PAR. IN NEWSPAPER: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 732 (i).
 FISHING BOUNTY. See "PIG-IRON."
 FISHING LICENSES, UNSETTLED RETURNS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lister*) 1065 (i).
 GAUTHIER, W., FISHING LICENSE: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3076 (ii).
 GREER, JAMES, FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3811, 3662 (ii).
 HERRING FISHERY, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: presented (Mr. *Trupper*) 393 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 213 (1).
 — Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 395 (i).
 INSPECTOR FOR P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 55 (i).
 LICENSES TO FISHERMEN IN ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 4169 (ii).
 LOBSTER FACTORIES IN P.E.I.: Remarks on Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 650 (i).
 LOBSTER FISHING REGULATIONS, REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 885 (i).
 MACKEREL FISHING, PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 248 (i).
 "MODUS VIVENDI" AND U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 814 (i).
 — Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3076 (ii).
 — STATEMENTS IN AMERICAN PAPERS: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 532 (i).

FISHERIES—Continued.

- SALMON FISHING WITH NETS: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 4399 (i).
 SMELT FISHING IN MIRAMICHI RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2229 (i).
 TRAWL FISHING IN ST. MARY'S BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2377 (i).
 [See "SUPPLY," "U. S. FISHING VESSELS."]
 FISH-HOOKS, NETS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3585 (ii).
 FISH IN BOND, CUSTOMS' DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 248 (i).
 FLAG'S COVE BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1795 (i).
 FLETCHER, JAS., SERVICES (ENTOMOLOGICAL): in Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).
 FLOATING LIGHT. See "STE. CROIX."
 FLOODS IN LAPRAIRIE: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 884 (i).
 FLOUR AND WHEAT, IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 55 (i).
 — IMPORTS INTO MAR. PROVS. *via* U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2670, 2671 (ii).
 — M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2671 (ii).
 FORBES, W. B., ARREARS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii).
Foreign Labor. See "ALIEN."
 FORREST, LIEUT.-COL.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4564, 4567 (ii).
 FORT COULONGE AND LA PASSE VILLAGE INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE: M. for Reprs. of Engineers* (Mr. *Bryson*) 1065 (i).
Franchise Act (Chap. 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 11** (Mr. *Choquette*). 1^o, 67 (i).
Franchise Act (Chap. 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 44** (Mr. *Barron*). 1^o*, 184 (i); Order for 2^o dschgd. and B. withdn., 3703 (ii).
Franchise Act (Chap. 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. 114** (Mr. *Brien*). 1^o, 1581 (i); 2^o m., 3720; deb. adjd., 3722 (ii).
Franchise Act (Chap. 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 136** (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1^o, 3196; 2^o* and in Com., 3895; 3^o m., 3937; Amt. (Mr. *Brien*) 3938; neg. (Y. 51, N. 87) 3947; Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3949; neg. (Y. 49, N. 83) 3954; 3^o, 3955; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 4663 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
Franchise Act (Chap. 5 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 108** (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1^o, 1348 (i); Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 3720 (ii).
 FRANCHISE ACT AND PROVINCIAL VOTERS' LISTS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1489 (i).
 FRANCHISE ACT, REPEAL: prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Etgin*) 257; M., 1193; neg. (Y. 78, N. 90) 1197. Deb. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 275; (Mr. *Casey*) 284; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 289; (Mr. *Lister*) 294; (Mr. *Edgar*) 298; (Mr. *Curran*) 300; (Mr. *McMullen*) 303; (Mr. *Platt*) 309; (Mr. *Sproule*) 312; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 315; (Mr. *Campbell*) 318; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 321; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 325; (Mr. *Hesson*) 328; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 332; (Mr. *Waldie*) 335; (Mr. *Welsh*) 337; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 337; (Mr. *Watson*) 339; (Mr. *Daly*) 340; (Mr. *Trow*) 1149; (Mr. *Fiset*) 1152; (Mr. *Becharé*) 1154; (Mr. *Brien*) 1158; (Mr. *Dawson*) 1160; (Mr. *Choquette*) 1162; (Mr. *Charl-*

- FRANCHISE ACT, REPEAL—*Continued.*
ton 1166; (Mr. *White, (Renfrew)* 1174; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1176; (Mr. *Foster*) 1180; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1185; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1189; (Mr. *Scemple*) 1191; (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 1193 (i).
- FRÉCHETTE, A. TRANSLATION OF CIRCULARS: in Com. of Sup., 2339 (i).
- FREDERICTON AND PRINCE WILLIAM, N.B., RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
- FREDERICTON, *via* OROMOCTO, AND GAGETOWN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4876 (ii).
- FREE LIST, EXTENSION TO CERTAIN ARTICLES: Ques. (Mr. *Fisher*) 403 (i).
- FREIGHT IN BOND ON AMERICAN VESSELS: M. for O.C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 99 (i).
- French Language in N.W.T. (abolition)**
B. No. 10 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1^o*, 38; 2^o m. and Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 532; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 554; neg. (Y. 63, N. 117) 838; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 877; agreed to (Y. 149, N. 50) 1017 (i).
- Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 545; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 549; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 554; Amt. to Amt., 557 (i).
- Deb. on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Denison*) 557; (Mr. *Mulock*) 576; (Mr. *Gigault*) 589; (Mr. *Curran*) 592; (Mr. *Robillard*) 595; (Mr. *Dawson*) 598; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 600; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 614; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 618; (Mr. *Charlton*) 651; (Mr. *Blake*) 670; (Mr. *McNeill*) 688; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 697; (Mr. *Laurier*) 725; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 745; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 752; (Mr. *Sproule*) 758; (Mr. *Wright*) 761; (Mr. *Landry*) 769; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 780; (Mr. *Dessaint*) 784; (Mr. *Chapleau*) 816; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 838; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 845; (Mr. *Davin*) 874; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 877 (i).
- Deb. on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 887; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 890; (Mr. *Edgar*) 895; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 902; (Mr. *Barron*) 905; (Mr. *Cook*) 918; (Mr. *Bécharde*) 926; (Mr. *Devdney*) 932; (Mr. *Masson*) 936; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 941; (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 949; (Mr. *Amyot*) 963; (Mr. *Charlton*) 970; (Mr. *Holton*) 981; (Mr. *LaRivière*) 983; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 998; (Mr. *Wallace*) 1001; (Mr. *Watson*) 1002; (Mr. *Dupont*) 1006; (Mr. *Sevier*) 1011; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1012; (Mr. *Puterson, Brant*) 1012; (Mr. *Jess*) 1015; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1016; (Mr. *Platt*) 1017 (i).
- FRENCH LANGUAGE IN N.W.T., ORDINANCES, &c., PRINTED IN: M. for Rets. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 83 (i).
 — Remarks (Mr. *McCarthy, &c.*) 160 (i).
 — Explanation (Mr. *Amyot*) *re* Vote, 1069 (i).
 — PETS.: M. to read (Mr. *McCarthy*) 504 (i).
- GARNEAU, JOSEPH, APPOINTMENT AND REMOVAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).
- Gas Inspection Act** (*Chap. 101 Rev. Statutes*)
Amt. B. No. 137 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1^o, 3290; 2^o, 4266; in Com., 4271; 3^o*, 4272 (ii). (53 *Vic., c. 25*.)
- GASPÉ COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Joncas*) 193 (i).
- GAUTHIER, W., FISHING LICENSE: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3076 (ii).
- General Inspection Act** (*Chap. 99 Rev. Statutes*)
Amt. B. No. 117 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1^o*, 1792 (i).
- GEOGRAPHICAL, &c., MAPS AND GLOBES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3243 (ii).
- Geological Survey Dept. B. No. 116** (Mr. *Devdney*). 1^o*, 1792; 2^o, 2099; in Com., 4028; 3^o*, 4033 (i). (53 *Vic., c. 11*.)
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 173, 2124 (i), 4789 (ii).
 — INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFICERS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1713 (i).
 — REPS. PUBLISHED AND SOLD: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 530 (i).
- Glover, Christiana Filman.** See "DIVORCE."
- GLOVES AND MITS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3484 (ii).
- GODERICH AND SIRATHROY P. O., TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 2377 (i).
- Goderich and Wingham Ry. Co.'s B. No. 20** (Mr. *Porter*). 1^o*, 104; 2^o*, 185; in Com. and 3^o*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic., c. 51*.)
- GOPHERS, N.W.T., DESTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).
- GOVTL. EXPENDITURE IN OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1857 (i).
- GOVT. BUSINESS, DELAY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1937; neg. (Y. 57, N. 95) 1950 (i).
- GOVT. BUSINESS: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Thursdays, 1066 (i).
 — M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Wednesdays, 2241 (i).
 — M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Mondays, 3937 (ii).
- GOVT. OF N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 2306 (i).
- GOVT. PRINTING BUREAU. See "PRINTING."
- GOVT. PROPERTY, DAMAGES TO BY STEAMERS, &c., CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cook*) 1488 (i).
- GOVT. STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 4041, 4779 (ii).
 — CARRIAGE OF MERCHANDISE: (Ques.) 504 (i).
 — TENDERS FOR SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1120 (ii).
- GOVERNOR, DEPUTY: Assent to Bills, 2385 (i), 3873 (ii).
- GOV. GEN.'S SEC., Letters to Speaker *re* Royal Assent, 2376 (i), 3810 (ii).
- GOV. GEN.'S SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 168; contingencies, 222 (i).
- GOV. GEN.'S SPECIAL CAR: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).
- GRANDIN, MGR., LETTER OF: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 119.
- Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. No. 80** (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1^o*, 638; 2^o*, 1019; in Com. and 3^o*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic., c. 63*.)
- Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s Ry. B. No. 79** (Mr. *Small*). 1^o*, 638; 2^o*, 1019; in Com. and 3^o*, 1965 (i). (53 *Vic., c. 48*.)

- Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. No. 125** (Mr. *Curran*). M. to suspend Rules, 2178 ; 1^o*, 2184 ; 2^o*, 2338 ; in Com., 3228, 3621 ; 3^o*, 3622 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND STEAM COM. : in Com. of Sup., 1957 (i).
- GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).
- GRAINS AND SEEDS, IMPORTS : prop. Res. (Mr. *Mc Millan, Huron*) 1029 ; neg. (Y. 50, N. 84) 1062 (i). Deb. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1032 ; (Mr. *Roucaud*) 1036 ; (Mr. *Boicell*) 1038 ; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1039 ; (Mr. *Semple*) 1040 ; (Mr. *Platt*) 1042 ; (Mr. *Foster*) 1043 ; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1044 ; (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 1045 ; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1047 ; (Mr. *Trov*) 1048 ; (Gen. *Laurie*) 1048 ; (Mr. *Fisher*) 1049 ; (Mr. *Cargill*) 1052 ; (Mr. *Hesson*) 1053 ; (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1056 ; (Mr. *Bergin*) 1056 ; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1057 ; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1059 ; (Mr. *Watson*) 1060 ; (Mr. *Scriver*) 1061 (i).
- GRAIN TESTER, CHANGES : Ques. (Mr. *Marshall*) 4399.
- GRAVING DOCK. See "ESQUIMALT," "KINGSTON," &c.
- GRAZING AND PASTURE LEASES IN N.W.T. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3693 (ii).
- GREAT EASTERN RY., &c. : M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 142 (i).
- Co.'s BRIDGE SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 ; in Com., 4889 (ii).
- GREAT NORTHERN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2379 (i).
- prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
- Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 106** (Mr. *Small*). 1^o and 2^o*, 1506 ; in Com. and 3^o*, 1823 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- GREEN COVE BREAKWATER, REBUILDING : Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 3154 (ii).
- REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 84 (i).
- GREENLY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3154 (ii).
- GREER, JAMES, LATE FISHERY OVERSEER : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3662, 3811 (ii).
- GROSSE ISLE, QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 3654.
- REGULATIONS : M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 145 (i).
- HALDIMAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 83 (i).
- RETURN OF MEMBER : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1402 (i).
- HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS IN N.W.T. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3309 (ii).
- AND RES. OF LEG. ASSEMBLY, N.W.T. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Laurier*) 100 (i).
- RELIEF OF DISTRESS IN N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 4069 (ii).
- See "BRESAYLOR," "BREMNER," "INDIANS."
- HALIFAX AND NEWFOUNDLAND *via* CAPE BRETON STEAM COM. : in Com. of Sup., 1964, 1970 (i).
- AND ST. JOHN AND W. INDIES AND S. AMERICA STEAM COM. : in Com. of Sup., 1973 (i); conc., 4275 (ii).
- IMMIGRATION AGENT : in Com. of Sup., 2449.
- INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 1920 (i).
- HALL'S HARBOR, N.S., REPS. OF ENGINEERS : M. for copies (Mr. *Borden*) 2031 (i).
- Hamilton Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 66** (Mr. *Brown*). 1^o*, 449 ; 2^o*, 1019 (i).
- HAMMOCKS AND TENNIS NETS, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3401 (ii).
- HARBORS AND RIVERS, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 1568, 4040, 4720 ; conc., 4274 (ii).
- HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS. See "MONTREAL," "QUEBEC" and "TORONTO."
- HATS, FUR, FELT, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3485 (ii).
- HEALTH, ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPT. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Roome*) 1660 (i).
- HEALTH STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 498 (i).
- HELMETS FOR MILITIA : Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 886 (i).
- HERCHMER, L. W. See "Mounted Police."
- Hereford Ry. Co.'s B. No. 51** (Mr. *Brown*). 1^o*, 244 ; 2^o*, 399 ; in Com. and 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- Hereford Ry. Co. and Maine Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 147** (Mr. *Ives*). Rules suspended, 4396 ; 1^o* and 2^o*, 4397 ; M. (Sir *Hector Langerin*) to place on Order Paper, 4499 ; in Com., 4503 ; 3^o*, 4504 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- HERRING FISHING INDUSTRY, REP. OF COMMISSIONERS : presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 393 (i).
- HICKORY SPOKES : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3586 (ii).
- HIGH COMMISSIONER : personal contingencies, 213 (i).
- HILLIKER, MR., CLAIM : Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 402 (i).
- HOLLY, M., INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 4792 (ii).
- Home Benefit Life Association incorp B. No. 63** (Mr. *Small*). 1^o*, 342 ; 2^o*, 531 (i) ; in Com. and 3^o*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- HOMESTEADS IN N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2023 (ii).
- MEMORIALS OF J. HOLDEN AND J. SHERA : M. for copy* (Mr. *Davin*) 1065 (i).
- (SECOND) IN N.W.T. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3298, 3316 (ii).
- HOULD, LÉANDRE, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Ste. Marie*) 4172 (ii).
- HOUSE OF COMMONS : ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH : moved (Mr. *Pope*) 4 (i) ; seconded (Mr. *Prior*) 9 (i).
- HIS EX.'S REPLY, 275 (i).
- ASH WEDNESDAY. See "ADJOURNMENTS."
- BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 2385 (i), 3873, 4938 (ii).
- WITHDRAWN, 4667, 4924 (ii).
- CABINET MINISTERS, REFLECTION ON BY MEMBER : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 2252 (i).
- CHISHOLM, MR., M.P., DECEASED : remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3981 (ii).
- COMPTON, RETURN OF MEMBER : notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- CONTROVERTED ELECTION, HALDIMAND : Judgment of Supreme Court (Mr. *Speaker*) read 83 (i).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL, ACCOMMODATION FOR STAFF : remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 2723 (ii).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL. See "COMMITTEES."

HOUSE OF COMMONS—Continued.

- GOVT. BUSINESS: Ms. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Thursday, 1066 (i).
 — to take in Wednesdays, 2241 (i).
 — to take in Mondays, 3937 (ii).
 HALDIMAND, RETURN OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1402 (i).
 HUDSPETH, MR., DECEASED: remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4831 (ii).
 INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS AND SENATORS, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Labrosse*) 4907 (ii).
 INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, MESS. FROM HIS EX.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 32 (i).
 KENT, N.B., REPRESENTATION: Issue of Writ (Mr. *Speaker*) 3722 (ii).
 — VACANCY: remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3591 (ii).
 LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR, RESIGNATION TENDERED, 4355.
 — See general heading.
 MEMBERS, IMPERFECT HEARING: remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3873 (ii).
 MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 184, 1403 (i), 4397, 4457 (ii).
 MEMBERS, NEW, 1, 1402 (i), 4457 (ii).
 MESS. FROM HIS EX.: 31, 149, 275, 393 (i), 2531, 3955, 4479 (ii).
 OTTAWA, RETURN OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 4448 (ii).
 PARLIAMENT: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 4935 (ii).
 PERLEY, MR., M.P., DECEASED: remarks, 2739 (ii).
 PRIEUR, ARTHUR, EMPLOYMENT BY HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Neveu*) 2022, 2185 (i).
 PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION AND SENATE: remarks, 2312 (i).
 PRIVATE BILLS. See general heading.
 PRIVILEGE. See "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE" and "PROCEDURE."
 PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: Rep. of Com. presented (Mr. *Girouard*) 4397 (ii).
 — See "LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR."
 RICHELIEU, RETURN OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
 ROYAL ASSENT: communications from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2376 (i), 3810 (ii).
 SESSIONAL INDEMNITY, ABSENT MEMBERS: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 4935 (ii).
 SHAWINIGAN SENATORIAL DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 27 (i).
 SPEAKER, DEPUTY, AND CHAIRMAN OF COMS.: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 22 (i).
 — SALARY: conc., 4273 (ii).
 SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: reported (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
 STANSTEAD, RETURN OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
 STATIONERY AND CONTINGENCIES OF SENATE: M. (Mr. *Rykert*) 883 (i).
 — Res. of Senate read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1341 (i).
 TASSÉ, ELIE, AND L. D. DUVERNAVY, EMPLOYMENT BY HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4026 (ii).
 VACANCIES: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i), 3439, 3722 (ii).
 VICTORIA, B.C., RETURN OF MEMBER: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
 WOOD, JOHN FISHER: appointment as Dep. Speaker, &c., 32 (i).
 [See "SPEAKER, MR.," and "LEGISLATION," under "SUPPLY."]
 HUDSPETH, MR., M.P., DECEASED: remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4831 (ii).

- HULL, RELIGIOUS DISTURBANCES: remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 303, 506 (i).
 "HUNGRY BAY" DAM, ENGINEER'S REPS., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3319 (ii).
 HURRELL'S AND VALIQUETTE'S PENSIONS: remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 2258 (i).
 HURRELL'S MILITIA PENSION: Ques., and M. for Ret., 2378 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1267 (i).
 — Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2312 (i).
 HYDRAULIC RENTS, NAMES OF PARTIES IN ARREARS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 1065 (i).
 IMMIGRATION. See "AGRICULTURE," "SUPPLY."
 IMPERIAL FEDERATION ASSOCIATION AND C. SERVANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 886.
 Imperial Trusts Co. of Can. incorp. Act
 Amt. B. No. 37 (Mr. *Hudspeth*). 1°*, 159; 2°*, 273 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3228 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 101.)
 IMPORTS AND EXPORTS. See "CUSTOMS."
 INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS AND SENATORS, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Labrosse*) 4907 (ii).
 Independence of Parliament B. No. 12 (Mr. *Casgrain*). 1°, 67; 2°, 2208 (i).
 Indian Act (Chap. 43 *Rev. Statutes*) Amt. B. No. 153 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°—; 2°, 4903, in Com., 4904; 3°*, 4905 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
 Indian Advancement Act (Chap. 44, *Rev. Statutes*) Amt. B. No. 132 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 3151; 2° m., 3604; 2°, 3624; in Com., 3625, 4033; 3°*, 4034 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
 Indian Advancement Act (Chap. 44 *Rev. Statutes*) Amt. B. No. 42 (Mr. *Doyon*). 1°, 184; Order for 2° read, 1507 (i); 2° m., 2718; deb. adjd., 2739 (ii).
 INDIANS:
 BLACKFEET INDIANS, CAPTURE OF WHITE GIRL: remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 815 (i).
 BREMNER FCRS, EVIDENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4449 (ii).
 — PAYMENT: remarks (Mr. *Troie*) 4931 (ii).
 — REP. OF SEL. COM.: presented (Mr. *McNeill*) 3810 (ii).
 — M. to conc. in Rep. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4732 (ii).
 BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) for Sel. Com., 1358, 1398 (i).
 CAPE CROCKER INDIANS, ANNUITY PER HEAD: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 505 (i).
 CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN RESERVE, QUARRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 85, 247 (i).
 — AGENT'S LETTER TO COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1797 (i).
 — COST OF SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 247 (i).
 — ENGAGEMENT FOR CIRCUS: Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1654 (i).
 — CLAIMS FOR INDEMNITY, COR., &c.: M. for Stmtnt. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1703 (i).
 — MONEYS BELONGING TO: M. for Stmtnt. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1711 (i).
 — SURVEYOR'S REP. (Mr. *Doyon*) 1069 (i).
 CHRISTIAN ISLAND INDIANS, DISTRESS; remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 4926 (ii).
 DINGMAN, INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: Stmtnt. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 2160 (i).

INDIANS—Continued.

- HALF-BREED'S CLAIMS AND RES. OF LEG. ASSEMBLY, N.W.T. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Laurier*) 100 (i).
 — prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3309 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 2151, 2443 (i), 4052, 4787 (ii).
 LIQUORS, SELLING TO INDIANS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 29 (i).
 LUCAS, S. B., INDIAN AGENT, N.W.T., CHARGES AGAINST : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3319 (ii).
 MICMAC INDIANS, SPEARING SALMON; remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 4926 (ii).
 MISSISSAUGA INDIANS, CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. *Madill*) 1656 (i).
 RESERVES IN MAN. : M. for List (Mr. *La Rivière*) 514.
 [See "SUPPLY."]
 INDIA RUBBER BOOTS, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3485 (ii).

Industrial Designs. See "TRADE MARKS."

- Inland Revenue (Chap. 34 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 133 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 3151; 2°, 3626; in Com., 3627; 3°, 3633 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 23.)

INLAND REVENUE :

- CULLERS' OFFICE, QUEBEC, SUPERANNUATION : M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).
 DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 26 (i).
 HYDRAULIC RENTS, NAMES OF PARTIES IN ARREARS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 1065 (i).
 LEATHER INSPECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Waldie*) 2258 (i).
 SALT MANUFACTURERS, PROSECUTION : Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 1654 (i).
 TOBACCO SALES AND INLAND REVENUE ACT AMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Small*) 85 (i).
 TOBACCO SEIZURES IN N. W. T. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4171 (ii).
 WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTION FEES : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1121 (i).
 [See "COLLECTION OF REVENUES," under "SUPPLY."]
 INSOLVENCY, LEGISLATION RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 1122 (i).

Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. No. 117 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 1792 (i).

- INSURANCE, SUPERINTENDENCE : in Com. of Sup., 2124 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY :

- I.C.R. and P.E.I. RY. WORKSHOPS, PETS. re INCREASE OF WAGES : M. for copies (Mr. *Davies*) 1711 (i).
 AMENDED FREIGHT RATES : Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2379, 3078 (ii).
 BRANCH LINES : remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4595 (ii).
 CASUALTIES, &c., AND COMPENSATION ALLOWED : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1065 (i).
 DERBY BRANCH, SWITCH AT BYRANTON : Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 187 (i).
 ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX : Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 5291 (ii).
 EMPLOYÉS' INSURANCE SCHEME : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1710 (i).
 FREIGHT RATES ON COAL : Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1796 (i), 4503 (ii).
 — ON FLOUR : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 248 (i).
 — ON PIG IRON : Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2828.
 — ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX : Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2024 (i).
 HARVEY BRANCH. See "SHORT LINE."
 MATANE BRANCH. See general heading.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—Continued.

- PASSENGER AND MAIL SERVICE : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 146 (i).
 OFFICIAL CARS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1710 (i).
 PAYMENT OF EMPLOYÉS : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1357 (i).
 PETS. OF N. AND A. OUELLET, G. VOYER, F. COTÉ, &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Fiset*) 1713 (i).
 RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 66, 1357 (i).
 ST. JEAN CHRYSOSTOME SIDING : M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Guay*) 530 (i).
 STEEL RAILS, PURCHASE : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2021 (i).
 TENDERS FOR SUPPLIES : Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1796 (i).
 PROPERTY SOLD FOR EXTENSION OF STATION AT LÉVIS : M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Guay*) 531 (i).

[See "RYS." under "SUPPLY."]

Interest Act (Chap. 127 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 140 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 3624; 2°, 4266; in Com., 4414, 4924; 3°, 4924. (53 Vic., c. 34.)

INTERIOR :

- ALASKA AND CANADA BOUNDARY LINE : Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 188 (i).
 COLONISATION COMPANIES AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR : M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
 DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 33 (i), 2739.
 DOIG, MRS. A. A., CLAIM FOR IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1486 (i).
 DOM. LANDS ACT AMT. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3298, 3316 (ii).
 EXTRA CLERKS IN DEPT. : Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 2826 (ii).
 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFICERS : M. for copies* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1713 (i).
 — REPS. PUBLISHED AND SOLD : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 53 (i).
 GRAZING AND PASTURE LEASES IN N.W.T. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3693 (ii).
 HOMESTEADS IN N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2023 (i).
 — MEMORIALS OF J. HOLDEN AND J. SHERA : M. for copy* (Mr. *Davin*) 1065 (i).
 — SECOND : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3298, 3316 (ii).
 IRRIGATION IN N.W.T. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3292.
 LANDS CLAIMED UNDER MAN. ACT : prop. M. withdn. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 514 (i).
 MCGIRR, WILLIAM, TRAVELLING EXPENSES : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lester*) 1065 (i).
 PRINCE ALBERT SETTLERS CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. *Macdovall*) 2668 (ii).
 RANGES IN N.W.T., APPLICATIONS, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Trow*) 1698 (i).
 RONDEAU POINT, GOVT. LANDS : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2022 (i).
 SASKATCHEWAN COLONISATION CO. AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
 SCHOOL LANDS IN MAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 145 (i).
 SETTLERS ON RY. RESERVE, B.C. : M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 137 (i).
 STEPHENSON, MR. R., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 92 (i).
 SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 140, 2186 (i).
 SURVEYS IN N.W.T., COST PER ACRE : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 402 (i).

INTERIOR—Continued.

- TEMPERANCE COLONISATION CO. AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR : M. for Cor., &c. * (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
 — on M. for Com. of Ways and Means: remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4907 (ii).
 TIMBER LIMITS: enquiry for Rets. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2674 (ii).
 — remarks (Mr. *Hickey*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4545 (ii).
 — See "LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR."
 UNIVERSITY FOR N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315 (ii).
 [See "CIVIL GOVT.," &c., under "SUPPLY."]
 INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 32 (i).
 International Ry. and Bridge Co. See "ST. LAWRENCE."
 Interpretation Act Amt. B. No. 130 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2825; 2°, 3155; in Com., 3157, 3600; 3°, 3604 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
 INTERPRETER, IMMIGRATION, WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 2471 (i).
 Interprovincial Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*). 1°, 273; 2°, 531; in Com. and 3°, 1506 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
 — See "FORT COULONGE."
 INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4880 (ii).
 Inverness Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 100 (Mr. *Small*). 1°, 1066; 2°, 1355 (i).
 IRON OR STEEL, WROUGHT, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3498 (ii).
 IRON, WROUGHT SCRAP, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3558 (ii).
 — See "PIG IRON."
 IROQUOIS LOCKMASTER, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3077 (ii).
 IRRIGATION IN N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3292 (ii).
 ISLE AUX NOIX WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1357.
 JACQUES CARTIER UNION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
 JAMAICA AND CANADA, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1199 (i).
 JAMAICA EXHIBITION, CAN. REPRESENTATION: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
 JELLIES, JAMS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3498 (ii).
 JESUITS' ESTATES ACT, REPS. AND OPINIONS OF LAW OFFICERS OF THE CROWN: M. for copies (Mr. *O'Brien*) 95 (i).
 — RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 189 (i).
 — RET.: enquiry (Mr. *Charlton*) 2029 (i).
 — prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4173; neg. (Y. 32, N. 130) 4252 (ii).
 Deb.: (Sir *John Thompson*) 4192; (Mr. *Blake*) 4210; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 4222; (Mr. *Laurier*) 4226; (Mr. *Davin*) 4228; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4236; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 4242; (Mr. *Casey*) 4243; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 4248; (Mr. *Fisher*) 4248; (Mr. *Mulock*) 4249 (ii).

JUSTICE:

- ADVISORY COUNCIL, N.W.T. RESIGNATION: M. for O.C.'s, &c. * (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 104 (i).
 CALVIE, LEGAL SERVICE *re* PROSECUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Béchar*) 4399 (ii).
 DISALLOWANCE MAN. MUNICIPAL ACT: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*) 2377 (i).
 — PROVINCIAL BILLS SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 28 (i).
 — POWER OF: Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4084 (ii).
 DOM. POLICE, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 33 (i).
 JUDGE'S RESIDENCE IN MONTMAGNY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2021 (i).
 — SAGUENAY DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 3292.
 JUNIOR JUDGE, ESSEX CO., APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 563 (i).
 LEBOURDAIS BROS., CASE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 187 (i).
 LEGAL SERVICES, AMOUNTS PAID FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 245 (i).
 — PETERBOROUGH FIRMS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1199, 1356, 1484 (i).
 — PAYMENTS FOR: Ques. and M. for Ret. (Mr. *Douyon*) 3292 (ii).
 MOREAU, ELIE, ACCOUNT *re* QUEEN *vs.* BOUCHER: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1657 (ii).
 PAUL, PETER, EXPENSES OF TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 505 (i).
 PENITENTIARIES BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 168 (i).
 QUEEN'S COUNSEL, APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1486.
 — on M. for Com. of Sup., prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) 2099 (i).
 REGISTRY OFFICES, N. W. T., RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1065 (i).
 SMITH, LATE MR. JUSTICE, N.S., LEAVE OF ABSENCE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1681 (i).
 STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, FLOODING PRISONERS: Ques. (Mr. *Laverne*) 1120 (i), 2826 (ii).
 SUPREME COURT, N.S., APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 885 (i).
 THREATS, INTIMIDATIONS, &c., PROP. LEG.: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1857 (i).
 VICE-ADMIRALTY COURTS (QUE., N. S. AND N. B.) CASES ENTERED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1065 (i).
 VOLLET, ROBT., EXPENSES OF TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 27 (i).
 [See "PENITENTIARIES" and "SUPPLY."]
 KAMOURASKA WHARF, ACCOUNTS *re* BUILDING: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 97 (i).
 Keefer, Hugh Forbes. See "DIVORCE."
 KENT, N.B., REPRESENTATION, VACANCY: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3591 (ii).
 — Issue of Writ (Mr. *Speaker*) 3722 (ii).
 KETTLE CREEK, ST. THOMAS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 153 (i).
 KING, MAJOR R. S., ESTATE: in Com. of Sup., 4012, 4156, 4898 (ii).
 KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1097 (i).
 Kingston, Napanee and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. *Bell*) 1°, 833; 2°, 1020 (i); in Com. and 3°, 3227 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 62.)

- KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4875 (ii).
- Kootenay Ry. Co.** See "SOUTH" and "WEST."
- LABOR CONGRESS (PARIS) PREPARATION OF REP. : in Com. of Sup., 4815, 4901 (ii).
- LABOR IN CANADA. See "ALIEN CONTRACT," &c.
- LEGISLATION RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3661 (ii).
- Labor Statistics provision B. No. 148** (Mr. *Chapleau*). Res. prop., 4590; in Com., 4836; ref. to Com. on B., 4837; 1° of B., 4398; 2°, 4835; in Com., 4838; 3*, 4846. (53 *Vic.*, c. 15.)
- LACHINE CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 2275, 2288 (i), 4653 (ii).
- LAC SEUL RY. CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4689 (ii).
- LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 (ii).
- Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 61** (Mr. *Taylor*). 1*, 342; 2*, 531; in Com. and 3*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4825; in Com., 4919 (ii).
- LAKE OF TWO MOUNTAINS INDIANS, REMOVAL TO GIBSON; in Com. of Sup., 2156 (i).
- LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONISATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
- LAND DAMAGES IN YAMASKA COUNTY : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 530 (i).
- Lands, Dom.** See "PUBLIC LANDS."
- See "DOM." "INTERIOR," "N.W.T.," &c.
- LAND SLIDE AT QUEBEC : M. for O. C. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 63 (i).
- LANDS CLAIMED UNDER MAN. ACT : prop. M. withdn. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 514 (i).
- LANDS IN C. P. R. BELT, EXAMINATION : in Com. of Sup., 4067.
- LA PASSE VILLAGE AND FORT COULONGE INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE : M. for Reps., of Engineers* (Mr. *Bryson*) 1065 (i).
- LARD, TRIED, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3498 (ii).
- LAURIE, GEN., MILEAGE : Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3198 (ii).
- in Com., of Sup., 4003 (ii).
- prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4644 (ii).
- LEATHER-BOARD, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3500 (ii).
- MOROCCO SKINS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3500 (ii).
- INSPECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Waldie*) 2258 (i).
- See "INSPECTION ACT."
- LEBOURDAIS BROS., CASE OF : Ques. (Mr. *Caugrain*) 187 (i).
- LE DICTIONNAIRE GÉNÉALOGIQUE DE FAMILLES CANADIENNES : in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
- LESUEUR, P., DUAL SALARY : Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 400, 504 (i).
- LEGAL SERVICES, AMOUNTS PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 245 (i).
- PAYMENT FOR : Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 3292 (ii).
- PETERBOROUGH FIRMS : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1199, 1356, 1484 (i).
- LEGISLATION : in Com. of Sup., 700, 1957 (i), 3874 (ii).
- LÉPINE, L. P., APPT. AS SUPT. OF GOVT. WORKS : M. for Cor. &c. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 66 (i).
- "LES BOURGEOIS DU NORD-OUEST" : in Com. of Sup., 4791 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1304 (i).
- "LE VIEUX LACHINE" : in Com. of Sup., 4791 (ii).
- LÉVIS, P. O., ERECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 506 (i).
- LIBRARIAN, SUPREME COURT : in Com. of Sup., 479 (i).
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT COM. : M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 31 (i).
- SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 713 (i).
- LICENSES TO FISHERMEN IN ST. LAWRENCE : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 4569 (ii).
- LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR : Ques. of Priv. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 449 (i).
- Documents, presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 795, 1652 (i).
- (Mr. *Rykert*) 1657 (i).
- LETTERS, BOOKS, &c., re INVESTIGATION : M. (Mr. *Girouard*) 2185 (i).
- SENATOR MACPHERSON : M. to summon (Mr. *Girouard*) 2311 (i).
- Resignation Tendered, 4355 (ii).
- EX-MEMBER FOR : M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 4730 (ii).
- REPRESENTATION : Issue of Writ (Mr. *Speaker*) 4396 (ii).
- prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) re Timber Limits, 1713 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. *Rykert*) 1733; M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. deb., 1746; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1749; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1759; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1762; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1767; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1770 (i); (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1771; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1777; (Mr. *Macdonald*) 1778; (Mr. *Beryin*) 1779; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1785; (Mr. *Hickey*) 1787; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 1788; agreed to (Y. 94, N. 72) 1790 (i).
- Deb. rsmd. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2051, Amt., 2055; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2055; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2059; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 2064; (Mr. *Casey*) 2068; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2072; (Mr. *Amyot*) 2073; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2075; (Mr. *Girouard*) 2078; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 2079; (Mr. *Colby*) 2084; (Mr. *Blake*) 2087; (Sir *John Thompson*) 2093; Amt. agreed to, 2097 (i).
- Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 21** (Mr. *Hudspeth*). 1*, 104; 2*, 186; in Com. and 3*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 (ii).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT (1883) COST OF ENFORCEMENT, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cook*) 1713 (i).
- COSTS OF PROSECUTIONS AND FINES : in Com. of Sup., 4121, 4255 (ii).

- LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. Kirk) 94 (i).
- LIVERPOOL OR LONDON AND ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup. 1958 (i).
- LOAD LINE. See "SHIPPING."
- LOANS AND POPULAR VOTE, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 4589 (ii).
- Lord's Day Observance B. No. 110 (Mr. Charlton). 1^o*, 1792 (i).
- LOBSTER FACTORIES IN P.E.I.: Remarks on Ret. (Mr. Perry) 650 (i).
- FISHING REGULATIONS, REVISION: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 885 (i).
- LOGS, EXPORT DUTY: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 884 (i).
- LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 156 (i).
- LOVELY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, ONT.: Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 2670 (ii).
- LOTBINIÈRE COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 85 (i).
- M. for Pets., Cor., &c. (Mr. Rinfret) 1680 (i).
- Louisburg and Richmond Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 101 (Mr. Small). 1^o*, 1066; 2^o*, 355 (i).
- LOWER TRAVERSE RIVER, PIER AND LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 2019 (i).
- LOYALTY TO HER MAJESTY: prop. Address (Mr. Mulock) 96, 123 (i); agreed to (Y. 161, N. 0) 136.
- LUCAS, S. B., INDIAN AGENT, N. W. T., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3319 (ii).
- LUMBER DUTIES: Remarks (Mr. Charlton) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. Bryson) 4662 (ii).
- AND MCKINLEY TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. Charlton) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).
- TIMBER, PLANKS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3585 (ii).
- LUNDY'S LANE, PROTECTION OF CEMETERY: prop. Res. (Mr. Ferguson, Welland) 1798 (i).
- MACDONALD, G. L., EXHIBIT OF STONE, PHIL. EX.: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
- MACHINERY, DUTY ON MANUFACTURING: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2670 (ii).
- MINING, FREE IMPORTATION: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 562 (i).
- prop. Res. (Mr. Platt) 1125; Amt. (Mr. Mara) agreed to (Y. 100, N. 77) 1144 (ii).
- MACKINTOSH, C. H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR OTTAWA: Introduced, 4457 (ii).
- MAÇKEREEL FISHING, PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. McIntyre) 248 (i).
- MCGIRR, WILLIAM, TRAVELLING EXPENSES; M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lister) 1065 (i).
- MCGREGOR'S CREEK, DREDGING, PILING, &c.: M. for Ret.s. (Mr. Campbell) 530 (i).
- MCKINACK RIVER WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Ste. Marie) 4172 (ii).
- MCKINLEY TARIFF. See "LUMBER DUTIES."
- MCLAGGAN, CUSTOMS OFFICER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 4500 (ii).
- MAGDALEN ISLANDS STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).
- MAHONE BAY LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 885 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE. See "POST OFFICE."
- MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1961 (i), 4773; conc., 4915 (ii).
- Maine Central Ry. See "HEREFORD RY. CO."
- MALT, REBATE OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. Landerkin) 516 (i).
- Manitoba and North-Western Ry. Co. of Canada B. No. 50 (Mr. Wallace). 1^o*, 244; 2^o*, 353; in Com. and 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 Vic., c. 78.)
- Manitoba and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 90 (Mr. LaRivière). 1^o*, 794; 2^o*, 1020; in Com. and 3^o*, 1654 (i). (53 Vic., c. 77.)
- MANITOBA AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Dewdney) 4825; in Com., 4919 (ii).
- MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4762; in Com., 4874 (ii).
- MAPLE HILL P. O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 27 (i).
- Marriage. See "DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER."
- MAYBEE, MISS, DISMISSAL FROM QUEBEC P. O.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Charlton) 2186 (i).
- MARINE:
- ALBERTON LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 1657 (i).
- "BAL TIC" STEAMER, ALLEGED OUTRAGE: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 186, 1858 (i); remarks, 3079, 4028 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. McNeill) 4027; remarks, 4663 (ii).
- "BRIDGEWATER," SHIP, SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 243 (i).
- BUOYS IN ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 2185 (i).
- DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. Colby) 1020 (i).
- GOVT. STEAMERS, CARRIAGE OF PRIVATE MERCHANDISE: Ques., 504 (i).
- TENDERS FOR SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 1120 (i).
- GREENLY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 3154 (ii).
- LOVELY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, ONT.: Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 2670 (ii).
- MAHONE BAY, LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Eisenhauer) 885 (i).
- MARINE HOSPITAL, QUEBEC: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 66 (i).
- EXPENDITURE, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 75 (i).
- MARINE HOSPITAL, SACKVILLE, ORIGINAL COST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1713 (i).
- MONTREAL HARBOR POLICE, GRATUITIES: Ques. (Mr. Curran) 92 (i).
- NEWFOUNDLAND HARBOR FEES: remarks (Gen. Laurie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4893 (ii).
- "QUINTÉ" STR., REPS., EVIDENCE, &c., re LOSS: M. for copies (Mr. Platt) 149 (i).
- "ROBERTS," E. K., AMERICAN TUG: Ques. (Mr. Cook) 3291 (ii).
- "ROOTH" TUG, SEIZURE, PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Charlton) 1698 (i).
- SAWDUST IN OTTAWA RIVER, SANDFORD FLEMING'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. Landerkin) 1065 (i).
- SAWDUST IN RIVERS: remarks (Mr. Eisenhauer) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4094 (ii).

MARINE—Continued.

- SHIPPING, CANADIAN IMP., Legislation respecting : remarks (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2381 (i).
 SICK MARINERS' FUND : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flynn*) 519 (i).
 STE. CROIX FLOATING LIGHT : Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2021.
 — M. for Pets., Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2207 (i).
 STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT : remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 4924 (ii).
 TIDAL OBSERVATIONS IN GULF AND ON ATLANTIC COAST : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 527 (i).
 VESSELS LOST IN GULF AND ON ATLANTIC COAST : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 527 (i).
 YAMACHICHE, FLOATING LIGHT OPPOSITE : M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1702 (i).
 ST. ROCH'S TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 1656 (i).
 — KEEPER : Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 2826 (ii).

[See "SUPPLY, &c."]

MANITOBA :

- BLAKE, CONVICT, EXPENSE OF TRANSFER TO ENG. : in Com. of Sup., 3999 (ii).
 BRANDON BRANCH LINE : prop. Res. (Mr. *Devdney*) 4589 (ii).
 GLENBOROUGH BRANCH LINE, LAND SUBSIDY : prop. Res., 4589 ; in Com., 4668 (ii).
 INDIAN RESERVES IN MAN. : M. for List (Mr. *LaRivière*) 514 (i).
 LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Devdney*) 4825 ; in Com., 4919 (ii).
 LANDS CLAIMED UNDER MAN. ACT : prop. M. withdn. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 514 (i).
 MANITOBA SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Devdney*) 4825 ; in Com., 4919 (ii).
 MUNICIPAL ACT, DISALLOWANCE : Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 2377 (i).
 SCHOOL LANDS IN MAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 145 (i).
 STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, CORPORAL PUNISHMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Laverne*) 1120 (i), 2826 (ii).

[See "SUPPLY," &c.]

- MARITIME PROVINCES MAILS, DELAY : Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) 1582 (i).
 MASKINONGÉ AND NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 ; in Com., 4890 (ii).
 MASSÉ, JOS. AIMÉ, ESQ., MEMBER FOR RICHELIEU : Introduced, 184 (i).
 MATANE BRANCH LINE RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 561 (i).
 — BUILDING : M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Fiset*) 3693.
 MAYBEE, MISS, DISMISSAL FROM P. O. AT QUEBEC : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2187 (i).
May, Samuel, Relief B. No. 16 (Mr. *Denison*).
 1^o, 86 ; 2^o*, 1019 ; in Com., and 3^o*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic., c.* 106).
 MEGANTIC COUNTY MAIL SERVICE, CHANGE : M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1147 (i).
 MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 184, 1403 (i), 4457 (ii).
 — IMPERFECT HEARING OF : Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3878 (ii).
 — NEW : notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 1402 (i).
 — OF PARLT., LIST OF, v.
 MERCHANTS' SHIPPING ACT, IMP. LEGISLATION : remarks (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2381 (i).

MESS. FROM HIS EXCELLENCY :

- ADDRESS IN ANS. TO SPEECH FROM THRONE : His Ex.'s reply, 275 (i).
 ESTIMATES, THE, 1890-91 : presented (Mr. *Foster*) 149.
 — SUPPL., 1889-90 : presented (Mr. *Foster*) 2532 (ii).
 — FURTHER, 1889-90 : presented (Mr. *Foster*) 2955.
 — SUPPL., 1890-91 : presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4479 (ii).
 HERRING FISHERY COMMISSIONERS' REP. : presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 393 (i).
 INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION : presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 31 (i).
 METHYLATED SPIRITS, SUPPLY TO MANUFACTORIES : in Com. of Sup., 2341 (i).
 MICMAC INDIANS, SPEARING SALMON : Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 4926 (ii).
 MIDDLETON, MAJ.-GEN., BREMNER FURS, PAYMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4927 (ii).
 — Sec "BREMNER FURS."
 MILEAGE, GEN. LAURIE'S : prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 4644 ; neg., 4649 (ii).
Militia Act (Chap. 41 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 145 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1^o, 4168 (ii).
 MILITIA :
 "A" BATTERY, KINGSTON, OFFICERS' QUARTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1358 (i).
 A. D. C., APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2669 (ii).
 CANTEENS AT FREDERICTON CAMP : remarks (Mr. *Gillmor*) 3078 (ii).
 CAVALRY SCHOOL, QUE., OFFICERS' PROMOTION : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 3291 (ii).
 CLOTHING SUPPLIES, TENDERS FOR : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3811 (ii).
 DEFENCES IN B. C., COR. WITH IMP. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1199 (i).
 DEPTL. SECRETARY, APPOINTMENT : Ques. Mr. *Lister*) 2670 (ii).
 ESQUIMALT FORTIFICATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1485 (i).
 FORREST, LIEUT.-COL. : remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.L.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4564, 4567 (ii).
 HELMETS FOR MILITIA : Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 886 (i).
 HURRELL'S MILITIA PENSION : in Com. of Sup., 1267.
 — Ques., &c. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2378 (i).
 — remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2312 (i).
 LUNDY'S LANE, PROTECTION OF CEMETERY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1798 (i).
 MIDDLETON, MAJ.-GENL., BREMNER FURS, PAYMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4927 (ii).
 MILITARY COLLEGE, BOARD OF VISITORS : Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 245 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 3662 (ii).
 — INSPECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 4026 (ii).
 — STUDENTS' MARKS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Platt*) 1025, 1064 (i).
 — PROP. CHANGES : Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 3662 (ii).
 — DISTRICT NO. 1, OFFICERS PAY, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Scriver*) 3319 (ii).
 — PROPERTIES, &c. CARE AND MAINTENANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1335 (i).
 MONCTON, MILITIA CAMP GROUNDS : remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 4926 (ii).
 PORTNEUF (61ST) BATTALION : Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 245 (i).
 POWELL, COL. WALKER, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 582 (i).
 PROMOTIONS AND CHANGES IN DEPT. : M. for O.C.'s* (Mr. *Lister*) 3693 (ii).
 VALIQUETTE AND COL. HUGHES : remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 3591 (ii).

MILITIA—Continued.

- VALIQUETTE'S AND HURRELL'S PENSIONS: remarks (Mr. Mulock) 2258 (i).
- VALIQUETTE'S PENSION: remarks (Sir Adolphe Caron) 2311 (i).
- VOLUNTEER'S SCRIP: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1485 (i).
- [See "SUPPLY," "BREMNER FURS," &c.]
- MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 122 (i), 3077 (ii).
- (LITTLE) SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 2022 (i).
- MISSISSAUGA INDIANS, CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Madill) 1656 (i).
- MINISTERS' SALARIES AND EXPENSES: M. for Rets. (Mr. McMullen) 70, 101 (i).
- MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 3658, 4113, 4790 (ii).
- Modus Vivendi.** See "FISHERIES," and "U. S. FISHING VESSELS."
- Moncton and Prince Edward Ry. and Ferry Co.'s B. No. 64** (Mr. Landry). 1^o*, 342; 2^o*, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1506 (i). (53 Vic., c. 75.)
- MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).
- MONEYS PAID FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES. See "LEGAL SERVICES."
- MILITIA CAMP GROUNDS: remarks (Mr. Mitchell) 4926 (ii).
- MONTAGUE, WALTER H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALDIMAND: Introduced, 1403 (i).
- MONTCALM COUNTY EXPLORATORY SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 186 (i).
- MONTREAL AND EUROPEAN SHORT LINE RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
- AND LAKE MASKINONGÉ RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4764 (ii).
- Montreal and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59** (Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil). 2^o*, 342; 2^o*, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1355 (i). (53 Vic., c. 58.)
- SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4762; in Com., 4848 (ii).
- AND SOREL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4764; in Com., 4883.
- Montreal and Western Ry. Co. and the C.P.R. Co.'s B. No. 82** (Mr. Desjardins). 1^o*, 638; 2^o*, 1019; in Com. and 3^o*, 1610 (i). (53 Vic., c. 67.)
- SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4763; in Com., 4876 (ii).
- Montreal Bridge and Terminus Co.'s incorp. B. No. 97** (Mr. Langelier, Quebec). 1^o*, 1019; 2^o, 1506 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 3227 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 93.)
- COURT HOUSE, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. Curran) 2188 (i).
- HARBOR COMMISSION, ABOLITION: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 401 (i).
- HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Beau-soleil) 884 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Curran) 3077 (ii).
- HARBOR POLICE, GRATUITIES: Ques. (Mr. Curran) 92 (i).
- P. O. DROP BOXES: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3512.

- MONUMENTS, ERECTION OF TWO: in Com. of Sup., 4651.
- MOREAU, ELIE, ACCOUNT *re* QUEEN *vs* BOUCHER: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 1657, 1797 (ii).
- MOUNTED POLICE, COMMISSIONER HERCHMER'S MANAGEMENT: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Davin) 2674; neg. (Y. 53, N. 76) 3367 (ii).
- Deb. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2685; (Mr. Laurier) 2687; (Mr. Macdowall) 2689; (Mr. Watson) Amt., 2690; (Mr. Kirkpatrick) 2690; (Mr. Mulock) 2692; (Mr. Blake) 2695; (Mr. Daly) 2697; deb. rsm'd. (Mr. Davin) 3332; (Mr. Macdowall) 3339; (Mr. Devdney) 3340; (Mr. Somerville) 3342; (Mr. Fisher) 3349; (Gen. Laurie) 3350; (Sir John A. Macdonald) 3352; (Mr. Fisher) 3355; (Mr. Laurier) 3355; (Mr. Watson) 3357; (Mr. Daly) 3358; (Mr. Mulock) 3361 (i).
- CONTINGENCIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 3319.
- RES. LEG. ASSEMBLY: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1485 (i).
- COMMISSIONER WHITE'S REP.: presented (Sir John Macdonald) 2050 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 2345 (i); suppl., 4053 (ii).
- prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) for Sel. Com., 1503.
- Mount Forest, Markdale and Meaford Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 46** (Mr. Sproule). 1^o*, 212; 2^o*, 273; in Com. and 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 Vic., c. 60.)
- MOUNT OXFORD RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4764 (ii).
- MOUNT ST. NICHOLAS P. O., CHANGE OF NAME: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Bourassa) 3319 (ii).
- MOYLAN, J. G., SERVICES ON ROYAL COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup. 4649 (ii).
- MUNICIPAL ACT, MAN., DISALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 2377 (i).
- MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i).
- Napanee, &c. Ry. Co.** See "KINGSTON NAPANEE AND WESTERN."
- NASH, COLLECTOR, EXTRA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 4792 (i).
- National Construction Co.'s incorp. B. No. 40** (Mr. Brown). 1^o*, 184; 2^o*, 399 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 3227 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 102.)
- Navigable Waters Protection Act** (*Chap. 91 Rev. Statutes*) Amt. B. No. 47 (Mr. Tupper). 1^o, 212 (i); withdn., 4667 (ii).
- New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 49** (Mr. Weldon, St. John). 1^o*, 244; 2^o*, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1149 (i). (53 Vic., c. 71.)
- NEW BRUNSWICK:**
- ALBERT RAILWAY GRANT: remarks (Mr. Ellis) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4559 (ii).
- CANTEENS AT FREDERICTON CAMP: remarks (Mr. Gillmor) 3078 (ii).
- CARAQUET RY. CO., GROSS EARNINGS: Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 3811 (ii).
- FINANCIAL AID: Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 3723 (ii).
- remarks (Mr. Blake) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4601 (ii).
- CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4763; in Com., 4876 (ii).
- FLAG'S COVE BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 1795 (i).
- FREDERICTON AND PRINCE WILLIAM, RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4764 (ii).

NEW BRUNSWICK—Continued.

- FREDERICTON *via* OROMOCTO and GAGETOWN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4763; in Com., 4876 (ii).
- KENT REPRESENTATION, VACANCY: Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 3581 (ii).
- Issue of Writ (Mr. Speaker) 3722 (ii)
- MARITIME PROVINCES MAILS, DELAY: Remarks (Mr. Ellis) 1382 (i).
- MONCTON, MILITIA CAMP GROUNDS: Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) 4926 (ii).
- SMELT FISHING IN MIRAMICHI RIVER: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 2229 (i).
- STEWIACKE VALLEY RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4764 (ii).
- ST. LOUIS WHARF, COMPLETION OF: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 505 (i).
- ST. STEPHEN AND MILLTOWN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4763; in Com., 4875, VICE ADMIRALTY COURTS (QUE., N.S. and N.B.) CASES ENTERED: M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 1065. [See "I.C.R.," "P.W.," "P.O.," "RYS.," "SUBSIDIES," "SUPPLY," &C.]
- NEW CANAAN P.O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. Brien) 563 (i).
- NEWFOUNDLAND, ADMISSION TO CONFEDERATION: Remarks (Mr. Charlton) 4927 (ii).
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADA, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1199 (i).
- HARBOR FEES: Remarks (Gen. Laurier) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4893 (ii).
- NEW LONDON HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. Welsh) 29 (i).
- NEWSPAPERS OR SUPPL. EDITIONS, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4243 (ii).
- SUBSCRIPTIONS AND ADVERTISEMENTS, &C.: Stmt. in Com. of Sup., 228 (i).
- NEW WESTMINSTER REPRESENTATION, VACANCY: Issue of Writ (Mr. Speaker) 3439 (ii).
- "NEW YORK MERCURY," CIRCULATION IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. Scriver) 4500 (ii).
- NICOLET, CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. Boisvert) 4588 (ii).
- North Canadian Atlantic Ry. and Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. No. 88** (Mr. Bryson). 1*, 794; 2*, 1019; in Com. and 3*, 1610 (i). (53 Vic., c. 70.)
- NORTH CARLETON POINT SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Yeo) 1484 (i).
- NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4762; in Com., 4855 (ii).
- Northern and Western Ry. Co.** See "CANADA EASTERN RY. Co."
- NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: M. for Cor. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 55 (i).
- NORTH-WEST COUNCIL, MEM. *re* DUAL LANGUAGE: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 401 (i).
- North-Western Coal and Navigation Co.'s B. No. 25** (Mr. White, Cardwell). 1*, 104; 2*, 186; in Com. and 3*, 1149 (i). (53 Vic., c. 89.)
- LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Dewdney) 4689.
- N.W.T. Acts Amt. B. No. 146** (Mr. Dewdney). 1*, 4373; 2° m., 4449; 2° and in Com., 4465 (ii).

N.W.T. Act (Chap. 50 Revised Statutes) **Amt. B. No. 10** (Mr. McCarthy). 1°, 38; 2° m. and Amt. (Mr. Davin) 532 (i).
[See "FRENCH LANGUAGE."]

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

- ADVISORY COUNCIL, RESIGNATION: M. for O. C.'s, &c.* (Mr. White, Renfrew) 104 (i).
- BANFF HOT SPRINGS, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).
- BLACKFEET INDIANS, CAPTURE OF WHITE GIRL: remarks (Mr. Charlton) 815 (i).
- BREMNER FURS, REP. OF SEL. COM.: presented (Mr. McNeill) 3810 (ii).
- EVIDENCE: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4449 (ii).
- M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com. (Mr. McNeill) 4732 (i).
- PAYMENT: remarks (Mr. Troc) 4931 (ii).
- BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS: prop. Res. (Mr. Lister) for Sel. Com., 1358 (i).
- BRITISH ASSOCIATION AND INDIANS OF N.W. AND B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
- COLONISATION COMPANIES AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Somerville) 66 (i).
- DOIG, MRS. A. A., CLAIM FOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1486 (i).
- DOM. LANDS ACT AMT.: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 3298, 3316 (ii).
- EAU CLAIR AND BOW RIVER LUMBER Co. *vs.* QUEEN, COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 4060 (ii).
- EXPENSES OF GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 4066 (ii).
- FIRE-GUARDS ALONG RY. TRACKS: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 3315 (i).
- FRENCH LANGUAGE IN N.W.T. See general heading.
- GOPHERS, DESTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).
- GRAZING AND PASTURE LEASES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3693 (ii).
- HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 3309.
- AND RES. OF LEG. ASSEMBLY: M. for Ret. (Mr. Laurier) 100 (i).
- RELIEF OF DISTRESS: in Com. of Sup., 4069 (ii).
- HERCHMER, L. W., COM., N.W.M.P., CONTINGENCIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davin) 3319 (ii).
- See "MOUNTED POLICE."
- HOMESTEADS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2023 (ii).
- MEMORIALS OF J. HOLDEN AND J. SHEERA: M. for copy* (Mr. Davin) 1065 (i).
- (SECOND): prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 3298 (ii).
- IRRIGATION: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 3292 (ii).
- LANDS IN C.P.R. BELT, EXAMINATION: in Com. of Sup., 4067 (ii).
- LEG. ASSEMBLY, RES. *re* MONEYS VOTED BY PARLT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Laurier) 104 (i).
- LUCAS, S. B., INDIAN AGENT. N.W.T., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3319 (ii).
- MEMORIALS, PETS. AND RES. PASSED BY LEG. ASSEMBLY: M. for copies (Mr. Davin) 212 (i).
- MEMORIAL *re* DUAL LANGUAGE: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 401 (i).
- LES BOURGEOIS DU NORD-OUEST: in Com. of Sup., 4791 (ii).
- ORDINANCES, &C., PRINTED IN FRENCH: M. for Rets.* (Mr. McCarthy) 83 (i).
- PASTURE AND GRAZING LEASES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 3693 (ii).
- PRINCE ALBERT SETTLERS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 2668 (ii).
- RANCHES, APPLICATIONS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Troc) 1698 (i).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—Continued.

- REGISTRY OFFICES : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 885.
 — RECEPTIONS AND EXPENSES : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1065 (i).
 SASKATCHEWAN COLONISATION CO. AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
 — PROVISIONAL DISTRICT, POPULATION BY ORIGIN : M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
 SURVEYS, COST PER ACRE : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huton*) 402 (i).
 TEMPERANCE COLONISATION CO. : M. for Cor., Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2032 (i).
 — on M. for Com. of Ways and Means : remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4907 (ii).
 TIMBER LIMITS GRANTED BY DOM. GOVT. SINCE MARCH, 1885 : M. for List (Mr. *Charlton*) 2188 (i).
 — enquiry for Rets. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2674 (ii).
 — remarks (Mr. *Hickey*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4545 (ii).
 TOBACCO SEIZURES : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4171 (ii).
 UNIVERSITY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315 (ii).
 [See "INTERIOR," "INDIANS," "MOUNTED POLICE," "SUPPLY," &c.]

NOVA SCOTIA :

- ALBERT AND CAPE TORMENTINE RY., PAR. IN "GLOBE" : personal explanation (Mr. *Wood*, *Westmoreland*) 4320 (ii).
 ANNAPOLIS POST OFFICE, &c., TENDERS FOR ERECTION : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*) 254 (i).
 — PAR. IN MONTREAL "HERALD" : Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Mills*, *Annapolis*) 1515 (i).
 — SITE : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2229 (i).
 — M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*) 3686.
 CROW HARBOR POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 400 (i).
 DIGBY WHARF, DEES COLLECTED : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*) 530 (i).
 ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX : Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*) 3291 (ii).
 FISH IN BOND, CUSTOMS DUTY : Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 248 (i).
 GREEN COVE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 84 (i).
 — REBUILDING : Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 3154 (ii).
 HALL'S HARBOR, REFS. OF ENGINEERS : M. for copies (Mr. *Borden*) 2031 (i).
 INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 ; in Com., 4880.
 LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE : M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 94 (i).
 LOBSTER FISHING REGULATIONS, BEVISION : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 885 (i).
 MAHONE BAY LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 885 (i).
 O'BRIEN, JOTHAM : Ques. (Mr. *Jones*, *Halifax*) 4277 (ii).
 OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., COMPLETION : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 402 (i).
 — CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 505.
 — TOTAL EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 187.
 QUEEN'S WHARF, ANNAPOLIS, GOVT. CONTROL : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*, *Annapolis*) 2828 (ii).
 RAILWAY COMMUNICATION IN EASTERN N.S. : remarks (Mr. *Kirk*) 3324 (ii).
 SACKVILLE MARINE HOSPITAL, ORIGINAL COST : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 1713 (i).
 SALMON FISHING WITH NETS : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 4399.
 SHELBURNE, LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 ; in Com., 4878 (ii).
 SMITH, LATE MR. JUSTICE, N.S., LEAVE OF ABSENCE : M. for Col. (Mr. *Jones*, *Halifax*) 1681 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—Continued.

- TRACADIE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REPS. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
 TRAWL FISHING IN ST. MARY'S BAY : Ques. (Mr. *Jones*, *Halifax*) 2377 (i).
 [See "P. W.," "RYS.," "SUBSIDIES," "SUPPLY."]
Oaths of Office. See "ADMINISTRATION."
 O'BRIEN, JOTHAM : Ques. (Mr. *Jones*, *Halifax*) 4277 (ii).
 OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 2017 (i). 4041 (ii).
 OCEAN MAIL SERVICE. See "ATLANTIC."
 OFFICERS AND INSPECTORS (EXCISE) SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 2313 (i).
 OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE, ii.
Official Documents Disclosure B. No. 122 (Sir *Adolphe Caron*). 1st*, 2020 (i) ; 2nd*, 3203 ; in Com., 3599 ; 3rd*, 3670 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
 OILS, LUBRICATING : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3502 (ii).
 OLD RECORDS OF CAN. : in Com. of Sup., 4791 (ii).
 OLEOMARGARINE, IMPORTS INTO B.N.A. : Ques. (Mr. *Bain*, *Wentworth*) 122 (i).
 ONEIDA, &c., INDIANS, GRANT TO AGRIC. SOC. : in Com. of Sup., 4783 (ii).
 ONTARIO MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, LEGISLATION re FACTORIES : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Edgar*) 90 (i).
Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 123 (Mr. *Bergin*). 1st*, 2020 ; 2nd*, 2338 (i) ; in Com. and 3rd*, 4026 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
Ontario Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. *Bell*). 1st*, 833 ; 2nd*, 1020 (i) ; in Com. and 3rd*, 3227 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
 ONTARIO :
 ABELL, MR. JOHN, ALLEGED INSOLVENCY : on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 3512 (ii).
 BANK OF UPPE CANADA : M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 100 (i).
 CAPE CROCKER INDIANS, ANNUITY PER HEAD : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 505 (i).
 CHRISTIAN ISLAND INDIANS, DISTRESS : remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 4926 (ii).
 COLLINGWOOD HARBOR, EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1655 (i).
 CORINTH P.O. : remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 94 (i).
 DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAM ROAD : Ques. (Mr. *Bain*, *Wentworth*) 68 (i).
 — M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bain*, *Wentworth*) 149 (i).
 DUNNVILLE DAM, DAMAGES AT LOOMIS' CREEK : Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 2021 (i).
 GAUTHIER, W., FISHING LICENSE : Ques. (Mr. *Sroule*) 3076 (ii).
 GODERICH AND STRATHROY P.O., TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 2377 (i).
 GREER, JAMES, FISHERY OVERSEER : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3962, 3811 (ii).
 INDIANS, SELLING LIQUORS TO : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 29 (i).
 IROQUOIS LOCKMASTER, SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3077 (ii).
 JUNIOR JUDGE, ESSEX CO., APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 563 (i).
 KETTLE CREEK, ST. THOMAS : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Wilson*, *Elgin*) 153 (i).

ONTARIO—Continued.

- LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 156 (i),
- LONELY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 2670 (ii).
- LUNDY'S LANE, PROTECTION OF CEMETERY: prop. Res. (Mr. Ferguson, Welland) 1798 (i).
- MAPLE HILL P.O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 27 (i),
- MISSISSAUGA INDIANS, CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Madill) 1656 (i).
- NEW CANAAN P.O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. Brien) 563 (i).
- OTTAWA, RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4448 (ii).
- PAUL, PETER, EXPENSES OF TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 505 (i).
- PICTON HARBOR, DREDGING AND IMPROVING: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 2186 (i).
- RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS, ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Brien) 562 (i).
- READ AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, COR., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Burdett) 1486 (i).
- ROCKPORT POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: on M. for Com. of Sup., 4895 (ii).
- RONDEAU POINT, GOVT. LANDS: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 2022 (i).
- SULTANA ISLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. Barron) 140 (i).
- INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Mr. Barron) 2186.
- TORONTO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barron) 1712 (i).
- TORONTO UNIVERSITY FIRE: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 1950 (i).
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 118 (i),
- M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barron) 145 (i).
- BRIDGE: Remarks (Mr. Barron) 3703 (ii).
- VOLLET, ROBT., EXPENSES OF TRIAL: (Mr. Landerkin) 27 (i).
- WOOD, MR. A. F. See "CANALS."

[See "CANALS," "P. O." "P. W." "RYS." "SUBSIDIES."]

OPIMUM, CRUDE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3503 (ii).

Orange (Grand Lodge) incorp. B. No. 32

(Mr. Wallace). 1st, 145; 2^d m., 395; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 65) 398; in Com., 3^d m. and Amt. (Mr. Curran) 1293; consdn. rsm'd., 1345; Amt. (Mr. Lavergne) to Amt. 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 63, N. 86) 1349; Amt. neg. (Y. 23, N. 124) 1353; 3^d agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 1354 (i). (53 Vic., c. 105.)

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE.**ORDER:**

- ABELL, MR. JOHN, ALLEGED INSOLVENCY: Member requested by Mr. Speaker not to use insinuating remarks towards other Members, 3514 (ii).
- ALIEN CONTRACT LABOUR B. 8: Member called to Order, a second speech on 2^d of a B. not admissible: personal explanation in Order (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 1246 (i).
- ANNAPOLIS LAND PURCHASE: Remarks checked and Member called to Order by Mr. Speaker, 1517 (i).
- CONTINGENCIES, UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Retraction demanded by the Member for West Elgin from the Minister of Militia, 378 (i).
- HULL RELIGIOUS DISTURBANCES: Member having spoken on a question of Privilege cannot speak

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—Continued.**ORDER—Continued.**

- again without unanimous consent of the House (Mr. Speaker) 509; personal explanation allowed, but time must be limited (Mr. Speaker) 510; Member's remarks checked, 513 (i).
- IMMIGRATION AGENTS' SALARIES, UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Objection taken by the Member for North York to language used towards the Member for North Wellington, by the member for East Grey, 2464; Ruling (Mr. Chairman) and withdrawal, 2467 (i).
- INTERRUPTIONS FROM THE GALLERIES: Attention of Mr. Deputy Speaker being drawn to same by Minister of Militia, orders were issued to the Sergeant-at-Arms to stop such improper conduct, 1279 (i).
- INTERRUPTION OF A SPEAKER: Ruled by Mr. Speaker that the language used by the Member for Kingston, and taken exception to by the Member for North Wellington, was in Order, said Member having no right to interrupt, 4557 (ii).
- LOYALTY TO HER MAJESTY: Member reminded by Mr. Speaker that he is out of Order in going beyond a personal explanation, 185 (i).
- LEATHER INSPECTION: Member ruled out of Order for discussing the subject after asking a question (Mr. Speaker) 2258 (i).
- MISQUOTING MEMBERS: Contradicting statement* made by Members and discussing same not admissible; a Member must state exactly what was said and nothing more (Mr. Speaker) 3942 (ii).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Member called on by Mr. Deputy Speaker to withdraw offensive expression, and withdrawal of same, 1118 (i).
- SAWDUST IN RIVERS: Members' remarks checked by Mr. Speaker, having spoken once, 4113 (ii).
- SUPPLY: Remarks checked by Mr. Deputy Speaker and Members requested to confine themselves to subject matter before the Chair, 2433 (i).
- UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Objection taken by the Member for North Perth to language used by the Member for North York towards the Minister of Public Works, 1451; withdrawal, 1453 (i).
- PRIVILEGE:
- ABELL, MR. JOHN, ALLEGED INSOLVENCY: Remarks of Member for East Simcoe as reported in Toronto *Mail* contradicted and retraction asked by Members for West York and Centre Toronto, 3512 (ii).
- ABSENT MEMBERS: Paragraph in *Empire* contradicted (Mr. Doyon) 84, 90 (i).
- ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE: Ms. made by Members to adjourn so as to obtain a second hearing an abuse of the privileges of the House (Mr. Speaker) 3474, 3516 (ii).
- ALBERT AND CAPE TORMENTINE RY.: Personal explanation and contradiction of statements made in the Toronto *Globe*, 4320 (ii).
- ANNAPOLIS LAND PURCHASE: Denial (Mr. Mills, Annapolis) of statements contained in paragraph in Montreal *Herald*, 1515; Member requested by Mr. Speaker to confine himself to Rules and not enter into a discussion of the subject, as it might establish a precedent, 1516 (i).
- GAS WELL IN ESSEX COUNTY: Remarks reflecting on a Minister and a Member made by the Member for West Elgin, read and criticised by the Member for Essex, 2252; objection taken by Mr. Laurier, the discussion being out of Order; Ruled (Mr.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—Continued.

PRIVILEGE—Continued.

Speaker) that when a gentleman finds his honor attacked through statements made he is allowed full opportunity to defend himself, but renewal of a discussion of a previous debate not allowed, 2258.

LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR: Correspondence in *Globe* newspaper purporting to be signed by a Member of the House and involving the names of other Members, brought before the House by Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 449, 638 (i).

LOYALTY TO HER MAJESTY: Personal explanation *re* paragraph in *Montreal Herald*, "Did he Shirk?" 184 (i).

MILEAGE, GEN. LAURIE'S: Personal explanation *re* paragraph in *Toronto Globe*, 3197 (ii).

QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Letter in *Le Canadien* reflecting on Member for Quebec West read and commented on by Member for North Victoria; attention called by Mr. *Speaker* to irregularity of discussion, 4825 (ii).

PROCEDURE:

ALIEN CONTRACT LABOR B. 8: Objection taken by Sir *Richard Cartwright* and others to 2°, after being declared carried by Mr. *Speaker*, as such a Bill ought not to be passed without division, 2194 (i).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT: Attention of Govt. drawn to the fact that a number of Bills having passed through all stages in both Houses only a certain number received the Royal Assent, when the whole of them, according to constitutional rule, should have become law at the same time, 2594 (ii).

CEREALS, PREVENTION OF FRAUD IN SALE OF: ON M. to introduce B., ruled by Mr. *Speaker* that it being a public B. notice must be given, 184 (i).

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES: As such has no power to compel a Member to withdraw offensive language, but he can report same to the *Speaker* if a member asks "that the words be taken down;" he can only rebuke a Member, 1452 (i).

CRIMINAL LAW AMT. B. 65: Objection taken by Mr. *Mitchell* to sub-Amt. of Mr. *Tisdale* to Amt. of his own; Mr. *Speaker* ruled sub-Amt. in Order, 3455 (ii).

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS B. 5: Order for House in Com. read, and there being no motion before the Chair the Order stands (Mr. *Speaker*) 1507 (ii).

DIVISIONS, VOTES GIVEN BY MEMBERS: According to English practice and authorities a Member voting on the wrong side is not allowed to change his vote (Mr. *Speaker*) 2227 (i).

DRAFTING AMENDMENTS: Uniformity of style should be adopted by Members (Mr. *Speaker*) 3455 (ii).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY DEPT. B. 116: Orders of the Day having been called, reference to previous item ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 4028 (ii).

LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR: Printing documents in Votes and Proceedings should be defined (Mr. *Speaker*) 571 (i).

MINING MACHINERY: Objection taken by Mr. *Blake* to M. to adjourn the debate, the same being a substantive motion; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) not a substantive motion but an Amt. to an Amt., and although improperly worded is in Order, 1144 (i).

SUPPLY: Objection taken by Mr. *Taylor* to the discussion of items foreign to the one read by the Chairman: Point of Order sustained by the Chairman and authority quoted, 2470 (i).

ORDERS IN COUNCIL, COLLECTION: in Com. of Sup., 3658 (ii).

ORDINANCES, &c., PRINTED IN FRENCH IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret. * (Mr. *McCarthy*) 83 (i).

ORDNANCE LANDS, COSTS, COMMISSIONS, SALES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4121 (ii).

ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4824 (ii).

OTTAWA, ADDITIONAL BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4696; conc., 4914 (ii).

— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1859 (i).

— AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763; in Com., 4875 (ii).

Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry.

Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. *Hickey*). 1*, 104; 2*, 186; in Com. and 3*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 66.)

— AND MORRISBURG RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762; in Com., 4855 (ii).

— IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 2448.

— RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 4448 (ii).

— SANDFORD FLEMING'S REP. *re* SAWDUST IN RIVER: M. for copy* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1065 (i).

"OTTER," MAIL STEAMER, CONTRACT: Ques: (Mr. *Anyot*) 123 (i).

OUELLET, N. and A., PETS. *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTIES BY I. C. R.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Fiset*) 1713.

Owen Sound and Lake Huron Ry. Co.' incorp. B. No. 99 (Mr. *Small*). 1*, 1066; 2*, 1355; in Com. and 3*, 1823 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

OYSTER PONDS POST OFFICE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 93.

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 402 (i).

— CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*, P.E.I.) 505 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1933 (i), 4017 (ii).

— TOTAL EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 187 (i).

PACIFIC RAILWAY. See "C. P. R."

PAGANS, CENSUS RETURNS OF STE. ELIZABETH: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 513 (i).

PAGE, JOHN. See "CORNWALL CANAL."

PAIS, TUBS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3553 (ii).

PAIRS DURING SESSION, LIST OF, viii.

PAINTS AND COLORS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3504 (i).

PALMER ROAD CHAPEL, P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 92 (i).

— M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 517 (i).

PAPER CURRENCY, GUARANTEE BY GOVT.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 189 (i).

PAPER HANGINGS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3504 (ii).

PARLIAMENT: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 4935 (ii).

Parliament. See "INDEPENDENCE."

- PASTURE AND GRAZING LEASES IN N.W.T. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 3693 (ii).
- Patent Act Amt. B. No. 17** (Mr. *Carling*). 1^o, 90; 2^{*} and in Com., 1076; 3^{*}, 140 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- Patent Act Amt. B. No. 144** (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1^o, 3811; 2^{*} and in Com., 4484 (ii).
- Patent Commissioner.** See "MAY" & "SMITH."
"PATENT RECORD" : in Com. of Sup., 496 (i), 4000; conc., 4272 (ii).
- PATTERSON, A. C., INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 4792 (ii).
- PAUL, PETER, EXPENSES OF TRIAL : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 505 (i).
- PEACHES : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3439 (ii).
- PEAKE'S STATION, P.E.I. Ry. : Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 118 (i).
- PENITENTIARIES :**
BLAKE, CONVICT, TRANSFER TO ENGLAND : in Com. of Sup., 3999 (ii).
— DORCHESTER : in Com. of Sup., 3637.
— INSPECTOR'S TRAVELLING EXPENSES, CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 354 (i).
— KINGSTON : in Com. of Sup., 496 (i), 3643 (ii).
— MANITOBA, CHAPLAINS' SALARIES, INCREASE : in Com. of Sup., conc., 4910 (ii).
— MANITOBA : in Com. of Sup., 3637, 3999, 4650, 4910 (ii).
MOYLAN, J. G., SERVICES ON ROYAL COM. : in Com. of Sup., 4649 (ii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL : in Com. of Sup., 3635 (ii).
STONEY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, FLOGGING PRISONERS : Ques. (Mr. *Laverne*) 1120, 2826 (i).
- PEMBROKE P. O. ROBBERY. See "POST OFFICE."
- PENSIONS : in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).
- People's Bank of N.B. B. No. 33** (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*). 1^o*, 159; 2^{*}*, 186; in Com. and 3^{*}*, 531 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- PEBLEY, MR., M. P., DECEASED : Remarks, 2739 (ii).
- PEMBROKE POST OFFICE ROBBERY : M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 158 (i).
- PERMANENT FORCES, PAY AND MAINTENANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).
- PICKLES IN BOTTLES : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3504 (ii).
- PICKS, MATTOCKS, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3524 (ii).
- PICTON HARBOR, DREDGING, &c. : M. for Cor., Pets., &c. (Mr. *Platt*) 2192 (i).
— DREDGING AND IMPROVING : Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 2186 (i).
- Pictou Harbor Act Amt. B. No. 152** (Mr. *Colby*). 1^o, 4588; 2^{*}*, in Com. and 3^{*}*, 4835 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- PIERREVILLE P. O. : M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 517 (i).
- PIG IRON AND FISHERY BOUNTIES : prop. Res. (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 1811 (i).
- Pig Iron Bounty Provision, B. No. 149** (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 2828; M. for Com., 4321; conc. in (Y. 69, N. 45), 4403; 1^o* of B., 4404; 2^{*}*, in Com. and 3^{*}*, 4835 (ii). (53 *Vic.* c. 22.)
- Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4322; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4327; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4332; (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) 4337; (Mr. *Watson*) 4342; (Mr. *Daly*) 4344; (Mr. *Casey*) 4347; (Mr. *Kenny*) 4351; (Mr. *Dawson*) 4356 (ii).
- Pilotage Act (Chap. 80 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 161** (Mr. *Colby*). 1^o*, 4924 (ii).
- PINETTE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP. : M. for copy* (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).
- PLANTS, FRUIT, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3531 (ii).
- PLUMBAGO : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3505 (ii).
- Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co's B. No. 87** (Mr. *Bryson*). 1^o*, 794; 2^{*}*, 1019; in Com. and 3^{*}*, 2338 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
— LABORERS' WAGES : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3722 (ii).
- Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co's and C.P.R. Co's B. No. 141** (Mr. *Sproule*). 1^o, 3591; 2^{*}*, 3702; in Com. and 3^{*}*, 4025 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
— PET. : M. (Mr. *Bryson*) to receive, 3511 (ii).
— SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764; in Com., 4886 (ii).
- Portage la Prairie and Duck Mountain Ry. Co's incorp. B. No. 78** (Mr. *Hesson*). 1^o*, 561; 2^{*}*, 1019 (i); ref. back to Ry. Com., 3322 (ii).
- Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Ry. Co's B. No. 14** (Mr. *Dawson*). 1^o*, 84; 2^{*}*, 91; in Com. and 3^{*}*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
— SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 (ii).
— HARBOR AND KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 1095 (ii).
- PORT STANLEY. See "LONDON."
- POPE, RUFUS H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR COMPTON : Introduced, 2 (i).
- POPULATION BY ORIGIN IN SASKATCHEWAN PROVINCIAL DISTRICT : M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
- PORK : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3501 (ii).
— MESS ; in Com. of Ways and Means, 3562 (ii).
- POST OFFICE :**
ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE AND MESSRS. ANDERSON : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 100, 1021 (i).
— ANDERSON'S CONTRACT : remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 3440 (ii).
— remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4694 (ii).
- BERTHIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE : M. for Pets., &c., (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
- BLISS' PATENT LETTER BOX : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2827 (ii).
- CASCAPEDIA (PETIT) P. O. SAVINGS BANKS : Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 2669 (ii).
- CORINTH P. O. : remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 94 (i).
- CRANE ISLAND MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 121 (i).
- CROW HARBOR POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 400 (i).
- DEAD LETTER OFFICE AND REGISTERED LETTERS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 83 (i).
- DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 69 (i).

POST OFFICE—Continued.

- ENGLISH PERIODICALS, COST OF MAILING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1856, 1918 (i).
- FERNETVILLE P. O., CLOSING: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
- GASPE COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Joncas*) 193 (i).
- LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 94 (i).
- LOTBINIERE COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 85 (i).
- M. for Pets., Cor., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1680 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 2668 (ii).
- MAPLE HILL P.O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 27.
- MAYBEE, MISS, DISMISSAL FROM P.O. AT QUEBEC: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2187 (i).
- MEGANTIC COUNTY MAIL SERVICE, CHANGE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1147 (i).
- MONTREAL P.O. DROP BOXES: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3512.
- MOUNT ST. NICHOLAS P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3319 (ii).
- "NEW YORK MERCURY," CIRCULATION IN CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Sevier*) 4500 (ii).
- "OTTER" MAIL STEAMER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 123 (i).
- OYSTER PONDS P. O.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 93 (i).
- PALMER ROAD P.O.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 92, 517 (i).
- PEMBROKE POST OFFICE ROBBERY: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 158 (i).
- PIERREVILLE P.O.: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 517 (i).
- POSTMASTER GENERAL'S REP.^s presented (Mr. *Hagpart*) 69 (i).
- QUEBEC P.O., SUPERANNUATION: M. for O.C. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 60 (i).
- ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 562 (i).
- RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS, INCREASED PAY: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 187 (i).
- READ AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, COR., &c.: M. for Rets.* (Mr. *Burdett*) 1486 (i).
- REGISTERED LETTERS AND DEAD LETTER OFFICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 83 (i).
- GUARANTEE TO PUBLIC: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2022 (i).
- REGISTERED LETTERS, REDUCTION OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1121 (i).
- RIMOUSKI MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1063.
- ROCKPORT, DEP. POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: on M. for Com. of Sup., remarks (*Richard Cartwright*) 4895.
- ST. EDOUARD MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1680 (i).
- STE. ANGELE DE MERICI MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 561 (i).
- ST. EDMOND P.O.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 91 (i).
- ST. GABRIEL AND ST. DAMIEN MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
- SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 29 (i).
- SUNDAY CLOSING OF P. O.'s: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1021 (i).
- WEST INDIES STEAM COMMUNICATION, ADVTSMNT., TENDERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Ellis*) 1713 (i).
- [See "COLL. OF REVENUES" and "CIVIL GOVT." under "SUPPLY;" also "P.W."]
- POWELL, COL. WALKER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 562 (i).

- PRECIOUS STONES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3099 (ii).
- PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2335 (i).
- PRIEUR, ARTHUR, EMPLOYMENT BY HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Neveu*) 2022, 2185 (i).
- PRINCE ALBERT SETTLERS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdowall*) 2668 (ii).
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
- ALBERTON LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1657 (i).
- BEDIQUE WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 561 (i).
- BELL CREEK HARBOR AND BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2669 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2377 (i).
- CAPE TRAVERSE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2378 (i).
- CASCUMPEK HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1655 (i).
- IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 1711.
- COVE HEAD HARBOR SURVEYS, REPS. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
- DUVAR, LIFUT-COL., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1485 (i).
- FISHERIES INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 55 (i).
- LOBSTER FACTORIES: remarks on Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 650 (i).
- MACKEREL FISHING, PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 248 (i).
- MARINE HOSPITAL, SACKVILLE, ORIGINAL COST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1713 (i).
- MIMINGASH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 122 (i), 3077 (ii).
- (LITTLE) HARBOR SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2022 (i).
- NEW LONDON HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).
- NORTH CARLETON POINT SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1484.
- OYSTER PONDS P. O.: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 93 (i).
- PALMER ROAD P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 92; M. for Pets., &c., 517 (i).
- PEAKE'S STATION, P.E.I. RY: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 118 (i).
- P.E.I. AND DOM. GOVT. MONEY DRAWN: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 27 (i).
- PINETTE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).
- "PRINCE EDWARD," STR., DREDGING: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 159 (i).
- PURSE SEINES AND GILL-NETS: M. for Pet., &c. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 248 (i).
- ST. PETER'S BAY WHARF, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 248 (i).
- SUMMERSIDE AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
- HARBOR BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 121, 247 (i).
- TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 96 (i).
- WHARFINGER'S RET. TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 561 (i).
- WHARVES, PIERS AND BREAKWATER, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Perry*) 1149 (i).
- WOOD ISLAND HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).
- [See "MARINE," "SUPPLY," "P.W.," &c.]
- "PRINCE EDWARD," STR., DREDGING: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 159 (i).

- "PRINCESS LOUISE" AND "LANSDOWNE" STEAMERS, J. O'BRIEN'S CLAIM : in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 4930 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 169 ; contingencies, 356 (i).
- PRINTING BUREAU, TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON BUILDING PLANT, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Innes*) 90 (i).
- ADDITIONAL PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 4118, 4814 (ii).
- ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT : conc., 4274 (ii).
- CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 475 (i).
- PRINTING COM. See "COMMITTEES."
- PRINTING, PAPER AND BOOKBINDING : in Com. of Sup., 715 (i).
- PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION AND SENATE : Remarks, 2312 (i).
- PRIVATE BILLS, EXTENSION OF TIME : Ms. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 84, 449 (i).
- M. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) to suspend Rules 49 and 51, 1936 (i).
- 60TH RULE : M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1936 (i).
- REPS. FROM COM. : Ms. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to extend time, 1198 (i), 2531, 3540 (ii).
- Nos. 135 AND 156 : M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to place on Order Paper, 4906 (ii).
- MISCELLANEOUS. See "COMMITTEES."
- PRIVILEGE. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."
- PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS. See "COMMITTEES."
- PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 168 ; contingencies, 224, 353 (i) ; conc., 4272 (ii).
- PROFESSIONAL SERVICES. See "LEGAL SERVICES."
- Promissory Notes. See "BILLS OF EXCHANGE."
- PROTECTION FISHERY STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2375 (i), 4779 (ii).
- PROVINCIAL BILLS DISALLOWED SINCE CONFEDERATION, &C. : M. for Stmtnt. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 28 (i).
- Provincial Governments, Transfer of Property B. No. 112 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1^o, 1512 (i) ; withdn., 4924 (ii).
- PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION, REPRINT OF COR., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 248 (i).
- Provincial Provident Institution of St. Thomas, Ont., B. No. 107 (Mr. *Ward*). 1^o, 1343 ; 2^o, 1506 (i).
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS : presented (Mr. *Foster*) 26 (i).
- COM. See "COMMITTEES."
- PUBLIC EXPENDITURE : prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1860 (i).
- Deb. (Sir *John A Macdonald*) 1865 ; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1868 ; (Mr. *Flynn*) 1869 ; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1873 ; (Mr. *Ives*) 1875 ; (Mr. *Davin*) 1876 ; (Mr. *Robertson*) 1876 ; (Mr. *Perry*) 1878 ; (Mr. *Yeo*) 1884 ; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1887 ; (Mr. *Welah*) 1895 ; (Mr. *Platt*) 1897 ; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1900 ; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1904 ; (Mr. *Daly*) 1903 ; (Mr. *Watson*) 1905 ; (Mr. *Scarth*) 1906 ; (Mr. *Casey*) 1907 ; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1906 ; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1908 ; (Mr. *Henson*) 1916 ; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1916 ; agreed to, 1918 (i).
- PUBLIC HEALTH, PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES : in Com. of Sup., 3655, 4001 (ii).
- Public Lands (Grants) B. No. 138 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1^o, 3624 ; 2^o and in Com., 4034 ; 3^o, 4035 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- Public Property. See "PROVINCIAL"
- Public Stores Act Amt. B. No. 53 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1^o, 245 ; 2^o, in Com., and 3^o, 1077 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- PUBLIC WORKS :
- ANNAPOLIS POST OFFICE, &C., TENDERS FOR ERECTION : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 254 (i).
- SITE : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2229 (i).
- M. for Cor., &C. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 3686 (ii)
- BEDIQUE WHARF, DUES COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 561 (i).
- BELL CREEK HARBOR, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2377 (i), 2669 (ii).
- CAPE TRAVERSE WHARF, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2378 (i).
- CASCUMPEC HARBOR : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1655 (i).
- IMPROVEMENTS : M. for Pet. (Mr. *Perry*) 1711 (i).
- COLLINGWOOD HARBOR, EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1655 (i).
- CONTRACTORS' CHEQUES : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 27 (i).
- COURT HOUSE, MONTREAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 2188 (i).
- COVE HEAD HARBOR SURVEYS, REPS. OF ENGINEERS, &C. : M. for copies (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
- DEPTL. REP. : presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 212 (i).
- DIGBY WHARF, DUES COLLECTED : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 530 (i).
- DREDGING, &C., MCGREGOR'S CREEK : M. for Pets. (Mr. *Campbell*) 630 (i).
- STR. "PRINCE EDWARD." M. for Stmtnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 159 (i).
- RIVER THAMES : M. for Pets., &C.* (Mr. *Campbell*) 144 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 55 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4894 (ii).
- PICTON HARBOR : Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 2186 (i).
- M. for Cor., Pets., &C. (Mr. *Platt*) 2192 (i).
- DRILL HALL, MONTREAL : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 883 (i).
- DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAM ROAD : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 149 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 68 (i).
- DUNNVILLE DAM, DAMAGES AT LOOMIS CREEK : Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 2021 (i).
- ESQUIMALT DRY DOCK : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1120 (i).
- FLAG'S COVE BREAKWATER : (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1795 (i).
- FLOODS IN LAPRAIRIE : Ques. (Mr. *Doyon*) 884 (i).
- GODERICH AND STRATHROY P. O., TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 2377 (i).
- GOVTL EXPENDITURE IN OTTAWA : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1857 (i).
- GOVT. PROPERTY, DAMAGES TO BY STEAMERS, &C., CLAIMS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cook*) 1488 (i).
- GREEN COVE BREAKWATER REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Lovitt*) 84 (i), 3154 (ii).
- HALL'S HARBOR, N.S., REPS. OF ENGINEERS : M. for copies (Mr. *Borden*) 2081 (i).
- "HUNGRY BAY" DAM, ENGINEER'S REPS., &C. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Lergeron*) 3319 (ii).
- ISLE AU NOIX WHARF : Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1357 (i).
- KAMOURASKA WHARF, ACCOUNTS re BUILDING : M. for Pets. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 97 (i).
- KETTLE CREEK, ST. THOMAS : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 153 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—Continued.

- LAND DAMAGES IN YAMASKA COUNTY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 530 (i).
- LÉVIS P. O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 506 (i).
- MCKINACK RIVER WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Ste. Marie*) 4172 (ii).
- MIMINGASH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 122 (i), 3077 (ii).
- (LITTLE HARBOR SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2022 (i).
- MONTCALM COUNTY EXPLORATORY SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 186 (i).
- MONTREAL COURT HOUSE, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 2188 (i).
- MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION, ABOLITION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 884 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Curran*) 3077 (ii).
- NEW CANAAN P.O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 563 (i).
- NEW LONDON HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).
- NICOLET, CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Boisvert*) 4588 (ii).
- NORTH CARLETON POINT SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1484 (i).
- OTTAWA, NEW DEPTL. BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1859 (i).
- OYSTER PONDS P. O.: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 93 (i).
- PIERREVILLE POST OFFICE: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Choquette*) 517 (i).
- PINETTE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).
- P.E.I., PUBLIC WORKS: remarks (Mr. *Welsh*) 4830 (ii).
- POST OFFICES, ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1484.
- PUBLIC WORKS IN P.E.I.: remarks (Mr. *Welsh*) 4830 (ii).
- QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS. See "QUEBEC."
- QUEEN'S WHARF, ANNAPOLIS, GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 2828 (ii).
- RIVER DU SUD PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Reps., &c.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 530 (i).
- STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 92 (i).
- ST. EDMOND P. O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 401 (i).
- ST. HYACINTHE, PURCHASE OF LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Béchar*) 4399 (ii).
- ST. LOUIS (LAKE) PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401 (i).
- RIVER WORKS, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 245 (i).
- ST. LOUIS, N.B., COMPLETION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 505 (i).
- ST. MICHEL WHARF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 246 (i).
- ST. PETER'S BAY WHARF, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 246 (i).
- ST. ROSAIRE P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 400 (i).
- SUMMERSIDE HARBOR BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 121, 247 (i).
- TIGNISH BREAKWATER REPAIRS, EXPENDITURES: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Perry*) 96 (i).
- WHARFINGER'S RET. TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 561 (i).
- TORONTO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 1712 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—Concluded.

- TRACADIE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REFS.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
- VALLEYFIED, USE OF DAM BY PUBLIC: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 884 (i).
- WHARVES IN MONTMAGNY COUNTY, PUBLIC USE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4026 (ii).
- WHARVES, PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I., EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Perry*) 1149 (i).
- WOOD ISLAND HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Welsh*) 29 (i).
- YAMASKA RIVER DAM, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 530, 1065 (i).
- [See SUPPLY," &c.]
- PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 248 (i).
- Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and Steamboat Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. *Davies*). 1^o*, 159; 2^o*, 273; in Com. and 3^o*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 3654, 4001 (ii).
- CATTLE: in Com. of Sup., 3657 (ii).
- GROSSE ISLE REGULATIONS: M. for copy (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1451 (i).
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners' Acts Amt. B. No. 111 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1^o*, 1506; 2^o* m., 1532; 2^o and in Com., 1533; 3^o m., 1582; Amt. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1583 (i).
- QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764; in Com., 4891 (ii).
- QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764; in Com., 4890 (ii).
- QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 4500, 4563 (i).
- STATEMENT OF MR. MCGREEVY: read (Mr. *Curran*) 4566 (ii).
- ARTICLE IN "LE CANADIEN": Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 4825 (ii).
- remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4907 (ii).
- remarks (Sir *Hector Lanquar*) 4935 (ii).
- POST OFFICE, SUPERANNUATIONS: M. for O.C. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 60 (i).
- RIVER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 2018 (i).
- QUEBEC:
- BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2671 (ii).
- SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2378 (i).
- BEAUHARNOIS CANAL ENLARGEMENT: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Bain, Soulanges*) 517 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 187 (i).
- BÉLANGER, P. R. A., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 1797, 2024 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Turoot*) 4500 (ii).
- BERTHIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
- BUOYS IN ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2185 (i).
- CALVIE, LEGAL SERVICES re PROSECUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Béchar*) 4399 (ii).
- CARDIN, ELPHÉGE AND JEAN, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
- CASCAPEDIA (GREAT) RIVER BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Turoot*) 2669 (ii).

QUEBEC—Continued.

- CASCAPEDIA (PETIT) P. O. SAVINGS BANKS: Ques. (Mr. Turcot) 2669 (ii).
- CATTLE QUARANTINE STATIONS; Ques. (Mr. Pope) 92.
- CAUGHNAWAGA RESERVE. See "INDIANS."
- CAVALRY SCHOOL, QUE., OFFICERS' PROMOTION: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 3291 (ii).
- CENSUS RETURN OF PAGANS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Charlton) 513 (i).
- CHAMPLAIN DISTRICT REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 2022 (i).
- CHAMBLY AND LONGUEUIL CANAL: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 401 (i).
- VESSELS, TONNAGE, &C., PASSED THROUGH: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Préfontaine) 1401 (i).
- COTÉ, F., PET. re DAMAGES TO PROPERTY BY I. C. R.: M. for copies* (Mr. Fiset) 1713 (i).
- COURT HOUSE, MONTREAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. Curran) 2188 (ii).
- C. P. R. AND RY. BRIDGES IN BAGOT COUNTY: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. Dupont) 141 (i).
- CRANE ISLAND MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 121 (i).
- CULLERS' OFFICE, QUEBEC, SUPERANNUATION: M. for O. C.'s, &c.*: (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 66 (i).
- DIONNE, JOS., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: (Mr. Dessaint) 2023 (i).
- DRILL HALL, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 883 (i).
- FERNETVILLE POST OFFICE, CLOSING: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. Beauvoileil) 529 (i).
- FLOODS IN LAPRAIRIE: Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 884 (i).
- GAREAU, JOSEPH, APPOINTMENT AND REMOVAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 66 (i).
- GASPÉ COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Joncas) 193 (i).
- GOVT. STEAMERS, TENDERS FOR SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 1120 (i).
- GRANDIN, MGR., LETTER OF: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 119.
- GREAT EASTERN RY., &C.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. Rinfret) 142 (i).
- GREENLY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 3154 (ii).
- GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: M. for copy (Mr. Landerkin) 145 (i).
- HEREFORD RY. CO.: M. (Mr. Ives) to suspend Rules, 4396 (ii).
- HILLIKER, MR., CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 402 (i).
- HULL, RELIGIOUS DISTURBANCES: remarks (Mr. Charlton) 303, 506 (i).
- "HUNGRY BAY" DAM, ENGINEERS' REP., &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 3319 (ii).
- HOULD, LEANDRE, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. Ques. (Mr. Ste. Marie) 4172 (ii).
- IMMIGRANT RATES TO WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 186 (i).
- ISLE AU NOIX WHARF: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 1357 (i).
- JUDGE'S RESIDENCE IN MONTMAGNY: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 2021 (i).
- SAGUENAY DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. Cimon) 3252.
- KAMOURASKA WHARF, ACCOUNTS re BUILDING: M. for Pets. (Mr. Dessaint) 97 (i).
- LAND SLIDE AT QUEBEC: M. for O. C. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 63 (i).
- LEBOURDAIS BROS., CASE OF: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 187 (i).
- LÉPINE, L. P., APPOINTMENT AS SUPT. OF GOVT. WORKS: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 66 (i).

QUEBEC—Continued.

- LÉVIS P.O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 506 (i).
- LOBINIÈRE COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 85 (i).
- M. for Pets., Cor. &c. (Mr. Rinfret) 1680 (i).
- MARINE HOSPITAL, QUEBEC: M. for O. C.'s, &c. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 66 (i).
- EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Langevin, Quebec) 75 (i).
- MATANE BRANCH LINE: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 561 (i).
- BUILDING: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. Fiset) 3693.
- MEGANTIC COUNTY MAIL SERVICE, CHANGE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. Rinfret) 1147 (i).
- MCKINACK RIVER WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Ste. Marie) 4172 (ii).
- MONTCALM COUNTY EXPLORATORY SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 186 (i).
- MONTREAL COURT HOUSE, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. Curran) 2188 (ii).
- HARBOR COMMISSION, ABOLITION: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 401 (i).
- HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Beauvoileil) 884 (i).
- HARBOR POLICE, GRATUITIES: Ques. (Mr. Curran) 92 (i).
- P. O. DROP BOXES: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 3512 (ii).
- MOREAU, ELIE, ACCOUNT re QUEEN vs. BOUCHER: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 1657, 1797 (ii).
- MOUNT ST. NICHOLAS P. O., CHANGE OF NAME: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Bourassa) 3319 (ii).
- NICOLET, CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. Boisvert) 4588 (ii).
- NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: M. for Cor. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 55 (i).
- "OTTER," MAIL STEAMER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 123 (i).
- OUELLET, N. AND A., PETS. re DAMAGES TO PROPERTIES BY I. C. R.: M. for copies* (Mr. Fiset) 1713 (i).
- PAGANS, CENSUS RETURNS OF STE. ELIZABETH: M. for Ret. (Mr. Charlton) 513 (i).
- PIERREVILLE P.O.: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. Choquette) 517 (i).
- PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO. PET.: M. (Mr. Bryson) to receive, 3511 (ii).
- LABORERS' WAGES: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 3722 (ii).
- PORTNEUF (81ST) BATTALION: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 245 (i).
- QUEEN vs. BOUCHER, LEGAL FEES: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 1657, 1797 (i).
- RICHELIEU, RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- RIMOUSKI MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. Fiset) 1063 (i).
- RIVER DU SUD PUB. WORKS: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. Choquette) 530 (i).
- RY. BRIDGES IN BAGOT COUNTY: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. Dupont) 141 (i).
- SHAWINEGAN ELECTORAL DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. Desaulniers) 27 (i).
- STANSTEAD, RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- SUPERANNUATIONS, QUEBEC P. O.: M. for O. C. (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 60 (i).
- STE. ANGELE DE MERICI, MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 561 (i).
- STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 92 (i).
- STE. CROIX FLOATING LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 2021 (i).

QUEBEC—*Concluded.*

- STE CROIX FLOATING LIGHT: M. for Pets., Cor., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2207 (ii).
- ST. EDMOND P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 91, 401 (i).
- ST. GABRIEL AND ST. DAMIEN MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
- ST. GERMAIN, BRUNO, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LAND: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
- ST. HYACINTHE, PURCHASE OF LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Bécharé*) 4399 (ii).
- ST. LOUIS (LAKE) PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401.
- ST. LOUIS RIVER WORKS, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 245 (i).
- ST. MICHEL WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 246 (i).
- ST. ROCH'S TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 1656 (i).
- KEPPER: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 2826 (ii).
- ST. ROSAIRE P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 400 (i).
- ST. SAUVEUR FIRE, AID TO SUFFERERS: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1121 (i).
- AND "B" BATTERY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1200 (i).
- TONNANCOURT, GEO., CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO LAND: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
- TOURIGNY, HONORÉ, M.P.P., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2377 (i).
- VALLEYFIELD, USE OF DAM BY PUBLIC: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 884 (i).
- VOYER, GEO., PET. *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY BY I.C.R.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Fiset*) 1713 (i).
- WHARVES IN MONTMAGNY COUNTY, PUBLIC USE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4026 (ii).
- YAMACHICHE, FLOATING LIGHT OPPOSITE: M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1702 (i).
- YAMASKA RIVER DAM, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
- [See "I.C.R.," "P.W.," "P.O.," "RYS.," "SUBSIDIES," "SUPPLY," &c.]
- QUEEN'S COUNSEL, APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1486 (i).
- prop. Res. (Mr. *Amyot*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2099; withdn., 2141 (i).
- QUEEN'S PRINTER, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3992 (ii).
- QUEEN'S WHARF, ANNAPOLIS, GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 2828 (ii).
- QUEEN *vs.* BOUCHER, LEGAL FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 1657, 1797 (i).
- "QUINTÉ," STEAMER, REPS., EVIDENCE, &c., *re* LOSS: M. for copies (Mr. *Platt*) 149 (i).
- Railway Act Amt. B. No. 29** (Mr. *Cook*). 1*, 118 (i).
- Railway Act Amt B. No. 104** (Mr. *Shanly*). 1*, 1343; 2*, 1507 (i); M. for Com. and Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 6 m.h., 3325; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 47) 3332 (ii).
- Railway B. No. 151** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1*, 4480; 2° and in Com., 4861; 3*, 4821 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- RAILWAY COM. See "COMMITTEES."
- RAILWAY COMMUNICATION IN EASTERN N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Kirk*) 3324 (ii).
- Railway Laborers Protection B. No. 52** (Mr. *Purcell*). 1*, 245 (i); 2°, 3704 (ii).

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS, ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 562 (i).— INCREASED PAY: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 187 (i).RAILWAY STATISTICS FOR 1889: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 3663 (ii).— presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4658 (ii).

RAILWAYS:

ALBERT AND CAPE TORMENTINE RY., PAR. IN "GLOBE:" personal explanation (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 4320 (ii).ALBERT RY. GRANT: Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4559 (ii).AYLMER BRANCH, C.P.R., SALE: M. (Mr. *Sproule*) 3591 (ii).BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Guy*) 2671 (ii).— SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Guy*) 2378 (i).BRIDGES IN BAGOT COUNTY: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Dupont*) 141 (i).CANADA ATLANTIC RY. BRIDGE, SUBSIDIES VOTED: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3663 (ii).CAPE BRETON RY., CONSTRUCTION OF TELEGRAPH: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 3319 (ii).CARAQUET RY. CO., GROSS EARNINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3811 (ii).— FINANCIAL AID: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 3723 (ii).— Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4601 (ii).CASCAPEDIA (GREAT) RIVER BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Turot*) 2669 (ii).COMMUNICATION IN EASTERN N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Kirk*) 3324 (ii).DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1343 (i).DERBY BRANCH RY. EXTENSION: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 514 (i).FIRE-GUARDS ALONG RY. TRACKS, N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315 (ii).GREAT EASTERN RY., &c.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 142 (i).GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2379 (i).HEREFORD RY. CO.: M. (Mr. *Ives*) to suspend Rules, 4396 (ii).LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 156 (i).MATANE BRANCH RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 561 (i).— BUILDING: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Fiset*) 3693 (ii).NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 55 (i).OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., TOTAL EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 187 (i).— COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 402 (i).— CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 505 (i).PEAKE'S STATION, P.E.I. RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 118 (i).PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S PET.: M. (Mr. *Bryson*) to receive, 3511 (ii).— LABORERS' WAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3722 (ii).STATISTICS: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4658 (ii).— FOR 1889: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 3663 (ii).SHORT LINE RY. (HARVEY BRANCH): Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 399 (i).— SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 505 (i).

RAILWAYS—Continued.

- SHORT LINE RY.: Ques. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 2674 (ii).
 — prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1583 (i).
 SNOW PLOUGHS ON GOVT. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1556 (i).
 — “ROTARY,” EFFICIENCY: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1797 (i).
 SUBSIDIES SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 69 (i).

See ALSO:

- ALBERTA COLONISATION RY. CO.
 ALBERTA RAILWAY AND COAL CO.
 BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.
 BRANTFORD, WATERLOO AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO.
 BRANDON AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
 CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY. CO.
 CANADA EASTERN RY. CO.
 CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. CO.
 CENTRAL ONTARIO RY.
 COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RY. AND NAV. CO.
 ERIE AND HURON RY. CO.
 GODEBICH AND CAN. PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
 GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO.
 GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.
 GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.
 HAMILTON JUNCTION RY. CO.
 HEREFORD RY. CO.
 HEREFORD AND MAINE CENTRAL RY. CO.'S.
 INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.
 INTERNESS RY. CO.
 LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.
 LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY. CO.
 LOUISBURG AND RICHMOND RY. CO.
 MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
 MANITOBA AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
 MONCTON AND P. E. I. RY. AND FERRY CO.
 MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
 MONTREAL AND WESTERN AND C.P.R. CO.'S.
 MOUNT FOREST, MARKDALE AND MEAFORD RY. CO.
 NAPANEE, TANWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. CO.
 NEW BRUNSWICK RY. CO.
 NORTH CAN. ATLANTIC RY. AND STEAMSHIP CO.
 NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. CO.
 NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. CO. OF N. B.
 ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. CO.
 OTTAWA, MORRISBURG AND NEW YORK RY. CO.
 OWEN SOUND AND LAKE HURON RY. CO.
 PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
 PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION AND C. P. R. CO.'S.
 PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE AND DUCK MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
 PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. CO.
 QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY.
 RIVER DETROIT RY. BRIDGE CO.
 SASKATCHEWAN COLONISATION RY. CO.
 SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND MINING CO.
 SAULT STE. MARIE AND ATLANTIC RY. CO.
 SAULT STE. MARIE AND HUDSON'S BAY RY.
 SOUTH KOOTENAY RY. CO.
 ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.
 ST. LAWRENCE INTERNATIONAL RY. AND BRIDGE CO.
 THOUSAND ISLANDS BRIDGE AND RY. CO.
 TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
 VAUDREUIL AND PRESCOTT RY. CO.
 VICTORIA AND SAULT STE. MARIE JUNCTION RY. CO.
 WEST KOOTENAY RY. CO.
 WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RY.
 WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RY. CO.

[See “SUBSIDIES,” “SUPPLY,” &C.]

- Rainy River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 60**
 (Mr. Dawson). 1^o*, 342; 2^o, 531; in Com. and 3^o*, 1610 (i). (53 Vic., c. 97.)
- RANCHES IN N.W.T., APPLICATIONS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Trowell) 1698 (i).
- READ AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, COR., &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Burdett) 1486 (i).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 83 (i).
- REBATE OF DUTIES. See “CORN.”
- Reciprocity in Wrecking.** See “WRECKING.”
- RECORDS, CLASSIFICATION OF OLD: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (i).
- RED RIVER SURVEY: conc., 4905 (ii).
- REGINA JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 3647 (ii).
- REGISTERED LETTERS AND DEAD LETTER OFFICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 83 (i).
 — GUARANTEE TO PUBLIC: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 2022 (i).
 — REDUCTION OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 1121 (i).
- REGISTRY OFFICES, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 885.
 — RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davin) 1065 (i).
- REMUNERATION GOVT. EMPLOYÉS ON CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4152, 4793 (ii).
- REPAIRS AND WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 3802 (ii).
- REPORTS PRESENTED:
- ALIEN CONTRACT LABOR (Mr. Taylor) 3367 (ii).
 - AUDITOR GENERAL (Mr. Foster) 90 (i).
 - BALLOT BOXES, PATENT (Mr. Chapleau) 4656 (ii).
 - BREMNER FURS AND BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS (Mr. McNeill) 4732 (ii).
 - DOM. POLICE, COMMISSIONER'S REP. (Sir John Thompson) 33 (i).
 - HERRING FISHERY COMMISSIONERS', REP. (Mr. Tupper) 393 (i).
 - INLAND REVENUE (Mr. Costigan) 26 (i).
 - INTERIOR (Mr. Devdney) 33 (i), 2739 (ii).
 - MARINE (Mr. Tupper) 1020 (i).
 - MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir Adolphe Caron) 275 (i).
 - MOUNTED POLICE, COMMISSIONER WHITE'S REP.: (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2050 (i).
 - POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Haggart) 69 (i).
 - PRINTING AND STATIONERY (Mr. Bowell) 4930 (ii).
 - PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Mr. Foster) 26 (i).
 - PUBLIC WORKS (Sir Hector Langevin) 213 (i).
 - RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Sir John A. Macdonald.) 1343.
 - SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. Chapleau) 118 (i).
 - TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS (Mr. Bowell) 26 (i).
- RESIGNATION OF MEMBER. See “LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR.”
- RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &C.:
- ADVISORY COUNCIL, N.W.T., RESIGNATION*: Mr. White (Renfrew) 104 (i).
 - AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS EXPORTED. See “SELF-BINDERS,” &C.
 - AMERICAN FREIGHT IN BOND: Mr. Laurier, 99 (i).
 - ANNAPOLIS P. O., &C., TENDERS FOR ERECTION: Mr. Weldon (St. John) 254 (i).
 - P. O. and CUSTOMS BUILDING, PURCHASE OF SITE: Mr. Weldon (St. John) 3986 (ii).
 - ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE and MESSRS. ANDERSON: Mr. Laurier, 100, 1021 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- BANK CHARTERS, B. N. A. AND B. C. : Mr. *Edgar*, 255.
 BANK OF UPPER CANADA : Mr. *McMullen*, 100 (i).
 BANKS, CHARTERED, IN LIQUIDATION, NAMES, &c. :
 Mr. *Hesson*, 76 (i).
 BEAUHARNOIS CANAL ENLARGEMENT : Mr. *Bain* (*Soulanges*) 517 (i).
 BEAUHARNOIS JUNCTION RY. CO., SUBSIDIES VOTED* :
 Mr. *Bergeron*, 3693 (ii).
 BERTHIER COUNTY MAIL SERVICE : Mr. *Beausoleil*,
 529 (i).
 BOARD OF TRADE, QUEBEC, AND NORTH SHORE RY.
 DEBENTURES : Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 55 (i).
 CANADA AND TREATIES OF COMMERCE, IMP. COR. : Gen.
Laurie, 3666 (ii).
 CANADA ATLANTIC RY. BRIDGE, SUBSIDIES VOTED : Mr.
Bergeron, 3663 (ii).
 CANADIAN COMMISSIONERS ABROAD : Mr. *McMullen*,
 100 (i).
 CANADIAN FLOUR IMPORTED INTO N.S., N.B. AND P.
 E.I. : Mr. *Weldon* (*St. John*) 2671 (ii).
 C. P. R. See general heading.
 CAPE BRETON RY., CONSTRUCTION OF TELEGRAPH* : Mr.
Macdonald (*Victoria*) 3319 (ii).
 CARDIN, ELPHÈGE AND JEAN, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO
 LANDS* : Mr. *Laurier*, 1065 (i).
 CASCUMPEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS : Mr. *Perry*, 1711.
 CAUGHNAWAGA RESERVE. See "INDIANS."
 CENSUS RETURNS OF PAGANS : Mr. *Charlton*, 513 (i).
 CHAMBLY CANAL, VESSELS, TONNAGE, &c., PASSED
 THROUGH* : Mr. *Préfontaine*, 1401 (i).
 CIVIL SERVICE, APPOINTMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL MEN
 WITHOUT PASSING C. S. EXAM., NAMES, &c.* : Mr.
Lister, 3693 (ii).
 COLONISATION COMPANIES AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR* :
 Mr. *Somerville*, 66 (ii).
 COTÉ, F., PET., re DAMAGES TO PROPERTY BY I.C.R.* :
 Mr. *Fiset*, 1713 (i).
 COURT HOUSE, MONTREAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION :
 Mr. *Curran*, 2188 (i).
 COVE HEAD HARBOR SURVEYS, REPS. OF ENGINEERS,
 &c.* : Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
 CULLERS' OFFICE, QUEBEC, SURERANNATIONS* : Mr.
Langelier (*Quebec*) 66 (i).
 DEAD LETTER OFFICE AND REGISTERED LETTERS : Mr.
McMullen, 83 (i).
 DERBY BRANCH RY. EXTENSION : Mr. *Mitchell*, 514 (i).
 DIGBY WHARF, DUES COLLECTED* : Mr. *Weldon* (*St.*
John) 530 (i).
 DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL BILLS SINCE CONFED-
 ERATION : Mr. *Landerkin*, 28 (i).
 DREDGING BY STR. "PRINCE EDWARD" : Mr. *Perry*,
 159 (i).
 DREDGING, &c., MCGREGOR'S CREEK* : Mr. *Campbell*,
 530 (i).
 DREDGING RIVER THAMES* : Mr. *Campbell*, 144 (i).
 DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAM ROAD : Mr. *Bain*
 (*Wentworth*) 149 (i).
 EGGS, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS TO AND FROM ONT. AND
 QUE.* : Mr. *Guillet*, 3693 (ii).
 ELECTORAL LISTS FOR DOM., EXPENSES : Mr. *Casgrain*,
 83 (i).
 FACTORIES, LEGISLATIN* : Mr. *Lister*, 90 (i).
 FERNETVILLE P. O., CLOSING : Mr. *Beausoleil*, 529 (i).
 FISHING LICENSES, UNSETTLED RETURNS* : Mr. *Lister*,
 1065 (i).
 FLOUR IMPORTED INTO N.S., N.B. AND P.E.I. THROUGH
 U.S. : Mr. *Weldon* (*St. John*) 2671 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- FORT COULONGE AND LA PASSE VILLAGE INTERPRO-
 VINCIAL BRIDGE* : Mr. *Bryson*, 1065 (i).
 FREIGHT IN BOND ON AMERICAN VESSELS : Mr. *Laurier*,
 99 (i).
 FRENCH LANGUAGE IN N.W.T., ORDINANCES, &c.,
 PRINTED IN* : Mr. *McCarthy*, 83 (i).
 GAREAU, JOSEPH, APPOINTMENT AND REMOVAL* : Mr.
Langelier (*Quebec*) 66 (i).
 GASPÉ COUNTY MAIL SERVICE : Mr. *Joncas*, 193 (i).
 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFICERS* :
 Mr. *Mulock*, 1713 (i).
 — REPS. PUBLISHED AND SOLD* : Mr. *Ferguson*
 (*Welland*) 530, 1027 (i).
 GOVT. PROPERTY, DAMAGES TO, BY STEAMERS, &c.,
 CLAIMS : Mr. *Cook*, 1488 (i).
 GRAZING AND PASTURE LEASES IN N.W.T.* : Mr.
Charlton, 3693 (ii).
 GREAT EASTERN RY., &c. : Mr. *Rinfret*, 142 (i).
 GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE REGULATIONS : Mr. *Lan-*
derkin, 145 (i).
 HALF-BREED CLAIMS AND RES. OF LEG. ASSEMBLY,
 N.W.T. : Mr. *Laurier*, 100 (i).
 HALL'S HARBOR, N.S., REPS. OF ENGINEERS : Mr.
Borden, 2031 (i).
 HERCHMER, L. W., COM. N.W.M.P., CONTINGENCIES* :
 Mr. *Davin*, 3319 (ii).
 HOMESTEADS IN THE TERRITORIES, MEMORIALS OF J.
 HOLDEN AND J. SHERA* : Mr. *Davin*, 1065 (i).
 "HUNGRY BAY" DAM, ENGINEER'S REPS., &c.* : Mr.
Bergeron, 3319 (ii).
 HYDRAULIC RENTS, NAMES OF PARTIES IN ARREARS* :
 Mr. *Somerville*, 1065 (i).
 I. C. R. See general heading.
 INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE. See "FORT COULONGE."
 IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF EGGS TO AND FROM ONT.
 AND QUE.* : Mr. *Guillet*, 3693 (ii).
 IMPORTS OF CAN. FLOUR INTO N.S., N.B. AND P.E.I.
 THROUGH U.S. : Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John* 2671 (ii).
 INDIAN RESERVES IN MAN. : Mr. *LaRivière*, 514 (i).
 INDIANS, SELLING LIQUOR TO* : Mr. *Landerkin*, 29 (i).
 JESUITS' ESTATES ACT, REPS. AND OPINIONS OF LAW
 OFFICES OF CROWN : Mr. *O'Brien*, 95 (i).
 KAMOURASKA WHARF, ACCOUNTS re BUILDING : Mr.
Desaint, 97 (i).
 KETTLE CREEK : Mr. *Wilson* (*Elgin*) 153 (i).
 LAND DAMAGES IN YAMASKA : Mr. *Laurier*, 530 (i).
 LANDS CLAIMED UNDER MAN. ACT : Mr. *LaRivière*,
 514 (i).
 LAND SLIDE AT QUEBEC : Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*)
 63 (i).
 LA PASSE VILLAGE AND FORT COULONGE INTERPRO-
 VINCIAL BRIDGE* : Mr. *Bryson*, 1065 (i).
 LEPINE, L. P., APPOINTMENT AS SEPT. OF GOVT.
 WORKS* : Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 66 (i).
 LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, COST OF ENFORCEMENT, &c. :
 Mr. *Cook*, 1713 (i).
 LITTLE DOVER POST OFFICE : Mr. *Kirk*, 94 (i).
 LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY. : Mr. *Wilson* (*Elgin*)
 156 (i).
 LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE, PETS., COR., &c. : Mr.
Rinfret, 1680 (i).
 LUCAS, S. B., INDIAN AGENT, N.W.T., CHARGES
 AGAINST, &c.* : Mr. *Charlton*, 3319 (ii).
 MCGIRR, WILLIAM, TRAVELLING EXPENSES* : Mr.
Lister, 1065 (i).
 MCGREGOR'S CREEK, DREDGING, PILING, &c.* : Mr.
Campbell, 530 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- MACKEREL FISHING, PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS : Mr. *McIntyre*, 248 (i).
- MARINE HOSPITAL, QUEBEC* : Mr. *Langelier* (Quebec) 66 (i).
- EMIGRANT HOSPITAL, QUEBEC, EXPENDITURE, &c. : Mr. *Langelier* (Quebec) 75 (i).
- MARINE HOSPITAL, SACKVILLE, ORIGINAL COST : Mr. *Davies* (P.E.I.) 1713 (i).
- MATANE BRANCH RY., PETS., &c. re BUILDING* : Mr. *Fiset*, 3693 (ii).
- MAYBEE, MISS, DISMISSAL FROM P.O. AT QUEBEC : Mr. *Charlton*, 2187 (i).
- MEGANTIC COUNTY MAIL SERVICE, PETS. AND COR. re CHANGE : Mr. *Rinfret*, 1147 (i).
- MILITARY COLLEGE, KINGSTON, STUDENTS' MARKS : Mr. *Platt*, 1025, 1064 (i).
- MILITIA AND DEFENCE DEPT., PROMOTIONS AND CHANGES* : Mr. *Lister*, 3693 (ii).
- MINISTERS, &c., EXPENSES, SINCE CONFEDERATION : Mr. *McMullen*, 70 (i).
- MINISTERS' SALARIES AND EXPENSES : Mr. *McMullen*, 101 (i).
- MONTREAL COURT HOUSE, COST OF CONSTRUCTION : Mr. *Curran*, 2188 (i).
- MOUNT ST. NICHOLAS P.O., CHANGE OF NAME* : Mr. *Bourassa*, 3319 (ii).
- NEW LONDON HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.* : Mr. *Welsh*, 29 (i).
- NORTH SHORE RY. DEBENTURES : Mr. *Langelier* (Quebec) 55 (i).
- N.W.T., RES. OF LEG. ASSEMBLY re MONEYS VOTED BY PARLT.* : Mr. *Laurier*, 104 (i).
- ADVISORY COUNCIL, RESIGNATION* : Mr. *White* (Renfrew) 104 (i).
- MEMORIAL, PETS. AND RES. PASSED BY LEG. ASSEMBLY* : Mr. *Davin*, 212 (i).
- ONTARIO MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, COR.* : Mr. *Lister*, 90 (i).
- ORDINANCES, &c., PRINTED IN FRENCH IN N.W.T.* : Mr. *McCarthy*, 83 (i).
- OTTAWA RIVER, SANDFORD FLEMING'S REP. re SAWDUST* : Mr. *Lauderkin*, 1065 (i).
- OUELLET, N. AND A. : PETS. re Damages to properties by I.C.R.* : Mr. *Fiset*, 1713 (i).
- OYSTER PONDS POST OFFICE : Mr. *Kirk*, 93 (i).
- PAGANS, CENSUS RETURNS OF STE. ELIZABETH : Mr. *Charlton*, 513 (i).
- PALMER ROAD POST OFFICE : Mr. *Perry*, 517 (i).
- PASTURE AND GRAZING LEASES IN N.W.T.* : Mr. *Charlton*, 3693 (ii).
- PEMBROKE POST OFFICE ROBBERY : Mr. *White*, (Renfrew) 158 (i).
- PICTON HARBOR, DREDGING, &c. : COR., PETS., &c., Mr. *Platt*, 2192 (ii).
- PIERREVILLE P. O. : Mr. *Choquette*, 517 (i).
- PINETTE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.* : Mr. *Welsh*, 29 (i).
- POPULATION BY ORIGIN IN SASKATCHEWAN PROVISIONAL DISTRICT* : Mr. *Laurier*, 1065 (i).
- POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS* : Mr. *McMullen*, 29 (i).
- PRIEUR, ARTHUR, AMOUNT PAID AS TRANSLATOR OF H. OF C. : Mr. *Neveu*, 2185 (i).
- "PRINCE EDWARD," STR., DREDGING : Mr. *Perry*, 159 (i).
- PRINTING BUREAU, BUILDING, PLANT, &c., TOTAL EXPENDITURE* : Mr. *Innes*, 90 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, PAYMENTS FOR : Mr. *Doyon*, 3292 (ii).
- PROVINCIAL BILLS DISALLOWED SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c. : Mr. *Lauderkin*, 28 (i).
- PURSE SEINES AND GILL NETS : Mr. *McIntyre*, 248 (i).
- QUEBEC P. O., SUPERANNUATIONS : Mr. *Langelier*, (Quebec) 60 (i).
- "QUINTÉ," STR., REP., EVIDENCE, &c., re LOSS : Mr. *Platt*, 149 (i).
- RANGES IN N.W.T., APPLICATIONS, &c. : Mr. *Trow*, 1698 (i).
- READ AND SHANNONVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, COR., &c.* : Mr. *Burdett*, 1486 (i).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE* : Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 83 (i).
- REGISTERED LETTERS AND DEAD LETTER OFFICE : Mr. *McMullen*, 83 (i).
- REGISTRY OFFICES, N. W. T., RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES* : Mr. *Davin*, 1065 (i).
- RIMOUSKI MAIL SERVICE : Mr. *Fiset*, 1063 (i).
- RIVER DU SUD PUBLIC WORKS* : Mr. *Choquette*, 530 (i).
- "ROOTH," TUG, SEIZURE, PAPERS, &c. : Mr. *Charlton*, 1698 (i).
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE. See "MILITARY COLLEGE."
- RY. BRIDGES IN BAGOT COUNTY : Mr. *Dupont*, 141 (i).
- STE. CROIX, LOTBINIÈRE, FLOATING LIGHT OPPOSITE : PETS., COR., &c.* : Mr. *Rinfret*, 2207 (i).
- ST. GABRIEL AND ST. DAMIEN MAIL SERVICE : Mr. *Beausoleil*, 529 (i).
- ST. GERMAIN, BRUNO, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LAND* : Mr. *Laurier*, 1065 (i).
- SACKVILLE MARINE HOSPITAL, ORIGINAL COST* : Mr. *Davies* (P.E.I.) 1713 (i).
- SASKATCHEWAN COLONISATION CO. AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR* : Mr. *Somerville*, 66 (i).
- PROVISIONAL DISTRICT, POPULATION BY ORIGIN* : Mr. *Laurier*, 1065 (i).
- SAVINGS' BANKS DEPOSITS IN DOM.* : Mr. *McMullen*, 29 (i).
- SAWDUST IN OTTAWA RIVER, SANDFORD FLEMING'S REP.* : Mr. *Lauderkin*, 1065 (i).
- SELF-BINDERS, REAPERS AND MOWERS EXPORTED* : Mr. *Paterson* (Brant) 1065 (i).
- SETTLERS ON RY. RESERVE, B. C. : Mr. *Laurier*, 137 (i).
- SICK MARINERS' FUND : Mr. *Flynn*, 519 (i).
- SMITH, LATE MR. JUSTICE, N.S., COR. re LEAVE OF ABSENCE : Mr. *Jones* (Halifax) 1681 (i).
- SUBSIDIES TO RYS. SINCE CONFEDERATION : Mr. *McMullen*, 69 (i).
- SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS : Mr. *Barron*, 140 (i).
- TEMPERANCE COLONISATION CO. AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR* : Mr. *Somerville*, 66 (i).
- COR., MEMORIALS, &c. : Mr. *Wallace*, 2032 (i).
- THAMES RIVER, DREDGING* : Mr. *Campbell*, 144 (i).
- TIDAL OBSERVATIONS IN GULF AND ATLANTIC COAST : Mr. *Curran*, 527 (i).
- TIGNISH BREAKWATER REPAIRS, EXPENDITURE : Mr. *Perry*, 96 (i).
- TIMBER LIMITS GRANTED BY DOM. GOVT. SINCE MARCH, 1875 : Mr. *Charlton*, 2188 (i).
- TONNANCOURT, GEO., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LAND* : Mr. *Laurier*, 1065 (i).
- TRACADIE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.* : Mr. *Davies* (P.E.I.) 1065 (i).
- TREATIES OF COMMERCE, IMP. COR. : Gen. *Laurie*, 3666 (ii).

- RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSION*: Mr. *Barron*, 145 (i).
- TORONTO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, TENDERS, &c.*: Mr. *Barron*, 1712 (i).
- UPPER CANADA BANK: Mr. *McMullen* 100 (i).
- VESSELS LOST IN GULF AND ON ATLANTIC COAST: Mr. *Curran*, 527 (i).
- VICE-ADMIRALTY COURTS (QUE., N.S., N.B.) CASES ENTERED*: Mr. *Weldon* (*St. John*) 1065 (i).
- VOTERS' LISTS (1889) PRINTED OUTSIDE OF PRINTING BUREAU*: Mr. *Innes*, 29 (i).
- VOYER, GEO., PET. *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY BY I.C.R.*: Mr. *Fiset*, 1713 (i).
- WEST INDIA STEAM COMMUNICATION, ADVTSMNT., TENDERS, &c.*: Mr. *Ellis*, 1713 (i).
- WHARVES, PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I., EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *Perry*, 1149 (i).
- WOOD ISLAND HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP.*: Mr. *Welsch*, 29 (i).
- YAMACHICHE, FLOATING LIGHT OPPOSITE, PETS. AND COR.: Mr. *Rinfret*, 1702 (i).
- YAMASKA RIVER DAM, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS*: Mr. *Laurier*, 530, 1065 (i).
- RETURNS: Enquiry (Mr. *McMullen*, &c.) 394 (i).
- REUTER'S TELEGRAPH AGENCY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 145 (i).
- RICE, UNCLEANED: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3245 (ii).
- RICHELIEU, RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- RIFLED ORDNANCE, IMPROVED: in Com. of Sup., 1335.
- RIMOUSKI MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1063 (i).
- River Detroit Ry. Bridge Co.'s Act Amt.**
B. No. 89 (Mr. *Ferguson*, *Welland*). 1*, 794; 2*, 1020; in Com. and 3*, 2210 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- RIVER DU SUD PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Reps., &c.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 530 (i).
- ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4766 (ii).
- "ROBERTS, E. K.," AMERICAN TUG: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 3291 (ii).
- ROBERTSON, CAPT. TAIT, CANCELLATION OF LICENSE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 186 (i).
- ROBICHAU, R., GRATUITY ON RETIREMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4119.
- ROBINSON TREATY, ANNUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 2153 (i), 4051 (i).
- ROCKPORT, DEP. POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL; remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4895 (ii).
- RONDEAU POINT, GOVT. LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2022 (i).
- "ROOTH," TUG, SEIZURE, PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Charlton*) 1698 (i).
- ROULEAU'S DEBATES, QUE. LEG. COUNCIL: in Com. of Sup., 4791 (ii).
- ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 2385 (i), 3873, 4938 (ii).
— COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC: read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2376 (i), 3810 (ii).
— INFORMALTY OF PROCEDURE: remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 2594 (ii).
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE. See "MILITARY COLLEGE."
- ROYAL SOCIETY, PUBLICATION OF PROCEEDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3659.
- RUBBER BELTING: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3505 (ii).
- RULES SUSPENDED. See "PRIVATE BILLS."
- RYKERT, J. C., M.P. FOR LINCOLN, RESIGNATION, 4355
- STE. ANGELE DE MERICI MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 561 (i).
- STE. CROIX FLOATING LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2021 (i).
- ST. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 92 (i).
- St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 69** (Mr. *Rykert*). 1*, 449; 2*, 679; in Com. and 3*, 1505 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762; in Com. 4855 (ii).
— MILLING AND LUMBERING CO. *vs.* QUEEN, COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 4058 (ii).
— M. for Pets., Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2207 (i).
- ST. CHARLES BRANCH RY.: in Com. of Sup., 4014 (i).
- ST. EDMOND P.O.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 91 (i).
— ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 401 (i).
- ST. GABRIEL AND ST. DAMIEN MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 529 (i).
- ST. GERMAIN, BRUNO, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO LAND: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
- ST. HYACINTHE, PURCHASE OF LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Bécharde*) 4399 (ii).
- ST. JOHN AND PORTS IN BASIN OF MINAS, &c., STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 1963 (i).
— DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 1972 (i).
— VALLEY AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY, CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4765; in Com., 4891 (ii).
- St. Lawrence International Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 70** (Mr. *Taylor*). 1*, 449; 2*, 679 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER LIGHTS: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 142 (i).
— AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
— FISHING: Remarks (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 4569 (ii).
— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).
- ST. LOUIS (LAKE) PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 401.
— RIVER WORKS, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 245 (i).
— N.B., COMPLETION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*) 505 (i).
- ST. MICHEL WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 246 (i).
- ST. PETER'S BAY WHARF, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 246 (i).
- ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4653 (ii).
- ST. ROCH'S TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 1656 (i).
— KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 2826 (ii).

- ST. ROSAIRE P.O. : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 400 (i).
- ST. SAUVEUR FIRE, AID TO SUFFERERS : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1121 (i).
- AND "B" BATTERY : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1200 (i).
- ST. STEPHEN AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 ; in Com., 4875 (ii).
- St. Stephen's Bank B. No. 24** (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*). 1st*, 104 ; 2nd*, 186 ; in Com. and 3rd*, 531 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 3635 (ii).
- SACCHARINE : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3511 (ii).
- SACKVILLE MARINE HOSPITAL, ORIGINAL COST : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1713 (i).
- SALMON FISHING WITH NETS : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 4399.
- PICKLED, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3561 (ii).
- SALT MANUFACTURERS, PROSECUTION : Ques. (Mr. *Trov*) 1654 (i).
- INCOMPLETE RETURNS : Remarks, 2186.
- SAN FRANCISCO AND VICTORIA (B. C.) MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 1972 (i).
- Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 15** (Mr. *McMullen*). 1st*, 84 ; 2nd*, 91 (i) ; ref. back to Ry. Com., 3321 (ii).
- AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Souerville*) 66 (i).
- LAND AND HOMESTEAD CO. See "Temp. Colonisation Co."
- PROVISIONAL DISTRICT, POPULATION BY ORIGIN : M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
- Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 34** (Mr. *Small*). 1st*, 159 ; 2nd*, 186 ; in Com. and 3rd*, 2338 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- Sault Ste. Marie and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 93** (Mr. *Dawson*). 1st*, 833 ; 2nd*, 1020 (i).
- Sault Ste. Marie and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 27** (Mr. *Dawson*). 1st*, 104 ; 2nd*, 186 ; in Com. and 3rd*, 724 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS IN DOM. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 29 (i).
- Savings Banks in Ont. and Que. Act (Chap. 122 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 115** (Mr. *Choquette*). 1st*, 115 (i).
- Saving Banks in Quebec B. No. 154** (Mr. *Foster*). 1st*, 4761 ; 2nd and in Com., 4847 ; 3rd*, 4848 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- See "FINANCE."
- SAWDUST IN OTTAWA RIVER, SANDFORD FLEMING'S REP. : M. for copy* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1065 (i).
- IN RIVERS : Remarks (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4094 (ii).
- SAW LOGS, REBATE OF DUTY : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3662 (ii).
- SCHOOL LANDS IN MAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 145 (i).
- Seamen's Act (Chap. 74 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 135** (Mr. *Colby*). 1st, 3153 ; 2nd, 4359 ; in Com., 4360 ; 3rd m. and Amt. (Mr. *Wilson Elgin*) 4400 ; neg. on a div. and 3rd, 4403 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- SECRETARY OF STATE :
- BALLOT BOXES, PATENT : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 2230 (i).
- M. (Mr. *Chapleau*) re Rep. of Sel. Com., 4655 (ii).
- CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, WORKING : Ques. (Mr. *Cimon*) 1021 (i).
- CHAMPLAIN DISTRICT REVISING OFFICER : Ques. (Mr. *Angot*) 2022 (i).
- CIVIL SERVICE, APPOINTMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL MEN WITHOUT PASSING C. S. EXAM., NAMES, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lister*) 3693 (ii).
- COPYRIGHT ACT AMT., 1889 : Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 84 (i).
- DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 118 (i).
- DOMINION LICENSE ACT, EXPENSES ; remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 4906 (ii).
- ELECTORAL LISTS FOR DOM., EXPENSES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 83 (i).
- FRANCHISE ACT, DOM. AND PROVINCIAL VOTERS' LISTS : prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1489 (i).
- prop. Res. (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) to Repeal, 257 ; m., 1193 (i).
- IMPERIAL FEDERATION ASSOCIATION AND C. SERVANTS ; Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 886 (i).
- LABOR STATISTICS : prop. Res. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 4590 (ii).
- LESUEUR, P., DUAL SALARY : Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 400, 504 (i).
- remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1304 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, COST OF ENFORCEMENT, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cook*) 1713 (i).
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP. : presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 4930 (ii).
- SECRETARY OF STATE'S REP. : presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 118 (i).
- VOTERS' LIST (1889) PRINTED OUTSIDE OF PRINTING BUREAU : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Innes*) 29 (i).
- COMPLIANCE WITH ACT : Ques. (Mr. *Waldie*) 3154 (ii).
- RECEIPT OF : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3724 (ii).
- REVISED, PRINTING : remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 2380.
- REVISING OFFICERS' RETURNS : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 2827 (ii).
- REVISION : Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1357 (i).
- [See "CIVIL GOVT.," under "SUPPLY."]
- Seduction, &c.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- SEED BARLEY, DISTRIBUTION : Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 1510 (i).
- EXPECTED ARRIVAL : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1795 (i).
- SEED GRAIN ADVANCES, COLLECTION : in Com. of Sup., 4060 (ii).
- FOR SETTLERS, N.W.T., PURCHASE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
- SEEDS AND GRAINS, IMPORTS : personal explanation (Mr. *Couture*) 1069 (i).
- SEEDS IN BULK : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3505.
- SEIZURES. See "BRIDGEWATER," "ROOTH."
- SELECT STANDING COMS. See "COMMITTEES."
- SELF-BINDERS, REAPERS AND MOWERS EXPORTED : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1065 (i).

- SENATE, MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
- MACPHERSON, SENATOR : M. (Mr. *Girouard*) to summon before Priv. and Elec. Com., 2311 (i).
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY : prop. Mess. (Mr. *Rykert*) 883 (i).
- SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 3874 (ii).
- SESSIONAL INDEMNITY, ABSENT MEMBERS : M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 4935 (ii).
- SETTLERS ON RY. RESERVE, B.C. : M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 137 (i).
- SHAWINIGAN SENATORIAL DIVISION : Ques. (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 27 (i).
- SHELburne, LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4763 ; in Com., 4878 (ii).
- SHIPPING, CANADIAN, AND IMP. LEGISLATION : Remarks (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2381 (i).
- Shore Line Ry. Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 55** (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*). 1^o, 273 ; 2^o, 531 ; in Com. and 3^o, 1506 (i). (53 *Vic., c. 94*.)
- SHORT LINE RY. (HARVEY BRANCH) : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 399 (i).
- SURVEYS : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 505 (i).
- prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1553 ; neg. (Y. 61, N. 98) 1566 (i).
- Deb. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1536 ; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1539 ; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1541 ; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1543 ; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1547 ; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1550 ; (Mr. *Kirk*) 1553 ; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1557 ; (Gen. *Laurie*) 1562 ; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1563 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2674 (ii).
- SHOVELS, SPADES, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3525 (ii).
- SICK MARINERS' FUND : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Flynn*) 519 (i).
- "SIR JAMES DOUGLAS," STEAMER TO REPLACE : in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
- SKEENA EXPEDITION : in Com. of Sup., 4057 (ii).
- SLIDE AND BOOM DUES, COLLECTION : in Com. of Sup., 3872 (ii).
- SMELT FISHING IN MIRAMICHI RIVER : Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2229 (i).
- Smith, Geo. T., Relief B. No. 98** (Mr. *Small*). 1^o, 1066 ; 2^o, 1506 ; Ms. for Com., 1965 (i), 2699 ; in Com., 3227 ; 3^o m., 3319 ; Amt. (Mr. *Hickey*) 6 m. h., 3320 ; neg. (Y. 37, N. 93) and 3^o 3321 (ii). (53 *Vic., c. 107*.)
- SMITH, LATE MR. JUSTICE, N.S., LEAVE OF ABSENCE : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1681 (i).
- SNOW PLOUGHS ON GOVT. RYS. : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1656 (i).
- "ROTARY," EFFICIENCY : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1797 (i).
- South Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 67** (Mr. *Mara*). 1^o, 449 ; 2^o, 679 (i).
- SPEAKER, DEPUTY AND CHAIRMAN OF COMS. : M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 32 (i).
- SALARY : CONC., 4273 (ii).
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE : rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
- SPIRITUOUS OR ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS, &c. : in Com. on Ways and Means, 3725 (ii).
- STANDING ORDERS. See "COMMITTEES."
- STANSTEAD, RETURN OF MEMBER : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- STATIONERY AND CONTINGENCIES, SENATE : M. (Mr. *Rykert*) 883 (i).
- RES. OF SENATE : read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1341 (i).
- Steamboat Inspection Act (Chap. 78 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 118** (Mr. *Colby*). 1^o, 1792 (i) ; 2^o m., 3186 ; deb. adjd., 3190 ; 2^o on a div., 4362 ; in Com., 4362, 4663 ; 3^o, 4663 (ii). (53 *Vic., c. 17*.)
- Steamboat Inspection Act, &c., Amt. B. No. 139** (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1^o, 3512 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 4924 (ii).
- STEAMBOAT INSPECTION : in Com. of Sup., 2019 (i).
- STEAM SERVICE. See "VANCOUVER," "WEST INDIES," &c.
- STEPHENSON, MR. R., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Brien*) 92 (i).
- STEREOTYPES, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3508 (ii).
- STEWIACKE VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4764 (ii).
- STONEY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, CHAPLAINS' SALARIES : CONC., 4910 (ii).
- CORPORAL PUNISHMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1120 (i), 2826 (ii).
- SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 140 (i).
- SUBSIDIES. See :
- BAY OF QUINTE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.
- BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.
- BRANDON AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
- BRANDON (C.P.R.) BRANCH LINE.
- BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.
- CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY. CO.
- CENTRAL RY. CO. OF N.B.
- COBURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
- COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RY. CO.
- DORVAL STATION AND RIVIERE DES PRAIRIES RY.
- DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.
- ERIE AND HURON RY. CO.
- FREDERICTON AND PRINCE WILLIAM, N.B., RY. CO.
- FREDERICTON *via* OROMOCTO AND GAGETOWN RY. CO.
- GLENBOROUGH BRANCH, C.P.R.
- GREAT EASTERN RY. CO.
- GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.
- INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.
- JACQUES CARTIER UNION RY. CO.
- KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
- LAC SEUL RY. CO.
- LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.
- LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.
- LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONISATION RY. CO.
- LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY. CO.
- MANITOBA SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
- MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.
- MASKINONGE AND NIPISSING RY. CO.
- MONTREAL AND LAKE MASKINONGE RY. CO.
- MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
- MONTREAL AND SOREL RY. CO.
- MONTREAL AND WESTERN RY. CO.

SUBSIDIES—Continued.

MOUNT ORFORD RY. CO.
 NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
 NORTH-WESTERN COAL AND NAVIGATION CO.
 ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
 OTTAWA AND MORRISBURG RY. CO.
 OTTAWA AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.
 PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY.
 PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. CO.
 QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.
 QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.
 SHELburne, LIVERPOOL AND ANNAPOLIS RY.
 ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA RY. CO.
 STEWACKE VALLEY RY. CO.
 ST. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. CO.
 ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.
 ST. STEPHEN AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.
 SUMMERSIDE AND RICHMOND, P.E.I., RY. CO.
 TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.
 TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. CO.
 WATERLOO JUNCTION RY. CO.
 WOODSTOCK AND CENTREVILLE RY. CO.
 WOODSTOCK *via* LONDON TO CHATHAM RY.

[See "RAILWAYS," &c.]

Subsidies (Land) to Rys. Act Amt. B. No.

43 (Mr. Dewdney). 1*, 184; 2*, in Com. and 3*, 1077 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 3.)

Subsidies (Land) to Rys. B. No. 160 (Mr.

Dewdney). Res. prop., 4589; in Com., 4668; rep., 4694; M. to conc. and Amt. (Mr. Watson) 4832; neg. (Y. 48, N. 83) 4834; further Res., 4825; in Com., 4917; conc. in, 1*, 2*, and in Com., 4919; 3° m., 4920; 3°, 4923 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 4.)

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. No. 157 (Sir

John A. Macdonald). Res. prop., 4762; in Com., 4848; conc. in, 4893; amended Res., 4824; in Com., 4896; 1* of B., 4898; 2*, in Com. and 3*, 4917 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

SUBSIDIES TO RYS. SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for

Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 69 (i).

SUGAR CANDY, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means,

3524 (ii).

SULTANA ISLAND, LAKE OF THE WOODS: M. for Ret.

(Mr. Barron) 140.

— INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Mr. Barron) 2186

(i).

Summerside Bank B. No. 72 (Mr. Davies,

P. E. I.) 1*, 449; 2*, 679; in Com. and 3*, 1355 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 44.)

— HARBOR BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. Perry)

121, 247 (i).

— AND RICHMOND, P. E. I. RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:

prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4764 (ii).

SUNDAY CLOSING OF POST OFFICES: Ques. (Mr.

Langelier, Quebec) 1021 (i).

SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 1304 (i).

— CULLERS' OFFICE, QUEBEC: M. for O.C.'s (Mr. Lan-

gelier, Quebec) 86 (i).

— POST OFFICE, QUEBEC: M. for O.C.'s (Mr. Lan-

gelier, Quebec) 60 (i).

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Amt. (Mr. Laurier) Rebate of Duty on Corn, 390; deb. adjd., 393; rsm'd., 451; neg. (Y. 69, N. 104) 459. Amt. (Mr. Laurier) Short Line Ry., 1533; neg. (Y. 61, N. 98) 1566. Amt. (Mr. Fisher) Corn Duties, 1583; neg. on a div., 1610. Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) Public Expenditure, 1860. Amt. (Mr. Laurier) Govt. Business, Delay, 1937; neg. (Y. 57, N. 95) 1049. Remarks (Mr. Blake) Toronto University, 1950. Amt. (Mr. Amyot) Queen's Counsel, Appointments, 2099; withdn., 2141. Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright and others) Can. Dead Meat Co., 2260. Remarks (Mr. Weldon, St. John) Load Line for Can. Shipping, 2381 (i). Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) Tariff Res. (spirits or alcoholic liquors) 3633. Remarks (Mr. Charlton) Lumber Duties, 3989. Amt. (Mr. Blake) Power of Disallowance, 4083; agreed to, 4094. Remarks (Mr. Eisenhauer) Sawdust in Rivers, 4094. Amt. (Mr. Charlton) Jesuits' Estates Act, 4174; neg. (Y. 32, N. 130) 4252. Remarks (Mr. Hickey) Timber Limits, 4545. Remarks (Mr. Ellis) Albert Ry. Subsidy, 4559. Remarks (Mr. Barron) Quebec Harbor Improvements, 4563; (Mr. Curran) 4566. Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) Lieut.-Col. Forest, 4564. Remarks (Mr. Beausoleil) St. Lawrence River Fishermen, 4569. Remarks (Mr. Mulock) I.C.R. Branch Lines, 4595. Remarks (Mr. Blake and others) Caraquet Ry., 4601. Amt. (Mr. Mc Mullen) Gen. Laurie's Mileage, 4644; neg. on a div., 4649. Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) Atlantic Mail Service, 4694. Remarks (Gen. Laurie) Newfoundland Harbor Fees, 4893. Remarks (Mr. Campbell) Dredging River Thames, 4894. Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) Rockport Deputy Postmaster, 4895 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1890-91, 149 (i); suppl., 1889-90, 2531, 3955; suppl., 1890-91, 4479 (ii).

RES. (Mr. Foster) for Com.: 25; Ms. for Com., 160, 1533, 1533, 1860, 1938, 2099, 2270, 2381 (i), 3633, 3983, 4083, 4094, 4174, 4545, 4595, 4694, 4893 (ii).

IN COM., 162, 213, 353, 459, 700, 1095, 1267, 1303, 1420, 1568, 1610, 1920, 1953, 1970, 2141, 2260, 2313, 2339, 2383 (i), 3634, 3779, 3992, 4036, 4113, 4253, 4570, 4649 4696, 4766, 4896 (ii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. See "Justice."

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:

Agricultural Societies, N.W.T., 2384 (i).
 Barley (two-rowed) purchase and distribution, 3999
 Census and Statistics, 2386 (i), 4650 (ii).
 Criminal Statistics, 498 (i).
 Dairying Interest, development, 2399 (ii).
 Experimental Farms, 715 (i), 3779, 4795 (ii).
 Health Statistics, 498 (i).
 Jamaica Exhibition, Can. representation, 4796 (ii).
 Macdonald, G. L., Exhibit of Stone, Phil. Ex., 4796
 Patent Record, 496 (i), 4000; conc., 4272 (ii).
 Public Health, 4001 (ii).

Charges of Management:

General Vote, 161 (i).

Canals. See "Railways" and "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Civil Government :

- Agriculture Dept., 179 (i).
- Contingencies :
 - Agriculture Dept., 473 (i).
 - Civil Service Examiners, 218 (i).
 - Deptl. Buildings (care and cleaning) 474 (i).
 - Indian Affairs, 387 (i).
 - Interior, Dept., 381 (i).
 - General, suppl., 4575 (ii).
 - Governor General's Secretary's Office, 222 (i).
 - Marine Dept., 474 (i).
 - High Commissioner (personal) 213 (i).
 - Militia and Defence, 375 (i).
 - Penitentiaries, Inspector's travelling expenses, 354 (i).
 - Printing Bureau (care and cleaning) 475 (i).
 - Printing and Stationery Dept., 356 (i).
 - Post Office Dept., 472 (i).
 - Privy Council Office, 224, 353 (i).
 - Public Works Dept., 470 (i).
 - Queen's Printer's Dept., 3992 (ii).
 - Railways and Canals, 3993, 4570 (ii).
 - Secretary of State's Dept., 460 (i).
- Customs Dept., 176 (i) ; suppl., 4574 (ii).
- Finance (Statistical Diagrams) 4571 (ii).
- Fisheries Dept., 180 (i).
- Governor General's Secretary's Office, 168 (i).
- Indian Affairs, Dept., 173 (i) ; suppl., 4574 (ii).
- Inland Revenue Dept., 176 (i).
- Interior, Dept. 171 (i) ; suppl., 4573 (ii).
- Geological Survey, 173 (i).
- Justice Dept., 168 (i).
- Penitentiaries Branch, 168 (i).
- Marine Dept., 179 (i).
- Militia and Defence Dept., 168 (i).
- Postmaster General's Dept., 176 (i).
- Interest on Deposits, calculating, 3994 (ii).
- Printing and Stationery Dept., 169 (i).
- Privy Council Office, 168 (i) ; conc., 4272 (ii).
- Public Works Dept., 180 (i).
- Queen's Printer's Dept., J. G. Barrette (extra services) 3992 (ii).
- Railways and Canals Dept., 180 (i), 3779, 4570 (ii).
- Secretary of State's Dept., 168 (i).
- Civil Service List, compilation, &c., 3992 (ii).
- Collection of Revenues :*
- Adulteration of Food, 2344 (i).
- Canals :
 - Remuneration to Govt. Employés for Saturday night and Sunday services, 4152, 4793 (ii).
 - Repairs and Working Expenses, 3865 (ii).
- Culling Timber, 2343 ; suppl., 4121 (ii).
- Customs :
 - Dyke, John, payment for services, 4119 (ii).
 - Nova Scotia, 1420 (i).
 - Robichau, R., Gratuity on retirement, 4119 (i).
- Dominion Lands—Income :
 - General Vote, (ii) 3659.
- Excise :
 - Cullen, Patriek, extra services, 4120 (ii).
 - Distilleries and Factories (extra pay of officers) 2337 (i).
 - Fréchette, A., translation of circulars, 2339 (i).
 - Manager, increase of salary, 4791 (ii).
 - Methylated spirits, supply to manufactories, 2341.
 - Nash, Collector, extra services, 4792 (ii).
 - Officers and Inspectors (salaries) 2313 (i).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Collection of Revenues—Continued.

- Preventive Service, 2335 (i).
- Travelling Expenses, Rent, Fuel, &c., 2338 (i).
- Minor Revenues :
 - Liquor License Act, 1883.
 - Costs of Prosecutions and Fines, 4121, 4255 (ii).
- Ordnance Lands :
 - Law Costs, Commissions, &c., 4121 (ii).
 - Post Office, 2288 (i), 4153, 4794 (ii).
- Public Works :
 - Slide and Boom Dues, Collection, 3872 (ii).
 - Telegraph Lines, Land and Cable, 3872 (ii).
 - Telegraph Lines, N.W.T., 3873 (ii).
- Railways :
 - Repairs and Working Expenses :
 - Cape Breton Ry., 3809 (ii).
 - Forbes, W. B., Arrears Travelling Expenses, 4150 (ii).
 - Intercolonial, 3802 (ii).
 - Prince Edward Island Ry., 3808, 4123 (ii).
 - Weights and Measures, 2343 (i).
 - Kelly, M., increase of salary, 4792 (ii).
 - Patterson, A. C., increase of salary, 4792 (ii).
- Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."*
- Dominion Lands—Capital :*
- Surveys, Exam. of Returns, Printing Plans, &c., 4155 (ii).
- Dominion Police :*
- General Vote, 494 (i).
- Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."*
- Fisheries :*
- General Vote, 2351 (i), 4779 (ii).
- Fish-breeding Stations, clearing rivers, &c., 2370 (i)
- Fishery Protection Steamers, maintenance, &c., 2375 (i).
- Fishing Bounty, expenses *re* distribution, 2376 (i).
- New Brunswick, 2352 (i).
- Nova Scotia, 2352 (i).
- Prince Edward Island, 2353 (i).
- Protection, 4779 (ii).
- Geological Survey :*
- General Vote, 2124 (i).
- Artesian Borings, 4789 (ii).
- Fletcher, Jas., services (entomological) 4789 (ii).
- Government of N. W. T. :*
- General Vote, 2306 (i).
- Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."*
- Immigration :*
- General Vote, 2403 (i) ; suppl., 4001, 4797 ; conc., 4915 (ii).
- European Agencies, 3647 (ii).
- Halifax Agent, 2449 (i).
- Interpreter (assistant) Winnipeg, 2471 (i).
- Ottawa Agent, 2448 (i).
- Vancouver Agent, 2472 (i).
- Victoria, B.C., Agent, 2471 (i),
- Winnipeg Agent, 2449 (i).
- Indians :*
- Ontario, Quebec and Maritime Provinces :
 - General Vote, 2151 (i).
 - Lake of Two Mountains Indians removal to Gibson, 2156 (i).
 - Oneida, &c., grant to Agricul. Soc., 4783 (ii).
 - Robinson Treaty, Annuities, 2153 (i), 4051 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Indians—Continued.

- Ontario, Quebec and Maritime Provinces—*Con.*
Schools, Ont., Que., N.S. and N.B., 2151 (i), 4787 (ii).
Survey of Reserves, 2157 (i).
British Columbia, 2165, 4043 (ii).
Manitoba and N. W. T., 2170 (i), 4788 (ii).
Schools, Day and Boarding, 2172 (i), 4045 (ii).
Nova Scotia, Medical Services, 4052 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 2164 (i).

Insurance Superintendence :

- General Vote, 2124 (i).

Justice, Administration of :

- Exchequer Court, 3rd class Clerk, 482 (i).
General Vote 475 (i).
Law Reports and Text Books, Supreme Court Library, 482 (i).
Librarian, Supreme Court, 479 (i).
Printing, &c., Supreme Court Reports, 481 (i).
Registrar, Vice-Admiralty Court, Quebec, 482 (i).
Vice-Admiralty Court, P.E.I., salary of Judge, 3994, 4575 (ii).

Legislation :

- House of Commons :
Contingencies, 711 (i).
Express Service between H. of C. and Printing Bureau, 4011 (ii).
Library, Salaries, &c., 713 (i).
Printing, paper and book-binding, 715 (i).
Salaries, per Clerk's estimate, 704 (i).
Speaker, Deputy, Salary, conc., 4273 (ii).
Thompson, J. S., Indemnity to Heirs, 4003 (ii).
Translators (extra French), 4008 (ii).
Wilson, Dr., late Law Clerk, Gratuity to Family, 4012 (ii).

Senate :

- Miscellaneous Expenses, 700 (i).
Salaries and Contingencies, 3874 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service :

- Lower Traverse River, Pier and Lighthouse, 2019.

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions :

- Campbellton and Gaspé, 1961 (i).
Canada and United Kingdom, 4773 ; conc., 4915 (ii).
Grand Manan and Mainland, 1957 (i).
Halifax and St. John, and West Indies and South America, 1973 (i) ; conc., 4275 (ii).
Halifax and Newfoundland *via* Cape Breton, 1964, 1970 (i).
Liverpool or London, and St. John and Halifax, 1958 (i).
Magdalen Islands, Steam Communication, 1953 (i).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 1961 (i).
San Francisco and Victoria, B.C., 1972 (i).
St. John and ports in Basin of Minas, &c., 1963 (i).
St. John, Digby and Annapolis, 1972 (i).

Marine Hospital :

- General Vote, 2019 (i).
Quebec, Gratuity to Dr. P. A. Wells, 4043 (ii).

Militia :

- Ammunition, Clothing and Military Stores, 1316 (i).
Armories (Public) and care of Arms, 1320 (i).
Contingencies, &c., Grants to Artillery and Rifle Associations, Bands and efficient Corps, 1331 (i).
Drill Instruction, 1320 (i).
King, Major R. S., prop. payment to Estate, 4012, 4156 4898 (i).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Militia—Continued.

- Militia Branch and District Staff, salaries, 1315 (i).
Military Property, &c., Care and Maintenance, 1335 (i).
Military College, Kingston, 1337 (i) ; conc., 4273 (ii).
Monuments, erection of two, 4651 (i).
Permanent Forces, Pay and Maintenance, 1341 (i).
Rifled Ordnance, Improved, 1335 (i).

Miscellaneous :

- Banff Hot Springs, Roads and Bridges, 3658 (ii).
B.C. *vs.* Attorney General of Can., Costs of Appeal, 4118 (ii).
Cartwright's Cases, Aid to publish, 3658 (ii).
Commercial Agencies, 3658 (ii).
"Cruiser," Govt. Yacht, repairs, &c., 4118 (ii).
Desjardins' "Débats Parlementaires de Québec," 4113 (ii).
Dictionnaire Généalogique de l'Abbé Tanguay, 3659 (ii).
Eau Clair and Bow River Lumber Co. *vs.* Queen, Costs, 4060 (ii).
Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies, 3658 (ii).
Gophers, N. W. T., destruction, 4790 (ii).
Half-breeds, Relief of Distress in N. W. T., 4069 (ii).
Indians of N. W. and B. C., Grant to Supplement Vote by British Association, 4167 (ii).
Labor Congress (Paris) preparation of Rep., 4815, 4901 (ii).
Lands in C. P. R. Belt, Examination, 4067 (ii).
"Le Vieux Lachine," 4791 (ii).
"Le Dictionnaire Généalogique des Familles Canadiennes," 4116 (ii).
"Les Bourgeois du Nord-Ouest," 4791 (ii).
N. W. T., Expenses of Govt., 4066 (ii).
Old Records of Can., 4791 (ii).
Orders in Council, Collection, 3658 (ii).
Printing Bureau, additional Plant, 4118, 4814 ; conc., 4274 (ii).
Records, classification of Old, 4118 (ii).
Rouleau's Debates Quebec Legis. Council, 4791 (ii).
Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings, 3659 (ii).
Seed Grain Advances, Collection, 4060 (ii).
Skeena Expedition, 4057 (ii).
St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co. *vs.* Queen, Costs, 4058 (ii).
Taschereau's Work on "Criminal Law," 4069 (ii).
- Mounted Police :
General Vote, 2345 (i) ; suppl., 4053 (ii).
- North-West Territories. See "Government."
- Ocean and River Service :
Canadian Registration of Shipping, 2017 (i).
Princess Louise and Lansdowne, J. O'Brien's claim, 4041 (ii).
Quebec River Police, 2018 (i).
Sir James Douglas, steamer to replace, 4779 (ii).
Tidal Observations, 4041 (ii).
- Open Account :
Seed-Grain for Settlers in N. W. T., Purchase and Supply, 4167 (ii).
- Penitentiaries :
British Columbia, 3646 (ii).
Blake, Convict, expenses of transfer to England, 3999 (ii).
Dorchester, 3637 (ii).
Kingston, 496 (i) 3634 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Penitentiaries—Continued.

- Manitoba, 3637 (ii).
- Chaplains' salaries, increase: conc., 4910 (ii).
- Maintenance and Repairs, 4650 (ii).
- Stoney Mountain, conc., 4910 (ii).
- Regina Jail, 3647 (ii).
- St. Vincent de Paul, 3635 (ii).
- Moylan, J. G., services on Royal Commission, 4649 (ii).

Pensions:

- Compensation in lieu of Land, 1267 (i).
- Police. See "Dominion Police."
- Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."

Public Works*—Capital:

- Cape Tormentine Harbor, 1098 (i).
- Esquimalt Graving Dock, 1105 (i).
- Kingston Graving Dock, 1097 (i).
- Ottawa, additional Building, 4696; conc., 4914 (ii).
- Port Arthur Harbor and Kaministiquia River, 1095 (i).
- St. Lawrence River, Improvement of Ship Channel, 1099 (i).

Public Works—Income:

- Buildings:
 - British Columbia, 1443 (i).
 - Manitoba, 1439 (i), 4038, 4719 (ii).
 - New Brunswick, 1111 (i), 4700 (ii).
 - North-West Territories, 1443 (i), 4039, 4719 (ii).
 - Nova Scotia, 1106, 1443 (i), 4036, 4698 (ii).
 - Ontario, 1437 (i), 4036, 4702 (ii).
 - Prince Edward Island, 4700 (ii).
 - Public Buildings generally, 1443 (i).
 - Quebec, 1112 (i), 4036, 4702 (ii).

Dredging:

- Manitoba, 1648 (i).
- Maritime Provinces (new plant) 4729 (ii).
- Nova Scotia, 1631 (i).

Experimental Farm, 2383 (i).

Harbors and Rivers:

- British Columbia, 4728 (ii).
- Harbors and Rivers generally, 1630 (i), 4166 (ii).
- Manitoba, 1627 (i), conc.; 4915 (ii).
- Maritime Provinces generally, 1615 (i), 4040 (ii).
- New Brunswick, 1610 (i), 4726 (ii).
- Nova Scotia, 1568 (i), 4720 (ii).
- Ontario, 1617 (i), 4040, 4727; conc., 4274 (ii).
- Prince Edward Island, 1569 (i), 4721 (ii).
- Quebec, 4040, 4726 (ii).

Miscellaneous, 1651 (i).

- Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c., 1455 (i).
- Roads and Bridges, 4766 (ii).
- Telegraph Lines, 1648 (i), 4772 (ii).

British Columbia, 4773 (ii).

Nova Scotia, 4041 (ii).

Quarantine:

- Cattle Quarantine, 3657 (ii).
- Chatham, N.B., 4001 (ii).
- Grosbe Isle, 3654 (ii).
- Public Health, precautionary measures, 3655 (ii).
- Tracadie Lazaretto, 3654 (ii).

Railways and Canals—Income:

- Canals:
 - Carillon and Grenville, 4655; conc., 4913 (ii).

* See "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Railways and Canals—Income—Continued.

- Chambly, 2288 (i).
- Lachine, 2288 (i), 4653 (ii).
- St. Peter's, 4654 (ii).
- Welland, 4654 (ii).
- Railways:
 - Surveys and Inspections, 4021 (ii).
 - Special Car for His Ex., 4021 (ii).
 - Concurrence, 4911 (ii).

Railways and Canals*—Capital:

Canals:

- Cornwall, 2275 (i).
- Lachine, 2275 (i).
- Murray, 2277 (i).
- St. Peter's, 4653 (ii).
- Tay, 2288 (i), 4652 (ii).
- Trent River Navigation, 2277 (i).
- Welland, 2277 (i).

Railways:

- Canadian Pacific Ry., construction, 4013, 4653 (ii).
- Cape Breton Ry., 4019 (ii).
- Eastern Extension Ry., 1936 (i).
- Grand Narrows Bridge, 4021 (ii).
- Intercolonial Ry.:
 - Dartmouth Branch, 4014 (ii).
 - Halifax, increased accommodation, 1920 (i).
 - Moncton, increased accommodation, 4014 (ii).
 - Montreal and European Short Line Ry., 4796.
 - St. Charles Branch, 4014 (ii).
 - Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., 1933 (i), 4017 (ii).

Statistics. See "Arts, Agriculture," &c.

Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies."

Superannuation, 1304 (i).

Superintendence of Insurance. See "Insurance."

Steamboat Inspection:

- General Vote, 2019 (i).

Territorial Accounts, 4253 (ii).

Unprovided Items, 4156 (ii).

CONCURRENCE:

- Can. and United Kingdom Mail Service, 4915 (ii).
- Carillon and Grenville Canals (repairs) 4913 (ii).
- Harbors and Rivers, Ont., 4274 (ii).
- Halifax and St. John and W. Indies and S. America, 4275 (ii).
- Immigration, suppl., 4915 (ii).
- Military College, Kingston, 4273 (ii).
- Ottawa, additional building, 4914 (ii).
- Privy Council Office, 4272 (ii).
- Patent Record, 4272 (ii).
- Printing Bureau, including Electric Light Plant, 4274 (ii).
- Railways and Canals (Income) 4911 (ii).
- Red River Survey, 4915 (ii).
- Speaker's (Deputy) salary, 4273 (ii).
- Stoney Mountain Penitentiary, Chaplains' salaries, 4910 (ii).

Supply B. No. 158 (Mr. Foster). Res. 4916; 1° of B., 2°, 3°, 4917 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 1.)

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act. Amt. B. No. 129 (Sir John Thompson). 1°, 2595; 2° and in Com., 3160; 3°, 3161 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 35.)

* For Repairs and Working Expenses, see "Collection of Revenues."

- SUPREME COURT LIBRARY, LAW REPORTS AND TEXT BOOKS: in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
- SUPREME COURT REPS., PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
- SUPREME COURT, N.S., APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. Jones, *Halifax*) 885 (i).
- SURGICAL BELTS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3233 (ii).
- INSTRUMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3487 (ii).
- SURVEY AND INSPECTION OF CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).
- IN N. W. T., COST PER ACRE: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 402 (i).
- OF INDIAN RESERVES: in Com. of Sup., 2157.
- TARIFF, THE. See "WAYS AND MEANS."
- RES., SPIRITS OR ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3633 (ii).
- TASCHEREAU'S WORK ON "CRIMINAL LAW": in Com. of Sup., 4069 (ii).
- TASSÉ, ELIE, AND L. D. DUVERNAY, EMPLOYMENT BY H. OF C.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4026 (ii).
- TAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2288 (i), 4652 (ii).
- TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 1648 (i), 3873, 4041, 4772 (ii).
- LAND AND CABLE: in Com. of Sup., 3872 (ii).
- See "CAPE BRETON RY."
- TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4824; in Com., 4896 (ii).
- TEMPERANCE COLONISATION CO. AND DEPT. OF INTERIOR: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 66 (i).
- M. for Cor., Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Wallace*) 2032 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 4907 (ii).
- TERRITORIAL ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 4253 (ii).
- Territorial Real Property Act** (*Chap. 51 Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 131** (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 2914; 2° m., 3198; withdn., 4924 (ii).
- THAMES RIVER, REMOVAL OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 55 (i).
- DREDGING: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Campbell*) 144 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4894 (ii).
- THOMPSON, J. S., INDEMNITY TO HEIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).
- Thousand Islands Bridge and Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 94** (Mr. *Bell*). 1°, 833; 2°, 1020 (i).
- THREATS, INTIMIDATIONS, &c., PROP. LEG.: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1857 (i).
- THREE PER CENT. LOAN OF 1888: Ques. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 27 (i).
- TIDAL OBSERVATIONS IN GULF AND ON ATLANTIC COAST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 527 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).
- TIGNISH BREAKWATER REPAIRS, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Perry*) 96 (i).
- WHARFINGER, RETS. TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 561 (i).
- Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 45** (Mr. *Brown*). 1°, 212; 2°, 273; in Com. and 3°, 1019 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- TIMBER LIMITS: enquiry for Rets (Mr. *Charlton*) 2674 (ii).
- GRANTED BY DOM. GOVTS. SINCE MARCH, 1885: M. for List (Mr. *Charlton*) 2188 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Hickey*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4545 (ii).
- See "LINCOLN, MEMBER FOR."
- TOBACCO, NATIVE GROWN: Ques. (Mr. *Thérien*) 2229 (i).
- SALES AND INLAND REVENUE ACT AMT: Ques. (Mr. *Small*) 85 (i).
- SEIZURES, IN N.W.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4171.
- TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4824; in Com., 4896 (ii).
- TONNANCOURT, GEO., CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO LAND: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1065 (i).
- Toronto Board of Trade B. No. 109** (Mr. *Small*). 1°, 1420; 2°, 1506; in Com. and 3°, 1965 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 1712 (i).
- Toronto Savings Bank Charitable Trusts B. No. 113** (Mr. *Small*). 1°, 1581; 2°, 1610; in Com. and 3°, 1965 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- UNIVERSITY FIRE: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1950 (i).
- TOURIGNY, HONORÉ, M.P.P., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2377 (i).
- TRACADIE HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1065 (i).
- LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 3654 (ii).
- TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 26 (i).
- TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2312 (i).
- Trade Combines.** See "COMBINATIONS"
- Trade Marks and Industrial Designs Act Amt. B. No. 18** (Mr. *Carling*). 1°, 90; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1076 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- TRANSLATORS, EXTRA, IN H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 4008 (ii).
- TRAWL FISHING IN ST. MARY'S BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2377 (i).
- TREATIES OF COMMERCE, COMS. BETWEEN H. M.'S GOVT. AND DOM. GOVT.: M. for copies (Gen. *Laurie*) 3666 (ii).
- TREES AND NURSERY STOCK: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3460 (ii).
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL BRIDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Barron*) 3703 (ii).
- COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 118 (i).
- M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barron*) 145 (i).
- TRUNKS, VALISES, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3528 (ii).
- Tug "ROOTH." See "ROOTH."

- TWINE, HARVEST BINDING : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3542 (ii).
- UMBRELLAS, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3546.
- UNIVERSITY FOR N.W.T. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3315
- UNPROVIDED ITEMS : in Com. of Sup., 4156 (ii).
- UPPER CANADA BANK : M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 100 (i).
- U.S. Fishing Vessels and "Modus Vivendi" B. No. 134** (Sir *John Thompson*).
1°, 3153; 2°, 3593; in Com., 3595, 3876; 3°*, 3878 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- U.S. VESSELS. See "AMERICAN."
- VACANCIES : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 83 (i), 3439, 3722, 4396 (ii).
- VALQUETTE'S PENSION: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2311 (i).
- AND HURRELL'S PENSIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 2258 (i).
- AND COL. HUGHES: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 3591 (ii).
- VALLEYFIELD, USE OF DAM BY PUBLIC: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 884 (i).
- VANCOUVER AND JAPAN STEAMSHIP SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 86 (i).
- VANCOUVER ISLAND, IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 2472 (ii).
- Vaudreuil and Prescott Ry. Co.** See "MONTREAL AND OTTAWA RY. CO."
- VESSELS LOST IN GULF AND ON ATLANTIC COAST : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 527 (i).
- VICE-ADMIRALTY COURT (P.E.I.) SALARY OF JUDGE : in Com. of Sup., 3994, 4575 (ii).
- (QUE., N.S. AND N.B.) CASES ENTERED : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1065 (i).
- REGISTRAR : in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
- Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 84** (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 722; 2°*, 1019; in Com. and 3°*, 1610 (i). (53 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- VICTORIA, B. C., IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 2471;
- VICTORIA, B. C., RETURN OF MEMBER: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- Vivian, H. H., & Co.'s B. No. 24** (Mr. *Dawson*)
1°*, 2097; 2°*, 2338 (i); in Com., 3231, 3622; 3°*, 3623 (ii). (53 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
- VOLLET, ROBT., EXPENSES OF TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 27 (i).
- VOLUNTEERS' SCRIP : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1485 (i).
- VOTERS' LISIS (1889) PRINTED OUTSIDE OF PRINTING BUREAU : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Innes*) 29 (i).
- REVISION : Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1357 (i).
- PRINTING : Remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 2380 (i).
- REVISING OFFICERS' RETURNS: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 2827 (ii).
- COMPLIANCE WITH ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Waldie*) 3154 (ii).
- RECEIPT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3724 (ii).
- VOYER, GEO., PET. *re* DAMAGES TO PROPERTY BY I. C. R. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Fiset*) 1713 (i).
- Walker, Emily.** See "DIVORCE."
- WATCHES, CASES, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3552 (ii).
- WATERLOO JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 4762; in Com., 4853 (ii).
- WAYS AND MEANS : prop. Res. for Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 26 (i).
- BUDGET, THE : Annual Statement (Mr. *Foster*) 2532 (ii).
- Ms. for Com., 3081, 3208, 3233, 3384, 3460, 3523, 3724, 4480, 4910, 4916 (ii).
- Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2566; (Mr. *Colby*) 2585; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 2596; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 2616; (Mr. *Charlton*) 2634; (Mr. *Ferguson, Wellingland*) 2656; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2645; (Mr. *Broten*) 2767; (Mr. *Flynn*) 2782; (Mr. *Heason*) 2787; (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2807; (Mr. *McKeen*) 2818; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 2829; (Gen. *Laurie*) 2845; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2853; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2856; (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 2876; (Mr. *MacMillan, Huron*) 2878; (Mr. *Fisher*) 2892; (Mr. *Turcot*) 2903; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2917; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2930; (Mr. *Watson*) 2951; (Mr. *Porter*) 2958; (Mr. *Ellis*) 2970; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 2978; (Mr. *Daly*) 2988; (Mr. *Seiple*) 3001; (Mr. *Ward*) 3008; (Mr. *Cameron*) 3012; (Mr. *Barron*) 3015; (Mr. *Masson*) 3022; (Mr. *Hall*) 3030; (Mr. *Platt*) 3030; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3044; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3055; (Mr. *Ross*) 3059; (Mr. *Davin*, 3069 (ii).
- TARIFF CHANGES :
[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]
(Acetic and pyroligneous acid, &c.) 3098; (Acid, phosphate) 3099; (Advertising pamphlets, &c.) 3243; (Animals, living) 3099, 3104, 3208, 4480; (Apples) 3402; (Axle grease) 3233; (Bank notes) 3243; (Beans, Tonquin) 3584; (Blacking, &c.) 3243; (Bookbinders' tools and implements) 3244; (Boots and shoes) 3561; (Braces or suspenders) 3244; (Brass for printers' rules) 3244; (Builders', &c., hardware) 3486; (Buttons, vegetable ivory, &c.) 3384; (Cabinets of coins, &c.) 3584; (Chalk-stone, china, &c.) 3584; (Clocks and clock cases) 3388; (Clothing, ready made, &c.) 3554; (Cocoa paste, &c.) 3390; (Collars, cotton, &c.) 3390, 3401; (Colors, dry) 3503; (Corn, Indian) 3584, 3598; (Corset clasps, &c.) 3485; (Cotton cordage, &c.) 3392; (Cotton denims, &c.) 3400; (Cotton twine) 3541; (Drain pipes, &c.) 3401; (Ether, sulphuric) 3558; (Fancy workboxes) 3244; (Feathers) 3225; (Feathers, ostrich) 3402; (Ferro-manganese) 3486; (Fibre ware, indurated, &c.) 3554; (Fish hooks, nets, &c.) 3585; (Geographical, &c., maps and globes) 3243; (Gloves and mitts) 3484; (Hammocks and tennis nets, &c.) 3401; (Hats, fur, felt, &c.) 3485; (Hickory spokes) 3586; (India rubber boots, &c.) 3485; (Iron or steel, wrought, &c.) 3498; (Iron, wrought, scrap, &c.) 3558; (Jellies, jams, &c.) 3498; (Lard, tried, &c.) 3498; (Leather board, &c.) 3500; (Leather, Morocco skins) 3500; (Lumber, timber, planks, &c.) 3585; (Newspapers or Suppl. editions, &c.) 4243; (Oils, lubricating) 3502; (Opium, crude) 3503; (Pails, tubs, &c.) 3553; (Paints and colors) 3504; (Paper hanging) 3504; (Peaches) 3439; (Pickles, in bottles) 3504; (Picks and mattocks, &c.) 3524; (Plants, fruit, &c.) 3531; (Plumbago) 3505; (Pork) 3501; (Pork, mess) 3562; (Precious stones) 3099; (Rice, uncleaned) 3245; (Rubber belting) 3505; (Saccharine) 3511; (Salmon, pickled, &c.) 3561;

WAYS AND MEANS—Continued.

TARIFF CHANGES—Continued.

- (Seeds, in bulk) 3505; (Shovels, spades, &c.) 3525; (Spirituous or alcoholic liquors, &c.) 3725; (Stereotypes, &c.) 3508; (Sugar candy, &c.) 3524; (Surgical belts, &c.) 3233; (Surgical instruments, &c.) 3487; (Trees and nursery stock) 3460; (Trunks, valises, &c.) 3528; (Twine, harvest binding) 3542; (Umbrellas, &c.) 3546; (Watches, cases, &c.) 3552; (Wheat flour) 3269; (Woollen manufactures) 3556; (Yeast, compressed) 3556 (ii).
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES : in Com. of Sup., 2343 (i).
 ——— INSPECTION FEES : Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 1121 (i).
- WELLAND CANAL. See "SUPPLY."
 ——— REP. OF MR. WOOD : Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 885 (i).
 ——— M. (Mr. Ferguson, Welland) to lay on Table, 1515 (i).
- WELLS, P. A., GRATUITY TO : in Com. of Sup., 4043.
- WEST INDIA STEAM COMMUNICATION, ADVTSMNT., TENDER, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. Ellis) 1713 (i).
- West Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 68 (Mr. Mara). 1^o, 449; 2^o*, 679 (i).
- WESTERN UNION TEL. CO. See "CAPE BRETON."
- WHARVES IN MONTMAGNY COUNTY, PUBLIC USE : Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 4026 (ii).
- WHARVES, PIERS AND BREAKWATER, P.E.I., EXPENDITURE : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Perry) 1149 (i).
- WHEAT FLOUR : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3269.
- WILSON, DR., LATE LAW CLERK, GRATUITY TO FAMILY : in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).
- Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 155 (Mr. Daly). Rules suspended, 4821; 1^o* and 2^o*, 4822; in Com. and 3^o*, 4906; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4930 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 80.)
- WINNIPEG IMMIGRATION AGENT : in Com. of Sup., 2449 (ii).
- WOOD ISLAND HARBOR SURVEY, ENGINEER'S REP. : M. for copy* (Mr. Welsh) 29 (i).
- WOOD, MR. A. F. See "WELLAND CANAL."
- WOOD, JOHN FISHER, APPOINTMENT AS DEP. SPEAKER, &c., 32 (i).
- Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B. No. 156 (Mr. Hesson). Rules suspended, 4846; 1^o and 2^o on a div., 4846; in Com. and 3^o*, 4906 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 83.)
- WOODSTOCK AND CENTREVILLE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 4763 (ii).
- WOODSTOCK *via* LONDON TO CHATHAM RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res., 4762; in Com., 4855 (ii).
- Wrecking and Towing Vessels, &c. (Reciprocity) B. No. 2 (Mr. Charlton). 1^o*, 26; 2^o called, 146 (i); Order for 2^o dschgd., 3704 (ii).
- Wrecking and Towing Privileges (U.S. in Can. Waters) B. No. 3 (Mr. Ferguson, Welland). 1^o* 26 (i); Order for 2^o dschgd.
- Wrecking (Foreign Vessels Aid) in Canadian Waters B. No. 4 (Mr. Kirkpatrick). 1^o*, 26 (i).
- WOOLLEN MANUFACTURES : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3556 (ii).
- YAMACHICHE, FLOATING LIGHT OPPOSITE : M. for Pets. and Cor. (Mr. Rinfret) 1702 (i).
- YAMASKA RIVER DAM, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO LANDS : M. for copies* (Mr. Laurier) 530, 1065.
- YEAST, COMPRESSED : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3556 (ii).
- York County incorp. B. No. 39 (Mr. Denison). 1^o*, 184; 2^o, 352 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 3228 (ii). (53 Vic., c. 41.)